

13 September 18

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 13 September 2018 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Mark Wingate opened the meeting at 9:34 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Mr. Patrick Williams, NOAA Fisheries

Mr. Mark Wingate, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman

Mr. Brain Lezina, 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. Wingate introduced himself, and asked for a brief moment to acknowledge the people of the East Coast who are facing a dangerous hurricane situation. He then asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves, which they did. Mr. Wingate asked for any opening remarks from the Committee; none were forthcoming.

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

Ms. McCormick mentioned a slight modification in the budget regarding the requests for Incremental funding; she requested that the change be addressed as that line item comes up in these proceedings. No objection was raised to her suggestion. No changes to the formal agenda were adopted. Mr. Wingate reminded attendees about the protocol for public comment, and 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.

Ms. Jernice Cheavis, USACE, presented an overview of CWPPRA funds. The fully funded total Program Estimate since its inception to the present (PPLs 1 – 27) is \$2.797 billion. Total projected funding received since inception (through FY 2018 and in addition to projected Department of the Interior (DOI) funds) is \$2.095 billion, leaving a potential gap of \$702 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 and Monitoring totals \$2.084 billion. Authorized funding for each agency as requested currently totals \$1.774 billion.

As previously mentioned the Program Estimate is currently \$2,797,729,632 for PPL's 1 – 27. There are several budget increases that will be brought to the Task Force for approval, which would potentially increase the total Program Estimate by \$11,504,617. The annual request for funding for Construction Program Technical Services would result in an increase of \$182,951. If all are approved, these budget increases bring the total program estimate to \$2,808,417,200.

The CWPPRA Program has \$9,033,393 of funding carried from the May Task Force meeting. The Program has received an estimate of DOI funding in the amount of \$75,674,836 (which will be allocated for the FY19 construction program.) Thus, the total available funds for requests presented at today's proceedings is \$84,708,229. The total of anticipated funding requests (which will be presented individually at this meeting) is \$13,594,622. If all funding requests are approved, the Program will move forward into 2019 with available funds totaling \$71,113,607.

CWPPRA has authorized 214 projects. The 141 active projects including 26 in Phase 1 Engineering and Design, 15 in Phase 2 Construction and 5 support projects. There are 95 projects which have been constructed and are now in O&M phase, and 17 projects that have been closed financially. 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. Wingate opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee; none were proffered.

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Report: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Brad Inman, USACE)

On behalf of the Planning and Evaluation subcommittee, Mr. Inman reported on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects. He asserted that the P&E subcommittee met in August 2018 to discuss and deem projects as challenged, on schedule, or delayed. No projects were selected for the "critical watch" list at that time. He referred to the list of unconstructed projects provided to the Technical Committee in their binders.

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

5. Agenda Item 4. Decision/Report: CWPPRA Draft 2018 Report to Congress (Kaitlyn Carriere, USACE)

Ms. Carriere gave an update on the draft Report to Congress, beginning with an assertion that EPA and COE have been working on the draft report; she provided a synopsis of its structure, which successfully reduces its bulk from 70+ pages to about 20 pages. The Technical Committee is being asked to review the draft and submit their comments in a timely manner, so that EPA can design the report for publication. The final design/ draft should be ready for Technical Committee approval in December. Ms. Carriere pointed out that several agencies contribute to portions of the report; she thus requested Technical Committee approval to add an additional note to the FY 18 and FY 19 planning budget to disburse funds among agencies for this effort. She pointed out that this would not result in a budget increase.

Mr. Wingate asked about the status of agency comments, wondering if comments were "aligned" among the agencies; Ms. Carriere responded affirmatively, and asserted that comments have not resulted in major changes to the report. Mr. Clark claimed that FWS comments have been submitted, and commended all involved for their efforts. He reminded attendees that Congress

requires CWPPRA to specifically include fish and wildlife benefits, and requested that a table be included in the report to illustrate such.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. On behalf of the EPA, Ms. McCormick offered support and willing assistance to complete the report; she reiterated the request for timely comments and additional information so that the format/ design could begin and proceed more efficiently. Mr. Williams iterated his appreciation for all agencies and their efforts toward the draft report. Mr. Wingate commended the CWPPRA organization on the efforts to make the report shorter and more succinct, suggesting that Congress would thus be better able to evaluate the success of the Program and more likely perpetuate funding for the Program. Mr. Inman concurred with that notion, and offered commendation to Ms. Carriere and Brad Crawford (EPA) for their leading efforts.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to discussion from the public. Ralph Libersat, Vermilion Parish approached the microphone, requesting a hard copy of the report for use in promoting the Program to Congress and other political entities. Several committee members offered assurances that the final document (once approved by the Task Force) would certainly be dispersed to the public either in hard copy or via the website.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion (which Mr. Inman iterated) to include a note on the FY18 and FY19 Planning Budget that would allow funds to be disbursed as needed (without increasing the budget) to various agencies as they contribute to the Report to Congress.

Decision: Ms. McCormick made the motion, which Mr. Clark seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

6. Agenda Item 5. Decision/Report: CWPPRA 20-Year Life Process Review (Brad Inman, USACE)

As a result of a motion made at the last Task Force meeting, the Technical Committee was tasked with reviewing the 20-year life process and identifying any improvements that can be made. On behalf of the P&E subcommittee, Mr. Inman reported that discussions were far-reaching and covered many details. As a result, recommendations regarding the 20-year life process have been provided to the Technical Committee in their binders for their consideration. The suggested improvements include changes to the process matrix and a renewed commitment to adhere to the process. Mr. Inman admitted that as a process, continual re-evaluation would likely be necessary.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. Mr. Clark expressed no objection to the changes in the process matrix, but addressed the “closeout inspection”. He highlighted concerns about structural components of projects, which he believes should be carefully evaluated during closeout proceedings to make sure they would not cause issues if they remain at the site after closeout. All other agency representatives on the Committee were satisfied with the recommended changes.

Mr. Wingate called for public comments. None were proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion (which Mr. Inman iterated) to accept the changes proposed by the P&E subcommittee regarding the 20-year closeout process, and to recommend the changes to the Task Force for approval.

Decision: Mr. Paul made the motion, which Mr. Williams seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

7. Agenda Item 6. Decision: Request for a Change in Scope for the PPL 19 – LaBranche East Marsh Creation (PO-75) (Mike Nichols, NRCS)

Mr. Nichols initiated the presentation with a history of PO-75 project (part of PPL-17), its location and its original scope. The original plan included marsh creation and nourishment of 715 acres within a semi-confined area adjacent to PO-17. He is now proposing fully contained marsh creation, which would omit some acreage due to dike placement restrictions. The new scope also includes the construction of interior ponds and tidal channels. Mr. Nichols summarized the project costs and benefits as follows: Costs are increased by about 34% from \$32,323,291 to \$43,365,132; benefits are reduced by 10% from 715 to 657 net acres.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. Mr. Clark questioned the cost increase. Mr. Nichols explained that the construction method (fully contained dikes) increases the cost, as does an overall increase in contractor prices in today's construction market. Mr. Wingate questioned contingency costs; Mr. Paul responded by saying that the sponsoring agencies are working toward a 95% design plan, and would provide those details at a later date.

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

Mr. Wingate called for a motion to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the change in scope for PO-75.

Decision: Mr. Paul made the motion, which Mr. Clark seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

8. Agenda Item 7. **Decision: Request of a Transfer of O&M to Monitoring for the Grand White Lake Land Bridge Project (ME-19) (Leigh Anne Sharp, CPRA)** *The Fish and Wildlife Service and Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority request Technical Committee approval to transfer \$72,800 from the Grand-White Lake Land Bridge project (ME-19) O&M budget to the Monitoring budget to continue project monitoring requirements.*

Ms. Sharp presented the request by explaining that another round of spatial analysis and assessment of the terraces and the land bridge is needed to inform the final report for the project. She referred to previously collected information in the Technical committee binders. Mr. Clark pointed out reported accretion rates of almost six feet per year from post-construction to 2013. Ms. Sharp responded that initially the terraces were successful, but that more recently the terraces within the Lake were eroding, which may put the land bridge at risk. Outer terraces were originally intended to be "sacrificial", but wave energy was not altered, so another monitoring event is required to determine the best path forward regarding the inner terraces.

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

Mr. Wingate called for a motion to make a recommendation to the Task Force the transfer of O&M budget funds in the amount of \$72,800 to the Monitoring budget for ME-19.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made the motion, which Mr. Paul seconded. The motion carried without dissent.

9. Agenda Item 8. Report/Decision: Request for De-authorization of the Shoreline Protection, Preservation, and Restoration Panel Project (LA-0280) (Brandon Howard, NOAA) NOAA and CPRA request de-authorization of the Shoreline Protection, Preservation, and Restoration Panel (LA-0280) demonstration project because overall cost have increased by 59%. The project cost increases have resulted from updated panel cost, engineering and design, and administrative labor costs. The total increase is \$1,315,245.

Mr. Howard began with a timeline of project activities, which began in 2017. The project intention was to install panels of a porous material at various sites to provide wave reduction while allowing for the transfer of marine organisms. The stated goal of the demonstration project was to provide a cost-effective alternative to rip-rap. Mr. Howard provided a map of project sites and the rationale for choosing them. He asserted that the vendor of the product informed the team of cost increases from \$1400 to \$3800 per panel. After consulting with the Academic Advisory Group about how to reduce project scope without negating project efficacy, and after conducting a per linear foot cost comparison of products, it became apparent that this demonstration project was cost prohibitive and ultimately contrary to project goals. Mr. Howard then reviewed the original funding amount (\$2.2 million), approximated what has been spent thus far (\$165,000), and what would be returned to the Program if this project is de-authorized (\$2.05 million).

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. Mr. Williams re-iterated cost comparisons between the proposed product, other non-rock alternatives and generic rock for erosion control/ wave reduction, and re-asserted that the demonstration project is not aligned fiscally with stated project goals. Mr. Clark asked whether or not other similar products are available. Mr. Williams answered that other patented cast-concrete products do exist, and stated that those costs would have to be acquired from each vendor.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to public comments. Laurie Cormier of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury spoke in opposition to de-authorizing the project, and asked for a discussion between all parties to clarify cost of the panels, to consider possibilities like adjusting the height of the panels, and to contemplate long-term goals and eventual cost-savings for the state of Louisiana.

Mike Turley, with Wayfarer Environmental Technologies, spoke to address the cost comparisons presented. As a provider of similar concrete products, and with expertise in product design and manufacturing, he asserted that costs are consistently being reduced. He asserted that data is often collected from other sources than the manufacturer, and thus is not accurate. Mr. Turley encouraged agencies to obtain accurate and fair cost data, by providing the product suppliers with information of project details, goals, and especially site conditions.

Ralph Libersat, with Vermilion Parish, stated that the project is located in Vermilion Parish, and asks that the de-authorization be denied or at least delayed so that further examination of the costs and discussion with the vendors could ensue to obtain current figures. He also criticized the Program regarding the removal of successful demonstration projects, citing LA-16 as an example.

Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, spoke in opposition to the de-authorization, observing a “striking” increase in E&D costs, and also encouraging a re-examination of costs since there are so many questions about the numbers presented today. He spoke in favor of a delay in this decision and encouraged further discussion with vendors.

David Minton, Cypress Engineering (inventor of the SPPR system), spoke in opposition to the de-authorization, asserting that while his firm was involved in the initial site selection process, they were not included in the E&D to determine system requirements. He stated that their estimate was based on the largest potential cost, and that with more engineering analysis, the construction costs could probably be reduced. He further asserted that since the outset, his firm has offered E&D services for this project at no cost to the CWPPRA Program (thus eliminating the E&D budget increase as presented). He finally encouraged foresight, declaring that if the project is successful, long-term savings to the state of Louisiana could exceed \$1 billion dollars.

Mr. Wingate explained that today’s decision begins the de-authorization process, and that indeed that process allows for further discussion. Mr. Inman clarified that today’s decision is to recommend to the Task Force the de-authorization process; if the Task Force approves, there will be an opportunity for questions, comments and input from the Congressional delegation and the public prior to the final vote by the Technical Committee (December 2018 and the Task Force (January 2019).

Mr. Williams commented, stressing the fact that the decision today begins the de-authorization process, and he offered assurances of commitment to dialogue with the government agencies, the vendor and other interested stakeholders within the process.

Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, commented again, repeating his request for a delay in today’s decision, citing an apparent lack of urgency, pointing out that the decision could be delayed until the next Technical Committee meeting, giving vendors, agencies and other stakeholders time to discuss and clarify the apparent differences in economic analysis.

Mr. Williams responded with a reminder that in the December and January meetings several projects will be competing for Phase 2 funding – a finite, flat-line budget for construction. That limited budget compels this process to be initiated. He asked for comments from project co-sponsor, CPRA.

Mr. Lezina began by expressing his appreciation for all comments, but supports the beginning of the de-authorization process for the reasons cited by Mr. Williams. He declared CPRA’s commitment to further discussion, and pointed out that the recommendation to the Task Force may possibly be reversed as a result.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion to recommend to the Task Force the initiation of de-authorization of the demonstration project SPPR Panel Project LA-0280.

DECISION: Mr. Williams made the motion, which Mr. Paul seconded; the motion carried without dissent. EPA assented with the caveat that earnest and resolute discussions occur prior to final decision; Mr. Wingate concurred with that caveat.

10. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Request of a Transfer of Monitoring to O&M for the Humble Canal Hydrologic Restoration Project (ME-11) (Darrel Pontiff, CPRA) *The Natural Resources Conservation Service and Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority requested Technical Committee approval to transfer \$87,560.11 from the Humble Canal Hydrologic Restoration Project (ME-11) Monitoring budget to the O&M budget to complete project O&M requirements through August 2019.*

Mr. Pontiff began by explaining that the 20-year project life of ME-11 ends in 2023, but that land rights expire in August of 2019; therefore a transfer of funds from monitoring budget to the O&M budget is required to continue project activities through August 2019. There are no anticipated O&M activities after August 2019. Mr. Clark asked about current O&M activities; Mr. Pontiff replied that current O&M activities are contracted, but will expire with the land rights. Mr. Williams cited the previous agenda item, which requires strict adherence to the 20-year life process, and encouraged team members and sponsoring agencies to devise a closeout-plan quickly. Mr. Paul assured the Committee that approval is needed for this transfer so that a proposal for path forward can be devised.

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

Mr. Wingate called for a motion requesting Technical Committee approval for the transfer of ME-11 Monitoring funds to its O&M budget, in the amount of \$87,560.11 for O&M activities through August 2019.

DECISION: The motion was made by Mr. Paul and seconded by Mr. Clark; the motion carried without dissent.

11. Agenda Item 10. Decision: Request for a No-Cost Time Extension for TV-04 Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration (Britt Paul, NRCS) *The NRCS and CPRA request Technical Committee approval for a one year no cost time extension for Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration in order to continue working out the proposed final actions before closeout.*

Mr. Paul made the request by explaining that the project is nearing the end of its 20-year life; finalization was approved a “couple of years” ago. However, interim staff changes have resulted in delayed finalization on the path forward to closeout. NRCS and CPRA have been working on a draft, and are requesting a one-year, no-cost time extension on the 20- year life of the project.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to questions or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion requesting Technical Committee approval for a one year, no-cost extension for TV-04.

DECISION: Mr. Paul made the motion, which Mr. Lezina seconded. The motion carried without dissent.

12. Agenda Item 11. Annual Request for Incremental Funding for FY21 Administrative Costs for Cash Flow Projects (Jernice Cheavis, USACE)

Ms. Cheavis presented the request on behalf of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, requesting funding approval in the amount of \$36,434 for FY21 administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1 (a list of which has been provided to the Technical Committee in their binders).

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

Mr. Wingate called for a motion for a Technical Committee recommendation to the Task Force on the request for funds as specified above.

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made the motion, which Mr. Clark seconded. The motion carried without dissent.

13. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Request for Funding for the CWPPRA Program's Technical Services (Michelle Fischer, USGS)

Ms. Fischer presented the request on behalf of The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and CPRA for FY19 funding in the amount of \$182,951 for technical services for the CWPPRA program. She iterated several services (programming administration, data-enabled fact sheets; website maintenance, project assessments, etc.) that are routinely provided, along with other miscellaneous CWPPRA requests. She pointed out that this is the first funding increase since 2011.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to questions or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion for The Technical Committee to recommend to the Task Force approval for the request of a budget increase and funding for technical services in the amount of \$182,951.

Decision: Mr. Clark made the motion, which Mr. Lezina seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

14. Agenda Item 13. Decision: Request for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Incremental Funding (Kent Bollfrass, CPRA)

Mr. Bollfrass reminded the committee that Ms. McCormick had previously mentioned a slight change in the incremental funding agenda item, and addressed that issue. He explained the rationale for combining funds from TE-20 and TE-40, dedicating the total to TE-40. He also highlighted projects requesting incremental finding above \$100,000. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY21 O&M incremental funding in the amount of \$1,840,548.12 and O&M budget increases in the amount of \$150,000.

- a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY21 O&M incremental funding in the amount of \$1,665,053 and budget increases in the total amount of \$ \$150,000 for the following projects:
- Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (TV-18), PPL-9, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$6,941.00
 - Freshwater Introduction South of Highway 82 (ME-16), PPL-9, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$15,357.00
 - Black Bayou Culverts Hydrologic Restoration (CS-29), PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$35,563.00
 - GIWW - Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization (CS-30) PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$7,208.00
 - Timbalier Island Dune and Marsh Creation (TE-40), PPL-9, EPA
Budget increase amount: \$150,000.00
Incremental funding amount: \$150,000.00
 - New Cut Dune and Marsh Creation (TE-37), PPL-9, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$7,961.00
 - Grand Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-21), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$8,109.00
 - Barataria Barrier Island Complex (BA-38), PPL-11, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$11,154.00
 - Little Lake Shoreline Protection (BA-37), PPL-11, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$3,620.00
 - Pass Chaland to Grand Bayou Pass Barrier Island Shoreline Restoration (BA-35), PPL-11, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$6,909.00
 - Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount (FY16): \$1,194,275.12
 - Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery System (BA-39), PPL 12, EPA
Incremental funding request: \$31,123.00
 - South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22), PPL-12, USACE
Incremental funding amount: \$8,825.00
 - Whiskey Island Back Barrier Marsh Creation (TE-50), PPL-13, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$42,156.00
 - East Marsh Island Marsh Creation (TV-21), PPL-14, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$15,730.00
 - West Belle Pass Barrier Island Headland Restoration (TE-52), PPL-16, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$7,213.00
 - Bayou Dupont Marsh and Ridge Creation (BA-48), PPL-17, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$10,780.00
 - Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration (BA-68), PPL-18, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$7,130.00
 - Coastwide Vegetative Planting (LA-39), PPL-20, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$7,826.00
 - Oyster Bayou Marsh Creation and Terracing (CS-59), PPL-21, NMFS

Incremental funding amount: \$9,987.00

- Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery- Marsh Creation 3 (BA-164), PPL-22, EPA

Incremental funding request: \$77,186.00

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to questions or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion for The Technical Committee to recommend to the Task Force approval for the request for total incremental funding in the amount of \$1,665,053, and budget increases totaling \$150,000 for PPL 9+ projects as listed.

Decision: Ms. McCormick made the motion, which Mr. Williams seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Bolfrass continued the request as follows:

- b. PPL 1-8 Project requesting approval for FY21 O&M incremental funding in the total amount of \$175,495 and no budget increases:
 - Isle Dernieres Restoration East Island (TE-20), PPL-1, EPA
Budget Increase amount: (funds moved to TE-40)
Incremental funding amount: (funds moved to TE-40)
 - Cameron Creole Maintenance (CS-04a), PPL-3, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$104,209.00
 - Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures at Headquarters Canal, West Cove Canal, and Hog Island Gully (CS-23), PPL-3, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$51,344.00
 - Black Bayou Hydrologic Restoration (CS-27), PPL-6, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$19,942.00

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to questions or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion for The Technical Committee to recommend to the Task Force approval for the request for total incremental funding for FY21 in the amount of \$175,495, and no budget increases for PPL 1-8 projects as listed.

Decision: Mr. Clark made the motion, which Ms. McCormick seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

15. Agenda item 14. Decision: Request for Monitoring Incremental Funding (Kent Bolfrass, CPRA) Mr. Bolfrass presented the request and highlighted projects requesting incremental finding above \$100,000. He clarified that the budget increase requested for PPL 9+ projects was dedicated to ME-22, and provided verbal rationale for that request. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for FY21 Monitoring incremental funding in the amount of \$11,534,689 and Monitoring budget increases in the amount of \$312,776.

a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY21 incremental funding in the amount of \$865,369 and budget increases in the total amount of \$119,239

for the following projects:

- Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection (BA27c), PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$5,169.00
- GIWW – Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization (CS-30), PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$5,339.00
- Black Bayou Culverts Hydrologic Restoration (CS-29), PPL-9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$75,256.00
- Freshwater Introduction South of Highway 82 (ME-16), PPL-9, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$11,000.00
- Timbalier Island Dune and Marsh Creation (TE-40), PPL-9, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$49,966.00
- Grand-White Lakes Landbridge Protection (ME-19), PPL-10, USFWS
Incremental funding request: \$72,800.00
- Delta Management at Fort St. Phillip (BS-11), PPL-10, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$42,396.00
- Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation (TE-48), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$37,287.00
- West Lake Boudreaux Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation (TE-46), PPL-11, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$44,335.00
- Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount (FY16): \$87,638.00
- Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge (BA-36), PPL-11, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$12,409.00
- Mississippi Sediment Delivery- Bayou Dupont (BA-39), PPL-12, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$20,000.00
- South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22), PPL-12, USACE
Budget increase amount: \$119,239
Incremental funding amount: \$119,239
- East Marsh Island Marsh Creation (TV-21), PPL-14, EPA
Incremental funding amount: \$115,035.00
- Bayou Dupont Marsh and Ridge Creation (BA-48), PPL-17, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$30,663.00
- Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration (BA-68), PPL-18, NMFS
Incremental funding amount: \$73,517.00
- Coastwide Vegetative Planting (LA-39), PPL-20, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$63,320.00

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to questions or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. Mr. Clark requested that a narrative regarding the increase for ME-22 be submitted prior to the Task Force meeting. No other comments were proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion for The Technical Committee to recommend to the Task Force approval for the request for Monitoring Incremental funding for FY21 in the amount of \$865,369, and a budget increase in the amount of \$119,239 for PPL 9+ projects as listed. The motion included the ME-22 narrative stipulation.

Decision: Mr. Clark made the motion, which Ms. McCormick seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Bolfrass continued with the request, assuring the Committee that all increase requests will be submitted with respective narratives.

- b. PPL 1-8 Project requesting approval for FY21 incremental funding in the amount of \$322,671 and budget increases in the total amount of \$193,537:
 - Isle Dernieres Restoration East Island (TE-20), PPL-1, EPA
Budget increase amount: \$30,000.00
Incremental funding amount: \$30,000.00
 - Cameron Creole Maintenance (CS-04a), PPL-3, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$76,870.00
 - Naomi Outfall Project (BA-03c), PPL-5, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$6,173.00
 - Sediment Trapping at the Jaws (TV-15), PPL-6, NMFS
Budget increase amount: \$69,019.00
Increment funding amount: \$69,019.00
 - Pecan Island Terracing (ME-14), PPL-7, NMFS
Budget increase amount: \$94,518.00
Incremental funding amount: \$94,518.00
 - East Sabine Marsh Creation Cycles 4 and 5 (CS-28-4), PPL-8, USFWS
Incremental funding amount: \$46,091.00

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to questions or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion for The Technical Committee to recommend to the Task Force approval for the request for Monitoring Incremental funding for FY21 in the amount of \$322,671, and a budget increase in the amount of \$193,537 for PPL 1-8 projects as listed.

Decision: Mr. Williams made the motion, which Ms. McCormick seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

Mr. Bollfrass presented the final request.

- c. Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) requesting approval for FY21 incremental funding in the total amount of \$10,346,649.00:
 - Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) (LA-30) USGS
Incremental funding amount: \$10,346,649.00

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to questions or discussion from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

Mr. Wingate called for a motion for The Technical Committee to recommend to the Task Force approval for the request for Monitoring Incremental funding for FY21 in the amount of \$10,364,649 for LA-30.

Decision: Mr. Paul made the motion, which Mr. Clark seconded; the motion carried without dissent.

16. Agenda Item 15. Additional agenda items.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to any additional agenda items from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered.

17. Agenda Item 16. Request for Public Comments

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to any additional comments from the public.

Mike Turley, Wayfair Environmental Technologies, offered his observation that O&M costs and statistics are not included in initial project costs. When considering breakwater systems of rock composition, there are frequently issues of settling and/or erosion; more rock must be added, leading to the need for increases in O&M budgets. While non-rock alternatives may be more expensive at the outset, they are likely to be less costly during O&M. He would like to see the cost of the initial rock, in addition to the cost of added rock over the life of a project, for a truer comparison of construction costs. He asserts that such “due diligence” would allow other products to compete with rock as breakwaters. He finally re-iterated his opinion that vendors should be informed early in the E&D process, so they can provide accurate cost estimates.

17. Agenda Item 18. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Events and Meetings

Mr. Inman provided upcoming event and meeting specifics as follows:

A dedication ceremony for the CWPPRA will be held on October 10, 2018. The ceremony will be held at the Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge in Grand Chenier, LA. More details will be provided via the CWPPRA Newsflash.

The Task Force meeting will be held October 11, 2018 at 9:30 a.m. at the Port Authority of Lake Charles (Board Room), 1611 West Sallier Street, Lake Charles, Louisiana.

The next Technical Committee meeting will be held December 6, 2018 at 9:30 a.m. in Baton Rouge. The date and place for January Task Force meeting has not been determined.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to any additional questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None was proffered.

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to a motion to adjourn these proceedings.

Decision: The motion was made by Mr. Clark and seconded by Mr. Williams; the motion carried without dissent. The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.