

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 11 April 2019 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Brad Inman opened the meeting at 9:47 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Mr. Patrick Williams, NOAA Fisheries

Mr. Brad Inman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman, sitting for Mr. Mark Wingate

Mr. Brian Lezina, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)

Mr. Quin Kinler, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), sitting for Britt Paul

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

A copy of the agenda is included as **Encl 1**. A copy of the sign-in sheet is included as **Encl 2**.

2. Agenda Item 1. Meeting Initiation

Mr. Inman introduced himself. He announced the delayed arrival of Technical Committee member Darryl Clark (and other eastbound attendees) due to a traffic accident on the Atchafalaya Basin Bridge. He asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves. He acknowledged Sarah Bradley and Kaitlyn Carriere, who are absent today in order to fulfill other appointments/obligations integral to the CWPPRA Program, but whose efforts render these proceedings effectual. Mr. Inman asked for any opening comments from the Technical Committee; none were proffered.

Mr. Inman opened to floor for any changes to the agenda for today's proceedings. Mr. Kinler proposed that the item for project ME-11 – Humble Canal Hydrologic Restoration (under agenda item #8a) – be removed from the agenda and taken up at a later meeting.

**Decision: Mr. Kinler made the motion to change the agenda as stated above. Ms. McCormick seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.**

Lastly, Mr. Inman iterated the protocol for public comment and reminded all attendees to sign in.

3. Agenda Item 2. Report: Status of CWPPRA Program Funds and Projects (Jernice Cheavis, USACE)

Ms. Jernice Cheavis, USACE, presented an overview of the status of CWPPRA funds as follows: The fully funded total program estimate since its inception through PPL 1 – 28 is \$2,941 billion. Total projected state and federal sources of funding (through FY21) for all authorized projects in addition to projected Department of the Interior (DOI) funds is \$2.104 billion. A potential gap of \$837 million remains if the Program were to construct all projects to date. Current Task Force-approved funding for projects in Phase I, Phase II and O&M totals \$2.112 billion. Authorized funding obligated to each agency for approved project phases currently totals \$1.812 billion.

Ms. Cheavis continued with an overview of funding as it relates to the electronic Task Force vote in February 2019, which authorized PPL-28. As a result of that vote, four projects – Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Creation, East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing, Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation (West), and Long Point Bayou Marsh Creation – were authorized for Phase I funding, at a total of \$13,239,163. The Task Force also authorized two other projects for Phase II,

Increment I funding – New Orleans Landbridge Shoreline Stabilization and Marsh Creation (PO-169) and Bayou DeCade Ridge and Marsh Creation (TE-138), at a total estimate of \$43,725,099. When subtracted the total available program funds (as of January 2019), the above stated authorizations result in a remaining total of \$15,631,433 available for today’s proceedings. A project scope change for Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Creation (BA-171) will be proposed at later today, and would increase the program estimate by \$5,588,553; the presenter will request Phase II, Increment I funding of \$4,303,187 for BA-171 at these proceedings. If approved, the total available fund brought forward would be \$11,328,246.

A request for approval of the FY20 Planning Program budget is on the agenda. A total of \$111,860 has been carried over from the last Task Force meeting. Added to that is the expected allocation of \$5,000,000 for Planning activities; total available funding is \$5,111,860. Today’s funding request for FY20 Planning and Outreach totals \$5,008,132. If approved, a surplus of \$103,728 would remain.

Ms. Cheavis then presented a pie chart summarizing projects as follows: CWPPRA has authorized 222 projects. There are 162 active projects including 30 in Phase 1 Engineering and Design, 15 in Phase 2 Construction, 95 projects that have been completed and are now in Operations, Maintenance and/ or Monitoring phase, 17 completed projects (i.e. reached the 20-year life mark), and 5 support projects. Additionally, CWPPRA has deauthorized 46 projects, transferred 8 projects, and placed 6 in the inactive category.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered. He declared that absent committee members would be allowed to comment when they arrived. He then commended Ms. Cheavis for her management of the Program budget, and encouraged constituents to voice their support of the Program when engaging with relevant elected officials.

#### 4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Electronic Votes and Approvals (Scott Wandell, USACE)

Mr. Inman began by explaining that the electronic vote became necessary in lieu of the most recently scheduled Task Force meeting, which was cancelled due to the partial federal government shutdown in January. While not ideal because such actions preclude public comment, they become necessary under such circumstances to avoid delays in project advancement.

Mr. Wandell reported that several items were thus voted upon 12 February 2019:

- A) Approval of the transfer of funds totaling \$182,233 from Monitoring to Operations and Maintenance for East Mud Lake Marsh Management (CS-20), and approval to increase the project’s O&M budget by an additional \$194,038 for continued maintenance until the expected end of project in December 2020.
- B) Approval of all items recommended by the Technical Committee (i.e. PPL 28 projects recommended for Phase I and Phase II funding as iterated in the budget report previously presented).

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered. As an aside, Mr. Inman commended Mr. Wandell for his efforts on behalf of the CWPPRA program, and announced his recent promotion; Ms. McCormick also verbalized her congratulations and appreciation to Mr. Wandell.

5. Agenda Item 4. Decision: Request to Increase the Incentive Payment for the Coastwide Nutria Control Program (CNCP / LA-03b) (Quin Kinler, NRCS)

Mr. Kinler began with a brief history of the CNCP, which began in 2002. The initial incentive payment was set at \$4.00/ tail; initial harvest rates were around 300,000/ year. Due to a decline in the harvest in 2005-2006 following Hurricane Katrina, the incentive payment was raised to \$5.00 beginning in 2006-2007. Following that increase, there was a sharp increase in harvest and a decrease in nutria related damage. In more recent years another decline in harvest has been noted. For that reason, and because of inflation, sponsoring agencies are requesting an increase in the incentive payment to \$6.00/ tail beginning in 2019-2020 (Program Year 18). As a point of clarification, Mr. Kinler declared that this is not a request for an increase in budget for the CNCP, since incentive increases were built into the approved project estimate as contingency funds.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee. Mr. Williams commended the CNCP for its success, and vocalized his support.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the public. None were proffered.

**Decision: Mr. Kinler made the motion to increase incentive payments from \$5 to \$6/ tail beginning the next harvest season. Mr. Lezina seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.**

6. Agenda Item 5. Decision: Final Deauthorization of the Shoreline Protection, Preservation, and Restoration Panel Demonstration Project (LA-0280) (Brandon Howard, NMFS)

7. Agenda Item 6. Decision: Request to combine the Caminada Headland Back Barrier projects, Increments 1&2 (BA-171/BA-193) and an Increase in BA-171 Phase 2 Budget (Brad Crawford, EPA)

A brief discussion ensued regarding the re-ordering of Agenda Item #5 and #6, delaying those presentations and subsequent actions, in deference to committee members and other potential attendees experiencing traffic hindrances. Technical members present were in general agreement. Mr. Inman asked for public comment on the matter. No objections were raised.

8. Agenda Item #7. Report: 20-Year Life Project Impact Analysis (Scott Wandell, USACE)

On behalf of the P&E Committee, Mr. Wandell provided an update regarding the development of a process analyzing 20-year life project impacts. The P&E Committee has developed a Risk Register (modeled on a USACE project matrix), which provides project impact analysis as it pertains to public safety concerns, financial risk, and possible mitigation measures. The register was presented to agencies for comment, and subsequently utilized (populated by the agencies) for individual projects on a test basis. The P&E Committee will review and further revise the Risk Register; the Technical Committee will be given a chance to scrutinize the revisions and finalize its recommendations to the Task Force prior to the scheduled meeting in May.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

9. Agenda Item #8 Report/Decision: Upcoming 20-Year Life Projects (Scott Wandell, USACE)

Mr. Wandell began by reporting that the P&E Committee met recently to discuss agency-recommended paths forward for projects nearing their 20-year closeout mark – a process that begins at year 15. He presented a slide to illustrate eleven such projects undergoing evaluation. He presented other slides indicating 21 projects approved for closeout (which are still be tracked) and approved for extension. Mr. Kinler was called upon to present the following recommended paths forward for Technical Committee consideration.

a. Projects requesting approval for *early* project closeout with no additional cost increase:

CS-30	GIWW-Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization	NRCS	31-Jul-22
CS-11b	Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration	NRCS	2-Oct-22
ME-11	Humble Canal Hydrologic Restoration	NRCS	1-Mar-23

(There was a general agreement that, since the first two projects are located in the Calcasieu-Sabine Basin, and in deference to attendees traveling from that direction who may have public comment, this portion of the presentation was delayed. Note: ME-11 was removed from the agenda earlier in these proceedings.)

The presentation continued with agenda item #8b, delivered by Mr. Wandell.

b. Projects requesting approval for closeout with a cost increase:

PO-22	Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection	COE	17-Dec-21
-------	-----------------------------------	-----	-----------

Mr. Wandell reported that the Technical Committee had very recently been provided with a 20-year report regarding PO-22, for which closeout approval with a \$2.35 million cost increase is being sought. The cost increase is for a final O&M event, which includes a rock lift and materials needed to restore the dike to its original design elevation. The event would also include specified navigational signage. Mr. Inman clarified that the actual request for funding of this request will not be made until the September Technical Committee meeting. Much discussion ensued among the Technical Committee members regarding specifics of the request today, the use of the risk analysis matrix, and details of the repairs. An understanding was reached – that approval of today’s request is an approval of the recommended path forward, rather than approval of the specified cost increase.

**Decision: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend the path forward as presented, with the condition that the cost be evaluated by the Engineering Workgroup. Ms. McCormick seconded the motion, which passed without dissent.**

c. Projects pursuing project extension through formal evaluation:

LA-03b	Coastwide Nutria Control Program	NRCS	30-Aug-22
--------	----------------------------------	------	-----------

Mr. Kinler began the proposal for the extension of CNCP (LA-03b) by iterating the purpose and historical benefits of the project, which has reached its 15-year status, and is thus subject to formal evaluation. He pointed out that the program has spent approximately \$32 million thus far, and resulted in a total reduction of nearly 15,000 acres that would have been lost to nutria herbivory. That translates to a very efficient cost of \$2,200/ acre, compared to an average of almost \$90,000/ acre for other CWPPRA projects. He further asserted that without the incentive program, an estimated 2,300 acres would be lost annually, a total of 46,000+ acres over the next 20 years. If the program is extended however, he estimates that 40% of those acres would be saved. According to preliminary evaluation, transfer of the project is not a viable option because an alternative funding

entity/ mechanism has not been identified. Projected future costs (for years 20-41), allowing for inflation and incentive increases, are an estimated \$80,000. Since unused (i.e. previously approved) funding carries over each year within the CNCP, Mr. Kinler expects to request about \$67 million to extend the program for 20 years. He is hereby requesting formal evaluation of the program by Environmental, Engineering (although not particular applicable) and Economic workgroups between now and the fall Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. Mr. Clark commented on the thoroughness of the presentation and verbalized support of the proposed path forward. Ms. McCormick commended the CNCP, but expressed concern for obligating \$80 million when overall funding is “short.” Mr. Kinler responded by reminding attendees that approval for actual expenditure of funds for this program is requested on an annual basis, and that the Technical Committee may deny approval at any point in order to redirect the allotted funds. He also re-asserted that on average, the program has surplus funds, which carry over, each year. Ms. McCormick indicated her satisfaction with his response. Mr. Williams asked for clarification about whether today’s request was for Technical Committee approval of the request for formal evaluation or for approval of the extension. Mr. Clark replied, asserting that this request is for approval of the general path forward – subjecting the program to formal evaluation by the Environmental and Engineering workgroups before the fall presentation. Mr. Williams made a final statement regarding the responsibility of yearly evaluation and funding determinations. Mr. Kinler assured the group that an annual report has been and will be part of the current process, thus facilitating a relatively easy risk evaluation by the Tech Committee on an annual basis.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the public. None was proffered.

**Decision: Mr. Clark made the motion to recommend to the Task Force the approval of the proposed path forward, pursuing project extension through formal evaluation by relevant workgroups. Ms. McCormick seconded the motion, which carried without dissent.**

As an aside, Mr. Williams raised an issue of the decision-making methodology, by which the Committee must determine the fate of projects entering the 15-20 year evaluation stage. He suggested that sponsoring agencies provide information to the Technical Committee and a request for plan approval (possibly via electronic vote) in advance of a formal request for the corresponding funding approval (during official fall proceedings). Mr. Inman, Mr. Clark and Mr. Lezina concurred, and so it was generally agreed that the Technical Committee would necessarily receive such information, although the timing of its provision must be determined.

10. Agenda Item #9 Decision: FY20 Planning Budget Approval, including the PPL 30 Process, and Presentation of FY20 Outreach Budget (Process, Size, Funding, etc.) (Scott Wandell, USACE)

Mr. Wandell began with a request for Technical Committee recommendation for approval of the PPL 30 process (which is based on loss-loss rates) as presented below:

- a. The PPL 30 Process to include selecting four nominees in the Barataria and Terrebonne Basins; three projects each in the Breton Sound and Pontchartrain Basins; two nominees each in the Mermentau, Calcasieu/Sabine, and Tech/Vermilion Basins; one nominee in the Atchafalaya Basin; and one in the Coastwide category.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for comment from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

**Decision: Mr. Williams moved that the PPL 30 process be approved and recommended to the Task Force. Ms. McCormick seconded the motion, which carried without dissent.**

Dr. Scott Wilson was called to present the Outreach request. He deviated from the agenda slightly, and began by formally introducing Jennifer Guidry as the new Outreach Coordinator, and Kacie Wright, new Assistant Outreach Coordinator. Dr. Wilson then presented the request as follows:

- b. A recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY20 Outreach Committee Budget, in the amount of \$452,113, to continue funding for multiple events, publications, mail-outs, agency involvement, and other endeavors (similar to previous years.)

Mr. Inman opened the floor for questions or comment from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered.

**Decision: A motion was made by Ms. McCormick and seconded by Mr. Lezina to recommend to the Task Force approval of the FY20 Outreach Committee budget in the amount of \$452,113 as presented; the motion carried without dissent.**

Ms. Cheavis presented the last budgetary request as follows:

- c. A recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY20 Planning Budget (which includes Outreach Committee Budget), in the amount of \$5,008,132.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for questions or comment from the Technical Committee. Mr. Inman asked if all line items remained the same; Ms. Cheavis responded in the affirmative, specifying the inclusion of “environmental banking.” Mr. Clark inquired as to whether or not the line item for the Report to Congress had been removed; Ms. Cheavis responded affirmatively.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for public questions or comments; none were proffered.

**Decision: A motion was made by Ms. McCormick and seconded by Mr. Williams to recommend to the Task Force for approval of the FY20 Planning Budget in the amount of \$5,008,132 as presented; the motion carried without dissent.**

Mr. Inman called for a brief recess in proceedings (at 11:06 a.m.) to determine attendee travel status; he reconvened the meeting approximately fifteen minutes later, beginning with the following agenda items:

11. (Re-ordered) Agenda Item 5. Decision: Final Deauthorization of the Shoreline Protection, Preservation, and Restoration Panel Demonstration Project (LA-0280) (Brandon Howard, NMFS)

On behalf of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA), Mr. Howard presented the request for final deauthorization for the Shoreline Protection, Preservation, and Restoration Panel (LA-0280) demonstration project. He began with background information, including the process of selecting optimal sites for the project, SPPR panel design, and an unanticipated increase in panel cost. In order to compensate for the cost increase, the academic advisory group was consulted, and adjustments were made to the project size and number of repetitions. Most recent meetings with the vendor resulted in a revised cost estimate. Mr. Howard presented a slide to compare the estimated cost of this demonstration project to the cost of other projects that utilized rock or other non-rock alternatives. Current estimates indicate that the SPPR panels do not represent a cost-effective alternative to rock/ riprap, in keeping with project goals; instead, the estimates (as presented) indicate very similar costs. Mr. Howard added that the

estimate indicated does not include contractor profit. Deauthorization of the LA-0280 project would allow any unused Phase 1 funds to be returned to the CWPPRA program – an estimated \$2.5 million. The Task Force approved initiation of deauthorization procedures in October 2018; today's request is the second step in the SOP for the deauthorization process.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for questions or comment from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark asked if the current estimates were indeed based on negotiations with the vendor after the October 2018 Task Force meeting; Mr. Howard responded affirmatively. Mr. Williams asserted that this project has been analyzed in various ways, and with consideration of public comments, maintained rationalization of this deauthorization request because the project ultimately does not fulfill stated project goals. Mr. Inman confirmed that three letters expressing opposition to this deauthorization have been received.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for public questions or comment.

Ralph Libersat approached the microphone as a representative for Vermilion Parish Coastal Committee. He criticized the deauthorization process for being based on cost estimates rather than contractor bids or construction estimates, which he asserts are “a lot of times” lower, and as such would allow for a potentially larger project footprint. He verbalized another criticism regarding the “pulling out” of demonstration projects which are apparently successful, which he asserts is a waste of money. He concluded by expressing his appreciation of efforts thus far, and by reiterating his fervent opposition to this deauthorization.

David Minton approached the microphone and introduced himself as the inventor of the SPPR system. He began his comments by expressing appreciation for the Committee's consideration of the demonstration project in PPL 25. He asserted that multiple meetings have indeed occurred with agencies, and that SPPR vendor(s) have supplied requested information. But he stressed that he/ his vendor(s) have not been given a change to review the estimates and confirm the validity of the cost comparisons. He asserted that fourteen percent of the budget he provided is capital recapture by the manufacturer of the panels. Thus, contractor profit is included in the estimate provided, which is contrary to the statement made in the presentation. He further stated that the comparisons are conservative, based on a “least-efficient” cross section SPPR panels and a “most-efficient” cross section of rock dike. With that in mind, he submitted that a difference of less than ten percent is worth the investment for project that would potentially exhibit its cost-effectiveness in the long-term. As a final comment, Mr. Minton referred to the 59% increase in the project budget as it appears on the agenda; he asserted that the vast majority of those costs are associated with the “design side” of the project, over which the suppliers have no control.

With no further public comment, Mr. Inman called for a motion from the Technical Committee.

**Decision: Mr. Williams made the motion to recommend to the Task Force the final deauthorization of the SPPR panel demonstration project. Mr. Lezina seconded the motion, which carried without dissent.**

12. (Re-ordered) Agenda Item 6. Decision: Request to combine the Caminada Headland Back Barrier projects, Increments 1&2 (BA-171/BA-193) and an Increase in BA-171 Phase 2 Budget (Brad Crawford, EPA)

Mr. Crawford, on behalf of EPA and CPRA, presented the request approval to combine the Caminada Headland Back Barrier, Increment 2 project (BA-193) with the Caminada Headland Back Barrier Increment 1 project (BA-171), which has already been approved for Phase II construction.

The request includes a corresponding increase in the BA-171 Phase II budget that would provide enough funding for the construction of both projects. The sponsors are proposing to take advantage of the opportunity to combine construction activities for these two adjacent projects to save considerable time and money. If approved, the BA-193 project area would be combined with BA-171 and the BA-193 project would be deauthorized.

The rationale for combining the projects is obvious in their proximity, and in their synergy with each other and previously constructed projects (BA-45 and BA-143). The proposed path forward would not result in a decrease of acres associated with the BA-193; rather, combining it with BA-171 would result in the same scope and same expected benefits for both projects. In fact, construction of both projects essentially “completes” the restoration efforts on Caminada Headland. Cost savings are due primarily to logistical and construction efficiencies; CPRA has also revised bid tabulations and cut-to-fill ratios. Mr. Crawford presented slides to illustrate that for an increase of \$5.5 million in BA-171 Phase II funding, the construction of BA-193 can be included. More specifically, the Phase II Increment 1 increase is an estimated \$4,303 million.

Furthermore, Mr. Crawford pointed out that BA-193 was the candidate project “next in line” as a result of the December voting; BA-171 Phase II Increment I funding had been authorized in January 2018. Since action by the Task Force was precluded by the government shutdown in January, the proposal is being made today, with an additional request that it be presented to the Task Force for immediate approval. An expedited response is needed for several reasons: a) in order to submit the solicitation package in the fall, b) to maximize mobilization outside of nesting season, c) to avoid delay in the construction of BA-193, thereby risking further breaches and sediment loss of BA-143 during storm events, and d) to maximize economy of scale.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for questions or comment from the Technical Committee.

Ms. McCormick reiterated the rationale for presenting the project today, and commended her staff, CPRA, the Technical Committee workgroups, and to others who had contributed to the proposal and cost revisions, resulting in a surprisingly beneficial project combination.

Mr. Clark, Mr. Lezina and Mr. Inman also commended the agencies and individuals for their recognition of this opportunity, and generally exemplified the proposal as one which optimizes resources and maximizes results, thus achieving CWPPRA intent – to restore and protect wetlands as efficiently as possible.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for public questions or comment

Amanda Phillips of the Wisner Donation, spoke in favor of combining the projects, reiterating the opportunity that exists – referring to it as a three-for-one: these two projects plus a possible third project with the remaining funds.

Erik Johnson, representing several non-profit foundations and coalitions, spoke in favor of the proposal, commending the contributing agencies, and referring to the decision a “no-brainer.” His final comment referred to project benefits for the piping plover.

Anne Coglianesse, representing the City of New Orleans, spoke in strong support of the project, calling it “fiscally responsible and bureaucratically smart”.

Amanda Voisin, of LaFourche Parish Government, spoke in favor of combining the projects, commending the agencies on their idea and efforts, and referring to the proposal as smart and cost-effective.



Lauren Averill, with Jefferson Parish Coastal Department, emphasized that she represents the third parish to support the combination of BA-171 and BA-193, and pointed out a potential \$18 million savings.

With no further public comment, Mr. Inman called for a motion from the Technical Committee.

**Decision: Mr. Lezina made the motion that the Tech Committee recommend to the Task Force (for immediate electronic vote) the combination of the Caminada Headland Backbarrier projects, Increments 1 and 2, BA-171 and BA-193, and increase the budget for BA-171 in Phase II. Mr. Clark seconded the motion, which carried without dissent.**

13. (Re-ordered) Agenda Item #8a Report/Decision: Projects requesting approval for *early* project closeout with no additional cost increase.

Mr. Kinler (NRCS) presented both projects; it was agreed that only one vote was needed following the presentations. Mr. Kinler began with the GIWW – Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization (CS-30), the 20-year life of which is ending in July 2022. Original project features included a rock dike, shallow water terraces (vegetatively planted), and an earthen plug at a breach in the spoil bank. With \$328,000 remaining in the project, and land rights having expired, or expiring soon, a request for a final maintenance event and early closeout was hereby made.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for questions or comment from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark inquired about risk or safety issues regarding navigation down the GIWW. Mr. Kinler denied such, asserting that the rock dike has maintained its elevation, and he indicated that maintenance is required only for the earthen plug, which will likely be completed in 2019.

Mr. Clark requested a close-out report (as per the close-out path forward SOP) prior to the Task Force meeting. Mr. Kinler assured him that one would be provided along with an O&M report, although the O&M report is not expected to be available prior to the Task Force meeting.

Mr. Kinler then presented the Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration (CS-11b), the 20-year life of which is ending in October 2022. Original project features include a rock embankment and vegetative planting on earthen terraces. The latter were deemed unsuccessful, but no maintenance events occurred or are being planned. He approximates \$490,000 remaining in the project budget. With land rights having expired or beginning to, he requested early close-out with no additional cost.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for questions or comment from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark proffered the same questions as above, adding that navigational signage became necessary at another project site along the GIWW after barges owners complained. Mr. Kinler iterated assurances that information will be provided utilizing the risk matrix, and that he is unaware of any issues specifically regarding navigational hazards.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for public questions or comment on these two projects. None were proffered.

**Decision: Mr. Clark made a motion that Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force approval of the 20-year life path forward for early close-out on CS-30 and CS-11b, on the**

**condition that pertinent reports be provided prior to the Task Force meeting in May. Mr. Williams seconded the motion, which carried without dissent.**

**14. Agenda Item #10 Report/Decision: Selection of Ten Candidate Projects to Evaluate for PPL 29 (Kevin Roy, FWS)**

Mr. Roy presented the location, scope, and costs associated with the following PPL 29 project nominees, for which the Technical Committee considered preliminary costs and benefits.

Region	Basin	PPL 29 Nominees	Agency
1	Pontchartrain	St. Catherine’s Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection	EPA
1	Pontchartrain	Miller Bayou Marsh Creation	NMFS
1	Pontchartrain	East Labranche Shoreline Protection	NRCS
2	Breton Sound	Phoenix Marsh Creation – East Increment	FWS
2	Breton Sound	Reggio Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration	EPA
2	Breton Sound	North Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS
2	Barataria	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension	NRCS
2	Barataria	Fifi Island Marsh Creation	FWS
2	Barataria	Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation	EPA
2	Barataria	North Fourchon Marsh Creation	EPA
2	Barataria	East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation	FWS
3	Terrebonne	Bay Raccourci Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration	FWS
3	Terrebonne	West Louisiana Hwy 1 Marsh Creation	NMFS
3	Terrebonne	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection	FWS
3	Terrebonne	South Falgout Canal Marsh Creation and Terraces	NRCS
3	Teche-Vermilion	Boston and Oaks Canals – Marsh Area Protection	NRCS
3	Teche-Vermilion	North Marsh Restoration (North Increment)	NMFS
4	Mermentau	Southeast Pecan Island Restoration	NRCS
4	Mermentau	Mermentau Basin Wetland Inundation Relief	NRCS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Mud Lake South Marsh Creation	EPA
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Cameron Meadows East Marsh Creation	NMFS
Coastwide		Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements	NMFS

Mr. Inman opened the floor for questions or comment from the Technical Committee. None were proffered.

Mr. Inman opened the floor for public questions or comment on these projects.

Ralph Libersat, representing Vermilion Parish, spoke in favor of several projects: a) Boston and Oaks Canal – Marsh Area Protection, b) North Marsh Restoration (North Increment), c) Mermentau Basin Wetland Inundation Relief, and Southeast Pecan Island.

Mark Black, representing Terrebonne Parish, spoke in favor of the following: a) Bay Raccourci Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration, and b) South Falgout Canal Marsh Creation and Terracing.

John Lane, representing St. Bernard Parish, spoke in favor of two projects in the Breton Sound Basin: a) Reggio Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration, and b) North Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing.

Carol Giardina, with the Lake Catherine Civic Association, spoke in support of two projects: a) Miller Bayou Marsh Creation, and b) St. Catherine Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection.

Robert Spears, of Plaquemines Parish, spoke in favor of the Phoenix Marsh Creation (East Increment) project.

Anne Coglianesi presented a statement from the mayor of New Orleans in support of St. Catherine Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection, and Miller Bayou Marsh Creation projects.

Devyan Kar, representing the Mississippi River Delta Coalition spoke in favor of the following: a) Miller Bayou Marsh Creation, b) St. Catherine Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection, c) Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation, and d) Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension.

Ralph Libersat, as a member of the Chenier Plain Authority, spoke in general support of projects in Calcasieu Parish and Cameron Parish; and he spoke specifically in support of the Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements.

Amanda Voisin, representing LaFourche Parish, spoke in favor of five projects: a) West LA Highway 1 Marsh Creation, b) East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection, c) North Fourchon Marsh Creation, d) East Bayou LaFourche Marsh Creation, and e) Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements.

Lauren Averill, with Jefferson Parish, spoke in support of a) Fifi Island Marsh Creation, and b) Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension (which she suggested could be combined with another Northeast Turtle Bay project currently in design.)

Rica Canik, representing the Cameron Parish Police Jury, spoke in support of four projects: a) Southeast Pecan Island Restoration, b) Mermentau Basin Wetland Inundation Relief, c) Mud Lake South Marsh Creation and d) Cameron Meadows East Marsh Creation.

Darrell Williams, with the Cameron Parish Police Jury, reiterated Ms. Canik's previous remarks, thanking the Committee for its consideration of projects in Region IV.

Amanda Phillips, with the Edward Wisner Donation, spoke in support of three projects: a) North Fourchon Marsh Creation Project, b) East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation Project, and c) West Louisiana Highway 1 Marsh Creation Project.

Nicholas Gaspard, representing Fenstermaker, spoke in support of the Boston and Oaks Canals Marsh Area Protection.

Leslie Suazo with Ducks Unlimited spoke in support of the nine projects within Barataria and Terrebone Basins – which have historically experienced the greatest land loss in Louisiana. (She specifically mentioned Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension, North Fourchon Marsh Creation, and East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation, Bay Raccourci Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration, and the South Falgout Canal Marsh Creation and Terracing). She also vocalized support for the Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements project.

Mr. Inman called for a recess at 12:49 p.m.

The meeting was reconvened approximately 25 minutes later. The Technical Committee selected 10 projects (highlighted, and in order according to votes received) as PPL 29 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis. Noted is a tie between projects placing 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>; both will proceed to Phase 0. Ultimately, a final selection of four projects will be approved for Phase I (Planning and Engineering and Design).

CWPPRA PPL 29 Candidate Vote – Technical Committee

11 April 2019

Region	Basin	Type	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	State	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
3	TE	MC/RR	Bay Raccourci Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration	9	5	11	5	10	10	6	50
2	BA	MC	Fifi Island Marsh Creation	7	11	9		3	6	5	36
2	BS	MC/TR	North Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing		2	5	11	4	9	5	31
2	BA	MC	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation Extension		1	7	2	11	8	5	29
3	TE	MC/sp	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection	3		12	10	7		4	32
1	PO	MC/SP	St. Catherine's Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection	11	10			5	3	4	29
3	TE	MC	West Louisiana Hwy 1 Marsh Creation	12		2	8		7	4	29
4	ME	MC/FD/T	Southeast Pecan Island Restoration		9		7	12	1	4	29
2	BS	MC	Phoenix Marsh Creation - East Increment		4	8	4		12	4	28
4	ME	HR	Mermentau Basin Wetland Inundation Relief	1	8			6	11	4	26
4	CS	MC	Mud Lake South Marsh Creation	4	12			8	2	4	26
1	PO	MC	Miller Bayou Marsh Creation	5	3	4	12			4	24
3	TV	MC/TR	North Marsh Restoration (North Increment)	8			6		5	3	19
2	BA	MC	North Fourchon Marsh Creation	6	6	6				3	18
3	TE	MC/TR	South Falgout Canal Marsh Creation and Terraces		7		1	9		3	17
4	CS	MC	Cameron Meadows East Marsh Creation	2			3		4	3	9
2	BS	MC/HR	Reggio Marsh Creation and Hyrdologic Restoration	10		1				2	11
CW			Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements				9	1		2	10
1	PO	SP	East Labranche Shoreline Protection			10				1	10
2	BA	MC	East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation			3				1	3
3	TV	SP/HR	Boston and Oaks Canals - Marsh Area Protection					2		1	2

2 BA	MC	Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation							0	0
TOTALS			78	78	78	78	78	78	72	468

15. Agenda Item #11 Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE)

None were proffered.

16. Agenda Item #12 Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman USACE)

None were proffered.

17. Agenda Items #13 & 14 Announcement: Dates of future Program meetings

Mr. Inman reviewed the dates and details of upcoming CWPPRA Program meetings as follows:

May 9, 2019	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 12, 2019	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 10, 2019	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
December 5, 2019	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	New Orleans

18. Agenda Item ##15 Decision: Adjourn

Mr. Clark made the motion to adjourn the meeting; Ms. McCormick seconded and the motion passed without dissent.

In brief, final comments Mr. Wandell expressed his appreciation for the CWPPRA Program and the opportunities it has afforded him.