

**LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION
FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT**

CULTURAL RESOURCES APPENDIX

June 2009



**U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
New Orleans District
Mississippi Valley Division**

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE..... 1
INTRODUCTION 1
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES..... 2
 Consideration of the National Historic Preservation Act..... 2
 Methodology Overview..... 2
EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES 3
 Cultural Metrics..... 3
 Criteria for Selecting Metrics..... 3
DATA COLLECTION 4
 Assumptions..... 4
 Archeological Sites..... 5
 Historic Districts..... 6
 National Register Sites..... 8
 National Historic Landmarks..... 8
OTHER CULTURAL RESOURCES CONSIDERED 9
 Historic Structures..... 9
 Traditional and Ethnic Communities..... 10
PROCESSES THAT COULD IMPACT CULTURAL RESOURCES 11
ASSESSING FUTURE CONDITIONS 13
GIS ANALYSIS OF STRUCTURAL ALTERNATIVES—THE PROCESS 13
 Archeological Sites..... 13
 Historic Properties and Historic Districts..... 15
RESULTS..... 15
CONSIDERATION OF NONSTRUCTURAL ALTERNATIVES 20
 Buy-outs and Relocations..... 21
 Possible Communities Impacted by Relocation or Raising Structures in Place... 21
 Critical Facilities..... 21
REVIEW..... 22
LITERATURE CITED 23

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Summary of Cultural Metrics and Sources of Data 4
Table 2. Metrics and Index for Alternatives of Each Planning Unit..... 17
Table 3. Summary of Worst Performing Structural Alternatives for
Each Planning Unit. 20

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

Purpose

The Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report has been developed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in response to Public Laws 109-103 and 109-148. Under these laws, Congress and the President directed the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to:

- Conduct a comprehensive hurricane protection analysis and design in close coordination with the State of Louisiana and its appropriate agencies;
- Develop and present a full range of flood control, coastal restoration, and hurricane protection measures exclusive of normal policy considerations for South Louisiana;
- Consider providing protection for a storm surge equivalent to a Category 5 hurricane; and
- Submit preliminary and final technical reports.

The purpose of this appendix is to support the cultural resources evaluation for LACPR, which is discussed in the main technical report.

Introduction

South Louisiana is subject to various levels of inundation by hurricane storm surges. These storm surges have the potential to damage or destroy numerous locally, regionally, and nationally important cultural assets. Cultural resources such as National Historic Landmarks, historic buildings and districts, archeological sites, shipwrecks, landscapes, and museums are particularly noteworthy with respect to the culture of communities in the area. In addition, the people that reside within South Louisiana derive from diverse cultural backgrounds and from numerous ethnic groups including Creole, Cajun, African American, French, Spanish, Native American, South American, Isleños, Filipino, Italian, Chinese, Vietnamese, among others. Communities of unique heritage can be found nestled within urban areas and on the rural landscape. Without hurricane risk reduction, these communities are at risk of dispersion and disintegration following inundation events. The damage to or loss of archeological sites, historic buildings, parks, and neighborhoods could lead to the loss of individual and community connection to place. Taken together, these outcomes could lead to a net loss of cultural diversity in South Louisiana.

In order to assess how different levels of risk reduction would help to preserve cultural resources, information is collected for a variety of cultural resources and compared to the structural and nonstructural plans. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc (ESRI) shapefiles are created for data that could be quantified easily and linked to a real world spatial location, including known archeological sites, National Register sites, and National Historic Landmarks. Given that not all cultural sites are recorded, the number of known cultural sites serves as a proxy measure of the actual number of sites that may be protected by the structural alternatives. The number of known sites protected by alternatives is computed by analyzing the location of sites and their proximity to the levees, flood zones, overtopping, and coastal erosion zones. The results are presented as the raw data, and as an index which weighs different resources by importance and standardizes the results for comparison across planning units and alternatives (See *Results, Table 2* below). Consideration of the effects on cultural resources from the

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report Cultural Resources Appendix

nonstructural plans involves reviewing economic and ethnic makeup of communities in order to address concerns relating to Environmental Justice as directed by Executive Order 12898. For example, the high velocity flood zones (V-zones) identified for nonstructural measures (see the *Nonstructural Plan Component Appendix*) are reviewed in order to identify possible disproportionate impacts from the implementation of nonstructural plan on low-income, minority, and traditional communities.

Goals and Objectives

The LACPR effort recognizes the important role of cultural resources to people, communities, and the Nation. Information on known cultural resources enters into the Risk-Informed Decision Framework (RIDF) in order to aid the planning process and screening of alternatives. The primary goal of this appendix involves considering how the different structural and nonstructural alternatives of LACPR have the potential to reduce risk to cultural resources. The first objective seeks to characterize and compare the level of risk reduction to cultural sites offered by each alternative. This objective is accomplished by providing cultural metrics to the multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA). These metrics are compiled from existing inventories of known sites and serve as proxy measures to characterize the level of risk reduction each alternative would provide to cultural resources. The second objective is to preliminarily identify low income, minority, and traditional communities, populations that require consideration of Environmental Justice under Executive Order 12898, that are at a high risk from disproportionate impacts of the nonstructural alternatives.

Consideration of the National Historic Preservation Act

Several laws and executive orders establish cultural sites as a significant resource and require the Federal Government to consider the effects of a Federal undertaking on cultural resources. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, requires Federal agencies to consider cultural resources during the planning and implementation of Federal undertakings. Additional laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, the Native American Grave and Repatriation Act of 1990, and Executive Orders 11593, 13006, and 13287 provide guidance on treating and preserving historic sites. The LACPR effort, as directed by Congress, is a government undertaking that has no potential to cause effects on historic properties as per 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1), because it is not authorized as a program nor project at this time. If the outcome of LACPR results in a program or projects that involve on the ground alterations, such as the construction of levees, restoration of wetlands, excavation of borrow, alterations to buildings, or other activities, USACE's responsibilities under Sections 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act will involve studies, surveys, and consultation to identify historic properties and traditional cultural properties as per §800.4.

Methodology Overview

The general methodology to identify effects to cultural resources uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to identify sites that would be protected by the structural alternatives, and to identify communities, particularly traditional and ethnic communities, that would be impacted by the nonstructural alternatives. The two types of analysis required different methodological approaches.

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report Cultural Resources Appendix

In order to assess the impacts from the structural alternatives qualitative data on site location is collected and encoded into GIS shapefiles. Three metrics are identified (1) archeological sites protected, (2) historic properties protected, and (3) historic districts protected. While these metrics are not a comprehensive inventory of cultural resources in South Louisiana, for this technical report they serve to represent the kinds of cultural resources protected by the alternatives. The shapefiles of known archeological sites, known historic properties, and known historic districts are then compared with shapefiles with data on levee placement, storm surge and levee overtopping, and coastal land loss projections in order to identify how an alternative protects known sites. The number of protected sites is calculated and this summary is input into the multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA—see the *Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix*).

In order to assess the impacts from the nonstructural alternatives, the location of the nonstructural impacts is observed and traditional and ethnic qualities of the communities are identified.

Evaluation of Alternatives

This section describes information on data collection, identification of impacts, and the process for calculating the metric information for input into the MCDA.

Cultural Metrics

The MCDA has three cultural metrics: (1) archeological sites protected, (2) historic properties protected, and (3) historic districts protected. *Archeological sites* are locations with buried information, including, but not limited to, prehistoric campsites, plantations, shipwrecks, and military places. *Historic properties* include properties listed or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks. *Historic Districts* are districts composed of a collection of sites, buildings, and structures. In general historic districts cover a geographic scale larger than an individual site. Taken together, these categories reflect cultural resources important at the local, regional, and national level.

Criteria for Selecting Metrics

The selection of cultural metrics was guided by criteria defined for the MCDA process. Please refer to the *Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix* for a comprehensive presentation regarding all criteria for metric selection. Several selection criteria are extremely pertinent to the development of the cultural metrics. For example the metrics for the MCDA are to be cost-effective, verifiable, credible, and minimally redundant. Therefore existing inventories were referenced (see *Data Collection* below), thus they are cost effective. Also since LACPR attempts to characterize how alternatives would protect cultural resources; these existing inventories serve as proxy measures of all cultural resources, both known and unknown. The inventories were developed over many years of research and field investigations and provide verifiable data. These data also derive from agencies with standards and guidelines for inclusion in an inventory, such as the Louisiana Division of Archaeology and the National Park Service. Lastly, metrics for the MCDA should be viewed holistically in order to minimize redundancy. For example, a metric for “historic structures” was considered (see below). However, when the

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

data were reviewed it was revealed that existing inventories of historic structures did not meet some criteria as stipulated by the RIDF. Many of the historic structures are included in historic districts, thus use of historic structures would create redundancy. In addition, the inventory of historic structures in South Louisiana disproportionately emphasizes some areas because parish-wide studies have been undertaken for some parishes, but not for other parishes (see *historic structures* below).

Data Collection

A variety of sources, including an inventory of archeological sites maintained by the Louisiana Division of Archaeology and an inventory of historic properties maintained the National Park Service, provide information for the inventories of cultural resources. Table 1 below presents the data type and data source of each metric. While much of the information is publicly available, some information, such as the location of archeological sites is restricted to individuals with appropriate research qualifications, as defined by the State.

Table 1 - Summary of Cultural Metrics and Sources of Data

Metric Name (Units)	Type of Data	Source
Archaeological Sites Protected (# of sites)	Recorded Archeological Sites	Louisiana Department of Culture and Tourism, Division of Archaeology
Historic Districts Protected (# of districts)	Known Historic Districts	Louisiana Department of Culture and Tourism, Division of Archaeology, Louisiana Department of Culture and Tourism, Division of Historic Preservation, and the City of New Orleans, Historic District Landmarks Commission, National Register of Historic Places.
Historic Properties Protected (# of properties)	Determined National Register Properties	Department of Interior, National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places
	Designated National Historic Landmarks	Department of Interior, National Park Service, National Historic Landmarks

Consideration of the impacts to cultural resources leads to the designation protected sites and unprotected sites. A *protected site* is a site that is protected under an alternative from storm surge, erosion, and flooding. An *unprotected site* is a site that could be damaged or destroyed under the given alternative. The number of protected sites is the measure used for the cultural metric inputs for the MCDA.

Assumptions

The fact that biases are inherent in the cultural sites data set is worth reiterating. First, the sites included in the analysis are *known* sites, and the data set is not an inventory of *all* sites. Archeological sites, for example, tend to be recorded when a Federal undertaking has the potential for disturbing archeological sites. Other recorded archeological sites may have prominent features, such as mounds, and are easily identified. In contrast, the data set likely

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

under-represents deeply buried sites because they are not easily identified. In addition, the vast majority of archeological sites and historic buildings have not been evaluated to determine eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Consequently the number of eligible National Register properties, is likely greater than the current inventory reflects. Therefore, the inventories of all cultural metrics comprise known or recorded sites, and are not accurate inventory of all archeological sites, historic districts, National Register Properties, or National Historic Landmarks. In many ways, it is useful to think of these inventories as proxy measures of the actual number of cultural sites. As outlined above, cultural resource inventories and assessments will be undertaken prior to construction of any elements in order to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act.

Archeological Sites

Archeological sites include the material remains of people and cultures from the historic and prehistoric past. Prehistoric sites include hunting and food processing camps, hamlets, villages, and mounds. Prehistoric and Native American groups of South Louisiana relied on hunting, fishing, and gathering plants. Archeological sites in this region tend to be located along natural waterways and in areas of relatively high elevation. Historic archeological sites include military sites, plantations, farmsteads, dwellings, commercial sites, and industrial sites. Historic archeological sites also tend to be located in areas of relatively high elevation, such as along natural levees, and on transportation routes. Shipwrecks form an additional category of historic sites and can be found throughout South Louisiana's waterways and off-shore.

Archeological sites provide important information about the past that is not available through other sources, such as historic records. Archeology is the main source of information from the prehistoric era, and of many societies that no longer exist. Information on proto-historic and historic period Native American groups survives through oral histories and ethnohistoric records. However, these sources tend not to extend far back into prehistory and the recorder's culture tends to bias ethnohistoric records. Historic archeological sites also offer information on segments of society, such as the lower classes, enslaved peoples, women, and children, not included in historic writings or not accurately depicted in writings. Archeology offers the opportunity to expand our knowledge of these components of society in order to depict how cultures were organized, explain why societies changed, and understand the region's, state's, and nation's heritage.

Archeological sites are preserved through an array of processes starting with the deposition of cultural material. Initially, a variety of factors influence site formation, such as the activities performed at a site, the number of people that occupied a site, the length of a stay, the kinds of materials used, and the rate of deposition (Schiffer 1987).

The presentation of two situations illustrates how these and other factors influence the creation and preservation of archeological sites. For example, if prehistoric hunters occupied a campsite for only few days, they may have built ephemeral shelters and left very little cultural material in a relatively small location. In addition, organic material tends to decay, which may result in little evidence of past human occupation surviving to the present day. In order to identify and collect information from the little surviving evidence, site identification requires an appropriate sampling strategy and recovery methodologies. In contrast, when many people occupy one

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report Cultural Resources Appendix

location for years or decades, they tend to possess a variety of objects made from a variety of materials. People living in one location for an extended length of time typically construct substantial structures, produce more trash, and may manage the trash by depositing it into trash heaps, middens, or pits. In this case, an archaeological site might be visible and easily identified from surface remains, in part due to structural remains and the concentration of cultural material. Careful excavation is still necessary in order to collect contextual information to address specific research questions. Archeologists take into consideration these types of behavioral and other natural processes when trying to identify the presence of archeological sites, ascertain past activities, and interpret what people did in the past.

Once a site is initially formed, additional factors, such as the rate of deposition, subsequent human activity, soil acidity, and climate influence site preservation. In South Louisiana, alluvium deposited from river floods and deltaic building episodes have deeply buried many sites. Many of the cultural resources located within the planning area were reported as having been disturbed in the initial site forms on file with the Louisiana Division of Archaeology. Some of these sites were impacted by construction activities conducted prior to the implementation of regulations governing the treatment of cultural resources. Unfortunately, destruction of cultural resource sites from man-made actions continues in South Louisiana. A discussion of processes that could impact cultural resources in South Louisiana is presented in a later section.

The Louisiana Department of Culture and Tourism, the Division of Archaeology archives State archeological site files and archeological reports in the State offices in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The Division of Archaeology maintains a web accessible GIS of recorded archeological sites and this database forms the primary source of information on known archeological sites for this analysis. The Division of Archaeology granted access to the database to the USACE. A direct copy of the GIS shapefile could not be obtained by the USACE; therefore, a shapefile was created by querying information available on the web-based GIS. The Division of Archaeology's web-based GIS displays site location and a table with pertinent associated data such as site name, occupation date or period, function, associated cultural material, and other related information. In addition, the Universal Transverse Mercator Northing and Easting coordinates (UTMs) are included in this table. The data on site location and site characteristics were extracted from the web-GIS and used to create an ESRI point shapefile for use in the LACPR analysis. The shapefile includes information on 2,149 archeological sites and serves as the data set of known archeological sites in the GIS analysis.

This data set is not complete and it is a reflection of *recorded* archeological sites, and not the *actual* number of sites. Archeological sites are typically identified and recorded by archeologists prior to a ground disturbing civil works project. As a result, the inventory of sites tends to reflect areas of development. Consequently, site density may appear to be greater in developed areas, but in reality site density may be higher in undeveloped areas.

Historic Districts

For LACPR, an historic district is defined as a group of spatially-related properties sharing a common theme. Some historic districts have obtained National Register status (see below), but many of the historic districts considered for LACPR have been defined by either State or local organizations. Generally, historic districts apply to a group of buildings or structures that are

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

historically or architecturally significant. A group of associated archeological sites may also form an historic district. Sites, buildings, structures, and objects within historic districts are categorized as contributing and non-contributing properties. Contributing properties are any property, such as a structure or object, which adds to the historical integrity or architectural qualities that make an historic district significant. Contributing properties are integral parts of the historic context and character of an historic district. Although non-contributing elements are embedded within historic districts, the whole of an historic district is viewed as being greater than the sum of its parts. For this reason, the loss of individual elements has the potential to change the overall character of an historic district.

Louisiana Department of Culture and Tourism, Division of Historic Preservation, the Louisiana Department of Culture and Tourism, Division of Archaeology, and the City of New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission, and the National Register of Historic Places provide information on historic districts for this effort. The current inventory includes 69 historic districts; 56 listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and 13 listed on the New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission. Examples of historic districts include historic urban neighborhoods, commercial and government centers within parish seats, plantations, and military sites. These historic districts are overwhelmingly significant due to their architectural styles. Others are significant due to their association with a person or event or their ability to yield information.

Historic districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places must meet the criteria necessary for inclusion on the National Register (see *National Register Sites* below). The National Register historic districts are not counted as historic properties for the LACPR effort, because this would cause redundancy in the metrics.

The New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission is a regulatory agency for local historic districts in New Orleans. The New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission has jurisdiction over nine local historic districts, 163 individual landmark buildings, and 182 nominated landmark buildings in city neighborhoods. A goal of the New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission is to adaptively reuse buildings in order to retain the architectural character of an area. Although there are numerous commercial corridors, the majority of buildings reviewed by the New Orleans Commission are residential in nature. In addition, the City maintains a Central Business District Historic Landmarks and the Vieux Carre Historic District (commonly known as the French Quarter). Historic districts include Faubourg Marigny, Irish Channel, Algiers Point, Esplanade Ridge, Holy Cross, Bywater, Lower Garden District, Warehouse District, Lafayette Square, Picayune Place, St. Charles Avenue, Treme, and Canal Street.

Given that the defined historic districts in this inventory overwhelmingly includes buildings, structures, and objects, the residual effects of flooding from levee overtopping has the potential to damage contributing elements of historic properties. This information is taken into consideration in determining the number of protected historic districts under the structural alternatives.

National Register Sites

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the Nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the National Register is part of a program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archeological resources. Sites listed or eligible for listing on the National Register are referred to as "historic properties." To be considered "historic," a property must be at least 50 years old (with certain exceptions), and possess integrity and significance. Integrity relates to a property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. If, for example, a structure was moved from the location where it achieved its significance, then the structure no longer possesses integrity of location. Therefore, such property would not meet the criteria necessary for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. A property's significance may be related to a number of factors including:

- Its association with events that have made a noteworthy contribution to the broad patterns of our history
- Its relation to the lives of historically important people of our past
- It represents the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction
- It represents the work of a master
- It possesses high artistic value
- It represents a significant or distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction
- It has yielded or may yield information important in history or prehistory

If an historic property is going to be adversely impacted by a Federal undertaking then the impacts must be mitigated.

An inventory of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places is available through the National Park Service's website (www.nps.gov/nr/). Similar to the State records, information on locations is typically not available on archeological sites, but it is available for historic structures and other properties. National Register properties also include 307 structures and 42 archeological sites within the planning area.

Historic districts are also included in the National Register of Historic Places. Historic districts are a special collection of historic places where individual elements may not meet the criteria to be included on the National Register; however, when many elements are considered the whole is considered to be greater than the sum of the parts. The 56 historic districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places are included in the *Historic District* metric and not the historic properties metric (see *Historic Districts* above).

National Historic Landmarks

National Historic Landmarks are nationally significant historic places designated by the Secretary of the Interior because they possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States. While there are many historic places across the Nation, only a small number have meaning to all Americans. Today, fewer than 2,500 historic

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report Cultural Resources Appendix

places bear the distinction of National Historic Landmark. National Historic Landmarks make tangible the American experience. They are places where significant historical events occurred, where prominent Americans worked or lived, that represent those ideas that shaped the Nation, that provide important information about our past, or that are outstanding examples of design or construction. National Historic Landmarks guide us in comprehending important trends and patterns in American history. They form the common bonds that tie together the many groups that settled the country and provide anchors of stability in a fast-changing world, ensuring that the Nation's heritage will be accessible to generations yet unborn. Within the planning area, 31 buildings and structures have achieved National Historic Landmark status.

Other Cultural Resources Considered

Identification of cultural resources involved considering a number of other resources including historic structures, and museums and archives. However, given the quality of the data, biases in the data, or likelihood that another metric already incorporated the data, these resources did not meet the selection criteria outlined for the risk-informed decision framework (see *Criteria for Selecting Metrics* above and the *Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix*).

Historic Structures

Historic structures include houses, buildings, bridges, levees, docks and other manmade structural objects. Historic structures are structures over 50 years old that possess certain unique qualities of significance. The Louisiana Department of Culture and Tourism, Division of Historic Preservation maintains an inventory of historic structures. While a total of 11,296 historic structures have been recorded for LACPR planning area, many historic structures remain unrecorded. Taken as a whole, this inventory's inherent biases result in an unreliable database for use in the MCDA. In addition, the historic nature of many of these buildings is already captured in the historic districts metric. While historic structures are not included in the MCDA, they will be inventoried and assessed, as necessary, under National Historic Preservation Act at the project implementation phase.

Two main factors influence whether structures have been recorded and are listed in the State inventory. The first factor involves efforts of local historical societies and individual preservationists. The second factor relates to Federal agencies requirement to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

In some parishes, historical societies and individuals have undertaken inventories of local historic buildings. For example, a comprehensive inventory of historic structures within town centers and rural landscapes was undertaken for St. Tammany Parish. This effort resulted in 1,809 historic structures recorded within that parish. Consequently, the inventory of historic structures for St. Tammany Parish closely matches the actual number of historic structures. Similar studies have not been implemented for other parishes, such as Jefferson Davis, Cameron, and Calcasieu. While the density of historic structures is expected to be low in this western, rural part of the State, the lack of inventory efforts has resulted in the documentation of only a handful of structures, and thus under-represents the true number of historic structures in these parishes.

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

In other parishes, the inventory of structures is a result of efforts related to Federal undertakings. For example, Orleans Parish contains 1,278 recorded historic structures. Many of these structures were badly damaged or destroyed by levee failures following hurricane Katrina. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) recorded historic buildings that were no longer habitable following the storm and prior to demolition. As a result, roughly 30 percent of all recorded structures within Orleans Parish currently listed on the Louisiana Division of Archaeology and Division of Historic Preservation on-line database are located within the Lower Ninth Ward, one of the hardest hit neighborhoods from the 2005 floods. The available online inventory does not reveal whether recorded historic structures are still standing, but the location of the vast majority of recorded structures within Orleans Parish suggests that many of the recorded structures are no longer extant. Using the State historic structures inventory within the MCDA would therefore lead to counting some structures as protected, when in fact they do not exist. An effort to verify the status of recorded buildings would require large labor deployment, and violate a criterion for metric consideration (see *Risk Informed Decision Framework Appendix*). Furthermore, given that historic structures tend to be included within historic districts the redundancy of including historic structures would not validate the need for the cost.

Museums form an additional cultural resource that provide personal and community connection to place. Museum assets are included within the “residual damages” metric (see *Economics Appendix* and *Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix*).

Traditional and Ethnic Communities

In addition to archeological sites, historic buildings, and other historic properties, cultural resources also include traditional and ethnic communities. Executive Order 12898 instructs Federal agencies to consider the Environmental Justice effects of Federal actions on minority and low income populations. Many of the traditional and ethnic communities tend to be either minority or low income populations. Numerous ethnicities live within South Louisiana and include Creole, Cajun, African-American, Latinos, Isleños, Filipino, Italian, Yugoslavian, Croatians, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Native American tribes including Chitimacha, Coushatta, Choctaw, and Houma Indians. Some of these groups depend on a subsistence economy from oystering and shrimping. In general, coastal wetland loss will adversely affect these groups causing displacement and community disintegration.

Unlike the inventory of archaeological sites and National Register properties, inventories of traditional and ethnic communities do not exist. While some information regarding ethnicity is available through census data, changes in population and in community composition following hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 and Gustav and Ike in 2008 is a dynamic and ongoing process.

The most comprehensive program documenting Louisiana’s folk and ethnic traditions is the Louisiana Folklife Program (<http://www.louisianafolklife.org>). Central to the State’s goals for cultural conservation, official folklorists are being assigned to cultural regions throughout the State. One of the purposes of the State program is to provide in-depth documentation of folk traditions and to facilitate the use of this information by the public and cultural tourism. These efforts will add to the existing detail on the cultural assets whose development and continued

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

existence depend upon the special geography and natural resources of southwestern and southeastern Louisiana.

If the outcome of this LACPR effort results in the implementation of risk reduction measures, then Environmental Justice outreach and evaluations would consider the effects of the proposed action on minority and low income communities. For the present LACPR effort, percentages of minority and low income populations are presented in the *Programmatic Cumulative Effects Analysis Appendix*.

Processes that Could Impact Cultural Resources

A variety of natural and human processes impact cultural resources in the LACPR planning area. Some impacts have a greater effect on archeological sites and site preservation, while others have greater impacts on historic structures. Natural processes, such as subsidence, erosion, storm surges, and levee overtopping, have the potential to negatively impact cultural resources. Understanding the effects of these processes is crucial when comparing the LACPR alternatives. Some alternatives include efforts to reduce some processes, such as coastal erosion, while others do not. Consequently, the ability to protect sites differs among the alternatives. The Cultural Resources section of the *Programmatic Cumulative Effects Analysis Appendix* considers the two worst case scenarios for each planning unit and potential impacts to cultural resources.

Land loss, due to processes such as coastal erosion or subsidence, forms a negative impact to all types of cultural assets. For example, eroding land also destroys the context of archeological deposits causing them to lose integrity and the ability to yield data. Erosion and subsidence of the soil underlying structures will negatively impact those structures by exposing them to the degrading effects of water or undermining the foundation. Therefore, if a site is located in an area that would be subject to land loss under any plan, then it is considered a negative impact. Land loss in the coastal zone is a particularly influential factor in the destruction of archeological sites within the LACPR planning area. Natural influences include subsidence, saltwater intrusion, and the frequency, magnitude, and duration of storms. Subsidence, compaction, and erosion accelerate the conversion of marsh to open water. Saltwater intrusion, coupled with subsidence, is resulting in the landward encroachment of the Gulf. These processes are deleterious to archeological sites located in proximity to various lakes, bays, sounds, canals, and other water bodies.

Flooding either from storm surges or levee overtopping would generally be a negative impact to historic structures, but not necessarily to archeological sites. Flooding of historic structures may undermine the structural integrity of the building by deteriorating portions of the structure or completely destroying a structure. Secondary impacts, such as mold growth, that may damage structural, architectural, or decorative elements can undermine a structure's integrity. This loss of integrity may decrease a structure's ability to meet criteria for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Alternatively, the replacement of structural and decorative elements may change the character of an historic district. If the flooding from storm surges alters the ecosystem from freshwater to saltwater marsh, then the storm surge has the potential to negatively impact archaeological sites. Saltwater intrusion kills freshwater vegetation exposing soils to increased erosion. When archaeological sites are located in these areas, sites are destroyed as the soil erodes.

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

Other factors influencing site preservation are related to the climate and topography of the area. The climate in this area is influenced by air masses, which result in severe storms during the summer months and sporadic, high energy disturbances during the winter months. When severe winds from high energy disturbances uproot trees growing on sites, the context is disturbed, hindering the research potential of the site. Rapid rainfall and flash flooding can cause erosion, leading to the destruction of archeological sites.

Wind damage associated with hurricanes is an additional negative impact to cultural assets. For example, wind can damage structural components of buildings, exposing building interiors and contents to wind and rain damage. Wind can also uproot trees, which can damage archeological sites. Given the difficulty in estimating wind damage and the need to take local features into consideration, wind damage is not considered in the analysis.

Human activities are significant contributing factors, influencing site preservation in the area. Natural levees and their adjacent waterways represent important features in the region. For example, distributary channels formed important routes of transportation during prehistoric, historic, and modern times. The natural levees adjacent to the waterways provided suitable landforms for settlement, fortifications, and agricultural lands. Prehistoric settlements focused on these high ridges and natural levees and high ground was also preferred for historic settlements. Some of the first agricultural concessions in the area were granted along the Mississippi River and the major bayous of the planning area (Giraud 1987). Historically, settlement and development concentrated on suitable dry land adjacent to navigable watercourses. However, in the recent past, settlement has expanded to drained lowlands and natural backswamp areas. The flooding from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 and Ike and Gustav in 2008 has heightened an awareness of the hazards associated with living in these drained lowlands, and future development has the potential to emphasize undeveloped high ground.

The construction of various flood and water control structures is another factor that has influenced site preservation in the coastal zone. Levees have been constructed to prevent flooding and to control the flow of water in some areas. Sites have been destroyed during the construction of levees and floodwalls. These water control projects also affect sediment transport and deposition in the area. Excavation and maintenance dredging of canals for the extraction of mineral resources and for navigation have accelerated erosion and disturbed archeological sites. Many archeological sites in the planning area have subsided and were exposed during dredging activities. The excavation of manmade canals divided some archeological sites. Subsequent erosion of the canal channels resulted in the loss of cultural deposits. Wakes from boats utilizing waterways forms an additional impact that negatively affects the preservation of archeological sites located along waterways.

The construction of new levees and expanding the footprints of existing levees also has the potential to damage cultural sites. Levees may be built upon archeological sites, or historic buildings may need to be moved or demolished in order to construct or expand levees. In addition, borrow material necessary for the levee improvement, expansion, and construction has the potential to impact and destroy both archeological sites and buildings present within borrow

and stockpile areas. The National Historic Preservation Act requires that cultural resources be considered prior to a Federal undertaking that has the potential to cause effects on historic properties. The opportunity to consider effects to historic properties will occur prior to the implementation of any plan.

Assessing Future Conditions

The overall LACPR technical evaluation considers future conditions; however, it is difficult to project the future conditions of cultural sites. For example, when considering the future in 50 years, structures being built today could be included on the National Register of Historic Places. However, as discussed above, historic properties must possess both integrity and significance. Both of these characteristics are difficult to predict 50 years into the future. Pre-fabricated homes constructed following Hurricane Katrina, referred to as Katrina cottages, could be eligible for the inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Precedence for this type of structure exists since pre-fabricated houses from the Sears and Roebuck Mail order catalog built between 1908 and 1940 have been determined eligible and are listed on the National Register. In addition, Katrina cottages are closely associated with the events of Hurricane Katrina and the rebuilding of New Orleans; therefore, it is possible that Katrina cottages will meet requirements of the National Register of Historic Places in 50 years. Consequently, predicting what may have merit in the future and inventorying such properties proves difficult. Analysis for LACPR therefore focuses on resources recorded now and did not attempt to quantify sites that could be considered cultural resources in the future.

GIS Analysis of Structural Alternatives—The Process

The cultural metrics for the MCDA are calculated with the use of GIS. The process includes identifying protected sites by overlaying and querying several shapefiles. The base layer includes information on site location. For archeological sites, the location of the proposed levee alignments and future wetlands factor into the calculation of the number of protected sites. In contrast, shapefiles with data on flooding location and depth from storm surges factor into the calculation of protected historic districts and historic properties.

Archeological Sites

The number of protected known archaeological sites is calculated with the use of three GIS shapefiles. The first shapefile includes the location of known archeological sites; the second shapefile contains the levee alignments; and the third shapefile is the Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Assessment and Restoration (CLEAR) model (Twilley and Barras, 2003; see *Coastal Restoration Plan Component and Environmental Metrics Appendix*). The CLEAR model is an estimate of coastal land loss if no action is implemented. Three inputs are associated with each alternative and scenario, (1) the number of protected known sites, (2) the upper uncertainty limit, and (3) the lower uncertainty limit. The upper uncertainty limit is the best case, in that the greatest number of sites would be protected, however, the least amount of confidence is associated with the upper uncertainty limit. The lower uncertainty limit presents the measure with the highest confidence, but relatively fewer sites are protected. The expected number of protected sites is an average of the upper and lower uncertainty limits. Treating these figures as actual statistics is not appropriate; however, they loosely compare to a mean and associated error ranges.

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

The first step in calculating the number of protected known archaeological sites involves identifying the sites protected by levees. The second step involves quantifying the number of protected sites when coastal lands are preserved and not transformed to open water. Calculating the upper and lower uncertainty limit varies for the baseline and alternatives (see below). The number of protected archaeological sites for the no action alternative is calculated by simply determining the number of sites protected by existing levees. The upper and lower uncertainty limits are calculated by adding and subtracting 12.5 percent to the number of protected known sites. This percentage is chosen because it is equivalent to the range attached to the number of protected known archaeological sites with coastal wetland features (see below).

The number of protected archaeological sites for the alternatives is calculated by adding the number of sites that are protected by levees and the sites that are protected by coastal wetland features. Determining the number of known archaeological sites protected by coastal wetland features utilizes the CLEAR Model. The CLEAR Model is a raster shapefile with grid blocks covering 0.0965 square miles (0.25 sq km). The attribute table associated with this shapefile contains the estimated percentage of wetlands within each cell for future conditions in 5-year increments. The field "TOTWET50" is referenced to explore where land loss, as the result of erosion or subsidence, is expected in 50 years. Given that the model estimates the percentage of wetlands within the 0.0965 square mile cells, the precise location of water is not projected. The basic assumption for this analysis is that if archaeological sites are located within a cell that contains water, then the archaeological site could be destroyed. The process of land loss and increased wave action and erosion are processes that are likely to destroy sites. In order to capture a range of uncertainty of site loss for this analysis, the number of archeological sites is calculated twice. The lower uncertainty limit is calculated by examining cells that are estimated to be 75 percent wetland or more in 50 years with no action. Similarly, the upper uncertainty limit is calculated by examining cells that are estimated to be 50 percent or greater wetland. Once the number of sites that intersects these cell blocks is computed they are added to the number of sites protected. The midpoint for the metric value is computed by taking the average of the numbers calculated for the 50 percent and 75 percent wetlands results. While some present day land would still be lost and new land would be created in the process of coastal restoration, the use of the CLEAR model provides relative measure of how known archaeological sites could be protected.

To summarize, the archaeological sites metric includes the following:

- For the no action plan, the metric includes sites protected by existing levees,
- For the coastal restoration and nonstructural alternatives, the metric includes sites that would otherwise be destroyed by wetland loss, and
- For the structural and comprehensive plans (which incorporate wetland restoration plans), the metric includes both sites protected by levees and sites that would otherwise be destroyed by wetland loss.

Historic Properties and Historic Districts

Calculating the number of protected known historic districts and historic properties makes use of a similar process and is accomplished with the use of three GIS shapefiles. The first shapefile includes the location of known historic districts or historic properties; the second shapefile contains data on the location and depth of flooding from storm surges and levee overtopping; and the third shapefile is the CLEAR model. The CLEAR model is used in a similar manner as in the calculation of protected known archaeological sites (see above). The shapefile on the location and depth of flooding is based on hydrologic data that models storm surges, relative sea level rise, and levee overtopping. Buildings and structures form the vast majority of historic districts and properties, and buildings and structures have a greater potential than archaeological sites to be damaged or destroyed by flooding.

In order to calculate the number of historic districts and historic properties protected by the alternatives, the shapefile with flood data is queried. Three flood depths serve to define the estimated protected sites, upper and lower uncertainty numbers. The basic assumption is that when historic districts flood, the damage to buildings, structures, and other contributing elements of historic districts will cause loss of integrity. A historic property or historic district is considered protected when it lies outside of four feet of flooding. For the upper uncertainty limit, the site must lie outside of two feet of flooding; and for the lower uncertainty limit sites lay outside of six feet of flooding. In addition, the results are calculated for low and high relative sea level rise.

Results

In order to identify the worst and best performing alternatives an index is developed to incorporate the three metrics. In addition, this index serves to provide a standardized ranking of the alternatives and assists in the selection of the best and worst case scenarios for the cumulative effects analysis (see *Programmatic Cumulative Effects Analysis Appendix*). While the cultural resource data is essentially qualitative in nature, the selection of the best and worst case scenarios needs to be reproducible and transparent. Therefore, the index provides a weighting system that takes into account general perceptions of the relative importance of the types of cultural resources included in the MCDA. For example, historic districts and historic properties are cultural resources that are recognized as important at a local, state, or national level, and must meet specific criteria in order to obtain that status. In contrast, archaeological sites in the Louisiana Division of Archaeology's inventory are recorded based on their presence. Archaeological sites are more numerous than the historic properties and historic districts, but it is highly unlikely that a large percentage of archaeological sites would be determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places if they were to be evaluated. Therefore, a greater weight is applied to historic properties and historic districts and a lesser weight is applied to archeological sites in the index calculation. To reiterate, the weights in the index calculation are arbitrary, but the index attempts to take into account the relative importance of historic properties and historic districts as viewed by the public and as regulated by laws.

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

The index is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Index} = \frac{((as + as')/2)*0.2 + ((hp + hp')/2)*0.4 + ((hd + hd')/2)*0.4}{AS + HP + HD}$$

Where

AS = Total number of archeological sites within the Planning Unit

as = average archeological sites for scenario 1&3

as' = average archeological sites for scenarios 2&4

HP = Total number of historic properties within the Planning Unit

hp = average historic properties for scenarios 1&3

hp' = average historic properties for scenarios 2&4

HD = Total number of historic districts within the Planning Unit

hd = average historic districts for scenarios 1&3

hd' = average historic districts for scenarios 2&4

The results of the index fall within the range of 0 to 1 and allow comparison across planning units. An index of 0 indicates that the alternative would not provide any risk reduction benefit to a single cultural resource. An index of 1 indicates that the alternative would provide a risk reduction benefit to all cultural resources within the planning unit. Therefore, the higher the index, the greater the amount of risk reduction would be provided to cultural resources. Table 2 presents the index and metric data for each alternative for low (Scenarios 1 & 3) and high sea level rise (Scenarios 2 & 4). For all alternatives the index ranges from 0.016 (PU3b-0) to 0.205 (PU1-LP-b-1000-2).

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

Table 2. Metrics and Index for Alternatives of Each Planning Unit

Planning Unit 1	Index	Scenarios 1 & 3									Scenarios 2 & 4								
		Archeological Sites (n = 488)			Historic Properties (n=165)			Historic Districts (n=54)			Archeological Sites (n = 488)			Historic Properties (n=165)			Historic Districts (n=54)		
		Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst
PU1-0 (No Action)	0.132	127	143	111	126	130	122	46	50	41	127	143	111	125	130	119	44	50	38
PU1-R1, R2, R3	0.175	267	313	221	130	134	126	48	51	43	267	313	221	129	134	123	45	51	40
PU1-NS-100, 400, 1000	0.175	267	313	221	130	134	126	48	51	43	267	313	221	129	134	123	45	51	40
PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.184	295	325	265	133	140	127	50	51	43	295	325	265	129	136	123	45	51	40
PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.189	297	327	267	137	142	131	50	51	48	297	327	267	133	138	129	50	51	45
PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.192	324	354	294	133	143	127	50	51	43	324	354	294	128	137	123	45	51	40
PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.188	305	335	275	133	137	126	50	51	43	305	335	275	128	134	124	48	51	40
PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.199	331	361	301	137	145	134	50	51	43	331	361	301	135	138	129	49	51	41
PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.193	312	342	282	138	141	132	50	51	43	312	342	282	135	138	129	49	51	41
PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.189	297	327	267	137	142	131	50	51	48	297	327	267	133	138	129	50	51	45
PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.202	326	356	296	146	149	141	50	51	48	326	356	296	142	147	134	50	51	45
PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.195	307	337	277	143	143	140	50	51	48	307	337	277	141	143	133	49	51	45
PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.205	333	363	303	159	159	156	50	52	48	333	363	303	135	138	129	49	51	41
PU1-HL-b-400-2	0.203	314	344	284	153	158	148	51	52	50	314	344	284	150	158	142	49	51	46

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

Planning Unit 2	Index	Scenarios 1 & 3									Scenarios 2 & 4								
		Archeological Sites (n=541)			Historic Properties (n=30)			Historic Districts (n=11)			Archeological Sites (n=541)			Historic Properties (n=30)			Historic Districts (n=11)		
		Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst
PU2-0 (No Action)	0.018	48	54	42	14	16	12	2	3	0	48	54	42	13	14	11	2	3	0
PU2-R1, R2, R3	0.077	213	272	154	15	16	13	6	7	4	213	272	154	14	14	12	6	7	4
PU2-NS-100, 400, 1000	0.077	213	272	154	15	16	13	6	7	4	213	272	154	14	14	12	6	7	4
PU2-WBI-100-1	0.078	213	266	160	15	17	14	7	8	6	213	266	160	14	15	13	7	7	6
PU2-G-100-1	0.160	449	502	396	26	26	24	9	9	8	449	502	396	26	26	23	9	9	8
PU2-R-100-2	0.096	266	449	160	15	17	14	7	8	6	266	449	160	14	15	13	7	7	6
PU2-R-100-3	0.096	266	449	160	15	17	14	7	7	6	266	449	160	14	15	13	7	7	6
PU2-WBI-400-1	0.079	213	266	160	26	26	25	9	9	8	213	266	160	25	26	23	9	9	8
PU2-R-100-4	0.082	224	277	171	15	17	14	7	8	6	224	277	171	14	15	13	7	7	6
PU2-R-400-2	0.079	213	266	160	26	26	25	9	9	8	213	266	160	25	26	23	9	9	8
PU2-G-100-4	0.160	449	502	396	26	26	24	9	9	8	449	502	396	26	26	23	9	9	8
PU2-R-400-3	0.098	266	449	160	26	26	25	9	9	8	266	449	160	25	26	23	9	9	8
PU2-R-400-4	0.083	224	277	171	26	26	25	9	9	8	224	277	171	13	14	11	2	3	0
PU2-S-1000-4	0.083	224	277	171	26	26	25	9	9	8	213	266	160	14	15	13	7	7	6
PU2-G-400-4	0.160	449	502	396	27	27	25	9	9	8	449	502	396	26	26	23	9	9	8
PU2-G-1000-4	0.160	449	502	396	27	27	25	9	9	8	266	449	160	14	15	13	7	7	6

Planning Unit 3a	Index	Scenarios 1 & 3									Scenarios 2 & 4								
		Archeological Sites (n=303)			Historic Properties (n=19)			Historic Districts (n=1)			Archeological Sites (n=303)			Historic Properties (n=19)			Historic Districts (n=1)		
		Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst
PU3a-0 (No Action)	0.055	82	92	72	4	7	0	0	1	0	82	92	72	3	5	0	0	1	0
PU3a-R1, R2, R3	0.090	134	157	111	6	10	3	0	1	0	134	157	111	6	10	3	0	1	0
PU3a-NS-100, 400, 1000	0.090	134	157	111	6	10	3	0	1	0	134	157	111	6	10	3	0	1	0
PU3a-M-100-1	0.132	180	203	157	17	18	13	1	1	0	180	203	157	14	18	8	1	1	0
PU3a-M-100-2	0.110	151	174	128	14	17	10	1	1	0	151	174	128	11	15	8	0	1	0
PU-3a-G-400-2	0.107	151	174	128	11	13	5	1	1	1	151	174	128	9	11	4	1	1	1
PU3a-G-1000-2	0.115	151	174	128	16	17	16	1	1	1	151	174	128	16	16	16	1	1	1

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

Planning Unit 3b	Index	Scenarios 1 & 3									Scenarios 2 & 4								
		Archeological Sites (n=433)			Historic Properties (n=20)			Historic Districts (n=5)			Archeological Sites (n=433)			Historic Properties (n=20)			Historic Districts (n=5)		
		Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst
PU3b-0 (No Action)	0.016	17	19	14	10	13	6	1	1	0	17	19	14	8	11	3	0	1	0
PU3b-R1, R2, R3	0.067	130	154	106	10	13	6	2	2	0	130	154	106	10	15	5	1	2	0
PU3b-NS-100, 400, 1000	0.067	130	154	106	10	13	6	2	2	0	130	154	106	10	15	5	1	2	0
PU3b-G-100-1	0.146	288	312	264	19	20	18	5	5	5	288	312	264	18	20	18	5	5	4
PU3b-F-100-1	0.093	178	202	154	15	16	14	3	3	1	178	202	154	15	16	14	2	3	0
PU3b-F-400-1	0.099	178	202	154	19	19	18	5	5	5	178	202	154	19	19	18	5	5	4
PU3b-F-1000-1	0.099	178	202	154	19	19	18	5	5	5	178	202	154	19	19	18	5	5	4
PU3b-RL-100-1	0.076	147	171	123	12	15	11	3	3	0	147	171	123	12	13	8	1	3	0
PU3b-RL-400-1	0.080	147	171	123	16	17	15	3	3	3	147	171	123	15	15	13	3	3	2

Planning Unit 4	Index*	Scenarios 1 & 3									Scenarios 2 & 4								
		Archeological Sites (n=274)			Historic Properties (n=4)			Historic Districts (n=0)			Archeological Sites (n=274)			Historic Properties (n=4)			Historic Districts (n=0)		
		Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst	Ave	Best	Worst
PU4-0 (No Action)	0.024	33	37	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	33	37	29	0	1	0	0	0	0
PU4-R1, R2, R3	0.067	83	107	58	3	3	2	0	0	0	83	107	58	2	3	1	0	0	0
PU4-NS-100, 400, 1000	0.067	83	107	58	3	3	2	0	0	0	83	107	58	2	3	1	0	0	0
PU4-G-100-1	0.092	116	140	91	3	3	3	0	0	0	116	140	91	3	3	3	0	0	0
PU4-G-100-2	0.083	115	139	90	0	2	0	0	0	0	115	139	90	0	2	0	0	0	0
PU4-G-400-3	0.086	115	139	90	1	1	1	0	0	0	115	139	90	1	1	0	0	0	0
PU4-G-1000-3	0.086	115	139	90	1	1	1	0	0	0	115	139	90	1	1	1	0	0	0
PU4-RL-100-1	0.063	85	109	60	1	1	0	0	0	0	85	109	60	0	1	0	0	0	0
PU4-RL-400-1	0.064	85	109	60	1	1	1	0	0	0	85	109	60	1	1	0	0	0	0
PU4-RL-1000-1	0.064	85	109	60	1	1	1	0	0	0	85	109	60	1	1	1	0	0	0

* Given the lack of historic districts in Planning Unit 4, historic properties were given a weight of 0.8.

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

All structural and comprehensive alternatives would provide some benefit toward reducing the risk to cultural resources. However, the amount of risk reduction to cultural resources varies among the planning units. In general the alternatives of the eastern planning units provide greater benefits to cultural resources than do the alternatives of the western planning units. History and geography are two important factors influencing this outcome. There are more historic properties and historic districts in Planning Units 1 and 2. Many of these historic properties and districts tend to be located within cities and towns with a long continuous settlement (e.g. New Orleans), on natural levees, and within existing levees. Improvements to the existing levee systems will result in creating additional storm damage risk reduction to these cultural resources. The no action alternative for PU 1 (index = 0.132) is equal to or greater than the best index for PU 3a (PU3a-M-100-1 = 0.132), PU 3b (PU3b-400/1000-1 = .099) and PU 4 (PU4-G-100-1 = .092). This result reflects the fact that metropolitan New Orleans is already provided some hurricane and risk reduction from the existing West Bank and Vicinity and Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity levee system.

For all planning units, the no action alternative provides the least amount of risk reduction. This alternative allows the greatest amount of flooding within levees and the lack of coastal restoration measures would lead to the loss of cultural resources sites, mostly archaeological sites, located within wetlands and marshes. The two worst case structural alternatives for each planning unit are selected for evaluation in the *Programmatic Cumulative Effects Analysis Appendix*. In some cases the first and second worst case structural alternative based on the index is the same structural alignment but at a different levee height (e.g. 100-year vs. 400-year). In order to provide some variation for the worst case alternative selection in the Cumulative Effects Analysis, the next worst case for a different structural strategy was selected for the second worst case scenario (see footnote below table). Table 3 presents the selected worst case alternatives examined in the Cumulative Effects Analysis Appendix.

Table 3. Summary of Worst Performing Structural Alternatives for Each Planning Unit.

Planning Unit 1	Planning Unit 2	Planning Unit 3a	Planning Unit 3b	Planning Unit 4
PU1-LP-a-100-1	PU2-WBI-100-1	PU3a-G-400-2	PU3b-RL-100-1	PU4-RL-100-1
PU1-HL-a-100-3	PU2-R-400-2	PU3a-M-100-2	PU3b-F-100-1*	PU4-G-100-2*

*In Planning Unit 3b, PU3b-F-100-1 was selected rather than PU3b-RL-400-1 in order to have a worst performing structural alternative from different strategies represented. In Planning Unit 4, PU4-G-100-2 was selected rather than PU4-RL-400-1 or PU4-RL-1000-1 for the same reason.

In summary, the metrics and the index illustrate that all of the alternatives would provide some benefit to the protection of cultural resources when compared to the no action alternative.

Consideration of Nonstructural Alternatives

In addition to the structural alternatives, the implementation of nonstructural alternatives has the potential to impact cultural resources. The *Nonstructural Plan Component Appendix* presents a full discussion of the nonstructural measures. To summarize, nonstructural measures seek to identify secondary flood risk reduction measures that will reduce the risk of property damage and make communities safer from future hurricanes. Nonstructural measures target specific areas that are at a high risk of flooding or critical facilities necessary for community health and safety, particularly during an emergency event. The buy-out and relocation of communities forms a

potential undertaking that will have impacts on communities. Given that this undertaking may apply to low-income or minority populations Environmental Justice issues emerge. Measures to improve critical facilities may involve altering buildings or adding to existing buildings. Some of the targeted critical facilities may be eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places and will need to be considered under the National Historic Preservation Act and National Environmental Policy Act. For the purposes of this technical report this initial assessment of the impacts to cultural resources from the implementation of the nonstructural alternatives aims to identify the types of resources that could be affected. In addition, a program for identifying low-income and minority populations and for identifying, assessing, and mitigating cultural resources impacted by nonstructural alternatives would be developed as part of the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act process.

Buy-outs and Relocations

Voluntary buy-out and relocation are the two nonstructural measures that could influence the most qualitative cultural impacts and severe effects on communities. Cultural impacts are changes to the “norms, values and beliefs” that guide individuals and help them to locate themselves in society (Barrow, 1997: 226). Assessing cultural impacts prior to implementation of a nonstructural program will help planners identify how buy-out or relocation may alter people’s norms, values, and beliefs when faced with new situations such as immigration, contact with new groups, changes in economic opportunities, and so on.

Possible Communities Impacted by Relocation or Raising Structures in Place

Community cohesion could be adversely affected by proposed buyouts in many locations in South Louisiana. Some possibilities include cultural impacts to subsistence fishermen of Yugoslavian heritage in Plaquemines Parish, and Isleños communities of Yscloskey, Regio, St. Bernard, and Toca in St. Bernard Parish. Grand Bayou in Plaquemines Parish is another community that will likely need to be assessed under Environmental Justice consideration prior to the implementation of nonstructural measures. Grand Bayou is an intercultural community of about 125 individuals that is composed of Atakapa, Houma, and Cajun heritage. Although this community is geographically dispersed along the coastal waterways and bayous, the Grand Bayou residents are a close-knit community built on familial and community networks that date back more than 300 years. Many of the residents rely on aquatic extractive activities such as shrimping, oystering, and trapping. Coastal erosion has threatened the economic options for many of the residents. The Louisiana State University Interdepartmental Disaster Science and Management program has been working with Grand Bayou in order to help preserve this traditional community and learn about local knowledge regarding disaster response. Additional communities that may need to be evaluated in terms of Environmental Justice include several Cajun fishing communities such as Il Caminada, that live within the vicinity of Grand Isle, and Native American groups such as the Lacombe Choctaw.

Critical Facilities

Nonstructural alternatives also include improving critical facilities in order to provide secondary flood risk reduction, especially during emergencies. Improvements may involve relocating critical facilities, raising structures in place, wet or dry flood proofing, re-facing exteriors with

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

brick, increasing the number of doorways or windows, transforming a ground floor to a lobby, or moving generators from the ground floor to an elevated floor. Since the nonstructural alternatives are unlikely to provide risk reduction to cultural resources in a comparable method as the structural measures, the potential impacts of nonstructural alternatives are not quantified and not factored into the cultural metrics in the MCDA. For the most part, historic buildings and historic districts form the cultural resources that have the greatest potential to be impacted by these types of building modifications.

The potential actions listed above have the potential to change the character of a structure. Prior to implementing these actions, the effects of these actions on historic properties must be evaluated as per 36 CFR 800.3(a). While some of the measures may change the character of a building, modifications and additions can also be developed in order to retain historic character. If a proposed action relating to improving a facility has the potential to cause effects to historic properties then mitigation measures will need to be employed. Depending on the effects mitigation as specified in a Memorandum of Agreement developed under 36 CFR 800.6 could involve documenting the structure with a Historic Architectural Building Survey and/or a Historic Architectural Engineering Record (HABS/HAER); using construction materials that meet both flood requirements and provide in-kind replacement; or implementing other mitigation measures.

Review

The cultural resources appendix presents an analysis of cultural resources within the LACPR planning area. The location of cultural resources, such as archeological sites, historic districts, National Historic Register Properties, and National Historic Landmarks, are examined in proximity to structural alternatives in order to determine a number of known sites protected by each alternative. This information is then incorporated into the MCDA. In addition, the impact of nonstructural alternatives are explored in order to identify affects to traditional and ethnic communities within the LACPR planning area. This exploration suggests that the no action alternative would provide the least benefit toward the protection of cultural resources. Coastal restoration measures would reduce risk to cultural resources, and a combination of coastal restoration and structural measures would provide the most benefits toward reducing risks to cultural resources.

Louisiana Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Final Technical Report
Cultural Resources Appendix

Literature Cited

Barrow, Christopher .J.

1997. Environmental and Social Impact Assessment: An Introduction. London: Arnold

Giraud, Marcel

1987. *A History of French Louisiana: The Company of the Indies, 1723 – 1731*. Translated by Joseph C. Lambert. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Schiffer, Michael B.

1987. *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Twilley, R.R. and J. Barras.

2003. Formulation of the CLEAR LCA Model, Chapter 2. In, R.R. Twilley (ed.), Coastal Louisiana Ecosystem Assessment and Restoration (CLEAR) Model of Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Comprehensive Ecosystem Restoration Plan. Volume I: Task 1-8. Final Report to Department of Natural Resources, Coastal Restoration Division, Baton Rouge, LA. Contract No. 2511-02-24. 319 pp