

The questions below were submitted to the New Orleans District in writing at the May 20, 2009 public meeting at St. Dominic’s School in New Orleans. The comments received were grouped by category and are addressed below. They are a part of the official record for Individual Environmental Report 5, Outfall Canal Closure Structures.

1.	What is Option 1?	Option 1 is to operate the new pump stations at the mouth of the 17 th Street, Orleans Avenue and London Avenue canals. As directed in public law the new permanent closure structures must work concurrently with the public drainage pump stations operated by the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans. At the 17 th Street Canal it would be pump station 6, at Orleans Avenue pump station number 7, and at London Avenue pump station numbers 3 and 4.
2.	What is Option 2/2a?	Option 2 removes the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans’ pump stations, deepens the canals (in a long, very large construction process), and conveys water to the outfall canals at the lakefront. The water is then pumped by the permanent pump stations into Lake Pontchartrain. Option 2 is a very extensive project with estimated construction durations of about 10 to 12 years. Option 2a adds a specific drainage project to drain certain parts of Metairie straight to the Mississippi River. In that affect option 2a is a small part of option 2. Option 1 currently is the only authorized and fully-funded option. Option 2 and 2a are not funded or authorized.

Low Rise/Concrete Volute Pumps

<p>3.</p>	<p>The rumor mill says that low-rise pump technology will not be used. What are the facts concerning the use of this technology?</p>	<p>In the design-build process the Corps will give construction contractors certain performance parameters. The public will have additional chances to provide input on the Requests for Proposal (RFP), including project design parameters, at a series of three meetings to be held in September, October and November 2009. We will discuss the capacities of the pump stations, height requirements, etc. The public will have an opportunity to give input into these types of technical parameters. We will specify a maximum height, but the design-builders will be free to propose their best technical solution for these pump stations whether they are the low-profile pumps or another type of pump.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>On page 18 of the IER 5, language in the 3rd and 4th paragraphs clearly indicate that the Corps has set aside the significant amount of public input on the type of pumping system that it will use. Citizens gathered information on more efficient, lower cost, lower environmental impact, low-rise concrete volute pumps. Why has the Corps continued to set aside public input while paying what appears to be lip service to the process?</p>	<p>The Corps is not setting aside public input, no decision has been made regarding the types of pumps that will be used in the pumping stations. The Corps is continuing to gather input and the public will have additional opportunities to provide input to the RFP, including project design parameters, at a series of three meetings to be held in September, October and November 2009. The public will have an opportunity to provide input into the technical parameters of the pumps.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Twelve neighborhood organizations organized to invite Dutch engineers from the world's third largest manufacturer of pumps who have refined the most advanced low rise pumping technology in the work. I had to call Mary Landrieu's office to get the Corps to even meet with them and was informed later that the engineers were greeted hastily by the Corps. Decision makers, such as Mr. Kendrick and Colonel Lee were not even present at the meetings. How can we believe that the Corps is truly</p>	<p>The appropriate representatives from the Corps met with representatives of the pump manufacturer. No decision has been made regarding the type of pumps that would be used.</p> <p>The Corps is gathering input and the public will have additional opportunities to provide input to the RFP, including project design parameters, at a series of three meetings to be held in September, October and November 2009.</p> <p>The public will have an opportunity to</p>

	considering citizen input? Why should we believe you now?	provide input into the technical parameters of the pumps.
6.	The Corps said the design parameters meeting would be in September 2009. Where does the meeting from last year regarding cement pumps fit into this plan? What was the purpose of that meeting?	<p>If you are referring to the meeting held last year on September 30th, the meeting was sponsored by multiple local neighborhood associations to allow the manufacturer of a specific pump a chance to present their product as an option for this project.</p> <p>No decisions have been made regarding the type of pumps to be used. The Corps is gathering input and the public will have further chances for input to the RFP, including project design parameters, at a series of three meetings to be held in September, October and November 2009.</p>
7.	How are bids going to be evaluated and how do you compare high-rise vs. low-rise?	The Request for Proposals will include evaluation factors which are currently under development. The RFP Phase II will include the evaluation factors. The Corps will have a group of technical evaluators from around the country review the RFP submissions from design-build contractors. Team New Orleans is also drawing on engineers from our Northwest division and other depths of the Corps for assistance. External experts will also serve as technical advisors to that team. The construction contract bidders will respond to the RFP with their designs and tell us how they are going to accommodate a lower than 45-foot height for the pump stations.

Prefer Option 2/2a/Pump to the River

8.	Please comment on the statement that Option 1 is being proposed by the Corps because it is the “line of least resistance” rather than what is best for the city in the long run, (i.e. a “short term quick fix”).	The primary purpose of this project is risk reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.
9.	If the Corps supports Option 2a, why are you not telling us how to advocate <u>with</u> you to get funding for this better	The primary purpose of this project is risk reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of

	Option?	<p>storm surge risk reduction.</p> <p>The Corps receives authorization and funding for projects through the US Congress. The Corps can not advocate for projects.</p>
10.	Will the New Orleans District stand up for New Orleans by advocating the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works that Option 2a is the plan that should be built, subject to approval of Congress?	<p>The primary purpose of this project is risk reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.</p> <p>The Corps receives authorization and funding for projects through the US Congress. The Corps can not advocate for projects.</p>
11.	I heard the phrase “only authorized” in your presentation, does that mean Option 2 and 2a are dead?	Options 2 and 2a are not authorized or funded. Congressional authorization and appropriation approval would be required for the Corps to take additional action on these projects.
12.	Why did Congress only authorize Option 1 if the Corps thinks Option 2 is the best?	<p>Congress intends to reduce the storm surge risk. The primary purpose of this project is risk reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.</p> <p>Option 1 satisfies the requirements without impeding the ability of the area’s internal drainage system to function.</p>
13.	Option 2 and 2a are the only way to save our community from a repeat of what happened as a result of Hurricane Katrina. Do what’s right for our area. If you must move Coconut Beach, fine, but be fair and keep it whole and in a timely manner.	<p>The primary purpose of this project is risk reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.</p> <p>The Corps is working with the project sponsor to keep Coconut Beach and the marina informed of project progress and to minimize the project impacts.</p>
14.	I support/want Option 2 or 2a.	Both Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction
15.	Safety is the priority. Therefore, I support Option 2 and 2a. Option 1 is not safe. Lives and this city are at stake. The Corps will loose its credibility forever if Option 1 goes forth and fails.	Both Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.
16.	Please tell Congress that Option 2 is the best and tell them we need the money	Thank you for your comment. Both Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of

	to do it right.	storm surge risk reduction. The Corps receives authorization and funding for projects through the US Congress. The Corps can not advocate for projects.
17.	Why doesn't the Army Corps support Pump to the River?	The Corps is not authorized or funded to build Pump to the River.

Proposed location of Orleans Pumping Station vs. London Ave Pumping Station

18.	If the London Avenue Canal permanent pump station is safely at the current Interim Control Structure location, why can't the Orleans Avenue Canal permanent pump station be placed at location "C" or "D," therefore negating the need for a breakwater and reducing visual impacts of the stations on the lakefront?	There are several disadvantages to placing the Orleans Avenue pumping station at sites "C" and "D." The C alternative is to locate the pump station immediately adjacent to the current Interim Control Structure. There will be complicated construction phasing issues with this site because of it's proximity to the Interim Control Structure. More parallel protection construction (levee/wall modification or construction) is required at the Orleans Avenue site than at the London Avenue site. Site D is further south and would require even more parallel protection construction as well as flood proofing modifications to the Robert E. Lee Bridge. Additional information may be found in Section 5.2 of Individual Environmental Report 5 which is available for public review at www.nolaenvironmental.gov . The need for a breakwater is being evaluated by the Corps and early indications are that it will not be needed, although results are not final.
19.	What are the objectives, criteria, reports, etc. that distinguish between the placements of the pumps at Orleans and London Avenue canals?	The criteria for the pumping station placement at all three locations includes determining if a workable footprint is feasible, ease of access for construction and constructability, minimizing effect to surrounding properties, minimizing the environmental impacts and cost. Section 5.1.7 of Individual Environmental Report 5 which is available for public review at www.nolaenvironmental.gov itemizes the selection criteria and Section 5.2 describes specific site selection information.

Safe Water Elevation

<p>20.</p>	<p>The safe water level is a limitation on your system with Option 1. It will be an ongoing occurrence forever with Option 1.</p>	<p>Maintaining the Safe Water Elevation would be necessary with either of the options, Option 1 or Option 2/2a.</p> <p>The Corps has set the Safe Water Elevations (SWE) for these canals based off of our new, more stringent, design criteria. We also work closely with the Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans to coordinate the pumping and canal water levels.</p> <p>The Safe Water Elevations (SWE) for the canals are as follows:</p> <table data-bbox="824 777 1185 892"> <tr> <td>17th Street</td> <td>6.0 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Orleans Avenue</td> <td>8.0 feet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>London Avenue</td> <td>5.0 feet</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Interim Control Structures currently match the pump capacity of the Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans stations. During a normal rain event the gates are open and water flows out as normal. The permanent structures would also be designed to match the Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans pump capacity.</p>	17 th Street	6.0 feet	Orleans Avenue	8.0 feet	London Avenue	5.0 feet
17 th Street	6.0 feet							
Orleans Avenue	8.0 feet							
London Avenue	5.0 feet							
<p>21.</p>	<p>How much water can be held in the outfall canals? What is the height of water that can be stored in the canals? How much water were the canals supposed to hold per the original design?</p>	<p>The outfall canal floodwalls are approximately 12 feet high. The canal floodwalls were designed to hold 10 feet of water and meet the Corps' pre-Hurricane Katrina design criteria and factors of safety.</p> <p>Now with the addition of closure structures at the mouth of the canals and the pump stations, these floodwalls serve as secondary measures of risk reduction. Therefore the canals are purely functioning as drainage canals.</p> <p>The Corps has set the Safe Water Elevations (SWE) for these canals based off of our new, more stringent, design criteria. We also work closely with the Sewerage &</p>						

		<p>Water Board of New Orleans to coordinate the pumping and canal water levels.</p> <p>The Safe Water Elevations (SWE) for the canals are as follows:</p> <p>17th Street 6.0 feet Orleans Avenue 8.0 feet London Avenue 5.0 feet</p>
--	--	--

Site Footprints

22.	<p>The footprint for the design-build bids include a large area north of the temporary pumps and a narrow strip of the land east of the 17th Street Canal. The narrow strip may prohibit a location due east of the temporary pumps. Can the footprint be expanded east of the canal to open the option of pumps near the Hammond Highway versus north of the present pumps?</p>	<p>The design-build contractors are free to propose designs within the confines of the footprints shown in the Individual Environmental Report. There is no technical reason to enlarge the proposed footprint since the required structures can fit in the footprint currently proposed. The Corps will encourage contractor(s) to minimize their impacts within the footprints.</p>
23.	<p>When will the decision be made on the actual impacts at the footprint at the 17th Street station?</p>	<p>The Request for Proposal (RFP) Phase II requires all responders to provide site plans as part of their submittal to the Corps. After a contractor is selected, we will know the actual footprint at each site based on the documents that would be included in the response to the RFP.</p>
24.	<p>How will the decision be made?</p>	<p>The submitted site plans will be evaluated as part of the technical evaluation of the bidders' proposals.</p>
25.	<p>What is the projected impact on Coconut Beach, not the 10% to 100%, the real number?</p>	<p>The Corps and construction contractor will try to minimize impacts within each of the footprints at the outfall canals. This is a design-build project, the impact to Coconut Beach will not be known until after a contractor is selected to perform the work.</p>
26.	<p>The footprints are not symmetrical. What was the reasoning behind selecting the non-symmetrical boundaries and how many other footprints of similar sizes were considered?</p>	<p>The footprints at each canal were created to minimize human and environmental impacts, performance risk, schedule and maximize reliability, ease of Operations and Maintenance and constructability. See Sections 5.1 and 5.2 of Individual Environmental Report 5 which is available at www.nolaenvironmental.gov for</p>

		additional information.
27.	Why not take less land and extend the footprint into Lake Pontchartrain?	This option was considered, but extending the project into Lake Pontchartrain increases the negative environmental impacts of the project and increases the cost of construction. Please see Individual Environmental Report 5 which is available at www.nolaenvironmental.gov for more details. See Section 5.2.1.2 for additional information regarding the 17 th Street Canal. See Section 5.2.2.2 for additional information regarding Orleans Avenue Canal. See Section 5.2.3.2 for additional information regarding London Avenue Canal.
28.	How can the Corps have one idea yet have three totally different footprints?	The site conditions are different at each of the outfall canals. The Individual Environmental Report 5, which is available at www.nolaenvironmental.gov , explored multiple footprint options at each location in an effort to shape solutions that were technically sound, environmentally friendly, and cost effective. See Section 5.2 of the IER for more details.
29.	If the proposed site location at the 17 th Street Canal is “A”, will the project budget include money to relocate the Coconut Beach Volleyball Complex?	Depending on specific circumstances, the Coconut Beach Volleyball Complex <u>may</u> be eligible for relocation benefits.

Pumping Capacity

30.	If Pump to the River is used, will the 17 th Street Canal pumping station capacity be reduced?	Further hydrology studies would be required to determine the capacity of the pump station if Pump to the River were implemented.
31.	Does the proposed system have the same discharge rates Gallon Per Minute/Gallon Per Second as the feeder pumps?	Yes. The proposed system will match the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans’ programmed capacities.
32.	Can you assure us that the pumping capacity of the proposed new pump at the end of the 17 th Street Canal proposed in Option 1 will be at least as effective as the existing one?	Yes, the pumping capacities of each of the new Outfall Canal Closure Structures would be as effective as the Interim Closure Structures and mimic the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans’ pump station capacities which includes the S&WBNO’s

		programmed capacity.
--	--	----------------------

General Questions

33.	How much would Option 2a cost?	<p>The current programmatic estimate for Option 2a is approximately \$3.5 billion dollars.</p> <p>In addition, during storm events the Mississippi River also experiences surges in elevation, just like surges in Lake Pontchartrain. There would not be a benefit to pump to the Mississippi River during a tropical event.</p>
34.	Is it smart to pump to the Lake Pontchartrain when a hurricane is coming into the lake?	The Outfall Canal Closure Structure project provides a barrier wall to reduce risk of storm surge that has a 1 percent chance of occurring in any given year from reaching the outfall canal walls. This project would function while not impeding the ability of the area's internal drainage system to function.
35.	What would happen to the canal levees/ floodwalls if the permanent pump stations (Option 2) was built?	The Corps would study the feasibility of implementing Option 2 if the study were authorized and appropriated. Some of the alternatives studied may include removing/modifying the floodwalls.
36.	Are you aware that Mary Landrieu and David Vitter filed legislation on May 20, 2009 which authorizes construction and funding of Option 2a, Pump to the River project, independent of Options 1 and 3; and filed other legislation requiring the Corps to further study Option 2?	Yes, the Corps is aware of the legislation filed by Senators Landrieu and Vitter.
37.	Isn't it obvious that many in Louisiana believe that your analysis of Options 2 and 2a has not been fair and balanced?	The primary purpose of the Outfall Canal Closure project is risk reduction from a storm surge. The Corps believes that when more people review the cost report, they will see both Options provide the same level of risk reduction. The only difference is how each Option handles interior drainage.
38.	Why can't the Corps suggest the gates at	The Individual Environmental Report 5,

	the Rigolets as a permanent solution?	which is available at www.nolaenvironmental.gov , addresses the option of a barrier at the Rigolets as “The Lake Pontchartrain Barrier Plan” in Section 2.5.2. A complete investigation of this alternative would require intensive analysis, including storm surges generated by greater than 100-year storm events, which is beyond the scope of this environmental document. This analysis is being performed under the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration project (LACPR). The primary purpose of Individual Environmental Report 5 is risk-reduction from a storm surge. Further investigation of the Barrier Plan would occur as a part of the LACPR effort, information about that project is available at www.lacpr.usace.army.mil .
39.	Why did the Corps put together an entire presentation that did not include pictorial descriptions of Option 2 and 2a?	The purpose of the May 20, 2009 public meeting and the presentation was to discuss and accept comments regarding the Proposed Action for risk reduction at the Outfall Canals which was discussed in Individual Environmental Report 5. Mailed and printed notices and news releases generated by the Corps defined the meeting purpose.
40.	Two ways to move a danger out is better and safer than just one. I feel two ways to move water in both directions provides a much greater protection for human life.	Thank you for your comment.
41.	When do you plan on starting the Pump to the River project?	Implementing the Pump to the River project would require study, environmental compliance, design etc. Pump to the River is not currently authorized or funded for study or construction.
42.	Individual Environmental Report 5 says construction duration is 4 years. The Corps says the contract will be awarded the in the 3 rd quarter of 2010, meaning completion won't be until 2014. Why does the Corps keep saying the stations will be done by 2013?	The construction schedule will not be known until a design-build contractor is selected. Until that time, our schedules are estimates.
43.	Why is there no discussion of safe water elevations in the Individual	The purpose of Individual Environmental Report 5 is to document the proposed

	Environmental Report 5?	<p>alternative and determine the expected environmental ramifications of the project as proposed. Operating within the Safe Water Elevation is assumed as part of the safe operation of the proposed alternative however, the Safe Water Elevations (SWE) for the canals are as follows:</p> <p>17th Street 6.0 feet Orleans Avenue 8.0 feet London Avenue 5.0 feet</p>
44.	Are the canals going to be concreted from the mouth of the canal to Pump Station 6?	For Option 1, only the portion of the canal affected by the requirements of the installation of the new pump station and gates would be concreted.
45.	How do you measure the quality of water surrounding work areas?	The Corps will have experts in water quality management onsite during construction. There will also be onsite monitoring of vibrations, dust, and noise.
46.	Why is the modification/retrofit of the existing facility not a viable option? If it is not a viable option, why not?	This option was evaluated in the Individual Environmental Report 5 as “Convert Interim Closure Structures to Permanent System.” See Sections 2.4.6 and 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 in the environmental document for additional details regarding the advantages and disadvantages of this option as well as the alternative selection rationale. Individual Environmental Report 5 is available at www.nolaenvironmental.gov .
47.	Why can't the pump discharge be diverted to the west of the canal into the cove where the existing U.S. Coast Guard station is located?	There will be a bypass channel that will go towards the U.S. Coast Guard station. The Corps will closely manage the water velocity near the U.S. Coast Guard station to avoid impacting their operations as they bring boats in and out of the area. The Corps will also make efforts to minimize impacts to local fisherman.
48.	Are any considerations being made with respect to Mickey Retif Sports Complex contribution to New Orleans Recreation Department and the City of New Orleans? Has the West End been considered? This is an under-utilized public facility that would seem to make more sense.	For each of the possible footprints, an assessment was made that included evaluations of the impact to the environment and to recreation and green space, as well as multiple other factors. See Section 2.3 and 3.2.8.2.2 of the Individual Environmental Report 5 is available at www.nolaenvironmental.gov for additional information.

49.	How will the project impact the continuation of Lakeshore Drive as a tourist attraction as well as its availability to families for recreation in the area?	We anticipate the project will have minimal adverse impact on tourism and availability for families to recreate.
50.	What is the “shelf life” of the permanent structures?	The design life of the levees and any barrier/gate structure is 100-years. The design life of the building is 50-years.
51.	Who has final authority for choosing the final design of the pump stations?	The Corps will have a review panel of 35 individuals, consisting of engineers from across the country along with advisors from industry serve on the panel. The panel is chaired by a government source selection authority. The group’s recommendation will be filed with our recommendations.
52.	What role does the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans play in the process?	The Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans plays a vital role in the project because ultimately they may be called upon to operate these pump stations. Their input on what is needed for maintenance, and feedback on what the Operations and Maintenance plans look like makes them valuable advisors and observers to the evaluation process.
53.	Why on the panel of 35 people is there not anyone from New Orleans or Louisiana?	The Selection Board panel will include representation from New Orleans and Louisiana.
54.	Why isn’t public comment allowed on the Outfall Canal Closure Structure project?	The Corps has been a part of over 25 public comment sessions since March 2007 and three future sessions are scheduled for this fall. Additionally, comments can be submitted directly to the Corps at www.nolaenvironmental.gov .
55.	I request an extension of the time to comment on Individual Environmental Report 5. There is insufficient time and information available to comment intelligently on the document.	Your request was taken under advisement, but no extension was granted.
56.	Why was the choice made to place the pumps at the mouth of the Orleans Canal before soil testing was completed?	Soil testing results will affect the details of a design, but do not typically affect the feasibility of site selection for a pile supported structure. The Corps has just completed soil borings at each of the proposed sites and the results will be given to the contractors for use in detailed design. Please see the Individual Environmental Report 5, Section 5.2 for advantages and

		disadvantages of each site.
57.	How can you “repair” the canal levees without completely re-doing the canal levees?	Repair of the canal levees is not in the scope of this project. The cost associated with canal work for Option 1 is primarily the canal work in and around the pumping stations and work associated with the Interim Closure Structures’ Decommissioning and Removal. With Option 1, the barrier becomes the primary risk reduction and the canal levees/floodwalls are secondary risk reduction.
58.	The Corps is to be commended for its work on the outfall canals. The design is excellent. Option 1 is the best in that it will have minimal impact on the water table and hence will not induce subsidence. If concrete box canals are installed, subsidence must be modeled prior to making a decision to do this.	Thank you for your comment.
59.	Current alternatives B & C are neither approved nor have funding approved, yet the Corps has included details of these plans in the Individual Environmental Report 5, I recommend that the Corps provide similar write-ups for proposed plans 2 and 2a as either an addendum or appendix to the IER #5 or in IER #6. This would be an incredible demonstration of transparency and would aid public relationships.	Each of the layout alternatives “B” and “C” at the canal outfalls are part of Option 1 which is authorized and funded. Options 2 and 2a are discussed as Alternatives in Section 2.4.4 Permanent Pump Stations at the Mouths of the Outfall Canals, and Section 2.5.8.2 Pump to the Mississippi River, of Individual Environmental Report 5 which is available at www.nolaenvironmental.gov .
60.	By definition, 100 year protection is guaranteed to eventually be overwhelmed by a strong storm. Greater protection is ultimately required (Category 5, 1000-year, etc.). With that I mind, how can Option 1, which utilizes floodwalls which failed during Katrina, be considered a viable first step towards the ultimate flood/storm protection this area needs to be safe?	Both Option 1 and Option 2 provide the same level of 100-year storm surge risk reduction. Option 1 provides a barrier wall as primary risk reduction measure and the canal levees/floodwalls become secondary risk reduction.
61.	Are all storm surge protection structures designed to survive over topping during and after a storm? If so, for how long?	Yes. All storm risk reduction structures in the hurricane system are designed to survive overtopping rates during and after a storm with surge and waves associated with an

		event with a 1 percent chance of occurring in any given year.
62.	Safe water elevations in London Avenue Canal contradict Option 1. Can the square footage under the bridge support the proposed flow rates? The bridges blocked flow from the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans pumps during Hurricane Katrina.	Yes. The Corps has modeled the flow in the canal, we have flow curves on the restrictions the bridge introduces and the canal capacity is adequate.
63.	Describe how the gates would work when there is high rain fall.	During high rainfall, the gates remain open allowing water to flow to Lake Pontchartrain and the Sewerage and Water Board pumps unrestricted to the canals.
64.	Use separate pumps for drainage (15' head), separate pumps for storm high tides (30'-40' heads).	The specific types of pumps to be used will not be known until after the selection of the design-build contractor.
65.	I do not support or trust the dual pump stations plan. We need 1 pump station on 17 th Street Canal, at Lake Pontchartrain. Almost no one in my neighborhood trusts the floodwalls on the Metairie side of the canal. What about the leak at the lake levee near the Suburban Canal? That was the early sign of failure of the 17 th Street Canal floodwalls.	<p>The primary purpose of this project is risk reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.</p> <p>The seepage at the levee near the Suburban Canal is being monitored and analyzed by the Corps and its local partners. There is no concern about the structural integrity of the levee.</p>
66.	The driving force appears to be keeping to the schedule, rather than safety for all properties in the entire city. What happens when storm surge and big rainfalls come? Lakeview, the 9 th Ward and Gentilly may be flood proofed, meanwhile the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans have to slow down their pumps because the Corps' Option 1 can't handle the pumping capacity of the S&WBNO. Then Uptown and around town will flood badly yet again. What does cheaper, quicker and on schedule protect?	<p>The primary purpose of this project is risk reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.</p> <p>Each of the pumping stations proposed in Option 1 is sized to handle all the programmed capacity of the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans pumping stations feeding those canals. The barrier wall protects the entire city from storm surge. It is not in the scope of this project to provide interior drainage improvements for the Uptown or other areas. Keeping to the schedule is a safety consideration as the Interim Closure Structures have a limited life span of 5-7 years</p>
67.	Why build the cheap structure instead of	The primary purpose of this project is risk

	<p>waiting for more money? By doing that you are setting yourself and the city up for problems. If the cheapest option is chosen because of money, we will be back here in 10 years debating what should we do and we will be \$100 million dollars poorer.</p>	<p>reduction from a storm surge and Option 1 and Option 2/2a provide the same level of storm surge risk reduction.</p> <p>Delaying the project is dangerous because of the limited lifespan of the Interim Closure Structures as outlined in the Parsons Final Report to Department of Defense Inspector General – Temp Outfall Canal Pumps dated 27 Feb 2009.</p> <p>Additionally, the Corps does not current have authorization or appropriations to study the Pump to the River project. Such rights would need to be authorized by Congress.</p>
68.	<p>Will you help the Bucktown shrimp and fish boat operators come back when you are finished?</p>	<p>The Bucktown shrimp and fish boats have been relocated to a location near the U.S. Coast Guard base.</p>
69.	<p>Please work with the city on this headline from the Times-Picayune “New Construction pending – City of New Orleans unclear about “above elevation” requirement”</p> <p>Please address road repairs necessary on Fleur de Lis and Bellaire Drive.</p> <p>Please address sewage replacement on Fleur de Lis and 36th Streets.</p>	<p>For Flood Elevation questions please contact Mike Hunnicutt, FEMA, michaelhunnicutt@dhs.gov .</p> <p>For sewage replacement questions, please contact the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans at 504-529-2837</p> <p>For street repairs in New Orleans, please contact the New Orleans Department of Public Works at 504-658-8003.</p>
70.	<p>The Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration report describes the Barrier Plan to be a “wier” barrier that will allow any surge greater than 12 foot to overtop the barrier. The reason for this was effects on Mississippi, construction uncertainty and cost being \$5 billion more. Has the Corps estimated the savings in the outfall canals that could be realized if Rigolets Full Barrier Gates could be built at the same time?</p>	<p>Section 2.5.2 of the Individual Environmental Report 5 details the investigation of “The Lake Pontchartrain Barrier Plan” as an alternative and the reasons for its rejection. Further investigation of the Barrier Plan is being performed under the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration project. Details of the LaCPR report are available at: www.lacpr.usace.army.mil</p>
71.	<p>What is the proposed mitigation for Coconut Beach Volleyball Complex?</p>	<p>The Coconut Beach Volleyball Complex occupies City of New Orleans property by lease. Real estate acquisition will ultimately be the responsibility of the non-Federal sponsor, the Louisiana Office of</p>

		<p>Coastal Protection and Restoration's, obligation to provide this land for the project. Depending on the terms of the lease, etc., the complex may be entitled to Uniform Relocation Assistance benefits as outlined under PL 96-646, as amended (a/k/a The Uniform Act). The non-Federal sponsor will follow all applicable State and Federal laws in determining eligibility for these benefits. These benefits, if eligible, may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relocation advisory services. 2. Payment for actual reasonable moving expenses for personal property. 3. Re-establishment expenses (\$10,000 maximum).
72.	<p>Do you have plans to put another form of recreation somewhere else? Coconut Beach has helped with the obesity of our population. Being a part of New Orleans Recreation Department, is the Corps going to offer alternatives or an alternative for the \$60,000/year the city receives. Everyone keeps mentioning lack of funds, funds were already used to put in the temporary pumps so, is that just a waste of money or can the pumps be used in the plan? How the Corps going to replace the \$60,000/year generated in taxes from Coconut Beach?</p>	<p>The Coconut Beach Volleyball Complex occupies City of New Orleans property by lease. As such, it will ultimately be the responsibility of the non-Federal sponsor's, the Louisiana Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration's, obligation to provide this land for the project. Depending on the terms of the lease, etc., the complex may be entitled to Uniform Relocation Assistance benefits as outlined under PL 96-646, as amended (a/k/a The Uniform Act). The non-Federal sponsor will follow all applicable State and Federal laws in determining eligibility for these benefits. These benefits, if eligible, may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relocation advisory services. 2. Payment for actual reasonable moving expenses for personal property. 3. Re-establishment expenses (\$10,000 maximum). <p>No decision has been made yet regarding pump selection for the new pump stations.</p>
74.	<p>I own a townhouse in Mariner's Cove on the 17th Street Canal. You plan to buy only those houses on the levee that will be impacted by the pumping station. I cannot sell my house because of the</p>	<p>The government is currently in the process of acquiring 14 of the 58 units in the Mariner's Cove Townhome Association, located along the eastern side of the 17th Street Canal. These properties were</p>

	<p>looming possibility of a structure that detracts from the value of the neighborhood. The remainder of Mariner's Cove is losing its value. Please buy all of Mariner's Cove. Use it for a staging area, heliport, etc.</p>	<p>required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the 17th Street Canal Interim Closure Structure. As a rule, the Government can only acquire property necessary for the construction, operation and maintenance of a project, which would be areas located inside of the required project footprint. As such, the remaining 44 Mariner's Cove units are not located within the project footprint of the proposed 17th Street Canal Permanent Pump Station Project. Therefore, there is no plan to acquire these remaining units for this upcoming project.</p>
--	--	--