CEMVN-PM-BC 7 December 2017

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 7 December 2017 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Agenda Item 1. Mr. Brad Inman opened the meeting at 9:35 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. Agenda Item 1. Meeting Initiation

Mr. Inman introduced himself. He asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves and asked for any opening remarks. He acknowledged the anniversary date of the attack on Pearl Harbor and paid tribute to the veterans of WWII.

Mr. Inman reminded attendees that at this meeting the Technical Committee would be voting on projects for Phase I and Phase II activities.

Mr. Inman then recognized Mr. Rick Hartman, who is retiring. Each of the Technical Committee members expressed words of commendation and appreciation as did John Foret of Fenstermaker, who once worked with Mr. Hartman. Mr. Hartman was presented with a certificate acknowledging his exemplary contribution to the CWPPRA program. Mr. Hartman announced that Patrick Williams would be taking his place on the Technical Committee, citing his experience and knowledge of the Program. He then iterated his plans for retirement, and expressed his pleasure in having been part of the Program.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor to the Technical Committee for any changes to the agenda.

With none forthcoming, Mr. Inman asked for a motion to adopt the agenda.

Decision: Ms. McCormick made the motion to adopt the agenda as is. Mr. Haase seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.

Mr. Inman reviewed the process for public comment and reminded attendees 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.

Ms. Jernice Cheavis, USACE, presented an overview of CWPPRA funds. The fully funded total program estimate since its inception (for PPL 1 – 26) is \$2,627 billion. Total projected funding for all authorized projects in addition to projected Department of the Interior (DOI) funds and state funds is \$2.107 billion. A potential gap of \$520 million remains if the Program were to construct all projects to date; the increase in this funding gap is due to the recently approved 20-year budget for CRMS program. Current Task Force-approved funding for projects in Phase I, Phase II and O&M totals \$1.816 billion. Authorized funding for each agency as requested currently totals \$1.716 billion.

The CWPPRA Program has \$9,120,159 of funding carried from the October Task Force meeting. The Program estimate of FY 2018 DOI funding, was \$77,782,034, of which \$5 million is set aside for planning activities. Funding approved in October for O&M and Monitoring totaled 16,031,992 which has been deducted from the original balance. The actual amount appropriated by DOI in November was \$79, 935, 402, an increase of \$2,153,368 from the previously reported DOI estimate. The total available remaining funds thus total \$68,023,569. Mr. Clark commented that the Sabine Marsh Creation project (Cycle 4 & 5) will likely be returning \$3.5 million to the Program. Mr. Inman cautioned that the final accounting has not yet been approved by the Corps' Resource Management Office. Ms. Cheavis will coordinate the closeout actions prior to the January Task Force Meeting.

Ms. Cheavis the presented a pie chart summarizing projects as follows: CWPPRA has authorized 214 projects. There are 154 active projects including 23 in Phase 1 Engineering and Design, 16 in Phase 2 Construction and 5 support projects. There are 110 projects which have been constructed and are now in the O&M phase. Additionally, CWPPRA has deauthorized 46 projects, transferred 8 projects, and placed 6 in the inactive category.

Finally, Ms. Cheavis provided a spreadsheet on which today's voting/ funding tallies will be calculated.

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control Measures (CS-65) Project Update (Jason Curole, CPRA) The Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority presented an update on the CS-65 RESTORE project, Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control Measures, which may inform CWPPRA project decisions for that region in the future.

Mr. Curole introduced himself as the Project Manager for the CS-65 RESTORE project. He pointed out that the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control Measures project is not a CWPPRA project, but contends that it is of vital interest to stakeholders present today. He provided a synopsis of the necessity of the project, a brief history of project feasibility and development, and a summary of project features, asserting that this project will enhance the success and

longevity of marsh creation projects adjacent to the ship channel. Mr. Curole then provided details of project feature refinement based on multiple models. He iterated plans to advance only the five southernmost features, shelving the remaining nine because they were not feasible. Mr. Curole announced that CPRA will host several informational meetings in early 2018 in order to garner opinion and support from major stakeholders.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman stated concerns about impacts to fish movement and other natural resources, and encouraged inter-agency coordination between CPRA and NOAA Fisheries prior to changing the number and/or location of project features. Mr. Curole re-stated CPRA's commitment to engage stakeholders.

Mr. Clark posed a question regarding the amount of salinity reduction expected with the project. Mr. Curole explained that according to the models, there was significant reduction but not much variance between all fourteen structures being employed and just the southernmost five features.

Mr. Inman asked about the time frame for permit application; Mr. Curole stated that it should be ready by the middle of next year.

Mr. Hartman requested a copy of the presentation, which will be made available on the USACE website as a matter of public record.

Mr. Inman expressed his gratitude to Mr. Curole for taking the time to make the presentation, stating that CPRA projects may indeed inform and influence CWPPRA project planning.

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

5. Agenda Item 4. Decision: Request for Final Transfer of the Shell Beach South Marsh Creation Project (PO-168) (Karen McCormick, EPA) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority made the request for final formal transfer procedures for the Shell Beach South Marsh Creation Project (PO-168). I

Ms. McCormick began the request by expressing her gratitude to CPRA for accepting the project, and including it within the Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group (LATIG) Final Restoration Plan #1 as part of the Deep Water Horizon Natural Resource Damage Assessment settlement.

Mr. Inman pointed out that if the project is transferred, the monies allocated for it would return to the CWPPRA Program.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion.

Decision: Ms. McCormick made the motion for final transfer of the project; Mr. Haase seconded and the motion carried without dissent.

6. Agenda Item 5. Decision: Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Demonstration Project (TE-45)
Closeout, Feature Removal, and Cost Increase (Darryl Clark, FWS) The Fish and Wildlife
Service and Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) made the request to
proceed to close the Terrebonne Bay Demonstration project (TE-45) and remove all features
but the Reach A & B gabions for an approximate cost of \$498,730.

Darryl Clark began by reiterating details of the original plan for closeout as previously presented at recent Technical Committee and Task Force meetings. Those details included removal of all features at an original cost of \$538, 527. However, the details have been modified, so the request is now for close out with removal of all features except the Gabion mats at reaches A & B, which are functioning well, and which pose no public safety issues. The cost estimate is now \$498,730, including landrights costs and signage (expenses previously overlooked.) Mr. Clark estimates a \$100,000 savings with the new closeout plan.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman, while willing to approve the expenditure for landrights acquisition, believes that the cost estimate is excessive. Mr. Clark concurred. Mr. Haase agreed as well, but cautioned not to "cut corners" in that regard.

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

Decision: Mr. Clark moved that the Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force closeout of TE-45, with the removal of all features except the Gabion mats at reaches A & B at a cost of \$498,730. Mr. Paul seconded, and the motion carried without dissent.

7. Agenda Item 6. Decision: Monitoring Budget Increase for Highway 384 Hydrologic Restoration (CS-21) (Leigh Anne Sharp, CPRA) CPRA and NRCS request a budget increase of \$20,000 for CS-21.

Ms. Sharp made the request in order to close-out the project early as proposed, for \$8000 to fill an overage for monitoring needs, and an additional \$12,000 to update the final OM&M Report. The final report will include a land change analysis from USGS and CPRA's end of project life assessment.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion.

Decision: Mr. Hartman made the motion for the budget increase, which Mr. Paul seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

8. Agenda Item 7. Report/Decision: 27<sup>th</sup> Priority Project List (Kevin Roy, FWS). *The Environmental Workgroup Chairman presented an overview of the ten PPL 27 candidate projects. The Technical Committee voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force for selecting PPL 27 projects for Phase I Engineering and Design.* 

Kevin Roy, FWS, provided an overview of projects which have been evaluated, and are being considered for PPL 27 Phase I Engineering and Design. The projects are listed in the table below:

Region	Basin	PPL 27 Candidates	Agency
1	Pontchartrain	Point aux Marchettes Shoreline Protection	FWS
1	Pontchartrain	Bayou Cane Marsh Creation	FWS
2	Breton Sound	East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS
2	Breton Sound	Mid Breton Land Bridge Marsh Creation and Terracing	FWS
2	Breton Sound	Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation (West)	NMFS
2	Barataria	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration	FWS
2	Barataria	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Critical Area Shoreline Protection	NRCS
3	Terrebonne	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing	FWS
3	Terrebonne	North Bayou DeCade Ridge and Marsh Creation	NRCS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Sabine Marsh Creation Cycles 6&7	FWS

Mr. Inman thanked the work groups and experts who gathered information and public input, and commended them for remaining within budget. He then asked for questions or comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark reiterated his appreciation as well to project managers, agencies, landowners and all involved in the planning process.

Mr. Hartman expressed his disagreement regarding CWPPRA funds being used to subsidize USACE dredging activities, (i.e. Sabine Marsh Creation Cycle 6&7), asserting that the USACE should be fully responsible for maintenance dredging and beneficial use of dredge materials. Ms. McCormick concurred with Mr. Hartman, and would rather see the sediment used beneficially. Mr. Clark explained that with CWPPRA funding dredged materials are more likely to be placed on CWPPRA project sites vs. upland disposal sites. Mr. Inman further explained that the USACE has developed a 20-year dredge material disposal plan, but that budget shortfalls preclude dredging as much as is stated in that plan. He also pointed out that the Port of Lake Charles must compete with larger ports for funding, and that the larger ports are often prioritized.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for public comment.

Eric Zollinger with Biloxi Marsh Lands Corporation spoke in favor of the Point aux Marchettes Shoreline Protection project, citing the erosion along Lake Borgne and corresponding wetland degradation.

Ryan Bourriaque, Cameron Parish Administrator spoke in favor of the Sabine Marsh Creation Cycle 6&7 project, citing cost-effectiveness, apparent success of previous cycles, and protection of several communities.

Ralph Libersat with the Chenier Plain Authority and representing Vermilion Parish spoke in favor of the Sabine Marsh Creation Cycles 6&7 citing previous success, and offered his opinion that CWPPRA should fund the project to assure that the dredged materials are used beneficially.

Amanda Phillips with the Edward Wisner Donation spoke in favor of the Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Critical Area Shoreline Protection project, for protection of Wisner property north of Turtle Bay.

Laurie Cormier of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury spoke in favor of the Sabine Marsh Creation Cycle 6&7 project, citing directives of the 2012 and 2017 State Master Plans and the extent of Lake Charles area economic development.

Phil Precht of Conoco Phillips asked for support of the Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and the East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing projects.

Guy McInnis, St. Bernard Parish President asked for support of the Point aux Marchettes Shoreline Protection citing subsidence rates and protection of the Biloxi Marsh. He also spoke in favor of the East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing project, citing the need to protect the state's commercial fishing industry and synergy with other projects.

Harold Schoeffler with the Sierra Club spoke of his concerns about borrow sites and whether or not the dredged materials are appropriate for use in certain areas, and the unintended impacts such activities may have on habitat, fishing, etc. He also questioned the use of public dollars on private land. He finally questioned whether or not the projects are subject to permitting and compliant with NEPA and Clean Water Act provisions.

Lauren Averill with Jefferson Parish spoke in support of the Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation project citing its importance as part of the entire Mid-Barataria Landbridge project.

Luke Ehrensing, engineer in the Little Lake Hunting Club area, commended the Technical Committee for their service and complimented the dredging and marsh creation projects that have been very successful. He asked for support of the Northeast Turtle Bay project.

Amanda Voisin of LaFourche Parish Government spoke in favor of the East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation project, citing synergy with other parish projects.

Robert Spears with Plaquemines Parish CZM spoke in favor of three projects: Mid-Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Terracing, Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation (West) and the Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration projects.

Albertine Kimbal, Plaquemines Parish citizen spoke in favor of the three aforementioned projects also, citing post-construction sustainability of the Mid-Breton and Breton Landbridge (West) projects, and essential storm surge protection which the Grand Bayou Ridge Restoration would provide.

Mr. Schoeffler approached the microphone again and questioned the monitoring of projects, citing projects that have either failed, or have had unintended consequences. Mr. Clark responded with assurances that detailed monitoring reports are available on the *lacoast.gov* website. Mr. Hartman pointed out that annual inspection reports are available on all projects as well.

Mr. Inman informed the audience that the Committee received several written comments in support of various projects; those have been or will be included in the briefing binders. Mr. Hartman reminded the attendees that the Committee is only allowed to vote for six of the ten projects nominated today. Mr. Inman explained the scoring matrix and recessed the meeting for voting to ensue.

Mr. Inman reconvened the meeting at 11:12 a.m., and asked Sarah Bradley to announce the results. Ms. Bradley did so as follows with the highest-ranking projects highlighted in yellow:

CWPPRA PPL 27 Technical Committee VOTE

7-Dec-17

Region	Project	COE	State	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
2	Mid Breton Land Bridge Marsh Creation and Terracing	3	6		6	5	4	5	24
1	Bayou Cane Marsh Creation	4	3	5		3	1	5	16
2	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Critical Area Shoreline Protection	1	1	2	2		6	5	12
4	Sabine Marsh Creation Cycles 6&7	6	5	6			3	4	20
2	East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing	5	4			4	2	4	15
2	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration		2	4	5	1		4	12
2	Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation (West)			3	3	6		3	12
3	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Terracing	2			4	2		3	8
3	North Bayou DeCade Ridge and Marsh Creation			1	1		5	3	7
1	Point aux Marchettes Shoreline Protection							0	0
	check	21 21	21 21	21 21	21 21	21 21	21 21	36 36	126 128

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion to recommend these projects to the Task Force for PPL 27.

Decision: Mr. Hartman made the motion to recommend the highest-ranking projects to the Task Force for final approval; Mr. Clark seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.

9. Agenda Item 8. Report/Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Sarah Bradley, USACE) The Technical Committee considered requests for Phase II authorization and approval of Increment 1 funding for cash flow projects for recommendation to the Task Force.

Due to limited funding, the Technical Committee will recommend a list of projects for Task Force approval within available program construction funding limits. Ms. Cheavis stated that the total available funding for Phase II Increment I funding is \$52,772,264. Representatives from the sponsoring agencies provided an overview of details and benefits for each project listed in the following table.

Agency	Project No.	PPL	Project Name	Phase II, Increment 1 Request	Fully- Funded Phase 1 Cost	Fully-Funded Phase II Cost incl O&M	Total Fully Funded Cost Est.	Net Benefit Acres	Total Cost per Acre
FWS	BS-24	22	Terracing and Marsh Creation South of Big Mar	\$35,564,224	\$2,308,599	\$36,697,435	\$39,006,034	314	\$124,223
FWS	BA-173	23	Bayou Grande Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration	\$35,108,413	\$2,742,302	\$36,274,092	\$39,016,394	237	\$164,626
NRCS	CS-49	18	Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2	\$18,567,073	\$1,614,405	\$24,015,234	\$25,629,639	218	\$117,567
EPA	BA-171	23	Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration	\$28,726,929	\$3,354,935	\$30,168,626	\$33,523,561	165	\$203,173

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee. None were proffered.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the public.

Ryan Bourriaque, Cameron Parish Administrator, spoke in favor of the Cameron Creole Freshwater Introduction project, citing broad public support based on information provided by CPRA and FWS, and police jury support.

Robert Spears of Plaquemines Parish Government spoke in favor of Bayou Grand Chenier Marsh and Ridge Restoration project, citing synergy with other CWPPRA projects.

Ralph Libersat, representing Chenier Plain Authority and Vermilion Parish, spoke in favor of the Cameron Creole Freshwater Introduction project, asserting that it is the only project proposed in SW Louisiana at this time.

Amanda Philips of the Wisner Donation read a letter from the Greater LaFourche Port Commission in favor of the Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration project, citing storm protection of vital oil & gas infrastructure, and unique natural resources in the area, as well as protection of adjacent CWPPRA projects.

Leslie Suazo with Ducks Unlimited spoke on behalf of Phil Precht in favor of the above named project, citing, protection of the oil & gas infrastructure and interior marshes.

Ted Joanen representing Miami Corporation spoke in favor of the Cameron Creole Freshwater Introduction project, because it would provide a barrier against the tremendous amount of salt water coming from the Calcasieu ship channel gates. Project benefits would include increased sedimentation and plant productivity.

Doug Miller of the North American Land Company and Sweet Lake Land & Oil Company spoke in full support of the Cameron Creole Freshwater Introduction project citing its longevity on the CWPPRA books, its relatively lower cost, and reiterating that it is the only one being proposed for the southwest side of the coast.

Laurie Cormier with the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury asked for support of CS-49.

Dottie Hartman asked questions regarding the borrow site for the Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Restoration project. She spoke of the extraordinary condition of Caminada Beach Restoration at Elmers Island, and encouraged the public to visit.

Amanda Voisin of LaFourche Parish Government spoke in favor of the Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Restoration project.

Albertine Kimble a Plaquemines Parish citizen spoke in favor of the Terracing and Marsh Creation South of Big Mar project, citing sustainability provided by the Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion project.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that there may be funding limitations for more than one project if CS-49 is not selected. Mr. Clark provided an estimate of possible increased funding expected which would bring the potential total to \$56.3 million. Mr. Inman explained the scoring matrix and recessed the meeting for voting to ensue.

Mr. Inman reconvened the meeting at 12:12 p.m., and asked Sarah Bradley to announce the results. Ms. Bradley did so as follows with the highest-ranking projects highlighted in yellow:

Project No.	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	STATE	No. of Agency Votes	Sum of Weighted Score
BA-171	Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration	2	3	3	1	1	3	6	13
C <b>S</b> -49	Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2	1	1		3	3	1	5	9
BS-24	Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar	3		1	2	2		4	8
BA-173	Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration		2	2			2	3	6
	BA-171 CS-49 BS-24	BA-171 Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration  CS-49 Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2  BS-24 Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar	BA-171 Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration 2  CS-49 Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2 1  BS-24 Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar 3  BA-173 Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration	BA-171 Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration 2 3  CS-49 Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2 1 1  BS-24 Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar 3  BA-173 Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration 2	BA-171 Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration 2 3 3  CS-49 Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2 1 1  BS-24 Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar 3 1  BA-173 Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration 2 2	BA-171         Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration         2         3         3         1           CS-49         Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2         1         1         3           BS-24         Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar         3         1         2           BA-173         Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration         2         2	BA-171         Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration         2         3         3         1         1           CS-49         Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2         1         1         3         3           BS-24         Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar         3         1         2         2           BA-173         Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration         2         2         2	Project No.         Project         COE         EPA         FWS         NMFS         NRCS         STATE           BA-171         Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration         2         3         3         1         1         3           CS-49         Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2         1         1         3         3         1           BS-24         Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar         3         1         2         2           BA-173         Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration         2         2         2         2	BA-171         Caminada Headland Back Barrier Marsh Restoration         2         3         3         1         1         3         6           CS-49         Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU 2         1         1         3         3         1         5           BS-24         Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar         3         1         2         2         4           BA-173         Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh and Ridge Restoration         2         2         2         3

Sum of Votes:

Ms. Cheavis was asked to provide the total amount for both projects chosen for Phase II Increment I funding. She indicated that the total is \$47,294,012, leaving a remainder of \$5,478,252.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee. Mr. Clark reiterated the probable return of \$3.5 million that will be added to this remainder.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the public. None were proffered, so he called for a motion.

Decision: Mr. Hartman moved that the top ranking projects be recommended to the Task Force for Phase II Increment I funding. Mr. Paul seconded, and the motion carried without dissent.

- 10. Agenda Item 9. Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE) None were proffered.
- 11. Agenda Item 10. Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman, USACE)

Mr. Schoeffler spoke with concerns about the causes of coastal problems, suggesting that human manipulation of coastland features have contributed to mash loss. Mr. Inman responded that the State Master Plan reveals the extent of study that has been invested in examining the causes and effects of coastal loss.

# 12. <u>Announcement: Priority Project List 28 Regional Planning Team Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE)</u>

January 30, 2018	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Grand Chenier
January 31, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
February 1, 2018	10:00 a.m.	Region I & II Planning Team Meeting	g Lacombe
February 27, 2018	10:30 a.m.	Coastwide Electronic Voting	(via email, no meeting

#### 13. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE)

Sarah Bradley was called upon to announce that the CWPPRA Task Force meeting will be held January 25, 2018 at 9:30 a.m. at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana in the District Assembly Room (DARM). She reminded attendees that this is when final approval of the projects voted on today will take place.

# 14. Agenda Item 13. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE)

January 25, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
January 30, 2018	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Grand Chenier
January 31, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
February 1, 2018	10:00 a.m.	Region I & II Planning Team Meeting	Lacombe
April 12, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee Meeting	Baton Rouge
May 24, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Task Force Meeting	New Orleans
September 13, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee Meeting	Baton Rouge
October 11, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Task Force Meeting	New Orleans
December 6, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee Meeting	Baton Rouge

## 15. Decision: Adjourn

Mr. Inman called for a motion to adjourn.

Decision: Mr. Hartman made the motion to adjourn, which Mr. Clark seconded; the motion carried without dissent. He meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.