Public Meeting Summary

Individual Environmental Reports 6, 7 & 11 (Tier 2)
New Orleans East / IHNC Surge Barrier Protection Public Meeting
July 29, 2008

Location	Church of New Orleans 1700 Chef Menteur Hwy. New Orleans, LA
Time	Open House 6:00pm Presentation 7:00pm
Attendees	Approx 40
Format	Presentation and Discussion
Handouts	Power Point Presentation Borrow Handout
Facilitation	Julie Morgan
Presenter(s)	Kevin Wagner, senior project manager Ron Elmer, branch chief IHNC

Welcome

Julie Morgan, public affairs

We are here to discuss the status of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project. It is important that we hear your comments which play a role in determining the alternatives that reduce risk in these neighborhoods. We appreciate your presence and look forward to hearing your constructive comments or questions. Tonight on the agenda we have Mr. Kevin Wagner, the senior project manager for the Orleans levees and Mr. Ron Elmer, branch chief of the Industrial Canal Surge Barrier project. We will start with Kevin giving the presentation followed by Mr. Elmer. After the presentations we will open the floor to questions and answers. I would like to ask everyone to hold their comments or questions until after the presentation because your questions may be answered during the presentation.

Kevin Wagner, senior project manager

My name is Kevin Wagner and I am the senior project manager of Orleans Parish. The area I am responsible for the area that extends from the 17th St. canal, along Lakeshore Dr., and goes all the way to New Orleans East and from the Lakefront Airport to the east side of Michoud Canal. We will discuss all these projects tonight.

The following notes were recorded by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the presentations and public questions and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

Public Meeting Summary

We are here to give you an idea of the projects and the alternatives we are looking at for each of the areas. Our goal and mission is to provide 100-year level of protection for the entire area and we intend to complete the work by 2011.



All major Federal actions are required to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act process, known as NEPA. We have to analyze and document all potential impacts to the natural and human environments. We do this through Individual Environmental Reports. IER's 6, 7, and 11 will be discussed tonight. The key to getting a better product is to have the public involved. The public can get involved in the process by providing comments about the alternatives. We have conducted numerous meetings at different locations and have adjusted some projects based on public input.

The area we are discussing tonight is from the Lakefront Airport to the east side of the Michoud Canal and then Ron Elmer's project from the MRGO to the GIWW. IER 6 is from the Lakefront Airport to Paris Rd. IER 7 is from Paris Road to the east side of the Michoud Canal.

These [pointing] are the different projects we have identified in the IERs. IER 6 covers 3 projects: 105, 106, and 107 for the Lakefront airport. There is an existing floodwall section here [pointing], it crosses under the overpass here [pointing], and then it ties into the levee structure that parallels Haynes Blvd. Reach 105 is from the IHNC all the way to just past the casino. One alternative is retrofitting the existing I-wall to an L-wall along the existing alignment. The second is to replace the T-wall along the current I-wall alignment. The third is to construct a T-wall or levee south of the NS Railroad at the west end of the project. One of the challenges we have had is dealing with the railroad. If we follow the existing alignment we have to construct 2 gates across the railroad tracks and that is a challenge in itself. There are issues when dealing with railroads. One of the alternatives we are looking at here [pointing] actually has some benefits when we move the alignment to the south side of the railroad track and



by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

avoid building the 2 gates. We would have to put a gate at Donald Rd but there are some issues with getting site clearance.

This is a T-wall. You see [pointing] we have a base foundation and then the stem sticks up. The elevation we are trying to have with the T-wall is 15.5 feet. Five piles will help support the foundation. The piling would have seepage cutoffs to prevent seepage under the floodwalls.





LPV 106 extends from where reach 105 ends to Paris Road. The area not included is by Lincoln Beach because that is a separate project. The alternatives we are looking at are to raise the levee. We will raise the levee with two seepage cutoffs. Deep soil mixing, which is a type of ground improvement we implement to act as a better foundation but also acts as a seepage cutoff. Another option would be to construct a T-wall along the current alignment.

The following is the proposed alignment.. This [pointing] would be the levee and it would be raised to elevation 13 ½. This [pointing] is the railroad tracks that we will not impact. In front of the levee along the lake's shoreline is the breakwater which we intend to raise.



One of the challenges is restoring the breakwater and this is how we are going to access these areas. The way this project was constructed before was to dig access channels in the lake. We thought we would have to extend it out to a 10 foot contour but additional investigation identified where a 10 foot contour exists. It raised the limit on the amount of impacts that we had along the shore. It took time but we are reducing the amount of impacts along the shore.



IER 6 project 107 addresses the Lincoln Beach area. Currently we have an existing I-wall that extends along this reach. We have a small section of T-wall right here [pointing] with a gate and we have an entrance gate what use to be the Lincoln Beach recreation area. The alternatives we are looking at are to modify or retrofit the existing I-wall and replace the gate following the existing alignment. We would construct a T-wall gate along the existing alignment and replace the I-wall over there. The other option is to construct a T-wall gate following the same alignment as 106. In this case, we can move the

The following notes were recorded by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the presentations and public questions and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

alternative a little further south from the [inaudible] side of the existing wall. Then we can replace the wall and gate with the levee. The idea is to get rid of the I-wall and instead of a floodwall construct a levee section similar to what we have at 6th street. Basically one of the ways to do this is through deep soil mixing.





This is deep soil mixing. This deep soil mixing zone we have here [pointing] will act as a tunnel so we would not get any further seepage in the area. To make this alternative work, we currently have to build a small retaining wall that runs parallel to the [inaudible]. This is the existing I-wall coming down and we need to utilize that under construction as interim protection and possibly incorporate it into the final solution. [Inaudible]. You can kind of see the piles I mentioned before [pointing], the sheet pile cutoff, and the base foundation that results in T-wall sanction. Here, the existing wall we would shift the alignment a little further to the south towards Haynes Blvd. Then we would compact the material and bring that to the retaining wall.

IER 7 focuses on Paris Road around the refuge to the east side of the Michoud Canal. Reach 108 is from Paris Road to South Point. The alternatives we are looking is a levee right now that is above 100-year protection. We have to make sure that this particular levee fits the berm design criteria. We will raise the levee so we can add stability berms that meet our criteria. Here is where we are going add the stability berms to prevent any problems.





Reach 109.02A focuses on the 100-year level of protection for this stretch of levee from South Point to the CSX railroad gate. One alternative is a levee enlargement, to raise the levee with large stability berms. Another option we are considering is reducing the levee footprint by using lightweight material in the core of the levee. Other alternatives we have involve ground improvements. We can use high geotextiles in the levees, wick drains, with slurry cutoff walls down the center line or at the

by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

choke. We could use deep soil mixing in both of these alternatives.

Reach 109.02B focuses on the area at the interstate where we have the challenge to maintain the traffic. We all know that we get regular traffic from the Slidell area across this stretch of the interstate. We are looking at constructing a levee with or to construct a levee with a bridge that passing over the levee. Another option we are considering is a T-wall with a bridge going over it.

Reach 109.02C actually focuses on Highway 11 where there is a levee crossing and a gate. The other is at Highway 90 where we do have a current existing gate. The idea is to retrofit the existing floodgates at those two locations or to replace the floodgates. We also talked about either building a levee or floodwall with a bridge over it.





A major area that has improved since Katrina is here [pointing] at the GSX railroad crossing. This floodwall and gate at the GSX railroad crossing was at elevation 13 ½ feet before the storm and now it is being built to elevation 20 with the tie in at elevation 22. We are now hardening the transition plates that ties into the levee sections. We still need other improvements to raise the gates to the 100-year level of protection.

Reach 111.01 goes from the CSX railroad gate to the east side of the Michoud Canal parallel to the GIWW. The alternatives are: a levee enlargement with stability berms; to raise the levee with the lightweight material; raise the levee with high-strength geotextile, wick drains, and slurry cutoff walls; or, raise the levees through deep soil mixing which would minimize the impacts to the refuge located there.



Reach 111.02: strictly focuses on pump station 15 that initially had damage from Katrina. We went back and rebuilt the wall with all the transition points to elevation 23 but we have to get that area to elevation 34. That is a significant raise in elevation and the reason this part of the project is a separate feature. We have to keep the pumping capacity at the existing pump station because it helps protect the New Orleans East levee. However, we are

replacing the existing wall at pump station 3 because we do not have many options.

The future contracts are for reach 108 that extends from Paris Road to South Point. The first phase of reach 109 is to barge the levee from South Point to GSX railroad. The other job is reach 113, the betterment for the NASA facility that extends from the Michoud Canal to the Michoud Slip.



The borrow we are going to need for these levee enlargements will come from general areas in New Orleans East but we are looking at the possibility of getting the borrow from Mississippi or south Louisiana. However we are not limiting our investigations for getting all the material we need to complete the project.

Some of the borrow sites for New Orleans East we are close to acquiring. One of the main sites is off I-10. We are going to be using the borrow for the contracts we mentioned that are will start in the near future. The other area we are looking at is actually owned by two property owners. Mr. Cummings owns the Franklin Baptist Church and we are in negotiations. One area that we have investigated and cleared for suitable borrow is in Eastover, but that would be contracted by [inaudible]. The final area we are looking at is about 850 acres along the GIWW that we call the Stumpf pile; we are currently investigating these properties now.

Now I am going to turn it over to Ron Elmer he is the branch chief of the IHNC structure.

Ron Elmer, branch chief IHNC

Good evening my name is Ron Elmer and I am the branch chief for the Inner Harbor Navigation Cannel Hurricane Protection program. This overview [pointing] shows you the overall area that our project plans to improve the hurricane protection system. This is Seabrook [pointing] where the IHNC canal flows into the Lake Ponchatrain. It goes south and ties into the Mississippi river on the bottom of the slide [pointing]. The GIWW starts here [pointing] and heads east all the way to Florida. This is the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet that heads southeast.

The following notes were recorded by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the presentations and public questions and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

Public Meeting Summary



IER 11 tier 1 document was signed in March and it narrowed down the two areas where hurricane protection would be the strongest. The first area is Lake Borgne where the proposed action is to protect the IHNC. Also it identifies the area south of Seabrook Bridge on the IHNC. Lake Pontchartrain 2 is the second area proposed to provide hurricane protection. In April, we awarded the largest design-build civil works construction project in the history of the Corps of Engineers. Currently the proposed actions are under design.



The Tier 2 document for the Lake Borgne project will probably go out for 30-day public review in August. Hopefully in the next couple weeks. The document identifies the alternatives that were assessed in that Lake Borgne site, which was done in the tier 1 document. Later in the summer we will be developing alternatives for the Seabrook site and they will be published in the subsequent IER 11 Tier 2B document.



The Tier 2 document for Lake Borgne identified, investigated and assessed the 5 alignments for the barrier system to provide hurricane protection. The first one is close to the Paris Road Bridge. The second is east of the Michoud Slip and the third one ties in east of the Michoud Canal, north of the existing Bayou Bienvenue floodgate. Alignments 4 and 5 are further east and will need a longer barrier.





The first alignment for the protection system would consist of a new gate on the GIWW [pointing] because of it is a deep draft channel. The gate would have to have a 40-foot draft be 350-feet wide. We would have to improve the levee system east to where the MRGO ties into the Bayou Bienvenue floodgate and improve around the Michoud Slip and Michoud Canal for the hurricane protection system. Currently there are I-walls at this location [pointing]. The second alignment pushes the structure east and we would have less [inaudible] hurricane system to increase the protection in this area. This gate would have to be a deep draft gate.

Alignment 3 is further east, however, by placing the gate at this location it allows there to be a smaller structure starting at this

point [pointing] and heading east. The channel in this area is16-feet and the width is 150-feet, at least that is the design channel. This gate would be shallow for shallow draft large craft barge traffic. The barrier system would come across the marsh and tie into the existing hurricane protection system just north of the Bayou Bienvenue floodgate. Alignments 4 and 5 are scaled to move further east and crosses the existing Bayou Bienvenue through the marsh. This process allows a gate to be built on the bayou. Both of the gates on these alignments are shallow draft, 150-feet wide, gated structures for navigation. The gates on Bayou Bienvenue are smaller, -10 or -8-feet depth and 56-feet wide.

The IER will be coming out for public review and the proposed action will alignment 4. This graft shows the alignment and the area of beneficial use which we will have to dredge for the alignment. We would have to build a construction channel to get barges and cranes into the area. The material we remove will be beneficially used in the open water areas adjacent to the sites where the barriers will be.



This diagram [pointing] is a tube section for preparing the canal that we have to dredge. The barrier consists of 66-inch diameter piles, similar to the pilings that hold up the interstate over the lake. They are currently under design. The piles will have to go down 30 feet. Then they will have a steel pile approximately 334-feet long to support the concrete pile. On top of that we will build a road system and tap it off with a concrete section that will finish the barrier.





The cofferdam system on the GIWW is where the front gate will be located. A cofferdam is where we build a wall around, underwater and above the water. Then we will construct the gates in the dry area. This will be the main system for the future navigation pass. For advance measures, we have this gate structure in place which consists of a concrete barge that will sink when a hurricane comes starting next hurricane season. During the construction process we will have a bypass channel through this area [pointing] for the navigation to continue while the system is under construction. We will try to have this project complete by next hurricane season. This whole operation will close off the bypass channel with a barrier that will continue north of the sector gate. Construction of the sector gate is complicated

and complex but it will be completed by hurricane season 2011.

This is just another picture of the gate when completed. We will have two 150-foot gates and there will be a sector gate once the system is complete.



This slide shows how we are going to shut off the MRGO portion of the barrier. The existing MRGO is approximately 40 to 45-feet deep in this area. What we will have to do is come in and fill it to an elevation -15 then we will drive pilings and finishing off the barrier system.

There are numerous opportunities to make comments on development of the system. We have the Web site www.nolaenvironmnetal.gov available to make comments on any of the IERs that are available now or during their public review period. There is also an address to send your comments to Gib Owen, the leader of the environmental process for this project.

Julie Morgan, public affairs

We are starting the question and answer portion of tonight's meeting. We have several project managers from different venues to answer questions. There is: August Martin, chief of floodwalls and armoring; Gib Owen, environmental manager; Joe Kopec, real estate; Laura Lee Wilkinson, environmental manager for HPO; Major Kurgan, chief of public affairs; Reuben Mabry, risk and reliability; Ron Elmer, chief of the IHNC surge barrier; Soheila Holley, senior project manager of borrow; Benny Rouselle, LA Department of Natural Resources and Dustin White, LA DOTD.

A few ground rules before we start: I know we have a lot of people who have strong feelings towards the Corps and have voiced them in the past. Tonight we are going to focus on constructive comments and questions. The purpose of these meetings is to get your comments and questions to help in the selection process. The project managers I just introduced will be available after the meeting to answer questions in case you do not feel comfortable asking a question at the microphone you can ask the project managers after the meeting. Please limit your questions to 3 minutes. We will stay here as long as you like to answer your questions. Please state your name because we are taking minutes to inform the senior staff of your comments and concerns. Please respect each other's time and sign in before you leave. We also have a questionnaire that we ask you to please fill out so we can have better meetings.

Comment 1. John Cummings: I work with the Corps and I am a land owner. Today everything was completed on the plan and I freed up 350 acres on the shift by the wetlands I have had disagreements with the Corps and have filed seven class action lawsuits against the Corps but these people are dedicated and hardworking. They know nothing about [inaudible] and they are trying to make this city safe. I am satisfied with that. When you think of a 23-foot levee in front of a pump [inaudible] came through and flooded in the east and how it will be raised to 34-feet is amazing. It will take time to complete but all of you are great.

Response 1. Soheila Holley: Mr. John Cummings I have personally thanked you but now I want to thank you publicly. Thank you again and we appreciate it.

Question 2. Gerard Maurice, Sunset Marine and Dredging: My comment is about putting the barriers up by the Michoud Slip, how is that going to affect the marine traffic going east or west?

Response 2. Ron Elmer: We do not anticipate any interruption in marine traffic. During construction there might be a time while we are moving equipment but we would put out navigation notices and we will have a bypass channel. We are starting the simulation efforts to make sure they are safe. These simulations are coordinated with the corporations of the navigation interest and the US Coast Guard.

Question 3. Gerald Maurice: Do you still have plans to do maintenance on the Industrial Canal Lock?

Response 3. Ron Elmer: There are maintenance plans for the IHNC Lock but they are waiting for the river level to go down. They anticipate that will happen in mid-August.

Question 4. Tangee Wall, Eastover: My comment has to do with Eastover in reference to the intended borrow sites. My concern is we realize the site is contractor furnished borrow but what role does the Corps play to help in determining the impact, risk and damage to the property of the homeowners. The golf course is the intended site. In February the Times-Picayune indicated they would take 33-acres and now it is about 66-acres. The increase in acres brings concerns because we are a residential community. We bought into Eastover as a country club, gated, and secure community. We did not anticipate this but I would like to ask how this works and what impacts can be expected? Have there been impact studies done?

Response 4. Soheila Holley: The blue area is Eastover. Contractor furnished is our second method of borrow. The landowner for that site approached the Corps saying he would like to participate and sell material to the construction contractor. We told him he had to turn in the required tests and documents to make sure the material is suitable and not violating any environment requirements. He did it and we approved the site. Once the site is approved and it goes through the IER, the commander signs the IER and that site is placed on a courtesy list for the construction contractor. The construction contractor can use the site or not. If he does use the site, then he will coordinate that with the landowner only. The Corps of Engineers will be out

of the picture. The conversation, excavation, and design is out of our hands. The only thing the Corps looks at is the suitability of borrow. The rest is up to the landowner and contractor. The excavation is totally out of our hands. The Corps of Engineers is out of the picture so we do not know. The person who will be able to respond to these questions is the landowner because the construction contractor will be dealing with the landowner.

Question 5. Tangee Wall: So, the Corps has no responsibility in the terms when the contractor furnishes the borrow.

Response 5. Soheila Holley: We have no authority of the design and excavation. All we know is that it can be used by the contractor who will have to test it again. It is the responsibility of the contractor. This is simply a courtesy list to the contractor to make sure we meet the 2011 deadline.

Question 6. Tangee Wall: Last October, when we were told about this the golf course was shut down. At this point what is the current status of borrow or potential excavation? What status are we at?

Response 6. Soheila Holley: At this time the status is that site is approved and deemed suitable for potential material. It is placed on a courtesy list and will be provided to the contractor. We do not know if he will use the site or not. We do not know how they will design the pit.

Question 7. Tangee Wall: The Corps does not engage that community. We want to have a meeting in Eastover with the property owners because of the specific issue. Would the Corps come to talk about it?

Response 7. Soheila Holley: I would be more than happy to attend but the reality is I don't know how constructive that would be. If I have no authority over the landowner and if I have no authority over the contractor, how constructive that would be? In my opinion that would be zero.

Question 8. Tangee Wall: I appreciate your candor with all of this because there are so many unknown and unanswered questions especially as a resident and homeowner in an area that is being furnished in this manor. We understand that the monetary compensation comes to the landowner. We are zoned as a residential gated country club community. We paid the extra money to be in this environment. This area is below sea level and has the potential risk of additional flooding from borrow pits. From what I understand the pits will be 20-30-feet deep and we are told it is going to be ponds. In Eastover there are already ponds and lakes. To have additional ponds and lakes makes me insecure that there is a possibility of flooding or erosion. We are concerned about who would be responsible for the damage, risk to property owners, and of course compensation for loss of property value that it would create. This is not a good thing. I appreciate you being honest and for the meeting to hear my concerns. When you look at land use and what it was intended for there is a real problem. The Corps is not involved or accountable except for the quality of the plant and soil, but this is not the only issue. The Corps does not know the impact that it would have then is there no fear of being drawn into a legal battle over this?

Response 8. Soheila Holley: I appreciate your concern but as far as the Corps' position it is very clear the responsibility and authority lies with the landowner and the contractor. Even though this is potential suitable material the construction contractor has to test the material. The negotiation and the design are strictly between the landowner and contractor. We can not dictate to the landowner on how to use the land.

Question 9. Tangee Wall: The Corps then looks at the studies to make sure they are done appropriately? The construction contractor does the core review the study?

Response 9. Soheila Holley: The construction contractor does the testing. Once the material is placed then we bore the site to make sure the material meets the standards. If it does not then it has to be taken out.

Question 10. Tangee Wall: What is the length of time from the beginning of the project to completion in the amount of acres?

Response 10a. Soheila Holley: That depends on the construction duration.

Response 10b. Kevin Wagner: Our construction timeline varies by what we are working on, maybe one or two years.

Question 11. Tangee Wall: So maybe a year or two.

Response 11. Julie Morgan: When you have a neighborhood meeting we would be more than happy to attend the meeting but we will probably need the landowner there for it to be productive.

Question 12. Morgan Elzey: I was wondering if there is anyone from the Corps to talk about the involvement with the oil spill clean up.

Response 12. Maj. Kurgan: The clean up of the oil spill is not the Corps function it is the Coast Guard or state authorities. We are responsible for the navigability of the Mississippi River. Our biggest concern is the Southwest Pass and dredging. Immediately after the spill we stopped operation on the IHNC and Algiers Lock to avoid cross contamination. After that we had to decontaminate the IHNC, not the Algiers Canal, to prevent cross contamination from getting into the canal. Recently the US Coast Guard held a press conference to announce that we have ceased dredging as of the 23rd. We stopped dredging due to the spill but we have to continue dredging the Southwest Pass.

Question 13. Morgan Elzey: Is the dredging of the material being damaged by the oil?

Response 13. Maj. Kurgan: The 25th we started dredging but on Monday we saw sheen indicating we had picked up some oil so we ceased dredging. Then we contacted the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration and they came to investigate. NOAH verified it was from the barge and we ceased dredging in the Southwest Pass.

Question 14. Morgan Elzey: When will that start again?

The following notes were recorded by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the presentations and public questions and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

Response 14. Maj. Kurgan: We need to identify what we are going to do with that material and how wide spread it is. Once we have identified the amount of contamination and deal with it then we should have an idea of when to begin again.

Question 15. Morgan Elzey: Can that all be fresh water diversion. [inaudible] Can DNR speak [inaudible]?

Response 15. Benny Rousselle: [Inaudible] Do we know when to open fresh water diversion? No we do not know right now.

Question 16. Morgan Elzey: Is there a plan to clean that?

Response 16. Benny Rousselle: I am not working on that but the Coast Guard would be in charge of that.

Question 17. Lester Maulet: The surge reduction barrier, when is it going to be awarded for contract? What will the process be?

Response 17. Ron Elmer: We awarded one contract to Shaw. They have subcontractors on board to do the work and they will be hiring other contractors. We are hoping to start construction soon.

Question 18. Daryl Malek-Wiley: I have not seen the discussion of cost of the current running from I-510 and back verses the alternative on the [inaudible] canal. There is talk about going around the area since we are protecting Bayou Savauge. I am concerned about the gigantic [inaudible] report and that it is missing items. I want to see the analysis from I-10 to I-510. Has there been discussion of making it a highway? It is frustrating not having completed documents. Reading the document is a concern. On the borrow issues there is still concern about Stumpf being adjacent to a waste management that is 200,000 cubic yards of an empty landfill. Any borrow sites near the landfill could be contaminated. When discussing borrow you should have an analysis of groundwater contamination at Chef Mentuer. When I hear how IERs will be out in July when it is August, I get frustrated. If you want meaningful citizen comments I recommend e-mail notices that have a hot link to what documents the meetings will talk about and to all these photos.

Response 18. Soheila Holley: In reference to Stumpf, it is still under investigation. What you are looking at is the maximum borrows and the yield rate of 20 percent but that site will be smaller.

Question 19. Daryl Malek-Wiley: We have concerns with the groundwater of the site. We have litigation going with DEQ.

Response 19. Kevin Wagner: In reference to the canal [inaudible]. Orleans borrow [inaudible]. It is on the west side of the existing drainage canal. We are still investigating and surveying. The boring part is not part of the federal project. [Inaudible]. We are following the existing alignment around the refuge if it becomes more cost effect for [inaudible]. We would try to get authorization there but several things would have to happen. We would need a proposition paper

to get approval [inaudible]. The project description document [inaudible] and that has to be approved. This is not pertaining to the hurricane protection system.

Question 20. Daryl Malek-Wiley: I meant the one that hugs the Vietnamese community. If we do the maximum [inaudible] we are making Mr. Cummings wealthier because he will have hurricane protection.

Response 20a. Kevin Wagner: This is a non-federal levee maintained by the Orleans levee district and is the shortest reach in the district. We have to deal with a floodwall at the Michoud [inaudible] and it is a longer alignment.

Response 20b. Laura Lee Wilkinson: Kevin is showing the current work but this is an alternative. Other presentations have shown all the alignments. The details will be available when they come out in the IER, but we do not have all the information yet.

Question 21. Daryl Malek-Wiley: We are talking about 6 different IERs. They are not coming out on the same day but they are all relate to the same project and the concern is they are all coming out together. What your scientist and my scientist are talking about once again [inaudible] is putting it out there for public review?

Response 21. Laura Lee Wilkinson: As part of the IER process we are analyzing the cumulative impacts for each project. We are hoping to gather all the impacts.

Question 22. Daryl Malek-Wiley: IER 15 in the cumulative impacts section [inaudible] because it is a page long. I have a problem with the [inaudible].

Response 22. Gib Owen: Cumulative impacts are growing. [Inaudible].

Question 23. Daryl Malek-Wiley: [Inaudible] it’s in one location on the web page.

Response 23a. Gib Owen: It is embedded in each IER.

Response 23b. Kevin Wagner: [Inaudible]. We are raising it but it is a much distance project. The area we are concerned with is where the hurricane protection system crosses this particular alignment. [Inaudible]. I can not talk on behalf of the DOTD. [Inaudible]. We do know there are discussions about this but it is a long term project and we will not be able to give you a time line. The areas we focus on are where the hurricane protection crosses the interstate. We are not talking about raising all of the interstate.

Response 23c. Dustin White: We are not going to raise the area we are concerned about [inaudible] it will be quite a distance in the future if we do that.

Question 24. Morgan Elzey: I am concerned about the marsh enrichment in IER 11. Is it going to be randomly pumped in or will there be a pattern to create islands in the bayou? I know having foresight will make the whole project not wash away.

Response 24a. Ron Elmer: It is not marsh creation but a beneficial use of the materials project for dredge. Most of the area [inaudible] we are pumping material into open bodies of water. We

are decking off the material to prevent them from going into existing waterways and along the existing marsh.

Response 24b. Laura Lee Wilkinson: To explain we are still trying to do the [inaudible]. To contain the material we have banks set up to prevent [inaudible] and keep the material within this open water area. A restriction of the permit allows only pumping to elevation 4. The existing marsh won't stack more than a foot. Hopefully it would settle in the correct amount of time creating some kind of marsh. The purpose of this project is just beneficial use only. There is mitigation in the IER that would address all the impacts on the acreage and construction of the barrier across the marsh. There is another shoreline protection [inaudible] MRGO operation and maintenance site. [Inaudible] they are going to create a marsh. It is for beneficial use and if it does not stack to the right height then there is opportunity for more beneficial material.

Question 25. Morgan Elzey: This would be the right time. There is only so much money the government has to [inaudible] save this project that could be placed somewhere else. It would save a lot of money in the long run.

Response 25. Ron Elmer: For one thing, we have a commitment to have something in place by the next hurricane season. We are on a very short time line to get that accomplished. To do what you would like us to do [inaudible]. We do not have time as a luxury.

Question 26. Morgan Elzey: We do not have the time to build the wall but we have time for marsh enrichment?

Response 26. Ron Elmer: We have to dredge the material to get the equipment into the area to build the wall.

Question 27. Morgan Elzey: [Inaudible]. It would save so much more on other projects.

Response 27. Ron Elmer: Another thing is that the 85% of material we are dredging is highly organic material which is not good material for creating marsh. I see where you say we could take it and store it somewhere but it would take time and money.

Question 28. Morgan Elzey: The MRGO will it be reauthorized or is it still being used as a shipping channel?

Response 28. Ron Elmer: No it is not [inaudible] because the control depth is 16 feet and it is not being done.

Question 29. Morgan Elzey: The real estate acquisition by the state and the project responsibilities is [inaudible] been accomplished.

Response 29. Maj. Kurgan: Part of the PPA is real estate and we are on schedule. They are working with the [inaudible] right now to start the funding. They are ready to go to the street and I believe that is within the next 3-4 weeks the proposal should be on the street.

Question 30. MorganElzey: This is the same discussion since March.

Response 30. Maj. Kurgan: We sent reports to Congress with the recommended study but initially the June 5th report to Congress it was [inaudible] so now it is closed. [Inaudible]. We stopped dredging as of June 5th. We are working with the PPA so we can put the RFP out. We have the money and will begin this fall. It should be in place by 2009.

Question 31. Mark Schlefstein: Concerning barge traffic, are there plans for using the access channel along the Green Wall across the triangle as an emergency channel through the GIWW in the event the IHNC lock is closed?

Response 31. Ron Elmer: No there are no other plans.

Question 32. Avery Dagons: My house faces Bayou Michoud. Pump station 15 is that supposed to control the levee by that water because I notice when there is an inch of rain the water is high and it covers the area. When they first put I-10 there was suppose to be underground pipes to go to the other side of Chef to an over flow pond [inaudible]. Question number 2 is that levee that separates [inaudible] from Hope Island and Six Flags. [Inaudible] it is a short levee from I-10 to Bayou Sauvage. If the next hurricane comes like the last one the levee hold a surge coming in from Hope Island or one of those areas?

Response 32. Kevin Wagner: Any interior drainage has to be dealt with the Sewage and Water Board. If you have issues there please call them and they should help or direct your questions. Our concern is the floodwall across from the discharge pipe. We are going to raise it to 34-feet in order to provide 100-year level of protection. The adjacent levee will be elevation 28 and there will be a transition point. The levee next to Six Flags is maintained by the Orleans Levee district. Our intent is not to let it over top if it would provide storage, then we would have enough pumping capacity to remove the water. We are not planning to do additional work on the interior levees unless we can prove that it is a viable alternative.

Question 33. Daryl Malek-Wiley: IER 6 segment 106 you have the barge canals coming into the lake for access. In the document how much material will be moved out and will it be backfilled? If not what is your intent?

Response 33. Kevin Wagner: Our intent with the channel is to get the rock for the project. We would stock pile adjacent [inaudible] then when we finished we would continue to backfill those channels.

Question 34. Daryl Malek-Wiley: Are you going to make grass beds?

Response 34a. Kevin Wagner: We are actually trying to avoid those because there are projects the universities have implemented. When we looked at the access channels we intended to use we went back to how we originally constructed the project and identified the areas that have already been disturbed. Then we have also done cultural resource investigations in these areas and we are making modifications to the plans. We are doing everything we can to minimize the impacts to the lake.

Response 34b. Laura Lee Wilkinson: All that on the graph is latitude coordinates.

The following notes were recorded by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the presentations and public questions and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

Question 35. Gerald Maurice: When you close the MRGO will it still be accessible for barge traffic?

Response 35. Ron Elmer: It will be dammed off completely.

Question 36. Morgan Elzey: Will there by any land loss for the MRGO and will there be backfill?

Response 36. Ron Elmer: No. This is where the sector gate ties into the GIWW. The bypass channel will come around this area and the barrier will be coming through. The pink line shows where we are impacting with the dredging. So we are taking a little material from this area here.

Question 37. Morgan Elzey: To create a channel for shipping?

Response 37. Ron Elmer: To create a bypass channel to do construction that will be closed once the gate is constructed.

Question 38. Morgan Elzey: So we are creating more erosion?

Response 38a. Ron Elmer: No we are not creating more erosion. What you will have is the by walls for the structures sticking out through this area.

Response 38b. Laura Lee Wilkinson: The structure will be the pink line to allow the bypass channel to function during construction.

Question 39. Morgan Elzey: But that would lead to erosion?

Response 39. Ron Elmer: [Inaudible]. It would be the same impact and probably less because the speed of the vessels will be slower since they have to navigate through the gates.

Question 40. Morgan Elzey: How deep into the ground?

Response 40. Ron Elmer: Right now -130 feet the pile would go down but it could vary depending on the geotechnical information.

Question 41. Morgan Elzey: How deep is the water in the barrier wall?

Response 41. Ron Elmer: We are digging the construction channel to -15. The elevation varies right now we are digging a construction channel to -15 when the barrier is in construction.

Question 42. Gerald Maurice: How long will the length be?

Response 42. Ron Elmer: I am guessing 2,000 feet with plenty enough room for tow. We are doing navigation simulations to make sure that they are safe and that we can navigate without problems.

Question 43. Gerald Maurice: Being a barge owner my concern is cost because when you bring a tow through there it is going [inaudible] Everything new takes time to get used to but our

The following notes were recorded by USACE contractors. These notes are intended to provide an overview of the presentations and public questions and comments, and are not intended to provide a complete or verbatim account of the meeting. This account is not intended to be a legal document.

concern is really how much will it be [inaudible]. The length of time from high river to low takes between 24 and 36 hours now.

Response 43. Laura Lee Wilkinson: The bypass channel, the impacts for this project will be mitigated but there will be marsh lost. We are doing mitigation to compensate.

Question 44. Morgan Elzey: But this is [inaudible] from one place. We are just destroying this to build something else.

Response 44. Laura Lee Wilkinson: It is within one year within marsh creation. You have to have it stacking depending on if planning comes back. You will see it come back within a year. You will have a sponsor to maintain and if you do not have the response we will go back and plan.

Julie Morgan, public affairs

Thank you for coming and please hand in your surveys when you walk out.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION SYSTEM

US Army Corps of Engineers

Why are we here tonight?

To discuss the status of completed, in-progress and proposed projects to the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity portion of the Hurricane Storm Damage Risk Reduction System that will provide 100-year level of protection for the surrounding communities.

National Environmental Policy Act: NEPA

- Required for all major Federal actions
- Analyze potential impacts to the human and natural environment and investigate reasonable alternatives
- Analyses documented in Individual Environmental Reports (IER)
- Public Involvement is KEY! We want to hear from you!
- Goal: more informed decision making through public involvement

New Orleans East Levees
IER #6 and IER #7



IER 6 LPV 105: Lakefront Airport Alternatives

- Retrofit I-wall to a L-wall along the current I-wall alignment
- Construct a T-wall along the current I-wall alignment
- Construct a T-wall or levee South of the NS Railroad at west end of project



T-wall


14′ - 0″
8′ - 0″
2′ - 0″
4′ - 0″
1/4′ - 0″
TOP OF WALL
EL. 15.5
FLOOD
SIDE
PROTECTED
SIDE
TOP OF SLAB
EL. +2.0
3′ - 0″
4″ STABILIZATION
SLAB
2.5
1
2.5
1
2.5
PZ - 27
SHEET PILE
2′ - 6″
2′ - 6″

IER 6 LPV 106:
Citrus to Lakefront Levee Alternatives

- Raise levee with and w/o retaining wall at Hayne Blvd.
- Raise levee with seepage cut-off wall
- Raise levee with Deep Soil Mixing (DSM)
- Construct a T-wall

Citrus to Lakefront Levee Alternative Improved Foreshore Protection and Standard Lift



US Army Corps of Engineers

Temporary Access Channels

	State Plane X	State Plane Y	Latitude (Decimal Degrees)	Longitude (Decimal Degrees)	Latitude	Longitude
1	3,701,595.52365	564,505.49973	30.04564	-90.00248	30°2'45.03"N	90°0'12.95"W
	3,701,878.83151	564,708.69074	30.04613	-90.00251	30°2'46"N	90°0'9.04"W
	3,702,495.11191	565,400.16419	30.04750	-90.00000	30°2'51"N	90°0'0.11"W
	3,702,225.21803	565,220.37159	30.04715	-90.00146	30°2'51.75"N	90°0'5.27"W
2	3,708,048.17773	569,863.88894	30.05977	-89.88096	30°3'34.32"N	89°52'51.47"W
	3,709,507.90064	569,171.25381	30.05614	-89.87623	30°3'29.31"N	89°52'41.61"W
	3,710,866.48647	567,538.95095	30.05444	-89.87556	30°3'26.80"N	89°52'32.02"W
	3,709,625.33668	567,293.15645	30.05299	-89.87824	30°3'10.72"N	89°52'41.67"W
3	3,713,309.14062	573,331.92452	30.06478	-89.86818	30°4'0.41"N	89°51'48.92"W
	3,714,219.65082	573,899.23013	30.06709	-89.86320	30°4'3.68"N	89°51'47.53"W
	3,715,258.01313	571,414.42807	30.06412	-89.87097	30°3'50.94"N	89°52'35.89"W
	3,715,024.83987	571,275.99992	30.06361	-89.87171	30°3'49"N	89°52'38.58"W
4	3,716,340.78156	575,979.70479	30.07044	-89.85037	30°4'35.16"N	89°51'37"W
	3,716,446.52526	576,146.56519	30.07073	-89.84971	30°4'32.5"N	89°51'36.94"W
	3,719,426.63303	576,107.20082	30.07414	-89.84665	30°4'26.89"N	89°51'47.94"W
	3,719,207.64917	574,900.94174	30.07358	-89.84723	30°4'24.89"N	89°51'50.45"W
5	3,721,427.07756	579,005.06563	30.08478	-89.83154	30°5'5.21"N	89°50'22.35"W
	3,721,944.78558	579,254.70663	30.08546	-89.83053	30°5'7.65"N	89°50'18.7"W
	3,722,773.54143	578,464.89915	30.08320	-89.83394	30°4'59.75"N	89°50'31.37"W
	3,722,497.61437	578,175.25508	30.08241	-89.83502	30°4'56.69"N	89°50'12.58"W
6	3,723,216.10135	580,581.10136	30.08906	-89.83446	30°5'19.02"N	89°50'4.05"W
	3,723,449.72630	580,823.85186	30.08972	-89.83371	30°5'22"N	89°50'1.35"W
	3,724,262.55656	580,081.84356	30.08765	-89.83113	30°5'15.55"N	89°50'52.2"W
	3,723,990.02417	579,793.58134	30.08684	-89.83202	30°5'12.63"N	89°50'55.26"W
7	3,724,266.77423	581,510.69613	30.09160	-89.83110	30°5'29.76"N	89°50'51.95"W
	3,724,391.39585	581,933.74283	30.09274	-89.83069	30°5'33.87"N	89°50'50.48"W
	3,725,247.49779	581,205.47543	30.09271	-89.82801	30°5'28.56"N	89°50'40.83"W
	3,724,989.44638	580,899.94532	30.09189	-89.82894	30°5'25.58"N	89°50'43.81"W
8	3,729,898.85235	588,591.82747	30.11198	-89.81334	30°6'38.11"N	89°50'47.99"W
	3,730,005.06120	588,949.93838	30.11152	-89.81258	30°6'42.54"N	89°50'45.53"W
	3,730,810.83335	588,517.88507	30.11458	-89.81070	30°6'38.27"N	89°50'38.53"W
	3,730,498.34459	588,198.16769	30.11373	-89.81142	30°6'35.02"N	89°50'41.13"W
9	3,734,728.43588	596,235.32138	30.13171	-89.80174	30°7'54.16"N	89°50'10.81"W
	3,734,939.48002	596,641.17797	30.13262	-89.80007	30°7'56.17"N	89°50'4.45"W
	3,735,721.12044	596,043.49520	30.13115	-89.80430	30°7'53.14"N	89°50'19.4"W
	3,735,488.78182	595,112.88808	30.13026	-89.80502	30°7'48.89"N	89°50'22.02"W
10	3,735,947.25109	599,053.95043	30.13610	-89.80105	30°8'12.11"N	89°50'38.89"W
	3,736,214.55588	599,382.89084	30.13751	-89.80000	30°8'15.04"N	89°50'33.54"W
	3,736,951.91731	597,866.30731	30.13612	-89.80634	30°8'10.03"N	89°50'26.22"W
	3,736,728.88008	597,534.26153	30.13521	-89.80706	30°8'08.47"N	89°50'27.8"W
11	3,739,217.10932	602,016.41772	30.14745	-89.80301	30°8'38.83"N	89°50'38.82"W
	3,739,535.48395	602,279.95868	30.14817	-89.80196	30°8'53.34"N	89°50'35.16"W
	3,739,797.13529	601,050.78844	30.14764	-89.80611	30°8'51.49"N	89°50'52.2"W
	3,739,574.08095	601,759.14242	30.14673	-89.80180	30°8'48.23"N	89°50'54.79"W



IER 6 LPV 107: Lincoln Beach Alternatives

- Modify/retrofit I-wall & gate along existing alignment
- Construct T-wall & gate along existing alignment
- Construct T-wall & gate along LPV 106 alignment
- Replace wall and gate with levee
- Construct levee with Deep Soil Mixing (DSM)

Lincoln Beach Alternative
Levee with Deep Soil Mixing (DSM)



Lincoln Beach Alternative
Levee with T-wall



US Army Corps of Engineers

IER 7 LPV 108: Lakefront Levee Alternatives

- Raise crown to meet authorized elevation
- Adding stability berm for 100-year elevation

Lakefront Levee Alternative Existing & New Typical Section with Stability Berm



IER 7 LPV 109.02a:
South Point to CSX Gate Alternatives

- Raise levee with stability berms
- Raise levee with lightweight material
- Raise levee with high-strength geotextile, wick drains, slurry cutoff walls with and without partial Deep Soil Mixing
- Raise levees using Deep Soil Mixing

South Point to CSX Gate Alternative Wick Drains And Deep Soil Mixing



IER 7 LPV 109.02b:
I-10 Crossing Alternatives

- Construct a levee and raise I-10 with a ramp
- Construct a levee and raise I-10 with a bridge
- Construct a T-wall and raise I-10 with a bridge



IER 7 LPV 109.02c:
US 11 & US 90 Alternatives

- Retrofit existing floodgates
- Replace existing floodgates
- Raise highway using ramp or bridge

IER 7 LPV 110:
CSX Railroad Gate Alternatives

- Raise existing gate
- New T-wall & gate along existing alignment

IER 7 LPV 111.01:
NOE Back Levee Alternatives

- Raise levee with stability berms
- Raise levee with lightweight material
- Raise levee with high-strength geotextile, wick drains, slurry cutoff walls
- Raise levees using Deep Soil Mixing

IER 7 LPV 111.02: Pump Stations No. 15 Alternative

- Replace existing wall at Pump Station #15

US Army Corps of Engineers

Upcoming New Orleans East Levee Contracts

- LPV 108: Paris Road to South Point
- LPV 109.01: South Point to Gulf Intracoastal Waterway
- LPV 113: Citrus Back Levee (Michoud Canal to Michoud Slip)

Borrow Areas



Updated on 7/9/2008

Job No. EGIS-08-111

NEW ORLEANS EAST - ORLEANS PARISH



Updated on 7/22/2008

Job No. EGIS-08-111

US Army Corps of Engineers

Improving Hurricane Protection on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal IER 11 Tier 2 Borgne

Where we've been

- Awarded largest design-build, civil works construction contract on April 3, 2008 for the amount of $695,489,766. Contract includes providing advance measures by hurricane season 2009.

- IER 11 Tier 1 Decision Record signed March 14, 2008 for Borgne 1 and Pontchartrain 2

Borgne 1

Pontchartrain 2

US Army Corps of Engineers

IER 11 Tier 2: Where we're going

Two Tier 2 IERs

- **IER 11 Tier 2 Borgne:**
  Alignment and design alternatives within "Borgne 1"

  Public Release of Draft IER 11 Tier 2 – August '08

- **IER 11 Tier 2 Pontchartrain:**
  Alignment and design alternatives within "Pontchartrain 2"
  (alternatives to be developed this summer)

IER 11 Tier 2 Borgne Alternative Alignments Overview



IER 11 Tier 2 Borgne Alternative Alignments

US Army Corps of Engineers

Alignment 1



Alignment 2



Levees & Floodwalls to be Raised

Alternative Alignments

Gate

IER #11 Tier 2 Borgne Alternative Alignments

US Army Corps of Engineers

Alignment 3



Alignment 4 & 5



- Levees & Floodwalls to be Raised
- Alternative Alignments
- Gate

US Army Corps of Engineers

Proposed Alignment with Beneficial Use Disposal Areas and Dredge Pipes



US Army Corps of Engineers

Floodwall



Advanced Measure Cofferdam & Swing Gate Design on the GIWW



US Army Corps of Engineers

GIWW Sector and Swing Gate



MRGO Closure



US Army Corps of Engineers

Opportunities for Public Input

- **Monthly Public Meetings throughout New Orleans Metro Area**
  - Make sure to sign in tonight to get on our meeting notification mailing list
- **Comments can be submitted at any time at www.nolaenvironmental.gov**
- **Individual Environmental Reports (IER) 30-day Public Review**

Questions and comments regarding Hurricane Protection Projects should be addressed to:

Gib Owen
PM-RS
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267
Telephone: 504-862-1337
E-mail: mvnenvironmental@usace.army.mil