

14 September 2017

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 14 September 2017 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Brad Inman opened the meeting at 9:40 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Mr. Brad Inman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Acting Chairman
Mr. Bren Haase, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)
Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
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. Mr. Inman introduced himself. He asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves and asked for any opening remarks.

Mr. Clark mentioned the people impacted by recent hurricanes, offering his thoughts and prayers; Mr. Inman concurred.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee regarding the agenda.

No additions were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion to adopt the agenda.

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made the motion to adopt the agenda as is; which Mr. Paul seconded and the motion carried without opposition.

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 Construction Program.

Ms. Jernice Cheavis, USACE, presented an overview of CWPPRA funds. The fully funded total program estimate since its inception to the present is \$2.44 billion. Total projected funding received since inception in addition to projected Department of the Interior (DOI) funds is \$2.115 billion, leaving a potential gap of \$329 million 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 \$1.836 billion. Authorized funding for each agency as requested currently totals \$1.719 billion.

The project program estimate currently is at \$2,444,423,093 for PPL's 1 through 26. There are two projects (TE-45 and CS-21) with budget increase requests on the agenda totaling \$765,380. Two support projects are also requesting budget increases: \$171,410 for Construction Program

Technical Services, and \$211,113,932 for the CRMS program. If approved, these budget increases bring the total program estimate to \$2,656,473,815.

The CWPPRA Program has \$9,120,159 of funding carried from the May meeting. The Program has received expected DOI funding, and has earmarked \$72,782,034 for construction projects. The total available funds thus total \$81,902,193. If the aforementioned budget increases are approved, available funds would be reduced by \$765,380. Routine incremental requests will be presented individually at this meeting, totaling \$15,805,141. If all funding requests are approved, the Program will move forward with available funds totaling \$65,331,672.

CWPPRA has authorized 214 projects. The 154 active projects including 23 in Phase 1 Engineering and Design, 18 in Phase 2 Construction and 5 support projects. There are 108 projects which have been constructed and are now in O&M phase. Additionally, CWPPRA has deauthorized 46 projects, transferred 8 projects, and placed 6 in the inactive category. There are 5 support projects. The technical support programs include Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS), monitoring contingency, storm recovery, Construction Program technical support, and the wetland conservation plan.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman suggested that the difference between the Program estimate (\$2,444,423,093) and the projected funding be tracked (perhaps illustrated in a graph or chart) in order to demonstrate need for future re-authorization.

Mr. Clark pointed out that there is a project to be transferred, which would result in some funds being available, but until the transfer occurs, it is too early to speculate on what the precise amount would be.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public; none were proffered.

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Electronic Votes and Approvals (Kaitlyn Carriere, USACE). Ms. Carriere reported on recent requests approved via electronic vote.

On June 23, 2017 the Task Force approved support of the LSU Extension Service (in the amount of \$100,000 from the monitoring contingency fund) to monitor distribution and range expansion of the Roseau scale along the Louisiana Gulf Coast. The LSU Extension Service will report on their findings during the October meeting.

On September 5, 2017 the Task Force approved the motion to select a contractor that put together a proposal intended to bring the CWPPRA Task Force in compliance with Section 5014 of the WIIN Act by January 3, 2018, requiring the Task Force to issue guidelines for the use, maintenance and oversight of environmental banks in Louisiana.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered.

5. Agenda Item 4. Report: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Kaitlyn Carriere, USACE). *The P&E Subcommittee will report on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects. There were no projects that were considered for “critical watch.”*

Ms. Carriere reported that the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee met via conference call on July 11, 2017, and determined that there are no projects that meet the level of “critical watch”; therefore it had no recommendations to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Inman complimented the members of P&E Subcommittee and represented agencies for their progress and management of all projects.

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

6. Agenda Item 5. Report: Land Area Change in Coastal Louisiana (1932-2016) (Brady Couvillion, USGS). *Brady Couvillion with USGS presented the data, net land changes, and land change trends in coastal Louisiana from 1932 to 2016.*

Mr. Couvillion introduced himself and initially provided imagery which illustrated the extent of marsh loss in the Barataria Basin and Breton Sound. He illustrated the inadequate and inaccurate conclusions of simple pre-and-post-date land rate analysis, and provided reason for multi-date linear analysis. He then described in detail how the most recent report utilizes improved temporal resolution and improved statistical analysis. Overall results indicate a slowing of land loss since the early 1980’s, and estimate a total of 5,197 sq. kilometers of wetland loss along Louisiana’s coast since 1932. He presented graphs of all nine basins as visual representation of wetland loss rates and trends; the Atchafalaya Basin is the only delta experiencing wetland gains. Mr. Couvillion then presented a graph which illustrated overall wetland loss rates, and asserted that statistics indicate decreased wetland loss rates since the late 1970’s/ early ‘80s. When rates vary, causal mechanisms are considered – subsidence, sea level rise, storms, sediment deprivation, shoreline erosion, and salt-water intrusion. Mr. Couvillion then discussed several possible factors contributing to the decrease in wetland loss rates. He emphasized that the recent upward trend in loss rates do not predict future trends, and that wetland loss is still a serious problem. Finally, Mr. Couvillion presented future plans, which primarily include the utilization of new satellite technology. He then opened the floor for questions.

Mr. Clark asked about the resolution of the “shoe box” satellite constellations; Mr. Couvillion responded that a 3 meter or better resolution is expected.

Mr. Hartman inquired about future interpretation of satellite imagery regarding the differentiation of land and vegetation that is growing in standing water. Mr. Couvillion responded that the definition of “land” in Coastal Louisiana is not always clear, which is why multiple data sets are so important.

Mr. Clark offered another unit of datum as reference, calculating that 10.85 square miles, or 6900 acres are lost each year.

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

7. Agenda Item 6. Report: Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Demonstration Project (TE-45) Monitoring Results (Glen Curole, CPRA; Dr. Earl Melancon). Mr. Glen Curole and Dr. Earl Melancon presented the monitoring results and project effectiveness of the Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Demonstration Project.

Mr. Curole initiated the presentation with a history of the 8-year demonstration project, and provided details. The purpose of the project was to determine which structure (A-Jacks, Gabion mats, or Reefblks) is the most effective method in reducing erosion, and establishing and sustaining oyster reefs. It consisted of the three different erosion control structures (mentioned above) installed at three different reaches on Lake Barre. He described each structure and how they were installed at each site. Pre- and post- construction evaluations reveal that Gabion mats are most beneficial, although they exhibited greatest settlement.

Dr. Melancon then presented the biological metrics of the structures, primarily the population characteristics. He began by pointing out that most of the time the structures were partially or totally underwater. Initially the Reefblks were working well from a biological standpoint, but by the end of the project they deteriorated rapidly. His conclusion is that the Gabion mats are the most effective in shoreline protection and oyster reef formation was most successful on the A-Jacks and the Gabion mats. Gabion mats were deemed the best overall when assessing both oyster reef formation and erosion control. He concluded by expressing his pride in the graduate and undergraduate students who participated in the project.

Mr. Curole presented cost analysis, stating that the Reefblks were cheapest, and Gabion mats were most expensive. Also, the heaviest structure (Gabion mats) exhibited the most settling, followed by the A-Jacks.

Dr. Melancon concluded by reiterating appreciation for the effort that went into the project, and mentioned Dr. Quenton Fontenot, who served as PI and statistician for the project.

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

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public.

Tommy McInnis pointed out that the reference area exhibited early recruitment compared to the structures which exhibited a more bell-shaped curve without early recruitment. Dr. Melancon replied that early recruitment on the structures is ephemeral until oysters become a certain size, and that is when distribution should be assessed.

Mr. Hartman asked for clarification about the structures which are still providing oyster habitat and shoreline benefits. Dr. Melancon replied that the Gabion mats were certainly providing benefits; less so with the A-Jacks. Mr. Curole concurred.

Randy Moertel provided anecdotal evidence of the successful performance of Gabion mats for the last 20 years at a previous demonstration project on Bay L'ours. He asserted that the mats are not sinking there.

Mr. Inman called for further comments. None were proffered. He then thanked Dr. Melancon and Mr. Curole for their presentation, and commended their inclusion of graduate and undergraduate students in the project.

8. Agenda Item 7. Decision: Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Demonstration Project (TE-45) Closeout, Feature Removal, and Cost Increase (Darryl Clark; Robert Dubois, FWS). *The Fish and Wildlife Service and Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) request to proceed to close the Terrebonne Bay Demonstration project (TE-45) and remove its features for an approximate cost of \$538,529.*

Mr. Clark presented the request to close out the demonstration project just presented. He presented photographic evidence of Gabion mat detachment and Reefblk sinking at Reach E. He stated that at least at Reach E features should be removed because of safety concerns. Landowners do not wish to accept transfer, but will sign another land-use agreement if CWPPRA retains responsibility. He presented four options: 1) Ten-year Project extension at a cost of \$450,000, 2) Close-out without feature removal at Reach E only at a cost of \$300,000, 3) Project transfer (which the landowner is not willing to accept), and 4) Project closeout with removal of all structures at a cost of \$538,529. He concluded by iterating that the sponsoring agency recommendation is the latter – closeout and removal of all features.

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

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public.

Dr. Melancon asserted that Niki Pace, attorney with the Louisiana Sea Grant is looking into existing legislation and/or pursuing legislation that would protect landowners and state and federal entities with structures like these onsite. Mr. Clark responded that his concerns are not just for the entities that own or manage the structures, but for public safety in general.

Mr. Hartman questioned (and Ms. McCormick concurred) the rationale for removing the Gabion mats, as they are performing well. Mr. Clark reasserted the State and FWS's stance to remove all features.

Mr. Clark made the motion to remove all features, which Mr. Paul seconded, but Ms. McCormick reminded Mr. Inman that more public comments were forthcoming.

Ralph Libersat spoke in favor of keeping the features in place, cautioning the various CWPPRA committees to avoid the mentality of "building to remove". He asked for accident statistics involving any CWPPRA projects, and advised against spending the money to remove something that is working.

Chad Courville asserted that there is a state law to protect landowners, but no federal statute to address liability for coastal restoration features. He also stated that if liability is the fundamental concept for restoration, nothing would get done.

Leslie Suazo asked whether or not Terrebonne Parish had been approached with the notion of taking responsibility for the project. She also wondered about going forward with removal of features at Reach E, but leaving the other structures in place until a potential compromise between state, parish and landowner could be attained, especially if legal guidance is being developed through the Sea Grant.

Mr. Clark responded that he believes the parish has been approached, and he expressed willingness to amend the motion if it can be transferred to the parish.

Chad Courville approached the microphone again and stated that the state law he referred to earlier is limited in that it is not retroactive from its inception, which remains a concern for landowners.

Mr. Inman pointed out that CWPPRA has been aware of end-of-life issues for projects, but asserted that the sponsoring entity is ultimately responsible for deciding the best path forward. He reminded the committee that there was a motion made and seconded and once again asked for further comments.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that if the Technical Committee approves the recommendation to remove all features, the FWS is not obligated to do so; it simply has the funds available. He encouraged Mr. Clark and the FWS to reconsider removal of the Gabion mats.

Ms. McCormick concurred, stating that she prefers to leave in place the structures that are working, and evaluate their performance in the future.

Mr. Clark offered reassurance that the sponsoring agency would continue to consider leaving the Gabion mats in place, and reach out to parish entities and landowners, but wants to keep the recommendation as it stands in case other issues cannot be resolved.

Mr. Inman called for a vote on the motion made previously

DECISION: Mr. Clark made the motion to remove all features at a cost of \$538,529, which Mr. Paul seconded. The motion carried without dissent.

9. Agenda Item 8. Decision: Request for a No Cost Increase Time Extension for the Point au Fer Canal Plugs Project (TE-22) (Richard Hartman, NOAA). NOAA Fisheries and CPRA request a one year no cost increase time extension for the Point au Fer Canal Plugs (TE-22) project. The project was constructed in 1997 with a 20 year life expiration this year. At the request of the landowner, signage is being replaced on most of the structures prior to closing out the project while the structures are to be left in place.

Mr. Hartman stated that the project was supposed to closeout this year – the contract has been let, but construction will not have been completed in time to close it out. Thus he requested a one-year, no-cost time extension.

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made the motion for a one-year, no-cost time extension, which Ms. McCormick seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

10. Agenda Item 9. Report/Decision: Request for early closeout and budget increase to reconcile O&M costs for the Highway 384 HR Project (CS-21) (Darrell Pontiff, CPRA). CPRA and NRCS requested early closeout of the CS-21. The project sponsors request \$226,851.34 to reconcile current budget shortfall and cover close out costs. The project will be closed out by February 2018.

Darrel Pontiff began his request with a brief report on the history and status of the project. He pointed out several project features, and provided photographic evidence of the projects success and acreage gained. In order to reach the 20-year mark, project sponsors considered renewing agreements with (80) current landowners. That was deemed imprudent because of the time and cost involved, with the result being such a short time remaining before project closeout. Project agencies also considered extending the project for another 20 years at an estimated cost of \$2.8 million, but opted not to request that from CWPPRA. Thus, they are requesting an early close-out of the project in 2018, with structures that would remain in place (flap gates left open.) Due to a budgetary deficit, funds are being requested to reconcile the budget and cover the cost of close-out.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman expressed his concern about the flap gates being vandalized, if they are merely being locked open as planned. He urged project sponsors to consider removing the flap gates and associated structures completely or at least take measures to minimize the potential for vandalism. Ms. McCormick expressed her opinion that the structure should still be useful. Mr. Paul wondered about revisiting the budget to cover the cost of such actions. Mr. Pontiff assured the committee that the operations contractor would not likely charge much, so the cost associated with removal of flap gates and weir boards would likely be minimal.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. None were proffered.

DECISION: The motion to approve the early close-out request and the increase in budget of \$226,851.34 was made by Mr. Paul with the caveat that the flap gate and weir boards be removed and the other structures remain in place. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haase and carried motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Inman then called for a ten minute recess; the meeting reconvened at 11:50.

11. Agenda Item 10. Decision: Request for Initial Deauthorization of the Shell Beach South Marsh Creation Project (PO-168) (Karen McCormick, EPA). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority request the initiation of formal deauthorization procedures for the Shell Beach South Marsh Creation Project (PO-168). It is recommended that the project be deauthorized because restoration of the project is being

implemented within the Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group (LATIG) Final Restoration Plan #1 as part of the Deep Water Horizon Natural Resource Damage Assessment settlement.

Ms. McCormick made the request by explaining that the project lies within the footprint of another project (Lake Borgne Marsh Creation Increment I) which is being funded by BP, NRDA, and RESTORE monies. The state agency sponsoring the above-named project is willing to include the PO-168 project and take responsibility for it.

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

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made the motion to transfer the project to the state; Mr. Hartman seconded. The motion carried without dissent.

12. Agenda Item 11. Decision: Annual Request for Incremental Funding for FY20 Administrative Costs for Cash Flow Projects (Jernice Cheavis, USACE). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will request funding approval in the amount of \$34,083 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. The Technical Committee will consider and vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the request for funds.

Ms. Cheavis presented the request for funding to handle the administrative task for cash flow project beyond Increment I, the list for which is in the binders.

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark motioned to recommend to the Task Force approval of the request for funding in the amount of \$34,083 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. Ms. McCormick seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.

13. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Request for Funding for the CWPPRA Program's Technical Services (Michelle Fischer, USGS). The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and CPRA are requesting funding for technical services for the CWPPRA program in the amount of \$171,410. The Technical Committee will consider and vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the request for budget increase and funding for technical services in the amount of \$171,410.

Ms. Fischer presented the request, explaining that the money is used to maintain the LACoast.gov website, project information maintenance and end-phase project evaluation, and miscellaneous requests from various CWPPRA committees and partners.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark pointed out that there has not been an increase in the amount of this request for the last five years and commended Ms. Fischer for her efforts in that regard. Mr. Inman also commended Ms. Fisher for her responsiveness to requests that are directed to her.

DECISION: Mr. Haase made the motion to recommend to the Task Force approval for the request for budget increase and funding for technical services in the amount of \$171,410. Mr. Paul seconded and the motion passed without dissent.

14. Agenda Item 13. Decision: Request for a Project Extension and Budget Increase for the Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) for FY 2020 to FY 2039 (Leigh Anne Sharp, CPRA) . CPRA requests a project extension and budget increase for the Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) for FY 2020 to FY 2039 in the amount of \$210,706,411

Ms. Sharp began with an update on CRMS equipment and infrastructure in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, asserting that expected damage would be minimal. She assured the committee that transient post-storm effects on the coast would be captured at real-time sites and through reference network data collection. She declared that big land change would be captured when comparing anticipated 2018 coastwide flight data with 2015-16 coastwide flight data. Storm surge data is also expected as long as the sondes are in place and still functioning. Ms. Sharp then informed the committee that CRMS contractors are assisting LSU with their Phragmites Scale study by collecting data at CRMS sites, and sometimes collecting tissue samples while they are onsite. She expressed gratitude for responses she has received from CWPPRA regarding the first basin scale report, which should be published shortly.

Ms. Sharp continued by illustrating how important CRMS data is during the life-cycle of CWPPRA projects, and provided justification for the number of CRMS sites required to monitor coastal change. She reminded the committee that the CRMS system was recognized by the National Science Foundation as a model for other Gulf states to employ.

Ms. Sharp presented her budgetary request starting with the 20-year extension totaling 281 – 282 billion. She iterated her understanding that CWPPRA members did not respond favorably to that total, and that it is CWPPRA’s desire to not be the sole funding source for CRMS. Therefore, after meeting with CWPPRA representatives, she modified her request and is now requesting that CWPPRA fund the first five years of the new budget while other funding sources are sought.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Ms. McCormick affirmed the importance of CRMS, but noted that it diverts funding from restoration projects that could be constructed. She then counter-offered with a recommendation of a fully funding CRMS 5 until December 2020, after which a \$10 million cap would be imposed each year starting in FY 2021

Mr. Hasse confirmed that a meeting was held to discuss this issue, during which the value of CRMS was reiterated. He pointed out that this counter-proposal (to the original budget request) was an attempt to bridge the funding gap between CRMS 5 and CRMS 6 until alternate funding sources could be identified and obtained. He expressed concern that the expected timing of funding RFPs may ultimately result in a gap in sufficient funds to sustain CRMS.

Mr. Clark pointed out that funding for CWPPRA is not expected to increase, and that CWPPRA is paying for data it is not using for its projects, because some of the CRMS sites lie outside the

areas designated by the State Master Plan. He indicated his support of Ms. McCormick's counter proposal.

Ms. McCormick disagreed with the assertion that CRMS data is not valuable coastwide, especially while considering and evaluating the Master Plan.

Mr. Hartman spoke in support of the proposal made by EPA, and pointed out that other funding entities will not manifest themselves until CWPPRA makes it known that it will no longer be the sole funding source for CRMS.

Mr. Hasse asserted that some state funding is indeed directed toward monitoring through SWAMP, which encompasses CRMS, thus demonstrating the state's willingness to support coastal monitoring.

Mr. Paul spoke in favor of the EPA proposal, and suggested other funding sources besides RESTORE, which may be more obtainable to fill the early funding gap.

Mr. Clark defended his earlier comments by pointing out that CWPPRA pays for CRMS *and* project-specific monitoring because not all CWPPRA projects are located where CRMS stations exist; thus the data may not be relevant to CWPPRA projects.

Ms. Sharp countered by asserting that CRMS data is the framework throughout the life of any CWPPRA project, relevant to planning, hydrologic implications, etc., but agrees that project-specific monitoring can be a necessary and added expense.

Mr. Inman concluded the discussion by saying that \$10 million is a good starting point in the annual budget for CRMS, and is hopeful that other agencies/ entities will be able to help. He also pointed out that this situation is much like the annual vote on PPL projects when excellent projects get voted out, another indication of limited funding.

Ms. McCormick was asked to reiterate her proposal. Some discussion ensued to clarify exact figures, and fiscal timing.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. None were proffered.

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made the motion to fully fund CRMS 5, thereafter capping its annual funding to \$10 million. Mr. Paul seconded the motion which passed without dissent.

15. Agenda Item 14. Decision: Request for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Incremental Funding (Stuart Brown, CPRA) *The Technical Committee will consider and vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY20 incremental funding in the amount of \$3,013,954.*

Stuart Brown began by stating that the funding for these projects has already been approved, and that he is asking for incremental funding to perform the associated tasks. He highlighted only the projects requesting more than \$100,000. The request applies to the following projects:

- a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$2,818,707 for the following projects:
 - Freshwater Introduction South of Highway 82 (ME-16), PPL-9, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$15,056
 - Black Bayou Culverts Hydrologic Restoration (CS-29), PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$34,899
 - GIWW - Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization (CS-30) PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$13,733
 - Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (TV-18), PPL-9, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$6,710
 - Barataria Barrier Island Complex (BA-38) , PPL-11, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$12,184
 - Little Lake Shoreline Protection (BA-37), PPL-11, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$8,878
 - Pass Chaland to Grand Bayou Pass Barrier Island Restoration, (BA-35), PPL-11,
Incremental funding amount: \$6,767
 - Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount (FY16): \$1,443,703
 - South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22), PPL-12, USACE
Incremental funding amount: \$8,651
 - East Marsh Island Marsh Creation (TV-21), PPL-14, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$14,568
 - West Bell Pass Barrier Headland Restoration, (TE-52), PPL-16, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$7,085
 - Bayou Dupont Marsh and Ridge Creation, (BA-48), PPL-17, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$7,067
 - Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration, (BA-68), PPL-18, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$7,004
 - Coastwide Vegetative Planting (LA-39), PPL-20, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$1,232,402

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. None were proffered.

DECISION: Mt. Hartman made the motion to recommend to the Task Force approval of the PPL 9+ Projects request for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$2,818,707. Mr. Clark seconded and the motion passed without dissent.

Mr. Brown continued:

b. PPL 1-8 Project requesting approval for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$195,247:

- Freshwater Bayou Wetland Protection (ME-04), PPL-2, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$11,645
- Cameron Creole Maintenance (CS-04a), PPL-3, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$102,166
- Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures at Headquarters Canal, West Cove Canal, and Hog Island Gully (CS-23), PPL-3, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$ 49,849
- Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization (ME-13), PPL-5, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$11,645
- Black Bayou Hydrologic Restoration (CS-27), PPL-6, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$19,942

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and public. None were proffered.

DECISION: Mt. Hartman made the motion to recommend to the Task Force approval of the PPL 1-8 Project request for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$195,247. Mr. Paul seconded and the motion passed without dissent.

16. Agenda Item 15. Decision: Request for Monitoring Incremental Funding (Stuart Brown, CPRA) The Technical Committee will consider and vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force to FY20 incremental funding in the amount of \$12,591,710.62.

Mr. Brown noted that there are no requests over \$100,000, and continued with the request for the following projects:

- a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$625,849 for the following projects:
- Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection (BA27c), PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$5,003
 - GIWW – Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization (CS-30), PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$5,169
 - Freshwater Introduction South of Highway 82 (ME-16), PPL-9, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$11,000
 - Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (TV-18), PPL-9, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$50,000

- Timbalier Island Marsh/Dune Restoration (TE-40), PPL-10, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$49,934
- North Lake Mechant Landbridge Restoration (TE-44), PPL-10, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$81,818
- Delta Management at Fort St. Phillip (BS-11), PPL-10, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$39,808
- East Sabine Lake Hydrologic Restoration (CS-32), PPL-11, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$61,636
- Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount (FY16): \$92,233
- Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge (BA-36), PPL-11, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$50,384
- Goose Point/Pointe Platte Marsh Creation (PO-33), PPL-13, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$45,071
- West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration (TE-52), PPL-16, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$37,134
- Coastwide Vegetative Planting (LA-39), PPL-20, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$96,659

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee and public. None were proffered.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made the motion to recommend to the Task Force approval of the PPL 9+ Projects request for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$625,849. Mr. Paul seconded and the motion passed without dissent.

Mr. Brown continued:

- b. PPL 1-8 Project requesting approval for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$6,017:
 - Naomi Outfall Project (BA-03c), PPL-5, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$6,017

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. None were proffered.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made the motion to recommend to the Task Force approval of the PPL 1-8 Project request for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$6,017. Mr. Clark seconded and the motion passed without dissent.

- c. Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) requesting approval for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$11,953,827.62:
 - Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) (LA-30) USGS

Incremental funding amount: \$11,953,827.62

Mr. Inman opened the floor to comments from the public. None were proffered.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made the motion to recommend to the Task Force approval of the Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) request for FY20 incremental funding in the total amount of \$11,953,827.62. Mr. Clark seconded and the motion passed without dissent.

17. Agenda Item 16. Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE)

No additional items were proposed.

18. Agenda Item 17. Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman, USACE)

Nedra Haines with the Chenier Plain Authority spoke to remind committee members about her invitation (which they should have received) to a CWPPRA/ Vermilion Parish/ Chenier Plain Authority event Oct 4, 2017 at the Vermilion Parish Library in Abbeville, LA. She will follow up with a phone call to get a head count.

19. Agenda Item 18. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Dedication Event (Brad Inman, USACE) A dedication ceremony will be held on October 11, 2017. The ceremony will begin at 10:00 a.m. at the USFWS Southeast Louisiana Refuges Complex (Big Branch) in Lacombe, LA. More details will be provided via the CWPPRA Newsflash.

Mr. Inman announced that a dedication ceremony for CWPPRA projects is planned on October 11, 2017 at the USFWS Southeast Louisiana Refuges Complex (Big Branch) in Lacombe, LA; more details will follow via newsflash.

20. Agenda Item 19. Announcement: Dates of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE)

Mr. Inman announced that the next Task Force meeting will be held October 12, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana.

21. Agenda Item 20. Announcement: Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE)

October 12, 2017	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
December 7, 2017	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
January 2017	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans

*Dates are subject to change. Please check back with lacoast.gov for the latest calendar.

22. Agenda Item 21. Decision: Adjourn Ms. McCormick made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Clark seconded. Mr. Inman adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:35 p.m.