Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project

Final Scoping Report

January 3, 2018

Prepared for:

US Army Corps of Engineers®
New Orleans District

Prepared by:

GEC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Appendices:

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S. Code [USC] 4321 et seq. 1969) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508) require federal agencies to use all practicable means to ensure that high quality environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken. NEPA and CEQ regulations require the preparation of a detailed written environmental impact statement (EIS) for proposed actions that constitute a major federal action. Major federal actions include those actions with effects that may be major and that are potentially subject to federal control and responsibility (40 CFR 1502.4, 1508.11, and 1508.18). Public scoping for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project (MBSD Project) was conducted in accordance with the scoping requirements set forth in 40 CFR 1501.7 and outlined in Section 3.0 of this report.

The regulatory authority of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) includes, but is not limited to, Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). These acts (collectively referred to as Section 10/404) authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to regulate: (1) activities and structures in navigable waters of the U.S., including construction, excavation, or deposition of materials in, over, or under such waters, or any work that would affect the course, location, condition, or capacity of those waters, and (2) the discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands and other waters of the U.S. at specific disposal sites. In addition, Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, codified in 33 USC 408 (Section 408), authorizes the Secretary of the Army to grant permission for the alteration, occupation, or use of a USACE civil works project, if the Secretary determines that the activity will not be injurious to the public interest and will not impair the usefulness of the project. Only after notice and opportunity for public hearing can the Department of the Army (DA) issue Section 10/404 permits and Section 408 permissions for proposed projects.

The Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA or the Applicant) is proposing to construct, operate, and maintain a Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project (MBSD Project), which is a multi-component river diversion system intended to convey sediment, freshwater, and nutrients from the Mississippi River at approximate Mississippi River Mile (RM) 60.7, in the vicinity of the town of Ironton, in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana to the mid-Barataria Basin. After passing through a proposed intake structure complex at the confluence of the Mississippi River and a proposed intake channel, the sediment-laden water would be transported through a conveyance channel to an outfall area in the mid-Barataria Basin located in Plaquemines and Jefferson Parishes.

Because the construction and operation of the proposed MBSD Project has the potential to directly and indirectly impact wetlands and other waters of the U.S., navigable waters of the U.S., and to alter multiple USACE civil works projects, CPRA

submitted a Joint Permit Application on June 22, 2016 and a Section 408 Permission Request Letter on January 13, 2017 to USACE, New Orleans District (CEMVN) for a DA Section 10/404 permit and Section 408 permission, respectively.

In addition to informing the USACE decisions, the EIS may be used to inform decisions that the *Deepwater Horizon* (DWH) Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group (LA TIG) may make regarding restoration planning in the Barataria Basin under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA) and the *Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Final Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* (PDARP/PEIS) (DWH NRDA Trustees 2016a[1]) and associated Record of Decision (ROD) (DWH NRDA Trustees 2016b[2]).

This scoping report presents and summarizes the scoping comments received at the public scoping meetings and throughout the 60-day comment period. These comments have been considered by CEMVN and the DWH NRDA LA TIG[3] and will be utilized in developing the draft EIS.

2.0 PROPOSED PROJECT

2.1 Description

The proposed MBSD Project consists of a controlled sediment and freshwater intake diversion structure in Plaquemines Parish on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at RM 60.7, with a conveyance system that would discharge sediment, freshwater, and nutrients from the Mississippi River into an outfall area within the mid-Barataria Basin in Plaquemines and Jefferson Parishes. The conveyance system would cross a portion of Louisiana Highway 23 (LA 23) and the New Orleans Gulf Coast (NOGC) Railroad, and alter a portion of the Mississippi River and Tributaries Program, Mississippi River Levee (MR&T Levee) and other USACE projects. When operational,

1 Deepwater Horizon Natural Resource Damage Assessment (DWH NRDA) Trustees. 2016a. Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill: Final Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

2 Deepwater Horizon Natural Resource Damage Assessment (DWH NRDA) Trustees. 2016b. Record of Decision for the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill: Final Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

3 On April 4, 2016, the LA TIG was established in Appendix 2 of the Consent Decree resolving civil claims by the DWH NRDA Trustees against BP Exploration and Production Inc. arising out of the DWH oil spill. (See United States v. BPXP et al., Civ. No. 10-4536, centralized in MDL 2179, In re: Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 (E.D. La.)). The LA TIG is comprised of: the State of Louisiana (which includes the following state agencies: CPRA, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF), Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office (LOSCO), Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR), and Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ)), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

the proposed MBSD Project would discharge up to 75,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients into the mid-Barataria Basin during periods when Mississippi River flows are 450,000 cfs or greater at the U.S. Geological Service (USGS) gage at Belle Chasse, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. When Mississippi River flows are below 450,000 cfs at the Belle Chasse gage, the proposed MBSD Project would maintain a base flow of up to 5,000 cfs.

Construction of the conveyance channel would require that a portion of LA 23 and the NOGC Railroad be raised and relocated over the conveyance channel. A number of other public and private facilities and utilities would also require relocation due to the construction and/or operation and maintenance of the proposed MBSD Project. The proposed Project would require a pump station and a new canal to direct drainage flows to the new pump station to accommodate impacts to features of existing drainage systems caused by the MBSD Project.

2.2 Applicant's Stated Purpose and Need

CPRA's Joint Permit Application dated June 22, 2016, states that the purpose of the proposed MBSD Project is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin, as a long-term resilient, sustainable strategy. The Applicant further states that the proposed MBSD Project is needed to reduce land loss rates and sustain wetlands injured by the DWH oil spill through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients.

3.0 NEPA SCOPING PROCESS

NEPA regulations require an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed in an EIS and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. This process is referred to as scoping (40 CFR 1501.7). As part of the NEPA scoping process, the lead agency may hold an early scoping meeting or meetings. In addition, as part of the scoping process, the lead agency shall:

- invite the participation of affected federal, state, and local agencies, any affected tribal nations, the Project applicant, and other stakeholders;
- determine the scope and the significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the EIS;
- identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues that are not significant or that have been covered by prior environmental review;
- allocate assignments for preparation of the EIS among the lead and cooperating agencies, with the lead agency retaining responsibility for the statement;
- indicate any public environmental assessments and other EISs that are being or will be prepared that are related to but are not part of the scope of the

impact statement under consideration;

- identify other environmental review and consultation requirements so the lead and cooperating agencies may prepare other required analyses and studies concurrently with, and integrated with, the EIS as provided in 40 CFR 1502.25; and

- indicate the relationship between the timing of the preparation of environmental analyses and the agency's tentative planning and decision-making schedule.

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for the proposed MBSD Project was published by CEMVN in the Federal Register on October 4, 2013 (78 FR 61843). A supplemental NOI was published by CEMVN in the Federal Register on April 27, 2017 (82 FR 19361) following the receipt of a modified DA permit application. The formal 60-day public scoping comment period for the EIS began on July 6, 2017 and ended on September 5, 2017.

The public scoping process included three meetings held in Jefferson and Plaquemines Parishes. Notices of the public scoping meetings were sent through email distribution lists, posted on CEMVN's Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion EIS website (http://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Permits/Mid-Barataria-Sediment-Diversion-EIS), and mailed to public libraries, government agencies, and interested groups and individuals. Scoping meeting dates and locations were advertised in the following local newspapers on the following dates:

- Plaquemines Gazette, July 4 and 11;

- The Times Picayune, July 5 and 14; and

- The Advocate, July 5 and 17.

The newspaper scoping meeting ads included a note stating that Vietnamese translation would be available at the meetings, and that translation services in other languages were available upon request.

A total of 282 people signed the attendance records at the three scoping meetings (Table 1). These included, but were not limited to, private citizens, industry stakeholders, non-governmental organizations, and elected and public officials. A copy of the sign-in attendance record sheets for each scoping meeting is provided in Appendix A.

Table 1. Scoping Meeting Locations, Dates, and Number of Attendees		
Location	**Date/Time**	**Number of Attendees**
Leo Kerner City Park Multipurpose Complex, 235 City Park Drive, Lafitte, LA	July 20, 2017/5:00 – 8:00 pm	71
Belle Chasse Auditorium, 8398 Highway 23, Belle Chasse, LA	July 25, 2017/5:00 – 8:00 pm	126
Port Sulphur Community Center, 278 Civic Drive, Port Sulphur, LA	July 27, 2017/5:00 – 8:00 pm	85

The scoping meetings consisted of a 30-minute open house, followed by a 30-minute presentation of the proposed Project by representatives from CEMVN, CPRA, and the LA TIG, followed by a two-hour open house forum. The open house session provided attendees with an opportunity to visit a series of display panels that showed maps of the proposed Project area, listed the goals and objectives of the Project, and provided an overview of the NEPA process and how to submit public comments on the Project for the EIS. CEMVN staff were available to answer questions. CPRA, the LA TIG, and NOAA also had posters and display tables that provided information about NRDA and the Marine Mammal Protection Act as they pertain to the proposed Project, and staff on hand to answer questions. Throughout the three-hour scoping meetings, court reporters were available to transcribe any verbal comments that attendees offered about the Project and the NEPA process. The public scoping meeting transcripts are provided in Appendix B.

Because commercial fishing interests were expected to have a large representation at the public scoping meetings for the proposed Project, and there is a large Vietnamese community within the larger commercial fishing industry in Louisiana, the scoping meetings provided accommodations for Vietnamese translation of the meeting presentation, submission of Vietnamese comments, and translation of questions and answers at the display panels. Non-English speakers requiring Vietnamese translation of the presentation were provided earphones through which a translator provided real time translation during the presentation. The translator was also available to record public comments provided in Vietnamese and translated into English for the official public comment record.

4.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

4.1 Overview

This section provides a general summary of the comments received during the public scoping process. All public comments in their entirety have been made a part of the administrative record and are provided in Appendix C, organized in alphabetical order by last name for ease of reference. Comments that were submitted by agencies or organizations (identified by those comments submitted with formal signatures or letterheads) are named by the agency or organization rather than an individual's name.

CEMVN received a total of 871 individual comment submissions via emails, letters, comment cards, and verbal comments transcribed at the public scoping meetings. Of these submissions, 555 (64 percent) included identical (form) letters signed by different individuals. Approximately 744 (85 percent) of comment submissions were from commenters that gave Louisiana addresses. The remaining comments were from people residing in other U.S. states, and one comment was received from England. Individual commenters identified an affiliation in 195 of the comment submissions, representing 62 unique affiliations. These affiliations included government agencies, non-governmental environmental organizations, and organizations representing commercial, social, cultural, or recreation associations.

All public scoping comments were reviewed and will be used to inform the scope and development of the EIS. Section 4.4 at the end of this document provides the name of all individuals, agencies, and organizations that submitted comments and indicates the EIS chapters in which each commenter's comments will be considered (Table 3). Table 2 below lists the primary topics that were identified in the comment submissions and the chapter of the draft EIS that will likely address each comment topic. EIS chapters that will address comments include Purpose and Need; Alternatives; Affected Environment; Environmental Consequences, which includes Cumulative Impacts and potential mitigation measures; Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations; and Public Involvement. Comment submissions that provided input on multiple issues will be addressed in multiple EIS chapters. Examples of the primary comment topics expressed in the comment submissions are summarized in Section 4.3 below.

Table 2. Example Comment Topics Expressed in Public Comments and Draft EIS Chapters that Will Address Them [1,2,3]

Comment Topic	PN	ALT	AE	EC	CLR	PUB
Alternatives Analysis		X				
Public Coordination						X
Project Operations		X		X		
Timeframe/Schedule	X				X	
Adaptive Management and Monitoring		X		X		
Land loss and Sea Level Rise	X	X	X	X		
Flooding and Storm			X	X		
Geology and Sediment Transport			X	X		
Wetland Impacts			X	X		
Water and Sediment Quality			X	X		
Protected Species			X	X		
Marine Mammals			X	X		
Commercial Fishing			X	X		
Fish Resources			X	X		
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice			X	X		
Land-Based Transportation and Public Utilities		X	X	X		
Navigation			X	X		

Table 2. Example Comment Topics Expressed in Public Comments and Draft EIS Chapters that Will Address Them [1,2,3]

Comment Topic	PN	ALT	AE	EC	CLR	PUB
Environmental Impact Analysis and Modeling				X		
Cumulative Impacts				X		
Other		X		X		

[1]Many comments provided input on multiple issues and therefore will be addressed in multiple chapters of the draft EIS.

[2] PN = Purpose and Need, ALT = Alternatives, AE = Affected Environment, EC = Environmental Consequences, CLR = Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations; and PUB = Public Involvement

[3] Information presented in Table 2 is based on preliminary binning of comments after the scoping period. Comment topics may be addressed in other sections of the DEIS and FEIS.

4.2 Summary of Comment Topics: Form Letter versus Unique Letters

Approximately 555 (64 percent) of all comment submissions were form letters, all of which stated support for the proposed Project. The form letters had five primary themes, including:

- Land loss: Without action, Barataria Basin could lose an additional 550 square miles of land over the next 50 years.
- Timeframe/schedule: Request that the USACE act swiftly through all phases of the Project.
- Alternatives: All analyses of the proposed MBSD Project and its effects on the Barataria Basin should also consider the effects of NOT building this Project, which would result in continued loss that threatens our communities, wildlife, and culture.
- Public engagement: Regularly share information with the public and other stakeholders throughout the EIS and permitting process and at critical milestones.
- Adaptive management in operations: The operation of the proposed MBSD Project should provide as much flexibility as possible to modify operations over time in response to changing environmental conditions.

The unique (non-form) letters (316 letters) showed more variation in the types of comments expressed. Approximately 23 percent stated support for the proposed Project, 54 percent stated opposition, and 23 percent did not state support or opposition to the proposed Project. The topics expressed in comment submissions are explained in Section 4.3 below.

4.3 Examples of Comments by EIS Topic

Paraphrased examples of comments, both for and against the proposed Project, that illustrate recurring themes observed in the comment submissions are shown below, organized by topic category. All public scoping comments, including those not shown below, have been reviewed and will be used to inform the scope and development of the EIS. Appendix C includes all comments submitted.

4.3.1 Alternatives Comment Topics

Some of the comments suggested various alternative Project plans and alternative features to be considered for analysis in the Alternatives chapter in the draft EIS. Below are examples of comments related to this category.

- Sediment diversions have long-term benefits that constructed marsh creation projects do not; mainly that they can continuously build land over time and sustain existing and created wetlands.

- Sediment diversions and marsh creation projects should be used in tandem to increase their effectiveness over time.

- The EIS should analyze marsh creation projects through the beneficial use of dredged material as an alternative to the proposed Project.

- Marsh creation projects through the beneficial use of dredged material are much less damaging to the fisheries and the environment, and studies show that over a period of 50 years, these projects were more economically feasible than diversion projects.

- Plaquemines and Jefferson Parishes would get immediate protection from coastal flood surges by building rock barriers to slow down storm surge. It took hundreds of thousands of years to build the Louisiana estuary with the natural rise and fall of the Mississippi River's alluvial valley, and the proposed Project will not promise protection to anyone soon.

- The land-building capacity of the proposed diversion Project due to the availability of sediment in the river water is questionable. The uncertainty surrounding the projected land-building capacity of the proposed diversion and the experimental nature of the project make it difficult to arrive at an accurate cost-benefit analysis.

- Recommend that the proposed diversion Project include the creation of “Chenier-like” ridges in the freshwater areas extending into more brackish areas to slow down the flow of water and allow phytoplankton and zooplankton to remediate some of the excess nutrients, insecticides, and herbicides contained in the river water. Ridges would also create barriers for

storm surge and wind.

- The Project should include the construction of canals or bayous to disperse the main flow with some type of terracing or ridges to manipulate the current; when the water is allowed to meander away from the main flow is where the best restoration happens.

- Tidal saline waters should be pumped into the diversion outfall area to mitigate excess nutrients and allow for oxygenation of river water to prevent hypoxia.

- Consider using the excavated material from Project construction to raise the ground in Ironton, fortify the back levee, or fill in borrow pits rather than placing all excavated material in a disposal area.

- Consider an alternative Project design that includes risk reduction measures for Ironton and surrounding communities, such as raising homes to prevent flooding.

- Study the benefits of building the conveyance channel upriver from the proposed location, farther away from residences.

- Consider an alternative that does not include costly upgrades to the NOGC railroad and redirect this money toward other improvements.

- Consider an alternative plan that does not include the RAM Terminals coal export terminal.

- Compare the proposed Project to a future-without-Project alternative.

- Don’t just compare the Project to the No Action alternative; compare it to other coastal restoration alternatives that will not cause such adverse impacts on commercial fisheries.

- Conduct an alternatives study to compare potential costs and benefits of implementing a smaller diversion project in conjunction with using dredging/pipeline sediment delivery for marsh creation. The diversion could then be operated at lower volumes causing less environmental problems and fewer user conflicts.

- Maximize the silt load as much as possible. When the diversion is open at high sediment level and flowing full stream, the addition of dredges pumping into the conveyance channel may take advantage of full sediment load.

- Request that the guide levees on the Project be built to the 100-year hurricane and flood protection standard so that levee construction and

highway bridging will not have to be modified at a later date.

- Request explanation of having two gates versus a more cost-effective option of one gate.

- Submit Project alternatives that include economic and operational mitigation for fisheries, as well as alternatives that include marsh creation.

- Review multiple disposal areas, including areas in the western reach of the Barataria Waterway to reduce tidal events for the Upper Barataria coastal communities and possibly lessen flooding impacts due to the proposed Project.

4.3.2 Public Coordination Comment Topics

Some of the comments expressed support for public coordination and offered suggestions for optimizing the public engagement process. These comments will be addressed in the Public Coordination chapter of the draft EIS. Examples of this comment topic are provided below.

- Recommend that the decision-making process for this Project be transparent to the public.

- Including the public in this process can help shed light on threats and concerns that those lacking experience and local knowledge may miss.

- As the state's proposal for the scale of the proposed diversion has increased, estuarine fishers' role in the decision-making process for the Project has decreased.

- Need public engagement to come up with a consensus for operations.

- A public meeting should have been held in Lafourche Parish.

- Recommend that from this point forward you seek public comment at a public meeting in Lafourche Parish.

- Scoping should have been held within the Barataria Basin. Future meetings should be more accessible to stakeholders living within the basin.

- The state has not done enough to inform the fishermen and engage them through the planning process. CPRA (the Applicant) has not spoken publicly about how the Project would impact fisheries.

- Establish a gulf oyster industry stakeholder group for consultation during the development of the draft EIS.

- To date, only clear information has been received regarding the diversion's ability to build land; those in charge must study and circulate equally robust information about its effects on industry-dependent species (shrimp, oysters, crab, finfish, etc.) and Louisiana's commercial fishermen and coastal residents.

- Create forums for addressing commercial fishermen and their communities' concerns.

- Request more specific discussion about the Project with navigation stakeholders.

4.3.3 Project Operations Comment Topics

Below are examples of comments related to how the Project would be operated. These comments will be addressed in the Alternatives and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS.

- Request clarification as to whether the diversion will flow continuously or only when the river is above a certain velocity at the Belle Chasse gauge.

- The proposed Project suggests that the diversion would flow at a 5,000 cfs minimum flow at all times; this may be both impossible and unwarranted.

- Concerned that there is no legal mechanism or other means of enforcing any particular operational regime or operational parameters for the proposed diversion.

- The key to sustainability for fisheries is salinity at the right time of year. How will the operational regime be balanced for achieving the salinity regime best for fisheries sustainability versus building land at a reasonable rate?

- The oyster is primarily a bimodal spawner from April to May and again from September to November. How will the introduction of freshwater in the late winter/spring influence spring gonadal development? If the spring gonadal development and spawn is lost due to excessive fresh water input to the bay, how may this influence the fall spawning cycle?

- Running diversions primarily in the spring when up-stream water volume is highest will suffocate juvenile shrimp, crabs, and other species that use the bay to reach maturity from March to May. This will drastically impact both the size and volume of shrimp in the bay and gulf.

- Need public engagement, especially with commercial fisher people, to come up with a consensus for operations.

- Recommend that the proposed diversion carry as much sediment (suspended and/or bedload) from the river as possible and incorporates pulsing (fluctuating the amount of water diverted) to optimize sediment delivery to receiving area wetlands. To aid in optimizing sediment delivery, recommend incorporating a network of sediment monitoring stations/gauges upriver of the potential diversion to provide advanced notification of sediment pulses moving down-river so that opening of diversion structures can be planned/coordinated a few days in advance (and affected interests can be forewarned). Placement of sediment/turbidity gauges early during the planning phase would greatly improve the data needed to develop and select an operation plan that would maximize sediment delivery.

- Consider operations that prevent or minimize adverse impacts on wetlands due to prolonged inundation and focus on the overall enhancement of the entire Project area.

- Concerned about the 5,000 cfs base flow rate. A total freshwater closure at times of low-river would mimic pre-levee hydrological conditions, would be beneficial for marine fisheries, and would allow for a gradation from saltwater to freshwater marsh types as was historical in Louisiana. When you are not getting the benefits of silt, close off the freshwater.

- An operational plan must be developed that is approved by all parties including representatives from the navigation industry.

- The operations plan should be developed with coordination from non-profit organizations to mitigate fisheries damages and damages to marine mammals under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

- Concerned that CPRA, after talking about this operations plan as a concept since 2012, has not submitted an operations plan since the last round of scoping for this Project in 2011.

- If tax dollars will be spent to restore the coast, the best use of that money is to operate the Project at full capacity to maximize benefits to wetlands. If the Project isn't operated to its capacity, then building it is a waste of money.

- Suggest that a comprehensive basin-wide operation plan be developed to coordinate all the diversions and siphons for the health of the basin.

4.3.4 Timeframe/Schedule-Related Comment Topics

Some comments were related to expediting the permitting process and implementation schedule for the Project. These comments will be addressed in the Purpose and Need, and Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations

chapters. Below are examples of comments related to this category.

- Recommend that the permitting process be sped up. Total decimation of the marsh in Buras has happened in a short time, and it is happening daily throughout the state. The EIS process should not go on for years.

- Five years to achieve a permit for a project that is just one of many cornerstone projects in our state's Coastal Master Plan is completely unacceptable.

- Our land loss crisis is severe and urgent and will only worsen unless we act, and that means ensuring swift, effective implementation of the state's Coastal Master Plan, including the MBSD Project.

- A delay of two years behind the previously published Project timeline is unacceptable in light of the Project already having 30-plus years of analyses and studies completed. With such an extensive background of research, a completion date of October 2022 is too long and shows the inability of our federal partners to be able to expedite vital public works initiatives.

- Request that the USACE as well as all other federal agencies assist with expediting permits for the project.

- The scoping report should be completed and released to the public as soon as possible.

4.3.5 Adaptive Management and Monitoring Comment Topics

Some of the comments were related to suggestions for applying adaptive management, flexibility, and a monitoring program to the Project operation plan. These comments will be addressed in the Alternatives and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS. Below are some examples of comments related to this category.

- There needs to be a robust, long-term monitoring program that begins well in advance of initial operations to collect baseline data during permitting and construction.

- A robust adaptive management plan should be included in the EIS that provides the range of adaptive management options and their potential effects, the process for reviewing operational decisions and monitoring data using the best available science each year, and a regular means of communicating and interacting with the public about any planned changes to operations.

- The preferred alternative should provide the flexibility to modify operations

over time in response to changing environmental conditions.

- An adaptive management approach to the operations plan should include feedback from fishers (referred to as Traditional Ecological Knowledge) to gain insight on seasonal and annual fishery practices and seasonal fluctuations on where fish are located.

- Resilience for a fishery and its community must be at the core of adaptive management as much as land building and land maintenance.

- Suggest the creation of basin-level, multi-agency advisory committees that would provide scientific recommendations to guide the operation of the structure, ensuring a watershed approach in the operation of all basin diversions and siphons to meet restoration goals.

- Recommend that a monitoring and adaptive management plan (MAMP) be developed in consultation with scientists, natural resource agencies (including, among others, the National Marine Fisheries Service), and the public. The MAMP should clearly identify variables and issues to be monitored and describe the monitoring plan. Include the MAMP in the draft EIS so that it is available for public/stakeholder review and comment.

- The Project is located in a dynamic environmental context, so flexibility must be incorporated into the operation plan to operate this asset to its highest and best use in any environmental situation.

4.3.6 Land loss and Sea Level Rise Comment Topics

Below are examples of comments related to land loss. These comments will be addressed in the Purpose and Need, Alternatives, Affected Environment, and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS.

- Consider impacts to the basin under No Action. Barataria Basin has experienced tremendous change with tens of thousands of acres of wetlands having been converted to open water, threatening communities, industry, and wildlife.

- The 2017 State of Louisiana Coastal Master Plan predicts with the No Action alternative, Barataria Basin will lose roughly 550 square miles in the next 50 years under the medium future scenario.

- The draft EIS should describe the causes of wetland losses and conversion to more saline types, including the impact of isolation of the Mississippi River from its delta.

- It is important to have a reasonable estimate of the likelihood of successful

restoration in light of climate change and sea level rise.

- The USACE should study the impact of increased rates of sea level rise on the ultimate success of the diversion as a tool for rebuilding land in coastal Louisiana.

- The losses our region would continue to face without this diversion—from an environmental, cultural, and economic standpoint—would be devastating and irreversible.

- The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion is a big piece in the overall solution to the issues of coastal erosion.

- The land loss crisis here in Louisiana is so severe and urgent that action must be taken now. The proposed diversion would be a very important step to help protect the future of this very complex and diverse ecosystem.

- This project is desperately needed on the fast track; citizens' way of life and homes are in danger. Many people moved out of the area because of Hurricane Katrina. Without this Project there will be a loss of more residents.

- Land loss in South Louisiana is very apparent. It's imperative to use the land-forming power of the Mississippi River to build new land to buffer coastal communities.

4.3.7 Flooding and Storm Risk Reduction Comment Topics

Some of the comments were related to the proposed Project's potential impact on flooding and storm risk reduction. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and the Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS. Below are examples of comments related to this category.

- Lafitte and other communities near the Davis Pond diversion are subject to flooding when the Davis Pond diversion is operated at 10,000 cfs. The proposed MBSD diversion would introduce approximately 700 percent more water into those areas, exacerbating flood hazards in those communities that are already highly susceptible to flooding.

- The long-term benefit of natural sediment accumulation and land building will create sustainable wetlands that are vital to the community's storm resiliency.

- Request strong coordination with the USACE project team on the West Bank Non-Federal Levee System currently under design to ensure the projects are working together.

- The diversion will increase flooding in low-lying communities.

- Diversion-related flooding is likely to impact Vietnamese and Cambodian fishermen's homes and displace their families, and inflict physical damages to the fishing vessels docked in these low-lying areas.

- Request that the USACE evaluate the effects of increased water levels within the Upper Barataria Basin, specifically in the coastal communities of Grand Isle, Jean Lafitte, Barataria, and Crown Point.

- Assess whether punching a hole in the levee will destabilize the remaining river levee.

- Study how the Project will impact river levees and back levees, including how conveyance channel walls and the proposed pump station could change flooding dynamics around Ironton and surrounding areas. Ground this analysis in the current height and structural integrity of river levees and back levees.

4.3.8 Geology and Sediment Transport Comment Topics

Some of the comments were related to geology and sediment transport. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences chapter of the draft EIS. Below are examples of comments related to this category.

- In the CPRA documentation for the Basis of Design reports, there are indications of the existence of faults and recent fault activity in the immediate vicinity of the Project. Recommend that a thorough subsurface geological evaluation of the Project vicinity be conducted to determine the location of geological faults, the recent history of fault movement, and the effects of active faults on subsidence rates and variations in the thickness of highly compactible soils.

- Recommend that a review of the subsurface geology in the Project area using oil and gas industry 2-D and 3-D seismic data be performed and the potential rate of horizontal and vertical displacement due to fault movement be estimated.

- Will guidance documents and regulations from other states be considered and modified to help develop mitigation techniques to accommodate horizontal and vertical displacement due to fault movement in the Project area?

- Request that the USACE evaluate Sediment Retention Plans to maximize land accretion.

- An indirect impact resulting from the diversion may be the future loss of

sediments from being delivered to the Birds Foot Delta and hence the Delta National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). Request that estimates of sediment transport changes to the Delta NWR as a result of the proposed diversion be determined and provided for the life of the Project.

- Will the stability of the land around the diversion be affected, and will the Project affect the stability of nearby elevated homes?

- The sediment that the Mississippi River carries has continually declined. It is questionable how much sediment can be derived from this Project.

- Study how the Project may affect federally maintained navigation channels, oil field access channels, and natural streams.

4.3.9 Wetland Impacts Comment Topics

Below are examples of comments related to wetland impacts. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and the Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS.

- The diversion would make brackish wetlands more susceptible to storm surge.

- Investigate whether the Project would create “flotant” marsh that is much more susceptible to hurricanes and storm surge than saline/brackish marsh.

- There is scientific uncertainty regarding the potential wetland responses to large-scale river diversions. Some research findings suggest that nutrient loads in diverted waters, combined with low salinity, could reduce soil shear strength and make affected marsh habitats more susceptible to wind and hydrologic forces. Other reports document significant amounts of marsh erosion associated with natural diversions of the Mississippi River. This literature suggests it may take significant numbers of years for wetlands near the outfall location to recover from such impacts.

4.3.10 Water and Sediment Quality Comment Topics

Examples of comments related to water quality and sediment quality are provided below. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and the Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS.

- When the diversion is open, will the river still maintain enough head pressure or flow to maintain freshwater conditions in the Bird’s Foot Delta in Venice? Concerned that funneling so much water from the main flow of the river will allow further saltwater intrusion into the Bird’s Foot Delta.

- Nitrates, phosphates, chemical pesticides, mercury, and other pollutants in Mississippi River water will be delivered into the basin by the proposed Project.

- Establish baseline monitoring of water and sediment expected to flow through the diversion for fecal coliform. Set a maximum daily limit and flow rate on fecal coliform amounts that ensures that Department of Health limits are not breached that would result in unnecessary area oyster closures.

- Establish a baseline level through monitoring of dissolved oxygen content and nutrient loading.

- Establish baseline monitoring of water and sediment for fecal coliform.

- Anticipate enough water gauges and instruments.

- Mississippi River water contains high levels of Atrazine, an herbicide used in farming practices, that could prove hazardous to marine life and wetland stability in the Project area.

- Prior water quality sampling of Mississippi River water has found Atrazine, Fipronil, and Chlorothalonil entering the marsh at the Bayou Lamoque Ballendock structure.

- Issues that should be studied include the impact of increased nutrient levels and the potential for increased eutrophication in coastal bays as a result of the Project.

- Diversions should be designed to minimize unacceptable levels of eutrophication and contaminant introduction. Even micro-plastics may become a concern with such large volumes of water shunted into the wetlands.

- Monitoring of the Davis Pond and Caernarvon diversions indicated that some chemicals were being introduced into the receiving areas from the Mississippi River at increased levels.

- Analyze sediment samples to determine toxicity levels for substances such as lead, mercury, PCBs, and other harmful chemicals. Ensure that there are enough water gauges and instruments installed in multiple locations in the basin to gather comprehensive and real-time data on water quality, flow, salinity, dissolved oxygen, fecal coliform, circulation pattern, and sediment flow.

- To monitor chemicals transported by the diversion, recommend that during the study the USACE undertake periodic water quality sampling to help

determine if chemical concentrations could begin to pose a threat to fish and wildlife resources in the Project area.

- Currently, water from the Mississippi River causes a dead zone (hypoxic zone) the size of Connecticut in the Gulf of Mexico each year. Algae blooms are also highly likely once freshwater is introduced into the Barataria Basin.

- The diversion will potentially create hypoxia above the Bayou Dupont marsh creation. When the Naomi siphon wasn't running in 2015 and 2016, hypoxic conditions were identified northwest of the Pen. The Naomi Siphon has two pipes functioning at this point. The hypoxia associated with them has not been accounted for.

- Because of the Bayou Dupont marsh creation project, hypoxic effects to the north are seen because the newly created marsh is blocking the flow of tidal waters. Salinity north and northwest of the Bayou Dupont project has remained near zero since its construction, demonstrating that tidal mixing isn't occurring and is contributing to hypoxia. Will the proposed Project cause similar impacts?

- The Mid-Barataria diversion may create large areas of hypoxia and expand the current area of hypoxia in the Naomi Siphon area.

- Salinity gradients radically increase the diversity of fish and plants.

- While the "dead zone" is located offshore and generally away from oyster grounds, the oyster industry has seen in recent years an increase in the number of "mini-hypoxic" zones that have negatively affected oysters in nearshore areas where oysters are harvested. The expanding hypoxic dead zone and lowering of salinity levels through freshwater releases for the Caernarvon and Davis Pond Sediment Diversions and the Bonnet Carre Spillway are indicators of the potential threat to oyster populations posed by this diversion.

- Concerned that sediment and water diversion into upper estuaries will cause hypoxic dead zones in areas that are highly important to a variety of juvenile aquatic species.

- The introduction of massive quantities of freshwater into the basin will have widespread adverse impacts on water quality.

4.3.11 Protected Species Comment Topics

Recurring comments were related to threatened and endangered species, examples of which are shown below. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS.

- Entrainment issues through diversion structures off the Mississippi River and associated with dredging operations in the river are two potential effects on the pallid sturgeon that should be addressed in the study. With entrainment of pallid sturgeons through the diversion structure being a possible issue, potential methods (such as structure modifications) should be assessed to reduce possible entrainment and/or return entrained pallid sturgeons to the river. A population viability analysis (PVA) is recommended to evaluate the risk of the diversion on pallid sturgeons.

- Manatee occurrences have been reported just south of the Project area. Human activity is the primary cause for declines in species number due to, among other reasons, entrapment in flood control structures. If siltation or turbidity barriers are used for the Project, they should be properly secured, made of material in which manatees cannot become entangled, and be monitored to avoid manatee entrapment or impeding their movement.

- The primary effects expected on sea turtles will be due to habitat impacts. These impacts are likely to include changes in water quality and chemistry, sedimentation impacts, as well as habitat loss. These habitat impacts are also expected to cause the loss and redistribution of prey species.

- The EIS should evaluate the short-term and long-term potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the Project on threatened and endangered species.

4.3.12 Marine Mammals Impacts

Below are examples of comments related to marine mammals. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences chapter of the draft EIS.

- One potential impact from major diversions is to resident populations of marine mammals, specifically bottlenose dolphins. Freshening an entire estuary is possible with major sediment diversions, which could affect dolphin health as they do not readily relocate.

- Concerned about the families of dolphins that reside in the Barataria Basin. Many of them are ill from the BP oil spill. If they are exposed to large quantities of river water, they may suffer high mortality rates.

- Dolphins in the Barataria Basin are a genetically different population from others in the Gulf of Mexico. Local fishermen in the basin have described personal experiences in seeing sick or dead dolphins as a result of the BP oil spill and fear that more dolphins will get sick or die as a result of the Project.

4.3.13 Commercial Fishing Comment Topics

Many comments were related to fisheries as an industry or livelihood. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS. Examples of comments related to this category are provided below.

- The river water will bring additional sedimentation that will settle indiscriminately over oyster reefs, in some cases smothering the crop.

- The fecal coliform levels in the Barataria estuary will dramatically increase with the introduction of huge volumes of Mississippi River water. Because of this, oyster harvesting closures implemented by the Department of Health will be greatly expanded to include areas many miles away from the diversion outfall. This would make oyster farming virtually impossible within the Barataria Basin because oysters need at least two, and up to four years of stable salinity (10-25 parts per thousand [ppt]) and water quality to grow to market size.

- Establish a baseline salinity average and flow rate between the preferred range of oysters of 15-30 ppt.

- Establish a gulf oyster industry stakeholder group.

- Having community and individual outreach involvement is a giant step in the right direction, but those efforts have not diminished the anxiety and uncertainty that fisher men and women express with regard to potential impacts from the proposed diversion.

- A 5,000 cfs continuous flow may well render estuarine fisheries to unstainable harvest levels, especially if flowing during warm water periods.

- If an estuarine fishery is displaced from Barataria, how will that natural resource in adjacent Louisiana estuaries be influenced by a potential increase in fishing pressure? Will state management of the fishery need modification?

- Shrimping has drastically declined in the past few years, making it difficult for fisher men and women to make money. With the Project in place things may be even worse.

- Modeling results have suggested that a 75,000 cfs controlled sediment diversion into mid-Barataria Bay would have significant impacts on oysters, finfish, and shellfish (including shrimp).

- That much freshwater poured into the bay during the spring months when shrimp and other seafood are spawning will most likely kill them all. Oysters

will die instantly and baby shrimps and crabs will not have enough time and oxygen to move away from such a huge surge of freshwater. The diversion will certainly have a negative impact on fishing businesses economically.

- The Fiscal Year 2018 Senate Energy & Water Appropriations Bill includes the following language in its committee report: "The Committee encourages the Corps, when conducting or reviewing environmental assessments or environmental impact statements for navigation or coastal restoration projects in areas where oyster reefs exist, to consider water quality and salinity impacts on those reefs and, when appropriate, to mitigate any negative impacts."

- Develop mitigation recommendations for public oyster reef and private lease areas where oyster loss is expected to be significant as a result of the Project.

- Fully map Barataria Bay/Basin oyster reefs and lease areas in order to establish pathways for sediment deposit and ensure those deposits do not cover or silt over oyster grounds.

- Disclose what the state is planning to do with the thousands of oyster leases in Barataria Bay and adjoining waterways.

- Some shrimpers may not be able to adapt to the potential negative impacts of sediment diversions without assistance. The range of vulnerability and ability to adapt is widely varied by socioeconomics and business operations of each shrimper and further complicated by the uncertainty of the magnitude with which Project impacts may occur. A thorough analysis of concerns on the front-end will lead to more expeditious construction and more effective operation of the proposed Project in the long-term.

- The commercial fishing interests from Mississippi have seen firsthand the impacts diversions can have and therefore express strong concerns over any future projects that aim to divert water and/ or sediment from the Mississippi River.

- The EIS should identify the impacts of the diversion on brown shrimp, white shrimp, oysters, and other seafood that is the foundation of Louisiana's third largest industry.

- Diverting oyster leases will create job decline throughout southeast Louisiana. Without mitigation funding for job training, many regional oystermen will be without jobs.

- Suggest a loan or grant program for commercial fishing or small businesses to assist in transitioning or perform upgrades to be able to be resilient and continue fishing.

- The EIS should investigate mitigation measures for commercial fishing interests such as the relocation of oyster leases and “alternative oyster culture” using off-bottom technology.

4.3.14 Fish Resource Comment Topics

Some comments were related to biological fish resources. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS. Below are examples of comments related to this category.

- The timing of diversion flows may impact larval stages of shrimp.

- The loss of fish resources may impact predator-prey systems and may alter food webs.

- There is evidence that shrimp populations have declined with the Caernarvon freshwater diversion. This Project may have the same results and should not be implemented.

- The number and size of the shrimp population have been reduced because of other diversions that have operated in the area.

- Many advocates of the Project point to Caernarvon as a model for how to operate a diversion project for maximum sediment delivery. Unfortunately, advocates of that project overlook the damage done to oysters in the process from the increased sedimentation and reduction in salinity levels due to the greater freshwater releases.

- A thorough assessment of the marine resources that would likely to be impacted by this Project should be conducted during the draft EIS phase with the help of commercial fishermen who currently and historically operate in the areas likely to be impacted. These assessments will help to collect baseline data so that researchers can accurately quantify Project-induced changes in biomass and mortality for areas within the Mid-Barataria Basin.

- Conduct surveys and stock assessments to establish baseline population estimates on oyster abundance prior to project construction. Conduct annual follow up surveys and assessments once the project is operational to evaluate the impact of water flows, oxygen levels, and sedimentation on area oyster populations in both public reefs and private leases.

- Diversions limited to winter and early spring operations could potentially diminish spring spawning and spat and favor a more successful fall oyster spat set, and would more closely mimic historical freshwater introductions in the basin.

- The outflow of river water from the Project will dramatically shift salinities from brackish to fresh for multiple periods during the course of a year; thus killing oysters when salinities drop below 5 ppt.

4.3.15 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice Comment Topics

Some of the comments were related to potential Project impacts on local economies and communities. Many of these comments were submitted by fisher men and women, some of which were translated from Vietnamese and Cambodian. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS. Examples are shown below.

- A comprehensive economic analysis of the seafood industry and the impacts the proposed Project should include not only the direct impacts of areas in the outfall vicinity but also surrounding areas that would normally benefit from vibrant marine resources as they migrate throughout the Gulf Coast region. Such an analysis should factor in both recreational and commercial transient fishing vessels that operate in the region regularly, even though they may reside or operate in another state for a significant portion of any given year.

- A socioeconomic analysis is needed to assess the Project's expected impact on the Gulf of Mexico oyster industry.

- The impact on businesses by the diversion must be discussed but should not stop a project that benefits the health of both the coast itself as well as its inhabitants.

- Directly or indirectly, this Project is going to take many livelihoods. Venice, Myrtle Grove, Belle Chasse, all of the surrounding areas that deal with seafood are going to take a hit from it.

- Decades of neighboring land loss and the destruction caused by recent storms Katrina and Gustav have impeded business investment and business growth, and reduced employment in Plaquemines Parish's coastal areas. There is strong pessimism among small and large businesses that the "delay of action" and "no-action alternative" to the Mid-Barataria Diversion Project will cause current businesses to continue to delay investment, discourage hiring, and relocate. The EIS should describe the economic impact to the parish tax base, school taxes, business revenue, family income, federal and state investment, and social and mental health impacts due to delaying Project implementation and the "no action alternative" of this Project.

- Many fisher people in the Project area have no other skillset besides shrimping and say they are too old to learn new skills. Knowing very little English is an additional impediment they have to finding another livelihood.

- Many shrimp fishing families moved here from other countries knowing very little English and became fisher people in the basin partly because of this. They have small boats and fish specifically in the basin to be closer to their home and keep fuel costs down. They fear that the Project will force shrimp fisheries to move south into deeper, more saline ocean waters where bigger, more expensive boats are necessary to fish. They fear they will lose their income to support their families and would need to relocate out of the area.

- Children of shrimp fishermen in the Project area expressed concern that their fathers would lose their fishing business and they would not be able to finish high school and go to college.

- Request that the EIS study the Project impacts on shrimpers, family, quality of life, and communities, including the many families that rely on shrimping not only for their income but also for their food.

- The Project will cause dramatic losses in commercial and recreational shrimp and crab harvests from the Barataria Basin. The loss of the fisheries for income and as a means of sustenance will cause major hardship and bring about economically forced displacement of families from the coastal communities that surround the Barataria Basin. Those communities include Cut-off, Golden Meadow, Leeville, Grand Island, Lafitte, Myrtle Grove, Grand Bayou, Happy Jack, Port Sulphur, Empire, Buras, and Venice. With the displacement of their fisherman families, many of these communities will lose much of their core social-cultural fabric.

- Commercial fishers are business people who are an integral part of the "Human Environment" within the pending EIS being prepared for the Project. This includes the charter boat industry and the ancillary businesses such as fuel docks, marinas, hardware stores, motels, and grocery stores that rely on fishers and recreational groups for revenue.

- Like any sustainable business, there is a need for fishers to develop future strategy planning, which requires a degree of predictability based on past experiences. The problem is that coastal restoration activities have not routinely provided fishery businesses with definitive answers to reinforce their ability to rely on past experiences to plan their future actions and investments.

- There needs to be more regular transparency so that commercial fishing people know whether to continue to invest in their operations.

- Recommend looking at progressive contracting language to encourage contractors to work with local community based organizations to promote training, workforce development, and hiring for restoration projects.

- Communities such as the Native Americans in Grand Bayou, Vietnamese

fishermen, and low-income resident fishers of Plaquemines, Jefferson, and Lafourche Parishes may be adversely impacted by this project.

- The proposed diversion would have a disproportionate impact on low-income and minority populations along the coast who rely on fisheries as a means of earning a living.

- Will the state have a mitigation plan ready to help the industry, especially for those commercial fishermen who rely on the fisheries in the basin for their livelihood?

- Request a socio-economic analysis of the project's expected impact on the Gulf of Mexico oyster industry. The analysis should encompass not only oyster harvesters and private leaseholders, but oyster processors, dealers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers and restaurants as well, not only within the State of Louisiana but including other gulf states given that Louisiana oysters are processed and distributed widely within the region. The analysis should also assess the economic impact on local communities, employment, and governments as well as the impact on the cultural fabric of these communities.

- Recommend analyzing the short- and long-term direct and indirect economic and social effects on individuals, households, businesses, and communities caused by continuing land loss and saltwater intrusion in the proposed Project area.

- Time is a critical component in a comprehensive assessment of the true cost-benefit of a project; recommend that the USACE use trajectory economics for assessing the flow of economic services in their evaluations of the proposed Project when compared to other means of coastal restoration.

- A thorough socioeconomic evaluation should be undertaken, based on fishery model outputs and established socioeconomic valuation methodologies. This information should be based on both short-term and long-term fishery model outputs both with and without project implementation.

- Consistent with Executive Order 12898, the economic and social/cultural effects on particularly vulnerable populations (tribal groups, minorities, and low-income populations) should be assessed. A description of the labor markets in the affected communities within the proposed Project area will allow better understanding of the employment choices that people in these vulnerable populations have as many of these communities are likely to be rural and thus isolated.

- Inundating the bay with fresh water will kill most shrimp larvae in the area. Those that do survive will be pushed farther out into the gulf, beyond the

water boundary designated by Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission. This will disallow the majority of Vietnamese and Cambodian fisher people, most of whom have small vessels, from participating in the industry, forcing them to find employment and possibly residence elsewhere.

- This study should explicitly identify the impacts of the diversion on brown shrimp, white shrimp, oysters, and other seafood that is the foundation of Louisiana's third largest industry to holistically evaluate the direct effects of diversions not just on marine life, but on the thousands of commercial boat owners, deckhands, fishing-dependent small businesses, and families who rely on them for survival.

- Diverting oyster leases will create job declines throughout southeast Louisiana. As CPRA has not allocated any mitigation funding for fishermen to relocate or train for new careers, many of the region's oystermen will be out of a job.

- Will there be loan and grant programs for commercial fishing and other small businesses to assist in transitioning their operations and perform upgrades to mitigate potential loss?

- Will there be state assistance if the fishing communities have to relocate?

- Will there be a state-led community mitigation plan if key fisheries and/or the entire industry is harmed by freshwater inundation? Will there be a mitigation plan for damaged boats, docks, and gear?

- Concerned about compensation for the fishermen who may be temporarily or permanently displaced by a diversion project. Would a buy-out be in order to prevent fishermen from being bankrupt by the diversion? This is important so they are compensated but also so they cannot block the Project for the rest of us who are adversely impacted by eroding and disappearing wetlands.

- Release the findings on this action’s impact on low-income residents.

- How can the proposed action increase employment opportunities for disadvantaged businesses and women-owned businesses?

- Request that the state provide grant assistance for fisher people in the basin to buy larger boats so that they may continue shrimping in deeper waters if the Project adversely impacts shrimp fisheries in the basin.

4.3.16 Land-Based Transportation and Public Utilities Comment Topics

Some of the comments and questions were related to potential Project impacts on land-based transportation and public utilities. These comments will be addressed in

the Alternatives, Affected Environment, and Environmental Consequences chapters of the draft EIS. Below are some examples of comments related to this category.

- The Louisiana Highway 1 roadbed is the only roadway supporting access to Port Fourchon and the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port, servicing 16 percent of America's domestic crude oil production and 5 percent of its natural gas production. Protecting this federally listed "High Priority Corridor", designated as such by the U.S. Congress in 2001, is vital to America's energy production and reserves in the Gulf of Mexico. The proposed Project would help protect this vulnerable but crucial infrastructure with long-term benefits of land building over time.

- Commenter expressed opposition to spending restoration dollars on a rail expansion into Ironton. Pollution, noise, and safety issues led to the removal of the rail from Ironton. Seeking to slip this rail bridge, and environmental review for a rail bridge, into another project with vast political support is unacceptable.

- Clarify why funds from the coastal restoration project are being used for a railroad that is privately owned.

- What will traffic flow be like on LA 23 during construction of the diversion?

- Study anticipated traffic, traffic patterns, and safety implications for the proposed LA 23 bridge and rail bridge. How will Ironton have unimpeded access to LA 23?

- Provide justification for using coastal restoration dollars to build a private rail company bridge that would end in the woods.

- Study what kind of rail traffic is planned for the rail, the economic feasibility and justification of this rail line, how rail traffic would impact the safety of Ironton (particularly evacuation routes in the foreseeable event of a significant weather event), and how rail traffic could impact the river levee.

4.3.17 Navigation Comment Topics

Some comments were related to navigation in the Project area. These comments will be addressed in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences chapter of the draft EIS. Examples of comments related to this category are provided below.

- The Mississippi River is a critical waterway for exporting goods from the U.S. to the world market. What are the possible consequences of continued wetland loss in the Barataria Basin on river navigation?

- Concerned about increased siltation of navigable waterways near diversion structures generating a need for increased maintenance dredging.

- If multiple diversions are to be operated simultaneously, or if the river experiences a period of very low stages, sufficient draft for shipping could be threatened.

- Concerned about potential Project impacts on the navigation channel including the potential development of a scour hole at the entrance to the diversion structure, increased shoaling in the area surrounding the diversion structure, and the flow of water into the diversion canal being strong enough to alter the path of vessels transiting in the general vicinity of the diversion location.

- CPRA should have dedicated funding set aside to ensure it can fund and execute dredging contracts attributable to the proposed sediment diversion.

4.3.18 Environmental Impact Analysis and Modeling

Some comments were related to how the Project alternatives would be analyzed and environmental impacts would be modeled. These comments will be addressed in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the draft EIS. Examples of comments related to this category are provided below.

- Include local Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) in ecological and climate change modeling of anticipated and/or foreseeable impacts that could impact the MBSD Project design and surrounding areas. Also, complete a TEK study of the Project area that includes nearby and adjacent communities, particularly black and indigenous communities and fishing communities.

- Don’t just analyze long-term benefits, also look at near-term (1-5 years) benefits. Is it possible to conduct alternative studies that focus on maximum land building from dredging/pipeline delivery utilizing the smallest diversion possible? The present focus by the state is not the near-term (1-5 years) of how a diversion will economically impact the human factor, but rather the projected long-term (20+ years) benefits of using a massive input of freshwater to move and place sediment.

- Address the following in fisheries modeling for the Project: the significant overlapping of species habitats (for example, white and brown shrimp fishing grounds) in the basin, the circular eddying current that brings gulf and Mississippi River waters up into the estuary through its tidal passes in the basin, and the well-known seasonal “dead zone” of hypoxic to anoxic habitat in the basin.

- If sea levels rise higher or faster than current CPRA projections, how will the

diversion's land-building ability be impacted? At what level of sea level rise do the diversion's effects become negligible? The USACE should study the impact of increased rates of sea level rise on the ultimate success of the diversion as a tool for rebuilding land in coastal Louisiana.

- A river diversion into Mid-Barataria has been studied extensively over the years and the decisions, models, and information gathered from those efforts should be integrated into this present study.

- A means of downplaying negative effects has been by using large-scale modeling that intentionally extends the scope of the model to cover larger areas besides those where the most direct impacts occur. An oyster grower from Lafitte whose leases in the Barataria Bay are rendered useless from the diversion, will not benefit if oyster farming improves elsewhere, far from their home. Recommend that the results of the environmental and economic impacts are divided and presented into smaller identifiable zones, from the direct outfall area of the diversion moving outward. Compare the future success of other marsh creation projects in the Project area with and without the proposed diversion.

4.3.19 Cumulative Impacts Comment Topics

Several comments related to concerns about how the draft EIS would address cumulative impacts of the Project along with other projects in the Project area. These comments will be addressed in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the draft EIS. Below are examples of comments related to this category.

- Consider existing and future coastal restoration projects both in the vicinity of the diversion outfall and within the footprint of freshwater dispersion, and how the proposed Project would impact those projects.

- Recommend examining the cumulative impacts of multiple proposed diversions operating simultaneously.

- Recommend that the EIS consider cumulative impacts of the existing Davis Pond diversion and siphons in the basin. The EIS should discuss how all diversions and siphons could be operated in conjunction with each other to minimize adverse impacts and maximize beneficial effects specifically to migratory birds and other resource species.

4.3.20 Other Comment Topics

There were other comment topics that did not fall under any of the above comment topics. Examples are provided below.

- RAM Terminals coal export terminal: Study how the proposed coal export

terminal or any pilings in the river and barges sited near/adjacent to the diversion would affect sediment flow and navigation. Study how the coal export terminal may affect water quality in the Project area. This comment would be addressed in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the EIS.

- Land rights: What would happen to the ownership rights (both mineral and surface rights) if the marsh land in question is inundated? Would it erase monuments and call in question ownership between the landowner and the state? This comment would be addressed in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the EIS.

- Invasive species: The majority of Louisiana's most troublesome invasive species are freshwater-dependent aquatic organisms. These species may expand their range as new diversions come online and create new freshwater habitat. These invasive species could be an impediment to navigation, impact boat launches, displace native species, and have a general negative change on other living resources. This comment would be addressed in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the EIS.

- Real estate: Investigate whether the land proposed for construction of the diversion is already leased. This comment would be addressed in the Alternatives chapter of the EIS.

- Levees: Will putting a hole in the levee to construct the diversion Project destabilize the remaining river levee? This comment would be addressed in the Environmental Consequences chapter of the EIS.

4.4 List of Commenters

Table 3 below lists each individual or agency commenter by name and indicates where the comment will likely be addressed in the draft EIS. Comments that were submitted by agencies or organizations (identified by those with formal signatures or letterheads) are named by the agency or organization rather than an individual's name. EIS chapters that will address comments include the Purpose and Need; Alternatives; Affected Environment; Environmental Consequences, which includes Cumulative Impacts; Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations; and Public Involvement. An individual scoping comment may be categorized under more than one EIS subject matter heading. Appendix C includes all comment submissions, organized in alphabetical order.

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Abdelnoor, Gregory	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Acosta, Heather	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Acs-Ray, Julie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Adams, Anthony	AE EC
Adams, Katherine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Agnew, Grace	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Albers, Chris	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Albert, Danny	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Albertine, Sissy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Alcazar-O'Dowd, Diana	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Allen, Richard	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Amedeo, M /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
America's Wetland Foundation	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Andrews, Barbara	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Andrews, Becky	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Anonymous, 1	ALT EC
Anonymous, 2	AE EC
Anonymous, 3	ALT AE EC
Anonymous, 4	ALT AE EC
AOS Interior Environments	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Armstrong, Bobbie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Armstrong, Suzanne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ashman, Cole /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ashman, Wanda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ashton-Jones, Evelyn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Aubrey, Claire	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Babin, Karen /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Babineaux, Carolyn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Baker, Pamela	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Baker, Raquel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Baldo, Hannah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ball, Beverly	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program	ALT AE EC PUB
Barbier, Sandra	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Barnes, Patrick /BFA Environmental	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Barnett, Stacy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Barras, Devin	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Barron, Mary Rose	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Barron, Tiobe	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Barry, Beverly	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Barry, Paul	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Baxter, Jo	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bazare, Judith	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bech, Diane /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bechtel, Deb	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Becnel, Karl	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Beeson, Roy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Belanger, Neal	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Benge, Robert	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Benitez, Victoria	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Berg, Elizabeth	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bergeron, Amy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bernard, Bryan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bernard, Pam /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bernstein, Joseph landowner	ALT AE EC
Big River Coalition	ALT AE EC
Billington, Scott /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bird, Oscar	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Biss, Jeffery	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Blanchard, Captain Cyrus	ALT AE EC
Blanchard, Dean	PUB
Blanchard, Dean	PN ALT AE EC
Bledsoe, Derek	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Blink, Richie /Plaquemines Parish	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Boatright, Michael /Marine Gardens LLC	ALT
Boeckman, Evelyn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bohmsach, Rebecca	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Boimare, Frank /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bolliger, Charlotte	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bond, George /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bond, Tim	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bonnaffons, Blake	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Borland, M /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Boudreaux, Brenda /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Boudreaux, Michael /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Boulet, Henri	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Bounds, Courtney	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bourg, Lauren	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bourgeois, Carl	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bourgeois, Webley	ALT AE EC PUB
Bourlet, Brett	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bowers, Peggy /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bradford, Jennifer	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bradley, Alice	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bradley, Lisa	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bradley, Ryan	AE EC
Braud, Ralph	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Braud, Taylor	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Bray, Amanda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brehm, Lisa /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brignac, Kathryn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brockbank, Derek	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brown, Dana	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brown, Gertrude	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brown, Gwyn /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brown, Joseph /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Brown, Thomas	ALT AE EC
Bryant, William	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Buquet III, James	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Buras, Paul	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Burch, Piper /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Burnham, Donald	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Burton, Jordan /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Bush, Lisa	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cafiero, Art	PN ALT CLR
Caillouet, Judy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Callaway, Sherry	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Calleja, Marta	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cambre, Michael	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Camel, Nancy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Campbell, Jacqueline /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Camus, Nathalie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cangelosi, Jo	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Carr, Rebecca	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Carter, Samantha	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Cass Marine Group LLC	PUB
Cerise, Helene	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Champagne, Hazel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Chan, Yi	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Chanda, Somphet	AE EC
Chaney, Wanda /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Charbonneau, Aimee /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Chauvin, William	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Chav, Saran	AE EC
Chavis, Jeanne /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cheap, Sovann	AE EC
Cheron, Po	AE EC
Chhong, Pok	AE EC
Chhum, Norng	AE EC
Chien, John	AE EC
Chien, John	AE EC
City of New Orleans	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Cleveland, Kevin	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cloos, Maggie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Close, Robert	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cloud, Jarrett	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana	AE EC
Coastal Communities Consulting, Inc.	AE EC
Coats, Timothy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cochran, Steve /Restore the Mississippi River Delta	PN ALT EC CLR
Cohn, Robert /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cole, Tracy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Colgin, Heather	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Condon, Craig	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Conn, Craig	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Conoco Phillips	PN ALT AE EC
Cooper Jr., Acey	PN ALT AE EC

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Copeland, Patricia /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Coulon, Daniel	AE EC
Coulson, Jennifer /Orleans Audubon Society	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Crail, Patricia	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Creppel, Foster	PN ALT AE EC
Creppel, Jacques	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Crews, Woody	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Cromartie, Margaret	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cruz, Brian	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cuadrado, Lola	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Cuadrado, Lola /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
D, Patrick	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dang, Kim	AE EC
Daniell, Anne	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Dao, James	AE EC
Dao, Ly Thi	AE EC
David, Connie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
David, Connie /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
De Godoy Lopes, Nicholas	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
De Lerno, Jacqueline /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Decareaux, Jeanne /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Declouet, Andrea	ALT AE EC
Deer, Vicki	PN ALT AE EC
Del Conte, Tom	PN ALT AE EC
Delahoussaye, Gary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Denman, Cathrine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dennard, Mary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dennis, Patrick	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Denny, Robbie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Derbes, Bob	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Derieg, GW	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Deroche Jr, Russel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Deroche Jr, Russel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Devall, Reverand Fred	PN ALT AE EC
Devine, Lauren	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Diep, Nga Diem Thi	AE EC
DiSalvo, Catherine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Do, Bup	AE EC
Do, Dan Chinh	AE EC
Do, Kiet	AE EC
Do, Steven	AE EC
Do, Yen Huynh	AE EC
Dodds, Barbara	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dodds, Barbara /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dodge, Daisy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dodge, Virginia	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dougherty, Dennis	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Doyle, Seamus /St. John's Episcopal Church	PN ALT CLR
Doyle, Sydney	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dreste, Arlene	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Driscoll, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dugin, Paula Cristina /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Duncan, Monica /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dunn, Richard	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Dupont, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Durbin, Myong	AE EC
Durham, D.	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Durham, Desiree /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Duthu, Gwen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Edgecombe, Kevin	PN ALT AE EC
Edmunds, Susan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Edmunds, Susan /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Edmunds, Susan Hester	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Elleson, David	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ellis, Haydee	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ellis, Shawn	AE EC
Ellis-Vickers, Camille	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Elsee, Allison	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Evans, Gerald	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Everson, Bart	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Ewy, Christine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Falgout , Ted	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Farrell, Sally /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fazende, Denice	AE EC

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Feldman, Alisha	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ferguson, Ray /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fischer, Darlene	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fitzpatrick, Pat	ALT AE EC
Flores, Linda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Foley, Mary Ellen /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Font, Nico /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Forbes, Courtney	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Forbes, William	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Foreman, Randall	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Forshag, Mark	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fortier, Barney	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fortier, Barney	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Foster, Lonie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fouquet, Errol /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fox, James	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Frank, Deborah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fraser, Bruce /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Freitas, Julene	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Freshney, Pam	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Freshney, Pam /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Frickey, Eric	PN ALT AE EC
Friedman, Carolyn Honey /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fruge, Bernadette	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Fuglaar, Mary /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gancarz-Davies, Eilise	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gardiner, Robert	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Garner, Joan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gartner, Rudolph	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gauthier, Sarah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gautreaux, Jaleh	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gautreaux, Karen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gelbart, Susannah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gelsomino, Rene	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gelsomino, Rene	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
George, Ronnie /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gettle, Angelique	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Gilbert, Valerie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gilley, Patricia /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ginn, Sherry	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gonzales, Edward	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gonzalez, Margaret	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Goodall, Carrie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Goodwin, Mattie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gordon, Ben /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gorman, Robert	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gossett, Wayne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gould, Marie /Louisiana Lost Lands Environmental Tours, L3C	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Graham-Gardner, Rosemary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Grams, Richard	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Grant, Elaine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Greater Lafourche Port Commission	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Greater New Orleans, Inc.	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Guidroz, Mel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Guidry, Clinton	PUB
Gulf Restoration Network	ALT AE EC
Gurley, Grant /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Gutelius, Phyllis	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Guy-Ostrowski, Jamie Lynn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Guy-Ostrowski, Jamie Lynn /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Haeuser, Rechard	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Haley, Rob	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hall, Shawn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hall, Wesley	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Halligan, Everett	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Halvorson, Jacqueline	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hamilton, Michelle	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hammond, Monica	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hammond, Monica /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hanby, Roma	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Handley, Jeana /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hangartner, Sarah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hansen, Michelle	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Harper, Monica /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Harrington, Debbie /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Harris Jr, Russell	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Harrison, Dianne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Harrison, Ellen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Harrison, Patricia	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hart, Alan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hartley, Kay	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Harville, Emily	PN CLR
Harville, Emily /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Haydel, Gregory	ALT AE EC
Hayes, Caroline /AOS Interior Environments	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Hebert, Jacques	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hebert, Jacques	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Heine, AJ /St. Augustine's Episcopal Church	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Henderson, Alice	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Henling, Daniel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Henry, Donata	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Herke, William	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hernandez, Gina /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Herren, Patrick /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Herrera, Vanessa	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hidalgo, Charlotte	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hidalgo, Stephen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hieng, Thiraphomrin	AE EC
Hightower, Christine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Him, Mony Cheath	AE EC
Hixson, Rosetta /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hodnett, Malcolm	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hooper-Bui, Linda	ALT AE EC
Horn, Keith /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Howard, Doris /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Howard, Sara	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Howard, Sarah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hubbell, Todd	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Hunter, Denise	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Huntsman, Debbie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Huon, Noert	AE EC
Hurst, Laurie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Huu, Ninh	AE EC
Huynh , Dominic	AE EC
Ihrke, Ashley	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
In, Kimyin	AE EC
In, Kimyin	AE EC
In, Leng	AE EC
Ioup, Georgette	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
James, Mavis	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Jefferson Parish	PN ALT AE EC
Jennings, Scott	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Jennings, Scott /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Johnson, Arthur /Center for Sustainable Engagement and Development	PN ALT EC CLR
Johnson, Chessa Rae /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Johnson, Happy	ALT AE EC
Johnson, Jean	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Johnston, Jennifer	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Johnston, Jennifer /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Jones, Daniel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Jones, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Jones, Steven	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Judge, Patrick /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Judge, Patrick /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Juneau, Lonnie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Jurisich, Frank	ALT AE EC
Kable, Charlann	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kamenitz, Laura	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kaminski, Kathleen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kang, Chamroeun	AE EC
Kanter, Sharon	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kay, Sovann	AE EC
Keenan, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Keller, Jack	PN ALT AE EC
Keo, Bunly	AE EC
Keyser, Kaori	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Khin, Sochenda	AE EC
Kiek, Siekleng	AE EC
Kilcommons, Mary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kim, Khel	AE EC
Kim, Khel	AE EC
Kimble, Albertine	ALT EC
Kinabrew, Catherine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kinabrew, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kineman, David	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
King, Wendy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kinler, Stephanie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kleinke, Andrea	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Kong, Seng	AE EC
Kong, Sovanara	AE EC
Kruth, Phally	AE EC
Kuhns, Deborah	PUB
Kuhns, Tracy	ALT AE EC PUB
Kurtz, Sheila	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
La Caze, Doris /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
LaBeaud, Wayne /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
LaBorde, Dennis	AE EC
Laborde, Marc	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lacinak, Juluie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lafleur, Donnette /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lafleur, Todd	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lai, Hen Kim	AE EC
Lam, Christi	AE EC
Lam, Kiet	AE EC
Lam, Lee	AE EC
Lambert, Ryan /Cajun Fishing Adverntures	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Lambeth, Ron	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lampton, Sue	PN ALT AE EC
Landry, Barry	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Landry, Roy	PN ALT AE EC
Laska, Anthony	PN CLR
Lassalle, Kennith /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lat, Chhiet	AE EC

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Latch, Talia	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lawrence, Conrad	ALT AE EC
Lay, Ly Kim	AE EC
Lazaro, Joseph	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Le, David R.	AE EC
Le, May Van	AE EC
Le, Que	AE EC
Le, Que	AE EC
Le, Que	AE EC
Le, Sang	AE EC
Leabeaud, Wayne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
LeBlanc, Gauth	ALT AE EC
LeBlanc, Lanvin	AE EC
LeBlanc, Lanvin	AE EC
Leblanc, Suzanne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Leboeuf, Brenda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
LeBoeuf, Michelle	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Leming, Chad /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Leming, Chad /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lemoine, Kathryn /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lessen, Linda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lewellyan, Colin /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lewis, Phoebe	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ligi, Toni	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lim, Chhay	AE EC
Lim, Seng	AE EC
Lima, Chhay	AE EC
Lima, Suni /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lirette, Terry	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Liv, Niem	AE EC
Livingston, Janet	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lopes, Nicholas /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lortie, Claire /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Louisiana Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries	ALT AE EC
Louisiana Oyster Dealers & Growers Association and the Gulf Oyster Industry Council	AE EC
Louisiana Oyster Task Force	ALT AE EC

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Louisiana Shrimp Association	ALT AE EC
Luong, Uyen	AE EC
Luquette, Ron	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lusk, Dede	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Luster, Deborah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Lyons, Lynne /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
M, Linda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
MacArthur, Samantha	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mack, Sarah	AE EC
Man, Cave	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mang, Caroline	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Manhart, Fred	AE EC
Manieri, Ellen /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mao, Chandarasy	AE EC
Marciante, Sandra /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Marone, Susan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Martin, Celeste	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Martin, Elaine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Marx, M	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Matherne, Gordon	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Matherne, Olympia	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Maumus, Marianne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mayor of Jean Lafitte	AE EC
McAnespy, Henry	AE EC
McAnespy, Henry	AE EC
McCormick, Bryan /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
McCormick, Jeff /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mccready, Tamara	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
McDonald, Emily	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mcgee, Loretta	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
McKinnon, Dotty	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
McLellan, Julia /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
McLin, Jaesa	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
McNeely, Tom /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Meador, Patricia	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mech, Jessica	AE EC
Medlin, Tony	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Meehan, Garrett	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mehrotra, Ayan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Melancon, Earl	ALT AE EC PUB
Merrigan, Anita /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Merrigan, Anita /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mestayer, Christopher	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Meyer, Donna /St. Mary Chamber of Commerce	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Michalos, Effie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Michalos, Effie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Michalos, Effie /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Middleton, Ann	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Middleton, Ann /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Midkiff, Robert	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mielke, Howard /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Miller-Becnel, Karen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mills, Alison /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mills, Susan /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Minton, Rebecca	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Miremont, Linda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mislove, Michael /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United, Inc.	AE EC
Mobley, Lawanda Smith	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Mok, Lovy	AE EC
Moncla, Shari	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Montgomery, Nathan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Moore, Amanda	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Moore, Evelyn /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Moore, Mandy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Morello, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Morgan, Jane	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Morgan, Jeffery	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Morris, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Moss, Ben /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Munson, Amanda /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Murphy, Spencer /Canal Barge Company, Inc.	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Murphy, Todd /Jefferson Chamber of Commerce	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Muth, David	PN ALT CLR

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Mysing-Gubala, Mary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Nakashima, Pamela	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Nasca, Andrea /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
National Marine Fisheries Service	ALT AE EC
Nause, Chrystal	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Nehrbass, Elizabeth	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Neumeister, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Neumeister, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
New Orleans Geological Society	AE EC
New Orleans Gulf Coast Railway	AE EC
Newman, Judith /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Nguyen, Canh V.	AE EC
Nguyen, Dung Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Giau Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Giau Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Hue Thi	AE EC
Nguyen, Hung Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Lap Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Loan thi	AE EC
Nguyen, Mao Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Muoi	AE EC
Nguyen, Nhan	AE EC
Nguyen, Nuong	AE EC
Nguyen, Phuoc	AE EC PUB
Nguyen, Sau Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Tam	AE EC
Nguyen, Tam	AE EC
Nguyen, Thanh	AE EC
Nguyen, Thanh	AE EC
Nguyen, Thuy	AE EC
Nguyen, Thuy	AE EC
Nguyen, Truc	AE EC
Nguyen, Van	AE EC
Nguyen, Van	AE EC
Nielsen, Nathan /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Nikolovski, Zoran	ALT AE EC
Nixon, Brenda	PN ALT AE EC CLR

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Norn , Sokthan	AE EC
O'Brien, Carter	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Odau, Elizabeth	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Odau, Elizabeth /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Odom, Erika	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ogilvy, Avis /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ogilvy, Avis /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Olivares, Augustin	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Oliver, Leslie /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Oliver, Marsha	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Om, Lynda	AE EC
Om, Ritha	AE EC
Om, Rithy	AE EC
ORA Technologies, LLC	PUB
Ordoyne, Michael	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Osborn, Jessica	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
O'Shea, Lynn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
O'Shea, Lynn /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Otero, Edward	ALT AE EC
Otero, Edward	ALT AE EC
Oum, Thanary	AE EC
Oum, Thanary	AE EC
Ourso, Caroline /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Paddock, Denise	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Palmasino, Tara	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Parker, Sandra	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Parria Jr., Louis	AE EC
Parria Sr., Gavin	AE EC
Parria Sr., Ross	ALT AE EC PUB
Parria Sr., Ross	AE EC
Parria, Christy	AE EC
Parria, Gavin C.	AE EC
Parria, Kelli	AE EC
Parria, Melissa	AE EC
Patterson, Helen Rose	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Patterson, Helen Rose	PN ALT EC CLR
Paulin, Jo Ann	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Payronnin, Natalie /Environmental Defense Fund, Restoring the Mississippi River Delta Campaign	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Pellerin, Tyra	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Pellerin, Tyra /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Peltier, Stephen	PN ALT AE EC
Peou, Sokunthea	AE EC
Percy, Katie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Percy, Patrick	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Perez, Laura	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Perez, Mary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Perrin, Mary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Perry, Michele	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Perry-Jones, Jean	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Peteinaraki, Maria	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Peters, Lynn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Peters, Lynn /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Pevny, Charlotte	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Pham , Bui Huu	AE EC
Pham, Khanh	AE EC
Phan, Sang	AE EC
Phan, Sang	AE EC
Phan, Sang Van	AE EC
Phan, Thanh Van	AE EC
Phea, Srinuon	AE EC
Pheap, Rith	AE EC
Phillips 66 Alliance Refinery	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Phillips, Matthew	AE EC
Phon, Pheap	AE EC
Phorn, Malachi	ALT AE EC
Phorn, Phen	AE EC
Phu, Phuong	AE EC
Pierce, Duane	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Pierce, Duane /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Pilgreen, Ronnie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Pizani, Chris	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Plaisance, Mike	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Plavidal, Matthew /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Plicque, Ann	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Plork, Phan	AE EC
Poag, Susan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Poche, Brieaux	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Poche, Brieaux /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Pomper, Liz	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Porter, Altion	PN ALT AE EC
Potter, Robert	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Preston, Lynne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Prom, Sandy	AE EC
Prum, Thou	AE EC
Prum, thou	AE EC
Pulaski, Christopher	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Radley, Jamie Lynn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ragas, Kenneth	ALT AE EC
Ragas, Kenneth	ALT AE EC
Ramirez, Michael	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ramoni, Elizabeth	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Randolph, Brooke	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ray, Sovann	AE EC
Raymond, David /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Redmond, Betty	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Redwomin, Thunder	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Reichard, Lynne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Remo, Leif	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Renfro, Alisha	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Restore or Retreat, Inc.	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Restore the Mississippi River Delta	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Restore the Mississippi River Delta	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Rhein, Sandy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Rhein, Sandy /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Rhein, Sandy /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Rhode, Rachel	PN CLR
Richard , Andrew	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Richard, Francis	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Richard, Pamela	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Richards, Derrick	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Richards, Derrick	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ricks, George	AE EC
Ricks, George /Save Louisiana Coalition	AE EC
Ricks, George /Save Louisiana Coalition	PN ALT AE EC
Riley, Kelly	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ritter, Jessie /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT EC CLR
Rivere, Gina	PN ALT AE EC
Roberts, Michael /Go Fish, Louisiana Shrimp Association, Save Louisiana Coalition, Louisiana Bayou Keeper	ALT AE EC PUB
Robichaux, Estelle	PN ALT CLR
Rodriguez, Kevin	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Rodriguez, Russell	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Rojas, Kerry	AE EC
Roy, Monika	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Rue, Donald	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ruppel, Christie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Ruppel, Christie /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Russell, Justin	PN ALT AE EC
Ruttley, Kevin	PN ALT AE EC
RWS Gulf, LLC	PN ALT AE EC
Ryan, Veronica	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Safron, R	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sagrera, Mike	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sagrera, Victoria /Restore or Retreat, Inc.	PUB
Sallettes, Barbara	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Salomon, David	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Salvaggio, Ruth	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sandler, Frederica /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sarco, Leanne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Savastano, Kenneth / Plaquemines Parish Coastal Zone Management and Caernarvon Interagency Advisory Committees	ALT AE EC
Savastano, Kenneth and Aloma	ALT AE EC
Save Louisiana Coalition	ALT AE EC
Savige, David	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sayas, Herbert /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Saze, Dave	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Schatzel, Emily	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Scheuermann, Darlene	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Scheuermann, Darlene /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Schexnaydre Jr, Ralph J	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Schroth, Johanna	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Schuler, Barbara /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Scott, Cody	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Seiferth, Eric	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sellers, Ben	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sellers, Leah	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Senger, David	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Serpas, Raymond	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Seung, Sophorn	AE EC
Shadel, William	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Shinn, Michon	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Siener, Jane /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sierra Club	ALT AE EC
Sierra Club New Orleans	EC
Sigur, Aida /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Simeone, Sam	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Simeone, Sam /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Singleton, Jenae /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Slay, Cindy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Smallpage, Maitland	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Smith, Debbie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Smith, Emma	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Smith, Michelle	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Smith, Tammeryn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Smith, V	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Soileau, Caleb	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Son, Ngli	AE EC
Sonnier, Alyce	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sparks, Cory /Commission on Stewardship of the Environment of the Louisiana Interchurch Conference	PN CLR
Speidell, Walter	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Spencer, Edward /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Spinks, Casey	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sreiy, Siphan	AE EC

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Starks, Malcom	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Steel, Caree	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Stewart, Drew	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Stirling Properties	PN ALT EC CLR PUB
Strong, Grace	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Stulb, Jeanne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Su, Donna	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Summers, Sunny	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Sunseri, Alfred /P&J Oyster Co., Inc.	ALT AE EC
Suong, Sieng	AE EC
Suong, Sieng	AE EC
Sweat, Mary Lee /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Swift, Ben	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Swigart, Frances	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tai, Nguyen The	AE EC
Tassin, Shawn /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Taylor, Ben	PN CLR
Teague, Kenneth G.	PN ALT AE EC
Teap, Phal	AE EC
Templet, Wayne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tervalon, Judy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tervalon, Judy /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Thanh, Do V	ALT AE EC
The Culpepper Group	AE EC
Thieng, Sophorn	AE EC
Tho, Tran	AE EC
Thomas, Claire	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Thompson, Kimberly /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Thournir, Eileen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Thurau, Brooke	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Thy, Ton	AE EC
Tiser, Eric	ALT
Tizzard, Marie /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
To, Cang V.	AE EC
To, Nguyen V	AE EC
To, Tan V	AE EC
To, Ty	AE EC

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
To, Ty	AE EC
Toeuk, Sokham	AE EC
Tornatore, Marianne	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tornqvist, Torgjorn	PUB
Toth, Gloria	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Toups, Timothy /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Trahan, Christine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Trahan, Iris	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Trahan, Monique /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tran, An	AE EC
Tran, Anh	AE EC
Tran, Hien	AE EC
Tran, Ho Van	AE EC
Tran, Hong	AE EC
Tran, Kim	AE EC
Tran, Lili	AE EC
Tran, Thanh Van	AE EC
Tran, Trieu	AE EC
Tran, Van C /Phong Nguyen	AE EC
Trichter, Vivien	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Trimble, William	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Trinh, Philip	AE EC
Tripp, Jim	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Trom, Van	AE EC
Troxclair, Vincent	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Trudell, Patti	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Truong, Lien Thi	AE EC
Truyen, Tran	AE EC
Tschirn, Kevin	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tschirn, Stephen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tucci, Louis	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tuck, Joni	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tuey, Crystal	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tugwell, Thomas /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tullos, Connie /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Turgeon, Valerie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Turgeon, Valerie /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Turley, Michael	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tuttle, James	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Tyner, Robin	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	AE EC
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	ALT AE EC
Van Aman, Linda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Van Aman, Linda	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Van Brown, Juli	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Van Brunt, Juli /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Van Teylingen, Mary Lou	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Vasquez, Richard	PN ALT AE EC
Vaughn, Melanie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Vickers, Michael	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Vidrine, Curt	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Viles, Aaron	PN ALT AE EC
Vincent, Gene	ALT AE EC
Vincent, Joseph /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Vizier, Glen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Vo , My Lynn	AE EC
Vo , My Lynn	AE EC
Voisin, Bart	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Vong, Bo	AE EC
Vong, Neang	AE EC
Vong, Noeun	AE EC
Vong, Nonh	AE EC
Vorn, Po	AE EC
Vu, Phuc H.	AE EC
Vu, Thao /Mississippi Coalition for Vietnamese-American Fisherman, Fisher Folks and Families	PN AE EC CLR PUB
W, M	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Waldron, Ryan /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Walker, Arthur /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wallsten, Karen	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wee, James	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Weems, James	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Weiner, Daniel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Weldon, Penn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB

Table 3. List of Commenters and EIS Chapters in Which Comments Will Be Addressed

PN=Purpose and Need Chapter, ALT=Alternatives Chapter, AE=Affected Environment Chapter, EC=Environmental Consequences Chapter, CLR=Compliance with Other Environmental Laws and Regulations, PUB=Public Involvement Chapter

Commenter Name/Agency	EIS Chapters That Will Address Scoping Comments
Wells, Richard	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wenzel, Joseph	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
West , Allison	PUB
Wheeler, Katherine	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wheeler, Katherine /Environmental Defense Fund	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Whipple, Susan	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
White, Carla	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Whitfield, Mallory	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wilbur, Lynn	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Williams, Elizabeth	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Williams, John	PN ALT AE EC CLR
Williams, Jolie	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Williams, Mary	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Williams, Naython	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Williams, Sally	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wilson, Andrew	AE EC PUB
Wilson, Johnnie	ALT AE EC
Wilson, Ralph	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Woessner, Charles	AE EC CLR
Wolf, Rachel	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Woods, Mikeal /National Wildlife Federation	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Woods, Patricia	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wyerman, Jim	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Wyman, Frank	AE EC
Wyman, Pearl	AE EC
Yean, Phonny	AE EC
Yetiker, Faruk	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB
Young, Deedy	PN ALT AE EC CLR PUB