

## MEMORADUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 27 April 2017 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Mark Wingate opened the meeting at 9:33 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Mark Wingate, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)  
Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)  
Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS)  
Brian Lezina, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)  
Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)  
Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

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

2. Agenda Item 1. Meeting Initiation

Mr. Wingate introduced himself and requested that each committee member introduce themselves, which they did. Mr. Wingate then asked for opening remarks from committee members; none were proffered. He welcomed everyone and thanked them in advance for their attendance.

Mr. Wingate asked if the Technical committee had any changes to the agenda; non were proffered.

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made the motion to adopt the agenda as written; Mr. Paul seconded and the motion passed without dissent.**

Mr. Wingate reviewed the procedure for public comments; commenters should approach the microphone, state their name and affiliation, then present their remarks. He also reminded them to sign in.

3. Agenda item 2. Report: Status of CWPPRA Program Funds and Projects (Jernice Cheavis, USACE) Ms. Jernice Cheavis provided an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding in the Planning and Construction Programs.

Jernice Cheavis, USACE, began with the status of funding for CWPPRA Construction programming. The fully funded total program estimate since its inception to the present is \$2.445 billion. Total projected funding received since inception and projected Department of the Interior (DOI) funds is \$2.115 billion. Thus, there is a funding gap of \$330 million if all authorized projects were to be constructed at this time. Current Task Force-approved funding for projects in Phase I, Phase II and O&M totals \$1.836 billion. Authorized funding for each agency as requested currently totals \$1.719 billion.

There are no funding actions to be taken at today's meeting that would impact construction funding, so Ms. Cheavis began with total program estimate of \$2,444,547,429. Funding to be carried forward to the fall meeting for O&M increases will be \$9,120,159.

In anticipation of today's vote, Ms. Cheavis presented the FY18 Planning Program Budget beginning with available funds carried over from previously approved budget totaling \$238,124. Anticipated DOI funds (as every year) total \$5,000,000, resulting in a total of \$5,238,124 to approve for the FY18 Planning Budget. In Agenda Item 6, requests will be made to approve \$4,666,019 for the Planning Budget and \$452,113 for the Outreach Budget. If approved, remaining funds to be carried forward to approve the FY19 planning budget would total \$119,992.

Ms. Cheavis then presented CWPPRA project status report. The total number of CWPPRA projects is 214. At this time 154 projects are active, 5 of which are support projects (including CRMS). There are currently 23 projects in Phase I – Engineering and Design, 18 projects in Phase II – Construction, 108 projects for which construction has been completed and are in the O&M phase. A total 46 projects have been de-authorized, 8 have been transferred to other agencies, 6 have been made inactive.

Mr. Wingate asked for any comments or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered.

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Electronic Votes and Approvals (Brad Inman, USACE) *Mr. Brad Inman reported on recent requests approved via electronic vote.*

Mr. Inman reported that a rapid response was needed on two issues that came up since the last Task Force meeting, so the electronic voting process was utilized on March 28, 2017.

The first issue was whether or not to approve project expansion for the Oyster Bayou Marsh Restoration project. Due to lower-than-estimated bids, the project could be expanded by 132 acres. The decision was unanimous to approve that project expansion.

The second issue involved Environmental Banking. In the WRDA bill (or so called the WIIN Act) of 2016, there was an addition to the language asking the CWPPRA Task Force to develop regulatory guidelines for Environmental Banking. The Committee voted unanimously to move forward with that action, and will meet next week with CPRA for consultation, as CPRA has done similar work on NRDA mitigation.

Mr. Wingate asked for any comments or questions from the Technical Committee and the public; none were proffered. He expressed gratitude to CPRA for their willingness to help with the effort.

5. Agenda item 4. Report/Decision: Selection of Ten Candidate Projects and up to Three Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for PPL 27 (John Petitbon, USACE) *The Technical Committee considered preliminary costs and benefits of the 27<sup>th</sup> Priority Project List (PPL) project and demonstration project nominees listed below. The Technical Committee selected 10*

projects as PPL 27 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects that will be approved for Phase I (Planning and Engineering and Design).

Mr. Jon Petitbon was called upon to present an overview of each of the projects being considered. He presented a slide show beginning with a map of all project areas being considered. He then highlighted the prominent features (including location, acreage affected and estimated costs) of each project in the following table.

Region	Basin	PPL 27 Nominees	Agency
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Sabine Marsh Creation Cycles 6&7	FWS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	East Holly Beach Shoreline Protection	NRCS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	North Mud Lake Marsh Creation	NMFS
4	Mermentau	Highway 82 South Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS
4	Mermentau	Deep Lake Spillway Modification/Mermentau Sub-Basin Hydrologic Restoration	NRCS
3	Teche-Vermilion	Lake Sand Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection	NRCS
3	Teche-Vermilion	West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection	EPA
3	Terrebonne	North Bayou DeCade Ridge and Marsh Creation	NRCS
3	Terrebonne	West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation	NMFS
3	Terrebonne	Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion	NRCS
3	Terrebonne	North Terrebonne Marsh Creation	EPA
3	Terrebonne	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing	FWS
2	Barataria	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Critical Area Shoreline Protection	NRCS
2	Barataria	East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation	FWS
2	Barataria	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Creation	FWS
2	Barataria	Elmer's Island Backbarrier Marsh Creation	NMFS
2	Breton Sound	Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation	NMFS
2	Breton Sound	East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS
2	Breton Sound	Mid Breton Land Bridge Marsh Creation and Terracing	FWS
1	Pontchartrain	Point aux Marchettes Shoreline Protection and Terracing	FWS
1	Pontchartrain	Cane Bayou Marsh Creation	FWS
1	Pontchartrain	Bayou Bienvenue Marsh Creation Increment 1	EPA
Coastwide		Feral Swine Control	FWS

	PPL 27 Demonstration Project Nominees	Agency
DEMO	Living Blanket	NRCS
DEMO	Shoreline Protection Utilizing Engineered In-Situ Native Material	NRCS
DEMO	Crescent Stabilization System	CPRA
DEMO	Marine Gardens/Marsh Armor	COE

Mr. Wingate commended Mr. Petitbon for his presentation, and all who participated in project work groups and efforts to get the project nominated.

Mr. Wingate then called for additional comments from the Technical Committee regarding the projects presented.

Mr. Hartman commented that as a result of discussions within the Environmental Engineering work group staff, the opinion was reached to not invest in the proposed demonstration projects. He explained that the proposed projects are not sufficiently different than other non-rock alternatives and thus not exhibit potential to advance the science of coastal protection.

Mr. Wingate asked the Technical Committee for further discussion.

Mr. Clark concurred with Mr. Hartman. While admitting to the innovation of some of the products, he questions the cost-effectiveness and the potential for broad use of the proposed technologies. A brief discussion ensued regarding the last year a demonstration project was selected. Mr. Hartman concluded by saying this is not an issue of whether or not CWPPRA invests sufficiently in demonstration projects; it is an issue of whether or not the projects provide new science in a cost-effective, applicable manner.

Mr. Wingate called for further comment from the Technical Committee; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for further comment from the public; none was proffered.

Mr. Inman was called upon to clarify the motion, which he did thus: simply not to move forward with further work on the demonstration projects for PPL 27.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved not to consider Demonstration Projects for PPL 27; Mr. Clark seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.**

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the Technical Committee regarding construction project nominees; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the public regarding construction project nominees.

Amanda Voisin of LaFourche Parish Government spoke in favor of the West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation project and the East Bayou LaFourche Marsh Creation project, citing vital protection of the un-elevated portion of the Hwy 1. She also spoke in favor of the East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing project, which would augment current parish efforts and investments in that area.

Ralph Libersat of Vermilion Parish spoke in favor of the West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection project, asserting its crucial location of the protection it will provide. He also spoke in favor of the Deep Lake Spillway Modification project citing its effect on multiple parishes – i.e. enhanced drainage that would also benefit parishes to the north.

Randy Moertle of the Rainey Conservation Alliance spoke in favor of West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection project as Rainey property lies just to the west of the project site. He asserted that Todd Baker assured him of DWF's willingness to assume maintenance responsibility of the Shoreline Protection component at the end of the project. He also spoke in favor of the Feral Swine project and offered anecdotal evidence to illustrate the effectiveness of helicopter gunning as opposed to other methods to control the population. He then commended CWPPRA for taking the lead on other state-wide projects like Nutria Control and Salvinia Weevil Propagation project, and pointed out the relative low-cost of this project.

Lance Campbell with DWF spoke in favor of the Lake Sand Marsh Creation project and the West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection project, stating that they lie on Marsh Island and within state wildlife refuge. He asserted that a breach in the shoreline at Lake Sand would adversely affect 10,000 acres of marsh. He stated that a formal letter should have been received by the committee stating that DWF would assume all liability and ownership of the hard structures after the 20 year life of the project is complete. He also spoke in favor of the Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion project on Pointe aux Chenes WMA citing continued deterioration over the last two decades.

Guy McGinnis, St. Bernard Parish president, spoke in favor of East Delacroix Marsh Creation project, citing multiple-entity investments. He explained that this project would protect a drainage levee and consequently all of the other projects being implemented. He also spoke in favor of the Point aux Marchettes Shoreline Protection and Terracing project, citing significant shoreline deterioration since Hurricane Katrina, and its importance as a storm surge buffer for SE Louisiana and Mississippi.

Mark Black, Coastal Restoration Director for Terrebonne Parish, spoke in favor of the North Bayou DeCade Ridge and Marsh Creation project, which builds on other successful projects, either completed or ongoing. He then spoke in favor of the North Terrebonne Marsh Creation project and the Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion Project, both located in the eastern part of the parish where marsh loss is greatest. The latter is potentially a recipient of non-profit funds, which could provide a model for future funding mechanisms.

John Hebert, a landowner in Jefferson Parish, spoke in favor of the Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation project, which is part of the Barataria Landbridge, crucial to protection against storm surges. He also spoke in favor of the Feral Swine Control program, offering a suggestion to add coyotes to the task.

Luke Ehrensing of the Little Lake Hunting Club spoke in favor of the Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation project, pointing out that it is a continuation of other CWPPRA projects (BA 36 and BA 27) to create the Jefferson Landbridge, and the economic efficiency of established borrow areas.

Mr. Wingate called for further public comments. None was proffered. Mr. Inman reminded the public that all letters of recommendation and other written comments from the public had been provided to members and given consideration prior to voting.

Mr. Wingate called for a recess at 10:22 a.m.

Mr. Wingate reconvened the meeting at 10:44. Results were displayed on the screen and time was allowed for general discussion throughout the room. Mr. Inman was called upon to verbally read the results.

Mr. Inman reminded the assembly that result were posted in numerical order based on agencies' votes from greatest to least. The results are illustrated in the table below:

**CWPPRA PPL 27 Candidate Vote - Technical Committee**

27-Apr-17

Region	Basin	Type	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	State	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
4	CS	MC	Sabine Marsh Creation Cycles 6&7	12	12	7	7	6	12	6	56
2	BA	MC/SP	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Critical Area Shoreline Protection	3	6	2	9	11	5	6	36
1	PO	MC	Bayou Cane Marsh Creation	11	9	4	10		7	5	41
3	TE	MC/SP	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing	7	3	11	4	3		5	28
2	BS	MC/TR	East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing	10	5		11	7		4	33
2	BS	MC/TR	Mid Breton Land Bridge Marsh Creation and Terracing	9		8		1	11	4	29
2	BA	MC/TR	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration	2	8	9			9	4	28
1	PO	SP/TR	Point aux Marchettes Shoreline Protection and Terracing	4		5		10	8	4	27
3	TE	MC	North Bayou DeCade Ridge and Marsh Creation	5			3	8	10	4	26
2	BS	MC	Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation (West)			10	12		6	3	28
3	TE	FD	Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion		4			12	3	3	19
3	TE	MC	West Louisiana Highway 1 Marsh Creation	8			6		1	3	15
4	ME	MC/TR	Hwy 82 South Marsh Creation and Terracing	1	1		8			3	10
CW	0	0	Feral Swine Control			3	2		4	3	9
2	BA	MC	East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation	6		1	1			3	8
4	CS	SP	East Holly Beach Shoreline Protection			12		5		2	17

2	BA	MC	Elmer's Island Backbarrier Marsh Creation		7	6				2	13
3	TV	MC/SP	West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection		11			2		2	13
1	PO	MC	Bayou Bienvenue Marsh Creation Increment 1		10				2	2	12
3	TV	MC/SP	Lake Sand Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection		2			9		2	11
4	CS	MC	North Mud Lake Marsh Creation				5			1	5
4	ME	HR/MC	Deep Lake Spillway Modification					4		1	4
3	TE	MC	North Terrebonne Marsh Creation							0	0

NOTES:

- Projects are sorted by: (1) "No. of Votes" and (2) "Sum of Point Score"

Mr. Inman recommended to the chairman that the selected projects be advanced to the Task Force for consideration.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to advance the top-ranked projects to the Task Force for consideration; Mr. Paul seconded and the motion carried without dissent.**

6. Agenda Item 5. Report/Decision: Upcoming 20-Year Life Projects (Brad Inman, USACE) *The project sponsors presented recommended paths forward for projects nearing the end of their 20 year lives (includes demonstration projects which have an 8 year life). The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force on the path forward for the following projects.*

Scott Wandell (USACE) presented the following project:

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

CS-28-1	Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Cycle 1	COE	2022
---------	--------------------------------------	-----	------

Mr. Wandell gave an overview of the project, which is sponsored by the USACE and heavily supported by the FWS. He reminded the assembly that it is the first of 7 cycles in the Sabine Marsh Creation project begun in 2002, which utilizes dredge material from the Calcasieu Ship Channel maintenance events. Cycle I utilized one million cubic yards of dredge material, creating 200 acres of marsh. Trenasses were dug prior to dredge filling to allow for hydrologic connectivity and species introduction. There has been little maintenance required except for the degradation of a dike. Extensive monitoring/ data collection occurs, primarily via a CRMS station (#6301) which was installed in 2008. Project goals have been met, with 85% of the area

now heavily vegetated with *spartina*, and a realized elevation of 1.3 feet above mean sea level. Lessons learned are being employed in the other cycles. Mr. Wandell requested a recommendation for the project move toward closeout.

Mr. Inman provided clarification about the closeout process. At the 15-year mark of a 20-year project, a review matrix is employed in order to determine the optimal path toward closeout. Project status is reviewed on a variety of issues – i.e. budget balance, maintenance needed, etc. – so that the committee can make conscientious decision. He then made a formal recommendation to the chairman that the project be moved toward closeout at the end of 20 years.

Mr. Clark commented that he was involved in this project and that the only maintenance done has been the degradation of the southern levee mentioned earlier. No other O&M is needed. Monitoring could continue along with that of the other monitoring. Leigh Ann Sharp commented on combining both the monitoring and reporting for the cycles.

Mr. Wingate asked for additional comments from the Technical Committee; none were proffered.

Mr. Wingate asked for additional comments from the public; none were proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Clark moved that the Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force the advancement of project CS-28-1 to closure after 20 years with no additional funding requested. Mr. Paul seconded the motion; the motion passed without dissent.**

Darryl Clark presented the following project:

- b. Projects requesting approval for project closeout, feature removal, and cost increase:

TE-45	Terrebonne Bay Shoreline DEMO	FWS	2016
-------	-------------------------------	-----	------

Mr. Clark (FWS) presented TE-45, which was approved in 2001. Construction completed in 2007. As a demonstration project its 8-year life expired in 2015. Location of the project is the NW portion of Lake Barre. The project consisted of three reaches (identified as A,B and E) with three features installed at each reach – Gabion mats, A-jacks and triangular Reef Blocks the latter two of which were 50 feet offshore. The goals were to reduce erosion and establish oyster reefs; Mr. Clark asserted that the mats were the most successful and cost-effective method of doing both. Reach E was problematic with A-jacks and Reef blocks that were submerged most of the time, and significant “cut around” increase behind the Gabion mats. The recommendation is to remove all features at Reach E, which are considered potentially hazardous to the public. Furthermore, Mr. Clark put forth a recommendation to remove the A-jacks and Reef Blocks at Reaches A & B, but possibly retain the Gabion mats, which are not deemed potentially harmful. However, the landowner is not willing to accept liability for any of the features. At this time if all features were removed from all reaches, the estimated cost would be \$424,000. Monitoring results will be presented at a later date. Several graduate theses were produced from this project, and it is deemed successful.

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the Technical Committee; none were proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment.

Dr. Earl Melancon, introduced himself as the biologist on the project through Nicholls State University. He is now working with Sea Grant. He asserted that the Gabion mats are least likely to pose harm at Reaches A & B, and they are functioning well for the purposes intended; he advocated for their remaining in place. He went on to say that mats at Reach E are compromised because of the erosion behind them and he urges their removal. He added that the liability issue has been discussed in depth with landowners and DWF, neither of whom is willing to accept it. He brought the issue to LA Sea Grant legal section.

Nikki Pace, with the LA Sea Grant law and policy program at LSU, offered her services to try to facilitate dialogue with the landowners to explore creative solutions to this situation, which could in turn apply to such situations in the future. Mr. Clark responded that the project still must be approved for closeout in September, but that the offer is generous.

Leslie Suazo, with Ducks Unlimited, commented that through DU's partnership with ConocoPhillips, she has had casual conversation with landowners in the area of concern; she stated that they are willing to continue to dialogue about retaining the Gabion mats. She pointed out that the purpose of demonstration projects is to determine the applicability of the technology in other areas, and suggested their use on the problematic east bank of Bayou Terrebonne emphasizing that this would extend the footprint of an adjacent RESTORE ACT project. Mr. Clark responded that RESTORE project TE-139 covers Reaches A & B, but has only been approved for E & D funding, so actual construction is not likely to occur until 3-4 years from now. Project managers for the large RESORE project (TE-139) are aware of the relationship of that project to TE-45.

Ms. McCormick spoke in favor of working with NGOs to resolve such issues and expressed appreciation for the efforts of DU and LA Sea Grant efforts. Mr. Clark pointed out a history of positive negotiations/ interactions with CPRA as well.

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the Technical Committee.

Ms. McCormick urged the state entities to continue to negotiate and explore resolutions to liability issues, asserting that such efforts will benefit future endeavors. Mr. Clark and Mr. Lezina responded affirmatively. Mr. Hartman interjected by stating that at the fall meeting a cost estimate will be submitted along with this recommendation for approval, implying that a resolution might be established by that time.

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the public; none were proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made motion to recommend to the Task Force its approval of a path forward to closure of TE-45, and removal of some or all of its features. Mr. Lezina seconded and the motion carried without dissent.**

7. Agenda Item 6. **Decision: FY18 Planning Budget Approval, including the PPL 28 Process, and Presentation of FY18 Outreach Budget (Process, Size, Funding, etc.) (Brad Inman, USACE)** *The P&E Subcommittee will present their recommended FY18 Planning Program Budget development, including the PPL 28 Process.*

1. *The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve that the PPL 28 Process include selecting four nominees in the Barataria and Terrebonne Basins; three projects in the Breton Sound and Pontchartrain Basins; two nominees in the Mermentau, Calcasieu/Sabine, and Tech/Vermilion Basins; and one nominee will be selected in the Atchafalaya Basin.*

Kaitlyn Carriere (USACE) presented the first item by iterating that the Process presented today is unchanged, but that the PPL 28 Process must comply with the 2017 State Master Plan. She presented a slide indicating the number of nominees in each CWPPRA basin. She also noted that the PPL28 Process includes language inserted which establishes the procedure for breaking a tie in the electronic voting. At the request of Mr. Clark, the new language was read aloud for the benefit of the assembly. Mr. Inman stated that the reason the language was developed was that two ties indeed occurred in recent coastwide electronic voting.

Mr. Hartman posed the observation that one nomination from Atchafalaya Basin was allocated, but that no project had ever been approved from there; he wondered why to include it because that region was not consistent with the State Master Plan. Stuart Brown interjected that the number of nominees in each basin is determined by land loss and is independent of the State Master Plan. It was generally agreed that the potential of one nominee in the Atchafalaya Basin should remain.

Mr. Wingate called for additional comments from the Technical Committee; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the PPL 28 Process as written in the binders. Mr. Paul seconded the motion which passed without dissent.**

2. *The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY18 Outreach Committee Budget, in the amount of \$452,113.*

Scott Wilson began by explaining that a \$6,000 increase in the budget for the *Watermarks* contract is required due to changes in printing costs. He also reiterated typical Outreach Committee activities, such as support of agency participation in outreach, *Watermarks* publication, mail outs, conference attendance and exhibits

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the Technical Committee; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the Outreach budget as presented; Ms. McCormick seconded and the motion passed without dissent.**

3. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY18 Planning Budget (includes Outreach Committee Budget), in the amount of \$5,118,132.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the FY18 Planning Budget as presented; Ms. McCormick seconded and the motion passed without dissent.**

8. Agenda item 7. Decision: Request for Project Expansion (Garvin Pittman, CPRA) *Due to favorable bids, the USFWS and CPRA requested expansion of the TE-72 project. The project expansion would create an additional 245 acres of marsh at a cost of \$7,057,247.*

Garvin Pittman (CPRA) presented the project TE-72 – Lost Lake Lery Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration for expansion consideration. Due to favorable bids and a contribution from the LDNR Office of Coastal Management, total available funding stands at \$8,861,395. Therefore, the request is to spend \$7,252,592 to create an additional 245 acres of contained marsh, removal of an abandoned pipeline, additional dredging and additional surveys. The cost of each of those actions was provided, although those estimates are verbal and not formal at this time. Based on these estimates, a sum of \$1,575,468 would remain for contingencies. Mr. Pittman went on to describe elements of the project. ConocoPhillips has legal control of the pipeline and is in agreement with its removal. The additional marsh creation would connect with the North Lake Michon project, effectively cutting off a deep scour inlet that allows tidal intrusion and degrades the marsh.

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman wondered if removal of the pipeline was necessary. Mr. Pittman responded that if costs are favorable, pipeline removal is the best option to facilitate contractor equipment in construction of containment dikes. Mr. Pittman assured that other options are available and would be considered if removal is not cost-feasible.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve expansion of the TE-72 project with surplus funds; Ms. McCormick seconded and the motion carried without dissent.**

9. Agenda Item 8. Additional Agenda Items (Mark Wingate, USACE)

Mr. Wingate called for any additional agenda items.

Brian Lezina requested that the Technical Committee discuss and consider for recommendation a no-cost extension of project CS-20 – East Mud Lake Marsh Management. Final maintenance and repair event realized an over-run of time, and a new Land Rights agreement had to be signed. Therefore, under the new Land Rights agreement, CPRA is requesting an extension until December 5, 2020.

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the Technical Committee regarding adding the request as an agenda item; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to accept this request as an additional agenda item: Mr. Clark seconded and the motion carried without dissent.**

Mr. Wingate called for comments from the Technical Committee regarding the actual request for recommendation to the Task Force; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for public comment; none was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion.

**DECISION: Mr. Lezina made the motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the no-cost time extension for the (CS-20) East Mud Lake Marsh Management thru December 5, 2020; Ms. McCormick seconded and the motion carried without dissent.**

10. Agenda Item 9. Request for Public Comments (Mark Wingate, USACE)

Mr. Wingate invited any final public comments.

Tyler Ortego with the Coastal Resilience Group spoke in favor of this process, and although his demonstration project was not chosen, invited new ideas and cooperation. He defended the Crescent Stabilization system as dredge material containment. He went onto suggest that the viability of such products may be evaluated without rigorous analytical testing, but could rather be performance-based.

Mr. Wingate called for any additional comments; none was proffered.

**11. Agenda Item 10. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE)**

The Task Force meeting will be held May 11, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. at the Estuarine Habitats and Fisheries Center, 646 Cajundome Blvd., Lafayette, Louisiana.

**12. Agenda Item 11. Announcement: Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE)**

Mr. Inman iterated the dates as follows, reminding the assembly that the December meeting is when voting will occur deciding which of the 10 projects selected today will advance into Phase I Engineering & Design. During the summer and fall, various work groups/ academic advisory groups will conduct site investigations and gather the information needed to present for that meeting.

May 11, 2017	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 14, 2017	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 12, 2017	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
December 7, 2017	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge

**13. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Adjourn**

At 11:35 Mr. Wingate called for a motion to adjourn.

**DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Clark seconded and the motion carried without dissent.**