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1 AGENCY MEETINGS

Below are a list of key meetings that were help with interagency partners and cooperating agencies. Full meeting minutes are documented in the project file and available upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24 October 2018    | Webinar with Resource Partners  
Information gathering, identify additional resource needs, discuss One Federal Decision, Staff from CEMVN, CEMVS, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fish, USGS, CPRA, Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, NOAA, USEPA. Slides from webinar provided below. |
| 6 November 2018    | Meeting with State Agencies. Notes provided below                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 7 November 2018    | Meeting with Federal Agencies. Notes provided below.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 31 July 2019       | USACE and NOAA staff call to discuss how to work through the One Federal Decision Process                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 13 November 2019   | Webinar with Resource Partners  
Inform the resource partners on the TSP and upcoming public review  
Staff from CEMVN, CEMVS, Louisiana Dept. of Wildlife of Fish, LDNR, NMFS, and USFWS attended. Slides from webinar provided below. |
INTRODUCTIONS
Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity
Project Manager: Bradley Drouant
Environmental Lead: Kip Runyon

West Bank & Vicinity
Project Manager: Bradley Drouant
Environmental Lead: Kat McCain

PURPOSE & OUTCOME
PURPOSE:
• To initiate data collection, identify partners, and discuss needs on supplemental studies for the USACE New
  Orleans District
• Discuss information needed to make a determination of level of investigation and need for EIS
• Discuss agency participation and expectations

EXPECTED OUTCOME:
• Inform agencies of the upcoming planning charrette and needs for ongoing agency coordination moving forward

FUTURE LEVEE LIFTS GENERAL REEVALUATION REPORTS FOR LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN & VICINITY (LPV) AND WEST BANK & VICINITY (WBV)

PROJECT OVERVIEWS
• Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) authorization did not authorize future levee lifts to sustain risk reduction required for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program
• Current studies seek to determine if work necessary to sustain the 1% level of risk reduction is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.
• General Reevaluation: a study to affirm, reformatulate, or modify an existing plan. Similar to a feasibility study.

NEW ORLEANS TOPOGRAPHY

HURRICANE STORM DAMAGE AND RISK REDUCTION SYSTEM (HSDRRS) FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>$ M</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEA, American Dream</td>
<td>81,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBR American Dream</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBR Improved Protection</td>
<td>38,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPV 1% Level of Protection</td>
<td>57,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Risk Reduction</td>
<td>18,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve in Erosion Mitigation</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of New Collector</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inundation Pump Stations</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Armoring</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of New Collector</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstructural Risk Reduction</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY ARE FUTURE LEVEE LIFTS REQUIRED?

While the LPV and WBY projects will provide the 1% level of risk reduction when constructed is completed, additional future levee lifts will be required to offer the desired consideration, settlement, subsidence, and sea level rise which will cause levee breaches within the system to fall below the required elevation necessary to provide the 1% risk reduction as early as 2033.

Multiple Lifts vs Single Lift Construction Compared

Typical Levee Crown Elevation Over Time

IMPACTS OF LEVEE OVERTOPPING

Without future LPV and WBY levee lifts, the levee heights will decrease over time, increasing the risk of flooding to downstream residents and property damage.

USACE SMART & RISK-INFORMED PLANNING

WHAT IS SMART PLANNING?

Smart Planning is:
- Strategic
- Measurable
- Attainable
- Risk-Informed
- Timely

RISK-INFORMED PLANNING

RISK-INFORMED PLANNING PROCESS

The Feasibility Study Process:
Key Decision & Product Milestones

COMPLIANCE WITH SMART PLANNING:
SCOPING (3 MONTHS)

SCOPING (October-November 2018)
- Initiate agency coordination
- Interagency meeting
  - Scheduled for week of November 5th
- Initial scoping
- Negotiate SOW for FWCA
- Request species list from USFWS/NMFS
- Information gathering
- Identify problems and opportunities
- Identify areas of uncertainty
COMPLIANCE WITH SMART PLANNING: SCOPING (3 MONTHS)

- Brainstorm solutions to the identified problems
- Invite appropriate agencies and open dialog for FWCA, ESA, Section 106 coordination
- Compile public/agency/tribal concerns
- Identify significant resources to consider
- Identify resources that may require mitigation
- Inventory potential models
- Collaborate on environmental screening criteria
- Develop initial array of alternatives
- Hold Alternatives Milestone [14 January 2019]
- Determine level of NEPA investigation/Potential EIS

COMPLIANCE WITH SMART PLANNING – ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION & ANALYSIS (9 MONTHS)

- Moving towards a Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) (February – October 2019)
  - IF EIS, publish NOI in Federal Register
  - USACE provides Biological Assessment
  - Develop EFH Assessment
  - 404(b)1 analysis
  - SHPO/TPO coordination
  - HTRW Phase 1, if needed
  - Identity mitigation per alternative
  - Describe environmental impacts per alternative

- Prior to TSP Milestone
  - USFWS provides Draft FWCA Report [15 Sept 2019]

- Hold TSP Milestone [15 October 2019]

COMPLIANCE WITH SMART PLANNING – FEASIBILITY LEVEL ANALYSIS (5 MONTHS)

- Moving from TSP to Agency Decision (May 2019 - April 2020)
  - Public/agency concurrent reviews (if EIS, NOAA Dec 2019-January 2020)
  - Release of Draft Integrated Report with draft FONSI (if EA); EIS – File Draft with EPA
  - Release of BA to USFWS/NMFS
  - USFWS/NMFS response to BA (30 days)
  - ESA formal consultation begins, if required
  - Public meetings
  - Identify/review public/agency/tribal comments and develop strategies to resolve
  - Conduct cultural resource field investigations, as needed

- Hold Agency Decision Milestone [April 2020]

COMPLIANCE WITH SMART PLANNING – FINAL REVIEW (15 MONTHS)

- Getting to Chief’s Report (May 2020-August 2021)
  - ESA formal consultation continues, if required
  - Final FWCA incorporated with responses
  - NEPA comment/response documented
  - NEPA conclusions (FONSI/ROD)
  - If EIS, release final (if feasibility report with EPA – Notice of Availability)

- Chief’s Report [August 2021]

ONE FEDERAL DECISION

Executive Order 13807 – Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects

- Signed 15 August 2017
- Policy:
  - (i) conduct environmental reviews and authorization processes in a coordinated, consistent, predictable, and timely manner...
  - (g) speak with a coordinated voice when conducting environmental reviews and making authorization decisions; and
  - (h) make timely decisions with the goal of completing all Federal environmental reviews and authorization decisions for major infrastructure projects within 2 years.

ONE FEDERAL DECISION – USACE IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE – SEPTEMBER 2018

- Coordinated Environmental Review
  - All Federal, Tribal, and State agencies required to conduct or issue a review for the study should be invited to serve as either a cooperating agency or a participating agency for the environmental review process.
  - Use risk-informed decision making to conduct environmental compliance concurrently with feasibility study – Use readily available information to gather only the information necessary for the next decision based on feedback from coordinating with cooperating and participating agencies...
  - Develop and follow an environmental review and authorization schedule.
1.2 6 NOVEMBER 2018 – STATE AGENCY MEETING

State Resource Agency Meeting Notes

7 November 2018

9:00AM

USACE: Kip Runyon, Monique Savage, Michelle Kniep, Matt Jones, Brian Johnson, Laura Lee Wilkinson, Brad Drouant, Frank Spiess, Terry Birkenstock

LDNR, Consistency Section – Jeff Harris

PHONE:

LWLF – Barry Hebert

LWLF - Dave Butler

LSHPO - Rachel Watson

LWLF - Zack Chain

Kip: Intros
Brad: Study/Project Intro

Kip: 13807-One Federal Decision Details

Kip: Existing NEPA documentation

Data/Coordination Needs:

- Planning Aid report from Fish and Wildlife in the next few months (from yesterday)
- Phone: Dave Butler can provide information on bald eagles and colonial nesting water birds; Zack from Ecological Services can provide information on invasive species
- Jeff: A lot of good information on SONRIS (Strategic Online Natural Resources Information System); [www.sonris.com](http://www.sonris.com)
- Thoughts on borrow sites: if commercial borrow sites are used they will not need coastal zone clearance;
- Mitigation – if mitigation is necessary, typically DNR goes along with what we propose as long as NEPA compliant
- DNR cares about transportation even if borrow isn’t from coastal zone
- If proposed action ends up being similar to what was done before, DNR could handle it as a modification of the existing consistency determinations done for the IERs rather than new determinations – would only work if minor changes; review process is the same for modification minus the requirement for public review
- Process requires that the action be consistent with Coastal Management Program. Consistency determination is typically presented to DNR when plans can still change. Typical review is 60-75 days at DNR. They have an issue with condemnation. As soon as we have the footprint of our potential impact, provide shapefile for consistency determination.
- Submit consistency determination electronically via email
- Mitigation for borrow sites - 3 options: Do it yourself, in lieu fee, or purchase credit at mitigation banks; there is limited availability at mitigation banks currently, more coming online; shouldn’t have issues if prior developed, access routes, staging areas to the extent that they impact wetlands – if we can put them in already impacted sites, that would be great
- Zach - Need to avoid and minimize impacts to Salvador WMA in WBV area and Bayou St. John in LPV
- Rachel agreed – Avoid issues around Bayou St. John; bigger cultural issue if uplands are impacted by additional borrow sites. If structures are impacted, it could also be an issue. Coordinate with the tribes…Tribes may have additional concerns.
- Oyster seed grounds and leases: Water Bottom Assessment POC: 225-765-2386 Christy McDonough – only need assessment if in seed ground area; shouldn’t be an issue for us – based on information in SONRIS, we aren’t likely to impact – closest seed grounds and leases are in Lake Borgne
- Commercial Fisheries: don’t impact business any more than you have to
- Recreation: avoid and minimize boat dock impacts, etc.
- LDNR generally accepts WVA results
Monique: Plan Formulation

- CPRA would be the first place to go for what works and what has not worked and what the costs are.
- Making marshes is not difficult if you have sediment. Possible to use existing dredge material from the harbor for marsh creation
- Rachel SHPO: a lot of the remaining high ground has archaeological resources – something to be aware of when considering nature-based features
- (Nonstructural): No major issues…superfund site on the northshore…there are existing projects like diversions we should avoid impacting; unanticipated discovery of human resources (pre-historic or European remains), small family cemeteries, etc. happens more frequently than you might think. 1. Unmarked burial act, 2. Land can't be re-purposed without removing remains.
- Nothing major from DNR Coastal: want to protect people from flooding…make sure to get the material NOT from bottomland hardwoods
- Team would prefer invitation for monthly teleconference meetings to be kept in the loop

Laura Lee will provide LDEQ contact information – we may want to touch

1.3 7 NOVEMBER 2018 – FEDERAL AGENCY MEETING

a. Attendees
   i. Corps: Kip Runyon, Brian Johnson, Karla Sparks, Laura Wilkinson Wolfson, Frank Spiess, Michelle Kniep, Matt Jones, Monique Savage, Joe Jordan, Brad Drouant, Elizabeth “Libby” Behrens, Jason Emery, Kevin Harper
   ii. National Park Service: Kelly Latenhofen, Guy Hughes
   iii. USFWS: Barret Fortier (web meeting), Dave Walther
   iv. NMFS: Craig Gothreaux
   v. USGS: Ann Hijuelos

b. Other agencies are getting similar guidance on EO 13807

c. Borrow. For HSDRRS we committed to not impacting wetlands
   i. However, since we don’t have alternatives yet, we cannot commit to no wetland impact at this time.

d. ROW was purchased for future levee lifts
   i. There is a Planning Aide Letter from 2007
   ii. Dave (USFWS) said that they are probably going to resubmit a list of ranked borrow sites.
   iii. Footprint, physical location of the project and then the ROW, built to the ROW. Future mitigation has been identified for the 2057, hierarchy for borrow. Resubmit a new that lays this out. GIS map national landcover and crossed it with soil maps to minimizing impacts to wetlands and forested habitat. Latest information was 2007. May look at with state agencies.

e. CED estimated impacts of future lifts but only mitigated for actual footprint constructed so far
   i. Are we considering raises to hard structures?
   ii. USACE: No.
Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report
DRAFT

f. Foreshore protection on lake front(s)
   i. Water access and dredging requires NMFS coordination that might take a long
time – Lake Pontchartrain east of the Causeway is Critical Habitat for the Gulf
Sturgeon. Formal consultation for Gulf Sturgeon impacts would take 12 to 18
months. Construction consideration for water access.
   ii. Foreshore protection access through the water, dredging was involved. Probably
have to put more rock. Not sure whether there is thru land and water.

g. FWS recommends not using IPAC – use SLOPES instead (Standard Local Operating
Procedures for Endangered Species)

h. Need a new Phase I HTRW
   i. West Shore Lake Pontchartrain project will be using a huge amount of borrow material
which may impact us - Will likely use all Bonnet Carre borrow material.

j. 404c area. Need to try to avoid any more impacts to the Bayou aux Carpes Clean Water
   Act Section 404c area for WBV.
   i. EPA is contact on 404(c) area
   ii. Guy (National Park Service) will share EPA POC with USACE

k. Impacts to Bayou Sauvage National Wildlife Refuge in NE corner of LPV must be
   mitigated within the Refuge. In general, desire to keep mitigation for impacts to public
lands located on those lands or added to them (stay in public use).

l. Cultural IER reports for those components, update that with the data LA State historical
   preservation areas, archeological site. Phase I HTRW all of these to the local sponsors
for the whole 150 acres. BMP’s for all the critical habitat. Howard Laderner slopes work
   with compliance.

m. FWS to provide Planning Aid Letter in advance of NOI, can include Essential Fish
   Habitat information; Dave will try to provide by end of calendar year.

n. NMFS would appreciate an early draft version of the EFH analysis – they can then
   provide suggestions to be included in the public draft document

o. USGS can help with some maps/data. Land loss analysis.
   i. Monique (USACE) asked if there are maps with all of the different species and
      cultural resources
   ii. Jasen (USACE Cultural) said that we can get updated maps with cultural sites.

p. Bald Eagles – Tammy Gilmore

q. Noise concerns along the lake front for local population
   i. Noise was a major issue. Used a press hammer to push to be less disruptive to
      the population and to meet the noise ordinance. Historic structures and paths,
      main roads used for temporary access for school zones and impacts.
      Construction managers, and CED to evaluate routes.

r. Look at haul roads from previous construction as possibly acceptable routes.
   i. Refine during PED, check with prior construction managers
   ii. CED Phase II did a traffic analysis (still draft)

s. Levees are used for recreation – walking, biking, access to other sites
   i. West Jefferson levee board doesn’t allow rec
   ii. Andrew Perez knows where rec is happening
      1. Jefferson, Orleans, Bayou Sauvage
t. Invasive species – Tulane, Xavier, etc.
i. Purple loose strife – new location
u. WVA model – plan on us using; tentatively plan on USACE doing analysis with FWS review, but FWS can likely help with analysis if needed – play by ear as we go through study.
v. Natural/Nature-based
   i. Marsh can reduce surge but need a LOT (many square miles) and need to buy land and maintain/rebuild.
   ii. Marshes in front – high wave energy environments, need to go with least cost alternative; if marshes get blown out will we re-create it. Trees don’t work but marsh may; 1 mile of marsh yields 3/10 of a foot surge reduction; but higher surges overwhelm marshes; marshes help more with minor surges. Armoring could be a natural feature.
   iii. Any additional project features like marshes could impact the sponsor and their ability to maintain them
iv. Marshes not tree plantings
v. Turn open water into land
vi. Is armoring a natural feature?
vii. Avoid and Minimize vs. Mitigation
viii. Change grass species on the levee – potential for biodiversity without impacting protection
ix. Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation has info on multiple lines of defense
x. Foreshore protection?
xi. Need to be able to replace quickly and inexpensively
xii. Patrick Smith in MVN used to work for Lake Pont Basin Foundation
w. Lake Pont Foundation website…look up foreshore with reef-balls/oyster barriers “living shore”
x. Floodwalls wildlife passage 1 every 3 miles, maintain water flow. Stagnant water, BMP for water. Drainage, canal, to a pump – NPS coming back along that the park is interested. 31-34 wildlife passage 404C area. Bayou Sauvage some structures that flow out but not in. Water circulation is better. Pipe of a certain size. Screens in front of it.
y. 300 ft. buffer for the river
   i. Break water outside sea grass beds – what was there was good so do we add more and replenish the barrier?
z. Trees would be okay on the river but not from waves action (but it would maybe work on WBV because of level of current marshes)
aa. Milton project: earthen bags didn’t work…replaced with rock.
bb. Remember wildlife passage for floodwalls
cc. Air quality – all areas currently in attainment
dd. Maintaining access during construction is important for recreation as well.
ee. Post-Katrina - Environmental Assessment #433 – Impacts of USACE response to Katrina and Rita – after-the-fact EA due to emergency nature; Murphy oil spill; transportation study on the HSDRSS. LA DEQ and DHH, population Andrew Perez and Joe Musso; other social effects, social/environmental justice in terms of phase
construction...populations have moved around, where are the potentially disproportionately affected populations now; CED Phase 2 socio-economic report

ff. There are some sea-grass beds so maybe put some breakwaters on Lake Pont

gg. USFWS like a lot of coordination—like updates - don't wait for a month to let them know what’s going on; supposed to be a member of the PDT per MOA

hh. Mondays are the worst for meetings...Thursdays seems to work

i. National Park Service wants to be involved with WBV - development of the alternatives and then if things change.

1.4 13 NOVEMBER 2019 – RESOURCE PARTNER WEBINAR ON TSP

Attendees:

Monique Savage - USACE MVS  Dave Butler LA Dept. Wildlife and Fisheries
Rachel Mesko, USACE Planning  Barry Hebert-LDWF-Fisheries Habitat
Hannah Sprinkle, USFWS  Jeff Harris LDNR
Dave Butler La Dept. Wildlife and Fisheries  Sara Krupa LDNR
Frank Spiess, USACE Project Management  Joe Heublein NMFS SERO
Craig Gothreaux, NMFS Habitat Conservation Division  Mark Hogan LDNR
Elizabeth Barron, LDWF  Kip Runyon USACE
Cornelius Williams, Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries  Kat McCain USACE
Laura Lee Wilkinson USACE
SLIDES ON West Bank & Vicinity Project available upon request
QUESTIONS:

1) Will the slides be made available?
   a. Response: yes
2 ONE FEDERAL DECISION COORDINATION

2.1 USFWS

2.1.1 4 APRIL 2019: USACE COOPERATING AGENCY REQUEST TO USFWS

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT
7400 LEAKE AVE
NEW ORLEANS LA 70118-3681

April 4, 2019

Mr. Joe Ramson
Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
200 Dulles Drive
Lafayette, LA 70506

Dear Mr. Ramson:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District, is initiating preparation of a general re-evaluation report with integrated environmental impact statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Project, located in St. Charles, Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard parishes, Louisiana. The study seeks to determine if the work necessary to sustain the 1% level of hurricane storm damage risk reduction is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. The non-Federal sponsor is the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a Cooperating Agency with the Corps in the development of the environmental decision document per the One Federal Decision, Executive Order (EO) 13807, Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects, 15 August 2017. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency’s independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable Federal laws, regulations, and Executive Orders.

Enclosed for your information is one copy of the project fact sheet (ENCL 1). This fact sheet provides a brief project description, relevant background information, and study area information.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5); the One Federal Decision (EO 13807) and Corps Implementation Guidance, 26 September 2018 (ENCL 2); and CECP-P Planning Bulletin 2018-01, Feasibility Study Milestones, 26 September 2018 (ENCL 3), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- Invite you to participate and provide input during agency coordination meetings, including pre-scoping and scoping;
- Consult with you on any relevant technical studies that will be required for the project;
• Provide comment and feedback on identifying the overall scope of the project (including project schedule to complete all federal environmental reviews and authorization decisions within two years), study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives, and important issues and impacts to be evaluated during the environmental review;
• Participate in identifying and eliminating from detailed study the issues which are not important;
• Identify issues related to your agency’s jurisdiction by law and special expertise; and
• Review the administrative and public drafts of the Draft and Final environmental impact statement.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation on or before May 4, 2019. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the environmental decision document. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies’ respective roles and responsibilities during the study, please contact Mr. Bradley Drouant, P.E., the Project Manager (504-862-1516), or Mr. Kip Runyon, the Environmental Manager (314-331-8396).

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Brian Johnson
Environmental Compliance Branch Chief
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North - St Louis
1222 Spruce St.
St. Louis, MO 63103
Brian.L.Johnson@usace.army.mil
314-331-8146

ENCL 1 - Study Fact Sheet
ENCL 3 - Planning Bulletin PB 2018-01, Feasibility Study Milestones, 26 September 2018
United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
200 Dulles Drive
Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

April 24, 2019

Brian Johnson
Environmental Compliance Branch Chief
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North - St Louis
1222 Spruce St.
St. Louis, MO 63103

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Please reference your April 4, 2019, letter requesting our participation as a cooperating agency during the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ (USACE) preparation of a draft general re-evaluation report with integrated environmental impact statement (DGER-EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Project, located in St. Charles, Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard Parishes, Louisiana. The study seeks to determine if the work necessary to sustain the 1 percent level of hurricane storm damage risk reduction is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. The non-Federal sponsor is the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the information provided, and offers the following comments in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (83 Stat. 852; 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The USACE and the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) have formally committed to work together to conserve, protect, and restore fish and wildlife resources while ensuring environmental sustainability of our Nation's water resources under the January 22, 2003, Partnership Agreement for Water Resources and Fish and Wildlife. Accordingly, the Service would be pleased to serve as a cooperating agency in developing the DGER-EIS for the proposed project in accordance with applicable NEPA Council on Environmental Quality guidance. Our participation will include: 1) participation in and providing input during agency coordination meetings, including pre-scoping and scoping; 2) consultation on any relevant technical studies that will be required for the project; 3) providing comment and feedback on identifying the overall scope of the project (including project schedule to complete all federal environmental reviews and authorization decisions within two years), study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives, and important issues and impacts to be evaluated during the environmental review; 4) participation in identifying and eliminating from detailed study the issues which are not important; 5) identifying issues related to the Service's jurisdiction by law and special expertise; and 6) reviewing the administrative and public drafts of the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement. The Service will also provide technical assistance in the development of a Biological Assessment describing the impacts of the proposed activity to federally listed threatened or endangered species and/or their critical habitat. Agreeing to be a cooperating agency does not preclude the Service from providing comments on the draft and final SEISs and does not ensure our support of the final selected plan.
We appreciate the opportunity to assist the USACE during the development of the DGRR-EIS. If you require further assistance in this matter, please contact Mr. David Walther (337-291-3122) of this office.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Ranson
Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office
2.1.2 29 APR 2019: RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE DGRR-EIS

Mr. Bradley Drouant, P.E.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CEMVN-PMO-L, Room 361
7400 Leake Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70118

April 29, 2019

Dear Mr. Drouant:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the Notice of Intent (ER 19/130) to prepare a Draft Integrated General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Impact Statement (DGRR-EIS) for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Coastal Storm Risk Management Project.

The authorization for the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) requires it to provide the 1% level of risk reduction needed for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program at the time of construction. It did not authorize future levee lifts that will be required to sustain the 1% level of risk reduction over the long term. The Future Levee Lifts study was first authorized in WRDA 2014 Section 3017. The authority terminates on 10 June 2024. The act requires a report be provided to Congress in 2019 with recommendations relating to continued need for this authority. The study seeks to determine if the work necessary to sustain the 1% level of hurricane storm damage risk reduction is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

The lead agency for this proposed action is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) is the non-Federal sponsor. The USACE is preparing the DGRR-EIS under the authority of Section 3017 of WRDA 2014. Public Law 115–123 (Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018) funded the study as a new start. The study phase is 100% federally funded.

The USACE will evaluate a range of alternatives for the proposed action including structural and nonstructural measures. The USACE will fully evaluate reasonable and practicable alternatives, including the no action alternative. Alternatives may result in avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures to reduce or offset any impacts.

To aid in the planning of that study the Service submits the following comments as

Endangered Species Act and other Acts

Various species protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) are known to occur in the project vicinity. Protected species that may occur in the coastal parishes of this project study include colonial nesting water/wading birds including the formerly listed brown pelican (Pelecanus occidentalis), various raptors including the formerly listed bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) and peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus). Forest clearing associated with project features should be conducted during the fall or winter to minimize impacts to nesting migratory birds, when practicable.

Federally-listed threatened and endangered species that could be encountered in the project area are the endangered pallid sturgeon (Scaphirhynchus albus), the threatened Atlantic Sturgeon (Aciplaner acutus desotoi), and the threatened West Indian manatee (Trichechus manatus) and sea turtles. The USACE should consult with the NMFS regarding sea turtles.

The Service recommends that USACE conduct ESA consultation on the DGRR-EIS as soon as plans are developed and impact locations are identified. Following that coordination, the Service recommends that the USACE contact the Service for additional consultation if: 1) the scope or location of the proposed project is changed significantly; 2) new information reveals that the action may affect listed species or designated critical habitat; 3) the action is modified in a manner that causes effects to listed species or designated critical habitat; or 4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated. Additional consultation as a result of any of the above conditions or for changes not covered in this consultation should occur before those changes are made and or finalized.

National Environmental Policy Act and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

The President's Council on Environmental Quality defined the term "mitigation" in the National Environmental Policy Act regulations to include: (a) avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action; (b) minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation; (c) rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment; (d) reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; and (e) compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. The Service supports and adopts this definition and considers the specific elements to represent the
desirable sequence of steps in the mitigation planning process.

The Service’s Mitigation Policy (Federal Register, Vol. 46, pp. 7644-7663, January 23, 1981) has designated four resource categories which are used to ensure that the level of mitigation recommended will be consistent with the fish and wildlife resources involved. The mitigation planning goals and associated Service recommendations should be based on those four categories, as follows:

Resource Category 1 - Habitat to be impacted is of high value for evaluation species and is unique and irreplaceable on a national basis or in the ecoregion section. The mitigation goal for this Resource Category is that there should be no loss of existing habitat value.

Resource Category 2 - Habitat to be impacted is of high value for evaluation species and is relatively scarce or becoming scarce on a national basis or in the ecoregion section. The mitigation goal for habitat placed in this category is that there should be no net loss of in-kind habitat value.

Resource Category 3 - Habitat to be impacted is of high to medium value for evaluation species and is relatively abundant on a national basis. FWS’s mitigation goal here is that there be no net loss of habitat value while minimizing loss of in-kind habitat value.

Resource Category 4 - Habitat to be impacted is of medium to low value for evaluation species. The mitigation goal is to minimize loss of habitat value.

The four resource categories are used to ensure that the level of mitigation recommended by Service biologists will be consistent with the fish and wildlife resource values involved. Considering the high value of forested wetlands and marsh for fish and wildlife and the relative scarcity of those habitats they are designated as Resource Category 2, the mitigation goal for which is no net loss of in-kind habitat value. Therefore, the Service recommends to the greatest extent possible, future levee lift features avoid or minimize the destruction of wetlands (see Attachment 1). Scrub-shrub habitat, open water areas with an abundance of submerged aquatic vegetation, and dry bottomland hardwoods are placed in Resource Category 3 due to their relatively reduced value to wildlife, fisheries and degraded wetland functions. The mitigation goal for Resource Category 3 habitats is no net loss of habitat value. Mitigation needs will be evaluated during the feasibility stage and proposed mitigation should comply with the twelve performance standards and criteria (see Attachment 2). For those project impacts that cannot be fully ascertained during the Feasibility Study the Service recommends that adaptive management be employed post construction to correctly identify the extend of such impacts and develop appropriate mitigation. All adaptive management measures should be developed in coordination with the Service and other natural resource agencies.

Public Lands
The Corps should avoid impacts to public lands, if feasible. If not feasible, the Corps should establish and continue coordination with agencies managing public lands that may be impacted by a project feature until construction of that feature is complete and prior to any subsequent maintenance. Points of contacts for the agencies potentially impacted by project features are: Neil Lalonde, Project Leader for the Service’s Southeast Louisiana National Wildlife Refuges and Pon Dixson (985) 882-2000, Refuge Manager for the Bayou Sauvage National Wildlife Refuge (NWR).

Other comments

The Service assumes this study will evaluate placement of additional earthen fill on existing levees to restore them to target elevations. Other existing project features, such as water control structures, have operational plans in place. All previous Service recommendations in our November 2007 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report for those existing features are incorporated herein by reference.

For any new access roads or staging areas the Service has the following recommendations:

Culverts should be installed and maintained in construction access roads unless otherwise recommended by the natural resource agencies. At a minimum, there should be one 24-inch culvert placed every 500 feet and one at natural stream crossings. If the depth of water crossings allow, larger sized culverts should be used. Culvert spacing should be optimized on a case-by-case basis. A culvert may be necessary if the road is less than 500-feet long and an area would be hydrologically isolated without that culvert. Additionally, all existing and new drainage structures should be cleared and maintained.

New structural or nonstructural features should avoid impacts to wetlands and fish and wildlife resources. The USACE shall fully compensate for any unavoidable losses of wetland habitat or non-wet bottomland hardwoods caused by project features.

Acquisition, habitat development, maintenance and management of mitigation lands should be allocated as first-cost expenses of the project, and the local project-sponsor should be responsible for operational costs. If the local project-sponsor is unable to fulfill the financial mitigation requirements for operation, then the Corps should provide the necessary funding to ensure mitigation obligations are met on behalf of the public interest.

Any proposed change in mitigation features or plans should be coordinated in advance with the Service, NMFS, LDWF, EPA and LDNR.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the Notice of Intent and to provide comments during the DGRR-EIS scoping period. We look forward to working with you and your staff as project development continues. If you or your staff have further questions.
regarding the above recommendations or would like to meet and discuss our recommendations, please contact David Walther (337-291-3122).

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Ranson
Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office

Enclosure

cc: EPA, Dallas, TX
NMFS, Baton Rouge, LA
LDWF, Baton Rouge, LA
LDNR, CMD, Baton Rouge, LA
OCPR, Baton Rouge, LA
ATTACHMENT 1
BORROW PROTOCOL

Through the efforts of Task Force Guardian and HSDRRS, the Corps restored Hurricane Katrina-damaged hurricane/flood protection projects to their authorized or previously permitted/constructed protection levels. Identification of borrow areas needed to complete those repairs utilized a protocol that prioritized selection of those sites in the following order: existing commercial pits, upland sources, previously disturbed/manipulated wetlands within a levee system, and low-quality wetlands outside a levee system. The Service supports the use of such protocols to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and bottomland hardwoods within project areas. Avoidance and minimization of those impacts helps to provide consistency with restoration strategies and compliments the authorized hurricane protection efforts. Such consistency is also required by Section 303(d)(1) of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA).

Accordingly, the Service recommends that prior to utilizing borrow sites every effort should be made to reduce impacts by using sheetpile, deep soil mixing, and/or floodwalls to increase levee heights wherever feasible. In addition, the Service recommends that the following protocol be adopted and utilized to identify borrow sources in descending order of priority:

1. Permitted commercial sources, authorized borrow sources for which environmental clearance and mitigation have been completed, or non-functional levees after newly constructed adjacent levees are providing equal protection.

2. Areas under forced drainage that are protected from flooding by levees, and that are:
   a) non-forested (e.g., pastures, fallow fields, abandoned orchards, former urban areas) and non-wetlands;
   b) wetland forests dominated by exotic tree species (i.e., Chinese tallow-trees) or non-forested wetlands (e.g., wet pastures), excluding marshes;
   c) disturbed wetlands (e.g., hydrologically altered, artificially impounded).

3. Sites that are outside a forced drainage system and levees, and that are:
   a) non-forested (e.g., pastures fallow fields, abandoned orchards, former urban areas) and non-wetlands;
   b) wetland forests dominated by exotic tree species (i.e., Chinese tallow-trees) or non-forested wetlands (e.g., wet pastures), excluding marshes;
   c) disturbed wetlands (e.g., hydrologically altered, artificially impounded).
Notwithstanding this protocol, the location, size and configuration of borrow sites within the landscape is also critically important. Coastal ridges, natural levee flanks and other geographic features that provide forested/wetland habitats and/or potential barriers to hurricane surges should not be utilized as borrow sources, especially where such uses would diminish the natural functions and values of those landscape features.
ATTACHMENT 2
MITIGATION GUIDANCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On April 10, 2008, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued regulations governing compensatory mitigation for activities authorized by Department of the Army permits (Federal Register, Vol. 73, No. 70). According to the Federal Register, those regulations establish performance standards and criteria for the use of permittee-responsible compensatory mitigation, mitigation banks, and in-lieu programs to improve the quality and success of compensatory mitigation projects. The following summary outline generally describes the process of developing a mitigation plan as outlined in those regulations (see the Federal Register for a detailed description of each step).

1. **Objectives**: a description of the resource type(s) and amount(s) that would be provided as mitigation, the method of compensation, and the manner in which the resource functions of the compensatory mitigation project would address the needs of the geographic area of interest.
2. **Site Selection**: a description of the factors considered during the site selection process.
3. **Site Protection Instrument**: a description of the legal arrangements and instrument that would be used to ensure long-term protection of the compensatory mitigation project site.
4. **Baseline Information**: a description of the ecological characteristics of the proposed compensatory mitigation project site.
5. **Determination of Credits**: a description of the number of credits to be provided, including a rationale for that determination.
6. **Mitigation Work Plan**: detailed written specifications and work descriptions for the compensatory mitigation project.
7. **Maintenance Plan**: a description and schedule of maintenance requirements to ensure the continued viability of the resource once initial construction is completed.
8. **Performance Standards**: ecologically based standards that will be used to determine whether the compensatory mitigation project is achieving its objective.
9. **Monitoring Requirements**: a description of parameters to be monitored in order to determine if the mitigation project is on track for achieving its performance standards and if adaptive management is needed.
10. **Long-term Management Plan**: a description of the manner in which the compensatory mitigation project will be managed after the performance standards have been achieved to ensure the long-term sustainability of the resource.
11. **Adaptive Management Plan**: a management strategy to address unforeseen changes in site conditions or other mitigation project components.
12. **Financial Assurances**: a description of the financial assurances that would be provided and how they are sufficient to ensure a high level of confidence that the mitigation project will be successfully completed in accordance with its performance standards.
2.1.3 17 OCT 2019: USACE CONCURRENCE LETTER ON TSP REQUEST LETTER

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ST. LOUIS DISTRICT
1222 SPRUCE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63103-2833

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North
Environmental Compliance Section (CEMVP-PD-C)

17 October 2019

SUBJECT: Request for Concurrence on Alternatives to be carried forward and the Preferred Alternative for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana General Re-evaluation Report

Mr. Joseph A. Ranson
Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
200 Dulles Drive
Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

Dear Mr. Ranson,

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District (CEM/VN), is preparing the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV), Louisiana General Re-evaluation Report with integrated Environmental Impact Statement to re-evaluate the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, and sea level rise over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to sustain the current 1% level of risk reduction for coastal storms. The measures that have been identified as part of the proposed action include lifts to existing levees, raising of existing flood walls, placement of foreshore protection in existing foreshore protection locations, and construction access dredging for placement of foreshore protection. The non-Federal sponsor is the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana.

The Executive Order 13807: Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects, (also known as One Federal Decision (OFD)), Memorandum of Understanding for Major Infrastructure Projects (MOU) establishes a coordinated and timely process for environmental reviews of major infrastructure projects. It sets forth the agreement under which agencies will cooperate to complete environmental reviews and make authorization decisions for major infrastructure projects. It describes the permitting timetable milestones, roles, and responsibilities for the lead, cooperating, and participating agencies.

The OFD MOU identifies three concurrence points in the environmental review process where the lead Federal agency must request the concurrence of cooperating agencies with authorization decision responsibilities (See Enclosure 1, Section XI). These are 1) Purpose and Need, 2) Alternatives to be Carried Forward for Evaluation, and 3) Preferred Alternative.
The CEMVN recently narrowed its list of feasible alternatives to the final array of alternatives to be carried forward for analysis in the EIS. The final array consists of the following alternatives:

Alternative 1: The No Action Alternative  
Alternative 2: System Levee and Floodwall Lifts to the Projected 1% Event at 2073 with Intermediate Relative Sea Level Rise  
Alternative 3: System Levee and Floodwall Lifts to the Projected 0.5% Event at 2073 with Intermediate Relative Sea Level Rise

Based on reasonably maximizing the net economic benefits of the alternatives while remaining consistent with the Federal objective of protecting the nation's environment, the CEMVN recently identified the Tentatively Selected Plan (i.e. the Preferred Alternative). Based on the evaluation of net economic benefits and potential environmental impacts, Alternative 2 was identified as the Preferred Alternative.

The CEMVN is seeking your agency's concurrence on the alternatives to be carried forward for analysis in the EIS and on the Preferred Alternative. Please provide your written concurrence within 30 days from the date of this letter. Concurrence, as defined in the MOU, means confirmation by the agency that the information is sufficient for the stage in the NEPA process and the environmental review process may proceed to the next stage. If, after concurrence, the CEMVN determines that changes to the alternatives to be carried forward or the Preferred Alternative are necessary, then the CEMVN and cooperating agencies will review such changes to determine if concurrence should be revisited.

We look forward to continuing to work with your agency on this study and appreciate the working relationship thus far. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this in more detail, please contact the Environmental Manager, Kip Runyon, at 314-331-8396 or kip.r.runyon@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Brian Johnson  
Chief, Environmental Compliance Branch  
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North

ENCL 1 – Memorandum of Understanding Implementing One Federal Decision Under Executive Order 13807
Colonel Stephen Murphy  
District Commander  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
7400 Leake Avenue  
New Orleans, LA 70118-3651

November 7, 2019

Dear Colonel Murphy,

Please reference the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Hurricane Storm Damage and Risk Reduction Re-evaluation Study (LPV) being conducted by the Corps of Engineers’ (USACE). This reevaluation addresses levee lifts that will be required to offset expected consolidation, settlement, subsidence and sea level rise and addresses impacts to fish and wildlife resources and public lands.

This letter is transmitted in accordance with the Executive Order 13807: Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects, (also known as One Federal Decision (OFD)). This letter is also transmitted under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) but does not constitutes the final report of the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 2(b) of that act.

At the current stage of planning USACE has completed preliminary studies to identify alternatives to be carried forward in the study process. Those alternatives have the potential to impact public lands, i.e., Bayou Sauvage National Wildlife Refuge managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve, Chalmette National Cemetery managed by the National Park Service (NPS).

Following a telephone conversation with Kip Runyon, USACE Environmental Manager (October 30, 2019), the Service does not object to the selected alternatives but reserves the right to voice an objection to project features that may impact those public lands. Continued coordination with the Service and the NPS, Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve will be necessary as engineering and design of those features is undertaken. The Service and Park Service will continue to work closely with USACE to identify those alternatives that are least damaging and acceptable.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist in the development of this project and to provide comments and recommendations to the proposed alternatives. However, the Service remains concerned with the lack of information provided in this stage of the feasibility study. If
practicable, the Service recommends the USACE provide project feature details at an earlier phase in the study process. Lack of data limits the ability to fully address impacts to public lands and causes concern in our concurrence of alternatives.

Should you or your staff have any questions, or if you would like to meet with us regarding the content of this letter, please contact Hannah Sprinkle (337-291-3121).

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Ranson
Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office
2.2 NATIONAL MARINES FISHERIES SERVICE (NMFS)

2.2.1 4 APR 2019: USACE COOPERATING AGENCY REQUEST TO NMFS

April 4, 2019

Mr. David Bernhart
NMFS – Protected Species Division
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701

Dear Mr. Bernhart:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District, is initiating preparation of a general re-evaluation report with integrated environmental impact statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Project, located in St. Charles, Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard parishes, Louisiana. The study seeks to determine if the work necessary to sustain the 1% level of hurricane storm damage risk reduction is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. The non-Federal sponsor is the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a Cooperating Agency with the Corps in the development of the environmental decision document per the One Federal Decision, Executive Order (EO) 13807, Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects, 15 August 2017. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency’s independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable Federal laws, regulations, and Executive Orders.

Enclosed for your information is one copy of the project fact sheet (ENCL 1). This fact sheet provides a brief project description, relevant background information, and study area information.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5); the One Federal Decision (EO 13807) and Corps Implementation Guidance, 26 September 2018 (ENCL 2); and CECW-P Planning Bulletin 2018-01, Feasibility Study Milestones, 26 September 2018 (ENCL 3), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- Invite you to participate and provide input during agency coordination meetings, including pre-scoping and scoping;
- Consult with you on any relevant technical studies that will be required for the project;
- Provide comment and feedback on identifying the overall scope of the project (including
Mr. David Bernhart

project schedule to complete all federal environmental reviews and authorization
decisions within two years), study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives,
and important issues and impacts to be evaluated during the environmental review;
• Participate in identifying and eliminating from detailed study the issues which are not
important;
• Identify issues related to your agency’s jurisdiction by law and special expertise; and
• Review the administrative and public drafts of the Draft and Final environmental impact
statement.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation on or before May 4, 2019.
Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you
provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward
to working with your agency on the preparation of the environmental decision document. If you
have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies’ respective
roles and responsibilities during the study, please contact Mr. Bradley Drouant, P.E., the Project
Manager (504-862-1516), or Dr. Kathryn McCain, the Environmental Manager (314-331-8047).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brian Johnson
Environmental Compliance Branch Chief
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North - St Louis
1222 Spruce St.
St. Louis, MO 63103
Brian.L.Johnson@usace.army.mil
314-331-8146

ENCL 1 - Study Fact Sheet
ENCL 2 - Implementation Guidance for Feasibility Studies for Executive Order 13807,
   Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and
   Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects
ENCL 3 - Planning Bulletin PB 2018-01, Feasibility Study Milestones, 26 September 2018
2.2.2 17 MAY 2019: NMFS COOPERATING AGENCY RESPONSE LETTER

Brian Johnson  
Environmental Compliance Branch Chief  
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North – St. Louis  
1222 Spruce Street  
St. Louis, MO 63103

Attention: Bradley Drouant, and Kathryn McCain

Dear Mr. Johnson:

NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has received your letter dated April 04, 2019, requesting our participation as a Coordinating Agency on the proposed Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project. Given that we have special expertise and jurisdiction by law in regards to the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, and Magnuson Stevens Act, NMFS agrees to serve as a Coordinating Agency for this project. Due to staffing and travel constraints, our heavy involvement in several other USACE One Federal Decision Projects, our participation may be limited to our review and comment on draft National Environmental Policy Act documents, teleconferences, and occasional travel to meetings.

We appreciate your invitation to serve as a Coordinating Agency for the proposed Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project. Please direct project correspondence related to habitat impacts and/or Essential Fish Habitat consultation to Craig Gothreaux, 5757 Corporate Blvd., Suite 375, Baton Rouge, LA 70808; by telephone at (225) 380-0078, or by e-mail at craig.gothreaux@noaa.gov. All other project correspondence can be directed to Noah Silverman, at the letterhead address, by telephone at (727) 824-5353, or by email at noah.silverman@noaa.gov.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

for Roy E. Crabtree, Ph.D.  
Regional Administrator

cc: GCERC, Reashaw, Lippy  
F/SER, Strelcheck, Blough, Silverman,  
F/SER3, Bernhart,  
F/SER4, Fay, Dale  
F/SER45, Wilber, Cooksey
2.2.3 17 OCT 2019: USACE CONCURRENCE ON TSP REQUEST LETTER

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ST. LOUIS DISTRICT
1222 SPRUCE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63103-2833

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North
Environmental Compliance Section (CEMVP-PD-C)

17 October 2019

SUBJECT: Request for Concurrence on Alternatives to be carried forward and the Preferred Alternative for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana General Re-evaluation Report

Roy E. Crabtree, Ph.D.
Regional Administrator
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701-5505

Dear Dr. Crabtree,

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District (CEMVPN), is preparing the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV), Louisiana General Re-evaluation Report with integrated Environmental Impact Statement to re-evaluate the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, and sea level rise over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to sustain the current 1% level of risk reduction for coastal storms. The measures that have been identified as part of the proposed action include lifts to existing levees, raising of existing flood walls, placement of foreshore protection in existing foreshore protection locations, and construction access dredging for placement of foreshore protection. The non-Federal sponsor is the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana.

The Executive Order 13807: Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects, (also known as One Federal Decision (OFD)), Memorandum of Understanding for Major Infrastructure Projects (MOU) establishes a coordinated and timely process for environmental reviews of major infrastructure projects. It sets forth the agreement under which agencies will cooperate to complete environmental reviews and make authorization decisions for major infrastructure projects. It describes the permitting timetable, milestones, roles, and responsibilities for the lead, cooperating, and participating agencies.

The OFD MOU identifies three concurrence points in the environmental review process where the lead Federal agency must request the concurrence of cooperating agencies with authorization decision responsibilities (See Enclosure 1, Section XI). These are 1) Purpose and Need, 2) Alternatives to be Carried Forward for Evaluation, and 3) Preferred Alternative.
The CEMVN recently narrowed its list of feasible alternatives to the final array of alternatives to be carried forward for analysis in the EIS. The final array consists of the following alternatives:

Alternative 1: The No Action Alternative
Alternative 2: System Levee and Floodwall Lifts to the Projected 1% Event at 2073 with Intermediate Relative Sea Level Rise
Alternative 3: System Levee and Floodwall Lifts to the Projected 0.5% Event at 2073 with Intermediate Relative Sea Level Rise

Based on reasonably maximizing the net economic benefits of the alternatives while remaining consistent with the Federal objective of protecting the nation’s environment, the CEMVN recently identified the Tentatively Selected Plan (i.e. the Preferred Alternative). Based on the evaluation of net economic benefits and potential environmental impacts, Alternative 2 was identified as the Preferred Alternative.

The CEMVN is seeking your agency’s concurrence on the alternatives to be carried forward for analysis in the EIS and on the Preferred Alternative. Please provide your written concurrence within 30 days from the date of this letter. Concurrence, as defined in the MOU, means confirmation by the agency that the information is sufficient for the stage in the NEPA process and the environmental review process may proceed to the next stage. If, after concurrence, the CEMVN determines that changes to the alternatives to be carried forward or the Preferred Alternative are necessary, then the CEMVN and cooperating agencies will review such changes to determine if concurrence should be revisited.

We look forward to continuing to work with your agency on this study and appreciate the working relationship thus far. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this in more detail, please contact the Environmental Manager, Kip Runyon, at 314-331-8396 or kip.r.runyon@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Brian Johnson
Chief, Environmental Compliance Branch
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North

ENCL 1 – Memorandum of Understanding Implementing One Federal Decision Under Executive Order 13807
2.2.4 12 NOV 2019: CONCURRENCE LETTER FROM NMFS ON TSP

Brian Johnson
Chief, Environmental Compliance Branch
Regional Planning and Environmental Division North
1222 Spruce Street
St. Louis, MO 63103

Attention: Kip Runyon, Regional Planning and Environmental Division North Environmental Compliance Section (CEMP-PD-C)

Dear Mr. Johnson:

NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has received your letter dated October 17, 2019, seeking our concurrence pursuant to the One Federal Decision Memorandum of Understanding on the alternatives to be carried forward for analysis in the EIS and on the Preferred Alternative on the proposed Lake Ponchartrain Vicinity project. After reviewing the information you’ve provided, including details provided during inter-agency meetings and conference calls, we do not have any concerns with your range of alternatives or tentatively selected preferred alternative, and as such we concur. If project scope changes, and/or new alternatives are added than we would appreciate the opportunity to review those changes/additions.

Sincerely,

for
Roy E. Crabtree, Ph.D.
Regional Administrator

cc:
GCERC, Renshaw, Lipswy
F. Chabot, Youngkin
F/SER, Strelecki, Blough, Silverman,
F/SER3, Burnhart,
F/SER4, Fay, Dale
F/SER45, Wilber, Cooksey
United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
200 Dulles Drive
Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

October 30, 2019

Colonel Stephen Murphy
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
7400 Leake Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70118-3651

Dear Colonel Murphy;

Please reference the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Hurricane Storm Damage and Risk Reduction Re-evaluation (LPV). Attached is the draft Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report which addresses project-associated impacts to forested habitats and estuarine marsh for activities associated with restoring existing levees to an authorized level of hurricane protection.

Levee lifts will be required to offset expected consolidation, settlement, subsidence and sea level rise. This report will evaluate impacts associated with raising and widening existing levee footprints and provides recommendations to minimize and/or mitigate project impacts on those resources. This report does not constitute the 2(b) report of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). This report has been provided to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) for comment; their comments will be incorporated into our final report.

INTRODUCTION

This draft Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) addresses project-associated impacts to forested habitats and estuarine marsh by the Corps of Engineers’ (Corps) for activities associated with implementation of the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV) Project. Our findings and recommendations are presented in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) and have been developed on the basis of surveys and analyses of project impacts and potential improvement of mitigation areas for fish and wildlife resources. This draft report does not constitute the final report of the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 2(b) of that Act. This draft FWCA provides additional comments in accordance with provisions of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) (54 Stat. 250, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 668a-d), the Migratory Bird
Treaty Act (MBTA) (40 Stat. 755, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (83 Stat. 852; 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The Service has provided copies of this report to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF), and their comments will be incorporated into the final report.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 authorized USACE to carry out measures needed to address consolidation, settlement, and sea level rise if the necessary work is determined to be technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 provided appropriations to conduct the General Re-evaluation Report necessary to inform this determination.

At the current stage of planning the USACE has preliminarily identified impacts to fish and wildlife resources. As planning and impact assessments continue to be refined, assessment of those impacts and mitigation needs will need to be revised accordingly.

**Study Area**

The portion of the New Orleans Metropolitan Area known as the East Bank extends from eastern St. Charles Parish to southern St. Bernard Parish along the left descending bank of the Mississippi River. It includes the communities of Norco, Destrehan, Kenner, Harahan, Metairie, New Orleans, Chalmette, Arabi, Meraux, Violet, Poydras, Caernarvon and St. Bernard. The Mississippi River Levee (MRL) protects this area from high river levels. The Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV) HSDRRS connects to the MRL at both the north and south end of the system.

The HSDRRS includes risk reduction features in nine sub-basins; five sub-basins are located in LPV (St. Charles, East Jefferson, Orleans Metro, New Orleans East). In this context a sub-basin is the geographic area protected by a specific component of HSDRRS and are independent hydrologic units. All of the sub-basins, except for the New Orleans East sub-basin, are located along the Mississippi River. Flood risk reduction from the Mississippi River flow is provided by the Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) Project.

Habitat types in the project area include forested wetlands [i.e., bottomland hardwoods (BLH) and/or swamps], non-wet BLH, marsh, open water, and developed areas. Due to urban development and a forced-drainage system, the hydrology of most of the forested habitat within the levee system has been altered. The forced-drainage system has been in operation for many years, and subsidence is evident throughout the areas enclosed by levees.

Wetlands (forested, marsh, and scrub-shrub) within the study area provide plant detritus to adjacent coastal waters and thereby contribute to the production of commercially and recreationally important fishes and shellfishes. Wetlands in the project area also provide valuable water quality functions such as reduction of excessive dissolved nutrient levels, filtering of waterborne contaminants, and removal of suspended sediment. In addition, coastal wetlands buffer storm surges, reducing their damaging effect to man-made infrastructure within the coastal area.
Essential Fish Habitat

The 1996 amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act; P.L. 104-297) set forth a new mandate for National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), regional fishery management councils (FMC), and other federal agencies to identify and protect important marine and anadromous fish habitat. The Essential Fish Habitats (EFH) provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act support one of the nation’s overall marine resource management goals of maintaining sustainable fisheries. Essential to achieving this goal is the maintenance of suitable marine fishery habitat quality and quantity. Detailed information on Federally-managed fisheries and their EFH is provided in the 1999 generic amendment of the Fishery Management Plans (FMP) for the Gulf of Mexico prepared by the Gulf of Mexico FMC (GMFMC). The generic FMP subsequently was updated and revised in 2005 and became effective in January 2006 (70 FR 76216). NMFS administers EFH regulations. Categories of EFH in the project area include the estuarine waters, estuarine emergent wetlands and mud, sand, and shell water bottoms.

Coastal wetlands also provide nursery and foraging habitat that supports economically important marine fishery species such as spotted seatrout, sand seatrout, southern flounder, Atlantic croaker, spot, Gulf menhaden, striped mullet, anchovies, and blue crab. Some of these species serve as prey for other fish species managed under the Magnuson-Stevens Act by the GMFMC (e.g., mackerels, snappers, and groupers) and highly migratory species managed by NMFS (e.g., billfishes and sharks). Where tidally-influenced waters designated as EFH are converted to a non-tidal elevation, loss of EFH would result. Should EFH be impacted, those losses should be quantified and presented in the Corps’ report. Close coordination with the NMFS is recommended because mitigation for those impacts is necessary.

Endangered and Threatened Species

To aid the Corps in complying with their proactive consultation responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Service provided a list of threatened and endangered species and their critical habitats within the Service’s Planning Aid Report dated April 29, 2019.

The Service provides the following additional information and guidance on best management practices (BMPs) for construction of the project.

The threatened West Indian manatee (Trichechus manatus) is known to regularly occur in Lakes Pontchartrain and Maurepas and their associated coastal waters and streams, however, manatee occurrences in southeastern Louisiana appear to be increasing. Based on data maintained by the Louisiana Natural Heritage Program (LNHP), over 80 percent of reported manatee sightings (1999-2011) in Louisiana have occurred from the months of June through December, mostly while the average water temperature is warm. Cold weather and outbreaks of red tide may adversely affect these animals. However, human activity is the primary cause for declines in
species number due to collisions with boats and barges, entrapment in flood control structures, poaching, habitat loss, and pollution.

During in-water work in areas that potentially support manatees, all personnel associated with the project should be instructed about the potential presence of manatees, manatee speed zones, and the need to avoid collisions with and injury to manatees. All personnel should be advised that there are civil and criminal penalties for harming, harassing, or killing manatees which are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 and the ESA of 1973. Additionally, personnel should be instructed not to attempt to feed or otherwise interact with the animal, although passively taking pictures or video would be acceptable. All on-site personnel are responsible for observing water-related activities for the presence of manatee(s). We recommend the following to minimize potential impacts to manatees in areas of their potential presence:

- All work, equipment, and vessel operation should cease if a manatee is spotted within a 50-foot radius (buffer zone) of the active work area. Once the manatee has left the buffer zone on its own accord (manatees must not be herded or harassed into leaving), or after 30 minutes have passed without additional sightings of manatee(s) in the buffer zone, in-water work can resume under careful observation for manatee(s).

- If a manatee(s) is sighted in or near the project area, all vessels associated with the project should operate at "no wake/idle" speeds within the construction area and at all times while in waters where the draft of the vessel provides less than a four-foot clearance from the bottom. Vessels should follow routes of deep water whenever possible.

- If used, siltation or turbidity barriers should be properly secured, made of material in which manatees cannot become entangled, and be monitored to avoid manatee entrapment or impeding their movement.

- Temporary signs concerning manatees should be posted prior to and during all in-water project activities and removed upon completion. Each vessel involved in construction activities should display at the vessel control station or in a prominent location, visible to all employees operating the vessel, a temporary sign at least 8½ " X 11" reading language similar to the following: “CAUTION BOATERS: MANATEE AREA/ IDLE SPEED IS REQUIRED IN CONSTRUCTION AREA AND WHERE THERE IS LESS THAN FOUR FOOT BOTTOM CLEARANCE WHEN MANATEE IS PRESENT”. A second temporary sign measuring 8½ " X 11" should be posted at a location prominently visible to all personnel engaged in water-related activities and should read language similar to the following: “CAUTION: MANATEE AREA/ EQUIPMENT MUST BE SHUTDOWN IMMEDIATELY IF A MANATEE COMES WITHIN 50 FEET OF OPERATION”.

- Collisions with, injury to, or sightings of manatees should be immediately reported to the Service's Louisiana Ecological Services Office (337/291-3100) and the LDWF, Natural Heritage Program (225/765-2821). Please provide the nature of the call (i.e., report of an
incident, manatee sighting, etc.), time of incident sighting; and the approximate location, including the latitude and longitude coordinates, if possible.

Should a proposed action directly or indirectly affect the West Indian manatee, further consultation with this office will be necessary.

The Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrhynchus desotoi*), federally listed as a threatened species, is an anadromous fish that occurs in many rivers, streams, and estuarine and marine waters along the northern Gulf coast. In Louisiana, Atlantic sturgeon have been reported at Rigolets Pass, rivers and lakes of the Lake Pontchartrain Basin, the Pearl River System, and adjacent estuarine and marine areas. Spawning occurs in coastal rivers between late winter and early spring (i.e., March to May). Adults and sub-adults may be found in those rivers and streams until November, and in estuarine or marine waters during the remainder of the year. Atlantic sturgeon less than two years old appear to remain in riverine habitats and estuarine areas throughout the year, rather than migrate to marine waters. Habitat alterations such as those caused by water control structures and navigation projects that limit and prevent spawning, poor water quality, and over-fishing have negatively affected this species.

On March 19, 2003, the Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published a final rule in the Federal Register (Volume 68, No. 53) designating critical habitat for the Atlantic sturgeon in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida. In Louisiana, the designation includes portions of the Pearl and Bogue Chitto Rivers and Lake Pontchartrain east of the Lake Pontchartrain Causeway, as well as Little Lake, The Rigolets, Lake St. Catherine, and Lake Borgne in their entirety. The primary constituent elements essential for the conservation of Gulf sturgeon, which should be considered when determining potential project impacts, are those habitat components that support feeding, resting, sheltering, reproduction, migration, and physical features necessary for maintaining the natural processes that support those habitat components. The primary constituent elements for Atlantic sturgeon critical habitat include:

- abundant prey items within riverine habitats for larval and juvenile life stages, and within estuarine and marine habitats for juvenile, sub-adult, and adult life stages;

- riverine spawning sites with substrates suitable for egg deposition and development, such as limestone outcrops and cut limestone banks, bedrock, large gravel or cobble beds, marl, soapstone, or hard clay;

- riverine aggregation areas, also referred to as resting, holding and staging areas, used by adult, sub-adult, and/or juveniles, generally, but not always, located in holes below normal riverbed depths, believed necessary for minimizing energy expenditures during freshwater residency and possibly for osmoregulatory functions;

- a flow regime (i.e., the magnitude, frequency, duration, seasonality, and rate-of-change of freshwater discharge over time) necessary for normal behavior, growth, and survival of all life stages in the riverine environment, including migration, breeding site selection, courtship, egg fertilization, resting, and staging; and necessary for maintaining spawning sites in suitable condition for egg attachment, egg sheltering, resting, and larvae staging;
• water quality, including temperature, salinity, pH, hardness, turbidity, oxygen content, and other chemical characteristics, necessary for normal behavior, growth, and viability of all life stages;

• sediment quality, including texture and other chemical characteristics, necessary for normal behavior, growth, and viability of all life stages; and,

• safe and unobstructed migratory pathways necessary for passage within and between riverine, estuarine, and marine habitats (e.g., a river unobstructed by a permanent structure, or a dammed river that still allows for passage).

Further consultation with this office will be necessary if the proposed action may directly or indirectly affect the Atlantic sturgeon. In addition, should the proposed action involve federal implementation, funding, or a federal permit and directly or indirectly affects designated critical habitat, further consultation with this office or the NMFS will be necessary. As part of the critical habitat designation, the Service and NMFS consultation responsibility was divided by project location and Federal action agency. In riverine waters, the Service is responsible for all consultations regarding Atlantic sturgeon and critical habitat, while in marine waters the NMFS is responsible for consultation. For estuarine waters, the Service is responsible for consultations with the Department of Transportation (DOT), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). All other Federal agencies should consult with the NMFS office (Ms. Cathy Tortorici at 727.209.5953).

Migratory Birds

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (40 Stat. 755, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) (54 Stat. 250, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 668a-d) offer protection to many bird species within the project area including colonial nesting birds, osprey, and the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus). We continue to recommend that a qualified biologist inspect proposed work sites for the presence of undocumented colonial nesting colonies during the nesting season (e.g. February through September depending on the species). If colonies exist, work should not be conducted within 1,000 feet of the colony during the nesting season.

On-site personnel should also be informed of the possible presence of nesting bald eagles and ospreys within the project boundary, and should identify, avoid, and immediately report any such nests to this office. If a bald eagle nest is located within 660 feet of the proposed activities, the Corps should complete an on-line evaluation (http://www.fws.gov/southeast/birds/Eagle/tamain.html) to determine potential disturbance to nesting bald eagles and any protective measures necessary. A copy of that evaluation should be provided to this office. If assistance is needed in completing the evaluation please contact this office.
Public/Protected Lands

Lands within public ownership/oversight impacted by the LPV project include the Jean Lafitte National Historic Park and Preserve (JLNHPP), Chalmette National Cemetery managed by the National Park Service (NPS) and the Bayou Sauvage National Wildlife Refuge Preserve managed by the Service.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Project impacts resulted primarily from levee ROWs expansion and construction of levees, borrows pits, floodwalls, navigable floodgates, and associated features. Development is ongoing within the hurricane protection levees; therefore, the Service has assumed that, for this specific project, project-induced development was insignificant. However, the Corps is continuing to refine projects plans; therefore, proposed habitat impacts cannot be finalized at this time. Impacts to wet bottomland hardwoods within the batture and adjacent to the MRL levee have been tentatively identified. Assessment of the value of those areas and their mitigation needs will be presented in our final report. Borrow sites have not been identified in this planning phase but will be identified during detailed planning efforts. Impacts and mitigation associated with those borrow sites will be identified in subsequent NEPA documents. Additional Service recommendations may be provided in supplemental reports as those plans are more fully developed.

Habitat Assessments

Wetland impacts are anticipated to be minimal due to the use of existing levee and floodwall rights-of-way and avoidance of bottomland hardwood habitat in selection of borrow areas.

To quantify impacts and mitigation needs, the Wetland Value Assessment (WVA) will be utilized. Any proposed change in impacts, mitigation features or plans should be coordinated in advance with the Service, NMFS, LDWF, EPA and LDNR.

ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION PROCESS

Six alternatives and one no action alternative were qualitatively evaluated and screened based on preliminary hydrology and hydraulics (H&H), life safety risk, and economic damages information.

The initial array of alternatives includes:

- No Action Alternative
- Alternative 1: System Levee Lifts to the Projected 1% Event at 2057
- Alternative 2: System Levee Lifts to the Projected 1% Event at 2073
- Alternative 3: System Levee Lifts at 2073 that Maximize Benefits
- Alternative 4: Selective Levee Lifts
- Alternative 5: Non-Structural
- Alternative 6: Sponsor Plan
Alternative 2 achieves the greatest net benefits and is thus the National Economic Development (NED) plan and the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) for LPV. The second alternative focuses on the 1% event at the 2073 time period. LPV authorization is for protection against 1% event and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) levee certification for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program under the base flood elevation at the time of construction. 2073 is the end of the studies’ 50-year period of analysis.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION MEASURES

The Service's Mitigation Policy (Federal Register, Volume 46, No. 15, January 23, 1981) identifies four resource categories that are used to ensure that the level of mitigation recommended by Service biologists will be consistent with the fish and wildlife resource values involved. Considering the high value of forested wetlands for fish and wildlife and the relative scarcity of that habitat type, that habitat type is designated as Resource Category 2, the mitigation goal for which is no net loss of in-kind habitat value. The scrub-shrub and dry bottomland hardwood habitat that may be impacted, however, is placed in Resource Category 3 due to their reduced value to wildlife, fisheries and degraded wetland functions. The mitigation goal for Resource Category 3 habitats is no net loss of habitat value.

The study assumes that existing borrow areas will continue to be used and additional borrow areas will be identified and utilized by other projects, both Federal and non-Federal. This may lead to a reduced availability of future borrow sites which avoid sensitive environmental areas. While this may occur, the study team has no way to predict the potential reduction in available borrow sites and, therefore, has assumed that sensitive environmental areas can be avoided. Identification of future borrow locations should follow guidance provided in Appendix A. Mitigation for those impacts should be coordinated with all natural resource agencies.

SERVICE POSITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We do not oppose the Corps’ plan to implement alternative 2 for the LPV HSDRRS provided that the following fish and wildlife conservation recommendations are incorporated into future project planning and implementation efforts:

1. Impacts to Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) should be avoided and minimized to the greatest extent possible. Because impacts to designated EFH habitat may need to be mitigated the Corps should coordinate with the NMFS regarding this need.

2. To the greatest extent possible, situate final flood protection features so that impacts to wetlands and non-wet bottomland hardwoods are avoided or minimized.

3. Avoid adverse impacts of bald eagle nesting locations and wading bird colonies through careful design of project features and timing of construction. Forest clearing associated with project features should be conducted during the fall or winter to minimize impacts to nesting migratory birds, when practicable.
4. The Service recommends that the USACE contact the Service for additional consultation if: 1) the scope or location of the proposed project is changed significantly, 2) new information reveals that the action may affect listed species or designated critical habitat; 3) the action is modified in a manner that causes effects to listed species or designated critical habitat; or 4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated. Additional consultation as a result of any of the above conditions or for changes not covered in this consultation should occur before changes are made and or finalized.

5. Further detailed planning of project features (e.g., Design Documentation Report, Engineering Documentation Report, Plans and Specifications, Water Control Plans, or other similar documents) should be coordinated with the Service, NMFS, LDWF, EPA and Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR). The Service shall be provided an opportunity to review and submit recommendations on the all work addressed in those reports.

6. The Corps should avoid impacts to public lands, if feasible. If not feasible the Corps should establish and continue coordination with agencies managing public lands that may be impacted by a project feature until construction of that feature is complete and prior to any subsequent maintenance. In addition all mitigation proposed to occur on public lands should be coordinated with the respective land managing agency. Points of contacts for the agencies potentially impacted by project features are: National Park Service (NPS), contact Superintendent Chuck Hunt, (504) 589-3882 extension 137 (Charles_Hunt@nps.gov) or Chief of Resource Management Guy Hughes (504) 589-3882 extension 128, (Guy_Hughes@nps.gov) and for Bayou Sauvage NWR, the following people should be coordinated with; Shelly Stiaes, (Shelly_Stiaes@fws.gov) Refuge Manager, Barret Fortier (Barret_Fortier@fws.gov) Southeast Refuges Complex Biologist and Neil Lalonde (Neil_Lalonde@fws.gov) Southeast Refuge Complex Supervisor. The telephone number for the Southeast Refuge Complex is (985) 882-2000.

7. If applicable, a General Plan for mitigation should be developed by the Corps, the Service, and the managing natural resource agency in accordance with Section 3(b) of the FWCA for mitigation lands.

8. The Corps should maintain full responsibility for all mitigation projects until the projects are found to be fully compliant with success and performance requirements.

9. The Corps should fully compensate for any unavoidable losses of wetland habitat or non-wet bottomland hardwoods caused by project features.

10. Borrow sites should be designed to avoid and minimize impacts to fish and wildlife habitat; in the event new borrow sites are identified, guidelines for borrow site selection are found in Appendix A.
11. Identified impacts shall have a fully defined mitigation plan that is included in the integrated National Environmental Policy Act document. The mitigation plan should be developed, including locations and AAHUs vetted through the natural resource agencies. Existing mitigation banks and existing credits released by Corps Regulatory Branch should be considered in accordance with Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources; Final Rule (33 CFR Parts 325 and 332).

12. If the local project-sponsor is unable to fulfill the financial mitigation requirements for operation and/or maintenance of mitigation lands, then the Corps should provide the necessary funding to ensure mitigation obligations are met on behalf of the public interest.

13. Any proposed change in mitigation features or plans should be coordinated in advance with the Service, NMFS, LDWF, EPA and LDNR.

14. The Corps should finalize mitigation plans and proceed to mitigation construction so that it will be concurrent with project construction. If construction is not concurrent with mitigation implementation then revising the impact and mitigation period-of-analysis to reflect additional temporal losses will be required.

We will continue to work closely with your staff to ensure that fish and wildlife resources are conserved. If you require further assistance in this matter, please contact Hannah Sprinkle (337-291-3121).

Joseph A. Ranson
Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office
Appendix A

Borrow Site Prioritization Criteria

Where multiple alternative borrow areas exist, use of those alternative sites should be prioritized in the following order: existing commercial pits, upland sources, previously disturbed/manipulated wetlands within a levee system, and low-quality wetlands outside a levee system. The Service supports the use of such protocols to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and bottomland hardwoods within project areas. Avoidance and minimization of those impacts helps to provide consistency with restoration strategies and compliments the authorized hurricane protection efforts. Such consistency is also required by Section 303(d)(1) of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA).

Accordingly, the Service recommends that prior to utilizing borrow sites every effort should be made to reduce impacts by using sheetpile and/or floodwalls to increase levee heights wherever feasible. In addition, the Service recommends that the following protocol be adopted and utilized to identify borrow sources in descending order of priority:

1. Permitted commercial sources, authorized borrow sources for which environmental clearance and mitigation have been completed, or non-functional levees after newly constructed adjacent levees are providing equal protection.
2. Areas under forced drainage that are protected from flooding by levees, and that are:
   a) non-forested (e.g., pastures, fallow fields, abandoned orchards, former urban areas) and non-wetlands;
   b) wetland forests dominated by exotic tree species (i.e., Chinese tallow-trees) or non-forested wetlands (e.g., wet pastures), excluding marshes;
   c) disturbed wetlands (e.g., hydrologically altered, artificially impounded).
3. Sites that are outside a forced drainage system and levees, and that are:
   a) non-forested (e.g., pastures fallow fields, abandoned orchards, former urban areas) and non-wetlands;
   b) wetland forests dominated by exotic tree species (i.e., Chinese tallow-trees) or non-forested wetlands (e.g., wet pastures), excluding marshes;
   c) disturbed wetlands (e.g., hydrologically altered, artificially impounded).

Notwithstanding this protocol, the location, size and configuration of borrow sites within the landscape is also critically important. Coastal ridges, natural levee flanks and other geographic features that provide forested/wetland habitats and/or potential barriers to hurricane surges should not be utilized as borrow sources, especially where such uses would diminish the natural functions and values of those landscape features.

To assist in expediting the identification of borrow sites, the Service recommends that immediately after the initial identification of a new borrow site the Corps should initiate informal consultation with the Service regarding potential impacts to federally listed threatened or endangered species. To aid you in complying with those proactive consultation responsibilities, the Service has provided (in the above letter) a list of threatened and endangered species and their critical habitats within the project area.
4  PUBLIC MEETINGS

4.1 OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 April 2019</td>
<td>USACE New Orleans District Office</td>
<td>~20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>upcoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 PUBLIC MEETING 30 APRIL 2019

4.2.1 PRESENTATION SLIDES FROM PUBLIC MEETING

---

**CURRENT STATUS**

Today, the system provides the 1% level of risk reduction authorized by Congress and USACE is fully confident it will perform as designed and continue to do so for several years without additional lifts. The need for future levee lifts has always been known, but was not authorized along with the system's initial construction.

---

**MEETING PURPOSE**

- As part of the scoping process, we need your input on:
  - Significant issues/impacts to be addressed in the EIS
  - Potential project features/alternatives
  - Data sources
  - Issues that are not significant and need not be addressed

- As part of the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires an early and open process for determining the scope of the issues to be addressed
- General Reevaluation Report (GRR): a study to affirm, reframe, or modify an existing plan. Similar to a feasibility study

---

**AGENCY PARTNERSHIP & COORDINATION**

**Non-Federal Sponsor**

Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)

- Feasibility cost-share agreement was executed on October 09, 2018.

**Permitting & Advisory Agencies**

---
TERMS & DEFINITIONS
Sea Level Rise + Subsidence = Relative Sea Level Rise

Comaction/Settlement of levee

Note: Because of the age of the levees, the topography, bathymetry, and other factors, the levee settlement rates are not equal across the system.

WHY ARE FUTURE LEVEE LIFTS REQUIRED?

While the LPV and WBV projects provided the 1% level of risk reduction when construction was completed, additional future levee lifts will be required to offset expected consolidation, settlement, subsidence, and sea level rise which will cause levee reaches within the system to fall below the required elevation necessary to provide 1% risk reduction.

Note: This study will also consider other risk reduction measures.

AUTHORITY
Section 3017 of WRRDA 2014 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out measures that address consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum to restore current federal authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction projects to their authorized levels of protection, if the Secretary determines the necessary work is technically feasible, environmentally-acceptable, and economically justified.

In 2018, Congress provided appropriations via the Bipartisan Budget Act to conduct the two General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statements necessary to inform this determination.

STUDY GOAL: Reduce the risk of life loss and economic damages due to hurricane storm surge in the New Orleans greater metropolitan area.

OBJECTIVE I - Reduce risk of life loss
OBJECTIVE II - Reduce Economic Damages
OBJECTIVE III - Reduce Environmental Damages

STUDY AREA CHARACTERISTICS
• Population increase by almost 6% by the year 2030.
• Estimated levee lift costs will be $8.20 million (2010 dollars).
Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report
DRAFT

STUDY AREA TOPOGRAPHY

City of New Orleans Ground Elevations

From Canal St. at Mississippi River to the Lakefront

RISK REDUCTION MEASURES

Structural
- Levee Raise
- Inlet/Surge Barrier
- New Floodwalls
- Breakwaters/sandbag
  in combination
- Interior drainage improvements
- Add armor on the flood side
- Valve Bemis

Non-Structural
- Risk Communication
  with the public/Flood Warning
- Buyouts
- Flood-proofing
- Diked buildings

Nature-Based
- Marshes
- Dunes/Beaches
- Living Shoreline

OVERALL STUDY TIMELINE

- Project Initiation
- Alternative Development
- Public & Agency Meetings
- Alternative Evaluation
- Tentatively Select Plan
- Public Review (anticipated mid-December 2019)
- Agency Endorsement of Recommended Plan
- Approval of Final Report

WHAT WE NEED FROM YOU

1. What hurricane event did your community see the most damages?
2. Are there risk reduction measures that you would like the planning team to evaluate to address the problems?
3. Are there specific things the planning team should consider?
4. Is there data/studies that you know of that could help the study?
5. Significant issues/impacts to be addressed
6. Issues that are not significant and need not be addressed

COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Comments or information can be provided to:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District
1010 Poydras Street, 4th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70112

Or by email to
CEMVN-WAVGRR@usace.army.mil
CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil

PATH FORWARD

- Geotech
  - Levee consolidation curves updates
  - HEC
  - Breach and overtopping modeling
  - Sea level rise scenarios
  - Including mapping using HEC-RAS
- Economics
  - Structure inventory updates, HEC-FDA
  - Lifespan
  - NED benefit quantification
  - Environmental Justice
  - Environmental
  - Prepare NEPA document, publish NOI
  - Determine quantity and cost of mitigation
  - Levee Safety
  - Semi-Quantitative Risk Assessment for levees
    - Identify alternative below tolerable risk guideline
4.2.2 COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM TIMES PICAYUNE AND CEMVN RESPONSES (IN RED)

The following comments were directed to CEMVN PAO and CEMVN PAO and PM responses back to the newspaper are provided in red.

Is there a document/documents that have already been completed that outline where things stand for both? No.

Has there been any memo issued outlining the limitations to be required for these two studies? 
There is implementation guidance.

Were these two studies requested by CPRA? Regional levee authorities? Are there documents for that?
No, they were authorized by Congress in WRRDA 2014 Sec 3017 and received appropriations from BBA18.

Were these first covered in a HSDRRS study? Since they are a re-evaluation what was the first evaluation?
There was not a HSDRRRS study, because Congress authorized and appropriated funds without a report or requiring a benefit/cost analysis.

In 2015, I wrote a story about a corps presentation to the east bank authority that seemed to be about this study for the east bank, at least, and tagged the cost of the study at $10-20 million, and said it should be finished by 2018 in order to give public, FEMA time to review it, etc, in advance of 2023 recertification.
Do you expect the reviews announced in these notices will include all the provisions discussed in that meeting?

No, the items discussed in that article largely involve re-running the ADCIRC model which does not fit within the smart planning $3M budget and 3 year schedule of the GRRs. They will utilize the existing ADCIRC models with some modifications. Recertification is a responsibility of the non-Federal Sponsor and is also not part of this effort.

With the language in the notice saying the study may show parts of the system will no longer meet 1 percent requirements by 2023, is it your belief that there will be enough time between its completion and the recertification deadline to address low areas in the system?

The 2023 date is an estimate based on existing data and previous settlement curves. The study is gathering new levee elevation data (to include some work done by the NFS) that may extend the timeline the levees remain above the 1% design elevations. Even if a portion of a levee reach were to fall below the 1% design elevation engineering analysis would be required to determine whether or not the system continued to provide the 1% level of risk reduction.

Are each of the levee systems expecting that present lift efforts associated with armoring will meet that goal? Do you already know other things that need to be done? Or are you expecting this new study to identify those issues and address them as future Corps projects?

The non-Federal sponsor has taken actions to raise some of the levees previously expected to be the first requiring future lifts. No new settlement curves have been generated by USACE at this time to determine how long those reaches will remain above the 1% design heights. Additional alternatives to sustain the 1% elevation may be identified by the study.

And, Matt, can I get a copy of the engineering analysis that the corps cites in its notice as showing the 1 percent standard might not be met by 2023?

Smart planning relies on the use of existing data to complete studies in a timely and cost efficient matter. The 2023 date is an estimate based on available data at the time the NOI was published.

And if the EIS/study finds additional work must be done, would that be sent to Congress as a proposed project in a chief’s report, assuming it’s given a positive benefit/cost analysis? And if so, how quickly could work be started/completed to meet flood insurance requirements?

WRRDA 2014 Sec 3017 provides construction authorization provided that the project is found to be technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified through 10 June 2024. Potential implementation would be subject to appropriations and the authority’s termination date.
Comments Received from private citizen and CEMVN Responses (in red)

As you will be aware, the State of Louisiana is currently in the process of putting out to bid for the Mid-Barataria and Mid-Breton sediment diversion projects. I was wondering whether the Corps will be taking the effects that these structures will undoubtedly have on river flow and volume into account when designing the levee lifts. Further, might these structures function in a similar way to the Bonnet Carre spillway when the river is high, providing additional flood control mechanisms?

The LPV and WBV GRR studies are authorized to consider alternatives related to Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction. I can't speak to what the State may or may not utilize the diversion structures for, but riverine flooding falls under a different Federal project the Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) project (i.e. river levees). The diversions are unlikely to be impacted by this study as they are outside our project area. I would not anticipate the diversions would be used during hurricanes, the details of how they are operated will be reviewed as part of the State's 408 permit request to the Corps seeking to modify the MR&T project.

Back in 2013, architects Waggoner and Ball released The Greater New Orleans Urban Water Plan, which the City of New Orleans adopted in its most recent Master Plan. The plan recommends a significant overhaul of the system of drainage canals that the Sewerage and Water Board currently operates and maintains. Again, will the Corps be taking the Urban Water Plan into account and coordinating with the City to ensure that the plan matches the Corps own objectives?

I have downloaded the Waggoner and Ball reports and shared them with the team for consideration. If in reviewing alternatives with the highest benefits it appears work on the canals may be required we would certainly consult with the S&WB and City of New Orleans, but work on the canals themselves is unlikely to provide the additional benefits that would be required to justify the expense of altering the existing floodwalls.

**Additional Information:** It should be noted, the interior drainage analysis was performed to determine if interior drainage function was impacted by HSDRRS construction efforts. Analysis results indicate that each basin performs independently of external water levels. Secondly, HSDRRS construction has no significant impact on interior water levels or drainage during an event that does not overtop the system.
5 PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM MEETINGS

Below are a list of key meetings that were help with project delivery team. The PDT met weekly. Only key meetings are summarized below. Full meeting minutes are documented in the project file and available upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-14 September 2018</td>
<td>Initial PDT Kick-Off Meeting, Rapid Iteration #1, Site Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2018</td>
<td>Environmental PDT CEMVS &amp; CEMVN: Call to discuss GRR NEPA documentation considerations moving forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 October 2018</td>
<td>Environmental, Tribal &amp; OC PDT CEMVS &amp; CEMVN: Call to discuss cooperating agency and coordinating with agency partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 November 2018</td>
<td>Rapid Iteration #2, Site Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 February 2019</td>
<td>Alternatives Milestone Meeting: MSC Planning and Policy Chief affirmed the PDT’s preliminary analysis of the Federal Interest, and problems, opportunities, objectives, constraints, existing and future without project conditions, status of environmental compliance and initial array of alternatives for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April 2019</td>
<td>PDT meeting to discuss plan formulation and screen measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 October 2019</td>
<td>Environmental and USFWS – Initial Wetland Value Assessment Discussion; Discussion with CEMVN Environmental on Mitigation Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 October 2019</td>
<td>Tentatively Selected Plan Milestone Meeting: MSC Planning and Policy Chief affirmed the PDT’s recommendation of the TSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 DISTRIBUTION LIST

6.1 DRAFT REPORT PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION LIST 9 DEC 2019
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DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
7400 LEAKE AVENUE  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118  

December 9, 2019

Regional Planning and Environment  
Division South

Dear Sir or Madam:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” You are receiving this letter because you may be interested in this project. The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


This GRR-DEIS will reevaluate the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is using this DEIS to initiate consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

Please review the documents at the link above and provide comments by February 7, 2020. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Interested parties may express their views on the proposed action. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report.

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; New District, CEMVN-PMO-L, Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper  
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch  
Regional Planning and Environment  
Division South
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DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
7400 LEAKE AVENUE
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

December 9, 2019

Regional Planning and Environment Division South

Cecilia Flores, Tribal Council Chairperson
Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas
571 State Park Rd. S6
Livingston, TX 77351

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRAS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity to for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Mr. Bryant J. Celestine, Historic Preservation Officer, Alabama Coushatta Tribe of Texas, celestine.bryant@actribe.org.
December 9, 2019

Regional Planning and Environment Division South

Tamara Francis-Fourkiller, Chairman  
Caddo Nation of Oklahoma  
117 Memorial Lane  
P.O. Box 487  
Binger, OK 73009

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper  
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter will be provided to Mr. Derrick Hill, THPO, Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, dhill@caddo.xyz
Regional Planning and Environment Division South

Gary Batton, Chief
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma
Attn: Choctaw Nation Historic Preservation Department
P.O. Box 1210
Durant, OK 74702-1210

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDDRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity to for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/.

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; New District; CEMVN-PMO-I; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Dr. Ian Thompson, Director/Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, ithompson@choctawnation.com and Ms. Lindsey Bilyeu, NHPA Section 106 Reviewer, Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, lbilyeu@choctawnation.com.
Regional Planning and Environment Division South

David Sickey, Chairman
Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana
P.O. Box 818
Elton, LA 70532

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NHPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Dr. Linda Langley, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana, llangley@coushattatribela.org.
Regional Planning and Environment Division South

Melissa Darden, Chairman
Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana
P.O. Box 661
Charenton, LA 70523

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvp.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NHPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvp.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Mrs. Kimberly Walden, M. Ed., Cultural Director/Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana, kim@chitimacha.gov.
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NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
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December 9, 2019

Regional Planning and Environment Division South

B. Cheryl Smith, Principal Chief  
Jena Band of Choctaw Indians  
P.O. Box 14  
Jena, LA 71342

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.usace.army.mil/News/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 802-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper  
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Mrs. Alina Shively, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, ashively@jena Choctaw.org.
The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New District, CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosing will be provided to Mr. Kenneth H. Carleton, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer/Archaeologist, Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, kcarleton@choctaw.org.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
7400 LEAKE AVENUE
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

December 9, 2019

Regional Planning and
Environment Division South

Mr. James Floyd, Principal Chief
Muscogee (Creek) Nation
Attn: Historic and Cultural Preservation Office
P.O. Box 580
Okmulgee, OK 74447

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity to for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70138. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Ms. Comin Lowe-Zepeda, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Muscogee (Creek) Nation, section106@mca-nsn.gov.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
7400 LEAKE AVENUE  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118  

Regional Planning and  
Environment Division South  

Greg Chilcoat, Principal Chief  
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma  
P.O. Box 1498  
Wewoka, OK 74884  

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.  

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:  


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.  

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.  

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/  

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drochant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drochant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.  

Marshall K. Harper  
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch  

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Mr. Theodore Isham, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, isham.t@sno-nsi.gov.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
7400 LEAKE AVENUE
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

December 9, 2019

Regional Planning and
Environment Division South

Marcellus W. Oceola, Chairman
Seminole Tribe of Florida
6300 Sterling Road
Hollywood, FL 33024

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at [https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/]. The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 301; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Dr. Paul N. Backhouse, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Seminole Tribe of Florida, TRFOCompliance@semtribe.com.
Regional Planning and Environment Division South

Joey Barby, Chairman
Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana
P.O. Box 1589
Marksville, LA 71351

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at [https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NHPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/]. The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: [https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/]

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Droissant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New District, CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Droissant may be contacted at (504) 862-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to Mr. Earl J. Barby, Jr., Cultural Director, Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana, earlj@tunica.org.
Regional Planning and Environment Division South

Kristin Sanders, SHPO
LA State Historic Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 44247
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4241

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has prepared a draft report entitled “Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity General Re-Evaluation Report with Integrated Draft Environmental Impact Statement (LPV GRR-DEIS).” This GRR-DEIS reevaluates the performance of the LPV system given the combined effects of consolidation, settlement, subsidence, sea level rise, and new datum over time, and determine if additional actions are recommended to address the economic and life safety risks associated with flooding due to hurricanes and coastal storms.

The draft report and appendices are available online for your review and comment at the below website:


The USACE is initiating consultation for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and with Federally-recognized Tribes with this letter for the referenced project. No determination of effect under the NHPA is being made at this time. Consultation will follow the standard Section 106 process.

NHPA consultation will address the Area of Potential Effects for portions of the project that are outside of the undertakings previously reviewed under Individual Environmental Reviews (IER) and Comprehensive Environmental Documents available at (https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/HSDRRS-Projects/). The LPV study includes the actions described in IERs #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, and #27. The Section 106 consultation will provide the results of any Phase I Cultural Resources Survey (if necessary), and USACE’s determination of effect to historic properties. This will provide an opportunity for consulting parties to review NHPA specific documentation, per 36 CFR 800.11. The determination of effect and any conditions will be documented in the Final Record of Decision (ROD) before it is signed.

For purposes of understanding the undertaking, please review the documents at the link above. Should your tribe or agency want to provide comments upon the NEPA document, please provide comments by February 7, 2020. All comments postmarked on or before the expiration of the comment period will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the final report. A public open house will be held the week of January 20th and details will be posted on the New Orleans District website: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Media/Public-Meetings/

Comments should be mailed to the attention of Mr. Bradley Drouant, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New District; CEMVN-PMO-L; Room 361; 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118. Comments may also be provided by email to CEMVN-LPVGRR@usace.army.mil. Mr. Drouant may be contacted at (504) 865-1516 if questions arise.

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

CC: An electronic copy of this letter with enclosures will be provided to the Section 106 Inbox, section106@.crt.la.gov.