

LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA
MISSISSIPPI RIVER HYDRODYNAMIC AND DELTA
MANAGEMENT STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT

Notice of Intent & Public Scoping Meetings
New Orleans, Louisiana

The above-entitled cause came in for a meeting at the Port of New Orleans, 1350 Port of New Orleans Place, New Orleans, Louisiana, on Thursday, April 12, 2012, commencing at 6:30 p.m.

BEFORE:

TIFFENY SUIRE GALLARDO
Certified Court Reporter
In and For the State of
Louisiana

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
♀

A P P E A R A N C E S

LEE MUELLER, USACE, MODERATOR
RENEE SANDERS, CPRA OF LA
CHERIE PRICE, USACE
SANDRA STILES, USACE
BREN HAASE, CPRA OF LA

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
♀

* * * * *

I N D E X

	PAGE
APPEARANCES.2
PROCEEDINGS.4
Presentation by Renee Sanders.6
Presentation by Cherie Price	12
Presentation by Sandra Stiles.	17
Informal Question & Answer Session	21
Formal Scoping Session	36
REPORTER' S CERTIFICATE	46

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
♀

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. MUELLER:

Good evening Ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Lee Mueller. I work with the Public Affairs Office at the Army Corps of Engineers. I'd like to thank you for joining us tonight to discuss the Louisiana Coastal Area Mississippi River Hydrodynamic & Delta Management Study.

At this time, I'd like to introduce several team members we have here with us this evening. We have Bren Haase, who's a planning manager with CPRA; Wes

15 Leblanc, a program manager with CPRA;
16 Renee Sanders, Study Manager, CPRA,
17 Micaela Coner, Study Manager, CPRA;
18 Summer Langlois, Environmental Manager,
19 CPRA; Chuck Perrodin, Public
20 Information Director is behind you;
21 Ehab Meselhe, CPRA Contractor. And
22 then for some of our Corps team
23 members, we have Darryl Broussard,
24 Senior Project Manager with the Corps;
25 Tim Aston, Senior Planner with the

♀

5

1 Corps; Sandra Stiles with the
2 Environmental Branch; Cherie Price, the
3 Planner for the Corps; and Danny
4 Wiegand, Planner with the Corps as
5 well.

6 As you can see, tonight is the
7 second of six public scoping meetings
8 we're going to be holding in the month
9 of April, jointly with CPRA and the
10 Corps. So if you have family and
11 friends that you think will be
12 interested, please let them know.
13 We'll be out four more times this
14 month.

15 Let's talk a little bit about what
16 we'll be covering. First, we'll go
17 ahead and start with talking about the
18 LCA Program. Then we'll move into some
19 details about the Hydrodynamic & Delta

20 Management Study. And then go ahead
21 and outline the NEPA Scoping Process.

22 So we recognize some of our
23 planners and study managers speaking
24 lingo that you guys may not be familiar
25 with. For that reason, we'll host an

♀

6

1 informal question/answer session.
2 We'll have a walk-around mic. You guys
3 can go ahead and raise your hands.
4 This is the opportunity for the team to
5 address your questions as best as
6 possible.

7 Now, if you don't have a question
8 but you do have a comment, a complaint,
9 complement, maybe, please save those
10 for the last part. That's going to be
11 the formal scoping period. Tonight, we
12 do have a court reporter with us.
13 She's going to go ahead and get all
14 your comments on the record. The team
15 cannot respond to your comments. This
16 is strictly for a on-the-record
17 purpose.

18 So just to reiterate why we're here
19 tonight is to gather some public input
20 on the development of the LCA
21 Mississippi River Hydrodynamic & Delta
22 Management Study.

23 So with that, I'll turn it over to
24 Renee Sanders with CPRA.

25 (PRESENTATION BY RENEE SANDERS)

♀

7

1 On behalf of the State, welcome.
2 We're excited to have you here and talk
3 about the LCA Hydrodynamic & Delta
4 Management Project. I'll give a little
5 bit of an overview of the LCA Program.

6 It stands for the Louisiana Coastal
7 Area Program. It was finalized in late
8 2004, 2005. It was a report that
9 listed details on short-term projects,
10 projects that were from about five to
11 ten years that took to implement. And
12 there was some other projects that were
13 listed in there that required longer
14 than five to ten years to implement.
15 This project is one of those.

16 The report had six long-term
17 studies identified in it. This project
18 is going to take two of those studies
19 and combine them into one.

20 This map is an LCA project map that
21 shows the 15 near-term projects, most
22 of which have not been developed or
23 have been built. Two of them have, and
24 that's Caernarvon and Davis Pond. Many
25 of you are familiar with those. That's

♀

8

1 Nos. 14 and 15 on the slide.

2 The other projects that are listed

3 in there are in various stages of
4 completion. Some of them are in design
5 phase, engineering and design, for
6 example, White Ditch, Blind River,
7 Amite, Terrebonne. There have some
8 other projects that are in the
9 feasibility stage, meaning, they're
10 still being studied. The benefits and
11 the impacts are still being evaluated.
12 Those include Myrtle Grove, as well as,
13 Caernarvon and Davis Pond.

14 The next map shows the proposed
15 project area. It begins around the
16 Gulf of Mexico and extends all the way
17 up to Vicksburg. The reason it goes to
18 Vicksburg is because part of the
19 modeling that will be in the river
20 needs to be extended that far to
21 capture some of the in-river impacts
22 and intricacies that are going on
23 around the Old River Control Structure.

24 There's a little portion that's
25 around the southwest column that goes

♀

9

1 around the shoreline, and that's to
2 include the longshore drifts. So
3 whatever sediments, nutrients, and
4 water are being transported along the
5 coast to the Texas area, that's why
6 that portion is being included.

7 Once we get further in the process,

8 this project area, the study area will
9 be refined into a project area. And
10 that's where we'll look more detailed
11 into the particulars of that area, the
12 soil properties, how much sediment is
13 in the river, how can we best utilize
14 those resources.

15 So some quick facts about this
16 particular project, an overview. This
17 project was part of the WRDA or the
18 Water Resources Development Act of 2007
19 - did I go backwards. No problem.

20 So this project will produce one
21 Environmental Impact Statement, and
22 that will describe the benefits and the
23 impacts of the project. So, again,
24 this study is a combination of two
25 completely different studies that are

♀

10

1 being combined, and they're intimately
2 related. One of them is the
3 hydrodynamic portion that includes the
4 in-river modeling. The second project
5 is the delta management. And that's
6 more of how do we best utilize the
7 sediment, and how do we implement the
8 projects.

9 The study is supposed to take
10 somewhere around five years and \$25.3
11 million to complete. It will build
12 upon existing information. So we're

13 not starting from scratch. A lot of
14 the model that we'll use are already
15 designed. They'll just be tweaked or
16 different things will be added to the
17 model to best utilize the existing
18 models that we have.

19 This project for the hydrodynamic
20 portion of the study will evaluate the
21 Mississippi River system. And what I
22 mean by that is looking at how much
23 sediment is available, what are the
24 river resources, where are they, how do
25 we best utilize. We're going to develop

♀

11

1 tools to evaluate those resources. And
2 then we'll also figure out how to best
3 implement the restoration strategies to
4 achieve a more sustainable delta coast.

5 Traditionally, the river has been
6 managed for flood protection and
7 navigation. And this particular study
8 will give us a chance to elevate the
9 importance of ecosystem restoration as
10 an important service that the river
11 provides.

12 The delta management report, the
13 portion of this project will focus on
14 identifying features that will provide
15 for a more sustainable delta coast.
16 And, originally, the 2004 report
17 mentioned large diversions greater than

18 50,000 cfs and alternative navigation
19 alignments.

20 We've also expanded that to include
21 other restoration features. The study
22 will be heavily influenced by the 2012
23 Master Plan. So the study will help us
24 better inform the placement and
25 operations of diversions. It will

♀

12

1 better define measurements and analysis
2 that will need to occur to implement
3 these diversions or other large-scale
4 restoration features. And it will also
5 provide us some information necessary
6 for Congressional authorizations for
7 these projects.

8 With that, I'd like to turn it over
9 to Cherie.

10 (PRESENTATION BY CHERIE PRICE)

11 MS. CHERIE PRICE:

12 Hello, everyone. I am Cherie Price
13 with the Corps of Engineers. I am the
14 Planner on the study, along with Danny
15 Weigand. And we want to thank you all
16 for coming out tonight.

17 As part of the Corps planning
18 process, we develop problems, we
19 identify the problems and issues that
20 we're dealing with in the study area,
21 and we identify opportunities that are
22 available to us through the execution

23 of the study. And we also identify
24 goals and objectives. And I'm going to
25 go through some of those with you.

♀

13

1 So, as Renee said, historically,
2 there have been two focus areas on the
3 Mississippi River: Navigation, which
4 has benefitted this State and Nation
5 very well and, also, the flood damages
6 reduction system to protect communities
7 surrounding the Mississippi River.

8 And now we're adding an additional
9 layer of use on the river, which is
10 trying to tap into the river resources
11 of sediment, water, and nutrients for
12 coastal restoration.

13 We're all familiar with the
14 subsidence, the sinking of the land,
15 and the erosional processes that
16 coastal Louisiana faces. When we're
17 looking at building or implementing
18 coastal restoration measures through
19 artificial means, such as diversions
20 and dedicated dredging, we're looking
21 at some very complex processes.

22 It's going to take us a little time
23 through this study to try to understand
24 those processes better to make sure
25 that the investments made are worth it,

♀

14

1 and we are affecting the coast in the

2 best possible way.

3 The Gulf of Mexico, as everyone
4 knows, is encroaching our communities
5 currently and will continue to do that
6 into the future.

7 So some of the study opportunities.
8 This is going to be one of the most
9 extensive data collection and
10 comprehensive systemwide modeling
11 efforts on the Mississippi River to
12 date. And we need that information to
13 fully understand the impacts of large-
14 scale sediment removal, water removal.
15 It's going to be very critical for us
16 to get to that place so that we can
17 make informed management decisions.

18 We would like to more effectively
19 manage the river resources to get the
20 sediment from the river and put it in
21 the areas where it's needed to
22 determine how to retain those sediments
23 once we get them into the marsh.

24 Influence processes which support
25 land forms and elevations. We've got

♀

15

1 to keep the marsh. We've got to keep
2 up with sea-level rise and with
3 subsidence rates and keep the marsh
4 above water.

5 Adjusting bay-side hydrology is
6 focusing primarily on actions such as

7 degrading oil and gas canals,
8 spoil banks, determining what widths and
9 depths of the outfall area are going to
10 be the best suited to build land to
11 retain sediments in certain areas.

12 It's not just going to be the river.
13 The delta management part of the study
14 is going to be focused mostly on trying
15 to determine how to be effective in the
16 bay areas.

17 Our broad-based overall study goal
18 here is to reconnect Mississippi River
19 resources to the surrounding delta, and
20 to also do that in balance with our
21 existing missions on the river of
22 navigation and flood control.

23 Again, these are our more specific
24 study objectives. These are the things
25 that we're going to be targeting

♀

16

1 specifically as we go through the
2 study. And all of these are drafts at
3 this point and time because we have
4 just started the study. We're looking
5 for input from the public and from
6 others to help guide this process so
7 that we can develop the best objectives
8 as possible.

9 So our first objective is to
10 identify those quantities that support
11 long-term sustainable restoration. We

12 don't want to just build land that's
13 going to be there now. We want it to
14 be there over the 50-year period of
15 analysis at year 50 and even beyond.

16 Providing a decision-making
17 framework is important. All of the
18 data that we're going to be collecting
19 through the study to fill those data
20 gaps that we've had on the river
21 historically. All of that data and all
22 of the modeling tools that are going to
23 be developed will be used - that's my
24 phone.

25 So everything that's produced

♀

17

1 through the study. The bayside models,
2 the riverine models, the data that we
3 collect, any other analysis, the
4 ecological modeling is going to be an
5 important component of the study as we
6 look at tradeoffs throughout the study.
7 All this information is going to be
8 used together as a decision-making
9 framework to help us make the best
10 decisions through the study.

11 So in areas around coastal
12 communities, to achieve a sustainable
13 net positive elevation. That's the
14 goal here is to build something
15 sustainable that will stay there. We
16 are going to be limited in what we can

17 do because we have such a large coastal
18 area of Louisiana. We're going to have
19 to focus our resources very smart and
20 in a smart and effective way to make a
21 big impact.

22 And that's it. With that, I'll
23 turn it over to Sandra Stiles, who is
24 going to talk about the NEPA process.

25 (PRESENTATION BY SANDRA STILES)

♀

18

1 MS. SANDRA STILES:

2 Good evening. Good to see you come
3 out tonight. I'm a substitute speaker.
4 I am not the Environmental Manager on
5 this study. The Environmental Manager
6 is Mr. Bill Klein. He happens to be
7 sick. So I have graciously stepped in
8 to help him out.

9 So the National Environmental
10 Policy Act was enacted to ensure that
11 environmental information from federal
12 actions is available to the public and
13 decision-makers prior to decisions
14 being made. It's like a disclosure law
15 to allow people to have input into what
16 is going on.

17 Part of that law includes the
18 require for scoping. It's an open
19 process to determine the scope, the
20 issues to be addressed on the study to
21 go out to agencies and the public and

22 to hear from you on how you think an
23 action should be handled, and what is
24 important to you to guide the study.
25 The document is spelled out that the

♀

19

1 information is developed into either an
2 Environmental Assessment or
3 Environmental Impact Statement. And
4 it's prepared whenever there's a major
5 federal action that will have
6 significant impacts on the environment.
7 I should of advanced my slide so that
8 you can see that.

9 So we're doing an Environmental
10 Impact Statement for this study.
11 Basically, it details the effects of a
12 federal action, whether they be
13 beneficial or adverse.

14 The schedule for the EIS, the
15 Notice of Intent was published in the
16 Federal Register on March 23, 2012.
17 And that pretty much kicks off the
18 scoping process. And then we host
19 several public meetings like we're
20 doing now, these scoping meetings, to
21 get your feedback. And that
22 information goes into guiding how the
23 report is developed, and where we
24 should focus our interests in the
25 writing of the Environmental Impact

♀

1 Statement.

2 We will publish a draft EIS around
3 November of 2015, where the public and
4 agencies will get an opportunity to
5 provide comments, less than 45 days
6 public comment period. And then we
7 respond to those comments and make
8 whatever adjustments need to happen to
9 the document and come up with a final
10 EIS, which would be available in
11 January 2016. And that will go
12 forward, and we would have a record of
13 decision on a plan.

14 So the scoping process, as I said,
15 it initiated with the Notice of Intent
16 published in the Federal Register. And
17 these meetings are scheduled throughout
18 the state area to get input from the
19 people that have an interest in the
20 study and we want to help guide the
21 direction, and what we look at from an
22 environmental aspect from the action.
23 And it's an opportunity to express your
24 concerns, things that you're most
25 interested in, where you think the

♀

21

1 study should go, your ideas for what
2 the study should be about. And that's
3 why we're here tonight.

4 From these public meetings over the

5 next three weeks, we will take that
6 information and compile it into a
7 scoping report that will, basically,
8 outline the comments, the themes, what
9 people thought were important. And
10 it's going to be pulled into a report.

11 All those who would like to have a
12 copy of that report, we'll make sure
13 you get a copy of it. We need your
14 comments within the 30-day period in
15 order to get them into the report.
16 However, the scoping process really
17 goes all throughout the study. We're
18 asking for you to get your comments
19 back to us in 30 days or so. But
20 really from the beginning to the end,
21 your input is valuable and we'll be
22 seeking it all throughout the study.

23 So Lee is going to lead us in the
24 question and answer session.

25 (QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION)

♀

22

1 MS. MEULLER:

2 Like we said, we do have a walk-
3 around mic. Ms. Christine Pendrick is
4 going to be walking around. So just
5 raise your hand.

6 So this is your chance to ask
7 questions and have the team clarify
8 anything you'd like to know more about.

9 So once again, Sandra Stiles, Bren

Haase, Renee Sanders, and Cherie Price.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
♀
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

MR. JOHN LOPEZ:

John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation. The way this is described, it sounds like a Corps feasibility study. And normally under a feasibility study, there will be an alternative analysis. And the initial presentation, it sounded more like the technical analysis and developing technical products to evaluate the river.

And I'm trying to understand more which of it is, and if it's kind of a formal process, a more truthful analysis. It seems like you're kind of

23

reinventing the State Master Plan that just went and chose a number of diversion projects and how to reform the river to a large degree.

I'm trying to understand the interplay. Is this more of a technical study or is this kind of a more of a planning document going through normal alternative analysis?

MS. CHERIE PRICE:

The hydrodynamic portion of the study, like Renee said earlier, we're combining two of the large-scale long-term LCA studies into one. And the

15 original intent and the current intent
16 of the hydrodynamic study is to provide
17 technical tools. It's to allow us to
18 go in and collect the data that's
19 needed and form the modeling that's
20 needed to make the analysis and to
21 understand some of the transport
22 process over time, spatially,
23 temporally. And the delta management
24 part of the study is still following
25 the traditional Corps planning process.

♀

24

1 But the hydro part of that will
2 feed into the delta management part.
3 So we still are going through the six
4 steps. But we will take the
5 information that we get from the
6 hydrodynamic part and feed that into
7 the bayside part of the study.

8 Does that help explain to you a
9 little bit?

10 MR. JOHN LOPEZ:

11 Yeah. It definitely does. But,
12 obviously, the alternatives you might
13 analyze for the delta management are
14 dependent on the other diversions that
15 might be strung up and down the river.
16 It seems like your delta managing
17 alternative would be to include a
18 complement of these other projects.
19 You seem to be segregating those two

20
21
22
23
24
25
‡

things.
MS. RENEE SANDERS:
I just want to make sure I understand the question. When we're using the technical tools, the models that are being tweaked, we're saying

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

they're not being developed from scratch, I would say they're being tweaked. They will look at existing and authorized diversions. So it's a combination thereof. And I think the intent is to take some of the ideas from the Master Plan and further develop those to make sure that, say, for instance, is a diversion, to make sure it's in the location that it needs to be in and decides that it's optimal for that location.

13
14
15
16

We're going to use the resources that we have, as well as the small scale physical model, to better define what works best in what area.

17

MR. GARY ROBERT:

18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Gary Robert. I work at the Corps and, actually, on this study at one point a long time ago. I wanted to follow-up on what John was saying. I had done a study management plan on this very study with the hydrodynamic model and the delta management in one

25

study.

♀

26

1

And now from what John is pointing out, you don't seem to be having a stated objective for your delta management study that says, okay, this is the objective of this study, and these are the alternatives that can lead you to that objective. You just seem to be doing some technical analysis on, maybe, ideas that are already out there, like, he's saying, some diversions that are in the Master Plan.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

So do you have an objective to this? At the time I wrote the case study plan for this very study, I had an objective stated that it would be to maximize the sediments that are retained in the literal system so that they stay somehow as a resource.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In your case, you don't have an objective to this study that's looking at how do you compare alternatives to get the most, whatever it is you're going to define with the objective to the study.

♀

27

1

MS. CHERIE PRICE:

2

To answer your question, the last objective that we showed in the list of

3

4 objectives up there, there may even be
5 one more. But the one that talked
6 about maintaining a sustainable net
7 positive elevation for the marsh areas,
8 that is specific to delta management.
9 That's referring to the bayside area.
10 So that we will have to develop an
11 initial ray of alternatives to
12 accomplish that.

13 So we will start off like we do in
14 Corps planning studies, and we'll
15 include the State Master Plan
16 alternatives in that process. But
17 there will be other alternatives too
18 that may not be in the State Master
19 Plan.

20 MS. RENEE SANDERS:

21 And, I think, just to reiterate on
22 that too. When we looked at the slide
23 of what was included in the 2004
24 report, it mentioned, you know, study
25 large-scale diversions that are greater

♀

28

1 than 50,000 cfs and that said, study
2 alternative channel alignments.

3 That's not the only thing that
4 we're going to do. The Master Plan is
5 not the only thing that we're going to
6 analyze. So we're open to whatever
7 large-scale restoration ideas the
8 public has and whatever we come up

9 with. And I do think that the overall
10 goals, kind of, captures what we're
11 saying. It's reconnecting the
12 Mississippi River with the basin and
13 optimize sediment and nutrients.

14 I think that meets what you're
15 saying. We are going to go through the
16 feasibility study. We are going to
17 start with alternatives and develop
18 those and figure out which alternative
19 is the best one. Maybe, a combination
20 of measures, it may be one measure, it
21 may be, ten. Just like the Master
22 Plan, their recommended plan had a
23 combination of measure that they said
24 was a good solution. Does that answer
25 your question?

♀

29

1 MR. GARY ROBERT:

2 Yes.

3 MR. HARLEY WINER:

4 Harley Winer, former Corps
5 employee, presently, an engineer with
6 Atkins. I'm concerned about the study
7 area. I see on the map that you're
8 going all the way up to Vicksburg, but
9 you're not including the Atchafalaya.
10 And if we look at the Atchafalaya, that
11 is one of the most successful diversion
12 points in the river right now. It's
13 the only place in Louisiana where we

14 actually see delta formation.

15 So why is the Atchafalaya not
16 included in the study area?

17 MS. RENEE SANDERS:

18 I think Cherie touched on it a
19 little bit in her presentation. You
20 know, \$25 million seems like a lot of
21 money until you start parceling down
22 what needs to be done and what data
23 gaps are on the river that we need to
24 fill. The question has been asked
25 before about why we haven't included

♀

30

1 the Atchafalaya River.

2 I can give you two main reasons.
3 One of which is, simply, we don't have
4 the financial resources to be able to
5 do the in-depth analysis that we need
6 to do. We wanted to focus our efforts
7 and have a really good product and have
8 some useful information out of it.

9 The other portion of it is that
10 we've been working with some people in
11 the Atchafalaya Basin, Paul Kemp,
12 specifically. And we're going to see
13 if we can't find a way to take those
14 models and possibly integrate them into
15 what we have. I'm not saying they're
16 going to be completely placed together.
17 But there's, potentially, going to be
18 an opportunity to take the information

19 their collecting and see how we can
20 possibly connect it into what we're
21 doing.

22 MS. CHERIE PRICE:

23 There is also, currently, in the
24 2004 report, there is a large-scale
25 study that's focused. It's not being

♀

31

1 executed currently, but it is in the
2 report that focuses on the Old River
3 Control Structure and the Atchafalaya
4 River system.

5 MR. RANDY CAIRE:

6 My name is Randy Caire. I'm from
7 St. Charles Parish, St. John Parish. I
8 can sure appreciate all the science
9 that you guys are going through with
10 this study. One diversion that I don't
11 see on any of the proposals is
12 diverting water from the Mississippi to
13 Lake Des Allemands. And I don't know
14 why that didn't attract the scientist,
15 as far as sediment possibilities there.

16 But I do know that if there was
17 such a diversion, it would greatly help
18 the wildlife and fishing in Lake Des
19 Allemands. There is a letter that
20 Kevin Vandant sent me that if we were
21 to have a diversion from the
22 Mississippi for the sake of Lake Des
23 Allemands as it was presently exist for

24 Lake Cataouatche via the Davis Pond
25 Diversion that it would be a mecca for

♀

32

1 fishing.

2 I want to suggest that to you guys
3 to look at that. Because you would not
4 only be having another way to help the
5 coast, but you'd also be improving the
6 sport fishermen possibilities in that
7 area. And we ought to have the office
8 of tourism, as well, involved in the
9 decision you make. But there's great
10 possibility right there.

11 MS. CHERIE PRICE:

12 That's a great idea. Thank you.

13 MR. SCOTT EUSTIS:

14 My name is Scott Eustis, Gulf
15 Restoration Network. And I just got a
16 question about climate change, and how
17 the study was accounting for this, the
18 different predictions of how climate
19 change is going to affect the
20 hydrodynamics of the river, whether
21 it's the different flood stages or
22 through sea-level rise?

23 MS. CHERIE PRICE:

24 As part of the study, we'll be
25 looking at future scenarios at year 50.

♀

33

1 And that includes sea-level rise. And

2 the Corps currently has sea-level rise
3 guidance that applies three different
4 relative sea-level rise rates to, will
5 be applied to the hydrodynamic models,
6 as well as to the bayside models.

7 Does that answer your question
8 completely?

9 MR. SCOTT EUSTIS:

10 Is there any consideration how
11 climate change might change the pattern
12 of flooding?

13 MS. CHERIE PRICE;

14 That's a good question. The
15 Institute of Water Resources within the
16 Corps of Engineers is currently
17 developing guidance for our studies to
18 analyze that. It's not currently
19 available to us yet. But it's
20 something that is coming down the road
21 fairly soon. And we will be taking a
22 look at it.

23 MR. SEAN DUFFY:

24 Sean Duffy, Big River Coalition. I
25 have to ask. One of the terms used in

♀

34

1 a couple of places was "dedicated
2 dredging." I'd like to hear a
3 definition of "dedicated dredging"?

4 MS. CHERIE PRICE:

5 You want my definition. Basically,
6 dredging outside of maintenance

7 dredging. Dredging that's dedicated
8 specifically to restoration that's not
9 part of maintenance dredging. That's
10 how I use it.

11 MR. BREN HAASE:

12 Dredging for the purpose of wetland
13 creation.

14 MR. BRIAN LITTLE:

15 Brian Little. I work for Remedial
16 Construction Services, and I'm teaming
17 up with Noranda Lumina over in
18 Gramercy, Louisiana, working with them.
19 Some of they're byproducts that they
20 have at their facility could be
21 possibly used in the future for
22 beneficial reuse. And I see a lot of
23 this what y'all speak of, and this
24 study has to do more with sediment
25 controls and hydrodynamic studies.

♀

35

1 Are y'all looking at any studies
2 for structural protection or other
3 materials that the state or the area
4 might have to better the integrity, I
5 guess, of the river or the area?

6 MS. CHERIE PRICE:

7 You're talking about resources
8 outside of just sediment from the
9 river?

10 MR. BRIAN LITTLE:

11 Yes, correct.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
♀
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

MS. RENEE SANDERS:
Or structures of some kind?

MR. BRIAN LITTLE:
Yes, ma'am.

MS. CHERIE PRICE:
I would think that that's something we could include that we can look at when we're developing an initial ray of alternatives. And if something pops to the surface that we see would be beneficial, then that would be something we can consider.
Primarily, we are looking at river resources for restoration. But if

36

there is opportunities there for us to look at other structural features for protection, then we would definitely not exclude it from the study.

MS. LEE MUELLER:
Any other questions?
From here, we're going to move into the formal scoping period.

(FORMAL SCOPING SESSION)

MS. SANDRA STILES:
This is your opportunity to give us comments on what you think are the important human natural resources that you think we should focus on. What you think we, maybe, don't need to focus on. What are your ideas for the

17 project. Where should we look; where
18 shouldn't we look. This is your
19 opportunity to give feedback.

20 I'm going to open the floor up, and
21 we'll wonder around with the mic to
22 whoever would like to offer a comment.

23 MR. JOHN LOPEZ:

24 John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain
25 Basin Foundation. We've already

♀

37

1 touched, obviously, on the value of
2 coastal habitats and maintaining the
3 land forms. However, what I would
4 suggest is that as you look at the
5 delta, I think you have to look at the
6 unique systems that the delta
7 represents, your riverine and oceanic
8 system. And also that there are two
9 major conservation areas in the delta:
10 Pass a Loutre Wildlife Management Area
11 and Delta National Wildlife Refuge.

12 So those are really irreplaceable
13 resources. I'm not saying that -- we
14 may be that ultimately we relinquish
15 those somehow. But if you look at
16 redesigning the delta, you have to, in
17 my opinion, consider what resources are
18 still there and what can we save.

19 MR. DARRYL PAUL WARD:

20 Darryl Paul Ward, Garden of Eden
21 plants. The critical nature in human

22 environmental issues, the main thing is
23 plants for fuel and food. And maybe we
24 can take a step to look at hybrid,
25 like, automobiles, two forms of fuel.

♀

38

1 We as humans, we eat animals and
2 plants. And resources, which are
3 natural and human environment in this,
4 is to take the animal, allow the spirit
5 to die, and be reborn as a plant. And
6 how this is done is: Boom, you're dead
7 and reborn in the name of Messiah. All
8 has spoken. You are a plant of God.

9 And when you think and you study as
10 a plant, instead of the animal
11 realizing that you're not the ape, that
12 you're reborn as an animal, all your
13 outlook changes, and this is what
14 brings out the plant of Jesus Christ
15 was the cross. And he knew the plan
16 was the cross. The plan, if you state
17 it, which the cross is the plant.

18 So the plant is the Messiah to rise
19 out of the earth as a plant. So if we
20 plant all of this, and the plant rises,
21 then we'll know that we are part of the
22 plant, and we'll know that Christ
23 allowed us to come from earth and not
24 from ape. But there's a lot of us who
25 would like to stay as ape as the

♀

39

1 animal, which is their prerogative.
2 But if you're reborn as a plant, you'll
3 see life natural, and the human
4 environment that would benefit. Thank
5 you very much.

6 MS. SANDRA STILES:

7 Does anybody else have a comment?
8 Specific ideas on where you'd like to
9 see this study go? Anything you think
10 is a waste of our time?

11 MR. HARLEY WINER:

12 My name is Harley Winer. Question
13 No. 3. What are reasonable restoration
14 alternatives that should be considered
15 in the EIS?

16 And to me, the objective is: How do
17 we get sediment into the system rather
18 than being deposited offshore? And it
19 seems to me there's a -- a channel
20 needs to deliver the sediment some
21 place. Right now, the Mississippi
22 River channel is delivering the
23 sediment offshore. But the Atchafalaya
24 channel is delivering sediment and
25 creating a delta in ATchafalaya Bay.

♀

40

1 And this goes back to my initial
2 question. Why is the Atchafalaya and a
3 diversion at the Atchafalaya not
4 considered as an alternative?

5 MR. RANDY CAIRE:

6 Randy Cai re, once agai n. When you
7 do your studies, all the money and
8 effort that we're going to be putting
9 into this, consider the accessibility
10 to the people to be able to enjoy
11 whatever results. In other words, it's
12 very hard for people to access these
13 areas of wildlife. The current boating
14 facilities, it's only for touch
15 Louisiana fishermen that can for the
16 most part gain access to all these
17 areas.

18 So whatever area we wind up
19 rebuilding or whatever, consider those
20 facilities that would make it more
21 accessible to people so that in years
22 to come, more and more people will find
23 value in just getting out on the water
24 and seeing the wildlife and,
25 eventually, that will gain us a lot of

♀

41

1 support.

2 MR. GARY ROBERT:

3 Gay Robert. I think you have this
4 in the study, but I just want to make
5 sure it goes down as an alternative.
6 In looking at ways that the river
7 distributes sediments now, as Harley
8 was pointing out, a lot of it still
9 goes off the Continental Shelf. And
10 when I had worked on this study myself,

11 I kind of envisioned an objective being
12 to maximize sediment, contain the
13 sediment, but in the literal system
14 somehow. So that would probably mean
15 looking at realigning the navigation
16 channel.

17 I know I talked to some folks in
18 the hallway that said, well, this study
19 wouldn't get that far. But I think in
20 your list of alternatives, that ought
21 to be in there, looking at how do you
22 maximize hanging on to the sediment.
23 That would probably mean moving the
24 navigation channel some kind of way,
25 blocking off Southwest Pass and ships

♀

42

1 in the channel.

2 MR. GEORGE DUFFY:

3 My name is George Duffy. And I'm
4 with the Louisiana Maritime
5 Association. First of all, not all the
6 spoil materials go out in the Gulf.
7 There's deposited at the Head of Passes
8 over 8 million cubic yards that are
9 then re-pumped into the wetlands.

10 When there is sufficient funding,
11 cutterhead dredges are used, and they
12 pump it over into the restoration area
13 along with Mississippi River Channel in
14 Southwest Pass. Realignment of the
15 channel has been discussed for many,

16 many years. And what people miss with
17 that is that the economic impact on
18 this channel to this nation is
19 horrendous.

20 We just finished with the study by
21 Dr. Tim Ryan with tremendous numbers
22 to what the economic impact is.
23 Discussions on realignment have been
24 talked about in a lock here and a lock
25 there and do this and do that. But if

♀

43

1 you look in the state's plan, they're
2 basically looking at abandoning the
3 material in the lower river from
4 Southwest Pass or Venice down because
5 it doesn't meet the quality that
6 they're looking for for restoration.

7 So I think that's going to be an
8 important aspect. I was told earlier
9 that eventually navigation will be
10 brought into these discussions with
11 that. That's all I have to say.

12 Thank you.

13 MS. SANDRA STILES:

14 Do we have any other questions?
15 Lee's going to come up and close us
16 out.

17 MS. LEE MUELLER:

18 Like I said, we have a court
19 reporter here, and she's captured all
20 your comments. You also have comment

21 cards available at the front table for
22 you to mail in if you prefer to submit
23 a written comment. We also have a
24 study email as you see up there. And
25 as Sandy said, Bill Klein is actually

♀

44

1 the Environmental Manager on this
2 project, and there's his contact
3 information for you to send in comments
4 until May 4 to be captured in the
5 scoping report.

6 We do want you guys to stay
7 engaged. The project team does plan to
8 participate in several coastal
9 restoration conferences. We do plan
10 very elaborate stakeholder engagement
11 throughout the five years. Speaker
12 requests at the Corps has an active
13 program. You can submit a request and
14 come speak to an association, a
15 military organization, et cetera. And
16 also, the team is also planning yearly
17 formal updates. LCA.gov is a great
18 source.

19 And here is the project web page.
20 You're also able to submit a comment
21 from the web page. With that said,
22 here is some additional contacts of
23 several team members to reach out to
24 them if you have further questions.
25 We'll also hang around this evening and

♀

1 answer any more questions you may have
2 out in the foyer.

3 Thank you very much for attending.
4 We appreciate your input.

5 (THE PROCEEDINGS ENDED AT 7:17 P.M.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

♀

1 C E R T I F I C A T E
2

3 This certification is valid only for a

4 transcript accompanied by my original signature
5 and original raised seal on this page.

6 That this testimony was reported by me in
7 the Stenomask method (voice-writing), was
8 prepared and transcribed by me or under my
9 personal direction and supervision, and is a
10 true and correct transcript to the best of my
11 ability and understanding;

12 That I am not related to counsel or to the
13 parties herein; am not otherwise interested in
14 the outcome of this matter; and am a valid
15 member in good standing of the Louisiana State
16 Board of Examiners of Certified Shorthand
17 Reporters.

18
19
20
21 _____
22 TIFFENY SUIRE GALLARDO
23 Certified Court Reporter
24 License No. 28014
25

♀