



**COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO THE
REVISED INTEGRATED DRAFT FEASIBILITY REPORT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**(Responses to comments on the December 2013 Initial Draft Report
are available upon request)**



SUMMARY

This document describes the public comments and responses by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New Orleans District (CEMVN) regarding the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS) for the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study. In accordance with the Council of Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR §1503.1) for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the CEMVN issued a Notice of Availability dated March 20, 2015, inviting public participation to comment on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the Southwest Coastal Louisiana study which was published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register Volume 80, No. 54, March 20, 2013, page 15001. The Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS was distributed for review and comment to Federal, state, and local agencies; Tribes; libraries; and other interested parties. The Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement was also posted on the study webpage: <http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/SouthwestCoastal.aspx>. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement were requested during the 45-day comment period from March 20, 2015 to May 4, 2015.

Three public hearings were held during the comment period. A total of 184 people signed in to the public hearings; however, more people were in attendance than had signed in for all three hearing sites. The CEMVN received a total of 2,752 comments, including: 2,540 signatures on petitions; 50 emails; 40 oral comments during the public hearings; 34 governmental (including Federal, state, parish, and local); 10 letters; 7 postcards; and 4 telephone comments received during the comment period. Most comments were comprised of several specific comments; a few of the comments provided attachments.

All comments received on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS, whether or not the comment is thought to merit individual discussion, are included in this report. Comments received most often included:

1. Request to include a list of all Parish Priority Projects and Coastal Restoration and Protection Plans in the report.
2. Request that any and all reference to eminent domain and involuntary participation be removed from the study.
3. Request that a 'Local Sponsor' be chosen and have immediate 'voice' in the remaining planning process.
4. Request to replace reforestation measures be replaced by shoreline protection measures.

All comments were reviewed and considered by the Project Development Team in further developing the Integrated Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Many salient comments, questions, and concerns were expressed in both the written and oral form.

The substantive comments received on the NED plan warranted significant changes resulting in revising it from a programmatic level to a feasibility level of detail suitable for recommendation for construction.

The environmental restoration (NER) component of the study remains at the feasibility level of detail and suitable for recommendation for construction. Two additional appendices are added to the Integrated Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement to include an appendix with copies of Parish Priority Projects and Coastal Restoration and Protection Plans, and an appendix displaying maps of all affected structures under the NED Plan. In addition, detailed responses included discussions of eminent domain and involuntary participation, why chenier reforestation is a necessary component of the NER Plan, and the continued involvement of local interested parties in the study process. The Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement will be made available for review and will also be posted on the study webpage: <http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/SouthwestCoastal.aspx>.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	J-2
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	J-3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	J-4
2.0 COMMENTS.....	J-6
ATTACHMENT 1: SIGN-IN SHEETS FOR APRIL 14, 2015, VERMILION PARISH PUBLIC HEARINGS/MEETINGS	J-153
ATTACHMENT 2: SIGN-IN SHEETS FOR APRIL 15, 2015, CALCASIEU PARISH PUBLIC HEARINGS/MEETINGS	J-159
ATTACHMENT 3: SIGN-IN SHEETS FOR APRIL 16, 2015, CAMERON PARISH PUBLIC HEARINGS/MEETINGS	J-162

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

A CHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
CCA	Coastal Conservation Association
CCMP	Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan
CEMVN	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mississippi Valley Division, New Orleans District
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CPRA	Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Agency
CWPPRA	Coastal Wetland Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act
CZM	Coastal Zone Management
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
GIWW	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway
LCA	Louisiana Coastal Area
LDNR	Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
LDWF	Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
NED	National Economic Development
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NER	National Ecosystem Restoration
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
PDT	Project Delivery Team
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
RP	Recommended Plan
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
TSP	Tentatively Selected Plan
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WRDA	Water Resources Development Act



1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document describes the public comments received during the 45-day public comment period and the CEMVN responses to those comments. The Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR §1503.1) for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) established a nationwide policy that after preparing a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) and before preparing a final EIS the agency shall:

- Obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved or which is authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.
- Request the comments of:
 - Appropriate state and local agencies which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards;
 - Indian tribes, when the effects may be on a reservation; and
 - Any agency which has requested that it receive statements on actions of the kind proposed.
- Request comments from the public, affirmatively soliciting comments from those persons or organizations who may be interested or affected.

An agency may request comments on a final environmental impact statement before the decision is finally made. In any case, other agencies or persons may make comments before the final decision unless a different time is provided under 40 CFR §1506.10.

A Notice of Availability (NOA), dated March 20, 2015, inviting public participation to comment on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (Revised Integrated Draft Report) for the Southwest Coastal Louisiana study was published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register Volume 80, No. 54, March 20, 2013, page 15001. The Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS was distributed for review and comment to Federal, state, and local agencies; Tribes; libraries; and other interested and affected parties; and was also posted on the study webpage: <http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/SouthwestCoastal.aspx>. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS were requested during the 45-day comment period from March 20, 2015 to May 4, 2015.

News releases announcing public hearings were distributed to media outlets throughout the study area, as well as posted to the USACE New Orleans District website (www.mvn.usace.army.mil) and social media outlets such as Facebook and Twitter. Paid advertisements for the meetings were placed in the following local newspapers: Vermilion Today on April 12 and 14, 2015; American Press on April 12 and 15, 2015; and Dequincy News on April 12 and 16, 2015. Notifications were sent to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that are actively involved in coastal restoration via the New Orleans. Public hearings were also coordinated with Calcasieu, Cameron, and Vermilion Parish Presidents' Office and Coastal Zone Managers. As an additional measure for providing public access to the document, the Revised Integrated Draft Report available for view and downloading from the World Wide Web at: <http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/SouthwestCoastal.aspx>. No reports of user difficulty were reported to the webmaster for the site.

Three public hearings were conducted by the CEMVN in April 2015. The public hearings provided a forum for public expression of verbal statements regarding the proposed action and the content of findings of the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Each meeting also provided an opportunity for attendees to ask questions of CEMVN and the non-Federal Sponsor representatives regarding the Southwest Coastal Louisiana study. The dates, locations number of individuals signing in, and number of individuals providing comments at the public hearings is presented in Table 1.



Date	Location	Attendees
April 14, 2015	Vermilion Parish: Abbeville High School 1305 Wildcat Drive Abbeville, Louisiana	61 individuals signed in 13 individuals offered comments
April 15, 2015	Calcasieu Parish: Lake Charles Civic Center 900 Lakeshore Drive Lake Charles, Louisiana	21 individuals signed in 7 individuals offered comments
April 16, 2015	Cameron Parish: Cameron Police Jury 119 Smith Circle Cameron, Louisiana	102 individuals signed in 20 individuals offered comments

The public hearing format included an Open House from 6:00 to 6:30 pm where general information about the proposed Southwest Coastal Louisiana study effort and process was provided. From 6:30 to 8:30 pm, an overview of the proposed Southwest Coastal Louisiana study was presented, followed by a question and answer session and acceptance of formal public comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. A copy of the sign-in sheets for the public hearings/meetings is presented in **Attachments 1, 2, and 3**.

A certified court reporter provided a written transcript of each hearing/meeting record. A copy of the transcripts from each hearing/meeting is available upon request. Provisions were made for comments to be written on comment cards and provided to the CEMVN during or following the hearings. A total of 184 people signed in to the public hearings; 61 people signed in at the Vermilion Parish hearing, 21 people signed in at the Calcasieu Parish hearing and 102 people signed in at the Cameron Parish hearing. There were more people in attendance of the public hearings than had signed in at all three sites. A total of 40 individuals offered oral comments during the public hearings.

The NEPA provides specific guidance (40 CFR 1503.4) about responding to comments. An agency preparing a final EIS shall assess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and shall respond by one or more of the means listed below, stating its response in the final statement. Possible responses to comments include:

- Modify alternatives including the proposed action.
- Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency.
- Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.
- Make factual corrections.
- Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

All comments received on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS, whether or not the comment is thought to merit individual discussion, are included in this report. Comments received most often included:

1. Request to include a list of all Parish Priority Projects and Coastal Restoration and Protection Plans in the report.
2. Request that any and all reference to eminent domain and involuntary participation be removed from the study.
3. Request that a 'Local Sponsor' be chosen and have immediate 'voice' in the remaining planning process.
4. Request to replace reforestation measures be replaced by shoreline protection measures.



All comments were reviewed and considered by the Project Development Team in further developing the Integrated Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Many salient comments, questions, and concerns were expressed in both the written and oral form.

The substantive comments received on the NED plan warranted significant changes resulting in revising it from a programmatic level to a feasibility level of detail suitable for recommendation for construction.

The environmental restoration (NER) component of the study remains at the feasibility level of detail and suitable for recommendation for construction. Two additional appendices are added to the Integrated Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement to include an appendix with copies of Parish Priority Projects and Coastal Restoration and Protection Plans, and an appendix displaying maps of all affected structures under the NED Plan. In addition, detailed responses included discussions of eminent domain and involuntary participation, why chenier reforestation is a necessary component of the NER Plan, and the continued involvement of local interested parties in the study process. The Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement will be made available for review and will also be posted on the study webpage: <http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/SouthwestCoastal.aspx>.

2.0 COMMENTS

The CEMVN received a total of 2,752 comments, including: 2,540 signatures on petitions; 50 emails; 40 oral comments during the public hearings; 34 governmental (including Federal, state, parish, and local); 10 letters; 7 postcards; and 4 telephone comments received during the comment period. Most comments included several specific comments; a few of the comments provided attachments.

Table 2 lists the Federal, state, and local agencies; individuals and other interested parties that provided oral testimonies, written and other comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS. A portable document format (pdf) copy of all comments, including petitions, is available upon request.

Table 2. List of individuals that provided comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS.		
Email Comments		
Ashely K. Buller	Keith Hayden	Nedra Davis
Alaine M Devalcourt	E. Scott Henry	Roderic Vaughn
Arnold Jones Jr.	Gloria Conlin	Ryan Bourriaque
Ashley K Buller	John Dale "Zach" Lee	Shannon Neveux
Carol Fountain	Judith Falcon	Shannon Neveux
Carolyn Woosley	Karen Wheat	CPRA
Mayor Randy Roach	Michael Hare	Sue Neveux
Stephen R. Spencer	Mike Toerner	Suzy Heck
Elvin "Bubba" Wheat	Morgan Herden	Tom Couste
	Nancy Murphy Geer Toerner	Tricia Gaspard
Government Comments (Federal, state, parish, local)		
Ashley K. Buller	Don Haydel	LDWF
(ACHP) Brian Lusher	Department of the Interior Office	Nedra Davis
D.Y. Doland	of the Secretary Stephen R.	Nicole Minvielle
Cameron Parish Gravity Drainage	Spencer	(NOAA, NMFS) Virginia M. Fay
District No. 4	(EPA) Craig Weeks	(SHPO) Pam Breaux
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	Erath (Town of)	Teche-Vermilion Fresh Water
City of Lake Charles Mayor Randy	Jonathan "JP" Perry, LA State	District
Roach	Senator, District 26	(NRCS) Kevin Norton, State
CPRA	Kristin Saltzman	Conservationist
State Senator Dan "Blade" Morrish	Kirk Quin	Vermilion Parish Police Jury
	Ray Fremin, Jr.	



Table 2. List of individuals that provided comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS.		
	Louisiana Delegation, Congress of the United States	
Letter Comments (other than Government)		
Alfred Broussard Ellray Henry	Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation Martin Miller	Michael Toerner
Petitions (names and copies of petitions available upon request)		
1,752 signatures on undated Petition to Change the SWCL Study's 2015 Draft (Shannon Neveaux) 63 signatures on petition dated April 16, 2015 748 signatures on petition dated April 17, 2015 4 signatures on petition dated April 21, 2015		
Postcard Comments		
Barbara Primeaux D.Y. Dolsard Jr. Davy L. Doxy	Iris Broussard Jeff & Shari Richard	Lisa Chiasson Susan Boudreaux
Public Hearings/Meeting Calcasieu Parish April 15, 2015		
Carolyn Woosley Jennifer Cobian	John Mouton Laurie Cormier	Mayor Randy Roach Nedra Davis Nic Hunter
Public Hearings/Meetings Cameron Parish April 16, 2015		
Benny Welch Billy Dorian Curtis Fountain Cynthia Sellers David Richard Dinah Landry J.C. Reina	Kirk Quinn Marshal Young Mike Mr. Miller Ms. Jones Nedra Davis Paul Sellers	Ray Clement Ryan Bourriaque Scooter Trosclair Sherriff Johnson Stacy Verret Terry Beard Unidentified
Public Hearings/Meeting Vermilion Parish April 14, 2015		
Earl Landry Joe Tessier Kevin Segrera Mark Shirley	Mayor John LeBlanc Mike Sagera Nedra Davis Peter Vincent	Randy Moertel Roland Viator Shannon Neveau
Telephone Comments		
Robert Duboit	Jolene Lane	Billy Waters

The formal NEPA comments presented at the public hearings, as well as all other comments (letter, email, comment cards, and telephone) on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS are presented in **Table 3**.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
1	Ashely K. Buller	May 5, 2015	Cameron Parish Police Jury	email	petitions on behalf of Cameron Parish residents	Please accept the attached petitions on behalf of the residents of Cameron Parish.	Acknowledge receipt of email and attached petitions. Response to petition comments are included in the General Responses.
2	Alaine M Devalcourt	April 24, 2015	public	email	flooding	I am a concerned citizen from Abbeville located in Vermilion Parish. I grew up in Esther which is about 15 minutes south of Abbeville. My grandparents have lived there for more than 50 years and will not leave the only place they know as home. Their house is built between 13-16 feet high, however for Hurricane Ike the water line marked more than halfway up the creosote poles. Living in the south flooding will always be a problem, especially with a hurricane in the equation.	Comment acknowledged.
3					fisheries	Also, our coast provides 1/3 of the nations coastal fisheries. Coastal fisheries off of our marsh lands are an incredible boost to our economy.	The Final Integrated Report provides details regarding potential project induced impacts and benefits to the significant resources of fishery and other aquatic resources, including essential fish habitat. Shoreline protection would protect existing and restored marsh which function as various essential fish habitats.
4					protection people and marshlands	The point is these people that live here and have lived here, as well as the marsh land that constantly erodes away, needs to be protected. Without the help of engineers building some type of 'barrier', the coastal wetlands will continue to erode and these people in the south will lose all they own. Eventually, maybe not in our life time, the land will erode away enough that these southern parishes will be part of the Gulf of Mexico and waters will continue to erode north.	The Recommended Plan would reduce risk of damages from hurricane storm surge flooding for almost 4,000 structures. The Recommended Plan also includes marsh and chenier restoration features and shoreline protection features resulting in restoration, nourishment and/or protection to over 15,000 net acres and over 4,000 average annual habitat units.
5					people, economy & jobs	Without some type of action put in place, there won't be any wetlands, will not be any elders enjoying their retirement in the only place they know as home, and the state economy will surely decline. Louisiana's coast gives this state's economy a huge boost. There are so many people that would lose jobs once the wetlands erode away. I hope me, along with all of the others petitioning, can get our voices across to someone who cares.	The Recommended Plan would reduce risk of damages from hurricane storm surge flooding for almost 4,000 structures. The Recommended Plan also includes marsh and chenier restoration features and shoreline protection features resulting in creation, nourishment and/or protection to over 15,000 net acres and over 4,000 average annual habitat units.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
6	Arnold Jones Jr.	April 17, 2015	public	email	eminent domain	We attended last night's meeting and wish to submit a comment and a request: We feel as though the use and or threat of "eminent domain" are not required and should be removed from the draft.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
7					list of affected properties	We would like to request a copy of affected properties in Cameron parish as we are property owners, we know the list is preliminary and subject to review but would like to know if any of my properties are affected.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in Appendix N to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
20	Cameron Parish Police Jury Ashley K Buller	April 24, 2015	Cameron Parish Police Jury	email	petitions on behalf of Cameron Parish residents	petitions dated 16 April 2015 from Theodor A. Broussard (Grand Chenier); Pamela Kelley (Grand Chenier); Richard James Dahlan (Creole); Mitchel Kelly (Grand Chenier); Darilyn Canik (Grand Chenier); David Al Duprie (Grand Chenier); Sheila Miller (Grand Chenier); Cecil J Clark (Grand Chenier); Craig Matthew Manuel (Sweetlake); Zachary Taylor Vincent (Grand Lake); Cheryl A. Broussard (Grand Chenier); Richard Cauik (Grand Chenier); Gary Shipman (Cameron); Kim Richard (Creole); Freddie Theriot (Grand Chenier); Gary Primeaux (Grand Chenier); Jeanette Thibodeaux Jacobs (Creole); Willis Luie (name is not legible, Grand Chenier); Carol Wainght (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Ceasar Swire (Grand Chenier); Christopher Fountein (Grand Chenier); Darren Richard (Creole); Catlyn Hendrix (Creole); Tye Fontenot (Creole); Win Kioin Warrant (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Barron Guidry (Grand Chenier); Michael Jacobs (Creole); Lanny Nihire (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Drucilla Vincent (Grand Chenier); Sara Roy (Grand Chenier); Susan Fawvar (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Kenton Bonsall (Grand Chenier); Watt Richard (Grand Chenier); Eruc Baccughlopi (Creole); Denton C. Vincent (Grand Chenier); Leslie D. Griffith (Grand Chenier); Craig Hendrix (Grand Lake); Danny Lavergue (Grand Lake); JoDee Roberts (Grand Lake); Peggy Reyes (Cameron); Martial A. Young (Grand Lake); Brandon J. Carter Jr.	Acknowledged receipt of petitions. Responses to petition comments provided in below and in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
						(Grand Chenier); Francis Guilbeau (Cameron); Iris Broussard (Grand Chenier); Barbara Portie (Creole); Ran Johnson (name not legible, Grand Lake); Steven Landry (Creole); Robert Portie (Creole); Ann Langlinais (Abbeville); Jimmie Ann McLean (Grand Chenier); Rodney McLean (Grand Chenier); Beulah Bradley (Hackberry); Toby Landry (Grand Lake); Dinah Landry (Grand Lake); Joseph E. Trahan (Grand Lake); Nadine Richard (Grand Chenier); Douglas M. Haynie (Creole); Judy & P.J. Broussard (Abbeville); Jerry Dockins (Cameron); Jennifer Dockins (Cameron); Emma Jean Miller (Cameron); Jennifer Picou (Cameron); Nina Jones (Grand Chenier).	
21	Carol Fountain	April 23,2015	public	email	property list	If a home was listed in the preliminary report and earmarked and has now been lifted what would be the outcome on this situation? How can someone find out which SRL properties are on this list?	Preliminary lists of identified affected structures should not be considered final. Affected structures have been identified in a series of maps and included in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
22	Carolyn Woosley	May 4, 2015	public	email	forward comments	Greetings to you two, and thanks for your hard work, P.J. and Paul. My apologies for not forwarding this modest comment through proper channels, but I could not figure out where the comment link was re: the draft feasibility study. Please forward these comments to the correct persons. I commend the USACE on the proposed marsh restoration and chenier ridge reforestation projects, as well as the coastline stabilization projects. Those cannot be implemented soon enough, as you well know.	Acknowledged
23					involuntary participation/eminent domain	Concerning the "hot topic" of this study, I believe that the "involuntary" eminent domain element should be removed until other risk reduction measures, re: storm surge and other high waters possibilities, are exhausted, particularly the former.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
24					Calcasieu Ship Channel	The USACE has as part of its mission, not only navigation, but also coastal preservation and protection. On the subject of protection, to the extent that you can address the causes of hurricane-related risk, please do. The Ship Channel, a true engine of the region's and the nation's economy, is unfortunately also a conduit of storm surge. Do not ask citizens to take it on the chin, whilst leaving a cause of hurricane storm damage, the Ship Channel, undressed.	The study recommends the Calcasieu Ship Channel salinity barrier be a separate long-term study due to the complexity of this project.
25					Calcasieu Ship Channel	I have proposed mobile gates that would swing out across the Channel only after, in anticipation of a major storm, it is closed to traffic. Such (expensive) gates could be porous and could possibly break some of the force of the surge, while allowing water to permeate those same gates but with its powers lessened. The waters would admittedly disperse over the southwest Louisiana landscape but at a lowered height and force. These gates could, perhaps, shave off a few feet from the height of this surge. This needs study, obviously.	The study recommends the Calcasieu Ship Channel salinity barrier be a separate long-term study due to the complexity of this project.
26					Calcasieu Ship Channel	Left to its own devices a surge arrives at Prien Lake and Lake Charles, its powers unaddressed. A curving (natural) river combined with 25+ miles of intervening marshes are supposed to take the bite out of the height and force of a surge; but, the Calcasieu River has been straightened; the marshes are waning. Not to address the Ship Channel (called by some in the USACE a 'hurricane highway') is not to address the cause of much destruction in the highly populated Lake Area.	The study recommends the Calcasieu Ship Channel salinity barrier be a separate long-term study due to the complexity of this project.
27					Calcasieu Ship Channel	I understand that an engineering firm is in the process of isolating or making whole the banks of the Calcasieu Ship Channel to the south of the GIWW. That is a very good thing, re: containing the salinization of the waters and marshes. However, given this scenario, with the Ship Channel's borders made whole, during a major storm, those same walls hold the Channel within its banks (up to a certain height), and this creates, I would think, an even	The study recommends the Calcasieu Ship Channel salinity barrier be a separate long-term study due to the complexity of this project.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
						more pure and powerful, unabated surge into the Lake Area. That is my fear.	
28					Calcasieu Ship Channel	I have lived through Audrey, Rita and Ike, always on the Ship Channel where it enters Lake Charles. I've seen a lot. I don't want to see what greater storms will deliver to a fast-developing area with a "hurricane highway" that is unaddressed. Please address the Ship Channel. Not to do so is wrong.	The study recommends the Calcasieu Ship Channel salinity barrier be a separate long-term study due to the complexity of this project.
29					Calcasieu Ship Channel	I realize fully that the Port of Lake Charles expresses strong sentiments against anything impeding ship traffic. Does the Port of Lake Charles speak for the citizenry? Does the area's citizenry control the Port of Lake Charles? What I suggest (and perhaps someone else can come up with a better plan) does not impede the normal course of ship traffic. It is a mobile solution/suggestion put into place only when ship traffic is already stopped in advance of a possible major storm. A solution which is a win-win is the ticket to success on this topic, but it must be pursued. Again, thanks. It was a pleasure to work with you since 2009.	The study recommends the Calcasieu Ship Channel salinity barrier be a separate long-term study due to the complexity of this project.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
30	City of Lake Charles Mayor Randy Roach	April 29, 2015	City of Lake Charles	email/letter	National Flood Insurance Program / eminent domain	1. We request that in the event the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) remains a relative part of the Study, that all eminent domain references be removed and that all owners of property identified as being candidates for relocation be notified and allowed opportunity to review the Study and make public comment.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table. The requirements under the authorized National Flood Insurance Program were considered during the study.. The Final Integrated Report will be available for public review during State and Agency Review.
31					Congressional authorization of use of flooding for coastal restoration	2. We further recommend that if "flooding" is to be used as a part of the criteria to develop and implement coastal restoration projects in this or any other coastal region of the country, such rule be based on a new set of standards authorized by Congress and which address: a) the unique hydrological characteristics of any coastal region affected by such regulations; b) the need to protect the history, culture and related socioeconomic characteristics of such coastal regions; and c) be designed to protect coastal residents from forced relocation of residences and businesses from those areas.	The recommended plan has been developed within Congressional authorizations specific to hurricane storm surge risk reduction as well as ecosystem restoration.
32					Cameron and Vermilion Parishes priority projects	3. We recommend adding an appendix to the report to include a list of all priority projects submitted by Cameron and Vermilion Parishes in order to make sure that these projects will be eligible for consideration in any future funding opportunities.	Parish priority projects have been included in Appendix N to the report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement							
Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
33					Calcasieu Parish update coastal plan including priority projects list	4. We recommend adding a statement in the draft as follows: "Calcasieu Parish anticipates coastal plan which will include a priority projects list. Those projects will be viable projects for consideration of funding for protecting Lake Charles to the 500 year level of protection as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana 2012."	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate new Appendix N in the Final Integrated Report. Appendix N contains the following statement: "Though not an endorsement of any project under this study effort, Parish Priority Projects that would be provided by the Parishes to the State for consideration as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana are included in this Appendix only as a reference for future planning under other study authorities."



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
34					original goals and objectives / national flood insurance program	5. We recommend that the original goals and objectives of the SWLA study, namely: Ecosystem Restoration, Risk Reduction and Historic and Cultural Preservation, be included, analyzed and specifically addressed in the conclusions and recommendations of the study instead of allowing the provisions of the NFIP to take preference and priority over such considerations in determining the programming and the priority for coastal restoration and protection projects eligible for funding with state and federal monies.	Generally, the planning goals of the NED Plan are to reduce risk of damages associated with hurricane storm surge. The NED storm damage risk reduction plans were formulated to achieve NED principles and objectives. Contributions to NED are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units, and are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and the rest of the Nation. The general planning goals of the NER Plan are to significantly and sustainably reduce land loss and coastal erosion in the study area, restore environmental conditions for the Chenier Plain ecosystem in SWC Louisiana, and evaluate a range of coastal restoration components to address a multitude of ecosystem problems. Plans were formulated to achieve NER principles and objectives. Contributions to NER are increases in the net quantity and/or quality of desired ecosystem resources, and are measured in the study area and nationwide.
35					shapefiles	6. We request that access to the Shape files for the elevation of all structures surveyed as part of your decision making criteria be made	Appendix N with maps of all identified structures included in the NED Recommended Plan is included in the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
						available to Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermillion Parishes.	
36					windshield survey vs benefit cost ratio	7. We specifically reject the methodology used to determine the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) parameters because it was based on "wind shield view" survey which is not adequate to assess and make recommendations as to the listing of projects or the development of programs necessary to implement the recommendations of the study.	The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.
37					original projects modeled	8. We recommend that the projects originally submitted by Cameron and Vermilion Parishes be modeled as they were originally submitted instead of using modified versions of the original projects and that the evaluation of these projects be re-submitted for review and comment before the plan is finalized. Thank you in advance for your consideration and support of the comments submitted above. Should you have any questions, please call (337) 491-1381	Projects submitted by Cameron and Vermilion Parishes were screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternative array.
38	Department of the Interior Office of the Secretary Stephen R. Spencer	May 4, 2015	Federal agency	email /letter	no comments	The U.S. Department of the Interior has reviewed the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. In this regard, we have no comment.	Comment acknowledged.
39	Elvin "Bubba" Wheat	April 19, 2015	public	email	involuntary participation/eminent domain	1. As a citizen residing within the 3 parish area affected by this study, I do not want the involuntary participation portion left in the final document containing the "eminent domain" language. It was added after the December 2013 draft, which is considered in the eleventh hour. I am fully aware of the benefits and also the weather dangers that are a part of residing in this coastal area. I do not wish for the government to decide where I choose to live.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
40					Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority	2. I view the windshield data collection within the document as problematic based on investigations made by the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority 7575 Jefferson Highway #322 Baton Rouge, LA 70806	The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
41					historical & Cultural	3. I strongly feel that the historical / cultural vision of our Louisiana heritage is lost in the document's scope and process.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process are specifically addressed subsections of Chapters 1 and 3. The Recommended NED and NER Plans were developed to address coastal land loss and reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damages to these resources.
42					government overreach	4. Based on reading previous versions I feel there is now a project distortion in the same sections of originally proposed areas. This needs to be addressed and returned to previous versions that local citizens approved. I consider this new draft an offensive government over reach.	The plan formulation process is an iterative process that develops and refines the proposed action based on consideration of existing, new and re-analyzed information. The study has moved from a general programmatic analysis documented in earlier draft reports and is now at a level of detail suitable for recommendation for construction.
43					shapefiles	5. The "shapefile" sharing issue is problematic; parishes have requested the "shapefiles" (all) since 2013.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in Appendix N to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
44					Parish Priority Projects	6. Local parish Priority Projects are not being included in this document. In previous years I have found that when this occurs, local projects are abandoned or funding is pulled. Our local citizens know best what our parishes need and are able to prioritize them better than non-residents.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
45					Representative Boustany's intent of bill	7. This study does not represent what was originally intended by Rep. Boustany's bill drafted after Hurricane Ike.	The study is consistent with the study authorization Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2747, on December 7, 2005. The study conducted a survey of the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes, with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes, including the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The 12-foot levee feature was evaluated and considered not viable because it would not provide the necessary hurricane storm surge risk reduction in a cost effective manner.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
46					Acknowledge receipt of comments and request final draft and future meeting dates	Thank you for reading and including my concerns to the study within the public comment period. I would appreciate some type of acknowledgement of receipt of my comments and also a copy of the final draft and any future meeting dates.	Acknowledge receipt of comments. The Final Integrated Report will be made available to all interested parties.
47	Environmental Protection Agency (Keith Hayden)	April 30, 2015	Federal agency	email/letter	comment letter	Thank you for submitting the Revised Draft EIS for EPA review. If you have any questions or concerns with our comment letter, please call or email at your earliest convenience. A hard copy of this letter will arrive by mail in the next few days.	Acknowledged receipt of comment letter/see separate responses to comment letter in "Government" subsection
48					request copy EIS	I would like to request a copy of the EIS, concerning the Southwest Coastal Louisiana project, proposed by the USACE, Mississippi Valley Division, New Orleans District (CEMVN). If not included, please furnish the NER plan for the Southwest Coastal projects for risk reduction measures. The National Ecosystem Restoration (NER) plan for the Southwest Coastal projects would be of great use; if it is possible to list the project funding status and impact to specific areas along with a realistic timeline.	A copy of the revised Draft Integrated Report was provided. The project funding status is pending upon receipt of Congressional approval of the project. The implementation timeline is presented in the Final Integrated Report.
49	E. Scott Henry	May 4, 2015	public	email	eminent domain	I have not heard if these projects are classified as eminent domain or voluntary. This knowledge would bring up, among other questions; funding, environmental cost and choice of citizens to participate or not.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
50					cheniers reforestation	The planting of chenier friendly trees and vegetation seems to be a great way to get the public involved, especially in Cameron and Vermillion Parishes. The Cheniers support a variety of trees, animals, human habitat and of course the mighty live oak. The protection and preservation of these magnificent trees has always been, a responsibility and tradition of landowners, big and small, for generations. They are almost sacred. Their protection has been passed down from one generation to the next, by example and dedication. The	The restoration of the chenier forests is considered an important component of ecosystem restoration across the southwest coastal Louisiana area.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement							
Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
						government has never had to protect them, the citizens have usually done the best job.	
51					Highway 82	We have fought the ROW clearing of Hwy 82 when the State DOTD ordered the live oak to be indiscriminately cut out of the State Row along Hwy 82 from Cameron to Abbeville. This authorized disaster was averted by the action of the citizens and the help of Mrs. Foster, who stepped up that day.	Comment acknowledged.
52					cheniers reforestation	The clearing of helicopter landing spots during Rita would have cost dozens of 100 year old trees to be removed for landing pads, had not General Honore intervened, upon learning of the significance of the tree to the survivors of Hurricane Audry. We did lose an especially large tree in Cameron at the Court House Square, because it was in the way of a construction path. The PW called for the removal of one of these great oaks due to the fact that this great tree was close to 7' in girth and impeded the construction of a FEMA project work space. The explanation was to "just plant another one!" Please allow the general public to participate in this part of the plan, we live here, we will be here for the next storm and we hope the great live oak will be left in the hands of the stewards and not just the policy makers and wage earners, who do what they are told and or lose their job. We were blessed with a group of Nat. Guard, La. State employees, local business and brave citizens; who spoke up and confronted the removal of even a limb, much to the criticisms of good people who grew up protecting these trees, but was caught up in the Fed vs State vs citizens dilemma and what to do and what not to do. Years ago, I ask my Grandfather why he planted acorns every year. He said he would never sit in the shade of any live oak he planted. I thought he was senile! But, he said because someone planted an acorn before him, he owed the next generation the ability to sit in the shade of a live oak. If he did not, then no one would be able to swing on a limb or sit in the shade of a tree he planted. He said he was	Comment acknowledged.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
						doing it for his grandchildren. Now I do the same, I appreciate your help and your offer, but please do not take the choice or freedom to protect these grand survivors.	
53					keep up good work	Please do not take anything I have said as being ungrateful to the community, Nat Guard, Femi, State and Federal government or any employee's for all the help and money they poured into our little corner of the world. You are why we are still here, It will take more of us to establish and guarantee that there will always be someone here to protect and work as a steward of the land. Please keep up the good work. Let us help.	Comment acknowledged
54	Gloria Conlin	April 22, 2015	public	email/petition	April 17, 2015 petition	As a voting resident of Louisiana I ask that you reconsider the attached and accept my personal comments in relation to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Please protect Our Coast, Our Culture and Our Ability to Provide for Our Families! Thank you.	Acknowledge receipt of email and attached petitions. Response to petition comments are included in the General Responses.
55	John Dale "Zach" Lee	April 22, 2015	public	email/petition	April 17, 2015 petition	As a voting resident of Louisiana I ask that you reconsider the attached and accept my personal comments in relation to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Please protect Our Coast, Our Culture and Our Ability to Provide for Our Families! Thank you.	Acknowledge receipt of email and attached petitions. Response to petition comments are included in the General Responses.
56	Judith Falcon	April 30, 2015	public	email	proposed plan will cause erosion and storm surge	I am extremely disappointed in the Corps of Engineer's Plan. Instead of submitting a plan to save our precious coast, they are submitting a plan to ensure further erosion and storm surge. An agency which was originally established to protect and serve has become an agency to ruin and rob. At one time, not many years in the past, the Corps was held in such high esteem. So disappointing.	The Recommended Plan would reduce the risk of hurricane storm surge flood damages for almost 4,000 structures. The Recommended Plan also includes marsh and chenier restoration features and shoreline protection features resulting in creation, nourishment and/or protection to over 15,000 net acres and over 4,000 average annual habitat units.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
57	Karen Wheat	April 19, 2015	public	email	involuntary participation/eminent domain	1. As a citizen residing within the 3 parish area affected by this study, I do not want the involuntary participation portion left in the final document containing the “eminent domain” language. It was added after the December 2013 draft, which is considered in the eleventh hour. I am fully aware of the benefits and also the weather dangers that are a part of residing in this coastal area. I do not wish for the government to decide where I choose to live.	*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table. See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat (see page J-16 of this Appendix).
58					Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority	2. I view the windshield data collection within the document as problematic based on investigations made by the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority 7575 Jefferson Highway #322 Baton Rouge, LA 70806	See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat on page J-16 of this Appendix.
59					historical & Cultural	3. I strongly feel that the historical / cultural vision of our Louisiana heritage is lost in the document's scope and process.	See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat on page J-16 of this Appendix.
60					government overreach	4. Based on reading previous versions I feel there is now a project distortion in the same sections of originally proposed areas. This needs to be addressed and returned to previous versions that local citizens approved. I consider this new draft an offensive government over reach.	See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat on page J-16 of this Appendix.
61					shapefiles	5. The “shapefile” sharing issue is problematic; parishes have requested the “shapefiles” (all) since 2013.	See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat on page J-16 of this Appendix.
62					Parish Priority Projects	6. Local parish Priority Projects are not being included in this document. In previous years I have found that when this occurs, local projects are abandoned or funding is pulled. Our local citizens know best what our parishes need and are able to prioritize them better than non-residents.	See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat on page J-16 of this Appendix.
63					Representative Boustany's intent of bill	7. This study does not represent what was originally intended by Rep. Boustany's bill drafted after Hurricane Ike.	See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat on page J-16 of this Appendix.
64					Acknowledge receipt of comments and request final	Thank you for reading and including my concerns to the study within the public comment period. I would appreciate some type of acknowledgement of receipt of my	See responses to Elvin "Bubba" Wheat on page J-16 of this Appendix.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
					draft and future meeting dates	comments and also a copy of the final draft and any future meeting dates.	
65	Michael Hare (Deputy Director, Congressman Charles W. Boustany Jr., LA 3)	May 4, 2015	Federal	email	submission of comments Louisiana Delegation	Ms. Stiles, On behalf of the entire Louisiana Delegation, please accept these comments and concerns. Please note, I have also attached 2 documents related to Cameron and Vermilion Parishes as referenced in our letter. Thank you,	Acknowledge receipt of comment letter. Please see response to Louisiana Delegation Comments in "Government" sub-table.
66					email with attached comments	I have attached a Word document that outlines my objections to the NED portion of the Corps' March, 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report. Thank you for considering my comments as you develop the final version of the NED plan.	Acknowledge receipt of comment email
67	Mike Toerner	April 28, 2015	public	email	elevation of structures	I am writing because my wife and I own property in Calcasieu and Cameron parishes and because I oppose the "National Economic Development (NED)" portion of the Corps' report. The reasons for my opposition are as follows.1. The Corps did not have the statutory authority to make the recommendations that it did.On 12/7/2005, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives authorized the Corps to survey the coast of Louisiana, use the survey information to recommend ways to provide hurricane and storm protection, and study the feasibility of constructing a levee along the Intracoastal Waterway. The House Committee did not give the Corps the authority to develop a plan to elevate residential structures and to use eminent domain to seize the property of the residents who did not want to participate in the elevation program.	The study is consistent with the study authorization Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2747, on December 7, 2005. The study conducted a survey of the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes, with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes, including the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The 12-foot levee feature was evaluated and considered not viable because it would not provide the necessary hurricane storm surge risk reduction in a cost effective manner. **See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
68					cost benefit ratio	2. The cost/benefit analysis that underlies the NED plan is based on questionable assumptions. The Corps defined "benefits" as the reduction in damages that would result from implementing its recommendations (page D-18). "Damages," however, can be defined in a variety of ways, many of which could produce lower dollar amounts (and, thus, "benefits") than the ones that the Corps obtained.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
69					due process, failure to identify affected public	3. Property owners affected by the NED plan were denied due process. To date, the Corps has refused to publicly identify the thousands of residential properties whose owners would be required to elevate their homes or face eminent-domain seizure of their property. There is no doubt that, had they known what the Corps was proposing with regard to their property, these individuals would have attended the Corps' public hearings and/or made written comments to the Corps.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in Appendix N to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures. Recommended Plan is included in the Final Integrated Report.
70					eminent domain	4. The NED plan is biased against residential property owners. As mentioned above, the NED plan provides that residential property owners who do not voluntarily participate in the Corps' structure-elevation program will face eminent-domain seizure of their property. The NED plan contains no such provision for non-residential property owners who refuse to either dry floodproof their structures or construct berms around their property.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
71					eminent domain	5. The NED plan discriminates against property owners in coastal Louisiana. People who live in other parts of the U.S. are not being told by the Corps or other Federal agencies to disaster-proof their homes or face eminent-domain seizure of their property. By not treating all disaster-area residents the same, the Corps is discriminating against the residents of coastal Louisiana.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
72					eminent domain	6. The eminent-domain feature of the NED plan represents governmental overreach.I believe that people, in choosing where to live, weigh the costs and risks against the perceived benefits. I do not believe that the government has the right to threaten to use its eminent-domain authority to try to make people move to an area that the government deems more desirable.Thank you for considering my comments as you develop the final version of the NED plan.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
73	Morgan Herden	April 17,2015	public	email	identify if included in NED Plan	My wife bought a piece of land in 2009 or 2010, 621 Shamrock Lane, Sulphur La 70663. In late 2013 we cleared it and built a pad for a double wide 2400 sq ft trailer. We went through the parish and met all the requirements for the flood stage which is 16' now. They raised this level after Hurricane Rita which basically 3-4' above the paved road. I have the I Beam of the trailer sitting at 17' and our main floor around 19'. I went a little higher for safety reasons. Pretty much if we flood, the city of Sulphur, Westlake, and Lake Charles will be under water for the most part. This Study is saying that you can take our land from us and there are 400 structures that are in the Involuntary Participation. I have spent almost \$40,000 on improving our land. How can I find out where we stand within this study? I do not want to wait a year and waste more money if you are going to come to me and say get out.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table. Appendix N with maps of all identified structures included in the NED Recommended Plan is included in the Final Integrated Report.
74	Nancy Murphy Geer Toerner	April 20, 2015	Public Comment	Email	Involuntary participation	As a citizen residing within the 3 parish area affected by this study, I do not want the involuntary participation portion left in the final document containing the "eminent domain" language. It was added after the December 2013 draft, which is considered in the eleventh hour. I am fully aware of the benefits and also the weather dangers that are a part of residing in this coastal area. I do not wish for the government to decide where I choose to live.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table. A new appendix with maps of all identified structures included in the NED Recommended Plan is included in the Final Integrated Report.
75					windshield data	I view the windshield data collection within the document as problematic based on investigations made by the: Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority, 7575 Jefferson Highway #322, Baton Rouge, LA 70806	The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.
76					historic & cultural heritage	I strongly feel that the historical / cultural vision of our Louisiana heritage is lost in the document's scope and process.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process and are specifically addressed in Chapter 1 and 3 the Final Integrated Report devoted entirely to these resources.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
77					previous versions of projects	Based on reading previous versions I feel there is now a project distortion in the same sections of originally proposed areas. This needs to be addressed and returned to previous versions that local citizens approved. I consider this new draft an offensive government over reach.	The plan formulation process is an iterative process that develops and refines the proposed action based on consideration of existing, new and re-analyzed information. The study has moved from a general programmatic analysis documented in earlier draft reports and is now at a level of detail suitable for recommendation for construction.
78					shapefiles	The “shapefile” sharing issue is problematic; parishes have requested the “shapefiles” (all) since 2013.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
79					include local parish priority projects into study	Local parish Priority Projects are not being included in this document. In previous years I have found that when this occurs, local projects are abandoned or funding is pulled. Our local citizens know best what our parishes need and are able to prioritize them better than non-residents.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the report.
80					Representative Boustany's intent of bill	This study does not represent what was originally intended by Rep. Boustany’s bill drafted after Hurricane Ike.	The study is consistent with the study authorization Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2747, on December 7, 2005. The study conducted a survey of the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes, with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes, including the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The 12-foot levee feature was evaluated and considered not viable because it would not provide the necessary hurricane storm surge risk reduction in a cost effective manner.
81					Acknowledge receipt of comments and request final draft and future meeting dates	Thank you for reading and including my concerns to the study within the public comment period. I would appreciate some type of acknowledgement of receipt of my comments and also a copy of the final draft and any future meeting dates. Best regards, Nancy Murphy Geer Toerner	Acknowledge receipt of comments. The Final Integrated Report will be made available to all interested parties.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
82	Nedra Davis	April 27, 2015	Local Government	email/letter	submission of comments of Chenier Plain Authority	In January of 2009 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Louisiana announced an agreement to jointly fund an eight (8) million dollar feasibility study to provide hurricane damage risk reduction and coastal restoration to Southwest Coastal Louisiana. The Southwest Coastal Feasibility Study was initially authorized in December of 2005. In March 2015, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released the Southwest Coastal Feasibility Draft Study (Draft Study) and the agency is currently accepting public comment until May 4, 2015. The Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority (Chenier Plain Authority), by intent of this correspondence, hereby respectfully requests that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers accept the following Letter and Resolution (attachments) as comments provided by the Chenier Plain Authority's review of the Draft Study. The Chenier Plain Authority would like to thank the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for allowing us to comment on this draft feasibility report for the Southwest Coastal Study. Please contact us if you have any questions or concerns regarding our comments.	Acknowledge receipt of comment.
83					involuntary participation/eminent domain	Section 1. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends the removal of all eminent domain or involuntary participation references from the study.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
84					Parish Priority Projects	Section 2. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers add an appendix to include a list of all priority projects from Cameron and Vermilion Parishes identifying these projects as good and viable for consideration in any future funding opportunities.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
85					Parish Priority Projects	Section 3. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers add a statement in the draft that states, "Calcasieu Parish anticipates updating their coastal plan which will include a priority projects list. Those projects will be viable projects for consideration of funding for protecting Lake Charles to the 500 year level of protection as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana 2012."	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new Appendix N to the Final Integrated Report. Appendix N contains the following statement: "Though not an endorsement of any project under this study effort, Parish Priority Projects that would be provided by the Parishes to the State for consideration as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana are included in this Appendix only as a reference for future planning under other study authorities."
					funding in place	Section 4. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that 100% federal and state funding be in place for all mitigation non-structural components.	Mitigation for project-induced impacts is not anticipated.
					historic and cultural preservation	Section 5. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that the original goals and objectives of the Ecosystem Restoration, Risk Reduction and Historic and Cultural Preservation, be included and implemented as part of the final draft of the study.	Generally, the planning goals of the NED Plan are to reduce risk of damages associated with hurricane storm surge flooding. The NED storm damage risk reduction plans were formulated to achieve NED principles and objectives. Contributions to NED are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units, and are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and the rest of the Nation. The general planning goals of the NER Plan are to significantly and sustainably reduce land loss and coastal erosion in the study area, restore environmental conditions for the Chenier Plain ecosystem in SWC Louisiana, and evaluate a range of coastal restoration components to address a multitude of ecosystem problems. Plans were formulated to achieve NER principles and objectives. Contributions to NER are increases in the net quantity and/or quality of desired ecosystem resources, and are measured in the study area and nationwide. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NED Objective 1. Reduce the risk of damages and losses from hurricane storm surge flooding. • NER Objective 2. Manage tidal flows to improve drainage, and prevent salinity from exceeding 2 parts per thousand (ppt) for fresh



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
							marsh and 6 ppt for intermediate marsh. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NER Objective 3. Increase wetland productivity in fresh and intermediate marshes to maintain function by reducing the time water levels exceed marsh surfaces. • NER Objective 4. Reduce shoreline erosion and stabilize canal banks to protect adjacent wetlands. • NER Objective 5. Restore landscapes, including marsh, shoreline, and cheniers to maintain their function as wildlife habitat and improve their ability to serve as protective barriers.
					shapefiles	Section 6. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers provide Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes the Shape files for the elevation of all structures surveyed as part of its decision making criteria.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
					benefit cost ratio	Section 7. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends a review of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) parameters instead of the “wind shield view” BCR and requests transparency of how the final Benefit Cost Ratio will be determined.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.
86					modeling original projects	Section 8. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that projects originally submitted be modeled as they were submitted and not have projects watered down to include only a small-scale section of what was originally intended.	Projects submitted by various entities (e.g., Cameron and Vermilion Parishes) were screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternative array.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
87					certified copy of resolution provided	BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, the Honorable Charles Boustany and all congressional representatives of the parishes of Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes, the Police Juries of Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes, the Louisiana State Levee Consortium, the Association of Louisiana Board of Levees, and the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, respectfully requesting consideration and support of the comments submitted by the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority by virtue of this resolution. THUS DONE AND APOTED by a unanimous vote of the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority, in regular session convened on this 21 day of April 2015.	Acknowledge receipt of comment resolution.
88	Roderic Vaughn	April 30, 2015	public	email/petition	email with April 17, 2015 petition	I am sending you a signed copy of petition opposing Eminent Domain writing in Vermilion Parish coastal protection recommendations. I was born in Vermilion Parish and oppose this part of the flood protection draft. I would like it removed.	Receipt of email and petition acknowledged, please see response to petition under April 17 2015 petition subheading. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
89	Ryan Bourriaque (Parish Administrator, Cameron Parish Police Jury)	April 27, 2015	Parish Government	email/letter	email with comment letter attachment	Please accept the attached letter of comment on behalf of the Cameron Parish Police Jury. The hard copy original will be forwarded to your office. Please reply and verify receipt of this email. Thank you for this courtesy,	Receipt of email and comment letter acknowledged, please see response to comment letter under "government" subheading.
90	Shannon Neveaux	May 1, 2015	public	email/petition	email with comment petitions	I respectfully request that the US Army Corps of Engineers accept the enclosed 2,040 comments pertaining to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement along with any others that may have arrived separately before or after receipt of this package. Although these comments are presented in a 'petition' format, this document was not created to replace personal comments. This comment/petition was designed to give the people of our communities the opportunity to clearly and uniformly express the MAJOR concerns that we have with the current draft, as we found	Receipt of petition format comments is acknowledged. Responses to petition comments are included in General Comment Response. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
						many struggled to consider comments on such a large detailed document in the time allowed. These simple signatures should be considered a representation of only a small portion, of the strength of our opposition the language in the draft that references 'Involuntary Participation' and 'Eminent Domain'. These signatures should not be considered to be a complete list of concerns. An electronic copy of the signatures and comments enclosed is available upon your request.	
91	Shannon Neveaux	May 5, 2015	public	email/petition	email with comment petitions	I respectfully request that the US Army Corps of Engineers accept the enclosed 445 comments, pertaining to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement in addition to the 2040 signatures sent on May 1, 2015 and along with any others that may have arrived separately before or after receipt of this electronic file. Please let me know where these comments will be recorded and how they will be included with other comments received during this draft's comment period. The originals have been sent to you via the US Postal Service and should arrive later this week. These additions bring the total number of comments/petitions to 2485. This total does not include copies that have been sent separately by individuals or parishes. To many people the total number may not seem very impressive, but it is very close to the 2616 owner-occupied units that were flooded in Vermilion Parish alone for Hurricane Rita. The majority of signatures were collected from residents of Vermilion, Cameron and Calcasieu parishes. We also received support for our message from people living outside of these parishes. Many of them own property here, worked here or enjoy the marshes and coastal areas in Vermilion, Cameron and Calcasieu that we are asking you to protect. Although these comments are presented in a 'petition' format, this document was not created to replace personal comments. This comment/petition was designed to give the people of our	Acknowledge receipt of petition comments. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
						communities the opportunity to clearly and uniformly express the MAJOR concerns that we have with the current draft, as we found many struggled to consider comments on such a large, detailed document in the time allowed. These simple signatures should be considered a representation of only a small portion, of the strength of our opposition the language in the draft that references 'Involuntary Participation' and 'Eminent Domain'. These signatures should not be considered to be a complete list of concerns. An electronic copy of the signatures and comments enclosed is available upon your request. Thank you,	
92	State of Louisiana, Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)	April 28, 2015	Louisiana State agency	email/letter	include locally proposed projects in report	Secondly, the CPRA recognizes the National Ecosystem Restoration Plan, while comprehensive and large in scale, addresses only the critical needs of the three-parish study area and that other restoration measures not included in this study, such as those contained in parish plans, would be beneficial and should be considered viable projects. We would therefore request that language be added to address the importance of locally proposed projects that may be pursued by federal, state and/or local governments. These projects should be evaluated independently on their merits and should be judged on how these projects will act in concert with existing programs and plans to address local issues of concern.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
93					contact information	Thank you again for this opportunity to offer comments on the SWCFS. We look forward to continuing to work with the USACE to advance this important study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jennifer Mouton of my staff at (225) 342-1452.	Acknowledged.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
94	Sue Neveaux	April 28, 2015	public citizen	email	involuntary participation/eminent domain	As a North Vermilion Parish resident I would like to comment on the recent studies and finding of the Corps of Engineers for the coastline of Vermilion Parish. We personally have been effected by laws set to "supposedly" protect our coast, wetlands and people. Because of the recent laws we cannot do what we want to do on our own land. Our children can't build homes where they want to on family land. I will never agree with studies you do with the words "imminent domain" or "involuntary participation" in them. Please remove these phrases from the studies.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
95	Suzy Heck	April 16, 2015	public citizen	email	elevation of structures and list of affected properties	Concerning an Article in the April 16, 2015 American Press Titled "Concerns expressed over SW La. coastal study". My home in Flooded in 2005 Hurricane Rita (2' floodwater in house for 24+ hours), and again in 2008 Hurricane Ike (3' floodwater in house for 3 days). I received a letter from Calcasieu Parish Police Jury - Division of Planning and Development on February 26, 2014 stating that "Congratulations! You have been approved for grant funding to assist with the costs..... Voluntary Homeowners Agreement for Elevation".I hear nothing back from them and called in April 2014. After talking with several employees there - I was told that they had decided that I was not worth it. If my property flooded again, that they "might" reconsider. How do I find out if my property is one that is considered in this study? I want to keep my house and land. I have lived here for 20+ years and never flooded before Hurricane Rita. Please, I cannot go through another flood. Please - the toll on my house, property, and health cannot take another flood. I live south of Lake Charles close to the Calcasieu River. Thank you in advance for any information you can give,	*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table. A new appendix with maps of all identified structures included in the NED Recommended Plan is included in the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
EMAIL COMMENTS							
96	Tom Couste	May 4, 2015	public citizen	email	beneficial use of dredged material	The following is my public comment regarding the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement: It is understood the USACE Federal Standard is defined as the least costly dredged material disposal or placement alternative (or alternatives) identified by USACE. In an effort to provide storm surge damage risk reduction and ecosystem restoration while maintaining navigable waters, I encourage the USACE, State of Louisiana, and Port Authorities to utilize dredged materials for beneficial use on all south Louisiana dredge maintenance projects. This includes developing long term strategies/planning for each Louisiana river requiring maintenance dredging, identify/develop specific beneficial use projects, and provide complementary Federal and State funding for the additional cost if needed. As a resident of southwest Louisiana, I feel beneficial use of dredged material is a critical part of stabilizing Louisiana's coastal areas. Dredged material should be treated as a resource instead of a waste material. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	The USACE is presently beneficially utilizing maintenance-dredged material to the maximum extent practicable during maintenance dredging operations. The Southwest Coastal Louisiana study includes the following beneficial use: Two marsh restoration features of the recommended plan (3a1 & 3c1) involve the beneficial use of dredge material from the Calcasieu Ship Channel. Feature 3c1 is partially located on USFWS refuge lands. USFWS should seek authorization and appropriation to construct this feature as described in the Final Report (including the beneficial use of dredged material).
97	Tricia Gaspard	April 28, 2015	public citizen	email	levee/oil funds	The money we get from oil in our area should only go to this protection levee.	Funding for the proposed Southwest Coastal Louisiana project would be authorized from Congress.
98					involuntary participation/eminent domain	This is our land that we paid for. Our home. This decision is not yours to make!!!! Don't play GOD.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
1	Ashley K. Buller Cameron Parish Police Jury April 16, 2015 dated Petitions signed by following: Cameron Parish Police Jury Ashley K Buller sent 64 petitions dated 16 April 2015 from following individuals: Ann Langlinais (Abbeville); Barbara Portie (Creole); Barron Guidry (Grand Chenier); Beulah Bradley (Hackberry); Brandon J. Carter Jr. (Grand Chenier); Carol Wainght (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Catlyn Hendrix (Creole); Ceasar Swire (Grand Chenier); Cecil J Clark (Grand Chenier); Cheryl A. Broussard (Grand Chenier); Christopher Fountein (Grand Chenier); Craig Hendrix (Grand Lake); Craig Matthew Manuel (Sweetlake); Danny Lavergue (Grand Lake); Darilyn Canik (Grand Chenier); Darren Richard (Creole); David Al Duprie (Grand Chenier);	April 24, 2015	Cameron Parish Police Jury	email/petitions	petitions on behalf of Cameron Parish residents	<p>As a voting resident of Louisiana I ask that you reconsider the listed items and accept my personal comments in relation to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement.</p> <p>*Please include Parish Priority Projects! The Corp has prepared a study that will recommend a non-structural plan of action. Due to the inability to meet your current 'cost/benefit ratio' standards, only a very small list of measures have been 'tentatively selected'. While the selected list may indeed be cost effective, I feel that our parish deserves 'protection'. In order to clearly support any future consideration of funding for a structural protection measure, I ask that you insert a LIST of ALL of the measures and projects proposed in the parishes' existing and proposed Coastal Restoration & Protection Plans. The inclusion will eliminate all unintentional exclusion of projects that were not tentatively selected and will clearly indicate worthiness for future consideration for funding. Inclusion of these projects will also allow the study to reflect the original purpose and intent of Rep. Boustany's bill, which was always to provide hurricane protection to Southwest Coastal Louisiana. The resiliency and efficiency shown by the parish's residents and business owners in protecting their homes and buildings should not have lessened the urgency and consideration given to protecting the land on which those structures have been built</p> <p>*I ask that any and all reference or language to 'eminent domain' and 'involuntary participation' be completely removed from this study. The property owner's choice remain at their 'own risk' or possibly without future assistance are the only appropriate alternatives to 'voluntary participation'. I do not agree that protecting the Federal government's interests</p>	<p>Acknowledge receipt of email and attached petitions. Response to petition comments are included in the General Responses.</p> <p>Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new Appendix N to the Final Integrated Report. Appendix N contains the following statement: "Though not an endorsement of any project under this study effort, Parish Priority Projects that would be provided by the Parishes to the State for consideration as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana are included in this Appendix only as a reference for future planning under other study authorities."</p> <p>The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.</p>



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response	
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)								
	Denton C. Vincent (Grand Chenier); Dinah Landry (Grand Lake); Douglas M. Haynie (Creole); Drucilla Vincent (Grand Chenier); Emma Jean Miller (Cameron); Eric Baccughlopi (Creole); Francis Guilbeau (Cameron); Freddie Theriot (Grand Chenier); Gary Primeaux (Grand Chenier); Gary Shipman (Cameron); Iris Broussard (Grand Chenier); Jeanette Thibodeaux Jacobs (Creole); Jennifer Dockins (Cameron); Jennifer Picou (Cameron); Jerry Dockins (Cameron); Jimmie Ann McLean (Grand Chenier); JoDee Roberts (Grand Lake); Joseph E. Trahan (Grand Lake); Judy & P.J. Broussard (Abbeville); Kenton Bonsall (Grand Chenier); Kim Richard (Creole); Leslie D. Griffith (Grand Chenier); Martial A. Young (Grand Lake);						<p>should supersede the choices that landowners make. It was my understanding that the goal of this plan was to restore and protect the coast and marshes, assist in preserving the unique culture, not to remove people from their homes and family lands. The precedence set by such language has the potential to completely destroy the culture and unique way of life in coastal Louisiana. PLEASE TAKE IT OUT!</p> <p>*I request that a 'Local sponsor' be chosen and have an immediate 'voice' in the remaining planning process of the study. It is clear that 'local sponsor' will be burdened with implementing and enforcing many portions of the study if ever funded. Modeling and Data should never realistically replace the practical knowledge gained by living in an area for a lifetime. Local sponsors can assist in making valid and important corrections and local concerns could be addressed immediately.</p> <p>*I ask that reforestation measures be replaced with shoreline protection measures. Reforestation is the most cost effective measure proposed in the study. By deleting all protective levees and structures out of the 'Temporary Selected Plan', the Corp's was able to meet one of its highest priorities, cost effectiveness. More shoreline protection is critical. Previous projects have shown that reforestation will be successful only after protection is implemented. Shoreline protection would be a better investment for our coasts future.</p>	<p>Coordination with Parishes and local stakeholders has occurred since the study was initiated. Efforts to keep stakeholders up to date were redoubled after the public review period to ensure awareness of study developments. This included study presentations, public meetings, conference calls, and other communication updates.</p> <p>Chenier and shoreline protection measures were all evaluated under a comprehensive integrated restoration strategy. Each measure accomplishes a different goal that is important for the ecosystem. Cheniers cover over 1,400 acres and shoreline extends for over 250,000 ft. Both measures are important in working towards overall ecosystem restoration.</p>



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
	Michael Jacobs (Creole); Lanny Nihire (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Mitchel Kelly (Grand Chenier); Nadine Richard (Grand Chenier); Nina Jones (Grand Chenier). Pamela Kelley (Grand Chenier); Peggy Reyes (Cameron); Ran Johnson (name not legible, Grand Lake); Richard Cauik (Grand Chenier); Richard James Dahlan (Creole); Robert Portie (Creole); Rodney McLean (Grand Chenier); Sara Roy (Grand Chenier); Sheila Miller (Grand Chenier); Steven Landry (Creole); Susan Fawvar (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Theodor A. Broussard (Grand Chenier); Toby Landry (Grand Lake); Tye Fontenot (Creole); Watt Richard (Grand Chenier); Willis Luie (name is not legible, Grand Chenier); Win Kioin Warrant (name not legible, Grand Chenier); Zachary Taylor Vincent (Grand Lake)						



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
2	Brian Lusher (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation)	May 4, 2015	Federal (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation)	email	cultural and historic resources	Thank you for the opportunity to comment the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement, March, 2015. I am also in receipt of the SHPO's comments on this draft. The SHPO has raised some very good questions and provided great information; I look forward to the Corps' response to those comments:	Acknowledgment
3					borrow areas	P1-21, Second paragraph: Though no previously recorded sites have been identified at the borrow locations, does Corps propose surveying those areas for historic properties?	USACE shall complete cultural resources investigations pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements. The level of survey to be conducted and the survey methodology will be developed in consultation with the SHPO and consulting Tribes and will be completed in a manner that meets the standards of the Louisiana Division of Archaeology.
4					presence of archeology in cheniers	1-33, first paragraph: this paragraph seems very vague and, in reference to SHPO's comments, should it be clarified to indicate the likely presence of archaeology in the Cheniers? Or perhaps Corps could allude to the fact that it may not yet know of the presence of historic properties and that identification efforts will be identified in a PA?	The likelihood of encountering cultural resources in the cheniers and the status of identification efforts have been clarified in Chapter 3.
5					survey and identification	Page 2-2, 2.2: historic and cultural resources: at the high altitude level this document has, it may be very worthwhile to also characterize how much land has NOT been surveyed for historic properties. In other words, how much ID of HP's is likely necessary in the future? The characterization that is presented might mislead the casual reader to think that all HP's have been identified. Does only one historic district fall into the APE?	This has been clarified in the report. It is estimated that less than 15% of the NER APE has been surveyed for cultural and historic resources. Identification and evaluation of historic properties will take place pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
6					13-foot elevation	Page 2-14, 2.5.5., second bullet: Are you saying that any building that would require elevation over 13 feet would be acquired? For what? Automatic demolition? This is unclear and should be clarified.	The NED RP is 100% voluntary. Any structure that requires raising more than 13 ft. above ground level would be ineligible to participate due to engineering and risk related factors.
7					PA implementation	Page 3-16, 3.3.9.: This may be too much detail, but if the Corps may wish to implement a PA by the fall of 2015, then time is of the essence. Is it the Corps strategy to identify HP's, via a PA protocol, after project authorization? Again, this begs the question as some HP's have been identified, but it is unclear how much survey work may be necessary.	Identification and evaluation of historic properties will take place pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements.
8					nonstructural concerns	Page 4-1, 4.1.1.: What happens if, say, an owner otherwise meets the criteria for a voluntary non-structural project, but then, say, refuses to accept a covenant (or is otherwise unwilling or unable to accept the conditions)? Would this then become an involuntary action? Who carries the cost of removing asbestos? What are the eligibility criteria used to determine if a property is eligible for a non-structural action? Dry flood proofing: is it a known fact that any historic building subjected to this treatment would suffer an adverse effect? In other words, is this treatment reversible or has the Corps considered whether that is possible? Who makes the determination that flood proofing has been installed as proposed? Corps?	The NED RP is 100% voluntary. Please refer to the NED RP draft implementation plan for additional details.
9					entire structure vs habitable area	4-3, 4.1.2.: Regarding lifting a structure – to determine effects, it seems the Corps would need to be able to distinguish between 'entire structure' and 'habitable area'. For instance, how would this distinction affect historic properties? Does this refer to, say, a main house and other support structures?	Effects to historic properties will be determined through consultation pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements.
10					elevated vs acquired	4.1.2.1.: regarding the 'elevated' or 'acquired' choice, can you provide more detail on how that choice would be made and how the Corps would consider effects? If acquired, is it solely for the purpose of demolition? I wonder whether there are circumstances in which Corps should consider ways to avoid or minimize the potential effect. What about	The NED RP includes elevating residential structures, dry flood proofing non-residential structures, and constructing localized storm surge risk reduction measures around warehouses. Effects will be determined through consultation pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						mitigation for cases in which demolition is unavoidable?	
11					finding cultural resources	Page 4-12, paragraph 3: SHPO raises an interesting question about the possibility of finding cultural resources in this area and it will be productive to hear the Corps' thoughts on this	USACE shall complete cultural resources investigations pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements. The level of survey to be conducted and the survey methodology will be developed in consultation with the SHPO and consulting Tribes and will be completed in a manner that meets the standards of the Louisiana Division of Archaeology.
12					exclude properties eligible for listing in NRHP	Appendix L: L-3, fourth paragraph, first sentence. Why does this specifically exclude all properties eligible for listing in the NRHP? At 17 years, this is to be a long-lived undertaking. Think about how the eventual 106 agreement will address periodic means for the CP's to assess the document's efficacy.	Historic properties are not excluded from participation.
13					historic property avoid minimize reduce	Appendix L: 7-7, C: Residential Structure Elevation Program – is it correct that a building may be only elevated or acquired for demolition? Would there be circumstances in which a historic property may meet one of the criteria for involuntary participation? In this case, how would Corps think about avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating adverse effects?	The NED RP includes elevation and floodproofing. There is no involuntary participation.
14	Cameron Parish Gravity Drainage District No. 5. D.Y. Doland, President		Cameron Parish	letter	do not limit restoration projects	1. Please do not limit the number of coastal restoration projects listed in the study. Include the Cameron Master Plan projects even in an appendix to be available for other discretionary funding sources in the future. Currently, the Parish has 9 projects listed in the study. We feel that there are significantly more projects that are viable and are not even up for discussion due to the benefit cost ratio and the national interest with these projects. THUS DONE AND ADOPTED on the 23rd day of April, 2015.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix (Appendix P) to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
15					Involuntary participation, funding sources local sponsors	Removing the discussion about involuntary participation in the non-structural aspect of the program. This was never the intent of the study to have relocations. Other questions arise from this section such as funding sources,	*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table. The CPRA is the non-Federal Sponsor or "Local Sponsor". As in most civil works projects,



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						sponsoring agencies, local sponsors, administrative processes, etc. that all should be addressed prior to finalizing the study with this included.	funding and other administrative processes follow prescribed laws, rules and regulation. The approval of funds for the project is by Congressional action.
16						3. Provide GIS Shapefiles of the eligible structures to be elevated as part of the NED project for Cameron Parish for the Parish to determine the current status of these structures. Cameron Parish has several State and Federal programs that have assisted with elevation and flood-proofing of structures post-Rita & Ike. Building codes and elevation requirements should assist with mitigating the risk of these structures.	A new appendix with maps of all identified structures included in the NED Recommended Plan is included in the Final Integrated Report.
17					contact telephone number	Regarding the Southwest Study, revisions to the draft version of this document would certainly result in a more effective and efficient study. Thank you for allowing us to comment on this draft feasibility report for the Southwest Coastal Study. Feel free to call me if you have any questions or concerns at 337-652-9771.	Comments on the Revised Draft Integrated Report have been incorporated into the Final Integrated Report.
18	Cameron Parish Gravity Drainage District No. 4	April 15, 2015	Cameron Parish	letter	do not limit restoration projects	1. Please do not limit the number of coastal restoration projects listed in the study. Include the Cameron Master Plan projects even in an appendix to be available for other discretionary funding sources in the future. Currently, the Parish has 9 projects listed in the study. We feel that there are significantly more projects that are viable and are not even up for discussion due to the benefit cost ratio and the national interest with these projects.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
19					involuntary participation/other questions to be answered	2. Removing the discussion about involuntary participation in the non-structural aspect of the program. This was never the intent of the study to have relocations.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
20					address other questions	Other questions arise from this section such as funding sources, sponsoring agencies, local sponsors, administrative processes, etc. that all should be addressed prior to finalizing the study with this included.	The Final Integrated Report identifies the non-Federal sponsor as the State of Louisiana, Coastal Protection & Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana, the cost share, and other



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
							administrative processes for implementing the project.
21					shapefiles	3. Provide GIS Shapefiles of the eligible structures to be elevated as part of the NED project for Cameron Parish for the Parish to determine the current status of these structures.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
22					elevation and flood-proofing	Cameron Parish has several State and Federal programs that have assisted with elevation and flood-proofing of structures post-Rita & Ike. Building codes and elevation requirements should assist with mitigating the risk of these structures.	Acknowledge Cameron Parish previous actions regarding building codes and elevation requirements.
23					revise draft report	Regarding the Southwest Study, revisions to the draft version of this document would certainly result in a more effective and efficient study. Thank you for allowing us to comment on this draft feasibility report for the Southwest Coastal Study.	The Final Integrated Report has been revised based on comments to the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS.
24	Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	April 24, 2015	Calcasieu Parish	memorandum of resolution on April 23, 2015	resolution	Enclosed is a certified copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury on April 23, 2015, wherein the Police Jury respectfully requests the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to accept comments and recommendations based upon its review of the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS Study) that was released in March 2015. Your support of the Police Jury in this matter would be greatly appreciated.	Copy of certified resolution adopted by the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury on April 23, 2015 is acknowledged



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
25					whereas	WHEREAS, in January of 2009, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Louisiana announced an agreement to jointly fund an \$8 million feasibility study to provide hurricane damage risk reduction and coastal restoration to Southwest Coastal Louisiana; and WHEREAS, authority for the reconnaissance study exists under resolutions of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives in response to a request for support submitted by Congressman Charles Boustany; and WHEREAS, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS Study) in March 2015, and the agency is currently accepting public comment until May 5, 2015; and WHEREAS, Southwest Coastal Louisiana is highly susceptible to an increased risk of coastal flooding, shoreline erosion, saltwater intrusion and loss of wetlands and habitats due to land subsidence, sea-level rise, the area's low elevation, flat terrain, and close proximity to the Gulf of Mexico; and WHEREAS, land loss and ecosystem degradation threaten the continued productivity of Southwest Coastal Louisiana's ecosystem, the economic viability of its industries, and the safety of its residents.	Acknowledged receipt of comment.
26					eminent domain	NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE POLICE JURY OF CALCASIEU, PARISH, LOUISIANA, in Regular Session convened on the 23rd day of April, 2015, that it does hereby respectfully request the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to accept the following comments and recommendations as part of the Police Jury's review of the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS Study). Section 1. Remove all eminent domain references from the study.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
27					add appendix priority list projects	Section 2. Add an appendix to include a list of all priority projects from Cameron and Vermilion Parishes identifying these projects as good and viable for consideration in any future funding opportunities.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
28					add statement Calcasieu Parish coastal plans	Section 3. Add a statement in the draft that states "Calcasieu Parish anticipates updating their coastal plan which will include a priority projects list. Those projects will be viable projects for consideration of funding for protecting Lake Charles to the 500-year level of protection as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana 2012."	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives. Appendix N contains the following statement: "Though not an endorsement of any project under this study effort, Parish Priority Projects that would be provided by the Parishes to the State for consideration as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana are included in this Appendix only as a reference for future planning under other study authorities."
29					funding in place	Section 4. Require that 100% federal and state funding to be in place for all mitigation non-structural components.	Mitigation for project-induced impacts of the NED Plan is not anticipated.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
30					original goals and objectives	Section 5. Include and implement the original goals and objectives, Ecosystem Restoration, Risk Reduction and Historic and Cultural Preservation, as part of the final draft of the study.	Generally, the planning goals of the NED Plan are to reduce risk of damages associated with hurricane storm surge flooding. The NED storm damage risk reduction plans were formulated to achieve NED principles and objectives. Contributions to NED are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units, and are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and the rest of the Nation. The general planning goals of the NER Plan are to significantly and sustainably reduce land loss and coastal erosion in the study area, restore environmental conditions for the Chenier Plain ecosystem in SWC Louisiana, and evaluate a range of coastal restoration components to address a multitude of ecosystem problems. Plans were formulated to achieve NER principles and objectives. Contributions to NER are increases in the net quantity and/or quality of desired ecosystem resources, and are measured in the study area and nationwide. Historic and cultural resources are considered in subsections of Chapters 1 and 3.
31					shapefiles	Section 6. Provide Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes the Shape files for the elevation of all structures surveyed as part of its decision making criteria.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
32					benefit to cost ratio and windshield survey	Section 7. Review the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) parameters instead of the "wind shield view" BCR and provide transparency of how the final Benefit Cost Ratio will be determined.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.
33					model projects	Section 8. Projects originally submitted be modeled as they were submitted and not have projects watered down to include only a small scale section of what was originally intended.	Projects submitted by various entities (e.g., Cameron and Vermilion Parishes) were screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternative array.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
34					funding	Section 9. Require that 100% federal and state funding to be in place for all restoration components.	Federal funding and availability for the project will be determined by Congress.
35					certified copies provided to Corps	BE IT FURTHER AND FINALLY RESOLVED that certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, the Honorable Charles Boustany and all congressional representatives of the parishes of Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes, the Police Juries of Cameron and Vermilion parishes, and the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, respectfully requesting consideration and support of the comments and recommendations submitted by the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury by virtue of this resolution.	Acknowledge receipt of certified copy the resolution.
36					National Flood Insurance Program / eminent domain	1. We request that in the event the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) remains a relative part of the Study, that all eminent domain references be removed and that all owners of property identified as being candidates for relocation be notified and allowed opportunity to review the Study and make public comment.	The requirements under the authorized National Flood Insurance Program were considered during the study. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses located at the end of this table.
37	City of Lake Charles Mayor Randy Roach (Matt Young email transmittal)	April 29, 2015	City of Lake Charles	letter/email	Congressional authorization of use of flooding for coastal restoration	2. We further recommend that if "flooding" is to be used as a part of the criteria to develop and implement coastal restoration projects in this or any other coastal region of the country, such rule be based on a new set of standards authorized by Congress and which address: a) the unique hydrological characteristics of any coastal region affected by such regulations; b) the need to protect the history, culture and related socioeconomic characteristics of such coastal regions; and c) be designed to protect coastal residents from forced relocation of residences and businesses from those areas.	The study has been developed within the described Congressional authorizations specific to hurricane storm surge risk reduction as well as ecosystem restoration.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
38					Cameron and Vermilion Parishes priority projects	3. We recommend adding an appendix x to the report to include a list of all priority projects submitted by Cameron and Vermilion Parishes in order to make sure that these projects will be eligible for consideration in any future funding opportunities .	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
39					Calcasieu Parish update coastal plan including priority projects list	4. We recommend adding a statement in the draft as follows: "Calcasieu Parish anticipates coastal plan which will include a priority projects list. Those projects will be viable projects for consideration of funding for protecting Lake Charles to the 500 year level of protection as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana 2012."	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
40					original goals and objectives / national flood insurance program	5. We recommend that the original goals and objectives of the SWLA study, namely: Ecosystem Restoration , Risk Reduction and Historic and Cultural Preservation, be included, analyzed and specifically addressed in the conclusions and recommendations of the study instead of allowing the provisions of the NFIP to take preference and priority over such considerations in determining the programming and the priority for coastal restoration and protection projects eligible for funding with state and federal monies.	Generally, the planning goals of the NED Plan are to reduce risk of damages associated with hurricane storm surge flooding. The NED storm damage risk reduction plans were formulated to achieve NED principles and objectives. Contributions to NED are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units, and are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and the rest of the Nation. The general planning goals of the NER Plan are to significantly and sustainably reduce land loss and coastal erosion in the study area, restore environmental conditions for the Chenier Plain ecosystem in SWC Louisiana, and evaluate a range of coastal restoration components to address a multitude of ecosystem problems. Plans were formulated to achieve NER principles and objectives. Contributions to NER are increases in the net quantity and/or quality of desired ecosystem resources, and are measured in the study area and nationwide. Historic and cultural resources are considered in subsections of Chapters 1 and 3.
41					shapefiles	6. We request that access to the Shape files for the elevation of all structures surveyed as part	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						of your decision making criteria be made available to Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermillion Parishes.	in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
42					windshield survey vs benefit cost ratio	7. We specifically reject the methodology used to determine the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) parameters because it was based on "wind shield view" survey which is not adequate to assess and make recommendations as to the listing of projects or the development of programs necessary to implement the recommendations of the study.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.
43					original projects modeled	8. We recommend that the projects originally submitted by Cameron and Vermillion Parishes be modeled as they were originally submitted instead of using modified versions of the original projects and that the evaluation of these projects be re-submitted for review and comment before the plan is finalized. Thank you in advance for your consideration and support of the comments submitted above. Should you have any questions, please call (337) 491-1381	Projects submitted by Cameron and Vermilion Parishes were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternative array.
44	Coastal Protection & Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana (CPRA)	April 29, 2015	State	letter/email	eminent domain	While the State understands that the nonstructural measures will consist of floodproofing , elevating structures, and in some cases, buying-out properties in the area, we have serious concerns with the use of eminent domain to compel a family or business owner to comply with the requirements of the plan. Reducing flood risk is important, but it must be done in an acceptable manner to the citizens and communities. Our own 2012 Coastal Master Plan includes a nonstructural component and we believe it is an essential part of an overall strategy to reduce risks associated with hurricanes and storm surge damages to our citizens. However, it does not contain any provisions that would involuntarily force families in low-lying communities to leave behind their homes and property. Rather, it	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						focuses on public education and communication of flood risk to encourage property owners to voluntarily reduce their risk of flooding. We believe this is the best approach for managing flood protection in coastal Louisiana. Therefore, we are requesting that the use of eminent domain be eliminated entirely from the National Economic Development Plan and that public participation remain voluntary.	
45					exclude self-insured property owners from involuntary plan	In addition, we are requesting that self-insured property owners, who choose to assume all risk due to flooding and consequently pose no financial liability to either the state or federal government, be clearly and completely excluded from the involuntary portion of the plan.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses
46					include locally proposed projects in report	Secondly, the CPRA recognizes the National Ecosystem Restoration Plan, while comprehensive and large in scale, addresses only the critical needs of the three-parish study area and that other restoration measures not included in this study, such as those contained in parish plans, would be beneficial and should be considered viable projects. We would therefore request that language be added to address the importance of locally proposed projects that may be pursued by federal, state and/or local governments. These projects should be evaluated independently on their merits and should be judged on how these projects will act in concert with existing programs and plans to address local issues of concern.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
47					contact information	Thank you again for this opportunity to offer comments on the SWCFS. We look forward to continuing to work with the USACE to advance this important study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jennifer Mouton of my staff at (225) 342-1452.	Acknowledge comments received.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
48	Coastal Protection & Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana (CPRA)	April 29, 2015	State	letter/email	eminent domain	While the State understands that the nonstructural measures will consist of floodproofing, elevating structures, and in some cases, buying-out properties in the area, we have serious concerns with the use of eminent domain to compel a family or business owner to comply with the requirements of the plan. Reducing flood risk is important, but it must be done in an acceptable manner to the citizens and communities. Our own 2012 Coastal Master Plan includes a nonstructural component and we believe it is an essential part of an overall strategy to reduce risks associated with hurricanes and storm surge damages to our citizens. However, it does not contain any provisions that would involuntarily force families in low-lying communities to leave behind their homes and property. Rather, it focuses on public education and communication of flood risk to encourage property owners to voluntarily reduce their risk of flooding. We believe this is the best approach for managing flood protection in coastal Louisiana. Therefore, we are requesting that the use of eminent domain be eliminated entirely from the National Economic Development Plan and that public participation remain voluntary.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
49					exclude self-insured property owners from involuntary plan	In addition, we are requesting that self-insured property owners, who choose to assume all risk due to flooding and consequently pose no financial liability to either the state or federal government, be clearly and completely excluded from the involuntary portion of the plan.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
50					include locally proposed projects in report	Secondly, the CPRA recognizes the National Ecosystem Restoration Plan, while comprehensive and large in scale, addresses only the critical needs of the three-parish study area and that other restoration measures not included in this study, such as those contained in parish plans, would be beneficial and should be considered viable projects. We would therefore request that language be added to address the importance of locally proposed projects that may be pursued by federal, state and/or local governments. These projects should be evaluated independently on their merits and should be judged on how these projects will act in concert with existing programs and plans to address local issues of concern.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
51					contact information	Thank you again for this opportunity to offer comments on the SWCFS. We look forward to continuing to work with the USACE to advance this important study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jennifer Mouton of my staff at (225) 342-1452.	Acknowledge contact information.
52	Dan "Blade" Morrish, Louisiana State Senator, District 25	May 1, 2015	State	letter	official comments of LA State Senator	In January of 2009 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Louisiana announced an agreement to jointly fund an eight (8) million dollar feasibility study to provide hurricane damage risk reduction and coastal restoration to Southwest Coastal Louisiana. The Southwest Coastal Feasibility Study was initially authorized in December of 2005. In March 2015, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released the Southwest Coastal Feasibility Draft Study (Draft Study) and the agency is currently accepting public comment until May 4, 2015 .Please accept this correspondence as my official comments to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.	Acknowledge receipt of comments



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
					involuntary participation and eminent domain	First, there is no circumstance that I foresee that provides enough justification to include any verbiage regarding "Involuntary Participation" or "Eminent Domain". You must recognize that, to Calcasieu, Cameron, & Vermilion Parishes, land ownership is a right that is not taken for granted. The intent of this study is being lost with the latest draft, in which the "Involuntary Participation" change was made recently and unbeknownst to these parishes. I feel the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should see to that this clause is stricken from the report in its entirety. Perhaps, a separate study should be conducted at a later date by FEMA or the NFIP to address this housing issue and have the Southwest Study remain focused on the potential for coastal restoration and protection projects for the three parishes.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
					Parish priority projects	Second, much time and effort has been afforded to the development of viable projects for Calcasieu, Cameron, and Vermilion Parishes. It is vital to have a reference of all of the Parish's existing projects listed in the study. Reference to these plans will not preclude the construction of other projects currently not listed in the study with discretionary funds, which may be a problem as the study is written today. In closing, I would like to request periodic updates on any changes associated with this study being that the CPRA is mentioned as the non-Federal sponsor for this initiative, and I sit on the CPRA Board. As I'm sure you have seen, much interest is being generated in my District and I do not take these concerns lightly. Please call me if you have questions or concerns at 337-824-3979.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
53	Department of Natural Resources, Office of Coastal Management, Don Haydel	June 2, 1025	Louisiana State agency	Letter	Programmatic Level is consistent with LCRP	As noted in our letter of June 30, 2014, at the programmatic level, this project is consistent with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program (LCRP). As information is developed and planning proceeds, consistency reviews will be necessary for each of the individual elements which make up the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Project.	Acknowledge consistency with LCRP. As additional information is developed the USACE and its non-Federal Sponsor will continue to coordinate with the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources regarding the LCRP.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
54					eminent domain	The state acknowledges the importance of reducing flood risk, and realizes the essential role that nonstructural components play in reducing risk; however, the state has great concerns about the use of eminent domain to compel a family or business to comply with requirements of the plan. Rather, the state encourages the COE-NOD to develop a program of enhanced public education and communication of flood risk with citizens and communities to encourage voluntary participation with the plan.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
55					Mitigation coordination	The report states that compensatory mitigation is not seen as a requirement at this stage of project planning. Please be aware that, should mitigation be necessary, LCRP requirements differ in some details from Corps of Engineers' practices. Early coordination with OCM will help to minimize the effects of these differences on project development.	Compensatory mitigation is not anticipated for this project. Should mitigation be necessary, the USACE and its non-Federal Sponsor will initiate early coordination with OCM.
56					support NED/NER objectives	With the above-mentioned caveats, OCM fully supports both the National Economic Development and National Ecosystem Restoration objectives of this project, and looks forward to continued cooperation as the project goes forward. If you have any questions concerning these comments, please contact Jeff Harris of the Consistency Section at (225) 342-7949.	Acknowledged OCM support of the NED and NER objectives.
57	Department of the Interior Office of the Secretary Stephen R. Spencer	May 4, 2015	Federal agency	email /letter	no comments	The U.S. Department of the Interior has reviewed the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. In this regard, we have no comment.	Acknowledge US Department of Interior has no comment.
58	Environmental Protection Agency Craig Weeks	April 30, 2015	Federal	letter	EPA rating of EIS: EC-1	EPA rates the Revised Draft EIS as "EC-1" i.e., EPA has "environmental concerns and requests additional information" in the Final EIS (FEIS). The EPA's Rating System Criteria can be found at http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ncap/comments/ratings.html . The "EC" rating is based on the potential for adverse impacts to protected species and coastal resources. The "1" indicates the Revised Draft EIS needs additional clarifying language or information regarding protected	Acknowledge EPA rating of EC-1. The Final Integrated Report and EIS includes additional information regarding potential adverse impacts to protected species and coastal resources in Section 3.3.8. Comments and responses regarding the Revised Draft Integrated Report and EIS have been included in a Comment Response Appendix J in the Final Integrated Report and EIS.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						species and coastal resources. Responses to comments should be placed in a dedicated section of the FEIS and should include the specific location where the revision, if any, was made.	
59					format changes Table of Contents	The table of contents section numbers, titles, and page numbers do not correspond to their actual location in the PEIS. In some instances, sections listed in the table of contents cannot be found in the PEIS. This makes review of the PEIS difficult. Make sure section names and numbers listed in the table of contents match what is found throughout the document. In addition, make sure the page numbers listed in the table of contents are more specific than "page 1 of the chapter".	The Table of Contents has been revised to more accurately reflect the contents of the Final Integrated Report.
60					air quality mitigation	3.7 Mitigation It should be noted that the Lake Charles Metropolitan Statistical Area is vulnerable to being designated as non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM) in the next few years. The Imperial Calcasieu Regional Planning & Development Commission (IMCAL), representing Calcasieu Parish, Cameron Parish, the Cities of Lake Charles, Westlake, Sulphur, Vinton, DeQuincy, the Town of Iowa, the Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District, the Chenault International Airport, the Lake Area Industrial Alliance, the Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance, and the Chamber SWLA has applied for and been accepted by EPA into the EPA Ozone Advance and PM Advance programs. The Advance programs are collaborative efforts between EPA, states and local governments to enact expeditious emission reductions to help near non-attainment areas remain in attainment of the NAAQS. This reflects the sensitivity of ozone and PM levels in the area, and the need for federally-funded projects in the study area to consider air emissions.	Acknowledge that Lake Charles Metropolitan Statistical Area is vulnerable to being designated as non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter. The USACE will continue to coordinate with EPA regarding designation of this area as non-attainment. We do not anticipate any air quality impacts due to construction of the NED and NER features. However, USACE will add EPA-suggested measures (i.e. a range of possible measures for reducing impacts associated with emissions of NOx, CO, PM, SO2, and other pollutants from construction-related activities has been included in the Final Integrated Report) to address potential air quality mitigation related to construction activities.
61					air quality mitigation	This section suggests as a mitigation measure for air quality impacts the use of "heavy machinery fitted with approved muffling	Concur to add EPA-suggested measures to address fugitive dust related to construction activities.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						devices that reduce noise, vibration, and emissions". EPA agrees with this suggestion as a potential mitigation measure, but also recommends consideration of measures to address fugitive dust related to construction activities.	
62					mitigation fugitive dust source controls	<p>Recommendations: In addition to all applicable local, state, or federal requirements, the following controls are provided to illustrate a range of possible measures for reducing impacts associated with emissions of NOx, CO, PM, SO2, and other pollutants from construction-related activities:</p> <p>Fugitive Dust Source Controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative where appropriate at active and inactive sites during workdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions; • Install wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions; and • Prevent spillage when hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment and limit speeds to 15 miles per hour. Limit speed of earth-moving equipment to 10 mph. 	Concur to add EPA-suggested measures for reducing impacts associated with emissions of NOx, CO, PM, SO2, and other pollutants from construction-related activities has been included in the Final Integrated Report.
63					Air Quality mitigation Mobile and stationary source controls	<p>Mobile and Stationary Source Controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan construction scheduling to minimize vehicle trips; • Limit idling of heavy equipment to less than 5 minutes and verify through unscheduled inspections; • Maintain and tune engines per manufacturer's specifications to perform at EPA certification levels, prevent tampering, and conduct unscheduled inspections to ensure these measures are followed; • If practicable, utilize new, clean equipment meeting the most stringent of applicable Federal or State Standards. In general, commit to the best available emissions control technology. Tier 4 engines should be used for 	Concur to add EPA-suggested Mobile and Stationary controls for air quality mitigation.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						project construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacking availability of non-road construction equipment that meets Tier 4 engine standards, the responsible agency should commit to using EPA-verified particulate traps, oxidation catalysts and other appropriate controls where suitable to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site; and • Consider alternative fuels and energy sources such as natural gas and electricity (plug-in or battery). 	
64					unintended consequences soft shoreline erosion reduction and fish dips	The ecosystem restoration component of the Southwest Coastal Louisiana plan includes shoreline erosion reduction measures. The use of rocks and other hard materials for shoreline erosion reduction can provide targeted environmental benefits for important landscape features. Such measures can also have unintended adverse effects due to alteration of sedimentation patterns (which, for example, can increase erosion in unprotected areas) and reduced fish access. Subsequent project-specific NEPA documentation for shoreline erosion projects should assess such potential unintended adverse impacts and include mitigation measures as appropriate. This could possibly include the use of alternative "soft" approaches to shoreline erosion reduction and "fish dips" to allow for greater ingress and egress of aquatic organisms.	The potential for unintended adverse consequences, such as alteration of sedimentation patterns, associated with shoreline protection measures has been assessed and determined not significant. Shoreline protection measures will include construction of "fish dips" to allow for ingress and egress of aquatic organisms. Assessment of potential creation of tombolo and longshore transport is presented in section 3.3.1 and in shoreline protection measures described in Appendix K
64					unintended consequences soft shoreline erosion reduction and fish dips	See Above	Supplemental Response based on Final State & Agency Review Comment Dated June 20, 2016 Fish dips will be provided for the foreshore rock dike shoreline protection measures to allow for ingress and egress of aquatic organisms. Sediment starvation is not expected to occur with the proposed Gulf shoreline breakwater measures along the shoreline of Rockefeller Refuge because this area is composed of a shell veneer covering marsh sediments with little long-shore movement of sediments in this system. The proposed



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
							<p>breakwater measure to be connected to the existing breakwaters at Holly Beach would provide continuous shoreline protection to the western Calcasieu Ship Channel jetty.</p> <p>The Calcasieu Ship Channel, and the jetties lining it, currently influence the longshore transport of coarse-grained material from east of the channel. By tying into the western jetty and fully extending project to the existing breakwater field to the west, the longshore transport would be normalized to a more uniform rate, which will decrease erosion.</p> <p>Additionally, the area immediately west of the Calcasieu Ship Channel jetty has been used as a single point discharge for maintenance dredging sediment from the jetty channel. Its probable continued use as such in the future should also help to further offset down current sediment starvation caused by the jetty.</p> <p>In addition to consideration of studies and monitoring reports, an analysis of survey data and tracer data reported in a Louisiana State University thesis study was considered which indicated the beach/breakwater system at Holly Beach is in a state of dynamic equilibrium at high tide, and static equilibrium at low tide. The existing "East Sabine Lake Hydrologic Restoration" project has introduced sands and increased the sediment budget for this area, so downstream sediment starvation is not expected to be a problem. Although the proposed breakwaters have been designed to initially capture sediment moving through the system, there will also be periods wherein sediments will flow freely through the system.</p> <p>In order to refine designs and implement the most effective possible projects we typically undertake additional assessment during Pre-construction Engineering and Design (PED). In collaboration with your agency, the final</p>



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
							design of the shoreline protection measures will be more fully developed and evaluated during the PED phase of the project through wave and sediment transport modeling. Included in this evaluation would be the indirect effects of proposed shoreline protection measures on down drift beaches.
65					finalize all environmental compliance and coordination with local, state and national agencies	Coordination with several county, state, and national agencies concerning environmental laws and executive orders is ongoing, and is not expected to be completed until after the FPEIS is released. EPA understands this is a PEIS, and that subsequent NEPA documentation and consultation will take place once individual elements of the TSP are implemented, but this does not absolve USACE from compliance with consultation requirements. Without specifics, and the available opinions of the agencies USACE is tasked with consulting, it is difficult to assess the potential environmental effects of the PEIS. EPA asks that USACE not release the Final PEIS until coordination with all local, state, and national agencies is finalized. This will allow the public and other interested parties a chance to fully evaluate the PEIS.	The Final Integrated Report and EIS includes documentation of all local, state and national consultation regarding both the NED and NER Recommended Plans in chapter 5. Additional details have been developed for the NER features that brings them to feasibility level of detail. As such the final report is not programmatic and all outstanding NEPA requirements have been addressed. No additional NEPA documents will be developed. The Final Report will be released for State and Agency Review in May 2016.
66					environmental justice	Even though the EJ analysis suggests that no disproportionate high and adverse impacts will occur to minority and low-income populations during the construction and normal operation, care should be taken to provide opportunities for public involvement and participation to ensure that EJ communities understand the plans, direct impacts, indirect impacts and cumulative impacts to their health and the environment. Information about this project, its location and the potential impacts upon its completion should be provided to the communities. The community should have opportunities to participate, ask questions, and voice opinions to those who plan the construction.	All interested parties, including EJ communities, have been provided opportunities to participate, ask questions and voice opinion regarding the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed action. The USACE and its non-Federal Sponsor will continue to provide opportunities of public involvement and participation.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
67	Erath (Town of)	April 30, 2015	Town of Erath	Letter	eminent domain	The Town of Erath recommends the removal of all eminent domain references from the study. This was never the intent of the study as originally agreed in 2009 and supported by Congressman Charles Boustany.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
68					redo levee benefit cost analysis	The Town of Erath was devastated with flooding during Hurricanes Rita and Ike and had hoped that the Southwest Study would provide the basis for funding for a flood protection system in southeastern Vermilion Parish. The levee alignments analyzed by the Study Team were not feasible as a result of the long north south segments of the levee on each end. The Town of Erath would like to hereby request that the levee benefit cost analysis be re-done with a levee that terminates at the Iberia Vermilion parish line near Bayou Tigre. The State of Louisiana is currently in the design phase of a flood control structure in that location and Iberia Parish is in the planning stages for a levee which will connect to the Vermilion Parish levee at the parish line.	The planning team was aware of the ongoing State of Louisiana effort in a flood control structure in that location in Iberia Parish and considered levee alignments to tie into the proposed State levee alignment. The planning team investigated various levee alignments, including an alignment similar to that suggested that would encompass the area south of the towns of Abbeville, Erath and Delcambre and terminate along the eastern shorelines of Delcambre Canal in Iberia Parish. No levee alignments considered had a positive benefit to cost ratio. The costs of constructing the necessary long lengths of levee required to provide risk reduction were consistently much greater than the benefits provided.
69	Jonathan "JP" Perry, LA State Senator, District 26	April 28, 2015	Louisiana State Senator	letter	Parish priority projects	This letter echoes the concerns of both myself and my constituents on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (March 2015) for the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study. Specifically, there are three (3) points of concern to which I must direct your attention: The failure to incorporate a local plan of action for Vermilion Parish	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
70					involuntary participation and eminent domain	The inclusion of an "Involuntary Participation" (Section 4.1.2.1) mandate	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
71					involuntary participation and eminent domain	The forced compliance by residents though use of federal eminent domain	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
72					protective plans for Vermilion Parish	As your study states, approximately 50% of the land within Vermilion Parish is considered coastal marsh. Vermilion Parish also houses Intracoastal City which provides access to both the Gulf of Mexico and Vermilion Bay, and is home to numerous fishing and energy sector-related businesses. While Vermilion Parish falls within my senate district (District 26), more importantly, it is an invaluable resource to the families and businesses that call this parish home. Therefore I must express my strong concern that protective plans suggested by local authorities be included within the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) that addresses the Vermilion Parish coastline.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
73					involuntary participation and eminent domain	Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, the language included in Section 3.1 of APPENDIX A of the TSP, which calls for the use of "eminent domain" in "absence of willing participation" should be stricken from the study. The forced compliance of my constituents by way of "involuntary participation" will not be tolerated. While it is the goal of the Army Corps of Engineers to protect the Louisiana coastline and marshes, this goal should not dictate how private landowners use their own property.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
74					involuntary participation and eminent domain	In Annex B-1 8 of the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (March 2015), Guideline 1.4 states: Guideline 1.4 These guidelines are not intended to nor shall they be interpreted so as to result in an involuntary acquisition or taking of property. /Emphasis added/ Response: No involuntary acquisition would be required for the proposed action. The above language, nor shall, is mandatory and should mean that in no way will the proposed Coastal Use Guidelines allow for the facilitation of eminent domain to force compliance of my constituents. Furthermore, the Department of the Army's response plainly states that "[n]o involuntary acquisition would be required for the proposed action". In order	*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement							
Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						to support any future federal measures to protect our coastline, I respectfully request that all reference or language to "eminent domain" and "involuntary participation" be completely removed from this study.	
75					involuntary participation and eminent domain	As the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (March 2015) states, Cameron, Calcasieu and Vermilion Parishes host many unique and diverse cultures. These areas also provide Louisiana with valuable job opportunities in the tourism, energy and fishing sectors. While the efforts by the Army Corps of Engineers to protect and strengthen the Louisiana coastline are sorely needed, such measures should not be forced via an involuntary participation component. Doing so would undermine the unique culture we are working so hard to protect	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
76	Kristin Saltzman Project Specialist Cameron Parish Police Jury	April 15, 2015	Cameron Parish Police Jury	email	attached comment letter	Please see the attached comments Cameron Parish Gravity Drainage District No. 5.	Acknowledged receipt of comments



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
77	Kristin Saltzman - Parish of Cameron Gravity Drainage District No. 5. D.Y. Doland, President	April 15, 2015	Cameron Parish	letter	do not limit restoration projects	1. Please do not limit the number of coastal restoration projects listed in the study. Include the Cameron Master Plan projects even in an appendix to be available for other discretionary funding sources in the future. Currently, the Parish has 9 projects listed in the study. We feel that there are significantly more projects that are viable and are not even up for discussion due to the benefit cost ratio and the national interest with these projects. THUS DONE AND ADOPTED on the 23rd day of April, 2015.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
78					Involuntary participation, funding sources local sponsors	Removing the discussion about involuntary participation in the non-structural aspect of the program. This was never the intent of the study to have relocations. Other questions arise from this section such as funding sources, sponsoring agencies, local sponsors, administrative processes, etc. that all should be addressed prior to finalizing the study with this included.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses. The non-Federal sponsor is the State of Louisiana.
79					shapefiles	3. Provide GIS Shapefiles of the eligible structures to be elevated as part of the NED project for Cameron Parish for the Parish to determine the current status of these structures. Cameron Parish has several State and Federal programs that have assisted with elevation and flood-proofing of structures post-Rita & Ike. Building codes and elevation requirements should assist with mitigating the risk of these structures.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
80					contact telephone number	Regarding the Southwest Study, revisions to the draft version of this document would certainly result in a more effective and efficient study. Thank you for allowing us to comment on this draft feasibility report for the Southwest Coastal Study. Feel free to call me if you have questions or concerns at 337-652-9771.	The Final Integrated Report has been revised based on comments to the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
81	Kirk Quin (President Cameron Parish Police Jury)	April 24, 2015	Cameron Parish	letter	briefings on SWC study	The intent of this correspondence is to state Cameron Parish's concerns with the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (Southwest Study). Due to the fact that this is a regional study addressing issues in .three Parishes (Calcasieu, Cameron & Vermilion), and in an effort to provide clear and concise guidance on the Southwest Study, briefings have been held among Parish elected officials, Administrative staffs, and members of the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority Board and staff to discuss this version of the Southwest Study. This transmittal, which may mimic concerns other agencies will provide, is submitted to you on behalf of the Cameron Parish Police Jury, Cameron Parish Coastal Restoration Committee, landowners, and residents. Collectively, our requests are as follows:	Acknowledge receipt of comments.
82					eminent domain and involuntary participation removed from study	1. Remove any verbiage regarding involuntary participation or authorization of eminent domain. (New request not previously submitted.) The Parish is utterly appalled at the inclusion of the "Involuntary Participation" clause in this revised version of the study. Including this verbiage has resulted in heightened awareness and concern from our residents who have had their fair share of issues in the past ten years. The inclusion of this clause is alarming in itself, however, the fact that evaluation criteria for eligibility in this proposed program is, as a Corps Project Manager stated at the Cameron Parish Public Meeting, "...written in pencil" is even greater cause for concern. This open-ended verbiage leads to_ more stringent criteria being developed in the future and much farther reaching impacts than originally intended. The number of items to be addressed in the eventual "Implementation Plan" which would guide this process is too large to even mention here.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
83					increase NER Measures in TSP/reference Parish Priority Projects for Coastal Restoration Master Plans	2. Increase the number of NER measures included in the TSP. (Repetitive request submitted initially in January 2014.) The TSP omitted several viable projects for a variety of reasons. The Parish acknowledges that there are budgetary limitations and federal regulatory limitations present in vetting projects for this study. The Parish is not requesting an analysis or authorization in the study for all restoration or protection projects relevant to Cameron Parish. At a minimum, however, the Parish is simply requesting that a reference to Coastal Restoration Master Plans present in the three Parishes be included in the study even in an appendix. If other projects are not included in some shape, form, or fashion, potential projects funded with Parish or discretionary funds and subsequent planning efforts for coastal restoration initiatives in the Parish could be discarded from consideration. The Parish does acknowledge that there are viable coastal restoration projects included in the study that would benefit our residents, however, these limitations and restrictions inherent to this study marginalize the potential construction of other projects.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
84					shapefiles	3. Provide GIS Shapefiles of the eligible structures to be elevated as part of the NED project for Cameron Parish for the Parish to determine the current status of these structures. (Repetitive request submitted initially in January 2014.) All three Parishes have several complete and ongoing State and Federal programs that have assisted with elevation and flood-proofing of structures post-Rita & Ike. Building codes and elevation requirements should assist with mitigating the risk of these structures as well.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
85					coordination with Parishes	4. Discuss major changes to this document with the relevant Parishes as they are incorporated and prior to the next comment period commencing. (New request not previously submitted.)	Coordination with all affected parishes regarding changes to the project will continue.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
86					consider comments	<p>Again, on behalf of our residents and landowners of Cameron Parish, I request that you provide every consideration to the comments presented herein. Our Parish has a long standing history of successes that span generations. Our culture and livelihood are tied to our land and its intrinsic value. Please do not threaten the harmony that exists there.</p> <p>In closing, the Police Jury feels that revisions to the draft version of this document would certainly result in a more effective and efficient study. Thank you for allowing us to comment on this Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement document. Feel free to call me if you have questions or concerns at 337-775-5718.</p>	Comments and responses on the Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS have been included in a new appendix to be included with the Final Integrated Report.
87					resolution	Enclosed please find Resolution No. 1015-18 as adopted by the Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District in Regular Session held on Thursday, April 28, 2015. This Resolution support Vermilion Parish Police Jury in opposition to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report on the Southwest Louisiana Coastal Study	Acknowledge receipt of resolution.
88	Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District, Ray Fremin, Jr. Director and Vermilion Parish Police Jury letter dated April 20, 2015	April 28, 2015	Iberia Parish	letter	support Vermilion Policy Jury comment letter	Resolution No. 2015-18 A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING VERMILION PARISH POLICE JURY IN OPPOSITION TO THE U.S. ARMY COPRS OF ENGINEERS REPORT ON THE SOUTHWEST COASTAL STUDY. WHERAS, In January 2009 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Louisiana announced an agreement to jointly fund an \$8 million feasibility study to provide hurricane damage risk reduction and coastal restoration to Southwest coastal La; and WHEREAS, Vermilion Parish Police Jury expressed opposition to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report onto the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study, as attached in Exhibit "A". NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District does hereby support the position of the Vermilion Parish Policy Jury, as	Acknowledge Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District support of Vermilion Parish Police Jury response as attached.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						attached in Exhibit "A". BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption by the Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District. Resolution adopted on April 28, 2015. SEE ALSO VERMILION PARISH POLICE JURY LETTER DATED APRIL 20, 2015	
89					resolution	copy of Vermilion Parish Police Jury letter dated April 20, 2015	Acknowledge receipt of copy of Vermilion Parish Police Jury letter dated April 20, 2015
90	Louisiana Delegation, Congress of the United States	May 4, 2015	Louisiana Delegation	letter	involuntary participation and eminent domain	We, as the Louisiana Delegation, are writing to express our view on the <i>Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement</i> (March 2015) for the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study. Despite the efforts to create a comprehensive storm surge protection and coastal restoration plan for Southwest Louisiana, the last minute inclusion of highly objectionable language by the Army Corps of Engineers and continued appropriate consideration of the project priority list from Cameron, Calcasieu and Vermilion Parishes threatens the long-term adoption and success of the study. The modifications requested in this letter will not diminish the effectiveness and benefits of the overall study, will likely increase the support and participation of local governments and residents, and will provide a meaningful investment in the protection of life and property while preserving a rich and diverse culture.	*See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
91					involuntary participation and eminent domain	Because of the potential risk to life, property, and the continued burden on the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) the 366 "Severe Repetitive Loss" properties (358 residential, 7 commercial, and 1 warehouse), as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), should qualify for the Voluntary Program with the added benefits of the relocation assistance or property buyout if they so choose. These benefits should also be extended to properties that lie within a floodway as delineated by FEMA.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
92					involuntary participation and eminent domain	While we strongly believe many property owners will take advantage of this program, to force it upon them at the end of a lengthy process undermines the cooperative nature in which everyone has been working on this study and it is insulting to the generations of citizens who have lived along the Louisiana coast. With much of the nation's oil and gas development, agriculture, and seafood production occurring along the Louisiana coastline, the overwhelming emphasis should be on restoring and preserving natural barriers and structural efforts to reduce the effects of storm surges and flooding events.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
93					Parish priority projects	To this end, we appreciate the inclusion of approximately \$1.2 billion in National Ecosystem Restoration projects. These projects will provide meaningful commitment to the restoration and protection requirements throughout the three affected parishes. Nevertheless, there are many important projects of interest to the local parishes that should be included in an additional Appendix. This written request was also made in January 2014 during the last public comment period. The concern arises from a practice whereby priority projects may not be allowed to proceed under other authorities if they are not included in the State of Louisiana Master Plan or an accompanying federal study.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
94					Parish priority projects	The effect of a project being excluded from either the Master Plan or a federal study, serves as a de facto "veto" when being considered for advancement under a different program like the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA). Local authorities have the history, experience and responsibility to propose projects that best serve the needs of the citizens. Please include a list of qualified project priorities from Cameron and Vermilion Parishes (NOTE: Calcasieu Parish support Cameron Parish's priority list). *attachment of Cameron Parish Master Plan and Vermilion Parish Coastal Priority Project list and map).	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
95					widening navigation channels (GIWW, Freshwater Bayou)	Lastly, we ask the Corps to address the damages done by widening the federal channels, including but not limited to the Gulf Intercoastal Waterway (GIWW) and Freshwater Bayou. Congress addressed this issue in Section 2009 of the Water Resources, Reform, and Development Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-121). This authority and all ongoing studies of the affected area must focus on this growing problem. While these waterways are important to promoting national commerce, the widening of these channels continues to significantly impact the marsh in surrounding areas. As a natural barrier to storm surge events, more focus should be given to containing these channels in order for the marsh to recover.	Addressing the impacts associated with widening of authorized navigation channels would be addressed under the authority for each navigation channel.
96					involuntary participation and eminent domain and Parish priority projects	The Louisiana Gulf Coast is a resilient part of our nation because of the hard-work dedication and culture of its people. We must never lose sight of this fact. We ask that you recognize the invaluable contribution the people of South Louisiana make to this nation. Please work to remove all references to the involuntary participation and eminent domain language and include project priority list. We appreciate your consideration of these requests and look forwarding to working with all of the agencies involved to improve this draft report.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
97	Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries	May 5, 2015	State	Letter	Request each NER project be submitted for comment	Overall, LDWF supports the conceptual plan referenced in the Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Furthermore, LDWF requests that each project proposed under the National Ecosystem Restoration Plan (NER) be forwarded to this office for review and comment.	Acknowledge LDWF supports the proposed project. The LDWF and all interested parties will be provided an opportunity to review and comment upon the final NER and NED Plans in the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
					Piping plover	The piping plover (<i>Charadrius melodus</i>) may occur within the project area. This species is federally listed as threatened with its critical habitat designated along the Louisiana coast. Piping plovers winter in Louisiana feeding at intertidal beaches, mudflats, and sand flats with sparse emergent vegetation. Primary threats to this species are destruction and degradation of winter habitat, habitat alteration through shoreline erosion, woody species encroachment of lake shorelines and riverbanks, and human disturbance of foraging birds. For more information on piping plover critical habitat, visit the U.S. Fish and Wildlife website: http://endangered.fvvs.gov .	Impacts to the piping plover and its critical habitat would be avoided and minimized by utilizing recommendations and buffer zones developed in coordination with LDWF and USFWS. Surveys would be conducted prior to construction to determine the presence of these species.
98					Wilson's Plover and Snowy Plover	Our database indicates an occurrence of Wilson's Plover (<i>Charadrius wilsonia</i>) and Snowy Plover (<i>Charadrius alexandrinus</i>) in your project area. These species are considered critically imperiled to imperiled in the state. We recommend that you take the necessary precautions to protect the breeding/wintering habitat of these species.	Impacts to the Wilson's plover and snowy plover would be avoided and minimized per the MBTA and by utilizing recommendations and buffer zones developed in coordination with LDWF and USFWS. Surveys would be conducted prior to construction to determine the presence of these species.
99					Protect Bald Eagle Nests	Our records indicate that the Mermentau Vermilion Teche Basin portion of the proposed project may potentially impact Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>) nesting sites. This species is protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668c) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-712) and is protected by the state of Louisiana. This proposed project is less than 1,000 ft. away from the bald eagle nest of concern. All bald eagle nests (active, inactive or seemingly abandoned) should be protected, and no large trees should be removed. Please refer to the Bald Eagle Management Guidelines for more information on avoiding impacts to bald eagles:	Impacts to the bald eagle and its nests would be avoided and minimized per the MBTA and by utilizing the Bald Eagle Management Guidelines and recommendations from USFWS. Surveys would be conducted prior to construction to determine the presence of active nests in the area. See Appendix A Annex K.
100					Protected bird nesting colonies	Our database indicates the presence of bird nesting colonies within one mile of the proposed project. Please be aware that entry into or disturbance of active breeding colonies is prohibited by the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF). In addition,	Impacts to colonial nesting wading birds and shorebirds would be avoided and minimized per the MBTA and by utilizing recommendations and buffer zones developed in coordination with LDWF and USFWS. Surveys would be conducted prior to



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						<p>LDWF prohibits work within a certain radius of an active nesting colony. Nesting colonies can move from year to year and no current information is available on the status of these colonies. If work for the proposed project will commence during the nesting season, conduct a field visit to the worksite to look for evidence of nesting colonies. This field visit should take place no more than two weeks before the project begins. If no nesting colonies are found within 400 meters (700 meters for brown pelicans) of the proposed project, no further consultation with LDWF will be necessary. If active nesting colonies are found within the previously stated distances of the proposed project, further consultation with LDWF will be required. In addition, colonies should be surveyed by a qualified biologist to document species present and the extent of colonies. Provide LDWF with a survey report which is to include the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. qualifications of survey personnel; 2. survey methodology including dates, site characteristics, and size of survey area; 3. species of birds present, activity, estimates of number of nests present, and general vegetation type including digital photographs representing the site; and 4. topographic maps and Arc View shapefiles projected in UTM NAD83 Zone 15 to illustrate the location and extent of the colony. <p>-For colonies containing nesting wading birds (i.e., herons, egrets, night-herons, ibis, roseate spoonbills, anhinga, and/or cormorants), all project activity occurring within 300 meters of an active nesting colony should be restricted to the non-nesting period (i.e., September 1 through February 15).</p> <p>- For colonies containing nesting gulls, terns, and/or black skimmers, all project activity occurring within 400 meters (700 meters for brown pelicans) of an active nesting colony</p>	<p>construction to determine the presence of active colonies in the area.</p>



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						should be restricted to the non-nesting period (i.e., September 16 through April 1).	
					Diamondback terrapin	The Diamondback terrapin (<i>Malaclemys terrapin</i>) may also occur in the Mermentau Vermilion Teche Basin portion of the project area and is considered imperiled in Louisiana. It inhabits brackish water habitats, especially coastal marshes. The diamondback terrapin nests from April to May with nest cavities dug at the sandy edges of marshes and dunes. This species is affected by pollution, disturbed habitat, and nest destruction near populated coastal and beach sites. If the project will be conducted during the breeding season, we recommend searching for nests prior to project activities. If nests are found, the applicant must contact Beau Gregory at 337-491-2576 to coordinate activities.	USACE will continue to coordinate with the LDWF during design and construction of this project. Language has been added to the report discussing the species and any potential impacts that may occur. To the extent feasible, best management practices would be implemented. However, conducting surveys for diamondback terrapin nests may not be feasible due to the extensive amount of marsh restoration proposed within broken marsh areas.
101					Crested Caracara and habitat	The proposed project within the Calcasieu Sabine Basin may impact the Crested Caracara (<i>Caracara cheriway</i>) and its preferred habitat. The Crested Caracara is considered critically imperiled in the state of Louisiana, and is limited to the southwest corner of the state. It is a vulture sized bird spending much of its time on the ground hunting snakes, rodents, and other available prey. The main cause of its decline is the loss of habitat due to development and agriculture. The mixed coastal prairie and marsh that constitutes the Crested Caracara's preferred habitat have been recognized as ecologically significant and in need of conservation. Best management practices should be used to minimize impacts to this species and its preferred habitat. If you have any questions, please contact Michael Seymour at 225-763-3554.	Language will be included in the plans and specifications to ensure the contractor is aware of the potential for the presence of this species. Impacts to the crested caracara would be avoided and minimized per the MBTA and by utilizing recommendations and buffer zones developed in coordination with LDWF and USFWS.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
102					Sandhill crane	The sandhill crane may occur within the project area. This species winters in Louisiana-its wintering habitat including shallow, open water marshes, coastal prairie, freshwater marshes, and working wetlands. Sandhill cranes are intolerant of human disturbance and are critically imperiled in Louisiana with a state rank of S2N. The species occurs in only a handful of reliable localities. This project occurs adjacent to the most well-known and documented sandhill crane wintering site in the state; the site has been known and followed closely by local bird enthusiasts for decades. We recommend that you take the necessary precautions to protect the wintering habitat of this species. In addition, because of the particular sensitivity of this site, we recommend a survey of the area for this species if work is done during the winter. If sandhill cranes are found, please contact LNHP at 225-765-2823 to coordinate activities.	Impacts to the sandhill crane would be avoided and minimized per the MBTA and by utilizing recommendations and buffer zones developed in coordination with LDWF and USFWS. Surveys would be conducted prior to construction to determine the presence of this species. The Corps will continue to coordinate with LDWF.
103					Paddlefish presence	The Paddlefish (<i>Polyodon spatulmla</i>) occurs in water bodies within the Mermentau Vermilion Teche Basin portion of the project area and is considered rare in Louisiana. The paddlefish is threatened by siltation of spawning habitat, pollution, back-to-back impoundments, and in some areas, exploitation by the caviar industry. Habitat destruction and river modification are the most obvious changes affecting abundance and distribution. We advise you to take the necessary measures in order to avoid any degradation of water quality of streams/canals. If you have any questions, please contact Beau Gregory at 337-491-2576.	Impacts to the paddlefish would be avoided and minimized by implementation of best management practices.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
104					Coastal Live Oak-Hackberry Forest Habitat (Cheniere)	The database indicates Coastal Live Oak-Hackberry Forest natural community records are located within the project area. This community is considered imperiled in the state of Louisiana with an S1 rank. This community type formed on ancient abandoned beach ridges in Southwest Louisiana. These ridges are composed primarily of sand and shell, and are approximately 4 to 5 feet above sea level. This community, also known as a cheniere, is an important storm barrier, limiting salt water intrusion, and acts as a migratory staging/stopover site for Neo-tropical migratory birds. We advise you to take the necessary measures to avoid any impacts to this ecological community. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Chris Reid at 225-765-2820.	The project would restore approximately 1,413 acres of chenier habitat and would have no permanent adverse impacts to this ecological community.
105					Coastal Prairie habitat impacts	The LNHP database indicates remnants of Coastal prairies within the proposed project area. Coastal prairies are considered imperiled globally and critically imperiled in the state of Louisiana, with a G2Q/S1 rank. This prairie region of southwestern Louisiana was once very extensive (~2.511 billion acres) but today is limited to small, remnant parcels. On the southern edge of its range, the community may occur on "islands" or "ridges" surrounded by marsh. If Coastal prairies are found within the proposed project area, applicant must contact Chris Reid at 225-765-2820 to coordinate activities.	Language will be included in the plans and specifications to ensure the contractor is aware of the potential for the presence of this habitat. Chris Reid will be contacted if any coastal prairies are found within the project area.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
	National Marine Fisheries Service	April 20, 2015	federal	letter	description of TSP	<p>The NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has reviewed the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The draft EIS evaluates alternatives which provide storm damage reduction and ecosystem restoration measures within the 4,700 square mile study area in Louisiana's Chenier plain, encompassing Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes.</p> <p>As described in the draft EIS and Feasibility Report, the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) is a combination of non-structural storm surge protection measures and an array of different types of ecosystem restoration features. The TSP for the non-structural storm surge protection features include: (1) elevation of residential structures, (2) dry-flood proofing non-residential structures, (3) construction of barriers or berms around non-residential structures, (4) floodplain management plans, (5) more stringent local floodplain regulations, and (6) more restrictive parish and municipal building codes, land use and zoning regulations, and other developmental controls. The TSP for the ecosystem restoration features includes one hydrology/salinity control measure, nine marsh creation measures, five shoreline protection measures, and eight chenier restoration measures.</p>	Acknowledged description of TSP.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
					ROW impacts	The NMFS has the following general and specific comments to make regarding information provided in the draft EIS: General Comments Marsh Restoration Features. While the majority of the pipeline routes from borrow to marsh creation areas are in open water, some are proposed to pass through marsh. The NMFS is concerned marsh in pipeline rights-of-way (ROWs) and staging areas could be adversely impacted by construction related activities. While NMFS understands such adverse impacts would be offset by the creation of marsh, we believe efforts are warranted to ensure the ROWs and staging areas impacted by construction are restored to pre-existing elevations. In general, such efforts include requiring contractors to pump dredged material into the ROW and staging areas as pipelines are removed, and armoring of ROWs with rip-rap where they intersect with open water areas. The NMFS recommends the Feasibility Report and final EIS include these potential construction-related adverse impacts, as well as description of measures to be taken to insure wetlands impacted by construction of marsh creation features are restored to the maximum extent practicable.	Added to the final report in Chapter 3 Section 3.3.4 Vegetation Resources is a discussion of the potential construction-related adverse impacts, as well as description of measures to be taken to insure wetlands impacted by construction of marsh creation features are restored to pre-construction conditions to the maximum extent practicable, prior to completion of construction activities.
					EFH	Section 1.4.8 Essential Fish Habitat Page 1-19 and Appendix A. The Essential Fish Habitat section of the draft EIS incorrectly lists some federally managed species potentially found in the project area. The species and life stages should be updated to reflect the attached list.	The list of federally managed species potentially found in the project area was updated in Section 1.4.8.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
					EFH	The NMFS has a "findings" with the New Orleans District (NOD) on the fulfillment of coordination requirements under provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. In those findings, the NOD and NMFS agreed to complete EFH coordination requirements for federal civil works projects through our review and comment on National Environmental Policy Act documents prepared for those projects. Therefore, NMFS recommends the following to ensure the conservation of EFH and associated fishery resources: EFH Conservation Recommendation The final EIS and Record of Decision for this project should include measures to ensure pipeline ROW and staging areas are restored to pre-existing conditions, to the maximum extent practicable, prior to completion of construction activities.	The Feasibility Report and final EIS section 3.3.6 has been updated to include measures to ensure pipeline ROW and staging areas are restored to pre-existing conditions, to the maximum extent practicable, prior to completion of construction activities.
					respond to comments	Consistent with Section 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and NMFS' implementing regulation at 50 CFR 600.920(k), your office is required to provide a written response to our EFH conservation recommendation within 30 days of receipt. Your response must include a description of measures to be required to avoid, mitigate, or offset the adverse impacts of the proposed activity. If your response is inconsistent with our EFH conservation recommendation, you must provide a substantive discussion justifying the reasons for not implementing the recommendation, If it is not possible to provide a substantive response within 30 days, the USACE should provide an interim response to NMFS, to be followed by the detailed response. The detailed response should be provided in a manner to ensure it is received by NMFS at least 10 days prior to the signing of a Record of Decision for this action. The NMFS is committed to working cooperatively with the USACE, the State and other natural resource agencies to facilitate planning on this effort. We appreciate the	The USACE, New Orleans District has provided written response to NMFS regarding comment letter.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						opportunity to provide these comments for consideration in finalizing the Feasibility Report and EIS.	
106					resolution	The Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority (Chenier Plain Authority), by intent of this correspondence, hereby respectfully requests that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers accept the following Resolution (attachment) as comments provided by the Chenier Plain Authority's review of the Draft Study. The Chenier Plain Authority would like to thank the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for allowing us to comment on this draft feasibility report for the Southwest Coastal Study. Please contact us if you have any questions or concerns regarding our comments.	Receipt of resolution acknowledged.
107	Nedra Davis (Chenier Plain Coastal Protection Restoration Authority)	April 24, 2015	Chenier Plain	letter	resolution	CHENIER PLAIN COASTAL RESTORATION & PROTECTION AUTHORITY WHEREAS, the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority was created pursuant to the provisions of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, Article VI, Sections 38, 38.1 and 44, and La. R.S. 38:329.5; and WHEREAS, the Chenier Plain CRPA is a political subdivision of the State of Louisiana, and through its board of commissioners, is organized with the primary duty to establish, construct, operate, or maintain flood control works as they relate to hurricane protection, tidewater flooding, saltwater intrusion, and conservation, and a secondary duty to establish flood control, adequate drainage relating to tidal or riverine flooding, and water resources development including but not limited to construction of reservoirs, diversion canals, gravity and pump drainage systems, erosion control measures, and marsh management; and WHEREAS, the Chenier Plain Authority is inclusive of the Parishes of Calcasieu, Cameron, & Vermilion; and WHEREAS, in January of 2009 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Louisiana	Resolution acknowledged.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						announced an agreement to jointly fund an \$8 million feasibility study to provide hurricane damage risk reduction and coastal restoration to Southwest Coastal Louisiana; and WHEREAS, authority for the reconnaissance study exists under resolutions of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives in response to a request for support submitted by Congressman Charles Boustany; and WHEREAS, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Feasibility Study in March 2015 and the agency is currently accepting public comment until May 4, 2015; and WHEREAS, Southwest Coastal Louisiana is highly susceptible to an increased risk of coastal flooding, shoreline erosion, saltwater intrusion and loss of wetlands and habitats due to land subsidence, sea-level rise, the area's low elevation, flat terrain, and close proximity to the Gulf of Mexico; and WHEREAS, land loss and ecosystem degradation threaten the continued productivity of Southwest Coastal Louisiana's ecosystem, the economic viability of its industries, and the safety of its residents; and WHEREAS, land loss and ecosystem degradation threaten the unique culture of Southwest Coastal Louisiana; and WHEREAS, the preservation of culture was one of the original goals of coastal legislation; and WHEREAS, involuntary participation in relocation would tear apart families and vital components of the community and culture; and	
108					eminent domain/involuntary participation	NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CHENIER PLAIN COASTAL RESTORATION & PROTECTION AUTHORITY, LOUISIANA, in regular session convened on the day of April, 2015, that it does hereby respectfully request the U.S.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						Anny Corp of Engineers to accept the following comments as part of the Chenier Plain Authority's review of the Study. Section 1. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends the removal of all eminent domain or involuntary participation references from the study.	
109					Cameron and Vermilion Parishes priority projects	Section 2. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers add an appendix to include a list of all priority projects from Cameron and Vermilion Parishes identifying these projects as good and viable for consideration in any future funding opportunities.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
110					Calcasieu Parish update coastal plan including priority projects list	Section 3. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers add a statement in the draft that states, "Calcasieu Parish anticipates updating their coastal plan which will include a priority projects list. Those projects will be viable projects for consideration of funding for protecting Lake Charles to the 500 year level of protection as deemed necessary by the Coastal Master Plan for Louisiana 2012."	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
111					funding	Section 4. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that 100% federal and state funding be in place for all mitigation non-structural components. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that 100% federal and state funding be in place for all coastal restoration components.	Mitigation for project-induced impacts of the NED Plan is not anticipated.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
112					original goals and objectives	Section 5. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that the original goals and objectives, Ecosystem Restoration, Risk Reduction and Historic and Cultural Preservation, be included and implemented as part of the final draft of the study.	Generally, the planning goals of the NED Plan are to reduce risk of damages associated with hurricane and coastal storm surge flooding. The NED storm damage risk reduction plans were formulated to achieve NED principles and objectives. Contributions to NED are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units, and are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and the rest of the Nation. The general planning goals of the NER Plan are to significantly and sustainably reduce land loss and coastal erosion in the study area, restore environmental conditions for the Chenier Plain ecosystem in SWC Louisiana, and evaluate a range of coastal restoration components to address a multitude of ecosystem problems. Plans were formulated to achieve NER principles and objectives. Contributions to NER are increases in the net quantity and/or quality of desired ecosystem resources, and are measured in the study area and nationwide. Both the NED and NER Plans include consideration of historic and cultural resources as described in the specific subsections in Chapters 1 and 3.
113					shapefiles	Section 6. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers provide Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes the Shape files for the elevation of all structures surveyed as part of its decision making criteria.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
114					windshield survey vs benefit cost ratio	Section 7. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends a review of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) parameters instead of the "wind shield view" BCR and requests transparency of how the final Benefit Cost Ratio will be determined.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.
115					original projects modeled	Section 8. The Chenier Plain Authority recommends that projects originally submitted be modeled as they were submitted and not have projects watered down to include only a	Projects submitted by Cameron and Vermilion Parishes were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternative array.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						small-scale section of what was originally intended.	
116					certified copy of resolution	<p>BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, the Honorable Charles Boustany and all congressional representatives of the parishes of Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes, the Police Juries of Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion parishes, the Louisiana State Levee Consortium, the Association of Louisiana Board of Levees, and the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, respectfully requesting consideration and support of the comments submitted by the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority by virtue of this resolution.</p> <p>THUS DONE AND APOTED by a unanimous vote of the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration & Protection Authority, in regular session convened on this 21 day of April 2015.</p>	Acknowledge receipt of resolution.
117	Nicole Minvielle - Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District, Ray Fremin, Jr. Director and Vermilion Parish Police Jury letter dated April 20, 2015	April 28, 2015	Iberia Parish	letter/email	resolution	Enclosed please find Resolution No. 1015-18 as adopted by the Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District in Regular Session held on Thursday, April 28, 2015. This Resolution support Vermilion Parish Police Jury in opposition to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report on the Southwest Louisiana Coastal Study	Acknowledge receipt of resolution.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
118					support Vermilion Policy Jury comment letter	Resolution No. 2015-18 A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING VERMILION PARISH POLICE JURY IN OPPOSITION TO THE U.S. ARMY COPRS OF ENGINEERS REPORT ON THE SOUTHWEST COASTAL STUDY. WHEREAS, In January 2009 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Louisiana announced an agreement to jointly fund an \$8 million feasibility study to provide hurricane damage risk reduction and coastal restoration to Southwest coastal La; and WHEREAS, Vermilion Parish Police Jury expressed opposition to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report on the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study, as attached in Exhibit "A". NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District does hereby support the position of the Vermilion Parish Policy Jury, as attached in Exhibit "A". BE IT FINALY RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall become effective immediately upon adoption by the Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District. Resolution adopted on April 28, 2015. SEE ALSO VERMILION PARISH POLICE JURY LETTER DATED APRIL 20, 2015	Acknowledge receipt of resolution and the Iberia Parish Levee, Hurricane, and Conservation District support of the position of the Vermilion Parish Policy Jury, as attached in Exhibit "A".
119					resolution	copy of Vermilion Parish Police Jury letter dated April 20, 2015	Acknowledge receipt of copy of Vermilion Parish Police Jury letter dated April 20, 2015.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
120	NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service Virginia M. Fay	April 29, 2015	Federal	letter	pipeline rights of way and staging areas impacts to existing marsh	Marsh Restoration Features. While the majority of the pipeline routes from borrow to marsh creation areas are in open water, some are proposed to pass through marsh. The NMFS is concerned marsh in pipeline rights-of-way (ROWs) and staging areas could be adversely impacted by construction related activities. While NMFS understands such adverse impacts would be offset by the creation of marsh, we believe efforts are warranted to ensure the ROWs and staging areas impacted by construction are restored to pre-existing elevations. In general, such efforts include requiring contractors to pump dredged material into the ROW and staging areas as pipelines are removed, and armoring of ROWs with rip -rap where they intersect with open water areas. The NMFS recommends the Feasibility Report and final EIS include those potential construction-related adverse impacts, as well as a description of measures to be taken to ensure wetlands impacted by construction of marsh creation features are restored to the maximum extent practicable.	Concur. The Corps will utilize best management practices to avoid and minimize potential impacts to existing marsh when routing dredge pipelines for marsh creation. The Corps will ensure wetlands unavoidably impacted by construction of marsh creation features are restored to the maximum extent practicable.
121					EFH species & life stages	Section 1.4.8 Essential Fish Habitat Page 1-19 and Appendix A. The Essential Fish Habitat section of the draft EIS incorrectly lists some federally managed species potentially found in the project area. The species and life stages should up updated to reflect the attached list.	Concur. The species and life stages have been updated in section 1.4.8 main report and section 1.4.9 Appendix A to reflect NMFS list.
122					pipeline rights of way and staging areas restoration	The NMFS has a "findings" with the New Orleans District (NOD) on the fulfillment of coordination requirements under provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. In those findings, the NOD and NMFS agreed to complete EFH coordination requirements for federal civil works projects through our review and comment on National Environmental Policy Act documents prepared for those projects. Therefore, NMFS recommends the following to ensure the conservation of EFH and associated fishery resources: EFH Conservation	The Final Integrated Report section 3.3.6 include measures to ensure pipeline ROW and staging areas are restored to pre-existing conditions to the maximum extent practicable prior to completion of construction activities.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						Recommendation The final EIS and Record of Decision for this project should include measures to ensure pipeline ROW and staging areas are restored to pre-existing conditions, to the maximum extent practicable, prior to completion of construction activities.	
123					response to NMFS	Consistent with Section 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and NMFS' implementing regulation at 50 CFR 600.920(k), your office is required to provide a written response to our EFH conservation recommendation within 30 days of receipt. Your response must include a description of measures to be required to avoid, mitigate, or offset the adverse impacts of the proposed activity. If your response is inconsistent with our EFH conservation recommendation, you must provide a substantive discussion justifying the reasons for not implementing the recommendation. If it is not possible to provide a substantive response within 30 days, the USACE should provide an interim response to NMFS, to be followed by the detailed response. The detailed response should be provided in a manner to ensure it is received by NMFS at least 10 days prior to the signing of a Record of Decision for this action.	Concur. An interim response has been provided to the NMFS. The final response is included in the Final Integrated Report and EIS.
124					NMFS commitment	The NMFS is committed to working cooperatively with the USACE, the State and other natural resource agencies to facilitate planning on this effort. We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments for consideration in finalizing the Feasibility Report and EIS.	Acknowledged
125					EFH table	NMFS table of EFH requirements for species managed by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council: Ecoregion 4, Mississippi River Delta (South Pass) to Freeport, TX	Concur. Table 1-14 section 2.4.8 was updated and incorporated into the Final Integrated Report and EIS
126	State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Pam Breaux	May 1, 2015	Louisiana State agency	letter	archeology	1. Section 4.1.1- Of the six measures outlined in this section, four do not have any potential archaeological historic property issues. The two that do include the elevation of eligible	Acknowledged



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						residential structures, and the construction of non-structural measures.	
127					archeology	2. Section 4.2.1 - The NER TSP measures have largely been addressed in a draft research design drafted by the New Orleans COE office. All but one of the proposed measures are straight-forward construction with specific footprints. The proposed research design in the draft report effectively addresses how historic properties will be identified and evaluated for these projects.	Acknowledge
128					archeology - Chenier reforestation	The one project of concern is the chenier reforestation. In this region, the cheniers represent the only elevated ground through the 2,500 year history of this area. Thus, they represent the location of all Native American and early Historic occupations. And due to the formational processes of the cheniers, all of the archaeological sites are situated at the modern surface in the top 12 inches of sediment. Sites will not be buried in the cheniers. These factors make the chenier reforestation measure of particular concern for its impacts on archaeological sites. The proposed planting interval and size of planting hole will have as yet undetermined effects on sites. Of equal or greater concern are the long term effects of establishing trees on sites. While the ultimate effect will be beneficial when the trees reach maturity and protect the cheniers from storm surge and wave erosion, there are challenges before then. Young trees may be more prone to toppling during storms as they lack the root system to anchor them. Toppling will cause the trees to uproot and create significant ground disturbances that will impact sites. We recommend further discussion concerning the benefits and potential impacts of planting trees on sites.	Concur. USACE shall complete cultural resources investigations pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements. The level of survey to be conducted and the survey methodology will be developed in consultation with the SHPO and consulting Tribes and will be completed in a manner that meets the standards of the Louisiana Division of Archaeology. Effects will be determined through consultation pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
129					archeology - survey lands purchased as part of project	The draft NER TSP indicates that the Corps intends to purchase the land to be incorporated into the reforestation project. We recommend that the Corps systematically survey this new land as it is brought into federal ownership, following Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This will enable the Corps to develop an appropriate process for assessing the potential impacts of the reforestation project upon archaeological historic properties.	USACE shall make the non-federal sponsor aware that cultural resources investigations should be completed during the evaluation by the non-federal sponsor of the real estate rights.
130					archeology - Chenier reforestation	3. Section 4.2.7 - We note that the chenier reforestation project will benefit cultural resources by bringing them into federal ownership and protection. As the reforestation project includes a significant acreage, this may ultimately result in a number of sites, some likely significant, that will be protected from development. The reforestation acreage can act as a preservation area where sites, along with important natural and environmental features, are preserved.	Real estate rights will be acquired by the non-federal sponsor.
131					archeology-chenier reforestation	4. Appendix L - The 4th paragraph of the Introduction states that any elevation project with potential ground disturbing effects to historic properties will not be considered eligible for the project. This restriction has the potential to eliminate a significant number of sites. As noted in an earlier comment, due to the geology and history of the cheniers, where people live today is where people have always lived on the cheniers. Archaeological sites are restricted to the cheniers and their presence will, by this language, potentially leave a significant number of buildings vulnerable to future storms. Furthermore, we question how "potential impacts" (4th paragraph, 2nd sentence) will be identified in the absence of systematic archaeological identification and evaluation.	There is no longer a restriction.
132					archeology- eminent domain	5. Appendix L - The last paragraph in the Introduction states that eminent domain may be used in some situations to acquire property. How will that process mesh with the previously stated goal that any property	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						potentially impacting historic properties will be excluded?	
133					built environment NFS	6. The acronym "NFS" is used throughout the document, but it is not defined. Because the document has a great many acronyms, please consider adding a list of them at the beginning of the document for easy reference.	Noted. NFS refers to the non-federal sponsor.
134					historic standing structures	7. It is our opinion that this EIS does not adequately address historic standing structures. Furthermore, Appendix L proposes to exclude the elevation process for historic buildings. While we are familiar with NFIP exemptions for historic properties, certain considerations must be addressed here, namely the lack of levees which place these important resources, when left at ground level in further harm's way of storm damage. If other buildings around extant historic buildings are elevated through this process, then historic properties/districts have the potential to be adversely impacted through visual character changes to a district or environment. Further discussions between SHPO and USACE regarding the language in Appendix L are requested, prior to the finalization of the EIS.	Noted. Section 106 consultation is ongoing, and two programmatic agreements have been executed.
135					historic properties in Abbeville and Lake Charles	8. Based on the maps provided, we note that historic properties in Abbeville and Lake Charles have the potential to be greatly impacted by this project. Currently, Abbeville has three historic districts that may be impacted and Lake Charles has two that we know of. If historic buildings in these areas are to be excluded from elevation and no other measures are made available to the owners as part of this process how will long term and cumulative effects be addressed or accounted for in this plan. Again, we request further discussions with USACE on this matter.	Noted. Section 106 consultation is ongoing. There are no longer any restrictions.
136					contacts at SHPO	We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important document. If you have questions regarding the Archaeology comments, please contact Dr. Chip McGimsey, State Archaeologist at	Acknowledged



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						cmcgimsey@crt.la.gov. And, if you have questions regarding the built environment, please contact Nicole Hobson-Morris at nmorris@crt.la.gov.	
137	Teche-Vermilion Fresh Water District	April 30, 2015	Teche-Vermilion District	Letter	eminent domain	1. The eminent domain issue should be removed from consideration as a means of solving the problem. This was never the intent of the supporters of this study. The intent of the study is ecosystem restoration, risk reduction, as well as historic and cultural preservation. These goals should be part of the final draft of the study.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
138						2. Citizens, Cities and The Governing Body of Vermilion Parish have invested countless hours into identifying and establishing a list of priority coastal projects that will benefit the objectives of the Feasibility Study and they should be recognized and added as being good and viable projects. This is necessary in order for these essential projects to have a possibility of being funded.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
139					benefits being left out	3. Cost benefit ratios should be reviewed and all possible benefits should be included. Parish engineers should be consulted to ensure that there are no benefits being left out of the equation	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100.
140					Shapefiles	4. It would be beneficial for the US Corps of Engineers to provide to the parish all GIS Shapefiles of the eligible structures to be elevated as part of the NED project for Vermilion parish. Vermilion Parish has several State and Federal programs that have assisted with elevation and flood-proofing of structures post-Rita.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
141					Opportunity to comment	We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this study and look forward to assisting you in any way that will improve the chances of Vermilion Parish receiving the federal assistance that it needs and deserves	Acknowledge comment.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
147	United States Department of Agriculture, NRCS; Kevin Norton, State Conservationist	May 5, 2015	Federal agency	letter	Reconsider position on Calcasieu Ship Channel;	NRCS requests that the USACE reconsider its position that the Calcasieu Ship Channel be excluded from further consideration due to potential impacts on navigation. The negative impacts of the CSC are well documented in the Calcasieu-Sabine Cooperative River Basin Study Report (USDA 1989) and addressing those are critically important to the area wetlands and estuaries.	The Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Barrier feature is considered an important feature of the Recommended Plan. However, because additional analysis regarding impacts to the authorized navigation channel is necessary, this feature is recommended for long term study
148					NER Plan Marsh creation	The NRCS is also concerned that of the approximately \$1 billion dollar estimated construction budget for the proposed projects, more than half is in marsh creation (i.e. Marsh Restoration). While these types of projects effectively provide immediate benefits in terms of land reconstruction, the total area that these projects encompass are only a small fraction of the total study area. According to the plan, the total wetland area of the project is over 1.3 million acres and the total benefits of the Marsh Restoration projects is only 8,714 acres (less than 1 percent of the study area).	Due to the complexity of the problems in southwest coastal Louisiana, the Recommended Plan targets critical landscape features in need of immediate restoration. The Recommended Plan also include additional long-term study of hydrologic and salinity features as well as features recommended for construction by the USFWS. In addition, the NER RP measures provide interactions, often synergistically, with other existing coastal restoration and mitigation projects
149					Lack of large scale hydrologic projects	We also understand that a comprehensive hydrodynamic modeling effort was included in this study and would have expected more emphasis on large scale hydrologic projects that are designed to address much broader areas that would provide comprehensive restoration to broad landscapes within the study area	Due to the complexity of the problems in southwest coastal Louisiana, the Recommended Plan targets critical landscape features in need of immediate restoration. The Recommended Plan also include additional long-term study of hydrologic and salinity features as well as features recommended for construction by the USFWS.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
150					WVA may overestimate habitat value marsh restoration	Another NRCS concern is that evaluations by the Southwest Coastal Study Team may overestimate the realized habitat value of marsh creation projects. Specifically, after containment gapping, the Wetland Value Assessment (WVA) of marsh creation projects assigned optimum values to the aquatic organism access variable (V6) to marshes that flood less than 10% of the time. According to key scientific studies, projects that are constructed to elevations of minimal flooding duration and therefore limit aquatic organism access throughout much of the project life do not provide optimal access (please see Minella et al. 2012). Therefore, NRCS has concern that the technical and scientific information relied upon to support recommendations in decision documents or form the basis of designs, specifications, and/or O&M requirements of the proposed marsh restoration projects are not substantiated by the best available science, and consequently, the project selection process may be compromised based on an inaccurate evaluation with respect to habit value.	The guidance documentation for V6 in the "Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act - Wetland Value Assessment Methodology - Coastal Marsh Community Models" from March 19, 2010, restricts fish access scores based on control structures, not marsh elevation relative to tidal range. There is no established mechanism for assigning a reduced suitability for fish access for partially flooded marshes (and even a marsh that is never flooded can provide high quality marsh edge habitat if there is sufficient interspersion). Reductions in fish access are noted where impoundment or water control structures are present or proposed. The target elevation of the marsh is initially near the upper end of the tidal range so longevity can be maximized. This is how all marshes have historically been constructed with no modification to the V6 suitability. The subsidence rate applied for the SW Coastal Louisiana Feasibility Study is 5.6 mm/yr. The tidal range in this area is about 12 inches. Under the Intermediate RSLR scenario, by TY25 the marsh surface would have experienced enough RLSR that the inundation period would be 50%. We feel that this duration of flooding and planned interspersion will be adequate to provide fish and invertebrate access to the marsh, both through marsh edge and marsh surface habitat. We appreciate that scientific knowledge on the subject is evolving, but don't feel that a numeric adjustment to the suitability is warranted at this time based on the degree of flooding anticipated for the marsh restoration features of this project.
151					coastal restoration and scientific analyses	NRCS continues to be a major partner and supporter of coastal restoration in Louisiana and remains dedicated to ensuring that the work done to protect and restore coastal wetlands is done in a manner that provides the most benefit for the costs involved. We encourage the most rigorous and accurate scientific analyses of each project feature so that the public can be assured that the benefits	Acknowledge comment.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement							
Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						are accurately reflected in the costs of this very important work.	
152	Vermilion Parish Police Jury	April 20, 2015	Vermilion Parish	letter	accept comments	The Vermilion Parish Police Jury, by intent of this correspondence, hereby respectfully requests that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers accept the following comments as part of the Police Jury's review of the Study.	Acknowledge receipt of comments.
153					eminent domain	1. The VPPJ recommends the removal of all eminent domain references from the study. This was never the intent of the study as originally agreed in 2009 and supported by Congressman Charles Boustany.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
154					Vermilion Parish priority projects	2. The VPPJ recommends the adding of an appendix to include a list of all priority projects from Vermilion Parish Coastal Plans identifying these projects as good and viable for consideration in any future funding opportunities.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
155					goals and objectives	3. The VPPJ recommends that the original goals and objectives, Ecosystem Restoration, Risk Reduction and Historic and Cultural Preservation, be included and implemented as part of the final draft of the study.	Generally, the planning goals of the NED Plan are to reduce risk of damages associated with hurricane storm surge flooding. The NED storm damage risk reduction plans were formulated to achieve NED principles and objectives. Contributions to NED are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units, and are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and the rest of the Nation. The general planning goals of the NER Plan are to significantly and sustainably reduce land loss and coastal erosion in the study area, restore environmental conditions for the Chenier Plain ecosystem in SWC Louisiana, and evaluate a range of coastal restoration components to address a multitude of ecosystem problems. Plans were formulated to achieve NER principles and objectives. Contributions to NER are increases in the net quantity and/or quality of desired ecosystem resources, and are measured in the study area and nationwide.
156					benefit to cost ratio	4. The VPPJ recommends a review of the Benefit Cost Ratio parameters regarding the proposed levee alignments within Vermilion Parish and request transparency of how the final Benefit Cost Ratio will be determined.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100.
157					benefit to cost ration for levee alignments	5. The VPPJ made comments on the initial release of the Draft Report in January of 2014 regarding the Study levee alignment along the eastern Parish line. Refer to comment 3 on page J-105. The response from USACE is that the measures planned in Iberia Parish could not be considered since they were still in the planning stage and were considered "conceptual". The VPPJ would again request that the Benefit Cost Ratio be recomputed for a levee alignment without the north south segment along the Parish line even though it will be considered conceptual. While the Parish understands this measure (a levee) may not end up being included in the recommended plan, the more accurate Benefit Cost Ratio may provide for future inclusion in the plan if the	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. Measures planned in Iberia Parish are considered conceptual and still in the planning stage and therefore not further considered for detailed analysis.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS (FEDERAL, STATE, PARISH, AND LOCAL)							
						conceptual plans (Iberia Parish levee) obtain funding as the study/project moves forward.	
158					shapefiles	6. The VPPJ recommends that the U.S. Corps of Engineers provide all GIS Shapefiles of the eligible structures to be elevated as part of the NED project for Vermilion Parish. Vermilion Parish has several State and Federal programs that have assisted with elevation and flood-proofing of structures post-Rita.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
159					Thanks/contact offices	The Vermilion Parish Police Jury would like to thank the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for allowing us to comment on this draft feasibility report for the Southwest Coastal Study. Feel free to contact our offices should you have questions or concerns regarding our comments.	Acknowledge comment.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
LETTER COMMENTS							
1	Alfred Broussard	not dated	public	letter	copy of report	I am requesting copies of the EIS, SW Coastal for Vermilion Parish	Acknowledged and copy of Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS provided
2	Ellray Henry, Manager C.F. Henry Properties LLC	April 15, 2015	public	letter	Parish priority projects	<p>The intent of this correspondence is to state our concerns with the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (Southwest Study). This transmittal is submitted to you on behalf of the C.F. Henry Properties, LLC and James Henry Co.</p> <p>In reviewing the Southwest Study, a few items caught our attention. Being a large landowner in lower Cameron Parish, it causes us a great deal of concern with the limited number of coastal restoration projects listed in the study. Our family has worked diligently with Cameron Parish to draft their Cameron Master Plan. It is the will of our board members to include other Cameron Parish projects even in an appendix to be available for other discretionary funding sources in the future. Currently, the Parish has nine projects listed in the study. We feel that there are significantly more projects that are viable and are not even up for discussion due to the benefit cost ratio and the national interest with these projects.</p>	Parish Priority Projects have been included in Appendix P to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
3					involuntary participation and eminent domain	Secondly, the reference of "Involuntary Participation" in the NED portion of the study is alarming. Please understand that our Parish is a rural one with land remaining within families for generations. Our family hopes that this was never the objective of this study.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
4					economic development	<p>Much time and effort should be given in considering the implementation side of the study prior to signing the final report. Much economic development is being conducted in Cameron Parish. Over \$30 billion in investments have been made in our Parish with another \$15-\$20 billion in announced projects working through permits. Such regulations as this will no doubt impact the operation and staffing of these industrial accomplishments.</p> <p>We appreciate your time and courtesy to allow us to comment. Please reconsider the aspects</p>	The proposed action is not to implement a new regulation. Rather, the Recommended Plan is to provide an opportunity for storm surge risk reduction throughout southwest coastal Louisiana project area. Implementing the Recommended Plan's storm surge damage risk reduction measures would not impact the operation of ongoing or future economic development.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
LETTER COMMENTS							
						of the draft that we have set forth. We look forward to reviewing the revised report.	
	Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Inc.	May 5, 2015	public	letter	involuntary participation and eminent domain	The Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation is an independent, nongovernmental voluntary organization of Louisiana farm and ranch families. Our purpose is to promote the well-being of our farm and ranch families and the agriculture industry in our state. After reviewing the Corps recommendations for public comment pertaining to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement, we are very concerned that the Corps in recommending a "non-structural" hurricane protection plan for Vermilion, Cameron and Calcasieu parishes. This means no levees or other structural measures would be utilized to help provide protection to people living and working in these areas. Instead, the Corps is proposing the use of "Involuntary Participation" and "Eminent Domain" as a means for relocations and buy-outs resulting in removing people from their homes and family lands. This would establish a precedence that not only could destroy the culture and unique way of life in coastal Louisiana but put at risk the rights of any landowner living in a flood zone or not. We recommend that the Corps remove language in its draft of recommendations that has any reference to Involuntary Participation and or Eminent Domain.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
					local sponsors	We further recommend that the Corps select and utilize local sponsors in implementing provisions of the study if approved and funded. Practical knowledge gained by living in an area cannot be replaced by computer modeling in making decisions for that area.	Implementation of the Recommended Plan will be closely coordinated with local communities, towns, cities and Parishes as well as the State of Louisiana. The practical and local knowledge of those living in the area will be used in implementing the Recommended Plan.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
LETTER COMMENTS							
					shoreline protection, buyouts and relocations	The people, the land, the history and culture of Southwest Coastal Louisiana is important and should be protected, not with “remain at your own risk” or forced buy-outs, but with projects that provide shoreline protection. The goal of this study was to restore and protect the coast and marshes of Southwest Coastal Louisiana and preserve the areas unique culture. What we see the Corp proposing through the use of buy-outs and relocation does not address this goal.	The NED Recommended Plan will provide reduced risk of hurricane storm surge flood damage for a total of 3,961 impacted structures consisting of 3,462 eligible residential structures; 342 eligible commercial structures and public buildings; and 157 eligible warehouses. The NER Recommended Plan (Alternative CM-4) includes marsh restoration features (which involve hydraulic dredging and placing of sediments), shoreline protection/stabilization features, and chenier reforestation that will work synergistically with other ecosystem restoration projects in the area and facilitate hydrologic and geomorphic stability and resilience.
5	Martin Miller	April 30, 2015	public	letter	Combination of NED and NER Plan	Wondering how Congressman Charles Boustamy's sponsoring a feasibility study in 2005 to provide "hurricane and storm damage risk reduction to reduce the risk of flood damage caused by hurricane and storm surges" was combined with the National Ecosystem Restoration (NER) Study, to "significantly restore environmental conditions for the Ecosystem", I contacted Andy MacInnes, Lead Planner of the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Feasible Study at (504) 862-1062. He informed me that the NER was included since a report had previously been done and it was decided to combine both reports in this feasibility study.	EC 1105-2-204 provides that project delivery teams (PDT's) should consider and take advantage of every opportunity to engage in the formulation of combined plans unless prohibited by study authority, the lack of financial capability or authority of the sponsors.
6					eminent domain marsh creation/condemnation for ecosystem restoration	I then asked about the element of marsh creation on private land and the threat of eminent domain if the landowner resisted, and he advised that he thought eminent domain was only applicable to structures, notwithstanding Appendix E to your feasibility study, pages 18-23, provides that the fee title is to be taken away from the landowner, excluding minerals, etc. He thought, "Fee Estate" meant an "offer to acquire" but deferred to the real estate specialist, Judy Dutierrez, at (504) 862-2575 who advised, after I spoke with her, that, yes, they recommend that the Coastal Protection and Restoration	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
LETTER COMMENTS							
						Authority have condemnation authority for marsh creation and ridge restoration.	
7					eminent domain	<p>The undersigned is one of the landowners currently working with State and Federal authorities on CWPPRA (Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act) projects on a voluntary basis where we maintain fee ownership of our land, said projects being identified as ME-20 and ME-32. Your Measures/Features 47a1 , 47a2 and 47C1 as shown in Appendix K of http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/SouthwestCoastal.aspx are in the proximity of the ME-20 and ME-32 projects and affect close to 2,000 acres of the undersigned's co-owned property. As your feasibility study includes the right of eminent domain for marsh creation I strongly object to same. Marsh creation is being accomplished through the CWPPRA programs and why we would want to support your study that would provide for the taking of our property for the same marsh creation? In addition to the above marsh creation features of your feasibility study, the Chenier Restoration Measure/Feature #416 shown in Appendix K affects the Grand Chenier ridge of which approximately 1/3 of the affected ridge land is the undersigned's co owned property, which also calls for eminent domain. In addition, the Bills Ridge Measure/Feature in Vermilion Parish, #509C shown in Appendix K, appears to be entirely on the undersigned's co-owned property. Accordingly, since eminent domain is also applicable to Chenier Restoration, I again oppose the inclusion of eminent domain in your feasibility study. Inasmuch as you are only in the feasibility study phase, should the</p>	Restoring large areas of marsh is a prominent feature of the NER recommended plan. USACE and CPRA are currently working out how to implement marsh restoration while ensuring the benefits of the marsh restoration are preserved over the 50-year period of analysis. More details about how marsh restoration areas would be acquired will be developed during the design phase of the project.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
LETTER COMMENTS							
						inclusion of eminent domain remain therein, we will endeavor to make certain that your study is neither authorized nor funded .I understand the state will share in 35% of the cost of any of your suggested projects and accordingly, we will contact our State and Federal representatives to voice our strong objection to the inclusion of eminent domain, which objection has already been voiced by the Chairman of the Coastal Protection Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana, the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority, and the Police Jury of the Parish of Cameron.	
8	Michael Toerner	April 28, 2015	public	letter	Study Authority	<p>I am writing because my wife and I own property in Calcasieu and Cameron parishes and because I oppose the “National Economic Development (NED)” portion of the Corps’ report. The reasons for my opposition are as follows.</p> <p>1. The Corps did not have the statutory authority to make the recommendations that it did. On 12/7/2005, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives authorized the Corps to survey the coast of Louisiana, use the survey information to recommend ways to provide hurricane and storm protection, and study the feasibility of constructing a levee along the Intracoastal Waterway. The House Committee did not give the Corps the authority to develop a plan to elevate residential structures and to use eminent domain to seize the property of the residents who did not want to participate in the elevation program.</p>	<p>Study Authority: A survey of the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes, with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes, including the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was authorized by a Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2747, on December 7, 2005.</p> <p>The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses</p>



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
LETTER COMMENTS							
9					cost/benefit analysis	2. The cost/benefit analysis that underlies the NED plan is based on questionable assumptions. The Corps defined “benefits” as the reduction in damages that would result from implementing its recommendations (page D-18). “Damages,” however, can be defined in a variety of ways, many of which could produce lower dollar amounts (and, thus, “benefits”) than the ones that the Corps obtained.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with ER 1105-2-100 Planning Guidance Notebook and with Appendix D, Amendment #1 Economic and Social Considerations. The analysis was subjected to Agency Technical Review, and Independent External Peer Review.
10					identify NED properties	3. Property owners affected by the NED plan were denied due process. To date, the Corps has refused to publicly identify the thousands of residential properties whose owners would be required to elevate their homes or face eminent-domain seizure of their property. There is no doubt that, had they known what the Corps was proposing with regard to their property, these individuals would have attended the Corps’ public hearings and/or made written comments to the Corps.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
LETTER COMMENTS							
11					eminent domain	<p>4. The NED plan is biased against residential property owners. As mentioned above, the NED plan provides that residential property owners who do not voluntarily participate in the Corps' structure-elevation program will face eminent-domain seizure of their property. The NED plan contains no such provision for non-residential property owners who refuse to either dry floodproof their structures or construct berms around their property.5. The NED plan discriminates against property owners in coastal Louisiana. People who live in other parts of the U.S. are not being told by the Corps or other Federal agencies to disaster-proof their homes or face eminent-domain seizure of their property. By not treating all disaster-area residents the same, the Corps is discriminating against the residents of coastal Louisiana.6. The eminent-domain feature of the NED plan represents governmental overreach. I believe that people, in choosing where to live, weigh the costs and risks against the perceived benefits. I do not believe that the government has the right to threaten to use its eminent-domain authority to try to make people move to an area that the government deems more desirable.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments as you develop the final version of the NED plan.</p>	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
PETITION COMMENTS							
1	Petition to Change the SWCL Study's 2015 Draft total of 1,752 signatures (available upon request)	not dated	public	signed petition	Parish Plans	Include the list of parishes' existing & proposed coastal restoration Plans. <u>We deserve better Protection?</u>	Parish Priority Projects will be included as an appendix in the Final Report.
					eminent domain/involuntary participation	Remove 'eminent domain' and 'involuntary participation' from the study. <u>Take it out!</u>	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
					local sponsor	Immediately choose and directly include the 'local sponsor' in ALL remaining stages of the study.	In addition to the CPRA, who is the non-Federal sponsor, other congressional, state, parish and local representatives, along with non-governmental agencies, have participated and will continue to be encouraged to participate in the planning process.
					replace chenier reforestation with shoreline protection	Replace 'reforestation' with 'Shoreline protection measures'. Shoreline Protection is Critical!	Five shoreline protection measures were developed that would protect the area of greatest shoreline erosion. Reforestation of the Cheniers was developed and targeted for those existing cheniers that are in greatest need due to deforestation.
2	Petition dated April 16, 2015 total 63 signatures (available upon request)	May 5, 2015	public	April 16, 2015 petition/email	April 16, 2015 petition	Dear US Army Corps of Engineers, Louisiana Congressional Delegation, Governor of Louisiana, Louisiana Delegation, Municipalities and Parish Government. As a voting resident of Louisiana I ask that you reconsider the listed items and accept my personal comments in relation to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement	Receipt of comments acknowledged



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
PETITION COMMENTS							
3					include Parish Priority Projects	*Please include Parish Priority Projects! The Corp has prepared a study that will recommend a non-structural plan of action. Due to the inability to meet your current 'cost/benefit ration' standards, only a very small list of measures have been 'tentatively selected'. While the selected list may indeed be cost effective, I feel that our parish deserves 'protection'. In order to clearly support any future consideration of funding for a structural protection measure, I ask that you insert a LIST of ALL of the measures and projects proposed in the parishes' existing and proposed Coastal Restoration and Protection Plans. The inclusion will eliminate all unintentional exclusion of projects that were not tentatively selected and will clearly indicate the worthiness for future consideration for funding. Inclusion of these projects will also allow the study to reflect the original purpose and intent of Rep. Boustany's bill, which was always to provide hurricane protection to Southwest Coastal Louisiana. The resiliency and efficiency shown by the parish's residents and business owners in protecting their homes and buildings should not have lessened the urgency and consideration given to protecting the land on which those structures have been built.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as Appendix P in the Final Report. Note that over 200 project features were initially considered and screened by the interagency, interdisciplinary planning team, including: Parish Priority Projects, as well as previous CWPPRA, State and other Federal projects USDOJ CIAP projects, LACPR, LCA Program, and the 2012 State Master Plan projects within the study area.
4					eminent domain and involuntary participation removed from study	I ask that any and all reference or language to 'eminent domain' and 'involuntary participation' be completely removed from this study. The property owner's choice to remain at their 'own risk' or possibly without future assistance are the only appropriate alternatives to 'voluntary participation'. I do not agree that protecting the Federal governments' interests should supersede the choices the landowners make. It was my understanding that the goal of this plan was to restore and protect the coast and marshes, assist in preserving the unique culture, not remove people from their homes and family lands. The precedence set by such language has the potential to completely destroy the culture and unique way of life in coastal Louisiana. PLEASE TAKE IT OUT!	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
PETITION COMMENTS							
5					Local Sponsor	I request that a 'Local sponsor' be chosen and have an immediate 'voice' in the remaining planning process of the study. It is clear that 'local sponsor' will be burdened with implementing and enforcing many portions of the study if ever funded. Modeling and Data should never realistically replace the practical knowledge gained by living in an area for a lifetime. Local sponsors can assist in making valid and important corrections and local concerns could be addressed immediately.	In addition to the State (CPRA) who is the non-Federal sponsor, other congressional, state, parish and local representatives, along with non-governmental agencies, have participated and will continue to be encouraged to participate in the planning process;
6					shoreline protection to replace reforestation	I ask that reforestation measures be replaced with shoreline protection measures. Reforestation is the most cost effective measure proposed in the study. By deleting all protective levees and structures out of the 'Temporary Selected Plan', the Corp's was able to meet one of its highest priorities, cost effectiveness. More shoreline protection is critical. Previous projects have shown that reforestation will be successful only after protection is implemented. Shoreline protection would be a better investment for our coast's future.	Five shoreline protection measures were developed that would protect the area of greatest shoreline erosion. Reforestation of the Cheniers was not developed solely because it would be cost effective. Rather, chenier reforestation was developed and targeted for those existing cheniers that in greatest need due to deforestation.
7	Petition Dated April 17, 2015 total 748 signatures (available upon request)	April 17, 2015 petition	public	April 17, 2015 petition	Parish priority projects	As a voting resident of Louisiana I ask that you reconsider the listed items and accept my personal comments in relation to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement: • Please include Parish Priority Projects! The Corp has prepared a study that will recommend a non-structural plan of action. Due to the inability to meet your current 'cost/benefit ratio' standards, only a very small list of measures have been 'tentatively selected'. While the selected list may indeed be cost effective, I feel that our parish deserves 'protection'. In order to clearly support any future consideration of funding for a structural protection measure, I ask that you insert a LIST of ALL of the measures and projects proposed in the parishes ' existing and proposed Coastal Restoration & Protection Plans. The inclusion will eliminate all unintentional exclusion of projects that were not tentatively selected and	Parish Priority Projects will be included as an appendix in the Final Report. Note that over 200 project features were initially considered and screened by the interagency, interdisciplinary planning team, including: Parish Priority Projects, as well as previous CWPPRA, State and other Federal projects USDOI CIAP projects, LACPR, LCA Program, and the 2012 State Master Plan projects within the study area



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
PETITION COMMENTS							
						will clearly indicate worthiness for future consideration for funding. Inclusion of these projects will also allow the study to reflect the original purpose and intent of Rep. Boustany's bill, which was always to provide hurricane protection to Southwest Coastal Louisiana. The resiliency and efficiency shown by the parish's residents and business owners in protecting their homes and buildings should not have lessened the urgency and consideration given to protecting the land on which those structures have been built.	
8					eminent domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I ask that any and all reference or language to 'eminent domain' and 'involuntary participation' be completely removed from this study. The property owner's choice to remain at their 'own risk' or possibly without future assistance are the only appropriate alternatives to 'voluntary participation'. I do not agree that protecting the Federal government's interests should supersede the choices that landowners make. It was my understanding that the goal of this plan was to restore and protect the coast and marshes, assist in preserving the unique culture, not to remove people from their homes and family lands. The precedence set by such language has the potential to completely destroy the culture and unique way of life in coastal Louisiana. PLEASE TAKE IT OUT! 	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
9					Local Sponsor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I request that a 'Local sponsor' be chosen and have an immediate 'voice' in the remaining planning process of the study. It is clear that 'local sponsor' will be burdened with implementing and enforcing many portions of the study if ever funded. Modeling and Data should never realistically replace the practical knowledge gained by living in an area for a lifetime. Local sponsors can assist in making valid and important corrections and local concerns could be addressed immediately. 	The CPRA is the non-Federal Sponsor or "Local Sponsor". As in most civil works projects, funding and other administrative processes follow prescribed laws, rules and regulation. The approval of funds for the project is by Congressional action.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
PETITION COMMENTS							
10					shoreline protection to replace reforestation	I ask that reforestation measures be replaced with shoreline protection measures. Reforestation is the most cost effective measure proposed in the study. By deleting all protective levees and structures out of the 'Tentatively Selected Plan', the Carp's was able to meet one of its highest priorities, cost effectiveness. More shoreline protection is critical. Previous projects have shown that reforestation will be successful only after protection is implemented. Shoreline protection would be a better investment for our coast's future	Five shoreline protection measures were developed that would protect the area of greatest shoreline erosion. Reforestation of the Cheniers was not developed solely because it would be cost effective. Rather, chenier reforestation was developed and targeted for those existing cheniers that in greatest need due to deforestation.
11					April 21, 2015 petition	Dear US Army Corps of Engineers, Louisiana Congressional Delegation, Governor of Louisiana, Louisiana Delegation, Municipalities and Parish Government. As a voting resident of Louisiana I ask that you reconsider the listed items and accept my personal comments in relation to the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Study's 2015 Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement	Acknowledge receipt of petitions
	Petition dated April 21, 2015 total 4 signatures (available upon request)	April 21, 2015	public	April 21, 2015 petition	include Parish Priority Projects	*Please include Parish Priority Projects! The Corp has prepared a study that will recommend a non-structural plan of action. Due to the inability to meet your current 'cost/benefit ration' standards, only a very small list of measures have been 'tentatively selected'. While the selected list may indeed be cost effective, I feel that our parish deserves 'protection'. In order to clearly support any future consideration of funding for a structural protection measure, I ask that you insert a LIST of ALL of the measures and projects proposed in the parishes' existing and proposed Coastal Restoration and Protection Plans. The inclusion will eliminate all unintentional exclusion of projects that were not tentatively selected and will clearly indicate the worthiness for future consideration for funding. Inclusion of these projects will also allow the study to reflect the original purpose and intent of Rep. Boustany's bill, which was always to provide hurricane protection to Southwest Coastal Louisiana. The resiliency and efficiency shown by the parish's residents and business owners in protecting their	Parish Priority Projects will be included as an appendix in the Final Report. Note that over 200 project features were initially considered and screened by the interagency, interdisciplinary planning team, including: Parish Priority Projects, as well as previous CWPPRA, State and other Federal projects USDOJ CIAP projects, LACPR, LCA Program, and the 2012 State Master Plan projects within the study area.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
PETITION COMMENTS							
						homes and buildings should not have lessened the urgency and consideration given to protecting the land on which those structures have been built.	
					eminent domain and involuntary participation removed from study	I ask that any and all reference or language to 'eminent domain' and 'involuntary participation' be completely removed from this study. The property owner's choice to remain at their 'own risk' or possibly without future assistance are the only appropriate alternatives to 'voluntary participation'. I do not agree that protecting the Federal governments' interests should supersede the choices the landowners make. It was my understanding that the goal of this plan was to restore and protect the coast and marshes, assist in preserving the unique culture, not remove people from their homes and family lands. The precedence set by such language has the potential to completely destroy the culture and unique way of life in coastal Louisiana. PLEASE TAKE IT OUT!	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
					Local Sponsor	I request that a 'Local sponsor' be chosen and have an immediate 'voice' in the remaining planning process of the study. It is clear that 'local sponsor' will be burdened with implementing and enforcing many portions of the study if ever funded. Modeling and Data should never realistically replace the practical knowledge gained by living in an area for a lifetime. Local sponsors can assist in making valid and important corrections and local concerns could be addressed immediately.	In addition to the State (CPRA) who is the non-Federal sponsor, other congressional, state, parish and local representatives, along with non-governmental agencies, have participated and will continue to be encouraged to participate in the planning process;
					shoreline protection to replace reforestation	I ask that reforestation measures be replaced with shoreline protection measures. Reforestation is the most cost effective measure proposed in the study. By deleting all protective levees and structures out of the "Temporary Selected Plan", the Corp's was able to meet one of its highest priorities, cost effectiveness. More shoreline protection is critical. Previous projects have shown that reforestation will be successful only after protection is implemented. Shoreline protection would be a better investment for our coast's future.	Five shoreline protection measures were developed that would protect the area of greatest shoreline erosion. Reforestation of the Cheniers was not developed solely because it would be cost effective. Rather, chenier reforestation was developed and targeted for those existing cheniers that in greatest need due to deforestation.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
POSTCARD COMMENT							
1	Barbara Primeaux	May 5, 2015	public	post card	elevation	I attended the meeting in Cameron on 4-16-15 & was very disturbed when I left, My home is in Creole, L.A. I was raised in my home, moved away & returned when I married. My Dad gave me the house. Raised all my children there. After Rita got insurance (flood) & repaired my homes. Parish officials told me I was <u>grandfathered</u> in & no one told us that we had to elevate. Same thing after Ike. I thought we had done the right thing & got flood insurance - we were wrong!	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation.
2	D.Y. Dolsard Jr.	May 5, 2015	public	post card	shoreline protection & restoration	Shoreline protection and restoration needs to be #1 Priority.	Acknowledge comment.
elevation					Elevation of houses either voluntary or involuntary should not be considered at this time!	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.	
shoreline protection & restoration					Save Cameron - Shoreline Protection & Restoration	Acknowledge comment.	
5	Davy L. Doxy	May 5, 2015	public	post card	spend money on coastal restoration	If you would take all the money spend on survey, studies, mileage, hotel room, meals & office expense and spend it on coastal rest. We would not need to attend this type of meeting.	Acknowledge comment.
6	Iris Broussard	May 5, 2015	public	post card	beach protection	I also have worked for Dr Martin O. Miller Estate for the last 35 years. In Pecan Island & Grand Chenier. The Miller property at Grand Chenier joins the Refuge. Along the Beach it's washing away so fast that some days with a south wind you can stand on the Beach and see it washing away. So I think first things first start at the Beach to stop it from washing away.	The proposed action would provide 6,135 acres of shoreline protection and stabilization.
7					nonstructural plan	I just don't thing making people leave their homes is the right thing to do.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation
8	Jeff & Shari Richard	May 5, 23015	public	post card	shoreline protection	I support shoreline protection	Acknowledge comment.
9					elevation	<u>OBJECT</u> to mandatory elevation of homes	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation
10	Lisa Chiasson	May 5, 23015	public	post card	eminent domain and involuntary participation	Please remove eminent domain and involuntary participation from the study. No one wants their life taken from them.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
POSTCARD COMMENT							
							"involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
11					levee	We want a levee that will protect all.	The following structural measures were considered during planning process: earthen levees, floodgates, floodwalls, pumps, and highway armoring. Fifteen levee variations were considered. The focused array included 6 levee alternative plans. However, all of the structural alternatives had benefit-to-cost ratios less than 1.0.
12	Susan Boudreaux	May 5, 23015	public	post card	study funds	You are spending a lot of money on a study that only pertains to less than 1% of the structures in our 3 parish area.	One of the study objectives is to reduce the risk of damages and losses from hurricane storm surge flooding in southwest Louisiana. The project would provide risk reduction for 3,961 total structures.
13					structures survive storms	In Creole as an example there are 7 structures that are businesses 5 being used that are not elevated properly but they all have made it thru the storms on our dime not yours. Some of these 3 storms.	Acknowledge comment.
14					100 year old structure	There are 6 homes in Creole that are old enough to go thru all 3 and one is over 100 years old.	Acknowledge comment.
15					risk	Everything in life they are risk we take. So a 1% risk is not worth the money spent on your study.	The NED purpose was authorized on December 7, 2005 – Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Resolution Docket 2747. <i>“Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, that, in accordance with Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, the Secretary of the Army is requested to survey the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes...”</i>



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement							
Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Draft Response
POSTCARD COMMENT							
16					study protecting coast	But a study protecting our coast is beneficial not just for storms and salt water intrusion. But for the water that drains on us from the North- the Mermentau River locks & Calcasieu Lock, GIWW systems need study.	The NER purpose was recommended in the 2005 Chief's Report for the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Ecosystem Restoration Program. The Chenier Plain Freshwater and Sediment Management and Allocation Reassessment Study was one of six large-scale restoration concepts to "significantly restore environmental conditions that existed prior to large-scale alteration of the natural ecosystem." The LCA Program was authorized in Title VII of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement							
Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
1	Nedra Davis	14-Apr-15	public meeting	oral comment	involuntary participation	My name is Nedra Davis. I'm the Executive Director of the Chenier Plain Authority. We're a new levee district in southwest. We represent Calcasieu, Cameron and Vermilion Parishes. So I wanted to start with that. My comments are a compilation of comments that have been collected over the last couple of weeks from meetings that we've had concerning the Southwest Coastal Study. So I wanted to read these into the record. First of all, my first one is that the parishes do not want the involuntary participation paragraph. We feel that it was added in after the 2013 draft at the eleventh hour and it's completely inappropriate.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
2					windshield survey	My second comment is that the Windshield data collection as it's being permitted -- presented as being problematic in that data was collected in 2010 and we feel that that data should be looked at in 2015.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis.
3					historic & cultural	The number three: The historical and cultural vision has been lost in this process.	Historic and cultural resources are required to be considered under various laws, regulations, and policy. Separate sections in Chapters 1 and 3 provide the historic, existing, future without project and future with project analyses. Effects to historic properties and cultural resources will be evaluated through consultation pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements.
4					project distortion	Number four: There is project distortion in some of the same sections of the originally proposed areas.	Without specific references, we cannot address alleged project distortion. Generally, the revised draft Integrated Report has been consistent with examining and developing alternatives for both storm surge risk reduction and ecosystem restoration throughout the study area.
5					shapefiles	Number five: We've asked for shape files and shape file sharing since 2013 and the parishes have requested this directly and have not received any shape files from the state or the Corps.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
6					Parish priority projects	Number six: We feel that the parish priority projects are not being included.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
7					Representative Boustany	Number seven: This study does not represent what was originally intended by Representative Boustany still. And we feel that it - it needs to be completely revised.	The study has been developed within the described Congressional authorizations specific to hurricane storm surge risk reduction as well as ecosystem restoration.
8					involuntary and eminent domain	Our main points with the involuntary or eminent domain clauses need to be taken out.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
9					Parish priority projects	That an appendix including the parish priorities and the parish plans for all three parishes be included. Cameron and Vermilion have a plan and we'd like to see language included and we'll request this in writing for Calcasieu's future planning. And then, what we've seen in the past with the master plan and in the proof rough is that if projects aren't included in the master plan, even though there was language included in the master plan that said that this was not the end all, be all, that's it's very difficult to get projects funded through means like CWPPRA. So that concludes my comments. Thank you very much.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
10	Shannon Neveaux	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Parish priority projects	My name is Shannon Neveaux and I'm a resident of Vermilion Parish. Neveaux. N-e-v-e-a-u-x. I have many comments about the study and I will be turning them in in writing but to be brief tonight, for the purpose of this meeting, I'm going to touch upon just four of them. I can't speak to the measures included in the study but I was present at many, many meetings after the first hurricane when our parish's coastal committee discussed things that could be done to protect our areas. I'm very disappointed to see that they're not physically included in this study. A statement saying that it's not the end all, be all is just not enough. I would not – I would encourage everyone to not accept or support a study turned in that does not literally include them.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
11		4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	involuntary and eminent domain	I think there is nothing acceptable or appropriate about eminent domain and involuntary participation. The better option would be when you reach out to someone in that position, that they be given another choice and the choice would be that they agree to never accept assistance from you again, in exchange for the fact that you allow them to live on their property the way they want, where they want, for as long as they want.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
12		4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Parish resiliency	I think that the fact that Vermilion Parish was so resilient and efficient in getting back on their feet, it's obviously been a detriment to us in this study. It allowed the Corps to be unable to prove that we truly needed help. And so, the message is clear that resiliency did not encourage the government to work with us. It just gave them an excuse to opt out of assisting us. And my final comment is to Mr. Boustany's staff. The message that I hear is very, very clear. It was clear to me in the meeting in January of 2014. When I left that -- I left there being so offended and disappointed by the message and it boils down to the fact that Vermilion Parish is deemed unworthy and not valued enough because of the cost beneficial ratio, that you know, if we don't -- we're not worth protecting because of the process that you use. I would be ashamed to have my name on the legacy of this study. And that's my final comment. Thank you.	Hurricane storm surge risk reduction and ecosystem restoration alternatives were based on demonstrated needs and that met the authorizations, and study goals and objectives.
13	Roland Viator	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	property rights involuntary and eminent domain	I'm Roland Viator. And my question is: This is all about FEMA insurance. Am I right? This whole program here is the insurance that we had to buy for our homes. The reason I'm saying that: Like that lady out there, we're not looking for handouts. We live on our land and we -- if it breaks, we fix it. I don't know who in the world -- we have our property rights. Who is giving y'all the authority that you can come around and just move people as you wish, tell us what to eat and where to live? Only God can do that. We don't -- those of us who don't have insurance, don't want insurance, we should not be forced to do anything that you're saying here tonight. We	The Recommended Plan components were developed with regard to hurricane storm surge risk reduction and not with regard to FEMA insurance. Rather, the NED Recommended Plan was developed specifically to address hurricane storm surge risk reduction and the NER Recommended Plan was developed specifically for ecosystem restoration. The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation. *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						want our property rights not to be taken away. And when you do have this contract ready, we would like to read it. We would like to see it before -- and I would advise everybody never sign it until you have someone read it for you, if you don't understand it yourself. This last contract was really wrong. Thanks.	
14	Sherrill Sagrera	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	list of properties involuntary and eminent domain	Mike Sagrera. Okay. You're listing --your list that says condemned property or condemnable property. When will the Police Jury get a copy of that list of the property? You have dots on the map and you have a lot of numbers. When will they get a list of the property? When can we get a list of the property? When will it be delivered to them? So your numbers are not good right now. Well, if it's considered even a draft list, you could assure a lot of people if you could produce this list. Then they are not included in it, so they don't have to mess with it. It would relieve a lot of people's anguish and anxiety that their property may be condemned.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures. The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses
15		4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	reforestation of Cheniers	I've got a couple of comments, if you don't mind. My first comment is on the reforest issue. I'm Sherrill Sagrera, a landowner. Sherrill. Not Shirley. It's Sherrill. On the reforestation, on the area on Cheniere Au Tigre, for instance, that y'all want to reforest. Between us and McIlhenny, we planted almost a thousand (1,000) trees there two or three years ago. How are y'all going to maintain that? I mean, y'all are going to plant these over four hundred (400) to five hundred (500) trees - - four or five hundred trees per acre on a ridge that if you get a little bit of dry weather, there's no moisture there. You're going to go and water them. Or you got a crew that's going to stay out there and water them. Are y'all going to take care of them and haul -- how are	Operations and maintenance (O&M) of all Recommended Plan features, include the chenier reforestation, has been considered and specific actions and associated costs included in the budget. O&M of project features would be the responsibility of the non-Federal Sponsor.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						y'all going to maintain that? But you should have thought about that when you did it. You know, what I mean? You've got to look at what -- the possibility of, you know, maintenance at that time.	
16		4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	floodway	My next comment is, basically, you're talking about a flood -- a flood -- I don't know what term you used. Where water flows out. Oh, floodway. Okay. For Rita and Ike, the flood way was from Iberia Parish to Texas. So how did y'all determine what's in that floodway? Because when the surge comes in, it's all a floodway. How do you determine that floodway? And these houses that's in that floodway, they're all in where it flooded. Well, I believe, with the drainage board we have in Vermilion Parish, we don't have that much problem with rain. We have problems when it comes from the south. And then, if you're worried about a floodway, it's all a flood way after a storm.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan, as well as identification of the designated FEMA regulatory floodway is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
17	John LeBlanc	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	elevation	My name is John LeBlanc and I'm Mayor of Erath. My question is: Who is going to manage the elevation program part of this study? We been through that before, as I said earlier. It has to be a true bid process, if you're going to elevate homes. Not a square footage type thing that we've been through before. So many more people could have been assisted if the past program, the HMGP program, had not had a square footage that a contractor could use. All the contractors knew what they'd use on a two thousand (2000) square foot home. It's not the right way. It's got to be a true bid. I worked the oilfield for thirty-eight (38) years and no one ever gave us that opportunity.	Elevation to the 100-year base flood elevation based on year 2075 hydrology of eligible residential structures. If the required elevation is greater than 13 feet above ground level, the structure would be ineligible to participate due to engineering and risk related factors. Tenants of structures that will be elevated are eligible for certain benefits in accordance with Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs of 1970, Public Law 91-646, 84 Stat. 1894 (42 U.S.C. 4601), as amended by the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987, Title IV of Public Law 100-17, 101 Stat. 246-256; 49 Code of Federal Regulations 24; and HUD Handbook 1378. The method of implementation utilizes a Federal procurement to obtain design and construction contractors for the various flood proofing measures. The contractor will also be responsible for all work associated with the elevation from approval of the elevation plans for each structure to final inspection. See Chapter 4 and Appendix L concerning the NED implementation plan.
18					eminent domain	The other thing is: If you come to Erath and you want to start telling people they have to move out, you've got a problem on your hands. And I need to know and my council wants -- would want to know, how many homes you are actually talking about in Erath? We are in Vermilion Parish but we are the governing body in Erath. And I think we are due that respect.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
19	Kevin Segrera	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	eminent domain	Kevin Segrera, Vermilion Parish Police Jury. I'd also like to thank the Colonel and the Corps for coming out to give us this opportunity to express our concerns and CPRA, Ms. Mouton and Pat over there. Thank y'all for coming out. One of the issues -- if Vermilion Parish cannot support this at all with -- if we have anything to do with eminent domain. It's just -- I mean, the bottom line, Vermilion Parish cannot support this.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
20					reforestation of Cheniers and shoreline protection	And the -- Mr. Sherrill touched on about the reforestation issues. We see where we have projects and the reforestation is great. It's going to be a barrier. It's going to stop -- it's going to stop a surge but what killed it in the first place? And I know that that's not where y'all are at now, but we should know what kills it before we have it in a plan to put it in. I know that it's a cheaper alternative than having a hard structure somewhere but in our parish's view, one of the most important things that was in the study from when they first started, which was shoreline protection from Fresh water Bayou to Southwest Pass that was taken out.	The reforestation of Cheniers is not intended to stop storm surge. Rather, this feature is to restore a critical habitat type used by numerous wildlife, especially as stopover habitat for migratory birds. Five shoreline protection measures would protect approximately 5,509 acres with approximately 1,738 AAHUs in benefits.
21					shoreline protection	I know that it's a cheaper alternative than having a hard structure somewhere but in our parish's view, one of the most important things that was in the study from when they first started, which was shoreline protection from Fresh water Bayou to Southwest Pass that was taken out. If you lose that, that reforestation that you just did, just starting there, is all for naught.	The Recommended NER Plan includes 5 shoreline protection measures would protect approximately 5,509 acres with approximately 1,738 AAHUs in benefits.
22					state master plan and parish priority projects	So if there's -- there's a lot of issues that we have with it. Also, we have -- we have -- they had a statement of CWPPRA and having projects that aren't in the state master plan. So if we have -- as a Parish have a project and it's not in the state master plan, it's not going to go off quicker. We are very concerned that the projects we have here that were taken out of this plan, if they're not included in the appendices, then that project will never have life, even though it's a good plan. We as a parish would want to be certain that that is included in the appendices. The plans that the parish has as their master plan.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.
23					executive order	And another thing I know of concern, is the executive order that the president has out there. That's just something we want on the record as being a concern, too.	We cannot respond to this comment without knowing the specific Executive Order being referenced.
24					Freshwater Bayou shoreline protection	The Freshwater Bayou, you know, we do have some projects in there. The Freshwater Bayou and for the shoreline protection there. But it's just -- it's since 2005 and until now, 2015, ten years.	The Recommended NER Plan includes 5 shoreline protection measures would protect approximately 5,509 acres with approximately 1,738 AAHUs in benefits.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
25					lack of projects for Vermilion Parish	There's really not a whole lot in that Vermilion Parish can look at and see it's really going to be of help. That's a lot of protection area and I would just hope that comments are taken -- you take the comments of the people seriously and try to go and work on some of these portions of this project that are leaving a bad taste in everyone's mouth. And we thank you for your time.	Both the NED and NER Recommended Plans include features in Vermilion Parish. All substantive comments received on the draft and responses thereto are included in the Final Integrated Report in the form of this table. Actions taken on comments may include: (1) Modify alternatives (2) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration (3) Supplement, improve, or modify the analyses. (4) Make factual corrections. (5) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.
26	Earl Landry	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	consider Bayou Corne	Yeah, my name is Earl Landry. I sit on the Chenier Plain Authority we started up two years ago. I'm past president. I just stepped down last month. But I live in Erath and I have family in Delcambre and John was talking about (inaudible). I'm under the impression that we got alot of it coming from the Bayou Corne, the Delcambre Bayou. It came from -- the east side of Delcambre got it first, I think, pretty much. And then, I mean, I got fifty (50) acres in the Town of Erath. I'm in the City -- I'm in the City limits -- the corporate limits. So I saw afterwards the way that it hit us. But I'm thinking -- my comment is I think we need to bring in -- and I know Bayou Corne is in Iberia Parish because Delcambre splits the parish line. I think, y'all should consider taking Bayou Corne in the southwest study. Thank you.	All areas within the authorized study area were included in considerations of both the NER and NED Plans. Bayou Corne is outside the authorized study area.
27	Peter Vincent	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Teche-Vermilion Basin	Peter Vincent. I'm with National Audubon Society. In this plan, you list the Teche-Vermilion Basin as a part of the study area and every project that I've seen excludes the Teche-Vermilion Basin, including shoreline protection in the parish from Freshwater Bayou to Southwest Pass. The most damage we had after the storm in Erath and Delcambre, the eastern side, that's in the Teche-Vermilion. There is not one project considered in that area. And I just	The Vermilion Parish was considered and includes features for both hurricane storm surge risk reduction and ecosystem restoration.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						don't think it's fair for the people on the eastern side of Vermilion that are in the Teche-Vermilion Basin that have no consideration whatsoever. Thank you.	
28	Sherrill Sagrera	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	hurricane protection plan	Just a question basically. After the storm, we were approached that, you know, what do y'all need in Vermilion Parish? They said you need to have a plan. So we sat down and we put together a hurricane protection plan for the parish. A few years later, we came back and said we're going to put together a resiliency plan to make our own people more resilient for any kind of storm. Did y'all take into consideration of these two plans, whenever y'all were doing all of this work? Because in this plan, it showed alot of hurricane protection and storm protection and everything that should have been in this plan, if it wasn't.	Previous, existing and proposed hurricane storm surge risk reduction and ecosystem restoration efforts and plans were considered during the plan formulation process.
29	Randy Moertel	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	structure elevation; involuntary participation	My name is Randy Moertel and I represent E. A. McIlhenny Company. And I just want to -- I'm stepping on very dangerous territory here. I don't live here. I live in LaFourche Parish. We got our own problems over there. But it seems to me that from what I am hearing here that this particular study provides a vehicle. Now, let's throw out the involuntary moving of houses. But it does provide a vehicle for voluntary elevation of houses that isn't there now. In other words, this study, if it were to be authorized, if I'm understanding correctly, then you can provide monies up to Eight Hundred Million Dollars (\$800,000, 000.00), roughly, is that right, Andrew? For elevating houses that isn't available right now for those people that want to, like where I live. I would, you know, if I had the same opportunity. I'm trying to be objective here. I'm thinking okay, I have an opportunity -- somebody is going to pay a hundred (100) percent. I still want to stay here. I'm going to elevate my house because the federal	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses. Elevation to the 100-year base flood elevation based on year 2075 hydrology of eligible residential structures. If the required elevation is greater than 13 feet above ground level, the structure would ineligible to participate due to engineering and risk related factors. Tenants of structures that will be elevated are eligible for certain benefits in accordance with Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs of 1970, Public Law 91-646, 84 Stat. 1894 (42 U.S.C. 4601), as amended by the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987, Title IV of Public Law 100-17, 101 Stat. 246-256; 49 Code of Federal Regulations 24; and HUD Handbook 1378.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						government is going to pay for that a hundred (100) percent. So the involuntary part, I would throw out. The voluntary part seems like a good thing to me. And I just want to make that comment because I know the involuntary thing is really cloudy. The other good part, from what I can understand, is going to happen on the voluntary side. So if that could be thrown out, it seems to me that the other part of elevating voluntarily is everybody's option. Nobody is moved. Nobody has to move. Everybody can live where they are. They can elevate or not elevate. It's strictly voluntary. But I was over here right after Hurricane Rita. I saw houses that were flooded in Erath and Delcambre, going all the way to Avery Island, people were under water. And guess what? They're all elevated now. And you know, and these people didn't move but they wanted to get elevated and get up out of the way so they could stay where they are. So I'm just saying that objectively, that's something that people might want to think about if say the involuntary movement part can be handled. When FEMA and insurance gets so high on my house, I'm just not going to get any flood insurance. But I'm not going to move. I own my house. You know, because I'm not -- that's where I want to live, if that makes sense. But anyway, I just wanted to make those comments. Thank you.	
30	Joe Tessier	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	sediment into Vermilion Parish	Joe Tessier, a parish resident for forty nine (49) years. I was flooded by Hurricane Rita. I moved up. Not moving out. My question is: And I know you can't answer it right now, but would there be any plans to have some sediment pumped into lower Vermilion Parish like in the LaFourche areas? I hear that area is doing real good with -- I said, LaFourche -- Terrebonne areas. That area is doing real good with the new sediment that's being pumped in there to rebuild their marshes, which will help keep the storm surge out. Thank you.	Marsh creation projects would include pumping dredged sediments from designated borrow sites into marsh creation and nourishment sites throughout the study area.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
31	Sherrill Sagrera	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Protection for Iberia Parish; buy out and property taxes	Let me give you one more. You know, me and Mr. Darrell and a couple of others from the Corps had a long discussion last year about cost benefit ratio. "Well," I said, "well, why there's some kind of protection from, say from Iberia Parish to the Vermilion River, that didn't meet the cost benefit ratio." He said, "Well, we've had some on there. All the houses were raised." I said, "You don't need no protection." You remember that, huh, Darrell? No, you don't want to admit it. Okay. But now, so, basically, if we're going to raise all the houses, what are you going to do with the land that is from there to the Gulf of Mexico. A lot of this stuff talks about buying out. When you buy it out, what happens to that land? It's government land, basically. Does the government pay property taxes. No, they don't pay property taxes. So that -- all of that land that is taken out of private ownership takes away from your tax benefits in that parish. Now, whenever -- that's one problem you're going to have.	Iberia Parish is not within the authorized study area.. The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
32					protection	The next problem is: If you're not protecting it now, when it's yours, are you going to protect it? So if it goes away, when we own it or it goes away when you own it, it's gone. I mean, I just have a problem with not protecting -- just protecting the home and not protecting the land around it.	Structural levee alternatives would not provide a positive cost/benefit ration. Hence, a primary goal of the Nonstructural NED RP is to reduce hurricane storm surge risk for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025 (the beginning of the 50 year period of analysis). The Nonstructural NED RP will provide reduced risk of hurricane storm surge damage for a total of 3,961 impacted structures consisting of 3,462 eligible residential structures; 342 eligible commercial structures and public buildings; and 157 eligible warehouses. In addition, the NER Recommended Plan would provide marsh creation and nourishment, shoreline protection and chenier restoration.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
33	Mark Shirley	4/14/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Parish priority projects	My name is Mark Shirley, a resident of Vermilion Parish. A couple of comments related to the ecosystem restoration. And it was mentioned before a couple of times but I wanted to make sure that everybody gets the message. The list of projects that were deleted from one of the previous drafts over two hundred (200) or so projects that you had local input addressing all these different projects that needed to be done from a coastal restoration standpoint. And those two hundred (200) and something projects were whittled down to twenty (20) or so. Okay? It is very important, like Kevin and a few others said, to make sure that these are listed somewhere in the appendix so that they are not deleted from the master plan or from some other plan in the future. We can say that here tonight and it may be true next year but ten years from now, when a whole new commission is in Baton Rouge or New Orleans, they won't know that. So all the projects that were listed that are critical for a coastal restoration in Vermilion Parish need to be listed and those for the other parishes too. Okay.	Parish Priority Projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report. Parish Priority Projects were evaluated and screened, along with other proposed measures, to the same level of analysis sufficient to determine viable alternatives.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
34					Freshwater Bayou	In the plan, when it calls for stabilization of the shorelines of freshwater Bayou Channel, and that is very important, that channel has altered the hydrology of that region on both the east side and the west side of the channel. The east side, which includes Audubon State Wildlife and some private marshland, that channel has short-circuited some of the water flow. And even though you do have the locks at Freshwater Bayou, down at the bottom end of it, it's still causing alteration in the flow of water through that whole marsh region and that's causing marsh loss, interior marsh loss. So that needs to be addressed further. And also, just the problem of that channel, Freshwater Bayou Channel. Already, CWPRA has spent many millions of dollars putting rocks along some miles of the channel and some of your projects offered had more miles of rocks. We're still not investigating the actual cause of the problem, which is boat wakes, and however many ships -- not ships but crew boats, a hundred (100) and something foot crew boats throwing a wake that's six or eight feet high. That's what has eroded that bank and continues to erode the bank and I'd like to see the Corps of Engineers address that. That's, I understand, is a federal navigation channel. If the Corps could address that, I'm sure you don't let a hundred and twenty (120) foot crew boat zip through Morgan City, you know, on step. So if that could be addressed as actually the cause of the problem, as well as stabilizing the shoreline and pumping sediment back into the marsh on both sides and restoring the marsh.	The Freshwater Bayou is an authorized navigation channel. Restoration of the authorized navigation channel would be accomplished under that navigation maintenance authority.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
35					harbor refuge	Also, one last thing about the resiliency of the community. It's been listed in the Vermilion Parish Hazard Mitigation plan to address harbor refuge for our shrimp fleet in Intracoastal City. We have over seventy-five (75) large shrimp vessels and a good number of smaller shrimp vessels. But these larger shrimp vessels that are sixty-five (65) feet or bigger, they need a place to go in a storm and we do have a plan that we're trying to get support for. It's called a Harbor Refuge. And that would be to locate some moorings up river in the Vermilion River to where these seventy-five (75) or more vessels to go during the period of the storm, tie up and be safe from that surge and -- until the storm passes and then, they can come back down the river and get back out in the Gulf and get back to shrimping. So then, that may also be addressed in this plan. Thank you.	Harbor refuge is an important concern. However, the purpose of the NER Recommend Plan (RP) is to restore environmental conditions for the Chenier Plain ecosystem as more fully described in the 2004 Louisiana Coastal Area, Ecosystem Restoration Study. Ecosystem restoration features are focused on areas of critical need where restoration would replace lost habitats and/or help prevent predicted habitat losses.
36	Nick Hunter	4/15/2015	public meeting	oral comment	list of properties	Nic Hunter of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury. First of all, thank you for being here just as in Vermilion, Plaquemines, Orleans, Gretna, just for us we're not just dots on the map as you know. This is our home. This is where we were born, where we're raised, where we want to live forever. This is a very emotional topic for us. I am going to make a few comments. The first one is all of those dots that were on that map a moment ago --I don't know if you have the ability to bring it up again -- but I promise you if those people who's houses represented those dots knew that, they would have been here this evening. And so I would make a formal to you and I think we will probably do it through the Police Jury, but that list needs to come out as soon as possible. People deserve to know that their houses are being looked at.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
37					eminent domain	Secondly, eminent domain is very emotional and scary language. I don't speak for the entire Police Jury, but I know that personally I would like to see that entire phrase removed from the proposal. And I'll offer a couple of scenarios. Let's say somebody is at a repetitive loss and it's not because of anything -- Well, I'll be a little self-deprecating here. Let's say local government has done a poor job of drainage in their neighborhood and let's say they flooded a couple of times that haven't flooded in 50 years because of rain, but let's say local government didn't do a good job of drainage in the neighborhood. Now they may be a part of this involuntary program and that is very scary, and I would hate to have people face that. Lastly, again I would just reiterate that eminent domain and that language locally we would like to see that completely removed. Let's say that someone has gone through the process and actually built their house to the specs that were required at that time and raised it to the levels necessary. We know that criteria changes over the years. What's going to happen to that person in five years when the criteria changes and all of a sudden they are asked to possibly surrender their home after they have built it to the criteria that was asked of them five years before. That is very concerning to us as well.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses
38					list of properties	I will end by saying, those squares on the map locally, I would make a formal request that we have that list as soon as possible because people deserve to know as soon as possible if their homes might fall into this criteria. Thank you.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
39	Randy Roach, Mayor City of Lake Charles	4/15/2015	public meeting	oral comment	House Current Resolution 180 by Representative Perry and cultural heritage ecosystem restoration	Thank you very much. Randy Roach, City of Lake Charles. I will go ahead and say we're going to submit a formal response and formal comment. But I do want to say a couple of things this evening. And I have with me a house resolution that was passed in 2008, House Current Resolution 180 by Representative Perry, and it touches in part on what we're talking about tonight, and that's the importance of the preservation, the cultural heritage of the coastal region of the entire area of Louisiana. And it asked for a study to evaluate the impact of the National Flood Insurance Program as it relates to those socioeconomics of the area and the impact that those floodplain regulations were having at the time on recovery as it related to Hurricanes Rita and Katrina. The study was never done. It was a study that the state looked at but never had actual funding to do that study, but as I look at the information that you're sharing with us tonight, it is apparent that what's happening is the National Flood Insurance Program is having a profound influence on decisions that are being made relative to coastal restoration. And when we started with the coastal study, we didn't necessarily think of it in those terms. I'm not saying that we shouldn't have but we didn't. And I think as a result this situation is catching a lot of people by surprise and I think that has already been communicated to you. So we will be responding with something in writing. I'm going to ask you I just brought this with me so we can submit to it you as part of the written record, but I think it's important that you look at this resolution because this resolution touches on many of the issues that I think relate directly to what we're talking about tonight.	Historic and cultural resources are required to be considered for both the NED Plan and NER Plan under various laws, regulations, and policy. Separate sections in Chapters 1 and 3 provide the historic, existing, future without project and future with project analyses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
40					House Current Resolution 180 by Representative Perry and hydrology and geology	It [House Current Resolution 180] talks about what happens all across the Gulf Coast. It also touches on what some people have commented on and that's why it doesn't happen in New Jersey. Why doesn't this happen in Florida? Why is it happening here? Why doesn't it happen in some other areas? And I know it does happen to a degree but perhaps not to the degree it's happening here. One of the reasons I would suggest to you is that the hydrology, geology of coastal Louisiana is entirely different than what you find in Destin, Florida. You have condos that are built on the beach in Florida that are just as susceptible to a storm surge, but the National Flood Insurance Program is based more on flood elevation produced by rain water not so much as the storm surge. So they can build close because the elevation the way it is -- the way that God made it goes right up to the outer continental shelf and it drops off. That's why you go Bill fishing five miles off the coast of Destin. We don't do that here because we have marshes that extend out.	Comment acknowledged.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
41					Marsh supports cultural, historic socioeconomic way of life	Those marshes support a way of life. They support an energy industry. They support a fishing industry. They support a trapping industry. They support a recreational industry. And that industry depends on people who live in that area to help support that industry. I don't know historically that Cameron Parish has ever had much more than 10,000 people. So if you quantify the risks, and we did some quick numbers right after Hurricane Rita, it seems like the government was spending more money storing trailers in Arkansas than they were spending on some of the repetitive loss that we talk about in Cameron Parish simply because of the numbers. So I think it's -- I think it's a subject that really needs to be carefully considered, and we would ask that the record be left open that we can look at the cultural and historical impact that these regulations will have long term and particularly from the socioeconomic standpoint as far as the community is concerned.	The proposed action is not to implement a new regulation. Rather, the Recommended Plan is to provide an opportunity for storm surge risk reduction and ecosystem restoration in the southwest coastal Louisiana project area. Ecosystem restoration features are focused on areas of critical need where restoration would replace lost habitats and/or help prevent predicted habitat losses. The NER RP would provide important, essential and critical habitats used for shelter, nesting, feeding, roosting, cover, nursery, and other life requirements of migratory birds, wildlife, finfish, shellfish and other aquatic organisms; increase productivity and essential fish habitat (EFH); increase transitional coastal wetland habitats between estuarine and marine environments; and restore imperiled chenier forest habitats used as stopover habitat by migrating neotropical birds. Restoration and protection of coastal wetlands and chenier habitats could help buffer and protect human habitations.. Restoration of coastal wetlands would also help improve water quality by filtering pollutants and sediments. The CEMVN proposes ecosystem restoration measures in the Calcasieu/Sabine and Mermentau/Tech-Vermilion basins and include marsh restoration, shoreline protection and chenier reforestation and invasive species control. Historic and cultural resources are required to be considered for both the NED Plan and NER Plan under various laws, regulations, and policy. Separate sections in Chapters 1 and 3 provide the historic, existing, future without project and future with project analyses including potential socioeconomic impacts. Effects to historic properties and cultural resources will be evaluated through consultation pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements.
42	Nedra Davis, Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration Authority	4/15/2015	public meeting	oral comment	involuntary participation	Nedra Davis with the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration Authority. We had several meetings over the last few weeks with all three parishes: Cameron, Calcasieu and Vermilion. And I want	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						to read some of the comments that were collected over the last few weeks into the record. We were at the meeting last night in Vermilion and we shared some of these comments with them and I'm sure the Corps and CPRA are very well aware of our comments, but I want to go ahead and read them into the record. The first comment is the parishes do not want the involuntary participation paragraph. We feel it was patterned after the 2013 draft in the last hour and it is completely inappropriate.	
43					windshield survey	Number 2, the windshield data that was collected in 2010 is problematic. We don't have a list of the properties. We don't -- it's been five years since it was collected. A lot of those properties have already been raised and we find it's problematic.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.
44					historic/cultural	Number 3, the historical and cultural vision has been lost in this process.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process are specifically addressed subsections of Chapters 1 and 3. Effects to historic properties and cultural resources will be evaluated through consultation pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements. The Recommended NED and NER Plans were developed to address coastal land loss and reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damage to these resources.
45					project distortion	Number 4, there's project distortions in some of the same sections of the originally proposed areas.	The plan formulation process is an iterative process that develops and refines the proposed action based on consideration of existing, new and re-analyzed information. The study has moved from a general programmatic analysis documented in earlier draft reports and is now at a level of detail suitable for recommendation for construction.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
46					shape files	Number 5, shape file sharing has been an issue. The parishes have requested the shale files since 2013 and has not received files from either the Corps or CPRA.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
47					Parish priority projects	Number 6, the parish priority projections are not being included.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
48					Representative Botany's bill	Number 7, the study does not represent what was originally intended by Representative Botany's bill.	The study is consistent with the study authorization Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2747, on December 7, 2005. The study conducted a survey of the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes, with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes, including the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The 12-foot levee feature was evaluated and considered not viable because it would not provide the necessary hurricane storm surge risk reduction in a cost effective manner.
49					Parish priority projects	Summing up our comments over the last few weeks, we would like to see language included that does not preclude parish priorities. We would like all of the parish plans to be included in an appendices, and for Calcasieu Parish who's plan is forthcoming, we'd like to have language opened to include that plan in the future.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
50					involuntary participation and eminent domain	The involuntary eminent domain clause we want out. Everyone does not see this as beneficial for the parishes.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
51					Parish priority projects	And also for the whole entire plan, you know, one of the reasons we want all of our parish priorities included in the appendices, because we've seen the master plan. If your project is not included in the master plan then you're not eligible for a program like CPRA and that is our main funding source right now. And so we would like to -- we would like to see all of our plans included in an appendices.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
52					Chenier Plain Authority	The Chenier Plain Authority will be making a written statement. I'd like to recognize Mike Dever, our president in the audience, and the board will be voting on Tuesday this next week here in Lake Charles to have a written resolution and the parishes have notified that they will also give written statements and resolutions during the comment period. So we want to make sure that everyone, you know in addition to comments that you make tonight. Please write a letter. Thanks so much.	Acknowledge comment.
53	Carolyn Woosley	4/15/2015	public meeting	oral comment	restoration and protection	Carolyn Woosley of Lake Charles. Concerning your call to restoration and protection which are newly highlighted goals of the Corps of Engineers, it was also a solitary goal of navigation, but those were added.	The USACE formally adopted national ecosystem restoration (NER) as a planning and evaluation objective in 2000 version of the <i>Planning Guidance Notebook</i> . In 2003 the USACE issued field guidance titled <i>Planning Civil Works Projects Under the Environmental Operating Principles..</i>
54					ship channel and land loss	Concerning addressing causes of the loss of land in this region, please address them not just symptoms. And in particular I'm looking at the ship channel isolation. You're doing a long-term salinity study which I condone that strongly, but I do know there is a plan to isolate the ship channel, in other words like a rocket and make it so that so much saltwater doesn't spill over into our fragile and disappearing marshes. I think that's an excellent, good plan.	Due to the complexity and various potential impacts the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Barrier feature and the Cameron-Creole Spillway Salinity Control Structure feature are both recommended for long-term study.
55					surge protection	However, it must be paired with the issue of surge protection. If surge protection is not addressed, the surge will land in Prien Lake and Lake Charles in a highly populated and highly industrial area. This can be done I believe, having worked on this for some years, not compromising the economy of the ship channel. When a storm is approaching, the ships do not any longer enter the ship channel. Design a mobile system, just gates swing out. Something obviously it's expensive and then long term, but is mobile and coordinate it to be the stoppage in the first place of ship traffic. Without protecting surge, our lives are in jeopardy. That's the end of my comments. Please address both issues. Thank you very much.	Due to the complexity and potential impacts to authorized navigation channels, the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Barrier feature and the Cameron-Creole Spillway Salinity Control Structure feature are both recommended for long-term study.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
56	Laurie Cormier, Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	4/15/2015	public meeting	oral comment	eminent domain	Laurie Cormier, Calcasieu Parish Police Jury. I'm going to reiterate a couple of things that Nedra said because I think they're really important. Calcasieu Parish requests that the eminent domain references be taken out of the study.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
57					Parish priority projects	Calcasieu Parish also requests a reference or appendix with all of Cameron Parish and Vermilion Parish projects identified.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
58					future Calcasieu Parish Projects	We would also like the open-ended statements about future projects specifically concerning Calcasieu Parish to be included.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
59					historic and cultural	We would like to see the historical vision placed back into the study. Especially referring to historic and cultural preservation.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process are specifically addressed subsections of Chapters 1 and 3. The Recommended NED and NER Plans were developed to address coastal land loss and reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damages to these resources.
60					shape files	We request as we did in January of 2014 the shape files which identify all structures that are in question in terms of the involuntarily and voluntary procedures.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
61					windshield survey and cost benefit analysis	Calcasieu Parish requests a greater consideration regarding the BCA parameters instead of the windshield view. We'd like to know what that would be and what it would look like for the future. And we'd ask that projections originally submitted be molded as is and not have projections watered down to only include a small section of what was originally intended and I believe that would end my comments.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
62	Jennifer Cobian	4/15.2015	public meeting	oral comment	funding	I just wanted to touch on the -- Jennifer Cobian. We have a dire need for mitigation funding in Calcasieu Parish. Mitigation funding that is 100 percent funded with no homeowner cost share. Calcasieu Parish currently has more willing participants than funds available on our 100 percent federally funded grants. After rains just like the one we had last Friday, that list keeps growing and growing as, you know, a waiting list. It's extremely important that we get more funding to Southwest Louisiana. I hear the people's stories, their struggles on a daily basis. It's become personal. It's very, very necessary.	No features of the Recommended NED or NER Plans are anticipated to require compensatory mitigation for project-induced impacts. The study authorization does not include providing mitigation funding or grants.
63					easements	And I just want to add that I think for possible acquisitions that we should look into the easements mixed with the covenants for future acquisitions.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
64	John Mouton	4/15/2015	public meeting	oral comment	unfulfilled promised projects	My name is John Mouton. I wasn't planning to say anything tonight, but I will. What concerns me is I've been coming to these meetings every time you had one. I've got maps at my house. I've got all kind of stuff. Y'all are going to do something to Calcasieu River, y'all are going to do everything in the world, and then all of a sudden that is out of the wind.	The plan formulation process is an iterative process that develops and refines the proposed action based on consideration of existing, new and re-analyzed information. The study has moved from a general programmatic analysis documented in earlier draft reports and is now at a level of detail suitable for recommendation for construction. The NED RP will reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damage for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025. The NER RP will provide marsh restoration, shoreline protection and chenier reforestation to 15,636 net acres.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
65				oral comment	storm surge protection	<p>What I'm concerned about is storm surge protection. And according to what you had on the slide right there was elevation, water coming up, land going down. Well, this is 25 years. I'm concerned about way in the future. You said levees and all of that. Levees does work. I was at a church in Lake Arthur and right there by the Catholic church they've got a levee right there where the town got a pumping station. If it wouldn't be for that when the Mermentau River went up, it'd have flooded. East Lake Charles has got a levee system. They got one right there on Interstate 10. They got a pumping station right there. That land is low. They got one right there by Pine Shadows Golf Course. You got one downtown. Downtown flooded. What they did is they raised the road right there. It didn't take them long to do that either. They got a pumping station. The only place we don't have protection is on Contraband Bayou. And the Corps of Engineers came down here, if I can remember correctly, and said that it wasn't enough damage, 200 and something houses got water in it during Hurricane Rita, to put a storm surge protection on Contraband Bayou. Storm levees do work. Look at Hurricane Ike. When Rita came through here, well Port Arthur was on the north end of the wind blowing. So the water didn't get there. When Ike came in there, look at Port Arthur, Texas, look at Bridge City, look at Orange, Texas. Bridge City and Orange, Texas got water damage like crazy. Look at Port Arthur, they've got a levee all the way around. They didn't have any storm surge. It's right there on the Gulf. My concern is whatever y'all are doing, appreciate whatever y'all are doing, I don't know much about what y'all are talking about, but I'm worried about storm surge protection. Thank you.</p>	Structural (e.g., levee) alternatives were considered but were not cost effective. The Recommended Plan would reduce the risk of hurricane storm surge flooding for almost 4,000 structures.
66	Curtis Fountain	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	enter, exit and dewater bermed structures	<p>Curtis Fountain, District 1. You talked about building levees around dikes or berms around homes and/or businesses, but you didn't talk about how once these things were built how are you going to enter and how are you going to</p>	Requirements for drainage are unique to each structure. Hence, more detailed design will be conducted during the preconstruction, engineering and design (PED) phase of the project.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						exit? You didn't talk about how when these things fill up with water, how are you going to get rid of that water.	
67					options for structure owners that disagree with proposed actions	Also you painted a pretty picture but you didn't talk about the circumstances if these people didn't agree to your plan.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
68					involuntary program and eminent domain	You did not talk about the ones that -- the involuntary program and eminent domain which that subject came up more than once, but it never was talked to here tonight. So my question is when are you going to give us the whole story. Thank you.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
69	Nedra Davis	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Chenier Plain Coastal Protection Restoration Authority	My name is Nedra Davis. I'm the Executive Director of the Chenier Plain coastal Protection Restoration Authority. We are a three parish levee board. We represent Cameron, Calcasieu and Vermilion Parishes. I would like to recognize our president Mike Dever, our vice-president, Scooter Trosclair. Scooter is from Cameron, Mike is from Calcasieu, and I would like to recognize another Commissioner. Ryan Boyett. And we have been to several meetings over the past few weeks concerning all of these issues and we compiled a list of comments, and I'm going to run through these comments pretty quick because I've got three minutes.	Acknowledge receipt of comments
70					involuntary participation	So the first comment is the parishes do not want involuntarily participation paragraphs left in this plan. It was added after the 2013 Draft. We feel it has been added in at the eleventh hour and is completely inappropriate.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
71					window survey	The second comment is the windshield data that was collected in 2010 is old. The drive by is not adequate. We don't have a list of what the properties are. And we want another look at that data. It's problematic.	The windshield data collection is consistent with requirements for feasibility report level of analysis. Additional detailed analysis will be conducted during subsequent project phases.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
72					historic & cultural	The third comment, the historical and cultural vision has been lost in this process.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process are specifically addressed subsections of Chapters 1 and 3. Effects to historic properties and cultural resources will be evaluated through consultation pursuant to the stipulations of the Section 106 programmatic agreements..The Recommended NED and NER Plans were developed to address coastal land loss and hurricane storm surge risk reduction to these resources.
73					project distortion	The fourth comment, there's project distortion in the same sections of some of the originally proposed areas from the parishes.	The plan formulation process is an iterative process that develops and refines the proposed action based on consideration of existing, new and re-analyzed information. The study has moved from a general programmatic analysis documented in earlier draft reports and is now at a level of detail suitable for recommendation for construction.
74					shape files	The fifth comment is shape file sharing has been problematic. The parish has requested the shape files since the 2013 Draft and as recently as January 2014 and the parishes have not received anything from the Corps or CPRA.	Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in Appendix N to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures
75					Parish priority projects	Six comment, the parish priority projects are not being included.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate Appendix P to the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
76					Representative Boustany	The seventh comment is this study does not represent what was originally intended in Representative Boustany's bill.	The study is consistent with the study authorization Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2747, on December 7, 2005. The study conducted a survey of the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes, with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes, including the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The 12-foot levee feature was evaluated and considered not viable because it would not provide the necessary hurricane storm surge risk reduction in a cost effective manner.
77					Parish priority projects	To sum up my comments, we want language in the study that does not preclude the parish priority list. We want all of the parish plans included in the appendices and we want language to also eventually include Calcasieu Parish Plan because it's not ready yet.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.
78					involuntary participation and eminent domain	The involuntary and eminent domain, we want that out. The parishes do not want involuntarily participation.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
79					Parish priority projects	And we also want to talk about if projects are not included in this plan, we feel that based on what we have with the master plan that if projects aren't included then they're like precluded later on from other federal funding sources like CWPPRA. So thank you very much.	Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
80	Marshal Young	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	sea level rise	My name is Marshal Young and I really wish I had had a chance to say something while you were answering. Because it seems to me that you adhere to Al Gore's global warming. You said in 2075, I believe it is, you expect the seas to raise four foot. That's arbitrary. I can say, I don't think it's going to raise at all. Matter of fact it's going to go down. That's an arbitrary figure.	ETL 1100-2-1 dated 30 June 2014 provides guidance for projected future sea level change on USACE projects.
81					Corps of Engineers poor track record	Another thing is I really wish you would sell me on why I should go along with the Corps of Engineers when the poor track record that they've got when I look at Katrina and what happened to New Orleans and the levees that were built there, the property my family has got up in Calcasieu Parish that was deemed wetland that has never flooded so sell me on why I should believe the Corps of Engineers and what they're putting forth as what's going to happen in 2075?	Due to the uncertainty and variability of future sea level change, social, economic, and ecological changes, and their associated interactions, the USACE employs a robust framework for project performance that is flexible and adaptable to multiple future scenarios. Emphasis is placed on both how the project operates within a larger system and how project decisions made today can influence future system responses to perturbations through adjustments, feedbacks, or cascading impacts. Robustness is considered to be the ability of a project or system of projects, or their adaptation strategies, to continue to perform satisfactorily under changing conditions and over a wide range of conditions
82	Cynthia Sellers	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	voluntary/involuntary	Hi, my name is Cynthia Sellers. I'm a Cameron Parish resident. I as one of the very few Cameron Parish residents who attended the January 2014 meeting and only about two or three of us actually made comments. I made several and one of them was we were concerned about the destruction of homes in the flood zone, but we don't have many homes left. The official response which we just received was actually given verbally but not during the comment period, but the official response was all participation will be voluntary. That's in black and white. And I really want to know when the change was made, when this was added and why. That's my comment for now.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
83	Billy Dorian	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Cameron Parish protection and restoration	I'm Billy Dorian, Grand Chenier. I just want you to know it's been a long hard road to hold since Hurricane Rita. People have been through a lot here. If you go back and look at that look	The Recommended Plan would reduce the risk of hurricane storm surge flooding for almost 4,000 The Recommended Plan also includes marsh and chenier restoration features and



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						book, Cameron by Nolan Mae Ross. It shows a picture of Hurricane Audry. The day after the storm, there wasn't nothing left in Cameron. It shows a picture a year later after Hurricane Audry and the streets were full of people. In Cameron Parish today and everything today, we don't have anybody. This land of protection and restoration is great. We definitely need something done on our coast, but what I've seen tonight, what's going on here, is death and destruction of Cameron Parish and putting the last nail in our coffin.	shoreline protection features resulting in creation, nourishment and/or protection to over 16,000 net acres and over 5,000 average annual habitat units.
84	David Richard	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Congressman Boustany	David Richard, y'all have already heard some of my comments but for the official record. I'm going to say a number of things. Number 1, I want to concur with what was said earlier that this was not what Congressman Boustany had in mind when it was envisioned 10 years ago. We're seven years overdue in regard to when your time limit was, and as an official comment, you can answer why.	The study is consistent with the study authorization Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2747, on December 7, 2005. The study conducted a survey of the coast of Louisiana in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes, with particular reference to the advisability of providing hurricane protection and storm damage reduction and related purposes, including the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The 12-foot levee feature was evaluated and considered not viable because it would not provide the necessary hurricane storm surge risk reduction in a cost effective manner.
85					study cost	I'd like to also know in a comment how much this study cost.	The total cost for the Southwest Coastal Study is \$10,560,000
86					nonstructural and eminent domain	I've been involved intermittently with these calls for 10 years now getting to this and we see nonstructural means and involuntary participation added in the last 30 days that we've seen it. For 10 years, we have never seen or heard about involuntary participation. The use of eminent domain is inexcusable and that is my comment in regard to that.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
87					Parish priority projects	The second thing is that we can see that some of the projects were precluded in this study because you used the 2012 Master Plan. The 2012 Master Plan did not include the projects that were listed for Cameron Parish. And I think that's why we're so adamant about having an	Project features were developed from a many different sources as well as those developed by the study team. Parish priority projects have been included as a separate and new appendix to the Final Integrated Report.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						appendices of the projects that had been proposed for Cameron and for Vermilion Parish.	
88					reforestation of Cheniers	The parishes have used lots of people, lots of manpower, lots of time to put projects together that should be funded and they should be funded in an ecological way. We have had a number of programs to reforest Chenier ridges. There has been money for that for years. Because of encroachment that the government agencies wanted to do as far as reforestation, you've seen almost none done in Cameron Parish and you won't see any done in Cameron Parish unless they're forced to.	Restoration of the Chenier forests is considered important not only for stopover habitat for migrating neotropical birds, but to also provide habitat to other wildlife as well as providing historic and cultural and other benefits for the human populations.
89					cultural heritage	I think that some of the issues that you're doing here will destroy the cultural heritage. One of the initial components of this project was to maintain the cultural heritage of Cameron. I am going to have my own written comments. But for this evening, thank you for your time.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process and are specifically addressed in Chapter 1 and 3 the Final Integrated Report devoted entirely to these resources.
90	Mike	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	infrastructure	This is Mike (inaudible) with Jeff Davis co-op. I am commenting on the infrastructure requirements that may be needed when all of these things are done. The switching of connection points for electrical service, water service, any type of service, and would like a comment if those costs will be included or covered so the people of Cameron Parish don't have to cover those costs. Plus any of these sites that you have identified if they're anything to do with infrastructure if those costs will be taken care of also. So ultimately the co-op people of Cameron Parish pay the rates for the electricity or any kind of services they get, if those happened to be altered will the cost be covered where the costs don't have to be passed through the people of Cameron Parish. Thank you.	The nonstructural work would include reconnecting existing services once construction is completed. Appendix L of the Final Report provides additional information concerning eligible and ineligible Project costs.
91	Ray Clement	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	involuntary participation and eminent domain	I'll stand for this one. My name is Ray Clement. I go back a long way in this parish. My family has been here for -- I guess my grandfather has been here since before the end of the 18th century. And I look at the people here. The	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						people that we have lost because of the regulatory concerns that were placed upon them. It's hard to see families displaced. The youngsters are leaving this parish to find a better life for themselves, yes. But Cameron Parish is losing its population which means it's going to lose its tax base. Anything that you do involuntarily to people are going to force them out of the area.	
92					tax base	One thing Cameron Parish has going for it is it's one of the richest parishes in the state because of the oil and gas revenue. We understand that, part of it. But if you don't have people to use the infrastructure that has been placed here and is trying to survive, if we don't have a tax base to help with that, it's going to be a difficult problem.	A primary goal of the Nonstructural NED Recommended Plan is to reduce the risk of hurricane storm surge damages for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025 (the beginning of the 50 year period of analysis). This would contribute to helping maintain the parishes' tax base.
93					sedimentation	Shifting gears, the comment was made a while ago about the loss of sedimentation because of the channelization projects of the Corps. I feel you need to look at that part of it. Mother Nature knows best. We didn't have these problems in the twenties. Yes, we had flooding. We understand that part of it. But Mother Nature was replacing what was being lost on an annual basis with the channelization projects the Corps undertook to try and protect people from the flood waters, the impact to the coastal regions and other regions as well is self-evident. All we have to do is look at the pictures that we have of what it was back then and what it is today. With the subsidence of the coastline, with the plate that continues to subside that we live on, and with all of the soil being channeled out off of the continental shelf, where it's not being able to be replaced on the grounds that we're trying to walk on, I think that you need to include in this study some way to get the sediment that's being channeled out back onto the grounds that we're trying to live on. You know, if you don't have a place for the people to live, they're going to have to move. There's no	The complexity of the southwest coastal system include loss of sediments. This and other reasons is why we are recommending the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Barrier feature and the Cameron-Creole Spillway Salinity Control Features are recommended for long term study.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						doubt about it. It's incumbent upon you as individuals who are trying to do something to help the people, and that's the caveat.	
94					inform public of meetings	Help the people. If you don't have that in the back of your minds when you're trying to develop a study, and I know looking at what I see here, the one big problem I have with this, I found out about this at 2:00 this afternoon. I didn't even know this study was ongoing.	Restoration and protection of coastal wetlands and chenier habitats could help buffer and protect human habitations. Restoration of coastal wetlands would also help improve water quality by filtering pollutants and sediments. The NED Recommended Plan will provide reduced risk of hurricane storm surge damage for a total of 3,961 impacted structures including reduce risk for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025 (the beginning of the 50 year period of analysis).
95					help the people	As a property owner, you would expect -- now, I'm not in this area. I live in Lafayette, but this is where I grew up. I'd like to be able to bring my grandkids and my great grandkids back down here so they can enjoy the things that I enjoyed, but we're losing that every day. So I'm asking you guys -- I know Jennifer. We work together. I'm asking you-all to help us, the people. That is your job. Your incumbent to help the people, not hurt them. Any project that you undertake	Restoration and protection of coastal wetlands and chenier habitats could help buffer and protect human habitations. Restoration of coastal wetlands would also help improve water quality by filtering pollutants and sediments. The NED Recommended Plan will provide reduced risk of hurricane storm surge damage for a total of 3,961 impacted structures including reduce risk for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						should be to make things better for Cameron, Calcasieu, all the way down the coastline. I'm not just looking at Louisiana. I'm looking at Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida. You know we're all impacted the same way. I worked on a lot of problems in my tenure with the state and every project that we undertook was to try and make things better for the people. In fact, that's the first thing in our code is our main concern is to help the people of this state, and I'm asking you guys to reflect on that when you take a look at this revised plan. And when you put it out as a final, try to give us as much time to review it. I'd like a copy of the CD if I can get it so I can review the plan at east. So I'll have some further comments to make before the May deadline. Thank y'all for what y'all are trying to do for the State. I'm not going to throw rocks at you guys. We need the help. So I'm asking you to try and find a way to help the people because we've got to keep the people here. If we don't have people here, what do we have, just open land. And we're losing that as you can see. Thank y'all.	25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025 (the beginning of the 50 year period of analysis).
96	Benny Welch	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	industry-caused land loss	My name is Benny Welch. I'm from Oak Grove. I would like to make three comments. Number 1, I have been here a long time and I was raised on Hackberry Beach almost. And at that time when I was 16, 17 years old, Hackberry Beach was a Chenier and about half a mile out in the Gulf was another Chenier forming and then we had the jetties that were built, you know, for industry, and we all know that if you come south of Fresh Water City, Rockefeller is gone. If you come west of Grand Chenier, Rutherford Beach is gone. If you go west of Sabine, you can't even go to Galveston on that road anymore. So how are you going to interact industry which is causing this and nature like that?	Land loss in southwest coastal Louisiana is from many different and interacting human and natural sources. The NER RP includes marsh restoration features, shoreline protection/stabilization features, and chenier reforestation that will work synergistically with other ecosystem restoration projects in the area and facilitate hydrologic and geomorphic stability and resilience.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
97					100 year forecast and global warming	Number 2, the 25-year plan and a 100-year plan. How do you know what's going to be out in a hundred years from now? People get married and they're in love and they just we're going to be together forever and ten years later, they can't even stand each other, you know. I'm not saying it to be funny. It's just a hundred years from now, what's going to be happening down here a hundred years from now? If you will remember during the Jimmy Carter administration we were preparing for an ice age. Everything pointed to an ice age coming. Now, its 30 years later, we're preparing for global warming.	The Principles and Guidelines (P&G) is the latest version of the Corps planning process that is structured and rational approach for solving problems that has been evolving for over 200 years and is consistent with good planning theory. ETL 1100-2-1 dated 30 June 2014 provides guidance for projected future sea level change on USACE projects.
98					wind damage to elevated structures	And number 3, I've been through three hurricanes, and two of them were in the northeast quadrant and my house is elevated. It doesn't make any difference how high your house is or what's going on with water or anything when the winds are coming in at 175 miles an hour and there's no let up, your house is gone. Luckily my house made it the last time. One of the very, very, very few. It made it but it didn't make it. We had to go back and work on it. That's just things you're going to have to look at.	The NED Recommended Plan is to reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damage for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025 (the beginning of the 50 year period of analysis). Elevation of structures would be limited to 13 feet due to potential for greater wind damages. If the required elevation is greater than 13 feet above ground level, the structure would be ineligible to participate due to engineering and risk related factors.
99	Paul Sellers	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	height of elevated structures	My name is Paul Sellers, and I normally don't like getting up in front of people. But looking at your plan and just what I read, you already have one glaring wrong. You're saying 13 feet. Go to Holly Beach, you're looking at what, Ray, 14? MR. RAY: 17, minimum of 17. MR. SELLERS: 17 feet. Most of the people down here have to go a minimum 15 feet. So you're saying 13. The government is saying 15 to 17. Who's going to pay the insurance difference in between?	Elevation of structures to greater than 13 feet is not acceptable due to the risk of exposure to greater wind damages. If the required elevation is greater than 13 feet above ground level, the structure would be ineligible to participate due to engineering and risk related factors.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
100					flood insurance and structure elevation	I have property -- my family is from Abbeville. They got hit with a \$250 raise on their flood insurance for certain properties that never flooded through Audrey, where I was in Abbeville for Audrey. Rita it never flooded. Ike it never flooded. Like I said, the rental properties up there, business properties got hit with an extra \$250 and may go up next year. So you're saying 13 feet, the government is saying 17, 14, 17, 22. I think it's 22 by the beach over there. So I mean, there's some glaring some obvious things just from my reading it now that y'all are going to need to check on.	The combined effects of the Biggert-Waters Insurance Reform Act, the modified conditions imposed by the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, and the likelihood of property transfers provide an incentive for property owners to have their structures flood-proofed. In addition, the clear and present risk of future storm surge events, and subsequent disaster declarations and relief funding, indicate potential situations for advantageously incentivizing and accelerating implementation. Elevation of structures to greater than 13 feet is not acceptable due to the risk of exposure to greater wind damages. If the required elevation is greater than 13 feet above ground level, the structure would be ineligible to participate due to engineering and risk related factors.
101	Ryan Bourriaque	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	buy out and relocation	Ryan Bourriaque, Grand Chenier. I tell you what we have some pretty intuitive residents if y'all haven't noticed. Show of hands how many of the residents here have heard relocation and buyout discussed before? How many of your grandparents, parents discussed Cameron Parish being a wildlife reserve, a bird sanctuary, on and on and on. This isn't the first time we've heard it. I think the problem with hearing it is when we heard it. Ms. Cindy was exactly right with her comments. Her specific comment was we have industry coming back to this parish. We have a parish that's revitalizing itself. The last thing we want to do is if someone is not able or willing to elevate. If we have a 70 year old couple, not picking on the 70 year olds. If we have a 70 year old couple that has made it through three major hurricanes, there's a reason because it's constructed well, they took care of their home, they raised their family here. If they don't want to leave, but they don't want to elevate, I don't think we should make them. I just don't. How many of your grandparents, parents discussed Cameron Parish being a wildlife reserve, a bird sanctuary, on and on and on. This isn't the first time we've heard it. I think the problem with hearing it is when we heard it.	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
102					cultural heritage	How many people here grew up in this parish and their parents grew up in this parish? How about grandparents? How about great-grandparents? How about five generations back? How about seven generations back? That's why you have so many people here tonight. It's not -- they're not here to complain. They're scared they're losing the culture and heritage that they and their ancestors worked so hard to build for my generation and my two daughters. My two daughters in Grand Chenier is the seventh generation in my family to grow up on the same piece of property. That means something to us. There's value in that. At the end of the day, I think we'll be able to work through all of these issues, okay.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process are specifically addressed subsections of Chapters 1 and 3. The Recommended NED and NER Plans were developed to address coastal land loss and reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damages to these resources.
103					residents fearful	But here's the problem. We're nervous. We're scared. We've heard that it was going to be okay before and it wasn't. We've heard we were going to be taken care of before and it wasn't. And we're a hard working group of people that normally take care of themselves anyway, you know. So going back to what we're talking about here.	Following approval by the Chief of Engineers, the Recommended Plan is then subject to Administration Review by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works and the Office of Management and Budget before being submitted for Congressional authorization and appropriation of construction funds.
104					Benefit to cost ratio versus value of oil and gas industry and fishing	Specifically in the study, we're going to talk about the benefit cost ratio and how some of these nonstructural and structural measures made it through. I think what we're neglecting to discuss is the value that we have in this parish across the board. LNG is expanding. A top two seafood fishing port, not that long ago. It's suffering right now. We understand that. We're putting some infrastructure in place to try to help that. We're open to the fishing industry. Hell, that's what made us. Before oil and gas was here, there were fishermen here.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
105					cultural heritage	<p>And way back in the 1800's when that British topographer claimed this was an uninhabitable wasteland. Some of our family members were living there. Some of our family members had already been buried here whenever that British topographer floated in his little boat along the Gulf of Mexico. So the thing about it is, we're a top beef producing county. We're the healthiest, don't ask me how. We're the healthiest parish in the state of Louisiana. We did not fund this study. The University of Wisconsin, a bunch of Yankees took care of it for us. They must not have come and done surveys through the Fur Festival because they might not have done so well. We don't know how. Don't know how we're the healthier parish. We have the second highest average median household income in the State of Louisiana. Now think about that. Our households bring in over \$64,000 a household. That's special. That's special. So we have people here who are succeeding. We have people here who have had a rough spot. No doubt about it. We weren't the first ones to go through a rough spot, people. There were those before us that went through the same rough spots, if not worse. They pulled through. You want to know why? They had faith in each other and faith in this parish. That's what we're going to find again. And we're going to work with Mike. We're going to work with Congressman Boustany and CPRA and the Corps, but we're not going to sell ourselves down the river. We can't.</p>	<p>Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process are specifically addressed subsections of Chapters 1 and 3. The Recommended NED and NER Plans were developed to address coastal land loss and reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damages to these resources.</p>



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
106	Mr. Miller	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	FEMA	MR. MILLER: I am getting back to my original comment. I asked you if you were working with FEMA and I've heard you talk, and Paul asked you the elevations and everything. All of that needs to be known to the public before you make your final survey, I mean your final whatever it is. You're not giving us enough information.	USACE and FEMA have coordinated to develop the nonstructural plan. The Nonstructural NED RP is to reduce hurricane storm surge risk for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025. All information on the details of the nonstructural plan can be found in Chp. 4 of the main report and Appendix L.
107	Unidentified	4/16/2005	public meeting	oral comment	Sabine Neches Channel	UNIDENTIFIED: Just one more official comment for your record. One of the areas you pointed to is western Cameron that has such land loss. The Sabine Neches Channel has now been authorized to 50 feet. I asked you-all this at a meeting a month ago but it wasn't official, so I'm going to ask you now. Is that the model, the expansion of the Sabine Neches Channel in regard to the saltwater intrusion and the wetland degradation, tide land pontoons and salinity increases that will happen with that increase. Thank you.	The study team coordinated with Galveston District regarding the oyster reef feature and a salinity control feature. The Galveston District modelers indicated that proposed salinity control feature could potentially cause a navigation hazard due to strong currents in the area.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
108	Ms Jones	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	flood insurance and elevation	<p>One of the objectives I note up here is reduce flood insurance premiums, and one of the good things that we noticed when we elevated our homes after Rita is that the flood insurance went down. My office right now is \$15,000 a year. Now it's worth it to me to stay here. That's what I want to do. But I could sure use some help with that. We had a program a while back about we were going to elevate commercial buildings, and I filled out this much paperwork, and I got three bids, and it was way more than the market value of my office to elevate that building because it doesn't look like it from the outside but it's pretty large.</p>	<p>The Nonstructural NED RP is to reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damage for residential and non-residential structures that have first floor elevations at or below the 0-25-year floodplain, based on hydrologic conditions predicted to occur in 2025. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §5154a, failure to maintain flood insurance on a property may prohibit the owner from receiving Federal disaster assistance with respect to the property in the event of a flood disaster. The property owner is also required to maintain this property in accordance with the flood plain management criteria of Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 60.3 and the floodplain management regulations adopted by the community within which this property is located.</p>



109					cost benefit analysis	So I'm concerned that we're going to have that type of cost benefit analysis as I think is what they called it to the elevation program because it is very expensive to elevate a building especially a building on a slab.	The cost/benefit analysis was conducted consistent with the Appendix D, Economics and Social Consideration in Environmental Regulation 1105-2-100. A full description of how the economic analysis was conducted is available in Appendix E - Economics.
-----	--	--	--	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
110					flood proofing	And you know, we may run into that being something that causes -- because this flood proofing thing here, that's not going to work in Cameron. You can put a little three foot thing there and that's not going to help you when we have storm surge. Thank you.	These measures are intended to reduce the risk of damage from hurricane storm surge not eliminate floodplain management and flood insurance requirements. Localized storm surge risk reduction measures less than 6 feet in height will be installed around warehouses if the owner chooses to participate in the Project and the warehouse meets the eligibility criteriat.
111	J.C. Reina	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	cultural heritage/real help	My name is J.C. Reina. I'm from Cameron Parish, Oak Grove, and I've been here a pretty long while and I've spent a lot of my time working -- all of my time really working in this parish. 89 years old. I've been working with this parish ever since 1950. Of course, my wife was here before me. But anyway we've lost an awful lot. I want to reiterate what the others have said before me about how important these cultural things are to us. It's not just the loss. What you're going to raise up and how much it coast. My house was lost for Audrey. It was in the Gulf. I went through Rita and Ike. I'm still here. And that's the most important thing is to get back on my feet, built my house as soon as I can without all of the commotion. In 2007 is when I finally got my house built. It should have been done in 2006. The thing I'm trying to say with these comments is we've had enough. It's time for us to have a little bit of help. Real help.	Historic and cultural resources have been considered throughout the entire plan formulation process are specifically addressed subsections of Chapters 1 and 3. The Recommended NED and NER Plans were developed to address coastal land loss and reduce risk of hurricane storm surge damages to these resources. NED Recommended Plan (RP) is to provide hurricane storm surge risk reduction to reduce the risk of flood damages caused by hurricane storm surge. Eligible properties must have a first floor elevation at or below the 2025 25-year Base Flood Elevation (BFE). Eligible structures would be raised to the 2075 100-year BFE.
112	Stacy Verret	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	involuntary participation	Hi, I'm Stacy Verret and I live in Grand Lake. Like all of y'all or most of y'all have been here y'all's whole life. That's not the case for us. We decided because of the sense of community to relocate here. We grew up in Calcasieu Parish. Me and my husband bought 15 acres and have built a home here. When we built, we knew if a hurricane came in that we were going to have some damage that probably, you know, the winds was going to get us and our home never flooded, but it surely had plenty of water because of the wind. And I just want to go on the record as saying anything done in this parish involuntarily is not going to work. It's not right. We kind of know what's going to happen. And trying to foresee what's going to happen in a	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to "involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						hundred years to me is ridiculous. We don't know what's going to happen in a hundred years and there's been plenty of studies done that are wrong. So I just want to go on record saying that anything done involuntary is objectionable.	
113	Dinah Landry	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	State cost share	I'm Dinah Landry. I'm the director of the Cameron Council on Aging and I'm in Baton Rouge quite a bit because we deal with budgets and we deal with the legislature. My concern is that when Ryan pointed out there's a 35 percent state match is what y'all said, I have no idea where the State of Louisiana is going to get that kind of money in this legislation session or the next legislation session or the next. So I have a big question mark when it comes down to is the legislature going to provide that kind of money.	Before construction may proceed, a Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) must be signed. The PPA is a legally binding agreement between the Government and a non-Federal sponsor (state, municipal government, flood control district, port authority, etc.) for construction of a water resources project. It describes the project and the responsibilities of the Government and the non-Federal sponsor in the cost sharing and execution of work.
114	Scotter Trosclair	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	Rockefeller Refuge	Scotter Trosclair with Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge, Program Manager, Chenier Plain also serve with the Gravity Drainage District Number 5. Also lived and grew up in Grand Chenier. My family was a big component with the fishing industry here in Cameron Parish with establishing the fur industry, also trapping and just living off the land. You know, you're looking at the group of people that, when you talk about survival of the fittest, here they are. There's no doubt about it. Just to go a little bit more about Rockefeller. You mentioned the shoreline stabilization project. That property was donated to the state maybe part of the state. There's no tax infrastructure. There's no license sale. This is funded -- self-funded from oil and gas and it's a success story from oil and gas. The same thing with this parish. We're rebuilding 74 miles of levee right now. We're rebuilding what we call the sub basin protection levee which is a 21 mile stretch of levee that we had to fight to get rebuilt. Before Hurricane Rita hit, we had it at an 11 foot elevation and they wanted to charge us \$8 million to mitigate for building an existing levee. I took the Corps out there. We probed it. Thank God they were willing to work and set this thing up which is happening right now. Some of that is FEMA reimbursement.	Shoreline protection features 6b1, 6b2, and 6b3 incorporate the design and construction of a portion of a CWPPRA demonstration project (ME-18) along the Rockefeller Refuge shoreline.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						Thank God they're willing to help. But when I read the study, if I recall right, it was just like Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge, like a two or three sentence deal. It's more than that. We invest to help the community, okay? Drainage I just got a text there from a guy up in Gueydan on the east end locks open, we're getting seven inches of rain. It happens all the time. We're cutting levees. The levees are important because of the coastline retreating. We have to build the levees. But we also have the east end locks. You had five locks listed in the plan. East end lock should be in that plan. We're losing -- I think I mentioned 15,000 acres is what's estimated to be lost since the property has been donated. We're at a rate of 35 feet per year. We're up close to 70 feet per year. There's an area that the CWPPRA program is investing that's going to end up being \$50 million. Why are we investing \$50 million when the coast is actually a mile away going in to jeopardize these projects without first fixing the first line of defense, our coastline? I think a lot of that would solve a lot of these problems if we can stabilize that coast first. We haven't lost our property yet. The eastern part of the state is a different story. Let's not get to that point. Thank you.	
115	Mr Johnson, Parish Sheriff	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	eminent domain and people will not move out	As sheriff of the parish, I want to make one final note for the federal government since this is the comment period. I can't say anything any better than our citizens have said it. Also noted that we've had the best turn out of the three meetings that you've had and probably the most partially populated area, but the best turn out. Now, I think the messages have come across very clear. We're not going anywhere. We're going to be here. And people was wondering what was happening in a hundred years from now or the year 2075, that's the year our great grandkids are still going to be here. So to the federal government from the Sheriff of Cameron Parish, we're going to be here. We're staying here.	Comment acknowledged.



Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
116	Terry Beard	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	request information and transparency	I am Terry Beard. I'm Police Jury District 4. I spent 23 years living here in Cameron and I've moved back to Sweet Lake, the northern end of the parish. I've spent half of my life there. If you've listened to all the people here tonight, you'll know we know you're here now. We want information. Let us know what's going on. Be transparent as you can with us. They all had good statements here tonight. But we will be watching. We want to know what's going on, but we will be watching.	The comments and responses are provided in the Final Integrated Report which will be provided for public review. The study team will continue to engage various elements of the public to inform about the progress of the study.
117	Kirk Quinn	4/16/2015	public meeting	oral comment	provide comments	Kirk Quinn, Cameron Parish Police Jury, District 3 and current president. A lot of people in this room, a lot of comments, a lot of people staring and don't know what they're looking at right now. They know what they're looking at but they're not hearing what they want to hear. I hope each and everyone of y'all submit a written comment, flood them, make them have to read every one that comes through. It's the only way we're going to get a word in, and I'm going to be here on behalf of all the jurors. I'm going to be here to let y'all know we're going to fight tooth and nail to get this right for each and every one of y'all for the whole parish. It's not just one district, it's going to be the whole parish, east and west, north and south. We're here. If y'all got any questions, call us, call me, call any of your jurors. Call Ryan Bourriaque. I'll give y'all his direct line. No, I want to let y'all know thank y'all for showing up for the support and asking all of the questions and giving all the comments. It's a very good thing and there's a lot of people in here that's been here a long time. And the alligators are hungry around here, so.	Acknowledged.
TELEPHONE COMMENTS							
1	Billy Waters	April 16, 2007	public	telephone	buying land	Mr. Waters saw a newspaper article about the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Revised Integrated Draft Report and EIS and thought the government was looking to buy land, as he had a parcel of land for sale.	Clarified the purpose of the project for him was hurricane storm surge risk reduction. Mr. Waters again offered his land for sale.
2	Jolene Lane	April 27, 2015	public	telephone	eminent domain	Request to remove the eminent domain language from the Southwest Coastal Louisiana Feasibility	The Recommended NED Plan would be entirely voluntary participation *See response to




Table 3. Comments on the Revised Integrated Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment #	Person/Agency	Date	Source of Comment	Mode of Comment	Theme	Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)	Response
PUBLIC MEETINGS							
						Report. We live in a flood zone and we do not want our property taken away from us.	"involuntary participation" and "eminent domain" comments in General Responses.
3	Robert Duboit	April 16, 2015	public	telephone	map of affected structures	Mr. Duboit requested access to more detailed map showing individual structures to be elevated or acquired.	Informed Mr Duboit that the map was purposely kept at a very broad scale so that individual structures could not be identified because the planning was still ongoing and the plan could significantly change. In addition, Each of the properties potentially affected by implementation of the NED Plan is presented in a new appendix to the Final Integrated Report displaying maps of all affected structures.
*GENERAL COMMENT RESPONSES							
<p>Response regarding “eminent domain” and “involuntary participation” Initially, the draft study recommendation was that severe repetitive loss structures, structures with any life and safety risk, and structures located within the regulatory floodway were to be acquired, either voluntarily or, in the alternative, through the use of eminent domain, and removed from the floodplain. However, due to valuable input from members of the public and from local officials, the USACE and the CPRAB have modified the NED Recommended Plan to make it entirely voluntary. No acquisition and removal of structures from the floodplain would occur under the NED plan. Any structure that requires raising greater than 13 ft above ground level would be ineligible to participate due to engineering and risk related factors..</p> <p>Response regarding Parish Priority Projects: A copy of the most recent available Parish Priority Projects has been included in Appendix P.</p> <p>Response regarding ‘Local sponsor’ be chosen: The State of Louisiana through the CPRA is the non-Federal Sponsor for the study. Other Parish and local community officials have been and will continue to be invited to participate in the study process.</p> <p>Response that reforestation measures be replaced by shoreline protection measures: five shoreline protection measures would provide a net benefit of 6,135 acres of protection with 1,738 AAHUs over the 50-year period of analysis. Whereas, the 35 chenier measures would reforest live oak and hackberry tree species for a net total of 1,413 acres with 538 AAHUs over the 50-year period of analysis. According to the Louisiana Natural Heritage Program (source: http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/fact_sheet_community/32367-Coastal%20Live%20Oak-Hackberry%20Forest/coastal_live_oak_hackberry_forest.pdf; accessed January 25, 2016) Louisiana’s coastal chenier forests occur in the Chenier Plain from Iberia Parish westward across Vermilion and Cameron parishes. Of the original 100,000 to 500,000 acres in Louisiana, only 2,000 to 10,000 acres remain, 2-10 % of presettlement extent.</p>							




ATTACHMENT 1
SIGN-IN SHEETS FOR
APRIL 14, 2015, VERMILION PARISH PUBLIC HEARINGS/MEETINGS




 US Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans Office		<h1>ATTENDANCE RECORD</h1>					Location: Abbeville High School	
Date: 14 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting						
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY								
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	
1	Priscilla Cormier	21208 Pine Island Rd	Abbeville	La	70510		337-344-4300	
2	Joseph Cormier	21308 Pine Island Rd	Abbeville	La	70510	jcormier50202@yahoo	337-257-9529	
3	Louise Fontenot	P.O. Box 1324	Jennings	LA	70546	lfontenot@jescous.com	337-824-9074	
4	Pat Landry	635 Cajundome Blvd	Lafayette	La	70506	patrick.landry@la.gov	337 482-0680	
5	Patrick Dutton	818 S. HENRY ST.	Abbeville, LA	LA	70510	bighunkedoc@yahoo.com	337-351-7946	
6	Randy Moertle	1008 Mar Dr., Lockport,	LA		70374	rmoertle@bellsouth.net	985-856-3630	
7	Cathy Sagrera	13411 Nelson Dr	Abbeville	LA	70510	cathy_sagrera@bellsouth.net	(337) 993-5317	
8	Lynn Sagrera	13411 Nelson Dr	Abbeville	LA	70510	↑ same	↑ same	
9	Stacy Lowmy	2026 HORSOSHOE Rd	Abbeville	LA	70510	stacy_g@com-internet.com	337-898-2242	
10	Allan Lemaire	11799 H. Iton R	Maurice	LA	70565		517-5369	
11	John Boudreaux	8301 Agnes Plantation	Abbeville, LA	LA	70510	agnesplata@bellsouth.net	893-6743	
12	James Theall	21975 LA Hwy 333	Abbeville, LA	LA	70510	JimTheall@bellsouth.net	893-6415	
13	Mark Shirley	8632 Meadow Lane	Abbeville		70510	mshirley@agcenter.lsu.edu		
14	Sylvia Trahan	19905 Cuz Rd	Abbeville		70510	strahan@agcenter.lsu.edu		
15	Karen Sagrera	13137 Pumping Plant	Abbeville		70510		893-0082	
16	Aaron Lee	12401 W LA HWY 82	Abbeville, LA		70510			
17	Michael Hare	Rep Boudreaux						
18	MICHAEL CARLOS	218 RUE DE LAUREGARD	LA		70508	mcarlos@ducks.org	34083288	
19	Tim Vincent	P.O. Box 187	Perry, LA		70525	raineymanager@aol.com	507-652-55	




 ATTENDANCE RECORD		Date: 14 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting		Location: Abbeville High School	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	Newspr
1 Amber Robinson	201 Rue Iberville	Lafayette	LA	70508	amber.robinson@hdrinc.com	337-347-5605	
2 DAVID JOHNSON	701 XENIA AVE S Ste 600	Minneapolis	MN	55413	david.johnson@hdrinc.com	612-245-9004	
3 Sherrill Sagrera	12139 W La Hwy 82	Abbeville			Sherrill.Sagrera@hdrinc.com	337-652-2364	
4 Sandrus Stelly	18404 E. Hwy 35	Abb, La			Sandrusstelly@yahoo.com	337-652-6445	
5 Delora Stelly	18404 E. Hwy 35	Abb, La			della.kaplantel.net	337-652-8365	
6 Kevin Sagrera	13036 Pumping plant Rd.	Abbeville	LA	70510	Kevin.Sagrera@bellsouth.net	337-303-4585	
7 Lisa Chiasson	116336 W. La Hwy 330	Abbeville	LA	70510	LVC2962@gmail.com	337-893-5540	✓
8 Barbara & Roland Viator	17915 W LA Hwy 330	Abbeville	LA	70510		337-893-6231	✓
9 Shannon Kevu Lemaire	13338 W. LA Hwy 82	Abbeville			shantm@bellsouth.net	337-652-2484	
10 Thomas McGinnis	635 Cajundome Blvd	Lafayette	LA	70506	tommy.mcginis@la.gov	337-482-0665	
11 Raymond Stelly	25201 SH 82	Kaplan	LA	70548		337-652-1548	
12 Antoine Carras	11723 Audubon Rd	Abbeville			antoine.carras1956@gmail.com	337-652-3885	
13 Chad Lege	19102 Cherry Rd	Abbeville	La	70510	legechad@bellsouth.net	337-652-7692	
14 Ken Duffy	8550 United Plaza Blvd. suite 702	BR LA	70810		kduffy@bemsys.com	225-706-8403	
15 SAM & JUDITH FAUCON	12611 RUE BAPTISTE	ABBEVILLE	LA	70510	samfal2@yahoo.com	337-652-2358	
16 Paul & Sarah Bourgeois	407 E. Villere	Abb. LA	70510		shatae.bourgeois@hdrinc.com	337-322-6562	
17 Joc Tessier	11413 Falcon Rd.	Abb. La	70510				
18 Nedra Davis	7575 Jefferson Hwy #322	BR LA	70806		nedra.davis@cedrpa.org	225-333-8230	
19 Al V. Arre	14024 Campisi Dr.	Abbeville	LA	70510	avidrme@omegareplications.com	337-249-1664	




 ATTENDANCE RECORD							
Date: 14 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting				Location: Abbeville High School	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	Vardanyan	12510 Wildwood Way	Abbeville	La	70510	Projectbuilders@gmail.com	249-9988
2	John Wilson	13161 Isaac Rd	Abbeville	La	70510	Swtrns@PPSinc.com	412-2142
3	Thu Pavi	500 main street	Franklin	LA	70570	tpavi@agentev.com	337-257-4662
4	John LeBlanc	308 S. Averin St.	Erath	LA	70533	john@leblancphoto.com	337-937-5528
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							



 ATTENDANCE RECORD							
Date: 14 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting				Location: Abbeville High School	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	Natalie McElyea Chitenden	6000 Johnston St	Lafayette	LA	70503	nmcelyea@agcenter.lsu.edu	337/781-4508
2	Mike Sagera	2219 ACORN	ABB	LA	70510		337 652-2281
3	Monica Poiran	12510 Wildwood Way	Abbeville	LA	70510	mpoiran1117@gmail.com	337-893-5990
4	Greg Sagera	12510 2833 W. LA Hwy B2	ABB.	LA	70510	greg.sagera@gmail.com	337-652-7640
5	Anne Howard					ann.howard@lasa.gov	
6	Alonda McPartly	218 Rue Beauvegard	Sikee Laf	LA	70508	amcpartly@ducts.org	
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							




 ATTENDANCE RECORD							
Date: 14 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting				Location: Abbeville High School	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	TODD VINCENT	148 B EAST ST.	LAFAYETTE	LA	70506	TAVINCENT@SELLERSANDASSOCIATES.COM	337-232-0777
2	Wayne Touchet	505 Lake	Abbeville	LA	70516	touchetbuildings@gmail.com	
3	EARL LANDRY	707 S. SEVERIN ST.	EXATH	LA	70533	elandry@iosinccs.com	337-258-8309
4	MIKE DEVERE	752 E. HOUSTON RIVER	SULPHUR	LA	70663	mikedevere@providenceeng.com	337-842-3852
5	Hunter Hall	1042 Camellia Blvd ^{APT 1502}	LAF	LA	70506	hunterhall@senate.gov	337-261-1400
6	George Saffra	PO BOX 12	Perry Co		70575		
7	AJ Lee	12401 W La 82	Abb				
8	RALPH LIBERSAT	732 Maple	Abbeville	LA		rlibersatcoast@comcast.net	337-652-6557
9	Donald Maynard	11617 N. La. Hwy. 82	Abbeville	LA			337-652-7327
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							




ATTACHMENT 2
SIGN-IN SHEETS FOR
APRIL 15, 2015 CALCASIEU PARISH PUBLIC HEARINGS/MEETINGS



 ATTENDANCE RECORD							
Date: 15 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting				Location: Lake Charles Civic Center	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	Chad Dean	455 Park Ridge Lane	Lake Charles	LA	70615	c74dean@gmail.com	337-842-0266
2	MIKE DEVER	752 E. Houston AVE	INCHHUR	LA	70663	mikedever@providenceng.com	337-842-3858
3	Nic Hunter	2131 LaCache Dr.	LC	LA	70601		3379128110
4	Tom Souste	1316 N. Chretien Side	LL	LA	70605	tsouste@jessais.com	337 515 0493
5	Ray Barnett	4105 Maidstone Dr	RC	LA	70605	raybarnett@suddenlink.net	3379942608
6	Nedra Davis	7575 Jefferson Hwy #322	B2 LA	LA	70806	nedra.davis@ccrpa.org	225 333 8234
7	Phyllis Holifield	2986 Rocky Lane	Sulphur	LA	70665		
8	RUSSELL LESKUNE	6854 BARBURY RD.	L.A.	LA	70605	RUSSCH90@YAHOO.COM	
9	RANDY ROACH	326 PUTO ST	LC	LA	70605		337-491-1386
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							




H

 US Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District		<h2 style="text-align: center;">ATTENDANCE RECORD</h2>						
Date: 15 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting					Location: Lake Charles Civic Center	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY								
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	Notes
1	Betty Minton	2636 Laura	L.C.	LA	70605		802-7940	
2	Laurie Coemier	418 Peake	LC.	LA	70601		436-5037	
3	JOHN R. MOUTON	3914 GENESSEE	L.C.	LA	70605	MOUTBABB@SUDDENLINK.NET		
4	Kathy Venable	2340 Lake St.	L.C.	LA	70601	Kathy@KathyVenable.com	526-9330	✓
5	Randy Venable	2340 Lake St	L.C.	LA	70601	Randy@RandyVenable.com	936-3369	✓
6	Karen Clapp	1011 Lakeshore Dr. Suite 614	LC	LA	70601			
7	Raleigh Newman	1820 Atalga	LC	LA	70601		485-1-781	
8	Scott Liggio	2012 Wilcox St	LC	LA	70605	scott@liggioconstruction.com	(337) 475-1119	
9	Carlynn Woodsley	428 Cleveland St	LC	LA	70609	cswoodsley@yahoo.com		✓
10	Brent Hoffmann	1831 N West Kirby	Sulphur	LA	70665			-
11	Michael Stare	Rep. Bonstanty						
12	David Stare	611 W. College	LC	LA	70605			-
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								




**ATTACHMENT 3
SIGN-IN SHEETS FOR
APRIL 16, 2015 CAMERON PARISH PUBLIC HEARINGS/MEETINGS**



 US Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District		<h2 style="text-align: center;">ATTENDANCE RECORD</h2>						
Date: 16 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting					Location: Cameron Police Jury	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY								
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	News
1	Brandie Nunez	4499 West Creole Hwy	Cameron	LA	70631	brandiedaigle@hotmail.com	337-249-9761	✓
2	Gilbert Daigle	4794 West Creole Hwy	Cameron	LA	70631	cassandra1958@hotmail.com	337-630-9002	✓
3	EMERY Henry	2837 W. Sale Rd	Lake Charles	LA	70665	eHenry@suddenlink.net	337-496-2553	-
4	Susan Boudreaux	175 Barro Rd	Creole	LA	70632	SBOWD21@gmail.com	337-513-6921	✓
5	Dinah Landry	191 Leboeuf	Bell City	LA	70633	dinahlandry@yahoo.com	532-3030	
6	Toby Landry	191 Leboeuf	Bell City	LA	70633	landrytoby@yahoo.com	598-4488	
7	Nadene Richard	122 Jones St	Grand Chenier	LA	70643	nadene31660@yahoo.com	538-2369	✓
8	Picard Dahley	236 Taus RD	L.C.	LA	70607		563-3073	
9	Jerome Cantara	813 OAK GROVE Hwy	Grand Chenier	LA	70647	Bedah1985@yahoo.com	542-4186	✓
10	RAY MILLER	2436 MALLARD ST.	HOLLY BENTH			RMILLER@CAMJURY.NET	567-2406	✓
11	JC Reina	1391 OAK GROVE Hwy	Grand Chenier	LA	70643		337-542-4449	✓
12	Wadell Wilkerson	2400 Hwy 384	Bell City	LA	70630	wadell@wilkersonhaus.com	337-540-4156	
13	Robbie Dadds	175 Willie Granger	Lake Charles	LA	70607			
14	Beth Gentry	7036 Great Home	L.C.	LA	70607	bethgentry@suddenlink.net	337-794-3705	
15	Lucas Verret	102 Beau Clos Rd	LC	LA	70607		540-3791	
16	Trey Prou	4735 Grand Chenier Hwy	GC	LA	70643		540-7306	✓
17	Jude Grimes	110 Desiree Rd	Cameron				540-7634	
18	Dan Dahley	1397 Little Channel	Creole	LA			337-274-3902	
19								



 US Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District		<h2 style="text-align: center;">ATTENDANCE RECORD</h2>						
Date: 16 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting					Location: Cameron Police Jury	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY								
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	News
1	Robert Landry	4399 Cushman Hwy	Creshe	La	70632		337-249-1072	
2	Rick Landry	4385 Cushman Hwy	Creshe	La	70632		337-249-9056	
3	Wland Guidry	1474 Hwy 384	Lake Charles	La	70607		337-905-4559	
4	James Boudreau		Cameron	La	70631			
5	Ron Johnson	148 Ednae Rd.	Grand Lake	La	70607	shantfronjohnson@gmail.com	337-274-1837	
6	Arnold Jones	5807 G.C. Hwy	Grand Lake	La	70649	rcj5807@cautel.net		
7	NINA Jones	" " "	" " "	" "	" "	" "		
8	Earline Mudd	6255 W. Creole Hwy.	Cameron	La	70632		337-775-7589	
9	Clément Ray	305 Presbyterie Pkwy	Lafayette	LA	70503	clenray@cox.net	337-280-5137	
10	Suzie Fawcett	3701 Grand Chenier						
11	Pam Kelley	112 East Lane	Grand Chenier	LA	70643	pam.kelley57@yahoo.com	337-540-9321	
12	Hazel Brown	474 Grand	Chenier	La			274-5723	
13	Della Queen	156 Queen Ln	Bell City	LA	70630		337-802-7059	
14	Scott Queen	" "	" "	" "	" "			
15	David Thuda MAJ (Ret)	2374 Tarr	Holly Beach					
16	Cam Waight	175 Olive Lane	Grand Chenier				337-538-2179	
17	Jerry Dockins	142 Domingue Rd	Cameron	LA				
18	Jennifer Dockins	142 Domingue Rd	Cameron	LA				
19	Stacy Jarret	102 Beau Bois Rd	LC	LA	70608		510-708	




ATTENDANCE RECORD							
Date: 16 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting				Location: Cameron Police Jury	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	James Roberts	4779 GCHwy	Grand Chenier	La	70643		337 538-2389
2	Phillip Trascail	5827 Grand Chenier	G C	La.	70643		337-538-2442
3	Robert Portie	PO Box 181	Creole	LA	70632		337-794-5749
4	JONES Sandra	127 Jones St	G.C	LA	70643		" 5382264
5	Barbara Portie	PO. Box 181	Creole	LA.	70632		794.0602
6	ANN Langinai's	16728 LA Hwy 35	Abbeville	LA	70510		
7	Mike Langinai's	16728 2527 Brent St.	Cameron	La			337-643-8140
8	MIKE DEVER	752E. Houston River	Jacoutre	LA	70663	mikedever@providencecc.org	337-842-3858
9	THOMAS McDaniel	891 East Creole	LA		70632	Thomas.McDaniel@camtel.net	337 912 2900
10	Steve Landry	4557 W Creole Hwy	Creole	LA.	70632		337 274-1786
11	Subha Wkoot	349 Miguel St	Lake Charles	La		bubbaw@camtel.net	
12	Joseph Miller	216 W Miller	Grand Chenier				
13	Sheila Miller	216 W. Miller	Grand Chenier			sheila_tarpons@hotmail.com	309 3510
14	Bruce W. Leland	1095 Oak Grove	Bayou				337-794-4875
15	Frank Monnet	37 535 Queyhan	LA				
16	Mechelle Stahow	PO Box 235,	Creole,	La.	70632		337-274-9862
17	Orson Bellings	PO Box 169	Cameron	LA.	70631		337-775-5416
18	Jo Dee Roberts	117 Brian Circle,	Lake Charles		70607	tdroberts@yahoo.com	337 274-1388
19	Peggy Ryea	1445 Marshall	Cameron	La	70631		337-249-1509



ATTENDANCE RECORD							
Date: 16 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting				Location: Cameron Police Jury	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	BARIZY THOMAS	1532 PARISH LIVE RD	L.C.	LA	70607	dbearthomas@CAMTEL.NET	337 764-9461
2	Ronald & Penny Vincent	409 Morgan Blvd	Holly Beal	LA	70604	penny.vincent	537 652-7061
3	RODNEY MCLEAN	1379 OAK GROVE HWY	GRAND CENIER	LA	70643		337-542-4243
4	Jimmie Ann McLean	1379 Oak Grove Hwy	Grand Chenier	LA	70643		337-542-4243
5	DAVE POYEG	PO Box 150	CAMERON	LA	70631		337 912 8951
6	Craig & Patty Brassard	2452 Brant St.	Cameron	LA	70631	I live 2 beach@yahoo.com	337-569-2274
7	Charles & Phoebe Bull	2431 Equit St.	Cameron	LA	70631	charles@charlesbulloffice.com	337 370-1039
8	Chris Brassard	6639 Grand Chenier	Grand Chenier	LA	70643	inist@rellimco.com	337-652-1355
9	Jo Ann Jung	3489 Mosclair Creole	LA	70632			337-542-4527
10	Jill Maxwell	15610 Anse de la	LA	70631			337 588-2248
11	Bobbie Primeaux	134 Wuy Creole	LA	70632		Chrisn 4247 aol	337 562 2249
12	David Richard	7531 Hans Rd	Bell City	LA	70630	darrichard@stann.companys	337-515-0855
13	Karen Wheat	349 Miguel St	Lake Charles	LA	70607	Karenwheat@yahoo.com	337-526-7460
14	EMMA Jean Miller	116 Layton Ln.	Cameron	LA	70631		337 251 3738
15	Mona Kelley	126 Highland St.	Cameron	LA	70631	cpao@camtel.net	337-715-5416
16	Jimmy Kelley	126 Highland St	Cameron	LA	70631	jkelly-77@yahoo.com	337-715-5298
17	Lawrence White	3511 Grand Chenier Hwy	Grand Chenier	LA	70643	flwhite@yahoo.com	537 802 4650
18	DOUGLAS HAYNIE	1539 Little Chaudin Rd	Creole	LA	70632		(337) 794 6176
19	Carolyn Hibodeaux	PO Box 736	Cameron	LA	70631	seashore - CA of yahoo	337-515-7155



 ATTENDANCE RECORD							
Date: 16 April 2015		SWC Public Meeting				Location: Cameron Police Jury	
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY							
	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	Preston Broussard	18318 Preston RD	Abbeville	La	70510		337-642-5513
2	Danny Lavergne	903 Hwy 384	Lake Charles	LA	70607	lavergne.danny@yahoo.com	
3	LEWARD Abovize	2249 MILLARD ST	Holly Beach	LA	70631	SHASHA180@HOTMAIL.COM	337 523 5710
4	MA YOUNG	355 Hwy 384	Big Lake	La	07	N/A	337 558-4877
5	J.T. Primeaux	134 Nazez Ly	Creole La				337 340 8605
6	Ashley Butler	146 Smith Cr.	Cameron, LA	70631		ashleyk@camtel.net	775-5718
7	Medra Davis	7585 Jefferson Hwy #322	BR	LA	70806	medra.davis@cpca.la.gov	225 333 8234
8	Jennifer Picou	154 Ratcliff St	Cameron	LA			
9	Terry Picou	154 Ratcliff St	Cameron				
10	FRANCIS GUILBEAU	123 HENRY ST	CAMERON	LA	70631	CLAPPEOS@HOTMAIL.COM	337 661 0085
11	Guy Murphy	360 Leonce NUNEZ Lane	Cameron, LA				337-513-3720
12	JOE Dupont	225 Dupont Dr	Grand Lake, LA			jbdupont@camtel.net	337 274 2488
13	Danny Boudreau	3475 G.C. Hwy	Grand Chenier			boudreau@camtel.net	337 287 2879
14	Jennifer Jones	1231 Marshall	Cameron	LA	70631	jenjones@camtel.net	337-725 5714
15	Gerard Smith	1933 Tronche Rd, 116 Boudreau Ln	Grand Lake, LA	70601			337-302-7132
16	Cyndi Sellers	110 Asa St	Cameron, LA	70631		Cyndi.sell@hotma.l.com	337-764-3352
17	PAUL SELLECA	110 ASA ST	Cameron	LA	70631		337-661-8780
18	Kerri Boudreau	175 Baro Rd	Creole	La	70632		337-5424395
19	Cornellia Dunaway	PO Box 683	Cameron	LA	70631	cd@ppj	337-274-0858