# **Volume VI APPENDIX L: Engineering**

# 5 **Medium Diversion at White Ditch Final Feasibility Report Appendix L1 – Engineering Investigations and Cost Estimates Table of Contents**







**ANNEX 3: MCASES Cost Analysis** 

**ANNEX 4: Hydrodynamic Modeling Analysis by URS Corporation** 

### <span id="page-2-0"></span>85 **L1. General**

l

The White Ditch project area is located in the Breton Sound estuary and covers the area extending north and south from just south of Belair, Louisiana to the coastline of Louisiana and extending east and west from the Mississippi River to the Oak River. This area extends about 50

- 90 km in the NW-SE directions and about 30 km in the SW-NE direction. Subsidence, erosion, channelization, saltwater intrusion, storm damage and the absence of fresh water, sediments and nutrients from the Mississippi River have all caused significant adverse impacts to the White Ditch project area resulting in extensive wetland loss and ecosystem degradation. There is an existing siphon at the mouth of White Ditch that was built in 1963 and has not been in operation
- 95 since 1991, except for two brief episodes.

The absence of a supply of fresh water, sediment, and nutrients has caused the marsh to degrade. This degradation coupled with the subsidence and sea level rise rate of approximately 1.04 cm per year has led to an increase in saltwater intrusion. The additional influx of saltwater from the

- 100 Gulf of Mexico through the vast canal network in the project area has further damaged the marsh vegetation. In August and September of 2005 Louisiana was hit by hurricanes Katrina and Rita. These hurricanes brought high winds and high tidal surges and destroyed thousands of acres of already weakened marsh. In September of 2008 hurricanes Ike and Gustav also hit the Gulf coast. While they did not make direct landfall in the project area, the tidal surges from these 105 storms caused the loss of additional marsh acreage.
- 

The White Ditch area is part of the Breton Sound estuary system. Breton Sound estuary is located in southern Louisiana, between Breton Sound Bay and approximately the last 85 miles of the Mississippi River before it discharges into the Gulf of Mexico. The estuary consists of about

- 110 430 square miles (1,100 km2) of fresh and brackish coastal wetlands that are made up of shallow water ponds, lakes, bays, and a man-made canal system (Figure 1). The major rivers in the estuary are the Oak River (also known as River aux Chenes) and Bayou Terra aux Boeufs. The larger water bodies are Big Mar, Lake Leary, Spanish Lake, Grand Lake, and Little Lake.
- 115 The project is examining alternative designs for a fresh water diversion from the Mississippi River to the White Ditch Project area. Different alternative locations, channel depths and widths are considered for different peak diversion flow rates, ranging from 5,000 to 100,000 cfs.

# **L2. Hydraulics and Hydrology**

<span id="page-2-2"></span><span id="page-2-1"></span>120

# **L2.1 Climatology**

The climate of the White Ditch study area is subtropical marine with long humid summers and short moderate winters. The climate is strongly influenced by the water surface of many sounds, 125 bays, lakes and the Gulf of Mexico and seasonal changes in atmospheric circulation. During the fall and winter, the study area experiences cold continental air masses which produce frontal passages with temperature drops. During the spring and summer, the study area experiences tropical air masses which produce a warm, moist airflow conducive to thunderstorm development (USACE 2008a (MRGO LEIS)). The study area is also subject to periods of both

130 drought and flood, and the climate rarely seems to truly exhibit "average" conditions (MsCIP 2008).

The study area is susceptible to tropical waves, tropical depressions, tropical storms and hurricanes. These weather systems can cause considerable property and environmental damage 135 and loss of human life. Historical data from 1899 to 2007 indicate that 30 hurricanes and 41 tropical storms have made landfall along the Louisiana coastline (NOAA 2009). The largest recent hurricanes were Katrina and Rita in 2005, which caused devastating damage in the study area. Hurricane Gustav, while much smaller and less intense, caused additional damage in the study area. Hurricane Ike, which made landfall in Galveston, Texas in 2008, caused flooding

140 and wind damage in coastal areas as it passed the Louisiana Coast.

The total amount of marsh lost as a result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita was over one third of the total predicted wetland losses predicted by the Coast 2050 Report (1999). Within the study area, about 40,910 acres of wetlands were converted to open water (Barras 2006). This loss rate

- 145 exceeded the average background loss rate of about 2,160 acres per year for the period from 1956 to 2004 (Wicker 1980; Barras et al. 1994; Barras et al. 2003; Morton et al. 2005). New water bodies formed and existing water bodies expanded north and west of Lake Lery (USGS 2006). These changes occurred largely as a result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The combined land-water changes caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita exceeded coastal land change from
- 150 previous recent hurricanes combined, such as Hurricanes Andrew (1992), Lili (2002), and Tropical Storm Isidore (2002) (Barras 2006).

### **L2.2 Selection of a Hydrodynamic Modeling Program**

- <span id="page-3-0"></span>155 A modeling program for a hydrologic study is primarily selected based on the following factors:
	- a. The configuration of water bodies, channels, and flow control structures in the study area;
	- b. The nature of water movement inside the system; and
	- c. The parameters to be studied (e.g., water level, velocity, sediment movement, and/or salinity etc.).

### 160

The project area is comprised of areas of marsh and open water with bounding channels and several intersecting interior channels. Since the project area is shallow, the vertical movement of water is insignificant relative to that in the longitudinal and transverse directions and can be ignored during hydrodynamic and salinity computations without loss of accuracy in the final

- 165 results. The marsh system is assumed to be well mixed vertically. Sediment transportation is an important feature that the model must have; however, due to time constraints hydrodynamic sediment modeling will not be conducted as a part of this study. The project delivery team wants to ensure the opprotunity for this modeling to be done in the future to investigate likely sedimentation patterns within the project area. Therefore, a modeling program that can simulate
- 170 2D, vertically averaged movement of water and salinity is the most appropriate for the study. A number of hydraulic models meet the above criteria and were considered for use in simulating the White Ditch diversion alternatives. The candidate models are listed below and organized into finite element and finite volume categories. In general, the finite element models have unstructured meshing capabilities that allow for the efficient detailed resolution of small features,

175 However, they are difficult to implement in projects with large areas of wetting and drying, often requiring excessive bathymetric and topographic smoothing to achieve a stable solution.

Finite Element Models include:

180 ADCIRC – Advanced Circulation Model for Oceanic, Coastal and Estuarine Waters: unstructured mesh, no salinity, poor wetting and drying.

> FESWMS – Finite Element Surface Water Modeling System: unstructured mesh, no salinity, poor wetting and drying.

185

RMA2 – Resource Management Associates: unstructured mesh, salinity transport, poor wetting and drying

Finite Volume Models include:

190 CMS– Coastal Modeling System: salinity transport, good wetting and drying, rectilinear mesh

> EFDC – Environmental Fluid Dynamics Code: salinity transport, good wetting and drying, curvilinear mesh

195

FVCOM – Finite Volume Community Ocean Model: unstructured mesh, good wetting and drying, commercial availability

POM– Princeton Ocean Model: salinity transport, good wetting and drying, curvilinear mesh

200

The finite difference models typically will not have any stability problems when considering wetting and drying, but often do not have the benefits of unstructured meshes since they typically use rectilinear or curvilinear structured meshes. The FVCOM model is unique in that it is a 205 finite volume model that uses an unstructured mesh and therefore can realize the mesh generation benefits often associated with finite elements. However, the model is relatively new and limited to research applications. Non-research applications are occurring but model documentation and general industrial familiarity with the model are not mature. The remaining three finite volume models (CMS, EFDC and POM) all have similar capabilities and are suitable

210 for the project.

OF those three, the CMS is supported by the USACE and therefore was selected for the project. CMS-Flow is a process-based 2D depth-averaged hydrodynamic, sediment transport and morphology model developed by the USACE for application in and around inlets and channels. 215 It is accessible via the Surfacewater Modeling System (SMS) graphical user interface.

### **L2.3 Data Collection for Modeling Purposes**

<span id="page-4-0"></span>There were a number of existing data sets available to support the configuration, calibration and 220 application of the hydrodynamic and salinity transport model. In addition to the existing data

sets, a bathymetric survey and a field measurement program were conducted prior to the modeling analysis in order to provide site-specific data. Each of these data sets is briefly described below.

### <span id="page-5-0"></span>225 **L2.3.1 Bathymetry**

There was sparse data within the coverage area, and the resolution of any available data was insufficient for model use. Digital Elevation Model (DEM) and contoured elevation coverages were available at http://atlas.lsu.edu/rasterdown.htm for portions of the modeled area, however 230 the elevation values available in these datasets did not contain the precision necessary for use in the model.

The USACE conducted a bathymetric survey of the White Ditch area to both support of the modeling analysis and the alternative designs. The survey transects are shown in Figure C2.1. 235 These data provide information on the channel depths and widths, the lake depths, ridges bounding the channels as well as the characteristics of the inter-tidal and land areas.



Figure L2.1: Surveys contract by the USACE to assist in Hydrodynamic modeling analysis of the White Ditch project area.

### <span id="page-5-1"></span>240 **L2.3.2 Tidal Stages**

Real-time tide data were downloaded from http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis for three U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) stations. Station locations include: Northeast Bay Gardene (Station

ID: 7374527), Black Bay near Snake Island (Station ID: 7374526) and Cow Bayou at American 245 Bay (Station ID: 73745258). Tide data were also obtained from http://tidesonline.nos.noaa.gov/ for the National Atmospheric Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Station Pilot East (Station ID: 8761305). Station locations are shown in Figure L2.2.

A review of the tide gages revealed that there were no suitable gage locations in the proximity of 250 the White Ditch area. The closest gages were Cow Bayou at American Bay and Northeast Bay Gardene. Data from the Bay Gardene station was chosen for model use since it provided the most available data with the fewest data gaps.

Utilization of the Bay Gardene data was not without difficulty. A downward shift of 0.5 feet was 255 done on the gage by the USGS in January 2010. They note that there is a level of uncertainty surrounding this gage considering its datum has been tied to a nearby telephone pole which has been through multiple hurricanes and is continually experiencing the effects of subsidence and erosion. In addition, although NOAA often publishes datum conversion between geodetic (i.e. NAV 88) and tidal datum for many gages along the US coast, its website Benchmark Page and 260 does not contain the NAVD 88 and tidal datum conversion for the Bay Gardene station. This is likely due to accuracy and or data issues. NOAA does provide the VDATUM software for converting data to various datum along the US coastline and the coastal regions of the Great Lakes. It also provides estimates of the accuracy in the conversions. The published VDATUM accuracy information for the East Louisiana/Mississippi area is +/- 17.1 cm.

265

When the Bay Gardene data was averaged over a period multi-year period of time, it was discovered that the average was approximately 1.0 feet above sea level (0.0 feet NAVD88). Using standard modeling practices, all data was shifted downward by 1.0' for the average to coincide with approximate sea level. This 1.0 downward shift falls within the acceptable range 270 established by coupling the USGS' 0.5 downward shift with the NOAA +/- 17.1 cm accuracy range. Most importantly, this adjustment reflects locally observed conditions and results in an

It is important to note that the results of the model and its calibration are completely dependent 275 on the accuracy of the tidal data that is used as input. Although it was the best available, there is a level of uncertainty surrounding the datum of the Bay Gardene gage which was used in the White Ditch Hydrodynamic Model. The USGS plans to re-survey the gage with state-of-the-art GPS in the near future, with possible publishing of the results in April 2010. It is recommended that the issue of calibration be revisited when this more accurate survey data is complete. It is

280 also recommended that a sensitivity analysis be performed with different levels of tidal drivers (i.e. 0.5 feet above and below the level the model is currently calibrated at) to examine changes in salinity distribution. This sensitivity analysis should demonstrate that the tidal driver used in the model was indeed accurate. These efforts should be conducted before or as part PED phase.

accurately responding model.



Figure L2.2: Salinity and Tidal gages used in the modeling process

<span id="page-7-0"></span>285

# **L2.3.3 Salinity**

Salinity data are available from the USGS. Data was accessed from http://waterdata.usgs.gov. Data originate from three Louisiana stations including: Northeast Bay Gardene (Station ID

- 290 7374527), Black Bay near Snake Island (Station ID 7374526), and Cow Bayou at American Bay (Station ID 73745258). Station locations are shown in Figure L2.2. Another salinity data set was available from Strategic Online Natural Resources Information System (SONRIS). This data set included hourly or monthly salinity measurements and stations were located throughout the Breton Sound with varying periods of record Figure L2.3. The average, max and minimum
- 295 salinity values at stations with sufficient data are shown in the table in Figure 10. The data reflect the freshwater source of the Caernarvon Diversion.

### **L2.3.4 Meteorological Data**

<span id="page-7-1"></span>300 Wind data are available from various stations in the project area. The wind data were collected by NOAA from 1999 through 2009 (http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/ncdc.html). Louisiana wind station locations include: Grand Isle (Station Number 8762417), Pilot East (Station Number 8760922) and Shell Beach (Station Number 8761305). The location of these stations is shown in Figure 6. Hourly data was available from the Pilot East station and was downloaded for the time

305 period of 3/25/2004 through 7/23/2009. Acquired data is noncontiguous in content, containing a number of dates with no recorded data.



Figure L2.3: Salinity gages used in the modeling process

Rainfall data were obtained from the NOAA Port Sulfer Station (Station 167471) and from a 310 Bell Chasse station. Station locations are shown in Figure L2.4.The data included a daily sum of rainfall in inches for 1/1/2004 through 8/27/2009 for Port Sulfur and 9/28/2006 through 8/20/2009 for Belle Chasse.

There were no daily evaporation data available from stations near the project area. In order to 315 provide some information for evaporation rates, data in the literature was reviewed. A study conducted by Cooke et. al. (2008) provided measured data at a variety of stations in Louisiana. The nearest station was Houma for which summer evaporation rates were available. The data indicate some daily fluctuations do occur, ranging between 2 and 8 mm/day, with an average rate on the order of 5 mm/day.

<span id="page-8-0"></span>320

# **L2.3.5 Caernarvon**

On the northern edge of Breton Sound estuary is the Caernarvon freshwater diversion structure. It is located on the east bank of a Mississippi River oxbow at river mile 81.5. The diversion 325 structure began operating in 1991 as a means for establishing optimal salinity conditions for oyster production, and can also be used to prevent saltwater intrusion during storms or droughts. The 23-meter-wide structure has the capacity to divert up to about 8,000cfs (226m<sup>3</sup>/s) of Mississippi River water into the Breton Sound estuary, and has been managed at many different discharge rates since its commencement.

330



Figure L2.4: NOAA rainfall and wind stations used in the modeling process

The Louisiana Department of Natural Resources manages the Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion Project and provides daily flow data in cubic feet per second (cfs) from 1992 through 2009. 335 Average monthly flows from the diversion are shown in Figure L2.5.

Based on discussions with local land managers, it is believed that the flow from the diversion followed two dominant paths from the diversion. The main one is to the south through the Bayou Mandeville area. The second one is directed to the west, through the Delacroix Canal, 340 and ultimately merges with the Oaks River. It is believed that about 20 to 30 percent of the diversion flows went through the western path until Hurricane Katrina impacted the area. After Katrina, many of the smaller channels to the west were clogged with debris, and it is believed that only 5 to 10 percent of the diversion flow now flows westward.



<span id="page-10-0"></span>345 Figure L2.5: Average monthly flows from the Caernarvon Diversion.

# **L2.3.6 URS Field Investigation**

The White Ditch field investigation was conducted from July 20, 2009 through July 23, 2009 to 350 collect necessary calibration data for the CMS-Flow hydrodynamic model of the study area. The field investigation was conducted by two crews of URS field staff operating from airboats hired for the project. The field crews were accompanied by William Terry of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) St. Louis District Office for most of the field investigation. A summary of the two data sets explicitly used in the modeling analysis, the water elevations and the salinity 355 data, are summarized here.

The study area and sampling stations are shown in Figure L2.6. Measurements of flow velocity, temperature, salinity and turbidity were collected periodically between July 21 and 23, 2009 at the primary stations (N1, N2, N3, S1, S2, and S3). Water level measurements were collected at 360 stations N3 and S3 from July 20 to July 23, 2009 using temporary staff gauges and recording pressure transducers that were installed at these locations. Less frequent flow velocity, temperature and salinity measurements were collected at the secondary locations (Oak River Channel, N4, N5, N6, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, and S11). Water depth measurements were collected at each of the primary and secondary locations, and at additional field locations (S12-

365 S33) shown on Figure L2.7.





*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 



Figure L2.7: Additional URS field stations for the modeling process.

370 Staff gauges and recording pressure transducers were installed at locations S3 and N3 to measure water level fluctuations within the study area. The transducers used were Micro-Diver Dataloggers (Model DI601) manufactured by the Schlumberger Corporation. The data loggers were initially programmed to collect pressure measurements every five minutes in feet of water. The sample interval was changed to 30 seconds after approximately 24 hours.

375

Staff gauges constructed of 1-inch diameter PVC pipe was also installed at locations S3 and N3. Periodic measurements of the water level at each staff gauge were recorded. When compared to the tides at the Bay Gardene Station, it is evident that there is s significant loss of tidal amplitude as the tides propagate into the White Ditch area.

380

Salinity data (as well as temperature and turbidity measurements) were collected at each primary location and other select locations using a HydroLab Quanta system. The mean, maximum and minimum salinity at each station was also recorded. The SONRIS salinity data are also shown in Figure L2.3, and although the data represent different time periods, they show a general trends in 385 the salinity patterns. The trends show a basic low to higher salinity gradient from offshore to the NW as well as a high to low gradient from the east bank of the Mississippi River to the NE. The

general gradients, even those in the White Ditch area, point towards the Caernarvon Diversion, indicating that it is a significant source of freshwater in the area.

Salinity measurements were also made at surface and bottom. The data indicates a very minor 390 difference between the two; less than 0.5 ppt.

### **L2.4 Hydrodynamic Model Domain and Grid Generation**

- <span id="page-13-0"></span>The model domain is shown in Figure L2.8. The domain includes all of the white ditch area as 395 well as an extensive portion of Breton Sound. A primary reason for including the larger portion of Breton Sound was the potential influence of the diversion peak flows on the east of the Oaks River. Also, the channels providing flow pathways from the Caernarvon Diversion to the White Ditch area required inclusion since the Caernarvon Diversion flows provided a significant portion of the freshwater to the White Ditch area (the other being rainfall).
- 400

To provide bathymetric data for the model grid, a project-specific bathymetric and topographic data set was developed. This data was used to set the bottom elevation of the cells in the model grid. Initial experiments with the model indicated that the grid resolution in the White

- 405 Ditch area would need to be on the order of 10 to 30 meters. This level of resolution would provide sufficient resolution of the channel features but allow for reasonable simulation times on high-end workstations. Therefore, the bathymetric and topographic data should have a minimum resolution of 10 meters in the White Ditch area.
- 410 The area bathymetry and topography were developed from existing bathymetric data, land/water boundary data and results from the project field survey. It was determined early in the bathymetric data development that existing bathymetric data were limited to areas above MSL and sets did not provide sufficient resolution for direct use in the grid generation. Therefore the following approach was used to develop the bathymetric and topographic data set:
- 415 Acquire the most recent land/water boundary data
	- Update the land/water boundary data for Post Katrina conditions
	- Divide the land/water boundaries into small polygons representing channels, lakes, land segments and other features
	- Assign depths to each polygon
- 420 Convert the polygons to a 10 meter grid and export
	- Import the 10 meter grid into SMS and use to populate the CMS

Figure L2.8: Grid/Model extents.





Figure L2.9: Marsh loss attributed to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita

425

Several datasets of land and water polygons were obtained for use in developing the bathymetric dataset; one from the Louisiana GIS Digital Map Compilation DVD (2007) and one from the ESRI Streetmap dataset. The land/water polygon data from the LA GIS Digital Map Compilation DVD was used to start the bathymetric data processing. This polygon data represents pre-

- 430 Katrina conditions and is shown in Figure L2.9 overlaying post-Katrina aerial images. It is clear that there were some significant changes in the land mass in the White Ditch area, especially in the NW region. These changes were confirmed in a USGS study, the results of which are shown in Figure L2.10. Therefore In order to update the land/water polygons to reflect post-Katrina conditions, polygons from the ESRI dataset were used in compliment and this set was further
- 435 modified. Additional digitizing was conducted so that the final set of polygons reflected the land and water boundaries as depicted in the most current aerial photography available for the area. Additional reviews of the polygon data set indicated that not all of the canals in the study area were completely represented in the processing. Canals not represented were digitized and canal water body connections that were inaccurate were modified. The final set of polygons is shown
- 440 in Figure L2.11a and L2.11b.

*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 







# Figure L2.11a: Land analysis polygons



*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 



# Figure L2.11b: Land analysis polygons





445 Figure L2.12: Distributed survey data developed by URS Corp.

The next step was to assign depth values to each of the polygons in the data set. As pointed out in Section 2, there was no comprehensive bathymetric data set available. In order to assign depths, information from the project bathymetric survey and NOAA nautical chart data were 450 used. The first step was to set the land elevation. For this purpose, all of the survey data was pooled and sorted to identify the distribution and range. The distribution of the data is shown in Figure L2.12. There is a distinctive break in the distribution at elevation 0 ft (NAVD 88) that is likely representative of MSL, where the channel and lake banks are steepest. Assuming that most of the inter-tidal zones and land segments lie at or above 0 ft elevation, the data was filtered 455 to eliminate values below 0 feet, and then resorted. The results are also shown in Figure L2.12, and indicate that the median land elevation is 1 foot NAVD 88. This value was adopted as the land elevation and all land polygons were assigned a depth of -1 ft.

In order to assign depth values to the canals and lakes, the survey data transects were processed 460 and used to develop a suitable average depth for each cross-section. Each transect cross-section was clipped so that the only the portion below MSL remained. Then the hydraulic radius of the cross-section was calculated. Then the cross-section effective depth was calculated so that it would yield the same hydraulic radius as the original cross-section. This value was then assigned to the center point of the cross-section transect and used to assign depth values in the

465 canal and lake polygons. The effective depths and their locations, as obtained by this procedure, are shown in Figure L2.13. The effective depth data did not provide sufficient information to assign depths to all canal and lake polygons. Therefore a generalized template for canal and lake depths was developed and used to assign the depths to the remaining polygons. A review of Figure L2.13 indicates that there is a general increase in the canal and lake depths from the NW 470 to the SE. A template, shown in Figure L2.14, was developed using this trend.

After completing the depth assignments to each polygon, the depth data were interpolated from the polygons to a point grid. The point grid consisted of 10 m spacing in the White Ditch area and expanded to 50 m spacing to the east of the Oaks River and to the SE. The 50 m resolution 475 was necessary to keep the file size manageable and still provide sufficient resolution of key features. A view of the bathymetric data as reflected by the point grid is shown in Figure L2.15. An enlarged portion of the point grid data is shown in Figure L2.16, where the points are color coded by the assigned depths.

- 480 The point grid bathymetry dataset was imported into SMS, triangulated, and the depths were interpolated on to the CMS grid. Based on trials in the focus area near White Ditch, a 20 meter resolution was determined to be optimal for areas in the vicinity of the proposed diversion.
- The grid was designed with 20 meter spacing in the White Ditch area with the cell spacing 485 expanding to the SE and SW. In these regions of grid expansion, the grid was allowed to increase to a maximum grid cell size of 500 meters in order to keep the number of cells as low as possible and help manage simulation run time while still providing detailed resolution in the White Ditch study area. Certain cells are 'inactive' and represent areas protected by levees or that are above 4 feet elevation. These cells are not used in the model simulations and are a by-
- 490 product of the inherent CMS rectangular grid structure. A QAQC process was performed in order to ensure canal connections and other components necessary for accurate flow simulation, and cell properties were adjusted manually where appropriate. The final grid contains 866,791 active cells in 992 Columns and 569 Rows. After some initial testing, a time step of 1.5 seconds was found to provide numerically stable solutions, and the model simulations (including salinity
- 495 transport) were determined to take about two days (48 hours) in order to simulate a one month period on an HP Workstation Z400 with an Intel 2.93 Ghz Xeon Quad processor and 8gb DD3 SDRam.



Figure L2.13: Measured water depths within the White Ditch project area













*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 

Figure L2.16: An enlarged portion of the point grid data for the White Ditch hydrodynamic model

### <span id="page-25-0"></span>505

l

### **L2.5 Boundary Conditions**

The boundary conditions required for the White Ditch model simulations included:

- Offshore tide elevation
- 510 Offshore salinity values
	- Flow boundaries (flow rate and salinity)
	- Rainfall and Evaporation
	- Wind Forcing
- 515 As discussed in the Section L2.3, it was not possible to obtain a tidal calibration to measured data in the White Ditch area without shifting the reported elevation of the tide data. The Bay Gardene tide data is reported as NAVD 88 and the mean tide elevation for one or more year period is approximately one foot above sea level; therefore, a shift of 1.0 feet down was made to set the average at approximately sea level.
- 520

Local survey data in the White Ditch area indicates that the median land elevation (based on numerous survey points on transects across the area) is about 1 foot. During the rising tide, it would be expected that land would become inundated and during a falling tide the inundated areas would become dry. When this was reproduced in the model simulations it caused a severe

- 525 attenuation of the tide range in the White Ditch area. The effect was so severe that there was no possibility of matching the measured tide range in the White Ditch area. Local knowledge of the area, based on discussion with airboat operators who spend a sufficient amount of time in the White Ditch area, indicates that during normal tides the land areas do not become submerged, even at high tides. These two factors further supported the decision to shift the Bay Gardene
- 530 data downward by 1.0 feet.

Note that during the model calibration, it was found that the salinity calibration was sensitive to both the total flow rate from the Caernarvon Diversion as well as the split between the amounts assumed to flow through the Delacroix Canal to the west and the through Bayou Mandeville to 535 the south. Therefore, the grid was modified slightly in the region of the Caernarvon Diversion so that the flow splits could be assigned directly.

The actual values assigned to each boundary condition varied for the model calibrations and the alternatives and the specific values used are discussed in the subsequent sections.

<span id="page-25-1"></span>540

### **L2.6 Hydrodynamic Model Calibration**

A model calibration was conducted for both hydrodynamics and salinity transport, with the hydrodynamic calibration completed first. The hydrodynamic and salinity calibration were 545 conducted simultaneously. This was necessary because it was learned in the preliminary salinity calibration simulations that the salinity calibration was sensitive to the total flow and flow split assumed for the Caernarvon Diversion. Since these flow rates may influence the tidal response in the project area, it was necessary to conduct the hydrodynamic and salinity calibration simultaneously.

550

The hydrodynamic calibration period was selected to coincide with the period for which the stage data was available from the project field program, namely the four day period July 20 through July 24th. Preliminary testing with the model indicated that the tidal flows required a relatively short spin-up period, on the order of one-week, but it was found that the salinity 555 simulations required a much longer spin-up period.

The salinity calibration focused on the same period for data comparison, July 20th through July 24th, for which salinity data was available from the project field program. After some preliminary testing with the model, it was found that a two-month spin-up was required to 560 eliminate the effects of the initial conditions on the solution.

For the calibration simulation, the model was configured with measured wind, tide, rainfall, evaporation, salinity and Caernarvon flow data corresponding to the calibration period. For the evaporation, the average value of 5 mm/day adopted from the Cooke et al. (2008) study was 565 used. For the Caernarvon diversion flows, freshwater was assumed, and the corresponding

salinity was assigned a value of zero.

The key calibration parameters are:

- Bottom Fiction (Manning's n)
- 570 Lateral Dispersion
	- Fresh Water flow and flow split from Caernarvon
	- Fresh Water from Caernarvon reaching River Aux Chenes
- The calibration simulations indicated that the hydrodynamic calibration was most sensitive to the 575 bottom friction, with a minor sensitivity to the Caernarvon flow splits. The salinity calibration was most sensitive to the Caernarvon Diversion flow rate and flow split, with a lower level of sensitivity to the lateral dispersion.

An initial range for the lateral dispersion was obtained by considering the length scales of the 580 water bodies in the White Ditch area and the length-scale dependent dispersion values from a study by URS. For this analysis, a length scale was developed by taking the square-root of the area of each of the polygons used to represent each water body and then selecting the median value. The median value is approximately 300 meters, for which the associated dispersion coefficient is  $10m^2/s$ .

585

The rational for adjusting the total Caernarvon flow is that the model grid domain does not contain the entire area influenced by the diversion flow. Therefore, only a portion of the flow actually drains through the region covered by the model grid. The remaining portion of the flow drains towards the MRGO channel that is not represented in the model grid. Thus it is

- 590 appropriate to reduce the Caernarvon flow rates so that they better represent the flow entering the area covered by the model gird. The 'best' reduction level was determined via the salinity calibration.
- It was found the salinity calibration was sensitive, albeit to a smaller degree, to the assumed split 595 in Caernarvon flows that go off to the west and south. Historically the portion flowing to the west, directly towards the White Ditch area, was about 20 to 30 percent. However, it is believed

by local land managers that after Hurricane Katrina, the percentage flowing directly to the west is lower, due to blockage of many of the smaller canals, and is currently about 5 to 10 percent.

- 600 After assigning the dispersion value, a sequence of final calibration simulations were completed in which the bottom friction and the total flow and flow split for the Caernarvon were systematically altered. The final calibration was obtained with the following parameter values:
	- Manning's n: 0.012
	- Dispersion Coefficient: 10 m2/s
- 605 Amount of Measured Caernarvon Flow applied: 58%
	- Amount of Applied Caernarvon Flow directed to the west: 5%

The final stage calibration is shown in Figure L2.17 and the final salinity calibration is shown in Figure L2.18. The simulated stage calibration indicates that the model represents the measured 610 tide amplitude reduction and phase shifts at stations S3 and N3. The salinity calibration results shown in Figure L2.18 represent the time-averaged salinity values over the last four days of the simulation, which correspond to the time period of the measured values obtained during the project field program. The spatial gradients and the actual salinity levels are well represented in the simulated results. The largest discrepancy occurs in the southern station (Simulated Salinity

615 Point 37) where the model results slightly under-predict the salinity levels.

620

# Figure L2.17: Final Stage Calibration





*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 

### Figure L2.18: Final Salinity calibration results

### <span id="page-30-0"></span>625 **L2.7 Hydrodynamic Alternatives Analysis**

The hydrodynamic model's primary purpose is to compare the different alternatives developed by the project delivery team and support the quantification of environmental benefits. Each series of simulations were established with the same background, or boundary conditions, to

- 630 allow for a direct comparison of benefits between each diversion alternative. There were thirteen total alternatives being modeled as shown in Figure L2.19. Alternatives at each location consist of a similar layout with expanded channels for the larger flow diversions. Layouts for Location 2 at the existing White Ditch are shown in Figure L2.20. Layouts for Location 3 at the existing White Ditch are shown in Figure L2.21. Specifics showing channel cross-sections and
- 635 dimensions of the features involved please see section L7 Civil Design Criteria.



645

640

650

Figure L2.19

- 
- 
- 
- 

3/17/2010

### Figure L2.20: General Layout of Outfall Features for Location 2





- 
- 
- 
- 

3/16/2010

### Figure L2.21: General Layout of Outfall Features for Location 3



### <span id="page-33-0"></span>655 **L2.7.1 Initial Screening Analysis**

The initial screening of alternatives was conducted to narrow down the number of alternatives to be run for the WVA Analysis based on time constraints. These simulations were setup to examine a hypothetical spring pulse period and allow for the comparison of results between all

- 660 runs. Each simulation was to run for a one month duration with "maximum" flows from the proposed new diversion as well as from the existing Caernarvon diversion (8,000cfs). Other parameters are as follows:
	- Average spring (March-May) tidal conditions.
	- Average spring (March-May) wind forcing conditions for Plaquemines Parish, LA.
- 665 Average spring (March-May) rainfall inputs.
	- An average evaporation constant of 5mm/day.
	- Starting salinity over the entire grid of 7ppt.

Images of the salinity results can be seen on Figure L2.21 thru Figure L2.28. It is very apparent 670 that any diversion alternative will greatly freshen the project area, particularly if the diversion is operated in conjunction with Caernarvon. Other conclusions that were drawn from this initial modeling are that the larger diversions, 70,000cfs and 100,000cfs, will overtop the River Aux Chene ridge which violates our project scope.





DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(hereinafter referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m guaranty, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, there express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, thereins or completeness of any of the data provided the herein. The USACE, its o



### 675 Figure L2.21: Initial screening analysis at Location 2 with a 5,000cfs outfall







DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(hereinafter referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m guaranty, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, timeliness or completeness of any of the data provide herein. The USACE, its officers, agents, employees, or servants shall assume no liability of employees or servants in any forum whatsoever for any damages<br>of any nature whatsoever that may result from or may be caused in<br>any way by the use of the maps and associated data.



Figure L2.22: Initial screening analysis at Location 2 with a 10,000cfs outfall






DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(hereinafter referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m guaranty, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, timeliness or completeness of any of the data provide ferein. The USACE, its officers, agents, employees, or sevants shall assume no liability of



Figure L2.23: Initial screening analysis at Location 2 with a 15,000cfs outfall







DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(hereinafter referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m guaranty, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, timeliness or completeness of any of the data provide ferein. The USACE, its officers, agents, employees, or sevants shall assume no liability of



#### Figure L2.24: Initial screening analysis at Location 2 with a 35,000cfs outfall

685



Figure L2.25: Initial screening analysis at Location 3 with a 5,000cfs outfall







DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(hereinafter referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m guaranty, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, timeliness or completeness of any of the data provide ferein. The USACE, its officers, agents, employees, or sevants shall assume no liability of







DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(interinatier referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE



690 Figure L2.26: Initial screening analysis at Location 3 with a 10,000cfs outfall







DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(hereinafter referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m guaranty, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, there express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, thereins or completeness of any of the data provided the herein. The USACE, its o



Figure L2.27: Initial screening analysis at Location 3 with a 15,000cfs outfall



695





DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(hereinafter referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m guaranty, either express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, there express or implied, as to the content, sequence, accuracy, thereins or completeness of any of the data provided the herein. The USACE, its o



Figure L2.28: Initial screening analysis at Location 3 with a 35,000cfs outfall



## 700 **L2.7.2 WVA Screening Analysis**

Based off of a preliminary screening involving costs and benefits for each alternative by the project delivery team, it was assessed that only the diversions at Phoenix, LA of 35,000cfs and less would have further analysis conducted on them. These runs are conducted to analyze how

- 705 salinities would encroach back into the Breton Sound with "maintenance" flows coming from the proposed diversion (1000cfs) and Caernarvon (800cfs). For these runs, simulations would start following the final results of their particular runs from the initial screening of alternatives using the salinities that were estimated there. These simulations would continue for a 3 month period with the following parameters:
- 710 Average summer (June-August) tidal conditions.
	- Average summer (June-August) wind forcing conditions for Plaquemines Parish, LA.
	- Average summer (June-August) rainfall inputs.
	- An average evaporation constant of 5mm/day.
- 715 Images of the salinity result show the models progression back to a natural salinity state can be seen in Figure L2.29. It appears that no matter the maximum diversion capacity, salinities will still re-regulate themselves in the sound with the maintenance flows.





DISCLAIMER - While the United States Army Corps of Engineers,<br>(netrinative referred to USACE) has made a reasonable effort to<br>insure the accuracy of the maps and associated data, its should be<br>explicitly noted that USACE m



## Figure L2.29: Results from the WVA Analysis of Location 3 Alternatives



## **L2.8 Ecohydraulic Modeling**

The ERDC-SAND2 Model is the tool used to project marsh acreages throughout the life of the project. It is an ecohydraulic model specifically designed to estimate impacts from flow 725 diversions on the land loss rates of coastal marsh. The ERDC-SAND2 Model is fundamentally based on three processes impacting marsh accretion due to flow diversion:

1) Historical land loss rates are applied to account for marsh loss due to all negatively impacting system processes (e.g. sea level rise, compaction, subsidence, etc.) along with 730 background processes existing prior to the diversion operation (e.g. marsh nutrient cycling, net tidal and groundwater inputs, etc.).

2) Inorganic benefits of flow diversion from the addition of sediment.

735 3) Organic benefits of flow diversion due to plant growth, mortality, and burial stimulated by addition of the limiting nutrient (nitrogen).

The model applies these processes to assess Future With Project (FWP) and Future WithOut Project (FWOP) conditions for alternative comparison. Since the FWOP condition is without 740 diversion, FWOP marsh acreage is a function of land loss only. The model processes these categories and projects acres of marsh within a specified project area.

For the Medium Diversion at White Ditch (MDWD) there were three different land loss rates 745 that were examined. These land loss rates were developed for the three relative sea level rise rates that were specified by the by USACE New Orleans District (MVN). The projected sea level rise rates that were used for analysis are shown in Figure 2.8.1 and are:

- Low Scenario (Historic Rate)  $0.40$  inches per year
- Intermediate Scenario 0.50 inches per year
- 750 High Scenario 0.81 inches per year



#### 755

Benefits from sediment introduction, or inorganic benefits, come from calculations within the model. The model has 25 years of flow and suspended sediment load data from the Mississippi River built in. This data set is rolled forward to allow for a 50 year project life. With the 760 MDWD, project maximum operations of the diversion are only proposed for March and April; throughout the remainder of the year there is a 1,000cfs maintenance flow. During March and April, the modeler assumed that 3% of the total flow in the Mississippi River would be diverted (The flow through the diversion will be driven by the head difference between the river and marsh; however, there is no good correlation between stage and flow built into the model) up to 765 the maximum capacity of the diversion. The modeler also assumed that the diversion would be shut down at any time the Mississippi River went below 300,000cfs to protect navigational interests. Calculations within the model distribute the sediment over open water areas.

Benefits from increased plant productivity are derived from higher nutrient rates entering into the 770 marsh. Nutrient levels are pulled from existing Mississippi River flow data and correspond to diverted flows into the project area. Benefits from increased plant productivity result in vertical accretion for areas of existing marsh.

For land building to occur in the ERDC-SAND2 Model, you must simply have more accretion 775 than sea level rise. With the MDWD, the majority of the benefits come from sediment

deposition. Greater diversion capacities allow for more sediment deposition and more benefits. Results from the model for the MDWD can be seen in Table 2.8.1 and Table 2.8.2.

Table 2.8.1: ERDC-SAND2 Model Calculations of Acreages for the MDWD Project Area under Historical Sea Level Rise Rates



\*\*\* The total project area for the Medium Diversion at White Ditch is 98,000 acres

Table 2.8.2: ERDC-SAND2 Model Calculations of Acreages for the MDWD Project Area under the Intermediate and High Sea Level Rise Rates



\*\*\* The total project area for the Medium Diversion at White Ditch is 98,000 acres

780

Further information on the ERDC-SAND2 Model concerning data from the runs used in the MDWD Analysis, model verification, and the equations behind the model can be found in Annexes of Appendix L.

785

# **L3. Surveying, Mapping, and Geospatial Data Requirements**

## **L3.1 Geospatial Data**

- 790 The data which represents the potential features in the project were created using ArcGIS 9.3. The horizontal coordinate system used for the features is NAD 1983 StatePlane Louisiana South FIPS 1702 Feet. The data that were created during this project references the 2008 Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quadrangles, for further information on that data set see C.3.2.
- 795 Plaquemine Parish provided oil gas well data, and landowner data. The horizontal coordinate system for both sets of data is NAD 1983 StatePlane Louisiana South FIPS 1702 Feet. Additional landowner data were provided by Ralph Gipson of Fenstermaker & Associates, Inc. The horizontal coordinate system for the Fenstermaker data is NAD 1927 StatePlane Louisiana South FIPS 1702 Feet. General base data is licensed for use from Tele Atlas North America.
- 800 The horizontal coordinate system for the Tele Atlas data is GCS WGS 1984. The Mississippi Valley- New Orleans District provided pipeline data. This data set was produced by the Coastal Management Division (CMD) of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources in a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Minerals Management Service (MMS). The data set is a map and database of all of the pipelines that could be identified in the data available to the CMD.
- 805 The data sets used included the Coastal Use Permit files, State Land Office Right Of Way files, the DNR Office of Conservation files, and MMS records. Also used were wall maps produced by the Louisiana Geological Survey and maps and information from individual companies. The horizontal coordinate system for the pipeline data is NAD 1983 UTM Zone 15N.
- 810 ArcGIS software provided the capabilities of transforming the data and aerial photography into one uniform coordinate system for analysis of features and map production. The uniform coordinate system used for these tasks was NAD 1983 StatePlane Louisiana South FIPS 1702 Feet.

## 815 **L3.2 Aerial Photography and LIDAR**

## **L3.2.1 2008 DOQQ Aerial Photography**

The 2008 Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quadrangles (DOQQs) were provided by the Mississippi 820 Valley- New Orleans District. The following information is provided in the metadata of the DOQQ data set. This data set was produced in accordance with USGS Standards for Digital Orthophotos, 1996. Review was provided by the USGS National Geospatial Technical Operations Center (NGTOC). The data set was created by Photo Science, Inc. in 2009 for the USGS National Wetlands Research Center and CWPPRA Task Force.

825

The horizontal coordinate system is projected coordinate system NAD 1983 UTM Zone 15N. The DOQQ horizontal positional accuracy and the assurance of that accuracy depend, in part, on the accuracy of the data inputs to the rectification process. These inputs consist of the digital elevation model (DEM), aero triangulation control and methods, sensor calibration, and aerial

830 imagery that meet National Aerial Photography Program (NAPP) standards. The vertical accuracy of the verified USGS format DEM is equivalent to or better than a USGS level 1 or 2

DEM, with a root mean square error (RMSE) of no greater than 7.0 meters. Field control is acquired by third-order class 1 or better survey methods sufficiently spaced to meet National Map Accuracy Standards (NMAS) for 1:12,000-scale products. Photo-identifiable ground test

- 835 points are identified in the orthorectified image and measured. The image coordinates are compared to the known positions of these points and the radial differences for each point computed. A radial RMSE value is then calculated for the DOQQ. Note: Adjacent DOQQ's, when displayed together in a common planimetric coordinate system, and may exhibit positional discrepancies across common DOQQ boundaries. Linear features, such as streets, may be offset
- 840 between images. However, these edge mismatches still conform to NMAS positional horizontal accuracy requirements. The estimated accuracy is 3.34 meters which was determined by the Federal Geographic Data Committee, 1998, Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standard, Part 3, National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy, FGDC-STD-007.3-1998.

## 845 **L3.2.2 1992 Landsat Thermatic Satellite Image of Louisiana, UMT 15 NAD27**

The 1992 Landsat Imagery was provided by the Mississippi Valley- New Orleans District. The following information is provided in the metadata of the Landsat data set. The originator of the data is Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office (LOSCO) and the publication date is 1996.

850

The horizontal coordinate system is projected coordinate system NAD 1983 UTM Zone 15N. This data set is comprised of a pair of satellite images of Louisiana that were produced from ten scenes of 30-meter resolution TM imagery. The original image data were geo-rectified and resampled to 25-meter cells by the Earth observation Satellite Corporation, EOSAT. These data

- 855 were obtained by LSU from the Baton Rouge office of the USGS National Wetlands Research Center through a cooperative agreement. The processing to make a seamless enhanced image was performed by LSU and funded by the Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office. The locational accuracy of the satellite imagery is approximately 98 feet (30 meters). The image was constructed from a red, green, blue (RGB) composite of bands 7,5 & 3 which has the relative
- 860 appearance of a normal color image, unlike typical false color composites using infrared light in which vegetation is red instead of green. The image is a simulation of the natural environment and is not an accurate representation of "true-color" as perceived by humans. Band 7 is midinfrared, band 5 is near-infrared, and band 3 is red-visible light. The 3-band, 24-bit composite images were contrast stretched, histogram corrected, and color-matched, and then reduced to a
- 865 single band, 8-bit image resembling the original composites. They were mosaicked and clipped to fit the 'state boundary'. That data set, which was in UTM zone 15, NAD27 coordinates, was published on the Louisiana Oil Spill Contingency Plan Map CD in 1996. This pair of images in UTM zone 15, NAD83 coordinates was derived by projecting and clipping splitting that UTM zone 15 NAD27 image. The images are in GeoTIFF format, but are accompanied by world files
- 870 (.tfw) so they can be used in GIS that support TIFF but do not read georeferencing information from GeoTIFF format files.

## **L3.2.3 2007 Mississippi River LIDAR**

The LIDAR was provided by the Mississippi Valley- New Orleans District. The following 875 information is provided in the metadata of the LIDAR data set. The originator of the data is NGS and the date is 2006.

This data set was created to evaluate the condition of the Mississippi River Levee System and river banks as a part of a larger levee assessment process to determine encroachments and

880 calculate slope stability. Data were collected through John Chance and Associates FLI-MAP system, in which a helicopter flies over a given corridor at a low altitude, collecting GPS coordinates and laser rangings. These coordinates and elevations are validated against a video simultaneously recorded by the helicopter. The horizontal controls are "B" order or better and the absolute accuracy is on the order of 15cm. The vertical control references the revised 2003 885 Geoid (revised in 2005 for South Louisiana) and the absolute accuracy is on the order of 10cm.

# **L3.3 Ground Topographic Surveys**

No surveying was conducted during the feasibility stage of this project.

890

# **L4. Geology**

The study area is from the Mississippi River, at approximately Mississippi River Mile 60, near the Plaquemines Parish town of Phoenix and extending into the marsh towards Oak River. This 895 is an area of low relief ranging from below sea level to approximately +7 NGVD in elevation on the area adjacent to the river.

Fine grained material make up the majority of the stratigraphy with deposits in the area consisting of a silt to sandy silt layer with clay seams extending from ground surface to

900 approximately -80 and -40 NGVD in elevation for borings R-59.75-LU and R-60.3-UL, respectively, shown in Figure L4.1. The silt to sandy silt layers are underlain by a clay layer with silt seams. After an average depth of -108 NGVD for the previously two mentioned borings, various silt and clay seams layers alternate until the end of the two borings. Borings R-59.75-LU and R-60.3-UL can be seen in Figures L4.2 and L4.3, respectively.

#### 905

Ground water is at or near the surface in the study area and is directly connected to the Mississippi River.



910

Figure L4.1 Overview of the project area with the boring locations used for the subsurface evaluation.









# **L5. Geotechnical Investigations and Design**

## 915 **L5.1 General**

l

The project area is located on the east bank of the Mississippi River near the town of Phoenix and the unincorporated area of Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. See the vicinity map on Figure L4.1 and Section L4 for the regional geology of the area. (This report was written after Location 920 3 was selected for the area of construction, and substantially, this geotechnical investigation and design only refers to Location 3.) This section describes the results of geotechnical investigation and designs performed for the diversion facility (box culvert) and transmission system (dredged canals), discussed in Sections L5.2 and L5.3, respectively. The subsurface information available for the design of the diversion facility and transmission system is for a general design and cost 925 estimate purposes only. A significant subsurface exploration will be needed in the future to accurately determine the geology of the construction area. The analyses shall be revised using the newly collected data including slope stability analyses, settlement analyses, pile foundation design, etc. Construction considerations shall include all aspects of construction including backfilling, dewatering, pile installation, culvert construction, and dredging. The subsequent

930 geotechnical design on the detail features will be presented in a Design Report (DR) in an appropriate time prior to the preparation of the Plans and Specifications of the project.

## **L5.2 Geotechnical Design for Diversion Facility**

### 935 **L5.2.1 Stability Analyses**

The results of the soil borings and laboratory test data were evaluated and the shear strength and density parameters were selected for design. In general, design shear strengths were based on the results of unconfined compression tests (UCT) and recommendation from the Hurricane and

940 Storm Damage Reduction System Design Guidelines (HSDRSDG). The boring locations used for design are located in Location 3 and are shown in Figure L4.1. In addition, the available soil design shear strengths and stratification from the borings are shown on Figures L5.1 and L5.2.

Global stability of the diversion facility was analyzed using the Spencer Method in GeoStudio 945 2007 (Version 7.14, Build 4606) for the slope stability analysis. Design requirements are such that a minimum factor of safety of 1.4 evaluated by unconsolidated-undrained (Q) shear strength parameters is required for low water conditions, where the Q-tests are supplemented by UCT tests. Due to time constraints, no new borings were drilled and design was based on existing borings with UCT test results. The analyses are shown on Plate L5.1. The results for the global

950 stability analysis showed that there were no unbalanced loads and the required factors or safety were met. A summary of the results are presented in Table L5.1.

955



## 960 Table L5.1 Global stability summary for the diversion facility

Note: \* indicates that analysis was performed using an infinitely strong and weightless material to prevent the failure surface from cutting into the diversion facility









### **L5.2.2 Construction Excavation**

- There was determined to be sufficient land both riverside and landside of the Mississippi River 965 Levee (MRL) for construction of temporary flood protection, which consists of natural ground. Excavated material from the degrading of the MRL will be used to construct this temporary earthen barrier. The diversion facility will be constructed using an engineered staged design. A carefully planned construction excavation should consider the following:
- 970 a. Risk of flooding.
	- b. Historical river elevations in the area of construction.
	- c. Excavation will be to Elevation –20 NGVD.
	- d. The approximate prevailing ground surface elevation is 6.5 NGVD.
	- e. Ground water outside the excavation is dependent on the river level of the Mississippi River (Approximate Elevation is 4 NGVD).

980

975

Following completion of the diversion facility construction, the temporary earthen barrier can be recycled into the MRL.

#### **L5.2.3 Pile Foundations**

985

A deep pile foundation is recommended for the diversion facility. The type of pile to be used and the estimated ultimate pile load capacity versus tip elevation curves for cost estimate purposes is presented. The final design should be verified in the forthcoming DR after site specific subsurface exploration and testing is completed. The overburden pressure will be limited 990 to approximately 3500 psf in accordance with the HSDRSDG.

Analyses have been made to determine the estimated allowable single pile load capacities in compression and tension for square, prestressed, precast concrete piles (12"x12" and 14"x14") and steel H-piles (HP14x73) for support of the proposed structures, as indicated by the Structural

995 Design Section. The results of the estimated pile load capacities are given on Figures L5.3 and L.5.4 and consider the two design borings (R-59.75-LU and R-60.3-UL). The allowable load capacities assume the piles are installed vertically and neglect skin friction along the top 2 feet to allow for embedment in the concrete and seal slab. These allowable load capacities contain an estimated factor of safety shown in the table below against failure of a single pile through the

- 1000 soil. The output for the pile design spreadsheet for both borings is shown in Plate L5.2. The pile capacities, which accounted for the factor of safety, for the two borings were combined and the lower, more conservative strength was chosen for design.
- The Structural Design Section determined from the pile capacity charts that all piles tips would 1005 terminate at EL. -90.0' (a total pile length of  $\approx$  70', excluding the 2' placed in the pile cap). Due to lack of boring information, negative skin friction was not accounted for. Negative skin friction from dragdown should be considered in subsequent design reports.

Recommended factors-of-safety for compression and tension design loads are:

#### 1010

l



Note: Q-Case is characterized as a short term undrained case relative to the soil. S-Case is characterized as a long term consolidated drained case relative to the soil.



Figure L5.3 Pile design charts for piles in compression without load tests (a) and with load tests (b).



Figure L5.3 Pile design charts for piles in tension without load tests (a) and with load tests (b).

1015 Precast concrete piles should meet the requirements outlined in Section 805.14 of the LSSRB. The design of the pile should consider allowable driving stresses.

Analyses for pile capacities are based only on a soil-pile relationship. Therefore, the structural capacity of the piles and their connections to transmit these loads should be determined by a 1020 structural engineer.

The piles will derive the majority of their supporting capacity from skin friction. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the effect of group action. In this regard, the supporting value of friction

piles installed in groups should be investigated on the basis of group perimeter. All piles should 1025 be installed to the same tip embedment in order to minimize differential foundation settlements.

All pile driving operations should be supervised by experienced personnel to ensure proper procedures are followed and accurate records are kept during all pile driving operations. The driving records should include the date, type of pile, pile size, hammer model, driving energy,

1030 and number of blows per foot of penetration for the embedment of the pile. An accurate driving record is especially important to verify piles are installed to the required tip embedment and to give an indication of any unusual driving characteristics which may include pile breakage.

### **L5.2.4 Lateral Earth Pressures**

1035

Lateral earth pressures and lateral fluid pressures from ground water should be calculated prior to design of the diversion facility.

## **L5.2.5 Hydrostatic Uplift**

1040

Hydrostatic uplift during construction should be controlled by dewatering using sumps and pumps, piezometers, positive cutoff, well points and/or deep wells if required. A passive trench collection system (French drain) with gravel fill is recommended; however the contractor is responsible for designing the necessary dewatering system. A registered professional engineer

- 1045 having qualifications and experience in similar dewatering and pressure relief systems shall design this system. If a trench collection system is chosen, the trenches should not be continuous from the riverside to the landside as to allow for uncontrollable seepage during a flood event after construction. For cost estimating purposes, the trapezoidal trench was 3 feet deep with an 8 foot width on top and a 2 foot width on the bottom. The design along with assumptions,
- 1050 computations, figures and detail plans, shall be submitted for review. Piezometric levels in the foundation strata should be reduced to no higher than the excavation surface. Adequate temporary piezometers shall be required to monitor the performance of the dewatering system. Because dewatering and pressure relief operations will lower the ground water level in the vicinity of the excavations and thus result in settlement of the adjacent ground surface, measures
- 1055 such as cutoff walls, recharge wells, and/or some other method may be necessary design of the dewatering system and excavation cofferdam to minimize these effects. Minimizing the duration of dewatering and pressure relief will also minimize these effects. The pressure relief system should be designed, installed and operated by a contractor experienced and qualified in the field of pressure relief
- 1060

Hydrostatic uplift will act upon the box culvert after construction due to the return of normal ground water levels. The total weight of the culvert plus overlying overburden must counteract this hydrostatic uplift. A minimum factor of safety against flotation, found in the HSDRSDG and based on total weights, should be provided at all times.

1065

## **L5.2.6 Backfill**

Placement of approved materials as backfill should be completed according to current recommended guidelines.

## 1070 **L5.3 Geotechnical Design for Transmission System**

Due to the time constraints and limited existing borings away from the Mississippi River levee, limited soil data is known for the marsh wetlands. The previously mentioned two borings (R-60.3-UL and R-59.75-LU) were assumed to be representative of the entire marsh. It is

1075 recommended that additional subsurface exploration and testing be completed to verify these assumptions.

The results of the soil borings and laboratory test data were evaluated and the shear strength and density parameters were selected for design. In general, design shear strengths were based on the 1080 results of UCT. The available soil design shear strengths and stratification are located on the previously mentioned Figures L5.1 and L5.2.

Stability of earth cuts were analyzed using the Spencer Method in GeoStudio 2007 (Version 7.14, Build 4606) for the slope stability analysis. Design requirements are such that a minimum 1085 factor of safety of 1.4 evaluated by unconsolidated-undrained (Q) shear strength parameters is

- required for low water conditions, where the Q-tests are supplemented by UCT tests. Due to time constraints, no new borings were drilled and design was based off of existing borings with UCT test results. This analysis is shown on Plate L.5.3.
- 1090 The main channel leading away from the diversion facility was analyzed for slope stability. For the 35,000 cfs outflow option, the slope for the main channel extends from +6 to -16 NGVD with a 10 foot wide access berm above the slope. Using this cross-section with the boring information, the maximum slope, meeting the required factors of safety, was determined to be 1 on 4.5 (Vertical on Horizontal). The results are summarized in Table L5.2.
- 1095

For cost estimating purposes, a 50% reduction factor was assumed for the consolidation of dredged material. In subsequent design reports, additional borings need to be taken along the transmission system in order to determine accurate material information. This additional information will be used for determining the transmission system's slope stability and for the 1100 settlement of the foundation and placement of the ridges lining the canals.



Table L5.2 Slope stability summary of the transmission system

1105

## **L5.4 Laboratory Testing Program and Evaluations**

Soil mechanics laboratory tests consisting of natural water content, unit weight, Atterberg liquid and plastic limits, and unconfined compression shear were performed on undisturbed samples 1110 obtained from the borings. There were two 5 inch diameter borings used in this evaluation. The borings are both in the vicinity of Location 3 and are shown on Figure L4.1. Boring R-59.75-LU is located 290 FT. R.S. from STA.1126+00 of MRL and Boring R-60.3-UL is located 152 FT. R.S. from STA. 1695+00 of the MRL. The results of these laboratory tests are presented on the boring logs in Figures L4.2 and L4.3. It is recommended that additional site specific subsurface 1115 exploration and testing be completed to verify the results of these two borings.





Name: Layer 1-ML Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 117 pcf Cohesion: 200 psf Phi: 15° Piezometric Line: 1 Name: Layer 2-SP Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 122 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Phi: 33 ° Piezometric Line: 1 Name: Layer 3-CL Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 105 pcf Cohesion: 1580 psf Phi:  $0^{\circ}$ Piezometric Line: 1 **EXECTION 71 And The Section 200 psf Phi: 15 ° Piezometric Line: 1** Anne: 1 And 2007 Cohesion: 200 psf Phi: 15 ° Piezometric Line: 1

**Top of Levee** 155 Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © <sup>1991</sup>‐<sup>2009</sup> GEO‐SLOPE International Ltd.

#### **1.0 FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 90

Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS

160 Date: 3/3/2010

Time: 3:29:48 PM

File Name: Location 3 ‐ 35k cfs ‐ Global Stability\_R‐59.75‐LU.gsz

Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\

Last Solved Date: 3/3/2010

 $165$  Last Solved Time: 3:31:00 PM  $\,$ 

#### **2.0 PROJECT SETTINGS**

Length(L) Units: feet Time(t) Units: Seconds

Force(F) Units: lbf 170 Pressure(p) Units: psf

Strength Units: psf

Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf

View: 2D

#### **3.0 ANALYSIS SETTINGS**

175 **3.1 Top of Levee** 

Kind: SLOPE/W Method: Spencer

Settings

- Apply Phreatic Correction: No 180 **PWP Conditions Source: Piezometric Line** 
	- Use Staged Rapid Drawdown: No

SlipSurface

Direction of movement: Left to Right Use Passive Mode: No185 Slip Surface Option: Block

Critical slip surfaces saved: 1

*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 





Starting Angle: 0 ° Ending Angle: 45 ° Angle Increments: 3 **7.0 PIEZOMETRIC LINES**  260 **7.1 Piezometric Line 1 Coordinates** 



## **8.0 REGIONS**



## **9.0 POINTS**



*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 





## **10.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



## 265 **10.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**






















 $285$  Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

#### **11.0FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 96Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS 290 Date: 3/7/2010 Time: 11:30:30 AM File Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - Global Stability\_R-60.3-LU.gsz Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\

Last Solved Date: 3/7/2010

 $295$  Last Solved Time:  $11:30:55$  AM

### **12.0PROJECT SETTINGS**

Length(L) Units: feet Time(t) Units: Seconds

Force(F) Units: lbf 300 Pressure(p) Units: psf

Strength Units: psf

Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf

View: 2D

#### **13.0ANALYSIS SETTINGS**

### 305 **13.1 Low Water (hurricane condition)**

Description: Active and Passive Wedge Method Kind: SLOPE/W Method: Spencer **Settings** 

- 310 Apply Phreatic Correction: No PWP Conditions Source: Piezometric Line
	- Use Staged Rapid Drawdown: No
	- SlipSurface
		- Direction of movement: Left to Right
- $315$  Use Passive Mode: No













## 425 **18.0 REGIONS**



## **19.0 POINTS**

 $\overline{X(ft)} \mid \overline{Y(ft)}$ 





# **20.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



# **20.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**









## **20.2 Slices of Slip Surface: 170**









### **LCA MVN - WHITE DITCH Location 3 - Diversion Facility Spencer's Block Search Boring: R-59.75-LU**



Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 0.001 pcf Cohesion: 2e+005 psf Phi:  $0^{\circ}$ Piezometric Line: 1 Name: Concrete Name: Layer 1 -ML - S Case Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 117 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Phi: 28 ° Piezometric Line: 1 Name: Laver 2-SP - S Case Unit Weight: 122 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Phi: 33 ° Piezometric Line: 1 Model: Mohr-Coulomb Name: Layer 3 - CL - S Case Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 105 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Phi: 23 ° **Piezometric Line: 1** Name: Layer 4 -ML - S Case Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 117 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Phi: 28 ° Piezometric Line: 1

### **Top of Levee - S-Case**

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.



Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 100 Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Date: 3/8/2010 445 Time: 4:40:55 PMFile Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - Global Stability\_R-59.75-LU.gsz Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\ Last Solved Date: 3/8/2010 Last Solved Time: 4:42:13 PM

### 450 **22.0PROJECT SETTINGS**

Length(L) Units: feet Time(t) Units: Seconds Force(F) Units: lbf Pressure(p) Units: psf

#### 455 Strength Units: psf

Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf View: 2D

## **23.0ANALYSIS SETTINGS**

### **23.1 Top of Levee - S-Case (2)**

460 Kind: SLOPE/W Method: Spencer Settings Apply Phreatic Correction: No PWP Conditions Source: Piezometric Line465 Use Staged Rapid Drawdown: No SlipSurface Direction of movement: Left to Right

Use Passive Mode: No Slip Surface Option: Block

 $470$  Critical slip surfaces saved: 1









# **28.0 REGIONS**

1000





### 555 **29.0 POINTS**





## **30.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



## **30.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**









### **30.2 Slices of Slip Surface: 3131**











#### **LCA MVN - WHITE DITCH Location 3 - Diversion Facility Spencer's Block Search Boring: R-60.3-LU**

#### Low Water (non-hurricane condition) S-Case Optimization



**Low Water S-Case** 

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

#### 565 **31.0FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 98Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS












*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 

Ending Angle: 45 ° Angle Increments: 3 **37.0PIEZOMETRIC LINES**  710 **37.1 Piezometric Line 1 37.1.1 Coordinates** 



## **38.0 REGIONS**



## **39.0 POINTS**

 $X (ft) \mid Y (ft)$ 





## **40.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



## 715 **40.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**









### **40.2 Slices of Slip Surface: 3480**









730

# 735 **Plate L5.2**

745

750

# **Boring R-59.75-LU 12x12 Concrete Pile Capacities**



### **Q-CASE CAPACITY**



#### **S-CASE CAPACITY**

*Appendix L (Vol VI) Engineering* 







*Appendix L (Vol VI) Engineering* 







775

780

# **Boring R-60.3-UL 12x12 Concrete Pile Capacities**



### **Q-CASE CAPACITY**

*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 



### **S-CASE CAPACITY**

**Capacity (Tons)**







Г







800

805

# **Boring**  810 **R-59.75-LU 14x14 Concrete Pile Capacities**


### **Q-CASE CAPACITY**



### **S-CASE CAPACITY**







Г







*Appendix L (Vol VI) Engineering* 

835

# **Boring R-60.3-UL**  840 **14x14 Concrete Pile Capacities**

\_



### **Q-CASE CAPACITY**

\_



### **S-CASE CAPACITY**







Г







855

860

## 865 **Boring R-59.75-LU HP14x73 Steel Pile Capacities**



### **Q-CASE CAPACITY**



**S-CASE CAPACITY**

870

\_







Г







885

890

# **Boring R-60.3-LU HP14x73 Steel Pile Capacities**

895



### **Q-CASE CAPACITY**

\_



### **S-CASE CAPACITY**







Г






910

915

# 920 **Plate L5.3**







965

#### **Low Water (hurricane condition)**

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

### 970 **41.0FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 76Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Date: 3/5/2010  $975$  Time: 2:46:08 PM File Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - MC\_R-59.75-LU\_1on3.5 Slope.gsz Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\

> Last Solved Date: 3/5/2010 Last Solved Time: 2:47:01 PM

### 980 **42.0PROJECT SETTINGS**

Length(L) Units: feet Time(t) Units: Seconds Force(F) Units: lbf Pressure(p) Units: psf

#### 985 Strength Units: psf

Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf View: 2D

### **43.0ANALYSIS SETTINGS**

### **43.1 Low Water (hurricane condition)**

990 Kind: SLOPE/W

Method: Spencer

Settings

Apply Phreatic Correction: No PWP Conditions Source: Piezometric Line

995 Use Staged Rapid Drawdown: No

SlipSurface

Direction of movement: Left to Right Use Passive Mode: NoSlip Surface Option: Block



*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 



*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 







### **48.0 REGIONS**



# **49.0 POINTS**





# **50.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



# **50.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**















\_



Name: Laver 2 - SP Model: Mohr-Coulomb Unit Weight: 122 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Phi: 33 ° Piezometric Line: 1 Model: Mohr-Coulomb Name: Layer 1 - ML - S Case Unit Weight: 117 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Piezometric Line: 1 Phi: 28 ° Name: Layer 3 - CL - S Case Unit Weight: 105 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Phi: 23 ° Piezometric Line: 1 Model: Mohr-Coulomb Name: Layer 4 - ML - S Case Unit Weight: 117 pcf Cohesion: 0 psf Model: Mohr-Coulomb Phi: 28 ° Piezometric Line: 1

**Low Water (non-hurricane condition) S-Case** 090 Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

#### **51.0FILE INFORMATION**







Starting Angle: 0 ° Ending Angle: 45 ° Angle Increments: 3 **57.0PIEZOMETRIC LINES**  195 **57.1 Piezometric Line 1** 

57.1.	<b>Coordinates</b>		
		$X(f_t)$	$Y(f_t)$
		$-200$	2
		-2	2
		43	U
		300	

# **58.0 REGIONS**



# **59.0 POINTS**





# **60.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



### 200 **60.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**



\_









### **60.2 Slices of Slip Surface: 1933**













210

### **Water at Project Grade (levee)**

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

#### 215 **61.0FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 76 Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Date: 3/5/2010 220 Time: 2:46:08 PMFile Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - MC\_R-59.75-LU\_1on3.5 Slope.gsz Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\ Last Solved Date: 3/5/2010 Last Solved Time: 2:48:58 PM

### 225 **62.0PROJECT SETTINGS**

Length(L) Units: feet Time(t) Units: Seconds Force(F) Units: lbf Pressure(p) Units: psf

#### 230 Strength Units: psf

Unit Weight of Water: 62.4 pcf

### View: 2D

**63.0ANALYSIS SETTINGS** 

### **63.1 Water at Project Grade (levee)**



**Settings** 

Apply Phreatic Correction: No

PWP Conditions Source: Piezometric Line

### $240$  Use Staged Rapid Drawdown: No

SlipSurface

Direction of movement: Right to Left Use Passive Mode: NoSlip Surface Option: Block

 $245$  Critical slip surfaces saved: 1





*EIS WRDA 2007 Section 7006(e)(3) August 2010* 

 $315$  Starting Angle: 45 ° Ending Angle: 65 ° Angle Increments: 3 **67.0PIEZOMETRIC LINES 67.1 Piezometric Line 1** 



# **68.0 REGIONS**



# **69.0 POINTS**





# **70.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



### **70.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**
















330

335

340

345 **Boring R-60.3-UL**



#### **Low Water (hurricane condition)**

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

### 355 **71.0FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS

Revision Number: 74

Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS

Date: 3/5/2010

360 Time: 10:57:29 AM

File Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - Main Channel R-60.3-LU 1on4.5 Slope.gsz Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\ Last Solved Date: 3/5/2010





Starting Optimization Points: 8

#### *Appendix L (Vol VI) Engineering*









#### **77.0PIEZOMETRIC LINES 77.1 Piezometric Line 1**

**77.1.1 Coordinates** 



## 510 **78.0 REGIONS**



# **79.0 POINTS**





# **80.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



## **80.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**









## **80.2 Slices of Slip Surface: 27631**









\_

### *Appendix L (Vol VI) Engineering*



515

520

525

530

535



540

### **Low Water S-Case - Flood Side - Shallow**

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

#### **81.0FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS  $545$  Revision Number: 74 Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Date: 3/5/2010 Time: 10:57:29 AMFile Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - Main Channel\_R-60.3-LU\_1on4.5 Slope.gsz 550 **Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\** Last Solved Date: 3/5/2010 Last Solved Time: 11:06:07 AM













Y Increments: 15Starting Angle: 0 ° Ending Angle: 45 ° Angle Increments: 3

695 **87.0PIEZOMETRIC LINES** 

## **87.1 Piezometric Line 1**

**87.1.1 Coordinates** 



## **88.0 REGIONS**



## **89.0 POINTS**

 $X$  (ft)  $Y$  (ft)





## 700 **90.0 CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



## **90.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**









## **90.2 Slices of Slip Surface: 16117**









705



#### **Low Water S-Case - Flood Side**

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

#### 710 **91.0FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 76

Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Date: 3/5/2010

715 Time: 1:00:10 PM

File Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - Main Channel\_R-60.3-LU\_1on4.5 Slope.gsz Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\ Last Solved Date: 3/5/2010 Last Solved Time: 1:01:27 PM










Angle Increments: 3

**97.0PIEZOMETRIC LINES** 

**97.1 Piezometric Line 1** 

**97.1.1 Coordinates** 



# 865 **98.0 REGIONS**



# **99.0 POINTS**

 $X$  (ft)  $Y$  (ft)





### **100.0CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



# **100.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**





\_





6

7

1917 20.223855 -0.66515402 106.80373 572.17776 197.53956 0

1917 | 21.40795 | -1.8492515 | 178.00422 | 679.93696 | 213.05781 | 0







870



## 875 **Water at Project Grade (levees)**

Report generated using GeoStudio 2007, version 7.15. Copyright © 1991-2009 GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.

### **101.0 FILE INFORMATION**

Created By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Revision Number: 74 880 Last Edited By: Goetz, Ryan MVS Date: 3/5/2010 Time: 10:57:29 AMFile Name: Location 3 - 35k cfs - Main Channel\_R-60.3-LU\_1on4.5 Slope.gsz Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\B3ECGRPG\My Documents\White Ditch\ 885 Last Solved Date: 3/5/2010 Last Solved Time: 11:07:39 AM

\_















**108.0**

## **U** REGIONS

22 6 300 6







### **110.0CRITICAL SLIP SURFACES**



# 035 **110.1 Slices of Slip Surface: Optimized**









## **110.2 Slices of Slip Surface: 7261**









# **L6. Environmental Engineering**

The proposed project will make beneficial use of dredge spoil produced. Dredged material from 3040 the proposed channel enhancement features, in addition to any other spoil available, will allow new areas of marsh to be created.

Regenerative planting, with native species, will be done to stabilize the placed dredge spoil and prevent return of the material to the waterway. The use of native species plantings to quickly 3045 establish targeted vegetative communities will assist in reducing the risk of invasive species impacts. Native vegetation will trap sediment following into the marsh from the proposed project, accreting additional marsh area over time.

# 3050 **L7. Civil Design Criteria**

## **L7.1 Site Recommendations**

Multiple features were considered to reintroduce and distribute Mississippi River water into the 3055 marsh. An inlet and outfall channel, working in conjunction with a structure, would feed distributary channels containing strategically positioned culverts or openings that allow sediment and freshwater to flow into the marsh. Notched dikes to constrict flow, but still allow boat traffic through, would be placed in key locations to prevent the loss of the valuable sediments and nutrients from the freshwater diversion. Areas of new marsh would be created from dredged 3060 material out of the proposed channel enhancement features as well as any other beneficial spoil that is available.

Four alternatives, utilizing box culverts described in section C8, were considered at Location 2, White Ditch, LA. Six alternatives, utilizing box culverts and siphons, also described in section 3065 C8, were considered at Location 3, Phoenix, LA.

Modeling was done with Bentley InRoads XM Edition v08. Data used for the modeling included a topographic survey of the marsh area performed by FTN Associates, LTD (July 2009) and LIDAR flown within approximately 250 feet of the levee corridor. The topographic survey

- 3070 contained points, but the cross-sectional data was spread out over a large area, with crosssections ranging from 915 feet apart to 3850 feet apart. Quantities were prepared by analyzing the proposed channel areas and using the closes cross-sectional data along the channel until the proposed channel changed.
- 3075 The following assumptions were made concerning Marsh Creation:
	- Berm: 6' tall (feasibility quantities only during construction contractor shall maintain a berm height of 5'), 10' crown, 1 on 6 side slopes.
	- This material will be pushed up from the interior of the footprint of the marsh creation area.
	- Excavation will be in the wet, material will settle under its own weight.
- 3080 1 unit of material pushed up with no compaction will result in 0.75 units in the containment dike.
- In marsh areas with no compaction, 1 unit dredged from the channel will result in 1 unit in the marsh creation area.
- All material for marsh creation will be all excess material dredged from the channel not 3085 used for the side berms on the channel.
	- Marsh areas are calculated to be 4' thick

# **L7.2 Civil Site Design for Diversion Facility**

# 3090 **L7.2.1 General**

Ten alternatives were studied for this proposed diversion project. Each alternative consists of, at a minimum, an inlet channel, structure, outfall structure with a concrete apron, outfall channel, system of distributary channels in the marsh with culverts or cutoffs to smaller channels and 3095 plugs at Oak River. Following is a description of the features that will hold constant for each

alternative, although quantities will change according to design template:

- Inlet: entire length will be reinforced with rock, on both side slopes and 15 feet past the top of the new bank. Top of rock should be the same elevation as the top of natural 3100 ground. Layers will match 400lb rip protection.
	- Outlet: at the end of the concrete apron for 100 feet there will be 1000 lb rip protection. At 100 feet, transitions to 400lb rip rap protection.
	- At culverts and cutoffs to smaller channels, anywhere there is a velocity change there will be 400lb rip rap for a minimum of 100 feet each side of cutoff.

## 3105 • Rock protection, 400lb rip rap, will be placed adjacent to the box culvert and as protection for the proposed road perpendicular to the structure.



# 3120 **L7.2.2 Alternatives Array**



Below are the alternatives for the proposed diversion project:

## 3125

# **L7.2.3 Description of Civil Site Alternatives**

Plan views of the alternatives are shown on the following plates:



Quantities for the alternatives are shown in the tables below:

3135 Location 2 15' x 15' Box Culverts

		3	3	10	10
		5,000 cfs	10,000 cfs	15,000 cfs	35,000 cfs
Excavation	<b>CY</b>	1,487,300	2,316,200	4,962,000	6,278,700
<b>Berm Fill</b>	<b>CY</b>	116,600	98,300	99,600	122,900
<b>Marsh Creation</b>	<b>CY</b>	1,371,000	2,218,000	4,863,000	6,156,000
<b>Bedding Material</b>	<b>TN</b>	487,300	528,200	595,200	746,400
400 lb. Riprap	<b>TN</b>	444,200	478,700	545,500	692,000
1000lb. RipRap	<b>TN</b>	12,100	13,500	13,400	19,200
Geotextile	SY	179,900	218,500	290,100	368,100
Geogrid	SY	179,900	218,500	290,100	368,100
36" Culvert Pipe	LF	3,000	3,130	5,220	7,830
36" Flared End Section	EA	104	156	260	390
Striping	AC	75	75	75	75
Clearing & Grubbing	AC	15	15	15	15
Road Removal	SY	270	270	270	270
9" Cement Treated	SY	270	270	270	270
Sand Shell Base					
3.5" Asphaltic	SY	270	270	270	270
<b>Concrete Binder Course</b>					
1.5" Asphaltic	SY	270	270	270	270
<b>Concrete Wearing Course</b>					
Remove & Dispose of	SY	950	950	950	950
<b>Articulated Concrete Mat</b>					
Install Articulated	SY	950	950	950	950
Concrete Mat					
Dewatering	LS	1	1	1	1
<b>Real Estate Costs</b>	LS	1	1		

Table 3

3140

30 Pipe Siphon					
		5,000 cfs	10,000cfs		
Excavation	<b>CY</b>	1,506,800	2,237,300		
Berm Fill	<b>CY</b>	116,600	98,300		
<b>Marsh Creation</b>	<b>CY</b>	1,390,000	2,139,000		
<b>Bedding Material</b>	<b>TN</b>	326,500	363,700		
400 lb. Riprap	<b>TN</b>	256,400	324,500		
1000lb. RipRap	<b>TN</b>	12,100	13,500		
Geotextile	SY	123,500	149,300		
Geogrid	SY	123,500	149,300		
Striping	AC	75	75		
Clearing & Grubbing	AC	15	15		
36" Culvert Pipe	LF	2,100	3,130		
36" Flared End Section	EA	104	156		
Road Removal	SY	1,210	1,210		
9" Cement Treated Sand Shell Base	SY	1,210	1,210		
Sand Shell Base					
3.5" Asphaltic	SY	1,210	1,210		
<b>Concrete Binder Course</b>					
1.5" Asphaltic Concrete Wearing Course	SY	1,210	1,210		
<b>Concrete Wearing Course</b>					
Remove & Dispose of	SY	1,880	1,880		
<b>Articulated Concrete Mat</b>					
<b>Install Articulated</b>	SY	1,880	1,880		
Concrete Mat					
Dewatering	LS	1	1		
<b>Real Estate Costs</b>	LS	1	1		

Location 2 30 Pipe Siphon

Table 4

# 3145



Location 3 15' x 15' Box Culverts

3150

Table 5



# Location 3 30 Pipe Siphon





 $\overline{2010}$ 



 $\overline{2010}$


















# **L8. Structural Design Criteria**

3165

# **L8.1 FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **L8.1.1 General**

- 3170 Development of this proposed diversion project would require various proposed features to accomplish the intended purpose. Among those would be a variety of structures. A description of the foundations for each structural feature will be shown below. The pile founded structures would incorporate the use of steel H-piles and sheet piles, precast prestressed concrete (PPC) piles, timber piles, and steel pipe piles where indicated on the drawings. Preliminary assumptions
- 3175 of pile sizes, spacing, and pile tip elevations were based on the design of similar structures found in the vicinity. Verification of the pile assumptions, along with any adjustments, was accomplished with the use of pile capacity curves that were developed for similar soils. A more accurate determination of soil properties was not possible due to the absence of reliable borings; therefore pile tip elevations may be adjusted in the next stage of design. All cast-in-place
- 3180 concrete structure monoliths exposed to lateral loadings were analyzed using the COE CASE program "CPGA" (X0080), Pile Group Analysis Program to determine adequacy of pile pattern assumptions. All designs were performed in accordance with applicable COE and technical publications, and industry codes. All structures will be constructed using conventional construction equipment and techniques. The contractor will be required to provide dewatering
- 3185 systems (where necessary) in order to construct foundations in a near dry atmosphere. The contractor will also be required to provide a system of shoring or open excavation to safely facilitate construction procedures.

# **L8.1.2 Description of Feature Foundations**

- 3190
- a. Project Feature 3-15'x15' Gated Box Culverts. The proposed concrete monolithic structures at this location will be supported on a combination of steel HP14x73 piles, 12"x12" PPC piles, and 14"x14" PPC piles. Location, spacing, and pile tip elevations of the piling is shown on drawings S-102, and S-103. A 4" stabilization slab will be placed 3195 between the concrete substructures and the soil foundation to act as a stable working surface during construction. A steel sheet pile seepage cut-off wall will be placed around the perimeter of the concrete substructures. The pile tip elevations of the cut-off walls are shown on drawing S-201.
- 3200 b. Project Feature 10-15'x15' Gated Box Culverts. The proposed concrete monolithic structures at this location will be supported on a combination of steel HP14x73 piles, 12"x12" PPC piles, and 14"x14" PPC piles. Location, spacing, and pile tip elevations of the piling is shown on drawings S-111, S-112, and S-113. A 4" stabilization slab will be placed between the concrete substructures and the soil foundation to act as a stable 3205 working surface during construction. A steel sheet pile seepage cut-off wall will be placed around the perimeter of the concrete substructures. The pile tip elevations of the cut-off walls are shown on drawing S-210.



## 3250

# **L8.2 STRUCTURAL DESIGN FOR DIVERSION FACILITY**

## **L8.2.1 General**

\_

3255 The general physical configuration of structures for this proposed diversion project were based on a variety of considerations, among them hydraulic requirements, similar structures performing the same function, and utilizing existing designs from other projects. All concrete structures will be reinforced and cast-in-place. Concrete and structural steel member sizes were assumed based on similar structures of equivalent size with similar loadings, therefore, no stress analyses were 3260 performed in this design phase.

## **L8.2.2 Description of Structural Features**

a. Project Feature 3-15'x15' Gated Box Culverts. – The proposed structures at this 3265 location will be a series of reinforced cast-in-place concrete box culverts constructed monolithically in conjunction with inflow, roller gate, bulkhead, and T-wall monoliths. These structures will be located under an existing earth levee. There will be three box culvert barrels, each 15 feet high and 15 feet wide (inside dimensions). The flow line elevation inside the barrels will be El.-15.0. The box culverts base slab will be 4.0 feet 3270 thick, the top slab will be 3.0 feet thick, the interior vertical walls will be 2.5 feet thick, and the exterior vertical walls will be 3.0 feet thick. The length of the box culverts will be 160.0 feet. The concrete inflow monoliths on the upstream end of the structure will be comprised of a 4.0 foot thick base slab and two 3.0 foot thick vertical guidewalls providing a length of 150.0 feet. The upstream end of the inflow monoliths will flare 3275 from 56.0 to 96.0 feet in width. The roller gate monolith will be 59.0 feet long and 56.0 feet wide. The concrete bulkhead monolith on the downstream end of the structure will also be comprised of a 4.0 foot thick base slab and two 3.0 foot thick vertical guidewalls providing a length of 95.0 feet and a width of 56.0 feet. The concrete Twalls which retain the earth embankment, will be located at the downstream end of the 3280 bulkhead monolith, on both sides of the channel. Two T-walls will be located on each side of the channel, and oriented 55 degrees from the centerline of the channel. Each Twall will be 36.0 feet long, with a top of stem elevation of El.+6.0. All the T-wall bases will be 3.0 feet thick, and the vertical stem thicknesses will vary. The foundation elevation of the T-walls nearest the bulkhead monolith will be El.-23.0, and the 3285 remaining T-walls will be founded at El.-15.0. The inflow channel bottom will be El.- 16.0, with a width of 96.0 feet and side slopes of 1 vert. on 3 horiz. The outflow channel bottom will transition from El.-16.0 at the bulkhead monolith to El.-20.0, 100.0 feet from the concrete structure with a width of 50.0 feet and side slopes of 1 vert. on 3 horz. Vertical slots and structural steel roller guides will be provided in the concrete 3290 walls at each end of the barrels for the placement of a bulkhead, when required. A 15 foot high and 15 foot wide fabricated structural steel roller gate will be located at the upstream end of each barrel. A flush bottom closure for the gates will be accomplished by providing a steel sill beam assembly at El. -15.0. Vertical slots will be provided in the concrete sidewalls for the installation of structural steel roller guides. A concrete 3295 platform will be located at El.+17.5 to support the roller gate operators. A machinery building will be located adjacent to the support platform, also at El.+17.5. A 2.0 foot thick vertical concrete seepage cut-off wall extending from the top of the box culverts toEl.+13.0 will be located on the roller gate monolith near the centerline of the earth levee. A 17.0 foot wide and 34.0 foot long timber pile supported concrete bulkhead 3300 storage slab will be located on the landside of the levee.

- b. Project Feature 10-15'x15' Gated Box Culverts. The proposed structures at this location will be a series of reinforced cast-in-place concrete box culverts constructed monolithically in conjunction with inflow, roller gate, bulkhead, and T-wall monoliths. 3305 These structures will be located under an existing earth levee. There will be ten box culvert barrels, each 15 feet high and 15 feet wide (inside dimensions). The flow line elevation inside the barrels will be El.-15.0. The box culverts base slab will be 4.0 feet thick, the top slab will be 3.0 feet thick, the interior vertical walls will be 2.5 feet thick, and the exterior vertical walls will be 3.0 feet thick. The length of the box culverts will 3310 be 160.0 feet. The concrete inflow monoliths on the upstream end of the structure will be comprised of a 4.0 foot thick base slab and two 3.0 foot thick vertical guidewalls providing a length of 150.0 feet. The upstream end of the inflow monoliths will flare from 178.5 to 218.5 feet in width. The roller gate monolith will be 59.0 feet long and 178.5 feet wide. The concrete bulkhead monolith on the downstream end of the 3315 structure will also be comprised of a 4.0 foot thick base slab and two 3.0 foot thick vertical guidewalls providing a length of 95.0 feet and a width of 178.5 feet. The concrete T-walls which retain the earth embankment, will be located at the downstream end of the bulkhead monolith, on both sides of the channel. Two T-walls will be located on each side of the channel, and oriented 55 degrees from the centerline of the channel. 3320 Each T-wall will be 36.0 feet long, with a top of stem elevation of El.+6.0. All the Twall bases will be 3.0 feet thick, and the vertical stem thicknesses will vary. The foundation elevation of the T-walls nearest the bulkhead monolith will be El.-23.0, and the remaining T-walls will be founded at El.-15.0. The inflow channel bottom will be El.-16.0, with a width of 218.5 feet and side slopes of 1 vert. on 3 horiz. The outflow 3325 channel bottom will transition from El.-16.0 at the bulkhead monolith to El.-20.0, 100.0 feet from the concrete structure with a width of 172.5 feet and side slopes of 1 vert. on 3 horz. Vertical slots and structural steel roller guides will be provided in the concrete walls at each end of the barrels for the placement of a bulkhead, when required. A 15 foot high and 15 foot wide structural steel roller gate will be located at the upstream 3330 end of each barrel. A flush bottom closure for the gates will be accomplished by providing a steel sill beam assembly at El.-15.0. Vertical slots will be provided in the concrete sidewalls for the installation of structural steel roller guides. A concrete platform will be located at  $E1+17.5$  to support the roller gate operators. A machinery building will be located adjacent to the support platform, also at El.+17.5. A 2.0 foot 3335 thick vertical concrete seepage cut-off wall extending from the top of the box culverts toEl.+13.0 will be located on the roller gate monolith near the centerline of the earth levee. A 17.0 foot wide and 34.0 foot long timber pile supported concrete bulkhead storage slab will be located on the landside of the levee.
- 3340
- reinforced cast-in-place concrete fresh water diversion control structure incorporating vertical lift gates, a rail mounted gantry crane and crane bridge, and a highway vehicle bridge. The 3.5 thick substructure base slab will be founded at El.-5.5, extend 4,007.0 3345 feet, and will be parallel to the vehicle, and gantry crane bridges. The upstream end of the base slab will include an elevated spillway with a top elevation of El.+8.0. The

c. Project Feature 4,000' Gated Weir. - The proposed structure at this location will be a

remaining portion of the base slab will serve as a stilling basin with a top of slab elevation of El.-2.0. The stilling basin will include two rows of baffle blocks located near the mid point of the stilling basin. The top elevation of the baffle blocks will be 3350 El.+3.0. Concrete divider walls will be located parallel to flow at 22.0 feet on center to form 182 gate bays, which will contain the vertical lift gates. The divider walls will be 3.0 feet thick and are approx. 45.0 feet long. The divider walls will also provide a support foundation for the vehicle, and gantry crane bridges. The bridges will extend 43.5 feet beyond each end of the substructure for a total length of 4094.0 feet. The 3355 gantry crane bridge will be located toward the upstream end of the structure, above the spillway, with a top elevation of El.+20.0. The gantry crane bridge will be constructed of 4.0 feet deep reinforced cast-in-place T-beams. A steel crane rail will be installed on each T-beam. The highway vehicle bridge will provide two 12.0 foot driving lanes, with a top of deck elevation of El.+19.0 and total bridge width of 28.0 feet. The bridge 3360 deck and supporting beams will be reinforced cast-in-place concrete. The top elevation of the divider walls supporting the bridge beams will be El.+15.5. The vertical orientation of the lift gates will be made possible with the use of the gantry crane. When the lift gates are in their lowest position they will rest on the spillway at El.+8.0, and the top of the gates will be at El.+15.0. When the gates are at their highest position 3365 the bottom of the gate will be at El.+16.0, and the top of the gates will be at El.+23.0. The lift gates will be fabricated from structural steel and utilize steel rollers. Vertical slots will be provided in the concrete divider walls for the structural steel lift gate guides. Also, provisions will be made for installation of dogging devices in the divider walls in order to retain the lift gates in an open position. 3370 d. Project Feature 3,000' Gated Weir. - The proposed structure at this location will be a reinforced cast-in-place concrete fresh water diversion control structure incorporating vertical lift gates, a rail mounted gantry crane and crane bridge, and a highway vehicle bridge. The 3.5 thick substructure base slab will be founded at El.-5.5, extend 2.995.0 3375 feet, and will be parallel to the vehicle, and gantry crane bridges. The upstream end of the base slab will include an elevated spillway with a top elevation of El.+8.0. The remaining portion of the base slab will serve as a stilling basin with a top of slab elevation of El.-2.0. The stilling basin will include two rows of baffle blocks located near the mid point of the stilling basin. The top elevation of the baffle blocks will be 3380 El.+3.0. Concrete divider walls will be located parallel to flow at 22.0 feet on center to form 136 gate bays, which will contain the vertical lift gates. The divider walls will be 3.0 feet thick and are approx. 45.0 feet long. The divider walls will also provide a support foundation for the vehicle, and gantry crane bridges. The bridges will extend 43.5 feet beyond each end of the substructure for a total length of 3,082.0 feet. The 3385 gantry crane bridge will be located toward the upstream end of the structure, above the spillway, with a top elevation of El.+20.0. The gantry crane bridge will be constructed of 4.0 feet deep reinforced cast-in-place T-beams. A steel crane rail will be installed on each T-beam. The highway vehicle bridge will provide two 12.0 foot driving lanes, with a top of deck elevation of  $E1.+19.0$  and total bridge width of 28.0 feet. The bridge 3390 deck and supporting beams will be reinforced cast-in-place concrete. The top elevation of the divider walls supporting the bridge beams will be El.+15.5. The vertical orientation of the lift gates will be made possible with the use of the gantry crane.

When the lift gates are in their lowest position they will rest on the spillway at El.+8.0, and the top of the gates will be at El.+15.0. When the gates are at their highest position 3395 the bottom of the gate will be at  $E1+16.0$ , and the top of the gates will be at  $E1+23.0$ . The lift gates will be fabricated from structural steel and utilize steel rollers. Vertical slots will be provided in the concrete divider walls for the structural steel lift gate guides. Also, provisions will be made for installation of dogging devices in the divider walls in order to retain the lift gates in an open position.

3400

- e. Project Feature 2,000' Gated Weir. The proposed structure at this location will be a reinforced cast-in-place concrete fresh water diversion control structure incorporating vertical lift gates, a rail mounted gantry crane and crane bridge, and a highway vehicle bridge. The 3.5 thick substructure base slab will be founded at El.-5.5, extend 2.005.0 3405 feet, and will be parallel to the vehicle, and gantry crane bridges. The upstream end of the base slab will include an elevated spillway with a top elevation of El.+8.0. The remaining portion of the base slab will serve as a stilling basin with a top of slab elevation of El.-2.0. The stilling basin will include two rows of baffle blocks located near the mid point of the stilling basin. The top elevation of the baffle blocks will be 3410 El.+3.0. Concrete divider walls will be located parallel to flow at 22.0 feet on center to form 91 gate bays, which will contain the vertical lift gates. The divider walls will be 3.0 feet thick and are approx. 45.0 feet long. The divider walls will also provide a support foundation for the vehicle, and gantry crane bridges. The bridges will extend 43.5 feet beyond each end of the substructure for a total length of 2,092.0 feet. The 3415 gantry crane bridge will be located toward the upstream end of the structure, above the spillway, with a top elevation of El.+20.0. The gantry crane bridge will be constructed of 4.0 feet deep reinforced cast-in-place T-beams. A steel crane rail will be installed on each T-beam. The highway vehicle bridge will provide two 12.0 foot driving lanes, with a top of deck elevation of  $E1,+19.0$  and total bridge width of 28.0 feet. The bridge 3420 deck and supporting beams will be reinforced cast-in-place concrete. The top elevation of the divider walls supporting the bridge beams will be  $E1,+15.5$ . The vertical orientation of the lift gates will be made possible with the use of the gantry crane. When the lift gates are in their lowest position they will rest on the spillway at El.+8.0, and the top of the gates will be at El.+15.0. When the gates are at their highest position  $3425$  the bottom of the gate will be at El.+16.0, and the top of the gates will be at El.+23.0. The lift gates will be fabricated from structural steel and utilize steel rollers. Vertical slots will be provided in the concrete divider walls for the structural steel lift gate guides. Also, provisions will be made for installation of dogging devices in the divider walls in order to retain the lift gates in an open position. 3430
- f. Project Feature 19-6' Dia. Pipe Siphons. The proposed fresh water diversion control structure at this location will be comprised of multiple components. The major component of this structure will be 19-6' dia. steel discharge pipes spaced at 10.0 feet on center, and will transport water over an existing levee. The approx. elevation of the 3435 top of the levee is El.+15.0. The pipes will be soil founded at various elevations on the landside of the levee. The pipes on the riverside of the levee at the water intake point will be supported with a pile founded structural steel component. The discharge pipe support structure will be located approx. 90.0 feet riverward from the centerline of the

existing levee. An inlet channel will be excavated between the waterway and the pipe 3440 support structure. The flow line elevation of the discharge pipes at the support structure will be El.-10.0. The inlet end of the discharge pipes will be fabricated as a horizontal line with a bottom elevation of El.-12.5. The pipe support structure will be supported with 16 inch dia. steel pipe piles placed in pairs between the discharge pipes. The riverward pile will be placed vertical, and the landward pile will be battered toward the 3445 levee. The support structure will be constructed of various sized structural steel members fastened to 24 inch dia. steel pipe sleeves. The pipe sleeves will be fastened over the end of the pipe piles. The pipe piles located at each end of the support structure will be battered either upstream or downstream depending on the location. Another component of this structure will be a system comprised of dolphins and floating booms, 3450 designed to restrain or deflect floating debris at the riverward end of the excavated inlet channel. A total of seven dolphins will be required and spaced at approximately 40.0 feet on center. Each dolphin will be attached to a cluster of three 16 inch dia. steel pipe piles. Two of the piles adjacent to the floating boom will be oriented in a vertical position, the third pile will be battered away from the boom. The top elevation of the 3455 vertical piles will be El.+14.0, and the top elevation of the battered piles will be El.+10.0. The upper portion of the dolphins will be a system constructed of structural steel members fastened to 24 inch dia. steel pipe sleeves. The pipe sleeves will be fastened over the end of the pipe piles. A floating boom placed horizontally will extend between every two dolphins. The booms will be constructed of watertight 24 inch steel 3460 pipe filled with foam, and fastened to the dolphins in a manner to allow the booms to rise and fall with the surrounding water elevation changes. A platform will be provided on top of two dolphins to support solar powered lanterns and storage batteries. The elevation of the top of the platform will be El.+12.5. One lantern will be located at each end of the dolphin group.

3465

 g. Project Feature 30-6' Dia. Pipe Siphons. - The proposed fresh water diversion control structure at this location will be comprised of multiple components. The major component of this structure will be 19-6' dia. steel discharge pipes spaced at 10.0 feet on center, and will transport water over an existing levee. The approx. elevation of the 3470 top of the levee is El.+15.0. The pipes will be soil founded at various elevations on the landside of the levee. The pipes on the riverside of the levee at the water intake point will be supported with a pile founded structural steel component. The discharge pipe support structure will be located approx. 90.0 feet riverward from the centerline of the existing levee. An inlet channel will be excavated between the waterway and the pipe 3475 support structure. The flow line elevation of the discharge pipes at the support structure will be El.-10.0. The inlet end of the discharge pipes will be fabricated as a horizontal line with a bottom elevation of El.-12.5. The pipe support structure will be supported with 16 inch dia. steel pipe piles placed in pairs between the discharge pipes. The riverward pile will be placed vertical, and the landward pile will be battered toward the 3480 levee. The support structure will be constructed of various sized structural steel members fastened to 24 inch dia. steel pipe sleeves. The pipe sleeves will be fastened over the end of the pipe piles. The pipe piles located at each end of the support structure will be battered either upstream or downstream depending on the location. Another component of this structure will be a system comprised of dolphins and floating booms,



3500

# **L9. Electrical and Mechanical Requirements**

# **L9.1 ELECTRICAL SOURCES AND SUPPLY REQUIREMENTS**

# 3505 **L9.1.1 General**

Development of this proposed diversion project will require various proposed structural features to accomplish the intended purpose. All the structural features will require either a single or multiple type of electrical power source depending on the operational requirements at each site. 3510 The ability to furnish electrical power to each structural feature from an off site location has not

been determined at this time, and will be investigated in another design stage. The possible electrical requirements at each feature site have been presented below.

# **L9.1.2 Electrical Requirements Per Site**

- 3515
- a. Project Feature 3-15'x15' Gated Box Culverts. An electrical power supply will be required to operate the roller gate operators. Whether the operators will be electrically or hydraulically operated has not been determined at this time. In either case an electrical power source will be required for the operator motors, or for the electrical 3520 motors driving the hydraulic pumps for the operators. In addition, a power source will be required for the machinery building lighting, and switchboard equipment in the building.
- b. Project Feature 10-15'x15' Gated Box Culverts. An electrical power supply will be 3525 required to operate the roller gate operators. Whether the operators will be electrically or hydraulically operated has not been determined at this time. In either case an electrical power source will be required for the operator motors, or for the electrical motors driving the hydraulic pumps for the operators. In addition, a power source will be required for the machinery building lighting, and switchboard equipment in the 3530 building.



# **L9.2 SOLAR POWER SUPPLY SYSTEMS**

# 3565 **L9.2.1 General**

The only project features that would incorporate a solar power system will be the two siphon structures mentioned above. The siphon features will include protective dolphins placed in the waterway. Warning lanterns will be mounted on top of the dolphins and powered with electrical 3570 storage batteries which will be charged with solar panels. Exterior lighting and a maintenance building are not proposed to be included in this project at this time, but in the event they are included, solar power may be provided in lieu of extending a conventional power supply to the sites.

# 3575 **L9.3 ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL DESIGN FOR DIVERSION FACILITY**

## **L9.3.1 General**

The size and type of electrical and mechanical components for the project features were selected based on a variety of considerations, among them hydraulic requirements, similar features 3580 performing the same function, and utilizing existing designs from other projects.

## **L9.3.2 Electrical/Mechanical Requirements Per Site**

- a. Project Feature 3-15'x15' Gated Box Culverts. Regulation of flow thru the culverts  $3585$  will be controlled with the use of three  $15'x15'$  fabricated structural steel roller gates. The gates will be raised/lowered with the use of a gate hoist supplied by a known and acceptable gate manufacturer. Selection of either electric motor operated or hydraulically operated gate hoists will be determined in a later project design stage. Two fabricated structural steel bulkheads approximately 15 feet square will be provided 3590 and stored on site when not in use. The bulkheads will be fitted with rollers, and vertical steel roller guides will be cast in slots in the concrete walls.
- b. Project Feature  $10-15x15$  Gated Box Culverts. Regulation of flow thru the culverts will be controlled with the use of ten 15'x15' fabricated structural steel roller gates. The 3595 gates will be raised/lowered with the use of a gate hoist supplied by a known and acceptable gate manufacturer. Selection of either electric motor operated or hydraulically operated gate hoists will be determined in a later project design stage. Two fabricated structural steel bulkheads approximately 15 feet square will be provided and stored on site when not in use. The bulkheads will be fitted with rollers, and 3600 vertical steel roller guides will be cast in slots in the concrete walls.
- c. Project Feature 4,000' Gated Weir. Regulation of flow thru the weir structure will be controlled by the operational use of one hundred eighty two fabricated structural steel vertical lift gates. The gates will be approx. 19.0 feet wide and 7.0 feet high. The gates 3605 will be fitted with steel rollers, and vertical steel roller guides will be cast in slots in the concrete divider walls. Dogging devices will be attached to the gates to lock them in a raised position. The gates will be raised with the use of a fabricated structural steel lifting beam, connected with steel cables to a movable rail mounted gantry crane. The crane size and lifting capacity to be determined during a later design phase. The gantry 3610 crane assembly will include a jib crane, and clamshell bucket suspended from a boom with a 180 degree swing capability.
- d. Project Feature 3,000' Gated Weir. Regulation of flow thru the weir structure will be controlled by the operational use of one hundred thirty eight fabricated structural steel 3615 vertical lift gates. The gates will be approx. 19.0 feet wide and 7.0 feet high. The gates will be fitted with steel rollers, and vertical steel roller guides will be cast in slots in the concrete divider walls. Dogging devices will be attached to the gates to lock them in a raised position. The gates will be raised with the use of a fabricated structural steel lifting beam, connected with steel cables to a movable rail mounted gantry crane. The 3620 crane size and lifting capacity to be determined during a later design phase. The gantry crane assembly will include a jib crane, and clamshell bucket suspended from a boom with a 180 degree swing capability.

e. Project Feature 2,000' Gated Weir. – Regulation of flow thru the weir structure will be 3625 controlled by the operational use of ninety one fabricated structural steel vertical lift gates. The gates will be approx. 19.0 feet wide and 7.0 feet high. The gates will be fitted with steel rollers, and vertical steel roller guides will be cast in slots in the concrete divider walls. Dogging devices will be attached to the gates to lock them in a raised position. The gates will be raised with the use of a fabricated structural steel 3630 lifting beam, connected with steel cables to a movable rail mounted gantry crane. The crane size and lifting capacity to be determined during a later design phase. The gantry crane assembly will include a jib crane, and clamshell bucket suspended from a boom with a 180 degree swing capability.

# 3635 **L10. Construction Procedures**

The MRT levee protects the project area from Mississippi River floods. A temporary levee will be in place, with the appropriate level of protection, when the levee is breached for construction to protect the evacuation route. Appropriate erosion control measures will be in place for the 3640 duration of the construction.

Highway 39 is the emergency evacuation route for areas south of the diversion site. Continued access to the project area during construction will be necessary to ensure the population will not be isolated. Temporary detours of Highway 39 will be constructed, with appropriate safety 3645 measures in place. Secondary road detours will be made to allow local residents access to their property during the construction of the project.

# **L11. Operations and Maintenance**

# 3650 **L11.1 Operations**

Operations for the diversion are yet to be determined. It is assumed that there will be some type of seasonal pulse in the spring of the year lasting from possibly two weeks to three months depending on conditions. For this pulse, water will be gradually introduced so as to minimize 3655 scour without affecting the sediment load. The current proposed operations are to have a March and April pulse of the maximum amount of water possible (up to 35,000cfs). Figure L11.1 shows the proposed hydrograph of the diversion structure.



Figure L11.1 – Proposed diversion hydrograph

3660

The operation of this structure will be closely tied to the operation of the Caernarvon Diversion as well other diversions along the Mississippi River. Interrelated operations between these different diversions are critical to provide benefits to the different coastal marshes and not create 3665 undesired impacts to the Mississippi River such as induced shoaling.

The diversion will be driven based off of the head differential between the Mississippi River and the coastal marsh where we are diverting water. The outfall of the diversion is in an estuary and assumed to have an average stage equal to sea level (0.00 NAD88) throughout the course of the

3670 year. Therefore, the river stage will typically be the head that the diversion can utilize. Figure 11.2 shows the average stage of the river at the Alliance, LA gage. The Alliance, LA gage is approximately 5 miles upstream from the proposed diversion site and is assumed to have the same stage. Figure 11.3 shows the rating curve for the  $10 - 15$ 'x15' Box Culvert Diversion.



# Figure 11.2 – Average Mississippi River stage at Alliance, LA



3675



Figure 11.3 – Diversion Rating Curve

3680 For more information operations of the diversion, please consult chapter 3.0 Plan Formulation of the White Ditch Feasibility Study.

# **L11.2 Maintenance**

3685 With the proposed diversion there will be needs for channel maintenance dredging, removal of sediment buildup in box culverts and sluice gate maintenance. It is estimated that there will need to be significant channel dredging every 10 years on the proposed channel enhancement features. Sediment removed from box culverts and dredged from channels shall be placed in sediment deficient areas near the dredge site. It is also assumed that there will be annual maintenance and 3690 lubrication needs provided to the sluice gates.

# **L12. Cost Estimates**

# **L12.1 Basis of Cost Estimate**

3695

An initial array of alternatives was developed by the PDT. The initial array of alternatives included at Location 2 are:

- Alternative 2A: 30 pipe siphon with a 5,000 cfs outfall capacity
- 3700 Alternative 2B: 3 box culverts with a 5,000 cfs outfall capacity
- Alternative 2C: 30 pipe siphon with a 10,000 cfs outfall capacity
- Alternative 2D: 3 box culverts with a 10,000 cfs outfall capacity
- Alternative 2E: 10 box culverts with a 15,000 cfs outfall capacity
- Alternative 2F: 10 box culverts with a 35,000 cfs outfall capacity

## 3705

The initial array of alternatives include at Location 3 are:

- Alternative 3A: 30 pipe siphon with a 5,000 cfs outfall capacity
- Alternative 3B: 3 box culverts with a 5,000 cfs outfall capacity
- 3710 Alternative 3C: 30 pipe siphon with a 10,000 cfs outfall capacity
	- Alternative 3D: 3 box culverts with a 10,000 cfs outfall capacity
	- Alternative 3E: 10 box culverts with a 15,000 cfs outfall capacity
	- Alternative 3F: 10 box culverts with a 35,000 cfs outfall capacity
- 3715 Each alternative consists of a structure paired with an appropriately sized outfall channel to convey a desired flow of fresh water and sediment into the weakened marsh area.

The preliminary cost estimates for the initial array of alternatives are unit price estimates based on preliminary design and associated quantity take-offs with price data from recent bid results, 3720 historical costs, and the expertise of the district's cost estimators and engineers. Appropriate contingencies are applied. The price level for these cost estimates is November 2009. The cost estimates for the initial array of alternatives can be found in Annex 3.

- The final array of alternatives included four alternatives at Location 3. The alternatives were 3725 selected from the initial array of alternatives and had to meet the project goals outlined in the main report. The final alternatives chosen are:
	- Alternative 3B: 3 box culverts with a 5,000 cfs outfall capacity
	- Alternative 3D: 3 box culverts with a 10,000 cfs outfall capacity
- 3730 Alternative 3E: 10 box culverts with a 15,000 cfs outfall capacity
	- Alternative 3F: 10 box culverts with a 35,000 cfs outfall capacity

The preliminary cost estimates for the final array of alternatives are also based on further refined preliminary design and associated quantity take-offs with price data from recent bid results, 3735 historical costs, and the expertise of the district's cost estimators and engineers. Appropriate contingencies are applied. The price level for these cost estimates is December 2009. The cost estimates for the final array of alternatives can be found in Annex 3. In addition to the four final alternatives, the cost estimates for the siphons at Location 3 were included. These estimates were included for quantity clarification purposes only.

3740

# **L12.2 DETAILED ESTIMATE**

The tentatively selected plan for the White Ditch Marsh Restoration project is Alternative 3F, 10 each, sized 15 feet x 15 feet box culverts, with an outfall capacity of 35,000 cfs. The selected 3745 plan involves excavating a section of levee and road to construct the 10 box culvert structure, replacing the levee and road on top of the structure, and excavating an outfall channel system to

convey 35,000 cfs of fresh water and sediment to the damaged marsh. The structure also has ten sluice gates with hydraulic operators that will be used to regulate the flow of fresh water and sediment through the structure.

3750

The preferred alternative cost estimate is a detailed estimate based on the expertise of the district's cost estimators and engineers. The cost estimate for the recommended plan was prepared utilizing the MCACES software. The MCACES estimate is included in Annex 3. The estimated costs were based upon an analysis of each line item evaluating quantity, production 3755 rate, and time, together with the appropriate equipment, labor, and material costs. Appropriate contingencies are applied. The price level for this cost estimate is January 2010.

The detailed estimate meets the requirements and recommendations of the following documents and sources:

- 3760 ER 1110-2-1150, Engineering and Design for Civil Works Projects.
	- ER 1110-2-1302, Civil Works Cost Engineering.
	- ETL 1110-2-573, Construction Cost Estimating Guide for Civil Works.

The detailed estimate assumes that the marsh and main outfall excavation will be completed by two small dredges and the side berms will be formed by several amphibious excavators. The 3765 detailed estimate also assumes that all construction elements associated with the box culvert will be completed on land.

Planning, Engineering and Design costs and Construction Management costs are included in the detailed estimates. These costs are calculated as a percentage rate of the construction cost. The 3770 rates are 17.5% for planning, engineering and design, which includes engineering and design during construction, and 10% for construction management. The planning, engineering, and design rate was calculated based on percentages for Engineering, Project Management, Estimating, Construction, and Planning & Environmental Compliance. The construction management rate is based on average expenditures for construction management.

3775

A plan construction schedule was developed based on the production rates used in the detailed estimate and the expertise of the district's cost estimators and engineers. The plan construction schedule was used in the Cost and Schedule Risk Analysis discussed below. The anticipated construction duration based on the plan schedule is four years and one month. The plan 3780 construction schedule is included in Annex 3.

The Total Project Cost table was developed based on the detailed estimate, the completed cost and schedule risk analysis, and the civil works work breakdown structure (CWWBS) elements included in the detailed estimate. Those elements are:

- 3785 01 LANDS AND DAMAGES
	- 02 RELOCATIONS
	- 15 FLOODWAY CONTROLS AND DIVERSION STRUCTURES
	- 30 PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN
	- 31 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

## 3790

The Total Project Cost table shows the effective price level for the detailed estimate of January 2010, the Budget Year effective price level of October 2010, and the Fully Funded Project Cost with a construction midpoint date of April 2014. Escalation for the price level years is based on the Army Corps of Engineers Engineering Manual (EM) 1110-2-1304 Civil Works Construction 3795 Cost Index System (CWCCIS) revised 30 September 2009. The Total Project Cost table is

included in Annex 3.

## **L12.3 Contingencies**

3800 Contingencies are based on a Cost Rick Analysis using Crystal Ball software. Results of this analysis are discussed in the Risk Analysis Section below.

# **L12.4 Risk Analysis**

3805 A cost risk analysis was performed for this project in accordance with ER 1110-2-1302 paragraph 7.3.2 and ER 1110-2-1302, appendix B, paragraph 4. The results of the cost risk analysis are shown in the Project Cost and Schedule Risk Analysis Report included in Annex 3.

# ANNEX 1

3810

Quantifying Benefits of Freshwater Flow Diversions to Coastal Marshes

# **Quantifying Benefits of Freshwater Flow Diversion to Coastal Marshes: Theory[a](#page-311-0) and Applications[b](#page-311-1)**

S. Kyle McKay<sup>1</sup>, J. Craig Fischenich<sup>2</sup>, S. Jarrell Smith<sup>3</sup>, and Ronald Paille<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) Environmental Laboratory 187 Oglethorpe Ave. Apt. B Athens, Georgia, 30606 Email: [Kyle.McKay@usace.army.mil](mailto:Kyle.McKay@usace.army.mil)

 $2^2$ U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) Environmental Laboratory 3909 Halls Ferry Rd. Vicksburg, Mississippi, 39180 Email: [Craig.J.Fischenich@usace.army.mil](mailto:Craig.J.Fischenich@usace.army.mil)

 $3$ U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) Coastal and Hydraulics Laboratory 3909 Halls Ferry Rd. Vicksburg, Mississippi, 39180 Email: [Jarrell.Smith@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jarrell.Smith@usace.army.mil)

4 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 646 Cajundome Boulevard, Suite 400 Lafayette, Louisiana 70506 Email: [Ronald\\_Paille@fws.gov](mailto:Ronald_Paille@fws.gov)

Keywords: wetland, Louisiana, accretion, uncertainty, organic, inorganic, coastal restoration, operation,

# **Abstract**

 $\overline{a}$ 

The combination of relative sea level rise and river/marsh disconnection has created a deficit of available soil and accompanying land loss in a large portion of coastal Louisiana. The U.S. Congress recently charged the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, State of Louisiana, and other federal and local agencies with restoring the coastal wetlands of Louisiana and Mississippi. Many alternative combinations of restoration measures have been proposed, and assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of these efforts must be made to determine the optimal design. One technique being applied for coastal restoration is the reconnection of rivers to coastal marshes through flow diversions.

<span id="page-311-0"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Based on material from McKay, S.K., J.C. Fischenich, and S.J. Smith. (2008). "Quantifying Benefits of Flow Diversion to Coastal Marshes. I: Theory." In draft for submission to Ecological Engineering.

<span id="page-311-1"></span><sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Based on material from McKay, S.K., J.C. Fischenich, and R. Paille. (2008). "Quantifying Benefits of Flow Diversion to Coastal Marshes. II: Application to Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration." In draft for submission to Ecological Engineering.

Freshwater flow diversions offer significant nutrient and sediment inputs to marshes that induce both organic and inorganic accumulation of soil. Boustany (2007) presented a screening level model for assessing both the nutrient and sediment benefits of flow diversion over long time scales. This paper has presented the adaptation of Boustany's (2007) model to include daily variation in sediment processes in order to optimize diversion structure design and operation. The model was verified using an existing diversion to prove the ability of the model to track land evolution associated with flow diversion. This paper also demonstrates the application of the model to diversion operational and structural optimization.

# **Introduction**

In the fall of 2005, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita awakened the United States public to the natural protection that coastal wetlands provide in reducing of the effects of hurricanes on coastal communities. In response to these catastrophic events, the U.S. Congress directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to "conduct a comprehensive hurricane protection analysis and design…to develop and present a full range of flood control, coastal restoration, and hurricane protection measures" (USACE, 2006). This paper focuses on interagency efforts to assess and weigh benefits of coastal restoration via freshwater flow diversion. The paper will focus on the development and adaptation of a screening level model to quantify the benefits of flow diversion to coastal marshes and will describe the assessment of various diversion operational and structural scenarios.

# **Coastal Marsh Accretion and Flow Diversion**

The tidal marshes of coastal Louisiana are receding at alarming rates as high as 115 km<sup>2</sup>/yr (Barras et al., 1994). Submergence of these valuable ecological assets [\(Figure 1\)](#page-334-0) was once counteracted by vertical accretion due to the addition of freshwater, nutrient, and mineral inputs from riverine environments; however, eustatic sea level rise (ESLR) and basin subsidence now exceed the current rate of vertical accretion, and coastal marshes have been disconnected from their freshwater and sediment sources, distributary channels of the Mississippi and Atchafalya Rivers. ESLR has been attributed to global increase in ocean volume and has been estimated as 1.0-2.4 mm/yr (Church et al., 2001). Subsidence of the Mississippi delta has been attributed to multiple factors, namely: regional isostasy, faulting, sediment consolidation, and soil dewatering (Dokka et al., 2006). Previous researchers identified other potential sources of subsidence as groundwater and petroleum extraction (Morton et al., 2002); however, Dokka et al. (2006) renounce these hypotheses as unlikely due to the relative lack of groundwater extraction from the highly saltwater intruded groundwater table of most of southern Louisiana and the lack of coincidence between petroleum extraction and subsidence. The synergy of ESLR and basin subsidence has created an apparent local change in sea level known as Relative Sea Level Rise (RSLR) that has been measured in the Mississippi Delta at rates as high as 10 mm/yr (Snedden et al., 2007).

In addition to RSLR, the disconnection of coastal marshes from their sediment and nutrient source is equally disconcerting. Over geologic time scales, large-scale delta lobe switching has lead to alternating episodes of delta building and redistribution of sediment

and nutrients throughout the coastal plain (Coleman, 1988; Coleman et al., 1998); however, in the last two centuries, the Mississippi River has been controlled by levees and other structures in order to maintain a consistent navigation channel for commerce and protect infrastructure against floods (Coleman et al., 1998; Parker et al., 2006). Presently, much of the sediment and nutrient load of the Mississippi River is discharged directly into the northern Gulf of Mexico through the birdsfoot delta, providing little benefit to protective delta building and contributing to an increasing zone of hypoxia near the river mouth (Mitsch et al., 2001). In addition to problems associated with fate of river sediment and nutrients, this disconnection starves coastal wetlands of historic nutrient and sediment inputs necessary for marsh sustainment. Although the relative importance of this multitude of factors has yet to be rigorously quantified throughout the Louisiana coastal plain, the combination of RSLR and river/marsh disconnection has led to high land loss rates and conversion of many freshwater marshes to shallow saltwater bays.

In recent years, freshwater flow diversions from river sources to coastal marshes have been offered as a tool for combating RSLR and disconnection of rivers and wetlands. In these diversions, river water is released into marshes to simulate flooding of a river onto its floodplain and increase hydrologic connectivity. Potential benefits have been observed from pulsing diversion discharges to simulate natural flood regimes (Day et al., 2003; Reyes et al., 2003; Snedden et al., 2007). Many studies have also shown that flow diversion is a plausible remedy to reconnect rivers to tidal marshes and deltas and induce organic and inorganic deposition (Parker et al., 2006; Snedden et al., 2007). An ancillary benefit of these flow diversions is potentially reduction of the nutrient loading to the Gulf of Mexico with associated reduction in the hypoxic zone (Lane et al., 1999; Mitsch et al., 2001).

Vertical accretion of marshes has been identified as highly dependent upon both inorganic and organic accumulation [\(Figure 2;](#page-335-0) Delaune et al., 1981; Nyman et al., 1993; Day et al., 1995; Reed, 1995; Foote and Reynolds, 1997; Nyman et al., 2006; Morris, 2007). Often accretion is only accounted for through sedimentation (e.g. Parker et al., 2006); however locations have been identified that depend more upon organic inputs than sediment inputs (Nyman et al., 2006). The characteristics of the receiving marsh and associated hydrologic connectivity are likely to influence whether inorganic or organic inputs control (Boustany, 2007). For instance, if a region is initially unvegetated, sediment inputs will be necessary to establish a soil platform for dense vegetative growth; however, once vegetation is well established, the vegetative inputs are likely to dominate while at the same time inducing higher retention of sediment in the process. This complex feedback system necessitates the inclusion of both inorganic (sediment) and organic (vegetative) inputs to any calculation of vertical accretion (Reed, 1995).

Vegetative accumulation in coastal marshes involves a delicate balance of above and belowground plant productivity (Gosselink, 1984; Edwards and Mills, 2005), salinity (Visser et al., 2004), nutrient availability (Delaune et al., 2005), flood frequency (Nyman et al., 2006), vegetation type (Gosselink, 1984), and seasonality (Visser et al., 2004), among other factors. Freshwater reintroduction has been shown to increase nutrient

inputs to coastal marshes (Lane et al., 1999) and stimulate growth in these ecosystems (Cardoch et al., 2002), further causing vegetative inputs to contribute to accretion. In coastal Louisiana most marshes are nutrient limited (Nyman et al., 1990; Delaune et al., 2005), so the introduction of limiting nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorous from flow diversion is a topic of great importance when considering flow diversion alternatives and benefits (Lane et al., 1999; Hyfield, 2004; Hyfield, 2008); however, excessive nutrient loading to coastal wetlands could potentially induce harmful water quality effects such as eutrophication (Delaune et al., 2005) or stimulation of invasive plant species (Carter and Bernard, 2007), so diversion of flow to coastal wetlands must be carefully balanced and planned.

The accretion of sediment on coastal marshes and deltas has also been studied extensively (Stumpf, 1983; Wang, 1997; Rybczyk and Cahoon, 2002; Reyes et al., 2003; Parker et al., 2006; Snedden et al., 2007). Relevant sedimentation processes have been identified as sediment loading from floods/diversions (Reed, 1995; Parker et al., 2006), sediment settling properties (Stumpf, 1983; Soulsby, 1997; Winterwerp and van Kesteren, 2004), tidal erosion (Stumpf, 1983; Wang et al., 1997), wind and storm induced erosion and deposition (Wang, 1997), sediment export through canals and bayous (Wang, 1997; Baustian and Turner, 2006), and vegetation induced settling (Gleason et al., 1979; Stumpf, 1983; Reed, 1995; Leonard and Luther, 1995).

Although flow diversions have proved useful for combating coastal land loss, the optimization of flow diversion locations and operation has been difficult due to the complexity in data needs of a coupled ecological and hydrodynamic model (Reyes et al., 2003; Delaune et al., 2003; Snedden et al., 2007). These complexities encourage the development of a simple, screening-level model that includes the effects of vegetation and sediment dynamics and allows for straightforward examination and optimization of flow diversion feasibility and operational benefits.

# **Boustany (2007) Landscape Evolution Model**

Boustany (2007) developed a composite nutrient and sediment model to assess the feasibility of flow diversions and screen diversion alternatives under the Coastal Wetland Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA; Boustany, Personal Communication). This model, herein referred to as the Boustany Model (BM), presents all benefits of flow diversion in terms of marsh area by assuming all nutrient and sediment benefits additive to the existing area and land change rate:

$$
A_{i+1} = A_i + \delta_{\text{nut}} A_i + A_{\text{sed}}
$$

## **Equation 1**

Where  $A_i$  is the marsh area at time *i*,  $\delta_{nut}$  is the fractional change in land area due to RSLR and river-marsh disconnection (value may be positive or negative) that has been adjusted to account for the benefits associated with nutrient addition, and *Ased* is the area benefit of sediment addition.

The BM was developed to compare long term relative benefits of many flow diversion locations and was implemented with an annual time step to provide quick estimates of the potential benefits of diversions. The BM is sufficient for quick estimation of flow

diversion benefits and initial screening of alternatives, but the LACPR program required greater temporal resolution in order to assess not only the relative benefits of diversion locations, but also the effects of diversion structure type, diversion operational regimes, and hydrologic variability. Ideally a detailed two- or three-dimensional model coupling nutrient and sediment processes would be used to account for the complex mechanisms governing coastal marsh accretion (Reyes et al., 2000; Dortch et al., 2007); however, the vast number of alternatives and short time scale of the LACPR report to Congress precluded development of such models for every alternative and marsh. As such, the BM was adapted to include processes deemed most critical to LACPR alternatives analysis. The following sections provide further details of the nutrient and sediment models implemented in the landscape evolution calculations, but the two major adaptations of the BM were:

- High temporal variability in sediment processes encouraged the refinement of the temporal resolution of the sediment model to include daily impacts of the diversion on the marsh.
- In order to maintain model simplicity, the BM required estimation of a number of parameters to account for nutrient and sediment processes (e.g. sediment retention and average annual suspended sediment concentration). The adaptation of the model has also included the calculation of many of these inputs in order to account for temporal variance, reduce data requirements, and minimize potential input errors.

# **Nutrient Benefits**

Nutrient addition to coastal marshes has proven to be a source of vegetation stimulation and strengthening and biomass creation (Deegan et al., 2007). Boustany (2007) proposes a model that accounts for the ability of nutrients to stimulate vegetation to better resist erosional processes. This model determines the percent of the vegetated area that is strengthened from nutrient addition. This parameter is found by examining the annual nutrient requirements of the marsh relative to the nutrients loaded to the marsh.

The nutrients required by the marsh for vegetative growth are assumed to be the mass of the nutrients held in plant biomass. This quantity may be assessed by examining the rate of biomass production (annual primary productivity,  $P_r$ ) and the percent of biomass containing these nutrients (γ). Since most Louisiana coastal marshes are nitrogen or phosphorous limited, Boustany proposes that the total concentration of nitrogen and phosphorous (*TNP*) be used to account for nutrient benefits.

$$
LR_{req} = P_r \gamma_{TNP}
$$

## **Equation 2**

Where  $LR_{req}$  is the marsh required nutrient loading rate  $[ML^{-2}T^{-1}]$ ,  $P_r$  is primary productivity  $[ML^{-2}T^{-1}]$ , and  $\gamma_{TNP}$  is the percent of plant biomass containing nitrogen and phosphorous [1].

The nutrient loading rate of the diversion to plant biomass, *LRdiv*, may be calculated from the volumetric discharge of water to the marsh from the diversion,  $Q_{div}$  [ $L^{3}T^{-1}$ ], the

concentration of nutrients in the source water,  $C_{source}$  [ML<sup>-3</sup>], the retention rate of nutrients in plant biomass,  $R_{nut}[1]$ , and the vegetated marsh area,  $A_{veg}[L^2]$ .

$$
LR_{div} = \frac{Q_{div} C_{source}}{A_{veg}} R_{nut}
$$

#### **Equation 3**

In addition to nutrient loading from the diversion, there is ambient nutrient loading to the marsh from other ongoing processes (e.g. atmospheric deposition, stormwater runoff, current plant decomposition, denitrification, etc.). These processes will be accounted for by a loading rate for background sources, *LRbackground*. The net loading of nutrients to the marsh, *LR<sub>net</sub>*, is therefore the sum of the background and diversion loading rates.

$$
LR_{net} = LR_{div} + LR_{background}
$$

### **Equation 4**

From knowledge of the loading rates applied, *LR<sub>net*</sub>, and required, *LR<sub>req</sub>*, one may obtain the fraction of wetlands sustained by nutrient addition, *Es*.

$$
E_s = \frac{LR_{net}}{LR_{req}}
$$

#### **Equation 5**

In this model, nutrients are assumed to be unable to freely construct land; however, they can reduce the loss rate by strengthening vegetated areas against erosion. This assumption produces conservative estimates of the organically-induced benefits of the diversion. For instance, in an environment with a low land loss rate, according to the model, the diversion could potentially reduce the land loss to zero; however, no land gain would be associated with organic inputs. The percentage of wetland sustained by nutrient addition serves as a reduction ratio to the land loss rate in the form of [Equation 6.](#page-316-0)

$$
\delta_{nat} = \begin{cases} \delta(1 - E_s) & ForE_s < 1 \\ 0 & ForE_s \ge 1 \end{cases}
$$

### <span id="page-316-0"></span>**Equation 6**

Where  $\delta$  is the land change rate prior to the diversion and  $\delta_{nut}$  is the nutrient adjusted land change rate.

## **Sediment Benefits**

The accumulation of diverted sediments is determined by a sediment budgeting model utilizing the input concentration of sediment from the source water and calculated hydrodynamics of the system to determine the quantity of diverted sediment retained in the marsh. As previously specified, the BM implemented sedimentation calculations on an annual timescale, and while this assumption is reasonable for preliminary screening of alternatives, further refinement is necessary for more detailed analyses of flow diversion benefits. The sediment model implemented herein relies on calculation of sediment inputs and sediment settling theory on a daily timescale over a single representative year and reapplies that year throughout the proposed project life cycle.

## **Sediment Input**

In order to minimize costs and maximize benefits of flow diversion in coastal Louisiana, diversion structures often withdraw water from one of the region's major rivers (e.g.

Mississippi, Atchafalya, Calcasieu). These rivers are located throughout the coastal plain, carry large water and sediment loads, and serve as a virtually infinite source of diversion resources.

River discharge and suspended sediment concentration have often been shown to be positively correlated (Mossa, 1996; Snedden et al., 2007). The relationship between discharge and sediment load may be determined by analytical and partially analytical models (e.g. Meyer-Peter Muller, Einstein, Yang; Richardson et al., 2001) or by empirical models for a given set of observed discharge and sediment concentration values (Mossa, 1996; Snedden et al., 2007). In coastal Louisiana, there exists enough recorded sediment discharge data to generate empirical models of sediment concentration for some of the major rivers of the region. For this analysis, a power function was found to provide enough resolution in sediment concentration variation ([Equation 7\)](#page-317-0). [Table 1](#page-345-0) presents a number of sediment ratings of this form for coastal Louisiana.

$$
Q_{s,river} = a_1 Q_{river}^{a}
$$

2

## **Equation 7**

<span id="page-317-0"></span>Where  $Q_{s,river}$  is sediment load (ton/da),  $Q_{river}$  is river discharge (cfs),  $a<sub>I</sub>$  is a dimensional coefficient, and  $a_2$  is a dimensionless coefficient. From this sediment rating, flowaveraged suspended sediment concentration of the river, *Criver*, may be

calculated  $C_{\text{river}} = \frac{\sum_{s,\text{river}}}{\sum_{s,\text{error}}}$ ⎠  $\left\langle C_{\text{river}} = \frac{Q_{s,\text{river}}}{Q} \right\rangle$ ⎝  $\Big( C_{\scriptscriptstyle river} = % \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} \\ 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} \end{cases} \Big)$ *river*  $C_{\text{river}} = \frac{Q_{s,\text{river}}}{Q_{\text{river}}}$  and transformed to the desired units.

Regardless of the model defining this relationship, the sediment concentration has been shown to be highly dependent upon discharge; therefore, in order to capture the temporal variance in sediment discharge through a diversion, the sediment concentration must vary with river discharge at an appropriate time scale (Snedden et al., 2007). For the purposes of this analysis, daily variation in discharge provides sufficient temporal resolution for accurate calculation of sediment loading to marshes by diversions.

One of the purposes for adapting the BM is the desire to examine relative diversion structure operation. In order to do this, daily estimates of diversion discharge are also required. These daily diversion discharges,  $Q_{div}$ , are combined with the daily predictions of river suspended sediment concentration, *Criver*, to determine the mass loading rate of sediment to the marsh,  $Q_{s,div}$  [\(Equation 8\)](#page-317-1). This increase in temporal resolution allows for examination of diversion discharge operation such that sediment benefits may be maximized by coinciding diversion discharges with periods of high river suspended sediment concentration.

$$
Q_{s,div} = Q_{div} C_{river}
$$

### <span id="page-317-1"></span>**Equation 8**

## **Sediment Retention**

After sediment laden water has been diverted to a coastal wetland, a portion of the sediment load is expected to settle from suspension and deposit. Sediment that remains in suspension is then subject to being transported outside the system boundaries. Sediment retention defines the fraction of diverted sediments retained within the coastal wetland.

Retention is dependent upon system properties such as: wetland geometry, diversion discharge, tidal velocities (Stumpf, 1983), wind and storm events (Wang, 1997), settling velocity of diverted sediments (Soulsby, 1997; Winterwerp and van Kesteren, 2004), vegetation coverage (Stumpf, 1983), and canal-induced sediment import/export (Wang, 1997). The approach taken by Boustany (2007) is to apply retention factors estimated for other sites (e.g. Wax Lake Outlet) or allow the analyst to choose a retention factor based on knowledge of the receiving area and best professional judgment. Building upon the suggestion of Stumpf (1983), an alternative to this approach is to use a simple calculation which includes effects of wetland geometry, sediment properties, and flow hydrodynamics at the site. The effects of vegetation and channels are ignored in this analysis in order to maintain model simplicity; however, vegetation would likely increase roughness, reduce turbulence, and induce greater sediment deposition leading to conservatively low estimates of sediment retention, while the influence of channels may serve as pathways to sediment export and thus produce non-conservatively high estimates of sediment retention.

Consider suspended sediments in a water body. The time required for a given particle to settle from the water surface to the bed is given as:

$$
T = \frac{H}{W_{s,eff}}
$$

#### **Equation 9**

Where *T* is the time required for sediment to completely settle, *H* is the local depth, and  $W_{s,eff}$  is the effective settling velocity of a specific sediment class.

As the particle settles, it is also transported by tidal and diversion currents, so the distance traveled by the particle is:

$$
X = U_{div} T = U_{div} \frac{H}{W_{s,eff}}
$$

#### <span id="page-318-0"></span>**Equation 10**

Where *U* is the diversion induced mean velocity. As the averaging timescale of the model is greater than the tidal period and net tidal flow is zero, [Equation 10](#page-318-0) neglects the influence of tidal velocities, and the net displacement of water within the marsh is described by the diversion flow.

For this analysis the wetland is assumed to have rectangular planform and cross-sectional geometries described by the average length (*L*), width (*B*), and depth (*H*). The fraction of sediment retained in the wetland then becomes a function of wetland length relative to transport distance prior to full deposition of the sediment fraction in question (Stumpf, 1983). If all diverted sediment is retained within the system, the retention factor is 1. Since this analysis takes a macroscopic view of the total sediment retained in the system and location of deposit is not considered, the retention factor becomes 1 if the length of the wetland is greater than the transport length, and the retention of a given sediment particle class, *Rj*, may be expressed as:

$$
R_j = \min\left(\frac{L}{X}, 1\right)
$$

### **Equation 11**

Due to variation in fall velocity with sediment size, coarse particles may be retained while fines are flushed from the system; therefore, the combined retention of the entire grain size distribution must be made. Retention over all sediment classes may be expressed as:

$$
R_T = \sum R_j f_j
$$

## **Equation 12**

Where  $R_T$  is the combined total retention factor and  $f_i$  is the mass fraction associated with each sediment class.

### *Fall Velocity*

A key element of the sediment budgeting model presented is the calculation of the effective fall velocity of a given sediment size class, which is a function of the fall velocity of that sediment in a static body of water, *Ws*, and the turbulence of the flow. Fall velocity of sediment is dependent upon both sediment properties (shape, size, density, concentration, ability to flocculate) and fluid properties (viscosity, density, temperature, salinity). In the natural environment, turbulence is generated by flow over the sediment bed. The presence of turbulence acts to vertically mix suspended sediments, which reduces the effective settling velocity of suspended particles. The steady-state vertical flux balance at a point in the water column is given by:

$$
W_s C + K_z \frac{dC}{dz} = 0
$$

### <span id="page-319-0"></span>**Equation 13**

Where *C* is the suspended sediment concentration,  $K_z$  is the vertical diffusivity, and *z* is the vertical distance from the bed.

For the purposes of this tool to estimate retention, it is convenient to combine the terms in [Equation 13](#page-319-0) to define an effective settling velocity ([Equation 14](#page-319-1)).

$$
W_{s, \text{eff}} C = W_s C + K_z \frac{dC}{dz}
$$

#### <span id="page-319-1"></span>**Equation 14**

Vertical diffusivity varies with turbulent intensity and height above the bed. Rouse proposes that diffusivity varies parabolically with height above the bed in the form (Richardson et al., 2001):

$$
K_z = \kappa u_* z \left( 1 - \frac{z}{H} \right)
$$

#### **Equation 15**

Where  $\kappa$  is the von Karman constant ( $\sim$ 0.4) and  $u$ <sup>\*</sup> is the total friction velocity (a measure of turbulent intensity).

Given the sediment flux balance in [Equation 13,](#page-319-0) the vertical concentration profile is:

$$
C = C_a \left( \frac{z}{z_a} \frac{H - z_a}{H - z} \right)^{-1}
$$

*b*

**Equation 16** 

Where *b* is the Rouse parameter  $\left(b = \frac{W_s}{\kappa u_*}\right)$  and  $z_a$  is a reference height above the bed with a known sediment condition, *Ca*.

The turbulent shear velocity is estimated from the depth-averaged velocity by the logarithmic boundary layer (law of the wall) (Kundu, 1990).

$$
u_* = \frac{U\kappa}{\ln\left(\frac{H/3}{z_0}\right)}
$$

#### <span id="page-320-0"></span>**Equation 17**

Where *U* is the daily mean wetland velocity with both tidal and diversion related components and  $z_0$  is the hydraulic roughness length.

For the diurnal tidal cycle of coastal Louisiana, the tide is assumed to have approximately sinusoidal periodicity. The mean instantaneous wetland velocity can then be determined by considering both tidal and diversion components ([Figure 3\)](#page-336-0).

$$
U_{i} = U_{div} + U_{\text{max,} +} \sin \omega = \frac{Q_{div}}{HB} + U_{\text{max,} +} \sin \omega
$$

## **Equation 18**

Where  $U_i$  is the instantaneous mean velocity with tidal and diversion components and  $U_{max, tide}$  is the maximum tidal velocity (or tidal amplitude), and  $\omega$  is tide phase.

For the use in the flow diversion model, the velocity is integrated over the tidal cycle (0 to  $2\pi$ ) to obtain the daily mean velocity, *U*.

$$
U = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left\{ U_{div} \left( 2\omega_1 - \omega_0 - \omega_2 \right) + U_{\text{max,side}} \left( \cos(\omega_2) - 2\cos(\omega_1) + \cos(\omega_0) \right) \right\}
$$

### **Equation 19**

Where  $\omega_0$  is the tide phase at zero up-crossing  $\omega_0 = \sin^{-1} \left[ \frac{-\sigma_{div}}{I} \right]$ ⎠  $\left(\omega_{0} = \sin^{-1}\left(-U_{div}\right)_{II}\right)$ ⎝  $\left(\omega_{\text{o}} = \sin^{-1}\left(-U_{div}\right)_{II}\right)$ ⎠  $\begin{pmatrix} -U_{\frac{div}{}} \end{pmatrix}$ ⎝  $=\sin^{-1}\left(-\right)$ *tide div U U* max,  $\omega_0 = \sin^{-1} \left| \begin{array}{cc} -U_{\text{div}} & \end{array} \right|$ ,  $\omega_I$  is the tide

phase at zero down-crossing  $(\omega_1 = \pi - \omega_0)$ , and  $\omega_2$  is the completed tidal phase  $(\omega_2 = \omega_0 + 2\pi)$  [\(Figure 3\)](#page-336-0).

In order to estimate the shear velocity, the hydraulic roughness must also be estimated from local sediment grain size, form roughness, and vegetative coverage. In this analysis, a lumped parameter accounting for both grain size and form roughness is implemented based on marsh surface character ([Table 2](#page-346-0)). Vegetative roughness is incredibly important in coastal marshes where emergent plants are encountered throughout the marsh, and although basing this parameter on bed material ignores the effects of vegetation, this will provide an estimate of sediment settling in open water and will therefore provide conservative estimates of settling in vegetated or partially vegetated marsh.

Combining [Equation 13](#page-319-0) – [Equation 17,](#page-320-0) one may obtain an expression for the effective settling velocity of sediment in coastal marshes.

$$
W_{s,eff} = W_s - bK_z \left(\frac{H - z_a}{z_a}\right)^{-b} \left(\frac{z}{H - z}\right)^{-b-1} \left(\frac{H}{\left(H - z\right)^2}\right)
$$

#### <span id="page-321-0"></span>**Equation 20**

For incorporation into the flow diversion model, vertical mixing has been computed at a height above the bed equal to 1/10 of water depth  $\left( z = H_{10} \right)$  and  $z_a$  is approximated as 1/100 of the depth  $\left( z_a = H_{100} \right)$ . These values provide an estimate of the settling velocity of particles very near the bed that are assumed to settle. Insertion of these relations into [Equation 20](#page-321-0) yields:

$$
W_{s,eff} = W_s - bK_z(99)^{-b} \left(\frac{1}{9}\right)^{-b-1} \left(\frac{0.81}{H}\right)
$$

**Equation 21**  Where  $K_z = 0.009 \kappa u_* H$ .

### **Net Sediment Benefit**

By accounting for sediment loading to the marsh and sediment retention within the marsh, the mass loading rate of sediment retained in the marsh may be determined by:

$$
Q_{s,net} = Q_{s,div} R_T
$$

#### **Equation 22**

Where  $Q_{s,net}$  is the net mass loading rate of sediment to the marsh.

This loading rate may then be used to calculate the net aerial sediment benefit due to flow diversion, *Ased*, for a given time period.

$$
A_{\text{sed}} = \frac{Q_{\text{s},\text{net}} dt}{H \rho_{\text{bd}}}
$$

#### **Equation 23**

Where  $dt$  is the time step (da) and  $\rho_{bd}$  is the average bulk density of the receiving area.

Bulk density in coastal marshes varies significantly with depth due to sediment consolidation. For our analysis, we assumed that the bulk density was a depth averaged value based on the depth of marsh being filled with sediment (i.e. flow depth, *H*). Bulk density profiles were obtained from literature (Nyman et al., 1990; Nyman et al., 1993; Delaune et al., 2003) and available data (Michael Channel, personal communication).

## **Application: Caernarvon Diversion and Breton Sound Estuary**

In order to verify the ability of the model to account for landscape evolution due to flow diversion, the model was applied to an existing diversion structure and marsh, the Caernarvon Diversion to Upper Breton Sound Estuary ([Figure 4\)](#page-337-0). The Caernarvon Diversion is located on the east bank of the Mississippi River at river mile 81.5 (131.2 km) (approximately 12.5 river miles (20.1 km) downstream of New Orleans) and

discharges Mississippi River water into Breton Sound through five 15-ft (4.57-m) box culverts with vertical lift gates (Lane et al., 1999; Snedden et al., 2007). The diversion was constructed between 1988 and 1991 and opened for operation in August of 1991 with goals of reducing the salinity in Breton Sound for commercial shell fisheries. An ancillary benefit of the diversion has been sediment and nutrient loading to the marsh and corresponding reduction in land loss (Snedden et al., 2007).

Upper Breton Sound is approximately 231 mi<sup>2</sup> (599 km<sup>2</sup>) in area with a length of 18.8 mi (30.2 km) and a width of 12.3 mi (19.8 km). This estuary was historically an intermediate marsh, but due to RSLR and river/marsh disconnection, marsh salinity elevated to brackish conditions before the diversion became operational (Carter and Bernard, 2007). The current marsh is dominated by brackish species (e.g. *S. patens*) near the diversion and saline marsh species (e.g. *S. alterniflora*) far from the diversion (Snedden et al., 2007).

Breton Sound is hydrologically isolated from surrounding marshes by levees on both the eastern and western borders; therefore accounting for inflows and outflows to the marsh is relatively straightforward with water budgets for Upper Breton Sound revealing major hydrologic processes to be precipitation, evaporation, and freshwater diversion. Groundwater and stormwater inflows have been shown to be relatively small compared to precipitation and diversion (Hyfield, 2004).

In order to maximize the retention time of diverted water and induce desirable sediment settling and nutrient uptake, the State of Louisiana has initiated outfall management for the Caernarvon Diversion. Management actions have included restoration and backfilling of man-made canals, installation of control structures throughout the marsh (Carter and Bernard, 2007), and operational adjustment to test theories of marsh sedimentation processes (Snedden et al., 2007).

Snedden et al. (2007) have shown that a large majority (nearly 99%) of Caernarvon's discharge flows downmarsh through two major flow routes for low discharges. These authors indicate that below 3500 cfs, the diverted waters remain almost entirely in these canals. When diversion discharge exceeds this threshold value, diverted waters appear to exceed canal banks and flow over the marsh as sheet flow (Snedden et al., 2007). This indicates that large pulses of discharge may be more effective in distributing sediments throughout the estuary. These authors also applied a local river sediment rating based on near-surface suspended sediment concentrations of the Mississippi River approximately 5 mi (8 km) downstream of the Caernarvon structure at Belle Chase, Louisiana. By examining sediment loading rates through the diversion, these authors concluded that pulsing of discharges in phase with high river sediment concentrations not only induces sheet flow over the marsh, but also has the ability to load much greater quantities of sediment to the marsh (Snedden et al., 2007).

The Caernarvon Diversion provides an excellent test case for the model developed herein due to the variable discharge inputs and extensive knowledge of current system processes. Table 3 presents the inputs to the model for the Caernarvon Diversion and

Breton Sound. Many of these inputs have a significant amount of variability and have been presented with standard deviations in order to provide the reader with a scale of parameter uncertainty. When data was not available, parameters and ranges were estimated by best professional judgment. Since many of the input parameters contain a significant amount of uncertainty and forecasting land evolution in such a complex system is difficult, model uncertainty has been characterized by a Monte Carlo risk analysis. In this analysis, parameter uncertainty was estimated and assumed normal about the mean. Random errors were then introduced in each parameter for 10,000 calculations. Model results were computed with each set of randomly induced errors, and the range of area predictions was analyzed to determine 90% confidence intervals.

In order to apply the model to Breton Sound, the diversion and river hydrographs must be estimated to indicate marsh nutrient and sediment availability. The river hydrograph may be estimated by using a representative water year or by averaging flows for many years and determining mean daily discharges over a period of record. The diversion hydrograph may be estimated by applying historic operational records, assuming an input hydrograph, testing various operational theories (e.g. pulses timed with river discharge), or linking the discharge to the diversion structure type (e.g. diversion discharge dependence upon river stage using a weir equation). A sample representative diversion and river hydrograph are displayed ([Figure 5](#page-338-0)) for operation of the Caernarvon structure in 1994. Both the diversion and river hydrographs for this year output very near average annual discharge volumes and the peak magnitudes of the hydrographs were well represented; therefore, for this analysis, the diversion and river hydrographs were assumed to be that of the 1994 calendar year for each year of the simulation.

[Figure 6](#page-339-0) presents the evolution of land area within Upper Breton Sound from before the diversion was opened (1 November 1990) until the end of 2006 (31 December 2006). This figure shows the observed values of marsh area along with estimates by the current model with associated parameter uncertainty alongside the Boustany Model. The estimated future without project (FWOP) is presented to provide the reader with the magnitude of marsh area benefit the Caernarvon Diversion is providing Breton Sound. Vertical lines indicate the beginning of diversion operation and hurricanes making landfall in Louisiana. It is clear that hurricanes create significant perturbations to the system; however, hurricanes may provide both import and export to a given marsh depending upon the location of landfall and are, for the purpose of this screening level model, assumed to create no net import or export of sediment over a long planning horizon.

In addition to model verification at Caernarvon, readers may be interested in the benefits provided by nutrient and sediment components separately; therefore [Figure 7](#page-340-0) presents the model predictions with nutrient only and sediment only scenarios for the Caernarvon Diversion application.

# **Optimization of Implemented Diversion**

The focus of LACPR has been the analysis of alternatives and the decision support framework associated with choosing diversion sites and quantities. The land evolution
model has been applied as tool for assisting in this framework and has provided relative benefits of various flow diversion sites and scenarios. The utility of the tool, however, has not yet been fully exploited. Following the narrowing of alternatives, the land evolution model may then be used in the initial optimization of the selected diversions by examining different operational and structural scenarios. This type of analysis has not yet been conducted for each of the alternatives of the LACPR, but this section provides a sample of how these analyses might be conducted for a given diversion site. The model will be applied to an existing diversion (Caernarvon) to assess the land gain benefits of six operational and five structural scenarios with near equal annual discharge volumes.

As previously stated, the Caernarvon Diversion discharges Mississippi River water to Upper Breton Sound through five 15 ft box culverts with vertical lift gates which can be used to control diversion discharges to the marsh. For this analysis the diversion is merely used to demonstrate the ability of the land evolution model to provide relative benefits of different operational and structural conditions. Table 3 provides the model inputs used for these optimization exercises. For these analyses, the 1994 Mississippi River hydrograph was found to be representative of the average annual discharge volume, peak magnitude, and seasonality of flow in the river and has been used throughout the duration of the model simulations in these exercises.

#### **Operational Optimization of Gate Structures**

The continuous hydrographic inputs of the model provide a tool for optimizing gate-type diversion operation to obtain the greatest land evolution benefits. In this section, the model will be applied to demonstrate the operational benefits for the six approximately equal-volume discharge scenarios that follow ([Figure 8](#page-341-0)). These annual hydrographs were chosen based on previous research indicating that pulsing and timing of diversions may be critical to land evolution (Day et al., 2003; Snedden et al., 2007).

- 1. Historic operation based on 2003 operational conditions (a "pulsed" diversion year with a large portion of the annual sediment load derived from two twoweek pulses)
- 2. Simulated operation with a large pulse of one-month duration timed *in phase* with high river sediment discharges
- 3. Simulated operation with a large pulse of one-month duration timed *out of phase* with high river sediment discharges
- 4. Simulated operation with a small pulse of six-month duration timed *in phase* with high river sediment discharges
- 5. Simulated operation with a small pulse of six-month duration timed *out of phase* with high river sediment discharges
- 6. Constant diversion discharge

Each of the annual hydrographs was input to the model, and land evolution estimates were made for a 50 year time period starting at the arbitrary starting date of January 1, 2001 ([Figure 9](#page-342-0)). These results indicate that, for the inputs considered, the magnitude and timing of the diversion discharges is critical to suppression of the land loss rate. Therefore, for this hypothetical diversion scenario at Caernarvon, the diversion of flows

could be altered to be in phase with high river sediment discharges and should occur from later winter to early summer (February – June). These periods of high sediment discharge may not, however, align with other project goals of a given diversion (e.g. reduction of salinity for maintenance of commercial fisheries). This analysis indicates a time period over which the greatest land evolution benefits may be obtained, and diversion operation may be optimized within that timeframe to include multiple project goals.

#### **Structure Selection**

Not only will operational considerations impact diversion benefits, but structure type will also have a drastic impact on the selection and operation of a given diversion. For instance, a gate-type structure (such as the one at Caernarvon) may be controlled to achieve the desired water and sediment discharges, but the cost and maintenance may be high. Whereas a broad-crested weir may have low cost, but control of diversion discharges is relatively minimal. A siphon is a third common diversion structure that may require significant maintenance and operational effort, but the suspended sediment concentration of the diverted water may be higher and the size gradation of the sediment diverted may be significantly larger inducing more land gain on both accounts. This section will demonstrate the ability of the model to assess land evolution by applying the model to the Caernarvon Diversion for the following five hypothetical structural scenarios:

- 1. Gate structure with pulsed operation based on the 2003 hydrograph
- 2. 100-ft wide broad-crested weir
- 3. 200-ft wide broad-crested weir structure
- 4.  $1 15$  ft siphon with a single short duration (113 day) discharge event
- $5. 1 6$  ft siphon with continuous operation throughout the year

The weir structures have been assumed to behave as theoretical broad-crested weirs ([Equation 24](#page-325-0)) and the discharge was determined based on the Mississippi River stage for the representative hydrograph (1994). The weir elevations were adjusted to produce annual discharge volumes approximately equal to the average annual diversion discharge volume from 1991-2006.

$$
Q_{div} = C_{weir} B_{weir} (z_{river} - z_{weir})^{3/2}
$$

#### **Equation 24**

<span id="page-325-0"></span>Where  $C_{weir}$  is a weir coefficient (~4.37 ft<sup>0.5</sup>/s),  $B_{weir}$  is the width of the weir (ft),  $z_{river}$  is the elevation of the river for a given flow rate (ft), *zweir* is the elevation of the weir (ft) (White, 2003).

In order to calculate the discharge of the diversion by siphoning, Bernoulli's equation was implemented [\(Equation 25\)](#page-326-0). Frictional losses in the pipe were assumed negligible due to the qualitative nature of this analysis. As with the weir, the marsh elevation was optimized to produce annual discharge volumes approximately equal to the average annual diversion discharge volume from 1991-2006. [Figure 10](#page-343-0) presents diversion discharge hydrographs for the five scenarios considered.

$$
Q_{div} = V_{siphon} A_{siphon} = \sqrt{2g(z_{river} - z_{mark})} \left(\frac{\pi d^2}{4}\right)
$$

<span id="page-326-0"></span>**Equation 25** 

Where *zmarsh* is the elevation of the marsh and *d* is the pipe diameter.

The land evolution model was applied using these annual diversion hydrographs and the parameters from the Caernarvon Diversion (Table 3). The only alteration of the Caernarvon model inputs was the sediment rating curve and size fraction applied to the siphon calculations. A weir or gate structure diverts surface waters of the Mississippi River to the marsh, and the Belle Chase surface sediment rating presented in [Table 1](#page-345-0) was determined as such (Snedden et al., 2007), but a siphon could draw water from lower in the water column, producing a larger sediment concentration and a more coarse sediment size fraction. As such, the total sediment rating at Belle Chase was applied with an assumed size fraction distribution based on the observed fraction of silt and clay (*fsand* =  $0.12, f<sub>silt</sub> = 0.44, f<sub>clav</sub> = 0.44, f<sub>floc</sub> = 0.3$ .

As evident by the land evolution calculations ([Figure 11\)](#page-344-0), the benefits of flow diversion are extremely sensitive to the size fraction and concentration of the river water diverted. Therefore, the choice of structure type from a land evolution perspective is overwhelmingly in favor of siphons which divert higher concentrations of coarser sediment. However, logistical difficulties associated with operation and maintenance of a siphon (e.g. maintaining head differential, priming the siphon, air intrusion) may eliminate this structure type from consideration in many instances. It is also important to note that the results presented herein likely offer overly optimistic benefits of siphon structures due to the exclusion of friction in the siphon and the use of the total suspended sediment rating at Belle Chase. Although the siphon will be able to draw water from lower in the Mississippi River water column than a gate or weir, in order to maintain appropriate pressure differential for flow to the marsh, the siphon inlet will likely be required to draw in the upper half of the water column where suspended sediment concentrations are lower. The land evolution benefits of a siphon may also be overshadowed by other project objectives which may be detrimentally impacted by high turbidity or suspended sediment concentrations, such as fisheries production and marsh vegetation stimulation.

#### **Summary of Diversion Optimization**

The purpose of this exercise was not to identify an operational condition or structural alternative that is ideal for all flow diversions in coastal Louisiana, but was instead to demonstrate the land evolution model's ability to maximize land gain benefits for various operational and structural alternatives. Land gain (or suppression of land loss) is often not the only objective in the large-scale, long-term projects of the LACPR, and many other factors may be included in the selection of a diversion operational or structural scheme, some of which include:

- Cost of diversion with both structural and operation/maintenance components
- Desire to control diversion releases
- Commercial fisheries impacts
- Public recreational land use patterns

### **Conclusions**

This paper has presented the adaptation of a model for quantifying flow diversion benefits and demonstrated the model's ability to estimate the relative benefits of various flow diversion locations, structures, and operational regimes; however, the model results are limited due to the exclusion of a variety of important system processes. Some of the major assumptions and limitations of the model were:

- Benefits of flow diversion are independent (in reality the benefits are likely nonlinearly coupled due to vegetation inducing sediment deposition and sedimentation increasing suitable habitat for vegetation)
- Nutrients serve as a reduction in land loss, not a source of land gain benefits (Deposition of particulate organic matter neglected)
- Spatial uniformity vegetation, roughness, bulk density, and other parameters are highly heterogeneous in coastal marshes
- Temporal resolution is only represented intra-annually, not contiuously
- Rectangular wetland geometry
- No vegetative component to settling/roughness
- Organic accumulation is not considered as a function of time even through biomass production is highly seasonal
- No habitat switching with time
- Canals are not accounted for as a sediment loss mechanism
- Sheetflow was assumed for all diversion flow rates
- No sediment resuspension due to rainfall, tidal flows, waves, or hurricanes
- Uniform distribution of sedimentation.
- Nutrient recycling neglected

Although these assumptions significantly limit the model's ability to quantify the benefits of flow diversion, approximations had to be made due to the time and resource constraints under which the model was developed. Further refinement of model processes and algorithms are recommended and should address the above limitations specifically focusing on the following:

- Temporal distribution of nutrient benefits to account for seasonality and storage
- Nutrients as a source of benefit, not just a source of loss reduction. Refer to the organic accumulation models of Blum et al. (1978), Mitsch and Reeder (1991), and Reyes et al. (2000) for examples of organic benefit frameworks
- Nutrient retention calculations inclusive of marsh nutrient cycling processes (e.g. denitrification, burial)
- Division of nutrients nutrients should be divided into individual components (e.g. nitrogen and phosphorous) due to marsh limitation to a single nutrient
- Salinity is roughly covered in the model by the adjustment of bulk density and primary productivity, but the parameter is not explicitly covered and habitat switching is not tracked
- Spatial complexity/geometry improvements
- Inclusion of coastal currents and erosion, major storm events, and wind erosion
- Better methods of accounting for hydraulic resistance

#### **Acknowledgements**

This effort was developed and funded under the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The authors would like to acknowledge the LACPR Habitat Evaluation Team (HET), and their extensive technical guidance of the development of the technology presented herein. In particular, Ronald Paille and Tamieka Armstrong provided critical feedback on formulation and application of the model. Ron Boustany provided the basis for the nutrient model presented herein and the authors are grateful for his willingness to assist in this effort. Gregg Snedden, Joann Mossa, Robert Lane, and Mike Channell all provided valuable data and knowledge resources throughout the development of this model.

#### **References**

Barras, J.A., P.E. Bourgeois, and L.R. Handley. (1994). "Land Loss in coastal Louisiana 1956-1990." *Open File Report 94-01*. National Biological Survey, National Wetlands Research Center, Lafayette, Louisiana.

Baustian, J.J. and R.E. Turner. (2006). "Restoration Success of Backfilling Canals in Coastal Louisiana Marshes." *Restoration Ecology*. Society for Ecological Restoration International, Vol. 14 (4).

Blum, U., E.D. Seneca, and L.M. Stroud. (1978). "Photosynthesis and Respiration of *Spartina* and *Juncus* Salt Marshes in North Carolina: Some Models." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 1 (4), pp. 228-238.

Boustany, R.G. (2007). "A Method of Estimating the Benefit of Freshwater Introduction into Coastal Wetland Ecosystems: Nutrient and Sediment Analysis." *April 2007 Draft Report*, USDA-NRCS, Lafayette, LA.

Cardoch, L., J.W. Day, C. Ibanez. (2002). "Net Primary Productivity as an Indicator of Sustainability in the Ebro and Mississippi Deltas." *Ecological Applications*. Ecological Society of America, Vol. 12 (4), pp. 1044-1055.

Carter, B.S. and T. Bernard. (2007). "2004 Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring Report for Caernarvon Diversion Outfall Management." Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Coastal Restoration Division and Coastal Engineering Division, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Church, J.A., J.M. Gregory, P. Huybrechts, M. Kuhn, K. Lambeck, M.T. Nhuan, D. Qin, and P.L. Woodworth. (2001). "Changes in Sea Level." In: *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Eds. Houghton, J.T.,Y. Ding, D.J. Griggs, M. Noguer, P.J. van der Linden, X. Dai, K. Maskell, and C.A. Johnson. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 881pp.

Coleman, J.M. (1988). "Dynamics Changes and Processes in the Mississippi River Delta." *Geological Society of America Bulletin*. Geological Society of America, Vol. 100, pp. 999-1015.

Coleman, J.M., H.H. Roberts, and G.W. Stone. (1998). "Mississippi River Delta: an Overview." *Journal of Coastal Research*. Vol. 14 (3), pp. 698-716.

Day, J.W., D. Pont, P.F. Hensel, and C. Ibanez. (1995). "Impacts of Sea-Level Rise on Deltas in the Gulf of Mexico and Mediterranean: The Importance of Pulsing Events to Sustainability." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 18 (4), pp. 636-647.

Day, J.W. et al. (2003). "Pulses: The Importance of Pulsed Physical Events for Louisiana Floodplains and Watershed Management." *Proceedings of the First Interagency Conference on Research in the Watersheds*. USDA-ARS, Benson, AZ.

Deegan, L.A., et al. (2007). "Susceptibility of Salt Marshes to Nutrient Enrichment and Predator Removal." *Ecological Applications*. Ecological Society of America, Vol. 17 (5), pp. S42-S63.

Delaune, R.D. and S.R. Pezeshiki. (2003). "The Role of Soil Organic Carbon in Maintaining Surface Elevation in Rapidly Subsiding U.S. Gulf of Mexico Coastal Marshes." *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution*. Kluwer Academic, Vol. 3, pp. 167-179.

Delaune, R.D., S.R. Pezeshki, and A. Jugsujinda. (2005). "Impact of Mississippi River Freshwater Reintroduction on *Spartina patens* Marshes: Responses to Nutrient Input and Lowering of Salinity." *Wetlands*. Society of Wetland Scientists, Vol. 25 (1).

Delaune, R.D., C.N. Reddy, and W.H. Patrick. (1981). "Accumulation of Plant Nutrients and Heavy Metals through Sedimentation Processes and Accretion in a Louisiana Salt Marsh." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 4 (4).

Delaune, R.D., A. Jugsujinda, G.W. Peterson, and W.H. Patrick. (2003). "Impact of Mississippi River Freshwater Reintroduction on Enhancing Marsh Accretionary Processes in a Louisiana Estuary." *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science*. Elsevier, Vol. 58, pp. 653-662.

Delaune, R.D., A. Jugsujinda, J.L. West, C.B. Johnson, and M. Kongchum.. (2005). "A Screening of the Capacity of Louisiana Freshwater Wetlands to Process Nitrate in Diverted Mississippi River Water." *Ecological Engineering*. Elsevier, Vol. 25, pp. 315- 321.

Dokka, R.K., G.F. Sella, and T.H. Dixon. (2006). "Tectonic Control of Subsidence and Southward Displacement of Southeast Louisiana with Respect to Stable North America." *Geophysical Research Letters*. AGU, Vol. 33.

Dortch, M.S., M. Zakikhani, M.R. Noel, and S.C. Kim. (2007). "Application of a Water Quality Model to Mississippi Sound to Evaluate Impacts of Freshwater Diversion." *ERDC/EL TR07-20*. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Edwards, K.R. and K.P. Mills. (2005). "Aboveground and Belowground Productivity of *Spartina Alterniflora* (Smooth Cordgrass) in Natural and Created Louisiana Salt Marshes." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 28 (2), pp. .

Foote, A.L. and K.A. Reynolds. (1997). "Decomposition of Saltmeadow Cordgrass (*Spartina patens*) in Louisiana Coastal Marshes." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 20 (3), pp. 579-588.

Gleason, M.L., D.A. Elmer, N.C. Pien and J.S. Fisher. (1979). "Effects of Stem Density upon Sediment Retention by Salt Marsh Cordgrss, *Spartina Alterniflora* Loisel." *Esturaies*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 2 (4), pp. 271-273.

Gosselink, J.G. (1984). "The Ecology of Delta Marshes of Coastal Louisiana: A Community Profile." *FWS/OBS-84109*. USFWS, Washington, D.C.

Hyfield, E.C.G. (2004). "Freshwater and Nutrient Inputs to a Mississippi River Deltaic Estuary with River Reintroduction." Master's Thesis, Louisiana State University.

Hyfield, E.C.G., J.W. Day, J.E. Cable, and D. Justic. (2008). "The Impacts of Re-Introducing Mississippi River Water on the Hydrologic Budget and Nutrient Inputs of a Deltaic Estuary." *Ecological Engineering*. Elsevier, Vol. 32, pp. 347-359.

Kundu, P.K. (1990). Fluid Mechanics. Academic Press, San Diego.

Lane, R.R., J.W. Day, and B. Thibodeaux. (1999). "Water Quality Analysis of a Freshwater Diversion at Caernarvon, Louisiana." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 22 (2A), pp. 327-336.

Leonard, L.A. and M.E. Luther. (1995). "Flow Hydrodynamics in Tidal Marsh Canopies." *Limnology and Oceanography*. American Society of Limnology and Oceanography, Vol. 40 (8), pp. 1474-1484.

McKay, S.K., J.C. Fischenich, and S.J. Smith. (2008). "Quantifying Benefits of Flow Diversion to Coastal Marshes. I: Theory." In draft for submission to *Ecological Engineering*. Elsevier.

McKay, S.K., J.C. Fischenich, and R. Paille. (2008). "Quantifying Benefits of Flow Diversion to Coastal Marshes. II: Application to Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration." In draft for submission to *Ecological Engineering*. Elsevier.

Mitsch, W.J. and B.C. Reeder. (1991). "Modelling Nutrient Retention of a Freshwater Coastal Wetland: Estimating the Roles of Primary Productivity, Sedimentation, Resuspension, and Hydrology." *Ecological Modelling*. Elsevier, Vol. 54, pp. 151-187.

Mitsch, W.J., J.W. Day, J.W. Gilliam, P.M. Groffman, D.L. Hey, G.W. Randall, and N. Wang. (2001). "Reducing Nitrogen Loading to the Gulf of Mexico from the Mississippi River Basin: Strategies to Counter a Persistent Ecological Problem." *Bioscience*. Bioscience, Vol. 51 (5), pp. 373.388.

Morris, J.T. (2007). "Ecological Engineering in Intertidal Saltmarshes." *Hydrobiologia*. Springer, Vol. 577, pp. 161-168.

Morton, R.A., N.A. Buster, and M.D. Krohn. (2002). "Surface Controls on historical Subsidence Rates and Associated Wetland Loss in South-Central Louisiana." *Transactions of the Gulf Coast Association of Geological Societies*. Vol. 52, pp. 767- 778.

Mossa, J. (1996). "Sediment Dynamics in the Lowermost Mississippi River." *Engineering Geology*. Elsevier, Vol. 45, pp. 457-479.

Nyman, J.A., R.D. Delaune, and W.H. Patrick. (1990). "Wetland Soil Formation in the Rapidly Subsiding Mississippi River Deltaic Plain: Mineral and Organic Matter Relationships." *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science*. Academic Press, Vol. 31, pp.57- 69.

Nyman, J.A., R.D. Delaune, H.H. Roberts, and W.H. Patrick. (1993). "Relationship between Vegetation and Soil Formation in a Rapidly Submerging Coastal Marsh." *Marine Ecology Progress Series*. Inter-Research, Vol. 96, pp.269-279.

Nyman, J.A., R.D. Delaune, S.R. Pezeshki, and W.H. Patrick. (1995). "Organic Matter Fluxes and Marsh Stability in a Rapidly Submerging Estuarine Marsh." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 18 (1B), pp. 207-218.

Nyman, J.A., R.J. Walters, R.D. Delaune, and W.H. Patrick. (2006). "Marsh Vertical Accretion Via Vegetative Growth." *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science*. Elsevier, Vol. 69, pp.370-380.

Parker, G., O. Sequeiros, and River Morphodynamics Class Spring, 2006. (2006). "Large Scale River Morphodynamics: Application to the Mississippi Delta." Proceedings River Flow 2006 Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, September 6-8, 2006, Balkema.

Reed, D.J. (1995). "The Response of Coastal Marshes to Sea-Level Rise: Survival or Submergence?." *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Vol. 20, pp. 39-48.

Reyes, E., M.L. White, J.F. Martin, G.P. Kemp, J.W. Day, and V. Aravamuthan. (2000). "Landscape Modeling of Coastal Habitat Change in the Mississippi Delta." *Ecology*. Ecological Society of America, Vol. 81(8), pp. 2331-2349.

Reyes, E., R. Lane, and J.W. Day. (2003). "Watershed Analysis of Pulsing Freshwater Events Using Landscape Modeling in Coastal Louisiana." *Proceedings of the First Interagency Conference on Research in the Watersheds*. USDA-ARS, Benson, AZ.

Richardson, E.V., D.B. Simons, and P.F. Lagasse. (2001). "River Engineering for Highway Encroachments: Highways in the River Environment." *FHWA-NHI-01-004- HDS-6*. FHWA, Washington, D.C.

Rybczyk, J.M. and D.R. Cahoon. (2002). "Estimating the Potential for Submergence for Two Wetlands in the Mississippi Delta." *Estuaries*. Estuarine Research Federation, Vol. 25 (5), pp. 985-998.

Snedden, G.A., J.E. Cable, C. Swarzenski, and E. Swenson. (2007). "Sediment Discharge into a Subsiding Louisiana Deltaic Estuary Through a Mississippi River Diversion." *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science*. Elsevier, Vol. 71, pp.181-193.

Soulsby, R.L. (1983). "The bottom boundary layer of shelf seas." In Physical Oceanography of Coastal and Shelf Seas, ed. B. Johns, pp. 189-266. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

Soulsby, R.L. (1997). "Dynamics of marine sands." Thomas Telford, London.

Stumpf, R.P. (1983). "The Process of Sedimentation on the Surface of a Salt Marsh." Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science. Academic Press Inc., Vol. 17, pp. 495-508.

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). (2006). "Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration: A Preliminary Technical Report to United States Congress." U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Visser, J.M. et al. (2004). "Chapter C.9: Habitat Switching Module." In Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Ecosystem Restoration Study, Appendix C. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Wang, F.C. (1997). "Dynamics of Intertidal Marshes near Shallow Estuaries in Louisiana." *Wetlands Ecology and Management*. Kluwer Academic, Vol. 5, pp.131-143.

White, F. M. (2003). Fluid Mechanics: Fifth Edition. McGraw-Hill, New York, New York.

Winterwep, J.C. and W.G.M. van Kesteren. (2004). Introduction to the Physics of Cohesive Sediment in the Marine Environment. Developments in Sedimentology Series No. 56 xiii, 446 pp. Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

# **Figures**



**Figure 1. Typical coastal Louisiana marsh community with a patchwork of dense vegetation and open water** 



**Figure 2. Conceptual model of coastal Louisiana marsh accretionary processes (from Day et al., 1995)** 



**Figure 3. Wetland velocity with diversion and tidal components** 



**Figure 4. Aerial view of Breton Sound displaying Caernarvon Diversion and project division areas for tracking land evolution. In this analysis only the following areas were considered to be directly influenced by the Caernarvon Diversion in order to maintain relative uniformity in conditions: Upper Reference Outfall East, Upper Project Outfall, Upper Reference West, Middle Reference West, and Middle Project Area.** 



**Figure 5. Representative diversion and river hydrographs for land evolution forecasting associated with the Caernarvon Diversion (1994 hydrographs)** 



**Figure 6. Marsh area prediction for the Caernarvon Diversion from 1990-2006 with observed acreages, model predictions with parameter uncertainty bounds, as well as the Boustany Model predictions** 



**Figure 7. Marsh area prediction for the Caernarvon Diversion from 1990-2040 with isolated nutrient and sediment benefits** 



<span id="page-341-0"></span>**Figure 8. Hydrographs considered in Caernarvon Diversion operational optimization** 



<span id="page-342-0"></span>**Figure 9. Land evolution predictions for multiple operational scenarios at the Caernarvon Diversion** 



<span id="page-343-0"></span>**Figure 10. Calculated hydrographs for various structure types at the Caernarvon Diversion** 



<span id="page-344-0"></span>**Figure 11. Land evolution predictions for various structure types at the Caernarvon Diversion** 

## <span id="page-345-0"></span>**Tables**

**Table 1. Sediment Ratings for Rivers on the Louisiana Coastal Plain** 

<b>River</b>	<b>Gauge Location</b>	a <sub>1</sub>	a <sub>2</sub>	$R^2$
Mississippi	Belle Chase Surface*	3.205E-07	2.000	0.6648
	<b>Belle Chase</b>	1.237E-08	2.320	0.7302
	Tarbert - 1949-1975	1.192E-04	1.702	0.7945
	Tarbert - 1975-2007	7.096E-03	1.342	0.7689
	St. Francisville	6.501E-04	1.507	0.7357
Atchafalaya	Melville	4.941E-06	1.937	0.7764
	Simmesport	8.286E-04	1.563	0.8138
All ratings developed from suspended sediment concentrations and water				

discharges from USGS Website except "Belle Chase Surface"

\* Surface concentrations of suspended sediment at Belle Chase and Tarbert's Landing Discharges (Snedden et al., 2007)

Roughness Height, $z_0$ <sup>1</sup> <b>Channel Boundary</b>			
ft	mm	m	
$6.6E-04$	0.2	$2.0E-04$	
$2.3E-03$	0.7	$7.0E-04$	
$1.6E-04$	0.05	5.0E-05	
1.3E-03	0.4	$4.0E-04$	
$2.0E-02$	6	$6.0E-03$	
9.8E-04	0.3	$3.0E-04$	
9.8E-04	0.3	3.0E-04	
9.8E-04	0.3	$3.0E-04$	
9.8E-03	3	3.0E-03	

**Table 2. Hydraulic roughness height as a function of bed material grain size** 



**Table 3. System properties and land evolution model parameters for the Caernarvon Diversion to Breton Sound Estuary** 



\*Best professional judgment

### **Symbols**

- $b$  = Rouse parameter
- *d* = Diameter of siphon
- *fi* = Sediment size fraction *i*
- *g* = Acceleration due to gravity
- $u^*$  = Shear velocity
- $x =$ Longitudinal or down-marsh coordinate
- *y* = Horizontal or cross-marsh coordinate
- *z* = Vertical coordinate
- $z_0$  = Hydraulic roughness length
- *za* = Reference depth
- *zriver* = River stage
- *zmarsh* = Marsh Elevation
- *zweir* = Weir Elevation
- $A =$ Marsh area
- $A_{veg}$  = Vegetated area of receiving area
- *Anut* = Total aerial nutrient benefit from flow diversion
- *Ased* = Total aerial sediment benefit from flow diversion
- *Asiphon* = Cross-sectional area of siphon
- *B* = Average marsh width
- $B_{\text{weir}}$  = Weir width
- *C* = Suspended sediment concentration
- $C_a$  = Suspended sediment concentration at reference elevation  $z_a$
- *Criver* = Suspended sediment concentration of river
- *Csource* = Nutrient concentration of source water
- *Cweir* = Theoretical weir coefficient
- $E_{sus}$  = Percent of wetland sustained by nutrient loading
- $H =$  Average marsh depth
- $K_z$  = Vertical diffusivity
- $L =$  Average marsh length
- $LR_{\text{req}}$  = Marsh required nutrient loading rate
- $LR_{div}$  = Loading rate of nutrients from the flow diversion
- *LRbackground* = Background loading rate of nutrients from preexisting marsh sources
- *LRnet* = Net loading rate of nutrients from diversion and background sources (=*LRdiv*

*LRbackground*)

 $P_r$  = Primary Production

- $Q_{div}$  = Volumetric water discharge through diversion
- *Qs,river* = Sediment discharge of river
- *Qs,div* = Sediment discharge of diversion
- *Qs,net* = Rate of sediment discharged to and retained in marsh
- $R_i$  = Sediment retention of size fraction *i*
- $R_T$  = Total sediment retention factor
- *T* = Time required for particle settling
- $U =$  Daily mean velocity with tidal and diversion related components
- $U_i$  = Instantaneous mean velocity with tidal and diversion related components

 $U_{div}$  = Diversion induced velocity (=  $Q_{div}/HB$ )

 $U_{max, tide}$  = Maximum tidal velocity (tidal velocity amplitude)

*Vsiphon* = Velocity of flow in siphon

 $W_s$  = Natural settling velocity

 $W_{s,eff}$  = Effective settling velocity due to natural settling and turbulence

 $X =$ Transport distance of suspended sediment

 $\delta$  = Land change rate (% / time)

 $\delta_{nut}$  = Nutrient suppressed land change rate (% / time)

 $\gamma_{nut}$  = Percent of plant biomass made up of nutrients

 $\kappa$  = von Karman's constant (0.4)

 $\omega$  = Tide phase

 $\omega_0$  = Tide phase of the up-crossing zero velocity

 $\omega_1$  = Tide phase of the down-crossing zero velocity (= $\omega_0 + \pi$ )

 $ω_2 = ω_0 + 2π$ 

### ANNEX 2

#### 3815

## ERDC-SAND2 Model Verification

## **ERDC-SAND2 Model Verification**

Verification of the SAND2 model was conducted by simulating the effects of the freshwater diversions (siphons) at Naomi and West Pointe a la Hache, both of which began operating in 1993 (Figure A), and the larger Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion Project, which began operating in 1991.



Figure A. Locations of the diversions simulated using the SAND2 model.

Daily discharge information from each of these diversions was used as input into the SAND2 model. Wetland acreages from the respective influence areas, from 1956 to 1990 were used to determine pre-diversion wetland loss rates. The SAND2 model was then used to predict post-operation wetland acreages. Those predicted acreages were then compared to post-operation observed wetland acreages to verify model results.

The SAND2 model did a reasonably good job forecasting Caernarvon benefits until 2005 when Hurricane Katrina caused severe marsh loss in the influence area. Because the model does not incorporate effects of major storm impacts, the modelpredicted acreages differed dramatically from observed acreages following Katrina (Figure B).



Figure B. SAND2 simulation of the Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion (1991-2006).

Compared to the 8,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) design maximum discharge for the Caernarvon Diversion structure, the maximum discharge of the 2 siphons is roughly 2,000 cfs. Although the SAND2 model did a fairly good job predicting the effects of the West Pointe a la Hache Siphon (Figure C), the predicted results tended to underestimate actual observed wetland acreages.



Figure C. SAND2 simulation of the West Pointe a la Hache Siphon (1993-2007).

Likewise, the SAND2 results also underestimated wetland acreage in the area influenced by the Naomi Freshwater Diversion Siphon (Figure D). The underestimate for the Naomi Siphon may be related in part to the large and relatively deep open water included within the siphon's influence area. Exclusion of this area, or a reduction in the influence area size, may have improved the accuracy of model results. This issue highlights the influence of project area selection on model results. Ideally, a hydrologic model or other systematic method to determining the project area (diversion influence area) is needed to achieve the best model results. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient time to conduct model runs to determine the potential ARTM diversion influence areas for each freshwater introduction measure. Instead, influence area polygons were determined using best professional judgment.

The SAND2 verification work, and other work with the SAND2 model indicates that it is most applicable in interior marsh systems. When applied to open bays or large lakes, it appears to substantially overestimate land-building. This may be related to resuspension and export of deposited sediments, a process that the model does not address. The ARTM measures, however, are all generally interior locations which are handled well by the SAND2 model. Unfortunately, no examples of freshwater introductions without sediment are available to verify the application of the SAND2 model for nutrient-only situations.



Figure D. SAND2 simulation of the Naomi Freshwater Diversion Siphon (1993- 2006).

## ANNEX 3

#### MCASES Cost Analysis

For Internal Use Only

## F I N A L R E P O R T

# USACE WHITE DITCH EVALUATION AND DESIGN

#### HYDRODYNAMIC AND SALINITY TRANSPORT MODELING

*Prepared for*  USACE

June 4, 2010



URS Corporation 1625 Summit Lake Drive, Ste. 200 Tallahassee, FL 32317

# **Table of Contents**



## **Tables**



## **Figures**


- Figure 22b Final Polygon Set in White Ditch Study Area
- Figure 23 Survey Data Distribution
- Figure 24 Effective Depths and Locations from Cross-Section Transect Data
- Figure 25 Template of Water Body Depths
- Figure 26 Scatter Set Used for Grid Generation
- Figure 27 Enlarged Portion of Point Grid Data
- Figure 28 Final Grid and Grid Information
- Figure 29 Depth Contours
- Figure 30 Grid Cell Resolution in area of interest (top) and showing number of cells in canals and rivers (right)
- Figure 31 Grid with Boundary Cellstring Locations
- Figure 32 Boundary Input Data
- Figure 33 Sensitivity of the Tide Calibration to the Datum Shifts in the Bay Gardene Stage Data
- Figure 34 Final Stage Calibration
- Figure 35 Typical Response of Salinity During a Calibration Simulation
- Figure 36 Final Salinity Calibration
- Figure 37 Location 2
- Figure 38 Location 3
- Figure 39 Location 2 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections
- Figure 40a Location 3 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections
- Figure 40b Location 3 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections
- Figure 40c Location 3 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections
- Figure 41 35,000 cfs Capacity Alternative 2 Depth Contours
- Figure 42 35,000 cfs Capacity Alternative 3 Depth Contours
- Figure 43 Sequence of Salinity Distributions at Location 2 with 35,000 cfs Capacity Grid.
- Figure 44 Sequence of Salinity Distributions at Location 3 with 35,000 cfs Capacity Grid.
- Figure 45 Time-averaged Salinities for Final 7 days of the Simulation at Location 2.
- Figure 46 Time-averaged Water Depths for Final 7 days of the Simulation at Location 2.
- Figure 47a Salinity Time Series Results at Points throughout the White Ditch Area
- Figure 47b Salinity Time Series Results at Points throughout the White Ditch Area



Figure 48 Final Week Salinity Simulation Results from the 35,000 cfs Capacity at Location 3 Summer Simulation at Maximum Flow

### **Appendices**

Appendix A Discussion of Bay Gardene Tide Gage Datum

The White Ditch project area is located in the Breton Sound estuary and covers the area extending north and south from just south of Belair, Louisiana to the coastline of Louisiana and extending east and west from the Mississippi River to the Oak River. This area extends about 50 km in the NW-SE directions and about 30 km in the SW-NE direction. Subsidence, erosion, channelization, saltwater intrusion, storm damage and the absence of fresh water, sediments and nutrients from the Mississippi River have all caused significant adverse impacts to the White Ditch project area resulting in extensive wetland loss and ecosystem degradation. There is an existing siphon at the mouth of White Ditch that was built in 1963 and has not been in operation since 1991, except for two brief episodes.

The absence of a supply of fresh water, sediment, and nutrients has caused the marsh to degrade. This degradation coupled with the subsidence and a sea level rise rate of approximately 1.04 cm per year has led to an increase in saltwater intrusion. The additional influx of saltwater from the Gulf of Mexico through the vast canal network in the project area has further damaged the marsh vegetation. In August and September of 2005 Louisiana was hit by hurricanes Katrina and Rita. These hurricanes brought high winds and high tidal surges and destroyed thousands of acres of already weakened marsh. In September of 2008 hurricanes Ike and Gustav also hit the Gulf coast. While they did not make direct landfall in the project area, the tidal surges from these storms caused the loss of additional marsh acreage.

The White Ditch area is part of the Breton Sound estuary system. Breton Sound estuary is located in southern Louisiana, between Breton Sound Bay and approximately the last 85 miles of the Mississippi River before it discharges into the Gulf of Mexico. The estuary consists of about 430 square miles (1,100 km2) of fresh and brackish coastal wetlands that are made up of shallow water ponds, lakes, bays, and a man-made canal system (Figure 1). The major rivers in the estuary are the Oak River (also known as River aux Chenes) and Bayou Terra aux Boeufs. The larger water bodies are Big Mar, Lake Leary, Spanish Lake, Grand Lake, and Little Lake.

On the northern edge of Breton Sound estuary is the Caernarvon freshwater diversion structure. It is located on the east bank of a Mississippi River oxbow at river mile 81.5. The diversion structure began operating in 1991 as a means for establishing optimal salinity conditions for oyster production, and can also be used to prevent saltwater intrusion during storms or droughts.

The USACE is investigating alternative designs for a fresh water diversion from the Mississippi River to the White Ditch project area. Two alternative locations (Locations 2 and 3) are proposed for the diversion near White Ditch and are shown in Figure 2. Location 2 uses a modification of the existing siphon at White Ditch. Location 3 is located farther to the south. At both alternative locations, different channel depths and widths are considered for different peak diversion flow rates, ranging from 5,000 to 100,000 cfs. Location 2 also includes culverts located throughout the modified channels to provide connectivity with the marsh areas.

The alternatives are evaluated in terms of their impact on water depths and salinities throughout the study area. A hydrodynamic and salinity model has been developed to quantify the impacts of each alternative and evaluate the effects of diversion flow operations on the water depth and salinity. The results of the hydrodynamic and salinity model simulations were post-processed and used as input for the Wetland Value Assessment model to quantify the environmental benefits of the diversion. In addition to assessing environmental benefits such as the impacts on plant and animal communities in the project area, the stage data was also used to estimate potential flooding impacts for each alternative.

This report describes the hydrodynamic and salinity modeling analyses used to evaluate alternative designs and flow rates. The application of the wetland value assessment and other analyses were conducted by the USACE and are reported separately.

There were a number of existing data sets available to support the configuration, calibration and application of the hydrodynamic and salinity transport model. In addition to the existing data sets, a bathymetric survey and a field measurement program were conducted prior to the modeling analysis in order to provide site-specific data. Each of these data sets is briefly described below.

# 2.1 BATHYMETRY

There was sparse existing data within the coverage area, and the resolution and precision of any available data was insufficient for model use. Digital Elevation Model (DEM) and contoured elevation coverages were available at http://atlas.lsu.edu/rasterdown.htm for portions of the modeled area (Figure 3), however the elevation values available in these datasets did not contain the resolution necessary for use in the model.

## 2.2 TIDE STAGE

Real-time tide data were downloaded from http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis for three U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) stations. Station locations include: Northeast Bay Gardene (Station ID: 7374527), Black Bay near Snake Island (Station ID: 7374526) and Cow Bell at American Bay (Station ID: 73745258). Tide data were also obtained from http://tidesonline.nos.noaa.gov/ for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Station Pilot East (Station ID: 8761305). Station locations are shown in Figure 4. Time series plots of sample portions of the tide data are shown in Figure 5.

A review of the tide gages revealed that there were no suitable gage locations in the proximity of the White Ditch area. The closest gages were Cow Bell at American Bay and Northeast Bay Gardene. Data from the Bay Gardene station was chosen for use in the modeling analysis since it provided the widest date range of available data with the fewest data gaps.

A plot of the monthly average water elevations for the period 2000-2009 for the Bay Gardene station is shown in Figure 6. The data show that the stage tends to be higher in the fall, which corresponds to the period when the winds are predominantly from the Southeast.

# 2.3 METEOROLOGICAL DATA

Wind data are available from various stations in the project area. The wind data were collected by NOAA from 1999 through 2009 (http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/ncdc.html). Louisiana wind station locations include: Grand Isle (Station Number 8762417), Pilot East (Station Number 8760922) and Shell Beach (Station Number 8761305). The locations of these stations are shown in Figure 7. Hourly data was available from the Pilot East station and was downloaded for the time period of 3/25/2004 through 7/23/2009. A wind rose based on data collected at the Pilot East station during the year 2008 is shown in Figure 8.

Rainfall data were obtained from the NOAA Port Sulfer Station (Station 167471) and from a Belle Chasse station. Station Locations are shown in Figure 7. The data included a daily sum of rainfall in inches for 1/1/2004 through 8/27/2009 for Port Sulfur and 9/28/2006 through 8/20/2009 for Belle Chasse. Annual and seasonal rainfall patterns are shown in Figure 9 for the Belle Chasse data set.



# SECTIONTWO Background Data

There were no daily evaporation data available from stations near the project area. In order to provide some information for evaporation rates, data in the literature was reviewed. A study conducted by Cooke et al. (2008) provided measured data at a variety of stations in Louisiana. The nearest station for which summer evaporation rates were available was Houma. The data indicate some daily fluctuations do occur, ranging between 2 and 8 mm/day, with an average rate on the order of 5 mm/day.

# 2.4 SALINITY

Salinity data are available from the USGS and were obtained from the website: http://waterdata.usgs.gov. Data from three Louisiana stations including Northeast Bay Gardene (Station ID 7374527), Black Bay near Snake Island (Station ID 7374526), and Cow Bell at American Bay (Station ID 73745258) were obtained. The station locations are shown in Figure 4. The monthly average salinities for 2009 for the Bay Gardene station are shown in Figure 10a.

Another salinity data set was available from Strategic Online Natural Resources Information System (SONRIS). This data set included hourly or monthly salinity measurements and stations were located throughout the Breton Sound with varying periods of record). Station locations are shown in Figure 10b, and average, max and minimum salinity values at stations with sufficient data are shown in the table in Figure 10b. The average salinity is lowest in the spring and is controlled by Freshwater from the Caernarvon Diversion and the Mississippi River, which are the two freshwater sources for this area.

# 2.5 CAERNARVON FLOWS

On the northern edge of Breton Sound estuary is the Caernarvon freshwater diversion structure. It is located on the east bank of a Mississippi River oxbow at river mile 81.5. The diversion structure began operating in 1991 as a means for establishing optimal salinity conditions for oyster production, and can also be used to prevent saltwater intrusion during storms or droughts. The 23-meter-wide structure has the capacity to divert up to about 8,000 cfs (226 m<sup>3</sup>/s) of Mississippi River water into the Breton Sound estuary, and has been managed at many different discharge rates since its commencement.

The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New Orleans District, manages the Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion Project and provided daily flow data in cfs from 1992 through 2009. The seasonal flows from the diversion are shown in Figure 11.

Based on discussions with local land managers, it is believed that the flow from the diversion followed two dominant paths form the diversion. The main one is to the south through the Bayou Mandeville area. The second one is directed to the west, through the Delacroix Canal, and ultimately merges with the Oaks River. It is believed that about 20 to 30 percent of the diversion flows went through the western path until Hurricane Katrina impacted the area. After Katrina, many of the smaller channels to the west were clogged with debris, and it is believed that only 5 to 10 percent of the diversion flow now flows westward.

## 2.6 BATHYMETRIC SURVEY DATA

The USACE conducted a bathymetric survey of the White Ditch area to support both the modeling analysis and the alternative designs. The survey transects are shown in Figure 12. The surveyed cross-sections are shown in a sequence of plots in Figures 13 and 14. These data provide information on the channel depths and widths, the lake depths, elevations of ridges bounding the channels as well as the characteristics of the inter-tidal and land areas.

# 2.7 URS FIELD INVESTIGATION

The White Ditch field investigation was conducted from July 20 through July 23, 2009 to collect necessary calibration data for the CMS-Flow hydrodynamic model of the study area. The field investigation was conducted by two crews of URS field staff operating from airboats hired for the project. The field crews were accompanied by William Terry of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) St. Louis District Office for most of the field investigation. A detailed report of the field program, its implementation and an analysis of the data were provided to the USACE as a deliverable on 9/28/2009 (URS, 2009). The two data sets explicitly used in the modeling analysis, the water elevations and the salinity data, are summarized here.

The study area and sampling stations are shown in Figure 15. Measurements of flow velocity, temperature, salinity and turbidity were collected periodically between July 21 and 23, 2009 at the primary stations (N1, N2, N3, S1, S2, and S3). Water level measurements were collected at stations N3 and S3 from July 20 to July 23, 2009 using temporary staff gauges and recording pressure transducers that were installed at these locations.

Less frequent flow velocity, temperature and salinity measurements were collected at the secondary locations (Oak River Channel, N4, N5, N6, S4, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, S10, and S11). Water depth measurements were collected at each of the primary and secondary locations, and at additional field locations (S12-S33) shown on Figure 16.

#### 2.7.1 Water Level

Staff gauges and recording pressure transducers were installed at locations S3 and N3 to measure water level fluctuations within the study area. The transducers used were Micro-Diver Dataloggers (Model DI601) manufactured by the Schlumberger Corporation. The data loggers were initially programmed to collect pressure measurements every five minutes in the units of feet of water. The sample interval was changed to 30 seconds after approximately 24 hours.

Staff gauges constructed of 1-inch diameter PVC pipe were also installed at locations S3 and N3. Periodic measurements of the water level at each staff gauge were recorded. The measured stage data collected at the two stations are shown in Figure 17. When compared to the tides at the Bay Gardene Station, it is evident that there is a significant loss of tidal amplitude as the tides propagate into the White Ditch area.

## 2.7.2 Salinity

Salinity data (as well as temperature and turbidity measurements) were collected at each primary location and other select locations (shown on Figure 15) using a HydroLab Quanta system. The median, maximum and minimum salinity at each station are shown in Figure 18. The SONRIS



salinity data are also shown in Figure 10b, and although the data represent different time periods, they show a general trend in the salinity patterns. The trends show a basic low to high salinity gradient from offshore to the NW as well as a high to low gradient from the east bank of the Mississippi River to the NE. The general gradients, even those in the White Ditch area, point towards the Caernarvon Diversion, indicating that it is a significant source of freshwater in the area.

Salinity measurements were also made at surface and bottom – the data indicate a very minor difference between top and bottom – less than 0.5 ppt.

A conceptual model for the analysis has been developed based on the project goals and the data summary. The key points considered in developing the conceptual model are discussed below:

- The area of interest is large with a network of inter-connecting channels and lakes with varying widths and depths. The land elevations and tide ranges indicate that the tidal flows will be contained to the channels during lower tide stages but may inundate the land segments during higher tide stages.
- The proposed Alternatives include relatively high flow rates, up to 100,000 cfs that will likely flood the land areas, at least in the vicinity of the discharge.
- The salinities are controlled by rainfall and evaporation and freshwater from the Caernarvon Diversion and the Mississippi River. The effects of the Mississippi river are inherent in the salinity data at the USGS gages near the southern extent of the study area.
- Salinity transport in the White Ditch area will also be affected by wind driven circulation.
- The time scale for salinity to reach steady state is relatively large for ambient conditions (including Caernarvon), on the order of one month but will be shorter for high-flow White Ditch diversions
- The proposed Alternatives include culverts to route freshwater to the White Ditch area and therefore these structures will require representation in the modeling analysis.
- The salinity data available from the field study indicate that there is very little vertical stratification, indicating the depth-averaged modeling is suitable

The components of the conceptual model that were developed based on the above considerations are described below:

- The model boundaries should extend from the Mississippi River levees from the northwest and southwest to the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet (MRGO) channel to the northeast and to the general vicinity of the Bay Gardene USGS station to the southeast. This domain includes the majority of the area influenced by the Caernarvon Diversion, which is important to properly represent its influence on the White Ditch area.
- The details of the intricate network of channels will need resolution in the model grid. The most detailed resolution should focus on White Ditch area but at least include large conveyance channels in the area to the east of the Oak River. This component will require grid cell dimension on the order of 10 to 30 meters in the White Ditch area.
- The model needs to include a simulation of tides, winds, diversion discharges, rainfall and evaporation and salinity transport.
- The simulations will require the representation of significant wetting and drying of land segments throughout the area, especially during larger White Ditch diversion flows
- The modeling analysis needs to represent the location and conveyance of culverts on the flow
- A 2D depth-average model is suitable for the analysis

### 4.1 MODEL SELECTION

A number of hydraulic models were considered for use in simulating the White Ditch diversion alternatives. The candidate models are listed below and organized into finite element and finite volume categories. In general, the finite element models have unstructured meshing capabilities that allow for the efficient detailed resolution of small features, However, they are difficult to implement in projects with large areas of wetting and drying, often requiring excessive bathymetric and topographic smoothing to achieve a stable solution.

*finite element models*  ADCIRC – unstructured mesh no salinity, poor wetting and drying FESWMS – unstructured mesh, no salinity, poor wetting and drying RMA2 – unstructured mesh, salinity transport poor wetting and drying

*finite volume models* 

- CMS– salinity transport, good wetting and drying rectilinear mesh
- EFDC salinity transport, good wetting and drying curvilinear mesh
- FVCOM unstructured mesh, good wetting and drying commercial availability
- POM– salinity transport, good wetting and drying curvilinear mesh

The finite difference models typically will not have any stability problems when considering wetting and drying, but often do not have the benefits of unstructured meshes since they typically use rectilinear or curvilinear structured meshes. The FVCOM model is unique in that it is a finite volume model that uses an unstructured mesh and therefore can realize the mesh generation benefits often associated with finite elements. However, the model is relatively new and limited to research applications. Non-research applications are occurring but model documentation and general industrial familiarity with the model are not mature. The remaining three finite volume models (CMS, EFDC and POM) all have similar capabilities and are suitable for the project.

Of those three, CMS is supported by the USACE and therefore was selected for the project. CMS-Flow is a process-based 2D depth-averaged hydrodynamic, sediment transport and morphology model developed by the USACE for application in and around inlets and channels. It is accessible via the Surfacewater Modeling System (SMS) graphical user interface (Militello, 2004; Buttolph, 2006).

### 4.2 MODEL DOMAIN AND GRID GENERATION

The model domain is shown in Figure 19. The domain includes all of the white ditch area as well as an extensive portion of Breton Sound. A primary reason for including the larger portion of Breton Sound was the potential influence of the diversion peak flows on the east of the Oaks River. Also, the channels providing flow pathways from the Caernarvon Diversion to the White Ditch area required inclusion since the Caernarvon Diversion flows provided a significant portion of the freshwater to the White Ditch area (the other freshwater source being rainfall).

To provide bathymetric data for the model grid, a project-specific bathymetric and topographic data set was developed. This data was then used to set the bottom elevation of the cells in the model grid. Initial experiments with the model indicated that the grid resolution in the White Ditch area would need to be on the order of 10 to 30 meters. This level of resolution would provide sufficient resolution of the channel features but allow for reasonable simulation times on high-end workstations. Therefore, the bathymetric and topographic data should have a minimum resolution of 10 meters in the White Ditch area.

The area bathymetry and topography were developed from existing bathymetric data, land/water boundary data and results from the project field survey. It was determined early in the bathymetric data development that existing bathymetric data were limited to areas above MSL and sets did not provide sufficient precision or resolution for direct use in the grid generation. Therefore the following approach was used to develop the bathymetric and topographic data set.

- 1. Acquire the most recent land/water boundary data
- 2. Update the land/water boundary data for Post Katrina conditions
- 3. Divide the land/water boundaries into small polygons representing channels, lakes, land segments and other features
- 4. Assign depth/elevation to each polygon
- 5. Convert the polygons to a 10 meter grid and export
- 6. Import the 10 meter grid into SMS and use to populate the CMS grid

Several datasets of land and water polygons were obtained for use in developing the bathymetric dataset; one from the Louisiana GIS Digital Map Compilation DVD (2007) and one from the ESRI Streetmap dataset. The land/water polygon data from the LA GIS Digital Map Compilation DVD was used to start the bathymetric data processing. This polygon data represents pre-Katrina conditions and is shown in Figure 20 overlaying post-Katrina aerial images. It is clear that there were some significant changes in the land mass as a result of Katrina in the White Ditch area, especially in the NW region. These changes were confirmed in a USGS study, the results of which are shown in Figure 21. Therefore, in order to update the land/water polygons, polygons from the ESRI dataset were merged with the LA GIS data and subsequently modified to best reflect the post-Katrina conditions. Additional digitizing was conducted so that the final set of polygons reflected the land and water boundaries as depicted in the most current aerial photography available for the area. Additional reviews of the polygon data set indicated that not all of the canals in the study area were completely represented in the processing up to this point. Canals not represented were digitized and canal water body connections that were inaccurate were modified. The final set of polygons is shown in Figures 22a and 22b.



The next step is to assign depth values to each of the polygons in the data set. As pointed out in Section 2, there was no comprehensive bathymetric data set available. In order to assign depths, information from the project bathymetric survey and NOAA nautical chart data were used. The first step was to set the land elevation. For this purpose, all of the survey data was pooled and sorted to identify the distribution and range. The distribution of the data is shown in Figure 23. There is a distinctive break in the distribution at elevation 0 ft (NAVD 88) that is likely representative of MSL, where the channel and lake banks are steepest. Assuming that most of the inter-tidal zones and land segments lie at or above 0 ft elevation, the data was filtered to eliminate values below 0 feet, and then resorted. The results are also shown in Figure 23, and indicate that the median land elevation is 1 foot NAVD 88. This value was adopted as the land elevation and all land polygons were assigned a depth of one foot.

In order to assign depth values to the canals and lakes, the survey data transects were processed and used to develop a suitable average depth for each cross-section. Each transect cross-section was clipped so that the only the portion below MSL remained. Then the hydraulic radius of the cross-section was calculated. Then the cross-section effective depth was calculated so that it would yield the same hydraulic radius as the original cross-section. This value was then assigned to the center point of the cross-section transect and used to assign depth values in the canal and lake polygons. The effective depths and their locations, as obtained by this procedure, are shown in Figure 24. The effective depth data did not provide sufficient information to assign depths to all canal and lake polygons. Therefore a generalized template for canal and lake depths was developed and used to assign the depths to the remaining polygons. A review of Figure 24 indicates that there is a general increase in the canal and lake depths from the NW to the SE. A template, shown in Figure 25, was developed using this trend.

After completing the depth assignments to each polygon, the depth data were interpolated from the polygons to a point grid. The point grid consisted of 10 m spacing in the White Ditch area and expanded to 50 m spacing to the east of the Oak River and to the SE. The 50 m resolution was necessary to keep the file size manageable and still provide sufficient resolution of key features. A view of the bathymetric data as reflected by the point grid is shown in Figure 26. An enlarged portion of the point grid data is shown in Figure 27, where the points are color coded by the assigned depths.

The point grid bathymetry dataset was imported into SMS, triangulated, and the depths were interpolated on to the CMS grid. Based on trials in the focus area near White Ditch, a 20 meter resolution was determined to be optimal for areas in the vicinity of the proposed diversion.

The grid was designed with 20 meter spacing in the White Ditch area with the cell spacing expanding to the SE and SW. In these regions of grid expansion, the grid was allowed to increase to a maximum grid cell size of 500 meters in order to keep the number of cells as low as possible and help manage simulation run time while still providing detailed resolution in the White Ditch study area. The final grid is shown in Figure 28. The green cells are 'inactive' and represent areas protected by levees or that are above 4 feet elevation. These cells are not used in the model simulations and are a by-product of the inherent CMS rectangular grid structure. A QAQC process was performed in order to ensure canal connections and other components necessary for accurate flow simulation were correctly implemented. Cell properties were adjusted manually where appropriate. The final grid contains 866,791 active cells in 992 Columns and 569 Rows. The bathymetry as represented in the final grid is shown in Figures 29 and 30. After some initial testing, a time step of 1.5 seconds was found to provide numerically



stable solutions, and the model simulations (including salinity transport) were determined to take about two days (48 hours) in order to simulate a one month period on an HP Workstation Z400 with an Intel 2.93 Ghz Xeon Quad processor and 8gb DD3 SDRam.

### 4.3 BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

The boundary conditions required for the White Ditch model simulations included:

- 1. Offshore tide elevation
- 2. Offshore salinity values
- 3. Flow boundaries (flow rate and salinity)
- 4. Rainfall and Evaporation
- 5. Wind Forcing

The location of each boundary application (for White Ditch location 3) is shown in Figure 31. Note that during the model calibration, it was found that the salinity calibration was sensitive to both the total flow rate from the Caernarvon Diversion as well as the split between the amounts assumed to flow through the Delacroix Canal to the west and the through Bayou Mandeville to the south. Therefore, the grid was modified slightly in the region of the Caernarvon Diversion so that the flow splits could be assigned directly.

The hydrodynamic and salinity calibration were conducted simultaneously. This was necessary because it was learned in the preliminary salinity calibration simulations that the salinity calibration was sensitive to the total flow and flow split assumed for the Caernarvon Diversion. Since these flow rates may influence the tidal response in the white ditch area, it was necessary to conduct the hydrodynamic and salinity calibration simultaneously.

The hydrodynamic calibration period was selected to coincide with the period for which the stage data was available from the project field program, namely the four day period July 20 through July  $24<sup>th</sup>$ . Preliminary testing with the model indicated that the tidal flows required a relatively short spin-up period, on the order of one-week, but it was found that the salinity simulations required a much longer spin-up period.

The salinity calibration focused on the same period for data comparison, July  $20<sup>th</sup>$  through July 24<sup>th</sup>, for which salinity data was available from the project field program. After some preliminary testing with the model, it was found that a two-month spin-up was required to eliminate the effects of the initial conditions on the solution.

For the calibration simulation, the model was configured with measured wind, tide, rainfall, evaporation, salinity and Caernarvon flow data corresponding to the calibration period. For the evaporation, the average value of 5 mm/day adopted from the Cooke et al. (2008) study was used. The tide, wind and Caernarvon flow data are shown in Figure32. For the Caernarvon diversion flows, freshwater was assumed, and the corresponding salinity was assigned a value of zero. The initial salinity in the grid domain was set to 7.0 ppt which was an approximate average value of the calibration data.

The key calibration parameters are:

- 1. Bottom Fiction (Manning's n)
- 2. Lateral Dispersion
- 3. Fresh Water flow and flow split from Caernarvon

The calibration simulations indicated that the hydrodynamic calibration was most sensitive to the bottom friction, with a minor sensitivity to the Carnarvon flow splits. The salinity calibration was most sensitive to the Caernarvon Diversion flow rate and flow split, with a lower level of sensitivity to the lateral dispersion.

An initial range for the lateral dispersion was obtained by considering the length scales of the water bodies in the White Ditch area and the length-scale dependent dispersion values from data summarized by Fischer (1979). For this analysis, a length scale was developed by taking the square-root of the area of each of the polygons used to represent each water body and then selecting the median value. The median value is approximately 300 meters, for which the associated dispersion coefficient is  $10 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$ .

During some initial sensitivity simulations, it was found that the stage calibration was difficult to obtain using a reasonable range of values to the friction and dispersion parameters. Eventually, the difficulty was traced to the gage Datum of the Bay Gardene stage data used as a boundary condition on the southeast boundary of the grid. After some investigation and discussions with USGS staff familiar with the gage it was determined that there was some uncertainty in the gage datum, and therefore an adjustment to the gage data was developed. More details of the investigation are discussed in Appendix A. The adjustment to the gage data consisted of a shift in



the stage that was based on some sensitivity of the calibration to the measured stage data. Figure 33 shows the results of the sensitivity analysis for the cases of no shift, a 0.5 foot shift and a one foot shift in the Bay Gardene stage data. For the 0.5 and 1.0 shifts, the simulated response shows a much smaller tide range. This is caused by the inundation of the land segments when the water elevations are higher. The inundation dampens the tide signal causing the lower tide range. The 1.0 shift for the Bay Gardene data was adopted for the modeling calibration and all subsequent alternatives analysis simulations.

The rational for adjusting the Carnarvon total flow is that the model grid domain does not contain the entire area influenced by the diversion flow. Therefore, only a portion of the flow actually drains through the region covered by the model grid. The remaining portion of the flow drains towards the MRGO channel that is not represented in the model grid. Thus, it is appropriate to reduce the Carnarvon flow rates so that they better represent the flow entering the area covered by the model gird. The "best" reduction level was determined via the salinity calibration.

It was also found that the salinity calibration was sensitive, albeit to a smaller degree, to the assumed split of the Caernarvon flow to the west and the south. As discussed in Section 2, historically the portion flowing to the west, directly towards the White Ditch area, was about 20 to 30 percent. However, it is believed by local land managers that after Hurricane Katrina, the percentage flowing directly to the west is lower, due to blockage of many of the smaller canals, and is currently about 5 to 10 percent.

After assigning the dispersion value, a sequence of final calibration simulations were completed in which the bottom friction and the total flow and flow split for the Caernarvon were systematically altered. The final calibration was obtained with the following parameter values:

- Manning's n: 0.021
- Dispersion Coefficient:  $10 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$
- Amount of Measured Caernarvon Flow applied: 58.2%
- Amount of Applied Caernarvon Flow directed to the west:  $5\%$

The final stage calibration is shown in Figure 34. The simulated stage calibration indicates that the model represents the measured tide amplitude reduction and phase shifts at stations S3 and N3. A typical time series of the salinity response in the White Ditch area is shown in Figure 35. The decrease in the salinity values for all but the most offshore station from the initial conditions and the asymptotic characteristic of the final values are evident in the time series data. The values for station 39 increase, because it is closest to the offshore boundary and less influenced by the freshwater flow from the Caernarvon diversion. The influence of the tidal excursion is also most evident at this station.

The final salinity calibration results are shown in Figure 36 and represent the time-averaged salinity values over the last four days of the simulation, which correspond to the time period of the measured values obtained during the project field program. The spatial gradients and the actual salinity levels are well represented in the simulated results. The largest discrepancy occurs in the southern station (Simulated Salinity Point 37) where the model results slightly under-predict the salinity levels.

## 6.1 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The calibrated CMS hydrodynamic and salinity transport model was configured to simulate the impacts of 12 alternative diversion designs. The alternatives are located in either of two locations referred to as Location 2 and Location 3 as indicated in Figure 2. The USACE initially considered another location (Location 1) but that location was discarded and not considered for modeling evaluation.

The alternative design at Location 2 is connected to the Mississippi River with a box culvert and consists of two main outfall channels and three distribution channels, as indicated in Figure 37. Culverts are distributed along the channels to enhance the connectivity to the wetlands, and plugs are placed at some junctures to control the flow. There is a short final outfall channel connecting the second main outfall channel and the Oak River

The configuration for Location 3 is shown in Figure 38. At this location, there is one main outfall channel connected to a second channel with a natural alignment. Ridges align the channels and some plugs are included.

At each alternative location, six design diversion flow rates were considered. For each flow rate a different channel cross-sectional area was used and therefore a flow-specific model grid was configured for each of the six different flow capacities at each of the two locations (for a total of 12 grids). Flow capacities for the twelve unique grid configurations are shown in Table A.

For each alternative location and flow rate, the channels were represented in the model grid by adjusting the grid cell elevations within the footprint of each channel. Examples of crosssections for the 5000 cfs capacity flow rate at Location 2 are shown in Figure 39 and shown for the 5000 cfs capacity flow rate at Location 3 in Figures 40a – 40c. In general the cross-section widths and depths increased as the design flow rates increased. An example of the 35,000 cfs flow-rate grid at Location 2 is shown in Figure 41. The corresponding grid for the 35,000 cfs flow-rate grid is shown in Figure 42.

The boundary conditions locations and implementation for these alternatives grids were identical to those used in the model calibration grid (i.e. existing conditions grid) except for the addition of the White Ditch diversion flow. A flow rate boundary condition cell string was created at the beginning of the main diversion channel for application of the diversion flow rate in the model simulations.

The evaluation of the alternatives was implemented in three phases:

- 1. Preliminary Evaluation/Initial Screening
- 2. Sea-level Rise Simulations
- 3. Long-term Simulations of the 35,000 cfs Flow Rate at Location 3

Each of these evaluations is described below.

## 6.2 PRELIMINARY EVALUATION/INITIAL SCREENING

A preliminary evaluation of the alternatives was conducted with a 29 day simulation. These simulations provided evaluations of the impact of the diversion flow on water elevations and salinity levels through-out the White Ditch area. For these simulations, the Caernarvon



Diversion flow was set to 8000 cfs and the water elevations for the Bay Gardene station for the period of July 2009 were used at the offshore boundary.

Instantaneous plots of the salinity distribution during the start-up of the diversions are shown in Figure 43 for Location 2 and in Figure 44 for Location 3. The freshwater flow through the diversion channels and culverts into the wetlands is evident in the sequence of plots.

As the simulations were completed, the model results were processed and delivered to the USACE for subsequent analysis. The main post-processing for these simulations were maps of the time-averaged salinity and water depth over the last week of simulation, during which conditions were quasi-steady, and varying only due to tidal effects. An example of the average salinity conditions for Location 2 35,000 flow-rate design conditions is shown in Figure 45. The corresponding plot of the time-average water depths is shown in Figure 46.

# 6.3 SEA LEVEL RISE SIMULATIONS

Twelve 90-day sea-level rise simulations were configured and are described in Table B. For these simulations, the existing no project conditions were used and there was no flow simulated from White Ditch. As indicated in Table B, both the Caernarvon flow rate and tide (sea) level were varied. Each sea-level rise was implemented by adding the rise to the water elevation time series used at the offshore boundary condition. The water elevations for the Bay Gardene station for the period of June through August were used for these simulations. Details of the sea-level rise scenarios designated in Table B are listed in Table C.

# 6.4 LONG TERM SIMULATIONS AT LOCATION 3

Seven additional alternatives were completed using the 35000 cfs capacity grid at Location 3. Three simulations represented a 90 day period using the Bay Gardene water elevation data for June – August, 2009 at the offshore boundary conditions. The diversion flows were steady at 10000, 15000, and then 35000 cfs, respectively. The flow at the Caernarvon Diversion was 1200 cfs. The results of these simulations were delivered to the USACE for further evaluation.

The remaining four simulations were 17 months long and were completed using the Location 3 35000 cfs flow capacity model grid. These model runs simulated conditions beginning during a Spring season and continuing through the Summer of the following year. Flow rates at both the White Ditch diversion and the Caernarvon diversion were varied throughout the simulation period. The flow conditions for each scenario are shown in Table D.

The 17 months of simulation time was divided into eight consecutive simulations. The first seven (a through g) each simulated two months time and the eighth simulation (h) simulated the final three-month period. The labels a through h at the top of Table D indicates the simulation period. For simulations 1 and 2, the simulations were started at period d, using the solutions at the end of the previous 90 day simulations.

Tide inputs for these long term simulations were taken from measured data at Bay Gardene Station for the entire year 2009. Data from March through December 2009 were used for the initial ten months of simulation, and then data from January through July 2009 were used during the last seven months of simulation.

Time series plots of salinity at seven observation locations within the model grid are shown for simulation 3 in Figure 47a and simulation 4 in Figure 47b. The impact of the high White Ditch Diversion flow rates during period a and f and g are very evident in the time series and the response time of the salinity levels in the White Ditch area can be inferred from these time series. A plot of the time-averaged salinity over the final three months of simulation period (Simulation 3h) for long-term Simulation 3 is shown in Figure 48.

The CMS Flow model was successfully configured and calibrated for the White Ditch area for simulations of tide, flow and salinity. The model was subsequently used to evaluate various alternative designs and operational scenarios for the White Ditch diversion.

During the calibration and implementation of the CMS Flow model, a number of assumptions and data limitations were identified that were required in order to complete the modeling analysis within the project schedule. In anticipation of a need for additional modeling analysis, it is recommended that additional data collection be completed to reduce the number of assumptions and limitations. The data categories are:

- 1. Additional bathymetric and topographic data
- 2. Additional water level and salinity data
- 3. Flow measurements geared towards verifying westward flow patterns from the Caernarvon Diversion
- 4. Better understanding of rainfall and evaporation runoff from the land segments

Each of these topics is discussed below.

#### *Bathymetric and topographic data*

The original survey data focused on the areas adjacent to the proposed diversion. Scheduling considerations and access rights prevent survey data collection from areas to the northwest, southeast and across the Oaks River area. Aerial images since the impact of Hurricane Katrina have provided suitable data for delineating the dense network of canals, streams and lakes, but the water depths and land elevations are not well documented. For the development of the existing model, assumptions for the water depths and land elevations were made based on the spatial patterns derived from the available project surveys. It is recommended that additional data, similar to the survey data collected as part of this project, also be collected. The ridge along the Oaks River north and south of the previous survey area should also be surveyed, as this is an important feature in the project area, controlling flows from the project area into the Oaks River.

Another area for survey data collection is along the canals that connect the Caernarvon Diversion to the Oaks River. During the model calibration it was found that Caernarvon Diversion flow westward to the Oaks River area had a strong impact on the salinity in the project area. Thus, an improved delineation of the flow-ways would enhance the reliability of the model.

#### *Additional Water Level and Salinity Data*

The model calibration data set consisted of a few days of continuous water elevations at two stations in the central area of the project. Salinity data consisted of point measurements at about eight stations around the central project area. Although this data set did provide reasonable constraints of water elevation and salinity, a more rigorous model calibration could be made if continuous water elevation and salinity data could be obtained. It is recommended that continuous monitoring of water elevation and salinity be made at stations spanning the entire project area, and in the vicinity of the flow-ways connecting the Caernarvon Diversion flows to the Oaks River. At least three stations would be located in the projected area, one each in the north, central and southern portion of the project area. An additional station should be located east of the Oaks River, in one of the major flow-ways connecting the Caernarvon Diversion flows to the Oaks River. Measurements should be made for at least two weeks (a complete spring-neap tide cycle), and preferably over a month or more to collect data under a larger



variety of conditions. Consideration should be given to collecting data during high and low Caernarvon Diversion flows.

The need for sensor maintenance during deployment in a marine environment should be considered in identifying station locations.

All water elevation sensors should be surveyed so that they can be referenced to the same vertical datum of the bathymetric and topographic survey data.

#### *Flow measurements for verifying westward flow patterns from the Caernarvon Diversion*

During the model calibration, it was found that the simulated salinities in the project area were sensitive to assumptions as to the total amount of Caernarvon Diversion flow that traveled westward and south-westward towards the Oaks River and project area. At that time, only antidotal estimates of the flow rates were available, mainly from observations of persons familiar with the area. Thus, additional data collection to establish the flow rates would be very useful in enhancing the model calibration. Flow measurements should be made at 2 to 5 stations in flowways connecting the Caernarvon Diversion to the Oaks River. Measurements should be made every 1 to 2 hours over a 24-hour period. (or 12-hour period if access is not feasible at night). At least one set of flow measurements should be collected during a spring tide and one during a neap tide.

#### *Better understanding of rainfall and evaporation runoff from the land segments*

Another model parameter that affected the salinity in the project area was the rainfall and evaporation rates. During the model calibration, assumption of the rainfall water balance (evaporation, direct run-off and infiltration and groundwater discharge) had to be made. It is recommended that two or three pressure gages be installed in shallow wells to provide continuous water table surface elevation and salinity data during the same period that the continuous surface water measurements are being recorded. The well should be able to be installed using a hand auger due to the shallow depths. The pressure sensors should also be surveyed to provide the data referenced to the same vertical datum as the bathymetric and topographic data. The installation of automatic rainfall gages and pan evaporation measurement systems should considered at each of the well locations.

- Buttolph, A. M.; Reed, C. W.; Kraus, N. C.; Ono, N.; Larson, M.; Camenen, B.; Hanson, H.; Wamsley, T. and Zundel, A. K., 2006. Two-Dimensional Depth-Averaged Circulation Model CMS-M2D: Version 3.0, Report 2, Sediment Transport and Morphology Change. Coastal and Hydraulics Laboratory Technical Report ERDC/CHL-TR-06-7. Vicksburg, MS: US Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- Cooke, William H. III, Katarzna Grala, Charles L. Wax, A Method for Estimating Pan Evaporation for Inland and Coastal Regions of the Southeastern U.S. , Southeastern geographer, 48(2) 2008: pp. 149–171.
- Fischer, H., List, J., Koh, R., Imberger, J., Brooks, N., Mixing in Inland and Coastal Waters, (Academic Press, Inc., Orlando) 1979.
- Militello, A., Reed, C.W., Zundel, A.K., and Kraus, N.C. 2004. Two-Dimensional Depth-Averaged Circulation Model M2D: Version 2.0, Report 1, Technical Documentation and User's Guide, ERDC/CHL TR-04-2, U.S. Army Research and Development Center, Coastal and Hydraulics Laboratory, Vicksburg, MS.
- URS, White Ditch Filed Program Results, 2009, Submitted to the USACE.

# **TABLES**

	<b>Flow Rate</b>
	(cfs)
	5,000 cfs
ິ	10,000 cfs
ocation	15,000 cfs
	35,000 cfs
	70,000 cfs
	100,000 cfs
	5,000 cfs
S	10,000 cfs
nonipoc	15,000 cfs
	35,000 cfs
	70,000 cfs
	100,000 cfs

**Table A. Grid Configurations and Flow Capacities.**

**Table B. No Project Simulations Boundary Conditions.** 

<b>Simulation</b> ID	<b>Caernarvon</b> Flow (cfs)	<b>Sea Level Rise</b> <b>Scenario</b>
2000	8,000	2009 Low
2500	2,800	2009 Low
3000	200	2009 Low
3500	8,000	2065 Low
4000	2,800	2065 Low
4500	200	2065 Low
5000	8,000	2065 Moderate
5500	2,800	2065 Moderate
6000	200	Moderate 2065
6500	8,000	High 2065
7000	2,800	High 2065
7500	200	High 2065

<b>Scenario</b>								
Year	Low feet	<b>Intermediate</b> feet	<b>High feet</b>					
2009	0	0	0					
2015	0.2	0.2	0.3					
2020	0.3	0.4	0.5					
2025	0.5	0.6	0.8					
2030	0.7	0.8	1.1					
2035	0.8	1	1.4					
2040	1	1.2	1.8					
2045	1.2	1.4	2.1					
2050	1.3	1.6	2.5					
2055	1.5	1.8	2.9					
2060	1.7	2.1	3.3					
2065	1.8	2.3	3.7					

**Table C. Sea Level Rise Scenarios.** 

Model Simulation Run By		Flow Input Location	a			b		C			e				g				
		March	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	Mav	June	July	
Simulation	<b>USACE</b>	White Ditch							1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	35000	1000	1000	1000
		Caernarvon							500	450	750	1750	2600	3000	2000	1500	1050	950	1000
Simulation	<b>USACE</b>	<b>White Ditch</b>							0	0	$\Omega$		$\Omega$	0	0	35000		0	0
2		Caernarvon							500	450	750	1750	2600	3000	2000	1500	1050	950	1000
Simulation	<b>URS</b>	<b>White Ditch</b>	35000	0	$\Omega$		$\Omega$		0	0	$\Omega$	0	15000	20000	35000	0		0	$\mathbf 0$
3	Caernarvon	2000	1500	1050	950	1000	650	500	450	750	1750	500	500	500	1500	1050	950	1000	
Simulation <b>URS</b>	<b>White Ditch</b>	35000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	15000	20000	35000	1000	1000	1000	1000	
	Caernarvon	2000	1500	1050	950	1000	650	500	450	750	1750	500	500	500	1500	1050	950	1000	

**Table D. Boundary Condition Inputs for Long-Term Simulations at Location 3.** 

**Table E. Time Period and Naming Convention for Long-term Simulations at Location 3.**

	Total Hours	Begin Month	<b>End Month</b>
SIM 3a, 4a	1464	March	April
SIM 3b, 4b	1464	May	June
SIM 3c, 4c	1488	July	August
SIM 1d, 2d, 3d, 4d	1464	September	October
SIM 1e, 2e, 3e, 4e	1464	November	December
SIM 1f, 2f, 3f, 4f	1416	January	February
SIM 1g, 2g, 3g, 4g	1464	March	April
SIM 1h, 2h, 3h, 4h	2208	May	July

# **FIGURES**



Figure 1. Study Area.



Figure 2. Alternative Locations.



Figure 3. Existing DEM and Contour Data.



Figure 4. Station Locations.



Figure 5. Sample Tide Record.



Figure 6. Monthly Average Tide Stage at the Bay Gardene Station for Period 2000–2009.



Figure 7. Wind and Rainfall Station Locations.



Figure 8. Pilot East 2008 Wind Rose.





Figure 9. Belle Chasse Rainfall Data.



Figure 10a. Monthly Average Salinity at the Bay Gardene Station for Year 2009.


Figure 10b. SONRIS Salinity Data.



Figure 11. Seasonal Flows from Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion.



Figure 12. Transect Locations.



Figure 13. Sample of the Surveyed Cross-Sections.



Figure 14. Sample of the Surveyed Cross-Sections.



Figure 15. Salinity and Velocity Sampling Stations.



Figure 16. Additional URS Field Locations.



Figure 17. Measured Stage Data.



Figure 18. Salinity Sampling Results.



Figure 19. Model Domain.



Figure 20. Water Polygon Data from the LA GIS Digital Map Compilation DVD.



Figure 21. USGS Water Area Changes Study Results.



Figure 22a. Final Polygon Set.



Figure 22b. Final Polygon Set in White Ditch Study Area.





Figure 23. Survey Data Distribution.



Figure 24. Effective Depths and Locations from Cross-Section Transect Data.



Figure 25. Template of Water Body Depths.



Figure 26. Scatter Set Used for Grid Generation.



Figure 27. Enlarged Portion of Point Grid Data.



Figure 28. Final Grid and Grid Information.



Figure 29. Depth Contours.



Figure 30. Grid Cell Resolution in area of interest (top) and showing number of cells in canals and rivers (right).



Figure 31. Grid with Boundary Cellstring Locations.



Figure 32. Boundary Input Data.



Figure 33. Sensitivity of the Tide Calibration to the Datum Shifts in the Bay Gardene Stage Data.



Figure 34. Final Stage Calibration.



Figure 35. Typical Response of Salinity During a Calibration Simulation (Point locations are shown on Figure 36).



Figure 36. Final Salinity Calibration (all values in ppt).



Figure 37. Location 2.



Figure 38. Location 3.



Figure 39. Location 2 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections.



Figure 40a. Location 3 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections.



Figure 40b. Location 3 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections.



Figure 40c. Location 3 5000 cfs Capacity Cross-Sections.



Figure 41. 35,000 cfs Capacity Alternative 2 Depth Contours.



Figure 42. 35,000 cfs Capacity Alternative 3 Depth Contours.


Figure 43. Sequence of Salinity Distributions at Location 2 with 35,000 cfs Capacity Grid.



Figure 44. Sequence of Salinity Distributions at Location 3 with 35,000 cfs Capacity Grid.



Figure 45. Time-averaged Salinities for Final 7 days of the Simulation at Location 2.



Figure 46. Time-averaged Water Depths for Final 7 days of the Simulation at Location 2.



Figure 47a. Simulation 3 Salinity Time Series Results at Points throughout the White Ditch Area (Point Locations shown on Figure 36).



Figure 47b. Simulation 4 Salinity Time Series Results at Points throughout the White Ditch Area (Point Locations shown on Figure 36).



Appendix A Discussion of Bay Gardene Tide Gage Datum The White Ditch hydrodynamic and salinity model developed by URS uses the USGS Bay Gardene tide data for the offshore water elevation boundary condition. During the model calibration it was not possible to obtain a tidal calibration to measured data in the White Ditch area without shifting the reported elevation of the tide data. The shift used was approximately 1 foot downward.

The Bay Gardene tide data is reported as NAVD 88 and the mean tide elevation for one or more year period is approximately one foot. The typical spring tide range is about 2 feet. The local survey data in the White Ditch are indicates that the median land elevation (based on numerous survey points on transects across the area) is about 1 foot. Thus during the rising tide, it is expected that the land will be inundated and during a falling tide the inundated areas would become dry. This was reproduced in the model simulations, but it causes a severe attenuation of the tide range in the White Ditch area, so much so that there was no possibility of matching the measured tide range in the area with adjustments to the friction or mixing parameters.

Local knowledge of the area, based on discussion with airboat operators who spend a significant amount of time in the area indicate that during normal tides the land areas do not become submerged, even at high tides. The only exception is during the month of September when high offshore water levels associate with predominant southeasterly winds causes a setup in the White Ditch area. In order to reconcile some of these findings an investigation of the tidal datum for the Bay Gardene gage was made. The findings of this investigation are summarized as follows:

- The USGS indicates that the gage was reset with the last year and there is larger than normal uncertainty in the accuracy of the gage datum (NAVD88)
- NOAA is not aware of or is not using the datum data that the USGS generated (no MSL to NAVD 88 info). NOAA has no published website Benchmark Page and they do not publish a NAVD to MSL conversion for the Bay Gardene gage.
- The NOAA VDATUM software quotes the uncertainty of datum conversions in the east Louisiana and Mississippi area as 17.1 cm (65% chance that actual area is below this level)
- Discussion with Garron Ross of USGS (referred to by Scott Beddingfield) indicates that there is a good degree of uncertainty in the tidal benchmark at Bay Gardene and that the USGS plans to re-survey it using a state-of-the-art GPS system in the near future, possibly publishing it in Summer 2010. The current gage was remounted about a year ago, and an expedient method of establishing the gage datum was used. Mr. Ross also pointed out that the Bay Gardene data of summer 2009 is still provisional, and noted that there was a sudden 0.5 foot shift in the data back in January.

These findings indicate that there is sufficient uncertainty in the Bay Gardene gage datum to allow for some adjustment of the stage levels in the modeling analysis.