

APPENDIX A

Figures




Figure A-1: WBV HSDRRS Mitigation Basin Habitats





Figure A-2: WBV Mitigation Basin



Figure A-3: Hydrologic Units that Encompass Both a Project Footprint and an "Impaired" Waterbody



A-4: Future Without Projects



Figure A-5: Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf Bayou Mitigation Site





Figure A-6: Sunset Ridge Site



A-7: Bayou Portuguese



A-8: Hwy 23 Site

APPENDIX B

Tables

Table B-1: Three SLR Scenario Analysis

Mitigation Site	Proposed Habitat	Mitigation Feature ID	Acres	Total Net Gain AAHUs			Mitigation Potential (AAHUs / acre)			HSI at End of Period of Analysis (forested habitats; FWP)			Variable V1 Value (%) At End of Period of Analysis (marsh habitats; FWP)		
				Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR
Bayou Segnette	BLH-Dry	BS2 (D1)	1121.03	232.26	232.26	232.26	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.68	0.68	0.68	--	--	--
Bayou Segnette	BLH-Dry	BS4 (D3)	21.56	4.62	4.62	4.62	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.68	0.68	0.68	--	--	--
Bayou Segnette	BLH-Dry	BS6 (D2)	68.84	14.49	14.49	14.49	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.68	0.68	0.68	--	--	--
Bayou Segnette	BLH-Wet	BS3 (W3), HSDRRS	253.19	76.76	76.76	76.76	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.96	0.96	0.96	--	--	--
Dufrene Ponds	BLH-Wet	DP1 (B2)	471.88	307.69	305.50	299.19	0.65	0.65	0.63	0.68	0.67	0.64	--	--	--
Dufrene Ponds	BLH-Wet	DP4 (B1)	190.63	90.90	90.26	87.96	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.66	0.65	0.62	--	--	--
Dufrene Ponds	Swamp	DP2 (S1)	210.08	88.99	89.00	74.40	0.42	0.42	0.35	0.60	0.60	0.32	--	--	--
Dufrene Ponds	Fresh Marsh	DP3 (M2)	220.74	117.97	114.24	90.38	0.53	0.52	0.41	--	--	--	95.43	91.90	0.00
Dufrene Ponds	Fresh Marsh	DP5 (M1)	108.32	56.57	55.11	46.15	0.52	0.51	0.43	--	--	--	97.73	95.33	0.00
Lake Boeuf	BLH-Dry	LB3 (D1)	375.77	169.89	169.89	169.89	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.66	0.66	0.66	--	--	--
Lake Boeuf	BLH-Wet	LB1 (W1)	145.65	86.59	86.59	86.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.86	0.86	0.86	--	--	--
Lake Boeuf	BLH-Wet	LB2 (W2)	66.59	37.83	37.83	37.83	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.82	0.82	0.82	--	--	--
Lake Boeuf	BLH-Wet	LB4 (W5)	110.04	64.53	64.53	64.53	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.85	0.85	0.85	--	--	--
Lake Boeuf	BLH-Wet	LB5 (W3)	51.38	31.03	31.03	31.03	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.87	0.87	0.87	--	--	--
Lake Boeuf	BLH-Wet	LB7 (W4)	90.69	51.38	51.38	51.38	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.82	0.82	0.82	--	--	--

Lake Boeuf	Swamp	LB6 (S1)	13.15	6.07	5.80	5.42	0.46	0.44	0.41	0.85	0.68	0.54	--	--	--
Lake Boeuf	Swamp	LB8 (S2)	26.71	11.95	11.88	11.10	0.45	0.44	0.42	0.73	0.68	0.53	--	--	--
Lake Boeuf	Swamp	LB9 (S3)	91.61	42.64	40.76	38.08	0.47	0.44	0.42	0.85	0.68	0.53	--	--	--
Mitigation Site	Proposed Habitat	Mitigation Feature ID	Acres	Total Net Gain AAHUs			Mitigation Potential (AAHUs / acre)			HSI at End of Period of Analysis (forested habitats; FWP)			Variable V1 Value (%) At End of Period of Analysis (marsh habitats; FWP)		
				Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR
Plaquemines Alt. 1	Swamp	P1 (S1)	150.35	68.39	65.87	61.49	0.45	0.44	0.41	0.79	0.68	0.67	--	--	--
Plaquemines Alt. 1	Fresh Marsh	P2 (M1)	312.18	129.53	132.99	102.93	0.41	0.43	0.33	--	--	--	97.53	96.34	0.00
Plaquemines Alt. 2	BLH-Wet	P3 (B1)	566.25	356.33	356.33	356.33	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.93	0.93	0.93	--	--	--
Plaquemines Alt. 2	Swamp	P4 (S1)	106.36	48.39	46.60	43.50	0.45	0.44	0.41	0.79	0.68	0.67	--	--	--
Salvador - Timken	Swamp	ST1 (S1)	183.78	81.23	78.47	69.28	0.44	0.43	0.38	0.71	0.60	0.33	--	--	--
Salvador - Timken	Fresh Marsh	ST2 (M1)	324.89	147.90	146.00	115.09	0.46	0.45	0.35	--	--	--	99.00	95.33	0.00
Jean Lafitte, General Mitigation	Fresh Marsh	JL1B (M4B), Mitigation Feature Portion	117.58	56.21	51.81	46.68	0.48	0.44	0.40	--	--	--	97.78	93.85	0.00
Jean Lafitte, General Mitigation	Fresh Marsh	JL4 (M3), Mitigation Feature Portion	46.62	8.52	8.32	6.49	0.18	0.18	0.14	--	--	--	0.00	0.00	0.00

Jean Lafitte, General Mitigation	Existing Fresh Marsh	JL1B (M4B), Shoreline Protection Portion	13.70	6.55	6.04	5.44	0.48	0.44	0.40	--	--	--	100.00	100.00	0.00
Mitigation Site	Proposed Habitat	Mitigation Feature ID	Acres	Total Net Gain AAHUs			Mitigation Potential (AAHUs / acre)			HSI at End of Period of Analysis (forested habitats; FWP)			Variable V1 Value (%) At End of Period of Analysis (marsh habitats; FWP)		
				Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR	Low SLR	Int. SLR	High SLR
Jean Lafitte, General Mitigation	Existing Fresh Marsh	JL4 (M3), Shoreline Protection Portion	329.59	60.21	58.85	45.91	0.18	0.18	0.14	--	--	--	39.14	35.11	0.00
Jean Lafitte, Park/404c Mitigation, BLH Alt. 1	BLH-Wet	JL12 (B2)	16.83	10.46	10.56	10.35	0.62	0.63	0.62	0.91	0.93	0.88	--	--	--
Jean Lafitte, Park/404c Mitigation, BLH Alt. 1	BLH-Wet	JL13 (B3)	20.55	12.72	12.85	12.60	0.62	0.63	0.61	0.91	0.93	0.87	--	--	--
Jean Lafitte, Park/404c Mitigation, BLH Alt. 1	BLH-Wet	JL14 (B4)	16.75	10.63	10.73	10.52	0.63	0.64	0.63	0.93	0.95	0.90	--	--	--
Jean Lafitte, Park/404c Mitigation, BLH Alt. 2	BLH-Wet	JL15 (B1)	54.00	20.16	20.16	19.37	0.37	0.37	0.36	0.89	0.89	0.83	--	--	--

Jean Lafitte, Park/404c Mitigation, BLH Alt. 2	BLH-Wet	JL17 (B3)	5.4	3.45	3.45	3.38	0.64	0.64	0.63	0.94	0.94	0.90	--	--	--
Jean Lafitte, Park/404c Mitigation, BLH Alt. 2	BLH-Wet	JL18	18.6	11.90	11.90	11.67	0.64	0.64	0.63	0.94	0.94	0.90	--	--	--

Table B-2: Plant Species

Common Name	Scientific Name
American elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>
American sycamore	<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>
Bald cypress	<i>Taxodium distichum</i>
Black willow	<i>Salix nigra</i>
Boxelder	<i>Acer negundo</i>
Bulltongue	<i>Sagittaria lancifolia</i>
Buttonbush	<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>
California bullwhip	<i>Scirpus californicus</i>
Cattail	<i>Typha latifolia</i>
Cedar elm	<i>Ulmus crassifolia</i>
cutgrass	<i>Zizaniopsis miliaceae</i>
Common persimmon	<i>Diospyros virginiana</i>
duckweed	<i>Lemna sp.</i>
Eastern cottonwood	<i>Populus deltoides</i>
Green ash	<i>fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>
Honey locust	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>
Iris	<i>Iris L.</i>
Nuttall oak	<i>Quercus nuttallii</i>
Pignut hickory	<i>Carya glabra</i>
Planertree	<i>Planera aquatica</i>
Red maple	<i>Acer rubrum</i>
Red mulberry	<i>Morus rubra</i>
Sugarberry	<i>Celtis laevigata</i>
Sweetgum	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>
Water lily	<i>Nymphaea odorata</i>
Water Oak	<i>Quercus nigra</i>
Water tupelo/tupelogum	<i>Nyssa aquatica</i>
Wild rice	<i>Zizania aquatica</i>

Table B-3: Common Wildlife Species Found in the WBV Basin

Common Name	Scientific Name
American alligator	<i>Alligator mississippiensis</i>
American beaver	<i>Castor canadensis</i>
American coot	<i>Fulica americana</i>
American kestrel	<i>Falco sparverius</i>
American white pelican	<i>Pelecanus erythrorhynchos</i>
American widgeon	<i>Anas americana</i>
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>
Banded water snake	<i>Nerodia fasciata</i>
Barred owl	<i>Strix varia</i>
Belted kingfisher	<i>Ceryle alcyon</i>
Black skimmer	<i>Rynchops niger</i>
Black-necked stilt	<i>Himantopus mexicanus</i>
Blue-winged teal	<i>Anas discors</i>
Boat-tailed grackle	<i>Quiscalus major</i>
Bobcat	<i>Lynx rufus</i>
Brazilian free-tailed bat	<i>Tadarida brasiliensis</i>
Bronze frog	<i>Rana clamitans</i>
Brown pelican	<i>Pelecanus occidentalis</i>
Bufflehead	<i>Bucephala albeola</i>
Bullfrog	<i>Rana catesbeiana</i>
Carolina wren	<i>Thryothorus ludovicianus</i>
Cattle egret	<i>Bubulcus ibis</i>
Clapper rail	<i>Rallus longirostris</i>
Common grackle	<i>Quiscalus quisqualis</i>
Common moorhen	<i>Gallinula chloropus</i>
Common snapping turtle	<i>Chelydra serpentina</i>
Common yellowthroat	<i>Geothlypis trichas</i>
Cotton mouse	<i>Peromyscus gossypinus</i>
Coyote	<i>Canis latrans</i>
Diamondback terrapin	<i>Malaclemys terrapin</i>
Double-crested cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>
Eastern pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus subflavus</i>
Eastern cottontail rabbit	<i>Sylvilagus floridanus</i>
Eastern wood-pewee	<i>Contopus virens</i>
Evening bat	<i>Nycticeius humeralis</i>
Feral hog	<i>Sus scrofa</i>
Forster's tern	<i>Sterna forsteri</i>
Fulvous harvest mouse	<i>Reithrodontomys fulvescens</i>
Gadwall	<i>Anas strepera</i>
Glossy ibis	<i>Plegadis falcinellus</i>
Gray fox	<i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i>
Great blue heron	<i>Ardea herodias</i>
Great egret	<i>Casmerodius albus</i>

Greater yellowlegs	<i>Tringa melanoleuca</i>
Green anole	<i>Anolis carolinensis</i>
Green-backed heron	<i>Butorides striatus</i>
Green sea turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>
Green treefrogs	<i>Hyla cinerea</i>
Green-winged teal,	<i>Anas crecca</i>
Ground skink	<i>Scincella lateralis</i>
Gulf coast toad	<i>Bufo valliceps</i>
Gull-billed tern	<i>Sterna nilotica</i>
Herring gull	<i>Larus argentatus</i>
Hispid cotton rat	<i>Sigmodon hispidus</i>
House mouse	<i>Mus musculus</i>
Kemp's ridley sea turtle	<i>Lepidochelys kempii</i>
Killdeer	<i>Chardrius vociferous</i>
Laughing gull	<i>Larus atricilla</i>
Lesser scaup	<i>Aythya affinis</i>
Lesser yellowlegs	<i>Tringa flavipes</i>
Loggerhead sea turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>
Lesser Scaup	<i>Aythya affinis</i>
Mallard	<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>
Marsh rice rat	<i>Oryzomys palustris</i>
Marsh wren	<i>Cistothorus palustris</i>
Mink	<i>Mustela vison</i>
Mottled duck	<i>Anas fulvigula</i>
Mourning Dove	<i>Zenaida macroura</i>
Muskrat	<i>Ondatra zibethicus</i>
Nine-banded armadillo	<i>Dasypus novemcinctus</i>
Northern cardinal	<i>Cardinalis cardinalis</i>
Northern mockingbird	<i>Mimus polyglottos</i>
Northern pintail	<i>Anas acuta</i>
Northern raccoon	<i>Procyon lotor</i>
Northern Shoveler	<i>Anas clypeata</i>
Northern yellow bat	<i>Lasiurus intermedius</i>
Norway rat	<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>
Nutria	<i>Myocastor coypus</i>
Olivaceous cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax brasilianus</i>
Pig frog	<i>Rana grylio</i>
Rafinesque's big-eared bat	<i>Plecotus rafinesquii</i>
Red bat	<i>Lasiurus borealis</i>
Red-eared slider	<i>Trachemys scripta</i>
River otter	<i>Lutra canadensis</i>
Red fox	<i>Vulpes vulpes</i>
Redhead	<i>Aythya americana</i>
Red-shouldered hawk	<i>Buteo lineatus</i>
Red-tailed hawk	<i>Buteo jamaicensis</i>

Red-winged blackbird	<i>Agelaius phoeniceus</i>
Ring-billed gull	<i>Larus delawarensis</i>
Roof rat	<i>Rattus rattus</i>
Seaside sparrow	<i>Ammodramus maritimus</i>
Shovelnose Sturgeon	<i>Scaphirhynchus platyrhynchus</i>
Snowy egret	<i>Egretta thula</i>
Southern leopard frog	<i>Rana sphenoccephala</i>
Squirrel treefrogs	<i>Hyla squirella</i>
Stinkpot	<i>Sternotherus odoratus</i>
Swamp rabbit	<i>Sylvilagus aquaticus</i>
Tricolored heron	<i>Egretta tricolor</i>
West Indian manatee	<i>Trichechus manatus</i>
Western cottonmouth	<i>Agkistrodon piscivorus</i>
White-eyed vireo	<i>Vireo griseus</i>
White-faced ibis	<i>Plegadis chihi</i>
White-footed mouse	<i>Peromyscus leucopus</i>
White ibis	<i>Eudocimus albus</i>
White-tail deer	<i>Odocoileus virginiana</i>
Wood duck	<i>Aix sponsa</i>
Yellow-crowned night-heron	<i>Nycticorax violaceus</i>

Table B-4: Project Parishes and LA Threatened and Endangered Species

Species	Parish	Critical Habitat	Status	Jurisdiction	
				USFWS	NFMS
Animal					
Louisiana Black Bear (<i>Ursus americanus luteolus</i>)	St. C, St. J, O, PI	X	delisted	X	
*West Indian Manatee (<i>Trichechus manatus</i>)	Asc, J, L, O, PI, St. C, St. J, St. JB,		T	X	
Alabama Heelsplitter Mussel (<i>Potamilus inflatus</i>)	Asc, St. JB,		T	X	
Gulf sturgeon (<i>Acipenser oxyrinchus desotoi</i>)	Asc, J, L, PI, St. J, St. C, St. JB,		T	X	X
*Pallid sturgeon (<i>Scaphirhynchus albus</i>)	Asc, J, O, PI, St. J, St. C, St. JB,		E	X	
Piping plover (<i>Charadrius melodus</i>)	J, L, O, PI	X	T	X	
Red knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>)	J, L, PI		T	X	
Green Sea Turtle (<i>Chelonia mydas</i>)	J, L, PI		T	X	X
Hawksbill Sea Turtle (<i>Eretomchelys imbricata</i>)	J, L, PI		E	X	X
Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle (<i>Lepidochelys kempi</i>)	J, L, PI		E	X	X
Leatherback Sea Turtle (<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>)	J, L, PI		E	X	X
Loggerhead Sea Turtle (<i>Caretta caretta</i>)	J, L, PI		T	X	X

Table B-5: Fish and Aquatic Species Found in the WBV Basin

Common Name	Scientific Name
Atlantic croaker	<i>Micropogonias undulatus</i>
American oyster	<i>Crassostrea virginica</i>
Asiatic clam	<i>Corbicula fluminea</i>
bay anchovy	<i>Anchoa mitchilli</i>
bighead carp	<i>Hypophthalmichthys nobilis</i>
black drum	<i>Pogonias cromis</i>
blue crab	<i>Callinectes sapidus</i>
blue catfish	<i>Ictalurus furcatus</i>
bluegill	<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>
bowfin	<i>Amia calva</i>
brown shrimp	<i>Farfantepenaeus aztecus</i>
buffalo	<i>Ictiobus bubalus</i>
channel catfish	<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>
common carp	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>
crawfish	<i>Procambarus sp.</i>
freshwater drum	<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i>
Gizzard shad	<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>
grass carp	<i>Ctenopharyngodon idella</i>
Gulf menhaden	<i>Brevoortia patronus</i>
Gulf sturgeon	<i>Acipenser oxyrinchus desotoi</i>
hardhead catfish	<i>Ariopsis felis</i>
inland silverside	<i>Menidia beryllina</i>
largemouth bass	<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>
least killifish	<i>Heterandria formosa</i>
mosquitofish	<i>Gambusia affinis</i>
paddlefish	<i>Polyodon spathula</i>
pallid sturgeon	<i>Scaphirhynchus albus</i>
rainwater killifish	<i>Lucania parva</i>
redeer sunfish	<i>Lepomis microlophus</i>
redfish/ red drum	<i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i>
Rio Grande cichlid	<i>Cichlasoma cyanoguttatum</i>
sand sea trout	<i>Cynoscion arenarius</i>
sailfin molly	<i>Poecilia latipinna</i>
sheepshead	<i>Archosargus probatocephalus</i>
sheepshead minnow	<i>Cyprinodon variegatus</i>
shovelnose sturgeon	<i>Scaphirhynchus platyrhynchus</i>
silver carp	<i>Hypophthalmichthys molitrix</i>
southern flounder	<i>Paralichthys lethostigma</i>
Spanish mackerel	<i>Scomberomorus maculatus</i>
spot	<i>Leiostomus xanthurus</i>
Spotted gar	<i>Lepisosteus oculatus</i>
spotted sea trout	<i>Cynoscion nebulosus</i>
striped mullet	<i>Mugil cephalus</i>

warmouth	<i>Lepomis gulosus</i>
white shrimp	<i>Litopenaeus setiferus</i>
Yellow bass	<i>Morone mississippiensis</i>
yellow bullhead	<i>Ameiurus natalis</i>
Zebra mussel	<i>Dreissena polymorpha</i>

Table B-6. Prime Farmland Soils

Parish	Acreage*	% of All Soils*
Ascension	8,499.6	83.7
Assumption	30,431.9	55.3
Jefferson	28,231.3	30.8
Lafourche	60,877.7	20.2
Orleans	7,036.5	52.7
Plaquemines	8,467.9	23.2
St Bernard	0.0	0
St Charles	31,360.9	17.3
St James	37,011.4	41.9
St John the Baptist	15,324.5	25.9
TOTAL	227,241.7	27.1

*Acreages and percentages are based on the portions of the parish that fall within the WBV mitigation basin boundary.

Table B7: 2012 Fishing, Hunting Licenses & 2011 Boating Licenses Sold by Parish and in the WBV Basin

Parish	Resident Salt *	NR Salt*	Resident Fresh*	NR Fresh*	Residential Hunting*	NR Hunting *	Boat
Assumption	1,833	13	2,971	3	1,186	0	3,607
St. James	2,027	1	2,456	1	763	0	2,135
St. John the Baptist	3,609	7	3,973	7	861	0	2,269
La Fourche	14,628	33	15,556	33	4,464	2	11,878
St. Charles	5,519	17	5,930	19	1,477	0	4,343
Jefferson	30,860	171	31,707	184	4,935	5	18,627
Orleans	11,544	98	12,059	122	1,466	6	4,649
Plaquemines	3,400	15	3,464	16	1,100	1	3,937
Total WBV Basin	73,420	355	78,116	385	16,252	14	51,445

Information is provided by the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (www.wlf.louisiana.gov)

* Numbers are for one license per year per individual; Salt= salt water fishing; Fresh =fresh water fishing; NR =Non-resident; Boat= boat licenses

Table 8: Weighted (dBA) Sound Levels of Construction Equipment and Modeled Attenuation at Various Distances

Noise Source	50 ft	100 ft	200 ft	500 ft	1,000 ft
Backhoe	78 dBA	72 dBA	68 dBA	58 dBA	52 dBA
Dump Truck	76 dBA	70 dBA	64 dBA	56 dBA	50 dBA
Excavator	81 dBA	75 dBA	69 dBA	61 dBA	55 dBA
Front end loader	79 dBA	73 dBA	67 dBA	59 dBA	53 dBA
Dozer	82 dBA	76 dBA	70 dBA	62 dBA	56 dBA

1. The dBA at 50 ft is a measured noise emission. The 100- to 1,000-ft results are modeled estimates.
Source: FHWA 2006. "Highway Construction Noise Handbook".

Table B-9: Cumulative Impacts of Past Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Projects in the WBV Basin

Project Name	Project Type	Wetlands and Other Surface Waters	Wildlife	Threatened and Endangered Species	Fisheries, Aquatic Resources, and Water Quality	Essential Fish Habitat	Cultural Resources	Recreational Resources	Aesthetic Resources	Air Quality	Noise	Socioeconomics	Environmental Justice
CIAP BA-43 (EB): EB-Long Distance Mississippi River Sediment Pipeline	Diversion	+	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
CWPPRA BA-39: Mississippi River Sediment Delivery System - Bayou Dupont	Diversion	+	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
State of Louisiana BA-03: Naomi Siphon Diversion	Diversion	+	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
WRDA BA-01: Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion and Forced Drainage Area	Diversion	+	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
CIAP BA-62: West Bank Wastewater Assimilation Plant	Habitat Enhancement	+	+	0	0	+/-	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
CIAP (PO-90) WLDS-SP: West Lac Des Allemands Shoreline Protection	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
CIAP BA-61: West Bank Wetland Conservation and Protection	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
CWPPRA LA-16 Non-rock Alternatives to Shoreline Protection Demonstration	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
National Park Service: Jean Lafitte National Historic Park Beneficial Use Site	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Park Service: Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection 2011	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pre-Katrina WBV Mitigation: Land Acquisition and BLH Mitigation	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
State of Louisiana BA05c: Baie de Chactas	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State of Louisiana BA-15x1: Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Extension Project	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	Project Type	Wetlands and Other Surface Waters	Wildlife	Threatened and Endangered Species	Fisheries, Aquatic Resources, and Water Quality	Essential Fish Habitat	Cultural Resources	Recreational Resources	Aesthetic Resources	Air Quality	Noise	Socioeconomics	Environmental Justice
State of Louisiana BA-16: Bayou Segnette	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surplus Funds 2007 BA-75-1: Jean Lafitte Tidal Protection/Fishers basin	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texaco Oil Spill Mitigation: Texaco Oil Discharge Mitigation 1991 (Netherlands Area)	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
US Department of Justice: St Charles Levee Conservation Easement	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
National Park Service: Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection 1997 shoreline protection and geocrib	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Park Service: Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection 2005	Habitat Preservation	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
CIAP BA-15x-2 (EB): EB-Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Phase III	Habitat Restoration	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
CWPPRA BA-15: Lake Salvador Shore Protection Demonstration	Habitat Restoration	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
CWPPRA BA-03c: Naomi Outfall Management	Hydrologic Restoration	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CWPPRA BA-02: GIWW (Gulf Intracoastal Waterway) to Clovelly Hydrologic Restoration	Hydrologic Restoration	+	+	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Park Service: 2002 Jean Lafitte National Historic Park Canal Partial Back Fillings	Marsh Creation	+	+	0	-	-	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
National Park Service: 2010 Jean Lafitte National Historic Park Canal Partial Back Fillings	Marsh Creation	+	+	0	-	-	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
State of Louisiana LA-01a: Dedicated Dredging Program - Lake Salvador	Marsh Creation	+	+	0	+/-	-	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
CIAP BA-59: Waterline Booster Pump Station, West Bank	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0

Project Name	Project Type	Wetlands and Other Surface Waters	Wildlife	Threatened and Endangered Species	Fisheries, Aquatic Resources, and Water Quality	Essential Fish Habitat	Cultural Resources	Recreational Resources	Aesthetic Resources	Air Quality	Noise	Socioeconomics	Environmental Justice
Louisiana DOTD: Future I-49 Corridor	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0
US Army Corps of Engineers: Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion Structure	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0
Algiers Lock	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	-	-	0	+/-	-	0	0	-	0
Algiers Non-federal Levee (Donner Canal Levee)	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
Bayou Gauche Ring Levee (Sunset Levee)	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) and North Lafourche Conservation, Levee and Drainage District, Valentine to Larose Levee, TE-111	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
Empire Lock	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	-	-	0	+/-	-	0	0	-	0
English Turn Non-federal Levee (Donner Canal Levee)	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
GIWW Navigation System	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	+	0
Harvey Canal Lock	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	-	-	0	+/-	-	0	0	-	0
Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSRRS), West Bank and Vicinity	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana, Hurricane Protection Project (LGM)	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
Mississippi River Levees : MR&T Project	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	-	-	+/-	-	-	0	0	+	0
Mississippi River Navigation Operations and Maintenance	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	-	0	0	0	+	0
New Orleans to Venice (NOV) levee project, Incorporation of Non-federal Levees (NFL) into NOV	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
New Orleans to Venice (NOV) levee project, St. Jude to Venice	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
Oakville to La Reussite Non-federal Levee	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0

Project Name	Project Type	Wetlands and Other Surface Waters	Wildlife	Threatened and Endangered Species	Fisheries, Aquatic Resources, and Water Quality	Essential Fish Habitat	Cultural Resources	Recreational Resources	Aesthetic Resources	Air Quality	Noise	Socioeconomics	Environmental Justice
St. Charles Parish Levee - West Bank Ellington Phase 3 (BA-85-3)	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
St. Charles Parish Levee - West Bank Magnolida Ridge Phase 1 (BA-85-1)	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
St. Charles Parish Levee - West Bank Willow Ridge Phase 2 (BA-85-2)	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
State of Louisiana - Surplus Fund 2007 project, Lafitte Tidal Protection, BA-75-3, 2007	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
State of Louisiana Surplus Fund 2007 Project - East of Harvey Canal Interim Hurricane Protection - Phase 1	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
State of Louisiana-Surplus Fund 2007 project, Jean Lafitte Tidal Protection, BA-75-1, 2007	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0
West Plaquemines Non-federal Levee	Structure	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	+	0

+ positive effect, - negative effect, 0 no effect, +/- both positive and negative effects

Table B-10 Race and ethnic characteristics for the Census Designated Places in the vicinity of the project

ACS 2013-17	Raceland		Des Allemands		Lafourche Parish		St. Charles Parish	
RACE								
Total population	10,322	100%	1,462	100%	98,112	100%	52,728	100%
One race	10,032	97.2%	1,354	92.6%	95,651	97.5%	52,195	99.0%
White	6,732	65.2%	1,232	84.3%	77,388	78.9%	36,851	69.9%
Black or African American	3,188	30.9%	113	7.7%	12,819	13.1%	14,008	26.6%
American Indian and Alaska Native	87	0.8%	9	0.6%	2,442	2.5%	136	0.3%
Asian	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	789	0.8%	567	1.1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	0.0%	0	0.0%
Some other race	25	0.2%	0	0.0%	2,192	2.2%	633	1.2%
Two or more races	290	2.8%	108	7.4%	2,461	2.5%	533	1.0%
Minority	3,590	34.8%	230	15.7%	20,724	21.1%	15,877	30.1%
HISPANIC OR LATINO								
Total population	10,322	100%	1,462	100%	98,112	100%	52,728	100.00%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	354	3.4%	9	0.60%	4,281	4.4%	3,062	5.80%

B-11 Poverty characteristics for the CDPs in the vicinity of the project

PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE WHOSE INCOME IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS IS BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL			
CDP/Parish	Population Estimate*	Population Below Poverty Level	Percent of Population Below Poverty
Des Allemands	1,462	88	6.00%
St. Charles Parish	51,926	6,337	12.2%
Raceland	10,153	2,102	20.7%
Lafourche Parish	95,542	15,299	16.0%
*Population for whom poverty status is determined			
Source: U.S. Census Bureau ACS, 2013-2017			

APPENDIX C

ACRONYMS

AAHU	Average Annual Habitat Units
AEP	Alternatives Evaluation Process
AM	Adaptive Management
BLH-Dry	Bottomland Hardwood Dry
BLH-Wet	Bottomland Hardwood Wet
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAR	Coordination Act Report
CED	Comprehensive Environmental Document
CEMVA	U.S Army Corps of Engineers Mississippi Valley Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CF	Contractor Furnished
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIAP	Coastal Impact Assistance Program
CNWB	Colonial-nesting wading birds
CRMS	Coastwide Reference Monitoring System
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWPPRA	Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act
dB	Decibel
dBA	Weighted Decibel
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level
DOI	Department of Interior
DR	Decision Record
EA	Environmental Assessment
ECO-PCX	National Ecosystem Restoration Planning Center of Expertise
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ER	Engineering Regulation
ESA	Endangered Species Act
°F	Fahrenheit
FMC	Fisheries Management Council
FMP	Fisheries Management Plan
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FS	Flood Side
FWP	Future with Project
FWOP	Future without Project
GIWW	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway
HPS	Hurricane Protection System
HSDRRS	Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System
HIS	Habitat Suitability Index
HTRW	Hazardous, Toxic, or Radioactive Waste

Appendix C: Acronyms

IER	Individual Environmental Report
IERS	Supplemental Individual Environmental Report
LA	Louisiana
LaCPR	Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration
LCRP	Louisiana Coastal Resources Program
LCWCRTF	Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force
LDNR	Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
LDWF	Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
LDEQ	Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
LIDAR	Laser Identification Detection and Ranging
LPV	Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity
L&WCF	Land and Water Conservation Fund
MBI	Mitigation Banking Instrument
MMPA	Modified Mitigation Plan Alternative
MPA2	Mitigation Plan Alternative 2
MSFCMA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
TSMP	Tentatively Selected Mitigation Project
TSMMP	Tentatively Selected Modified Mitigation Plan
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCC	Notice of Construction Complete
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFS	Non-Federal Sponsor
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOV	New Orleans to Venice
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge
PDT	Project Delivery Team
PED	Preconstruction Engineering & Design
PIER	Programmatic Individual Environmental Report
PL	Public Law
ppt	Parts per Thousand
PM	Particulate Matter
PS	Protected Side
RDB	Right Descending Bank
REC	Recognized Environmental Conditions
RMP	Recommended Mitigation Plan
ROD	Record of Decision
ROE	Right of Entry
RSLR	Relative Sea Level Rise
SAV	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
SCORP	Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SHS	State Historic Site
TIER	Tiered Individual Environmental Report
TSMP	Tentatively Selected Mitigation Project
TSMPA	Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan Alternative
USACE	U.S Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code

Appendix C: Acronyms

USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WBV	West Bank and Vicinity
WCRA	Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Authority
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
WRDA	Water Resources Development Act
WVA	Wetland Value Assessment
ZIP	Zone Improvement Plan

APPENDIX D
AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

Cultural Programmatic Agreement

Coordination Act Report

Coastal Zone Consistency

ESA

Final
Programmatic Agreement
Among
The United States Army Corps of Engineers,
Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer,
And
The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Regarding the
Hurricane Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS)
Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity and
West Bank & Vicinity
Mitigation Projects

WHEREAS, Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita resulted in major damage to businesses, residences and infrastructure and to the Federal and non-Federal flood control and hurricane and storm damage reduction structures in the Greater New Orleans Metropolitan area, in Louisiana in August and September 2005; and

WHEREAS, Public Law 109-234, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (4th Supplemental) and Public Law 110-28, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (5th Supplemental), and Public Law 110-252, Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (6th Supplemental) direct the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, to accelerate completion of unconstructed portions, to raise levee and floodwall heights and to otherwise improve the Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity (LPV) and the West Bank & Vicinity (WBV) hurricane and storm damage risk reduction projects to provide the level of protection necessary to achieve the certification required to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program; and

WHEREAS, the projects will be implemented with funds appropriated by Congress for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies related to Hurricane Katrina as set forth above in the area covered by the disaster declaration made by President George W. Bush under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, P.L. 93-288, 88 Stat 143, as amended (42 U.S.C. sec. 121 et seq); and

WHEREAS, the USACE has elected to fulfill its obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through the execution and implementation of this Programmatic Agreement (Agreement) as provided in 36 CFR Part 800; and

WHEREAS, the USACE has negotiated Emergency Alternative Arrangements with the Council on Environmental Quality (Federal Register Volume 72, Number 48, Tuesday, March 13, 2007) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and its

implementing regulations (40 CFR Part 1500) for proposed actions with significant environmental effects that respond to the emergency, pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.11. Pursuant to the Emergency Alternative Arrangements, proposed actions are to be evaluated in an Individual Environmental Report (IER); and

WHEREAS, the USACE seeks to avoid and minimize environmental impacts to the maximum extent practical while developing the Greater New Orleans Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), and when habitat losses occur, the Corps will offset such losses through compensatory environmental mitigation. Compensatory environmental mitigation is an important part of the HSDRRS effort and could include habitat creation, restoration and/or enhancement. Separate plans to compensate for habitat losses caused by HSDRRS construction are being developed for LPV and WBV; and

WHEREAS, the USACE notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of the potential for this undertaking to adversely affect historic properties pursuant to the ACHP's regulations (36 CFR Part 800) implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470f); and

WHEREAS, the ACHP accepted the invitation to participate in consultation to develop this agreement and to seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects; and

WHEREAS, the USACE, the ACHP, Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer (LA SHPO), and federally recognized Indian Tribes as defined under 36 CFR 800.16(m), and other appropriate consulting parties have consulted to develop this Agreement to define efficient and cost effective processes for taking into consideration the effects of the LPV and WBV Mitigation projects upon historic properties pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b) consistent with the NEPA Emergency Alternative Arrangements and in the public interest; and

WHEREAS, the USACE acknowledges federally recognized Indian Tribes as sovereign nations which have a unique government-to-government relationship with the federal government and its agencies; USACE further acknowledges its Trust Responsibility to those federally recognized Indian Tribes; and

WHEREAS, the USACE, has notified affected federally recognized Indian Tribes and shall fulfill its tribal consultation responsibilities through ongoing consultation with federally recognized Indian Tribes that attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by the undertaking; and

WHEREAS, the USACE will invite any interested federally recognized Indian Tribe to sign this Agreement as an Invited Signatory Party, and those federally recognized Indian Tribes not requesting to sign this Agreement as an Invited Signatory Party will be invited to sign as a Concurring Party; and

WHEREAS, the USACE, in coordination with the LA SHPO, has taken appropriate measures to identify other consulting parties and to invite such parties to participate in the development and execution of this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the USACE has requested the participation of local governments and the public by mail and will take appropriate steps to involve and notify those parties, as appropriate, during the implementation of the terms of this Agreement; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the USACE, ACHP, and LA SHPO agree that the implementation of the following stipulations will evidence that the USACE has taken into account the effects of the HSDRRS LPV and WBV Mitigation projects upon historic properties.

STIPULATIONS

The USACE shall adhere to the process and protocols set forth in this Agreement.

I. Tribal Consultation

- A. The USACE has invited the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas, Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana, Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana, Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma, Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, Seminole Tribe of Florida, and Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe to consult in the development of the Programmatic Agreement. The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana, Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, and the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians have participated in the development of the Programmatic Agreement and will sign the Programmatic Agreement as an Invited Signatory Party (hereafter also known as "signatory Indian Tribes"). The USACE will provide the signatory Indian Tribes with a copy of the Final Programmatic Agreement.
- B. The USACE shall provide the signatory Indian Tribes with copies of all plans, determinations, and findings that are provided to the LA SHPO to assist in identifying activities that are part of the HSDRRS LPV and WBV Mitigation projects.

II. Public Involvement

- A. The USACE, in coordination with the LA SHPO, shall identify and provide members of the public likely to be interested in the effects of the HSDRRS LPV and WBV Mitigation projects upon historic properties

with a description of the undertaking and the provisions of the Agreement.

- B. The USACE will involve the public through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, which affords all persons, organizations and government agencies the opportunity to review and comment on proposed major federal actions that are evaluated by a NEPA document.
- C. The USACE will release a draft IER for the HSDRRS LPV Mitigation projects and a draft IER for the WBV Mitigation projects to the public for a review period of thirty (30) calendar days. Substantive comments received during this review period will be incorporated into the final IERs. The development of this Agreement will be communicated to the public during the IER development process and comments will be solicited regarding the Agreement and any other historic preservation concerns.
- D. To the extent permitted under applicable federal laws and regulations, including Section 304 of the NHPA, the USACE will release to the public, documents developed pursuant to this Agreement, effects determinations, and Interim Progress Reports.

III. Other Consulting Parties

- A. The USACE, in coordination with LA SHPO, will continue efforts during the duration of this Agreement to identify other parties with demonstrated interests in preservation issues and invite them to participate as consulting parties.
- B. The USACE will document the consulting parties in the consultation process for each of the IERs and maintain it as part of the project record.
- C. If any dispute arises about the right to be recognized as a consulting party, the USACE will contact the ACHP and provide all appropriate documentation. The ACHP will participate in the resolution of the issue.

IV. Determination of HSDRRS Mitigation Projects

- A. If the USACE determines that it is appropriate and environmentally preferable based on consideration of relevant factors to mitigate the loss of habitat caused by construction of the HSDRRS through purchase of Mitigation Bank Credits, the purchase of such credits would have no effects on historic properties. If USACE purchases Mitigation Bank Credits to offset identified losses of habitat, documentation of the

purchase of Mitigation Bank Credits will be provided to all Signatories to this agreement as evidence that the USACE has met its obligations under Section 106 of the NHPA for this project. If Mitigation Bank Credits are purchased to partially offset habitat losses, USACE will provide documentation of that purchase to all Signatories as evidence that USACE has met its obligations under Section 106 of the NHPA for that portion of the project.

- B. If USACE determines that it is environmentally preferable based on consideration of relevant factors to construct mitigation projects to offset habitat losses caused by the HSDRRS, USACE will develop Corps-constructed mitigation proposals. For all Corps-constructed mitigation proposals developed by USACE to compensate for habitat losses due to development of the HSDRRS, the USACE will ensure that each individual proposal will be assessed for its effect on historic properties as outlined in this Agreement.
- C. For Mitigation proposed on National Park Service lands within the Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve, the USACE will assess those proposals for effects to historic properties in accordance with this Agreement. The National Park Service will conduct its own consultation with the LA SHPO and Indian Tribes in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA independently of this Agreement. The USACE will continue to coordinate with the National Park Service to ensure that information being provided to the LA SHPO and Indian Tribes is consistent between the two agencies.

V. Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties for Corps-Constructed Mitigation Projects

- A. The USACE, in consultation with the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes, will define and document the area of potential effect (APE) for each proposed Corps-constructed mitigation project activity area. The APE associated with each activity area will anticipate the potential for direct, indirect, and cumulative effects upon historic properties. The reasonable and good faith identification and evaluation efforts will be limited to the APE.
- B. Following the delineation of the APE for each Corps-constructed mitigation project, the USACE will ensure that a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties within it will be conducted. The USACE will ensure that the results of the identification efforts for each recommended mitigation project are documented in a report that meets the standards of the Louisiana Division of Archaeology, and will ensure that the reports are submitted to the LA SHPO and signatory Indian

Tribes for review and comment. The USACE will ensure that the comments provided by the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes are incorporated into a final report for each Corps-constructed mitigation project. The USACE will ensure that all collections and associated records developed from each Corps-constructed mitigation project identification effort are curated in accordance with 36 CFR 79.

- C. At the completion of the Identification effort, historic properties identified within an APE will be assessed for their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places following 36CFR800.4(c), if such properties cannot be avoided through project design. If eligible properties cannot be avoided, the USACE will proceed in accordance with Stipulation VII. If undetermined properties cannot be avoided, the USACE, in consultation with LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes, will develop plans to evaluate the eligibility of each property. The USACE will ensure that the results of the evaluation efforts for each mitigation project are documented in a report that meets the standards of the Louisiana Division of Archaeology, and will ensure that the reports are submitted to the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes for review and comment. The USACE will ensure that the comments provided by the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes are incorporated into a final report for each Corps-constructed mitigation project evaluation effort. The USACE will ensure that all collections and associated records developed from each Corps-constructed mitigation project evaluation effort are curated in accordance with 36 CFR 79.
- D. In the event of disagreement between the USACE, LA SHPO, and/or signatory Indian Tribes concerning the eligibility of a property for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under 36 CFR 60, the USACE shall request a formal determination of eligibility for that property from the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places (Keeper). The determination by the Keeper will serve as the final decision regarding the National Register eligibility of the property.

VI. Coordination of Effects Determinations

- A. All standard response timeframes established by 36 CFR 800 will apply to this Agreement, unless an alternative response timeframe is agreed to by the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes. The USACE may request expedited review by the LA SHPO and Indian Tribes on a case by case basis. Such expedited review period shall not be less than 15 calendar days.
- B. Electronic mail (email) will serve as the official correspondence method for all communications regarding this Programmatic Agreement and its

provisions. See Appendix A for a list of contacts and email addresses. Contact information in Appendix A may be updated as needed without an amendment to this Agreement. It is the responsibility of each Signatory and Invited Signatories to immediately inform the USACE of any changes in the name, address, email address or phone number of any point-of-contact for the Signatory and Invited Signatories. The USACE will forward this information to the Signatories and Invited Signatories by email. The failure of any party to this Agreement to notify the USACE of changes to their point-of-contacts information shall not be grounds for asserting that notice of a proposed action was not received.

- C. The USACE shall evaluate the effects of an Action on historic properties in a holistic manner and will not segment activities. In the event the USACE determines that any aspect of the Action will have an effect or adverse effect on a historic property within the Action's APE, the entire Action will be reviewed accordingly.
- D. Consultation under this Agreement will be concluded for USACE findings of *no historic properties affected* and *no adverse effect* when the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes have reviewed the written documentation and do not object with the USACE finding, and subject to the provisions of this Agreement.
- E. Following submission of written documentation to the SHPO and signatory Indian tribes, the USACE may propose a finding of *no adverse effect with conditions*, as appropriate. Such conditions may include, but are not limited to:
 - 1. Avoidance and/or preservation in-place of historic properties;
 - 2. Modifications or conditions to ensure consistency with the Secretary of Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* and applicable guidelines.
- F. Should the LA SHPO or signatory Indian Tribes object to the USACE's findings of *no historic properties affected*, findings of *no adverse effect*, findings of *no adverse effect with conditions*, or should USACE determine that it cannot accept conditions requested by LA SHPO and/or signatory Indian Tribes, the USACE shall seek to resolve such objection through consultation in accordance with Stipulation XI Dispute Resolution Provisions of this Agreement.

VII. Resolution of Adverse Effects

- A. If USACE, in consultation with the LA SHPO and Indian Tribes, determines that the implementation of a project activity may result in an adverse effect upon historic properties as defined in 36 CFR 800.5(a) (1) and (2) of the ACHP's regulations, the USACE shall notify the LA SHPO, the ACHP, signatory Indian Tribes, other interested parties and the public. If the project activity will affect a National Historic Landmark, USACE shall also notify the National Park Service (NPS). The Adverse Effect notification shall include the following documentation:
1. Summary description of the activity area;
 2. Summary of identification efforts in accordance with this Agreement;
 3. Summary analysis of effects to historic properties;
 4. Summary of alternatives considered to avoid adverse effects;
 5. Proposed standard mitigation measures in accordance with Stipulation VIII of this Agreement; and
 6. Request for ACHP comment and involvement, as appropriate.
- B. The ACHP, LA SHPO, signatory Indian Tribes, interested parties, including NPS, as appropriate, and the public shall be afforded an opportunity to review and to comment on the adverse effect notification for a period of thirty (30) days after receipt of the adverse effect notification.
- C. Should the USACE, LA SHPO, and signatory Indian Tribes disagree on the proposed mitigation measures, the USACE shall seek to resolve such objection through consultation in accordance with Stipulation XI. Dispute Resolution of this Agreement.

VIII. Standard Mitigation Measures

- A. The USACE, in coordination with the LA SHPO, ACHP, and signatory Indian Tribes will develop Standard Mitigation Measures for adverse effects to historic properties. Standard mitigation measures will be tailored to the significance of the historic property, and may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Public Interpretation and development of educational materials;
 2. Documentation consistent with the Level II Standards of the Historic American Building Survey/ Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER);
 3. Historical, Architectural or Archeological Monographs;
 4. Rehabilitation of historic buildings in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (36 CFR 68);
 5. Off-site mitigation, including acquisition of property or preservation easements on property, as appropriate, containing threatened resources of comparable significance in circumstances where there is an imminent need to proceed with construction activity and it is in the public interest;
 6. Ethnographic studies;
 7. Studies of traditional cultural properties;
 8. Relocation of historic properties to sites that the LA SHPO agrees possess similar overall character; and
 9. Data recovery for archeological properties where data recovery has been determined to be the appropriate treatment whether or not they are eligible for the National Register under criterion "D."
- B. In the event that, in the opinion of the LA SHPO, ACHP, and/or signatory Indian Tribes, standard mitigation measures as proposed are not adequate or are inappropriate to resolve adverse effects, the USACE, LA SHPO, and signatory Indian Tribes will consult to negotiate different or additional mitigation measures. Other consulting parties may express their concerns regarding the adequacy of the mitigation through written comments submitted to any of the signatories to the Agreement. Once consulting parties agree to the terms of the expanded mitigation, such agreement will be formalized through an MOA executed and implemented pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6(c). If there is a disagreement that cannot be resolved, the formal dispute provisions at Section XI will be implemented.

IX. Unanticipated Discoveries and Effects

- A. In the event that the USACE discovers a previously unidentified historic property, including archeological sites, human remains, and properties of traditional religious and cultural significance to Indian Tribes, during the execution of the project, the USACE immediately shall secure the jobsite and suspend work in the vicinity of the affected resource. If the USACE determines that the proposed work has or will adversely affect a previously unidentified historic property or a known historic property in an unanticipated manner, the USACE shall notify the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes immediately. The USACE, in consultation with the LA SHPO and Indian Tribes, will develop a treatment plan or Standard Mitigation Measures agreement. The USACE will implement the plan or Standard Mitigation Measures agreement once agreed to by the LA SHPO and signatory Indian Tribes.
- B. USACE shall insure that all contractors are made aware of the requirements of this Agreement. In the event that a contractor discovers a previously unidentified historic property, the contractor shall immediately notify the USACE and refrain from further project activities within the immediate vicinity of the discovery and shall take reasonable efforts to avoid and minimize harm to the historic property. USACE shall implement additional measures to secure the historic property for safety and security concerns, as appropriate.
- C. In the event that previously unidentified -adverse effects to historic properties are identified following the completion of work within an activity area, any party may provide the USACE with evidence of such effects for a period of twelve (12) months from the completion of the Corps-constructed mitigation project that may have caused the adverse effect. The USACE, in consultation with the LA SHPO, signatory Indian Tribes, and ACHP will review the effect in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.
- D. If the USACE, LA SHPO, Indian Tribes, consulting parties, or member of the public, as appropriate cannot agree on an appropriate course of action to address the discovery situation, the USACE shall initiate the dispute resolution process set forth in Stipulation XI.

X. Treatment of Human Remains

- A. The USACE recognizes that the respectful treatment of human remains and funerary objects is a paramount concern. The USACE will ensure

that the views of living descendants, including Indian Tribes, and other interested parties, are fully considered in the decision-making process.

B. Unanticipated discovery of human remains

1. When human remains or indications of a burial are discovered, the individual(s) who made the discovery shall immediately notify the local law enforcement and the USACE, New Orleans District.
2. In the event that the USACE is notified of a previously unidentified burial, including burial sites, human skeletal remains, or burial artifacts, on private or state land during the execution of any of the Undertakings, the USACE will ensure that the procedures established in the Louisiana Unmarked Human Burial Sites Preservation Act (La. R.S. 8:671-681) will be followed.
3. In the event that the USACE is notified of a previously unidentified burial, including burial sites, human remains or funerary objects, on federal or tribal land during the execution of any of the undertakings, the USACE will ensure that procedures established by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 and the regulations that implement it (43 CFR Part 10) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-95; 16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm), as amended, and implementing regulations (43 CFR Part 7) will be followed.
4. The USACE shall have an archaeologist immediately survey or resurvey the general area where the remains were found to determine the nature of the remains and evaluate the possibility of preserving the remains in place or whether they will need to be exhumed/moved. Federally recognized Indian Tribes likely to have a cultural affiliation with the remains will be notified by telephone immediately in accordance with 43 CFR 10.4(b). If possible Tribal representative(s) shall be present to advise on appropriate treatment of the exposed remains and on the most appropriate long-term solution.
5. The USACE shall provide information collected on the nature of the remains and a recommended plan of action pursuant to 43 CFR 10.5(e) within five (5) working days to the signatory Indian Tribes and the LA SHPO. The USACE shall consult with all relevant parties to determine the appropriate course of

action with regard to the human remains and any accompanying artifacts, grave goods, or funerary objects.

6. All signatories to the PA agree that the most appropriate treatment, if feasible, is to protect the remains and permanently preserve the burial in situ.
7. If the USACE, after consultation, determines that protection, avoidance, or repair is not feasible, disinterment shall be conducted in accordance with methods and procedures developed in accordance with the appropriate federal and state laws and in consultation with the signatory Indian Tribes and the LA SHPO.
8. The USACE may authorize the activity in the direct discovery areas to resume as soon as the remains have been removed from the ground.

XI. Dispute Resolution

- A. Except for the resolution of eligibility issues, as set forth in Stipulation VI. D. above, should the LA SHPO, Indian Tribes, or member of the public disagree on the implementation of the provisions of this agreement, they will notify the USACE, who will seek to resolve such objection through consultation.
- B. If the dispute cannot be resolved through consultation, USACE shall forward all documentation relevant to the dispute to the ACHP, including any proposed resolution identified during consultation. Within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the ACHP may:
 1. Provide USACE with recommendations to take into account in reaching final decision regarding the dispute; or
 2. Notify USACE that it will comment pursuant to 36 CFR 800.7(c) and provide formal comments within twenty-one (21) calendar days.
- C. Any recommendation or comment provided by ACHP will be understood to pertain only to the subject of the dispute, and USACE's responsibilities to fulfill all actions that are not subject of the dispute will remain unchanged.

- D. If the ACHP does not provide USACE with recommendations or notification of its intent to provide formal comments within seven (7) calendar days, USACE may assume that the ACHP does not object to its recommended approach and it will proceed accordingly.

XII. Administration and Duration of this Agreement

- A. This Programmatic Agreement will remain in effect for eight (8) years from the date of execution, unless extended for a two-year period by written agreement negotiated by all signatories.
- B. The USACE, LA SHPO, and signatory Indian Tribes shall meet annually to evaluate the effectiveness of this Agreement. The USACE shall coordinate such annual meetings following the execution of this Agreement.

XIII. Comprehensive Review

- A. At the conclusion of all of the distinct project actions, the USACE will analyze the HSDRRS LPV and WBV Mitigation undertaking holistically to identify cumulative effects upon historic properties.
- B. Holistic analysis of the undertaking's cumulative effects will be coordinated with the preparation of the draft supplemental comprehensive environmental document to be prepared in accordance with the NEPA Emergency Alternative Arrangements approved by the Council on Environmental Quality.
- C. The USACE, in coordination with the signatories to this Agreement, shall identify and shall implement additional mitigation measures to address adverse cumulative effects, as appropriate.

XIV. Amendment and Termination

- A. Notwithstanding any provision of this Agreement, any signatory may request in writing that it be amended and shall include in such request the reasons for the proposed amendment. The signatories will consult to consider the requested amendment. The USACE will initiate consultation within thirty (30) days of receipt of the written request. Any amendment will be in writing and will be signed by the USACE, the LA SHPO, the signatory Indian Tribes, and the ACHP, and shall be effective on the date of the final signature.


- B. Any Invited Signatory Party may terminate its participation in this Agreement by providing thirty (30) days advance written notification to all other parties. In the event of termination by one signatory, the Agreement will remain in effect for the USACE and other signatories.

Execution of this PA by the USACE, the LA SHPO, and ACHP and implementation of its terms, evidences that the USACE has taken into account the effects of the HSDRRS LPV and WBV Mitigation projects upon historic properties and has afforded the ACHP an opportunity to comment.

Final
Programmatic Agreement
Among
The United States Army Corps of Engineers,
Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer
And
The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Regarding the
Hurricane Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS)
Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity and West Bank & Vicinity
Mitigation Projects


Signatories:

United States Army Corps of Engineers

By: 
Colonel Edward Fleming
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District


Date: 17 May 2013

Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer

By: 
Pam Breaux
Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer
Louisiana Office of Cultural Development

Date: May 7, 2013

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation


By: 
John M. Fowler
Executive Director
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Date: 6/18/13

Final
Programmatic Agreement
Among
The United States Army Corps of Engineers,
Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer
And
The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Regarding the
Hurricane Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS)
Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity and West Bank & Vicinity
Mitigation Projects

Invited Signatory Party:

Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma

By: 
Gregory E. Pyle, Chief

Date: _____

Final
Programmatic Agreement
Among
The United States Army Corps of Engineers,
Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer
And
The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Regarding the
Hurricane Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS)
Lake Pontchartrain & Vicinity and West Bank & Vicinity
Mitigation Projects

Invited Signatory Party:

Jena Band of Choctaw Indians

By: B. Cheryl Smith
B. Cheryl Smith, Principal Chief

Date: 4-29-13





Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma

P.O. Box 1210 • Durant, OK 74702-1210 • (580) 924-8280

Gregory E. Pyle
Chief

Gary Batton
Assistant Chief

May 3, 2013

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District
ATTN: Joan M. Exnicios
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

RE: Programmatic Agreement for the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV) and West Bank and Vicinity (WBV) Mitigation Project, Louisiana

Ms. Exnicios,

The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma thanks you for the consultation regarding the above mentioned Programmatic Agreement. I have attached a copy of the agreement along with all the signed signature pages. If you have any questions or concerns please contact us at the Choctaw Nation Historic Preservation Office, 580-924-8280 Ext 2631.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ian Thompson
Director, Historic Preservation Department
Tribal Archaeologist, NAGPRA Specialist

By:

Lindsey Huffman


Administrative Assistant

lhuffman@choctawnation.com

Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma

P.O. Drawer 1210

Durant, OK 74701



Preserving America's Heritage

June 18, 2013

Ms. Joan Exnicios
Chief, Environmental Branch
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
New Orleans District
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

REF: Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System, Lake Pontchartrain-West Bank
and Vicinity

Dear Ms. Exnicios:

Enclosed is the executed Programmatic Agreement for the referenced program. By carrying out the terms of the Agreement, the Corps of Engineers will have fulfilled its responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's regulations.

If you have any questions, please call Dr. Tom McCulloch at 202-606-8554 or via email at tmcculloch@achp.gov

Sincerely,

Caroline D. Hall
Assistant Director
Federal Property Management Section
Office of Federal Agency Programs

Enclosure

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803 • Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202-606-8503 • Fax: 202-606-8647 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov



State of Louisiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT

July 23, 2019

Marshal Harper
Corps of Engineers- New Orleans District
7400 Leake Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70118
Via email: marshall.k.harper@usace.army.mil

RE: **C20140014 mod 05**, Coastal Zone Consistency
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers (COE)
Direct Federal Action
Highway 307 Bottomland Hardwood-Wet and Swamp mitigation project for the West
Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System
Lafourche Parish, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Harper:

The above referenced project modification has been reviewed for consistency with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program in accordance with Section 307 (c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended. The project, as proposed in this application, is consistent with the LCRP.

If you have any questions concerning this determination please contact Jeff Harris of the Consistency Section at (225) 342-7949 or jeff.harris@la.gov.

Sincerely,

/S/ Charles Reulet
Administrator
Interagency Affairs/Field Services Division

CR/SK/jdh

cc: Tammy Gilmore, COE-NOD
Elizabeth Behrens, COE-NOD
Dave Butler, LDWF
Kelley Templet, OCM
Kirk Kilgen, OCM
Amanda Voisin, Lafourche Parish



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 60267
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70160-0267

July 15, 2015

Regional Planning and
Environment Division South

Mr. Don Haydel
Acting Administrator
Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
Interagency Affairs, Compliance, and Field Services Division
P.O. Box 44487
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4487

Dear Mr. Haydel:

Enclosed for your review is a modification to our coastal zone consistency determination (CZD) (C20140014) which addressed implementation of the constructible features of the Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (PIER) #37, Titled "West Bank and Vicinity (WBV) Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Mitigation Plan" with a signed Decision Record on June 13, 2014. The modification to the CZD addresses the applicable Louisiana Coastal Use Guidelines for implementation of the modified mitigation projects for flood side BLH-Wet and swamp and protected side BLH-Dry.

Currently the CEMVN is analyzing implementation of the projects in a Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (SPIER) entitled "West Bank and Vicinity (WBV), Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Mitigation Project Jefferson, St. Charles, Lafourche, and Plaquemines Parishes, Louisiana SPIER #37a". The proposed projects mitigate impacts to general flood side BLH-Wet and swamp and general protected side BLH-Dry.

This office is seeking your concurrence with the enclosed CZD, if possible, within 45 days of the date of this letter. Please contact Tammy Gilmore at 504-862-1002 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,


for  Joan M. Exnicios
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

MODIFIED CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION (C20140014)

Louisiana Coastal Use Guidelines

West Bank and Vicinity (WBV), Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Mitigation Project Jefferson, and Lafourche, Louisiana

SPIER #37a

INTRODUCTION

Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, 16 U.S.C. 1451 et. seq. requires that "each federal agency conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the coastal zone shall conduct or support those activities in a manner which is, to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with approved state management programs." In accordance with Section 307, a modification to Consistency Determination C20140014 has been prepared for the purchase of mitigation bank credits for non-Park/404(c) protected side (PS) bottomland hardwoods impacts incurred from the construction of the WBV, HSDRRS. Coastal Use Guidelines were written in order to implement the policies and goals of the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program, and serve as a set of performance standards for evaluating projects. Compliance with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program, and therefore, Section 307, requires compliance with applicable Coastal Use Guidelines.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The purpose of the WBV, HSDRRS Mitigation project is to replace the lost functions and services of habitats impacted by the WBV HSDRRS construction as required by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and WRDA 1986 and 2007. A programmatic individual environmental report (PIER) was completed in June 2014 that presented the whole plan for mitigating the WBV HSDRRS impacts, but only recommended moving forward with implementing the part of the approved mitigation plan that included the purchase mitigation bank credits for non-Park/404(c) PS impacts to bottomland hardwoods (BLH) Dry and BLH-Wet habitats. LDNR provided Coastal Zone Consistency #C20140014 for this constructible feature of the plan and BLH-Wet mitigation bank credits were purchased to satisfy some the non-Park/404(c) PS BLH-Dry/Wet impacts. Since that time, three of the features of the mitigation plan have become un-implementable. As such, SPIER #37a is being completed to evaluate substitute projects for the FS BLH-Wet, FS swamp and PS BLH-Dry features of the mitigation plan and make those features constructible as well. The decision to prepare a SPIER and recommend implementation of only part of the tentatively selected modified mitigation plan (TSMMP) was made in an effort to complete as much mitigation as possible concurrent with construction of projects incurring the impact as required by WRDA 1986, 33 U.S.C. 2283(a).

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The SPIER #37a TSMMP consists of a combination of pump and fill operations in interior open water areas to create fresh marsh, swamp, and BLH-Wet habitat on and adjacent to Jean

Lafitte National Historic Park and Preserve (JLNHPP); elevation manipulation, invasive species eradication and reforestation on existing agricultural fields to enhance/restore/create BLH-Wet, BLH-Dry and swamp habitats, and the purchase of BLH-Wet/Dry and swamp mitigation bank credits to address the WBV HSDRRS mitigation requirement. The following are the WBV HSDRRS mitigation projects that make up the TSMMP, however, only the construction of the Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf projects, the Bayou Segnette project or the purchase of mitigation bank credits for general FS BLH-Wet, FS swamp and PS BLH-Dry impacts are recommended as constructible features of the plan and proposed for implementation at this time. Designs for the projects identified as Programmatic Features of the mitigation plan are underway and currently PIER #37, TIER 1 EA is being prepared in collaboration with the National Park Service (NPS) to evaluate implementation of the programmatic features of the mitigation plan thereby making them constructible. The EA is scheduled to be released soon and may be available for public review at the same time SPIER #37 is out for public review. Coastal Zone Consistency determinations on the constructible features covered in the TIERs would be submitted at the time of TIER completion.

CONSTRUCTIBLE FEATURES

If a proposed project becomes infeasible due to difficulties in implementation or changed conditions, the CEMVN will take appropriate action to ensure satisfaction of its mitigation requirement. If any of the TSMMP projects could not be implemented, the CEMVN would default to one of the other alternatives evaluated in this SPIER. The other alternatives involve the purchase of out of basin (watershed) mitigation bank credits. In accordance with the USACE Implementation Guidance for the WRDA of 2007- Section 2036(c), Wetlands Mitigation, if mitigation bank credits are not available in the same watershed, documentation of the analysis and of the rationale for leaving the watershed is necessary (see attachment).

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK PS BLH-DRY AND BLH-WET

As part of the approved mitigation plan in PIER #37, MVN purchased credits from 1 bank (Enterprise Woodlands) in the WBV basin for non-Park/404c PS BLH-Wet impacts. The purchase of mitigation bank credits for non-Park/404c PS BLH-Dry impacts is awaiting sufficient in basin credit availability. LDNR provided Coastal Zone Consistency #C20140014 for this constructible feature of the plan.

Under SPIER #37a, Bayou Segnette PS BLH-Dry enhancement (figure 3) is the tentatively selected project for the PS BLH-Dry feature and recommended as a constructible feature of the WBV HSDRRS Mitigation Plan. The proposed project is located adjacent to the Bayou Segnette State Park, on the protected side of the hurricane protection levee in Jefferson Parish. The proposed site is bounded to the south by the existing Westbank Hurricane Protection Levee (HPL) and to the north by Nicolle Boulevard and the NOLA Motorsports Park.

Two locations have been identified within the Bayou Segnette area. Both sites are currently populated with invasive tree species. The two options are identified as BLH West and BLH East. BLH West is 1,000 acres and BLH East is 993 acres. Target mitigation effort is to enhance approximately 920 acres by removing the existing invasive trees and planting the same

area with desired high quality trees to mitigate 193 AAHUs.

Due to the high density of invasive plant species, the project area would receive multiple herbicidal treatments prior to the initial planting of native, high-quality species. Initially the entire area would be aerial sprayed in late summer or early fall. Approximately two months after the initial aerial spraying, the mitigation features would be mechanically cleared without grubbing. Large native trees and shrubs would be preserved during the mechanical clearing process to the greatest degree practicable. Woody debris generated during the clearing operations would be chipped and left within the mitigation features. Following the clearing activities, the features would be planted with high quality native BLH tree and shrub species.

An alternative to the Bayou Segnette TSMMP would be the purchase of credits from an active mitigation bank that is in compliance with the requirements of the USACE Regulatory Program, which include monitoring and reporting by the owner/operator. Selection of the mitigation bank would occur through a "Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposal" process, through which any mitigation bank having the appropriate number and resource type of credits available could submit a proposal for selling credits. In order to qualify, a bank would have to be in compliance with an approved mitigation banking instrument, including an approved mitigation plan and appropriate real estate and financial assurances. CEMVN would utilize in basin banks, however, depending on credit availability, credit purchase could occur outside the basin. If credits are purchased from a mitigation bank, non-Park/404c protected side BLH-dry impacts would be mitigated with the purchase of BLH-Dry or Wet credits equaling 193 Average Annual Habitat Units (AAHUs).

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK/404 (c) FS BLH -WET

Under SPIER #37a, Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet Restoration (figure 2) is the tentatively selected project for the FS BLH-Wet feature and recommended as a constructible feature of the WBV HSDRRS Mitigation Plan. The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of current or abandoned agricultural fields. Within the 521 acres, approximately 137 acres would be used for BLH-Wet restoration. All proposed footprint elevations are at or above that desired for BLH-Wet restoration (+2.5 feet to 3.25 feet NAVD88), therefore no outside borrow is required for this proposed restoration action. If sites that are above desired elevations fall within the final selected footprint for BLH-Wet restoration, these areas will be degraded, and material will be hauled to lower areas within the project footprint. All such earth moving efforts will be achieved with dozers, trucks, and backhoes.

The entire proposed footprint is contained within a perimeter water retention dike, certain portions of which would be degraded to reconnect the restoration project with adjacent swamp/BLH habitat. There are ditches adjacent to the dikes that would be filled or partially filled during dike degrading.

Once cultural surveys are complete, layout of the project features would be based on existing LIDAR data, which can be clearly mapped to confirm existing elevations. In general the features will be laid out (1) to avoid cultural sites, (2) to minimize required earth moving from high to

low areas, (3) maximize the remaining higher elevations for ongoing farming, (4) minimize the need for retention dike realignment to maintain the integrity of remaining agricultural fields, and (5) accommodate the potential for swamp restoration which is also being considered within this footprint.

In general, the worst case scenario would require scraping of approximately 1.5feet to 0.5feet of topsoil in the higher areas to achieve elevations within the desired range. This material would remain on-site, to be truck hauled or pushed by dozer to areas of existing lower elevations. It is envisioned that the majority of the acres required could simply be planted at the existing elevation once the water retention dikes have been degraded. As the vast majority of the potential project footprint(s) is existing agricultural fields, little to no anticipated clearing would be required. What little woody or vegetative debris which requires removal would be stockpiled and burned on site. The project would then be planted with BLH species.

An alternative to the Hwy 307 TSMMP would be the purchase of credits from an active mitigation bank that is in compliance with the requirements of the USACE Regulatory Program, which include monitoring and reporting by the owner/operator. Selection of the mitigation bank would occur through a “Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposal” process, through which any mitigation bank having the appropriate number and resource type of credits available could submit a proposal for selling credits. In order to qualify, a bank would have to be in compliance with an approved mitigation banking instrument, including an approved mitigation plan and appropriate real estate and financial assurances. CEMVN would utilize in basin banks, however, depending on credit availability, credit purchase could occur outside the basin. If credits are purchased from a mitigation bank, non-Park/404c flood side BLH-Wet impacts would be mitigated with the purchase of BLH-Wet credits equaling 72.04 Average Annual Habitat Units (AAHUs).

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK/404 (c) FLOOD SIDE SWAMP IMPACTS

Under SPIER #37a, Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf Swamp Restoration (figure 2) is the tentatively selected project for the FS Swamp feature and recommended as a constructible feature of the WBV HSDRRS Mitigation Plan. The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of current or abandoned agricultural fields. Within the 521 acres, approximately 330 acres would be used for swamp restoration. All proposed footprint elevations are at or above that desired for swamp restoration (+2.5 feet to 0.0 feet NAVD88), therefore no outside borrow is required for this proposed restoration action. If sites that are above desired elevations fall within the final selected footprint for swamp restoration, these areas will be degraded, and material will be hauled to lower areas within the project footprint. All such earth moving efforts will be achieved with dozers, trucks, and backhoes.

The entire proposed footprint is contained within a perimeter water retention dike, certain portions of which would be degraded to reconnect the restoration project with adjacent swamp/BLH habitat. There are ditches adjacent to the dikes that would be filled or partially filled during dike degrading.

Once cultural surveys are complete, layout of the project features would be based on existing LIDAR data, which can be clearly mapped to confirm existing elevations. In general the features would be laid out (1) to avoid cultural sites, (2) to minimize required earth moving from high to low areas, (3) maximize the remaining higher elevations for ongoing farming, (4) minimize the need for retention dike realignment to maintain the integrity of remaining agricultural fields, and (5) accommodate the potential for swamp restoration which is also being considered within this footprint.

In general, the worst case scenario would require scraping of approximately 1.0feet to 0.5feet of topsoil in the higher areas to achieve elevations within the desired range. This material would remain on-site, to be truck hauled or pushed by dozer to areas of existing lower elevations. It is envisioned that the majority of the acres required could simply be planted at the existing elevation once the water retention dikes have been degraded. As the vast majority of the potential project footprint(s) is existing agricultural fields, little to no anticipated clearing would be required. What little woody or vegetative debris which requires removal would be stockpiled and burned on site. The project would then be planted with swamp species.

An alternative to the Hwy 307 TSMMP would be the purchase of credits from an active mitigation bank that is in compliance with the requirements of the USACE Regulatory Program, which include monitoring and reporting by the owner/operator. Selection of the mitigation bank would occur through a “Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposal” process, through which any mitigation bank having the appropriate number and resource type of credits available could submit a proposal for selling credits. In order to qualify, a bank would have to be in compliance with an approved mitigation banking instrument, including an approved mitigation plan and appropriate real estate and financial assurances. CEMVN would utilize in basin banks, however, depending on credit availability, credit purchase could occur outside the basin.

If credits are purchased from a mitigation bank, non-Park/404c flood side swamp impacts would be mitigated with the purchase of swamp credits equaling 134.52 AAHUs.

PROGRAMMATIC FEATURES (not recommended for construction in this SPIER)

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK/404 (c) FLOOD SIDE FRESH MARSH IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte FS Fresh Marsh Restoration Project mitigation project would involve restoration of FS fresh marsh habitats. Two restoration features are proposed. Feature JL1B5 would be built in an open water portion of Yankee pond (29° 51' 09.52"N 90° 10' 27.90W), would occupy approximately 91.2 acres, and would be located within the Park (figure 4). Feature JL15 (figure 5) would be situated in an area along the shoreline of Lake Salvador (29° 46' 45.47"N 90° 09' 05.70W) where prior work has already largely established a marsh platform that was previously an open water portion of the lake. Feature JL15 would encompass a total of approximately 55.5 acres. Portions of this feature would overlap Park property, while the remaining portions would overlap lands not currently owned by NPS. Both of the marsh restoration features would be located in Jefferson Parish.

Approximately 8,400 linear feet of retention dike would be required for JL1B5. Of the total

8,400 linear feet of dikes, approximately 3,100 linear feet would be armored/capped with stone. This armored dike segment would be located along the eastern boundary of feature of JL1B5 adjacent to Bayou Segnette.

Marsh restoration would require approximately 600,000 cubic yards of material hydraulically dredged from Lake Cataouatche. The borrow site would be approximately 1,200 feet x 1,500 feet (roughly 42.0 acres) with a maximum cut of 10 feet. The pipeline would be approximately 18,000 linear feet and routed adjacent to the western bank of Bayou Segnette. As the pipeline would need to cross a portion of Lake Cataouatche, a small segment of submerged pipeline would be installed at the crossing with appropriate signage to ensure safe passage of vessels over the line. Throughout the initial construction phase, project construction would be coordinated with the US Coast Guard.

The initial target marsh elevation in JL1B5 would be +3.5 feet with a final target elevation of approximately +1.0 to +1.5 feet. It is estimated that the initial project construction activities discussed above would require approximately 5 to 6 months. The final construction phase would begin following settlement and dewatering of the created marsh platform.

Fish dips (essentially armored gaps) would be constructed in the armored dike segment. The fish dips would allow water exchange and provide aquatic organism access to the marsh feature. It is anticipated that the final phase of construction activities (degrading dikes, constructing trenasses and fish dips, installation of dike armoring) would require approximately 3 to 4 months. As part of the proposed project, the JL15 footprint would be degraded to design grade elevation of +1.0 to +1.5 feet. Fish dips would be constructed in this dike. The fish dips would allow water exchange and provide aquatic organism access to the marsh feature. It is anticipated that the final phase of JL15 construction activities (re-grading the marsh platform, refurbishment of rock dike, constructing fish dips) would require approximately 4 to 5 months.

MITIGATION FOR PARK/404 (c) BLH-WET IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte BLH-Wet Restoration Project would involve restoring native BLH-Wet habitats in an existing open water area (an existing borrow pit). The project would be located in Jefferson Parish. The proposed restoration features would include JL14A (approximately 6.28 acres), and JL14B (approximately 5.88 acres), as shown in figure 6. Both features would be located within the Park, adjacent to the West Bank HPL (29° 50'37.43"N 90° 07'40.43W).

Features JL14A and JL14B would be constructed by placing fill material in the borrow pit to establish earthen platforms for the restored habitats. The mitigation features would be filled with an estimated 18 feet of sand to elevation -0.0 feet. A 4-foot clay cap to elevation +3.5 feet would then be placed on top of the sand fill. It is anticipated that it would take approximately 1 year for the fill materials to settle to the desired final target grade of elevation +2.0 feet.

Approximately 400,000 cubic yards of sand fill and 80,000 cubic yards of the clay cap would be required to fill the 12.2 acres being restored to BLH-Wet habitats. These borrow materials would be obtained from off-site government furnished and/or contractor furnished borrow pits.

Project access would be via two roadways extending west from Barataria Boulevard. An appropriate traffic control plan would be implemented during the initial construction phase to minimize traffic congestion and safety hazards. Establishment of the construction access routes would require clearing a corridor, roughly 20-foot wide, through existing wetland habitats.

The initial construction phase would last roughly 9 to 10 months. Plantings would be in accordance with the BLH-Wet planting guidelines. This secondary construction phase, would likely last approximately 3 to 4 months.

MITIGATION FOR PARK/404 (c) SWAMP IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte Swamp Restoration Project would involve restoring native swamp habitats in primarily existing open water areas. The project would be located in Jefferson Parish. The proposed restoration features would include JL7 (29° 50' 59.34"N 90° 08' 17.87W) (approximately 11.31 acres) as shown in figure 6, and JL8 (29° 47' 39.71"N 90° 04' 11.82W) (approximately 5.00 acres) and JL9 (29° 47' 18.21"N 90° 04' 04.32W) (approximately 4.13 acres) as shown in figure 7. All three features would be located in the Park, while features JL8 and JL9 would also be located within the 404c area.

Proposed feature JL7 would encompass a segment of an existing man-made canal, although the far eastern end of this feature would encompass a previously filled and disturbed upland area. A portion of an existing spoil berm running along the north side of JL7 would be cleared and degraded (excavated) to use as a source of fill to establish feature JL7. The existing upland area within the eastern end of JL7's footprint would also be cleared and degraded.

Another component of the JL7 swamp restoration would involve excavating "gaps" in the existing spoil berms adjacent to both sides of Millaudon Canal. Each gap would be degraded to approximately elevation 1.0 feet to match the existing grades typically found in nearby swamp habitats.

The quantity of fill that would be obtained from the degrading of the spoil berm adjacent to JL7 and from degrading the existing upland portion of JL7 is approximately 35,000 cubic yards. Combining this with the material obtained from degrading the Millaudon Canal gaps would yield a total of roughly 36,600 cubic yards that would be placed in the existing canal portion of JL7 to establish the platform for the proposed JL7 swamp. However, it is estimated that an additional 140,000 cubic yards of fill (borrow) would be required to bring the canal portion of JL7 to the initial target grade elevation.

Project access would be via two roadways extending west from Barataria Boulevard. Due to the anticipated volume of dump truck traffic, an appropriate traffic control plan would be implemented during the initial construction phase to minimize traffic congestion and safety hazards.

The initial construction phase to establish feature JL7 would require an estimated 8.5 to 9.5 months. Once settled, the restoration feature would be planted native swamp canopy and midstory species.

The proposed restoration features JL8 and JL9 would encompass existing canals that would be filled and planted to restore native swamp habitat. Two construction access corridors would be required to build features JL8 and JL9. There are existing spoil berms on the north and south sides of both restoration features which would be “gapped” to improve surface flow and exchange. Each gap would be degraded to approximately elevation 1.0 feet to match the existing grades typically found in nearby swamp habitats.

It is estimated that approximately 3,600 cubic yards of fill would be obtained through construction of the spoil berm gaps. However, it is estimated that an additional 135,000 cubic yards of fill would be required to establish the earthen platforms for the restored swamp features. This borrow material would be bucket dredged from the GIWW. The proposed borrow area would be approximately 70 feet wide and 5,000 feet long (17.2 acres) and would be dug to 4 feet below existing grade with an allowable 1 foot of overdepth. All activities within the GIWW would be coordinated with the US Coast Guard as to not impede navigation.

The initial construction of JL8 and JL9 would require about 3 to 4 months. The final construction phase (e.g. initial planting of features JL8 and JL9) would require roughly 2 to 3 weeks.

MITIGATION FOR PARK/404 (c) FRESH MARSH IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte FS Fresh Marsh Restoration mitigation project would involve restoring fresh marsh habitat from open water. The single proposed marsh restoration feature, JL1B4 (figure 8), would encompass approximately 20.4 acres, located in Jefferson Parish within the Park (29° 50'53.05"N 90° 10'37.92"W). Restoration work would involve establishing a land platform for the new marsh habitat proposed.

Approximately 3,780 linear feet of retention dike would be required. Of the total 3,780 linear feet of dikes, approximately 1,780 linear feet would be armored/capped with stone during the second project construction phase. Fish dips would be constructed in the armored dike segment. The initial target marsh elevation (elevation of slurry fill) would be +3.5 feet. It is estimated that the initial project construction activities discussed above would require approximately 3 to 4 months. The final target elevation of this feature is approximately +1.0 to +1.5 feet. The final construction phase would begin following settlement and dewatering of the created marsh platform. In conjunction with this dike degrading effort, trenasses would be constructed as necessary to serve as tidal creeks to facilitate water exchange and create shallow water interspersed features within JL1B4. It is anticipated that the final phase of construction activities (degrading dikes, constructing trenasses and fish dips, installation of dike armoring) would require approximately 3 to 4 months.

Marsh restoration would require approximately 150,000 cubic yards of material from Lake Cataouatche. The borrow site would be approximately 1,500 feet by 300 feet (roughly 10.3 acres) with a maximum cut of 10 feet. The pipeline would be routed adjacent to the western bank of Bayou Segnette. Throughout the initial construction phase, project construction would be coordinated with the US Coast Guard.

GUIDELINES APPLICABLE TO ALL USES

Guideline 1.1 The guidelines must be read in their entirety. Any proposed use may be subject to the requirements of more than one guideline or section of guidelines and all applicable guidelines must be complied with.

Response 1.1: Acknowledged.

Guideline 1.2 Conformance with applicable water and air quality laws, standards and regulations, and with those other laws, standards and regulations which have been incorporated into the coastal resources program shall be deemed in conformance with the program except to the extent that these guidelines would impose additional requirements.

Response 1.2: none of the work is taking place in open water or waters of the United States and therefore neither a 404(b)(1) or a Water Quality Certificate is required. The parishes that the work will take place in are in attainment and any air quality impacts are expected to be minimal, temporary and localized (dust and vehicle exhaust) and would not put the parishes out of attainment.

Guideline 1.3 The guidelines include both general provisions applicable to all uses and specific provisions applicable only to certain types of uses. The general guidelines apply in all situations. The specific guidelines apply only to the situations they address. Specific and general guidelines should be interpreted to be consistent with each other. In the event there is an inconsistency, the specific should prevail.

Response 1.3: Acknowledged.

Guideline 1.4 These guidelines are not intended to nor shall they be interpreted so as to result in an involuntary acquisition or taking of property.

Response 1.4: Acknowledged.

Guideline 1.5 No use or activity shall be carried out or conducted in such a manner as to constitute a violation of the terms of a grant or donation of any lands or water-bottoms to the State or any subdivision thereof. Revocations of such grants and donations shall be avoided.

Response 1.5: Acknowledged.

Guideline 1.6 Information regarding the following general factors shall be utilized by the permitting authority in evaluating whether the proposed use is in compliance with the guidelines.

- a) type, nature and location of use.
- b) elevation, soil and water conditions and flood and storm hazard characteristics of site.
- c) techniques and materials used in construction, operation and maintenance of use.
- d) existing drainage patterns and water regimes of surrounding area including flow, circulation,

quality, quantity and salinity; and impacts on them.

- e) availability of feasible alternative sites or methods – for implementing the use.
- f) designation of the area for certain uses as part of a local program.
- g) economic need for use and extent of impacts of use on economy of locality.
- h) extent of resulting public and private benefits.
- i) extent of coastal water dependency of the use.
- j) existence of necessary infrastructure to support the use and public costs resulting from use.
- k) extent of impacts on existing and traditional uses of the area and on future uses for which the area is suited.
- l) proximity to, and extent of impacts on important natural features such as beaches, barrier islands, tidal passes, wildlife and aquatic habitats, and forest lands.
- m) the extent to which regional, state and national interests are served including the national interest in resources and the siting of facilities in the coastal zones as identified in the coastal resources program.
- n) proximity to, and extent of impacts on, special areas, particular areas, or other areas of particular concern of the state program or local programs.
- o) likelihood of, and extent of impacts of, resulting secondary impacts and cumulative impacts.
- p) proximity to and extent of impacts on public lands or works, or historic, recreational or cultural resources.
- q) extent of impacts on navigation, fishing, public access, and recreational opportunities.
- r) extent of compatibility with natural and cultural setting.
- s) extent of long term benefits or adverse impacts.

Response 1.6: Acknowledged.

Guideline 1.7 It is the policy of the coastal resources program to avoid the following adverse impacts. To this end, all uses and activities shall be planned, sited, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to avoid to the maximum extent practicable significant:

- a) reductions in the natural supply of sediment and nutrients to the coastal system by alterations of freshwater flow.

Response 1.7: a) No reductions anticipated. Restoration of BLH-Wet and swamp habitat and reconnection of the project area to the coastal zone would slightly increase the natural supply of sediment and nutrients into the coastal system.

b) adverse economic impacts on the locality of the use and affected governmental bodies.

Response 1.7: b) There would be no significant adverse economic impacts.

c) detrimental discharges of inorganic nutrient compounds into coastal waters.

Response 1.7: c) None anticipated as the projects are not located near coastal waters.

d) alterations in the natural concentration of oxygen in coastal waters.

Response 1.7: d) None anticipated as the projects are not located near coastal waters.

e) destruction or adverse alterations of streams, wetland, tidal passes, inshore waters and waterbottoms, beaches, dunes, barrier islands, and other natural biologically valuable areas or protective coastal features.

Response 1.7: e) The proposed project would re-establish wetland forests and reconnect them to the coastal zone.

f) adverse disruption of existing social patterns.

Response 1.7: f) No social impacts are anticipated.

g) alterations of the natural temperature regime of coastal waters.

Response 1.7: g) None anticipated as the projects are not located near coastal waters..

h) detrimental changes in existing salinity regimes.

Response 1.7: h) None anticipated as the projects are located inland and do not include any type of water control structures.

i) detrimental changes in littoral and sediment transport processes.

Response 1.7: i) None anticipated as the projects are located inland and do not include any type of sediment transport.

j) adverse effects of cumulative impacts.

Response 1.7: j) None anticipated. Cumulative impacts to the coastal zone are expected to be beneficial as restored wetlands would be reconnected to the coastal zone.

k) detrimental discharges of suspended solids into coastal waters, including turbidity resulting

from dredging.

Response 1.7: k) None anticipated as the projects are not located near any coastal waters and doesn't dredging.

l) reductions or blockage of water flow or natural circulation patterns within or into an estuarine system or a wetland forest.

Response 1.7: l) None anticipated as the projects are expected to restore the hydrology of the areas.

m) discharges of pathogens or toxic substances into coastal waters.

Response 1.7: m) None anticipated as best management practices would be utilized and the projects are not near coastal waters.

n) adverse alteration or destruction of archaeological, historical, or other cultural resources.

Response 1.7: n) None anticipated. The project strives to avoid any potential archaeological sites by waiting to finalizing its location within the 521 acre Hwy 307 project area once cultural surveys are complete.

o) fostering of detrimental secondary impacts in undisturbed or biologically highly productive wetland areas.

Response 1.7: o) The Hwy 307 site is currently farmed and is not an undisturbed or biologically highly productive wetland area. The Bayou Segnette site is currently forested with predominately invasive Chinese tallow.

p) adverse alteration or destruction of unique or valuable habitats, critical habitat for endangered species, important wildlife or fishery breeding or nursery areas, designated wildlife management or sanctuary areas, or forestlands.

Response 1.7: p) The project areas are not unique or valuable habitat.

q) adverse alteration or destruction of public parks, shoreline access points, public works, designated recreation areas, scenic rivers, or other areas of public use and concern.

Response 1.7: q) None anticipated as the projects are not located on public lands.

r) adverse disruptions of coastal wildlife and fishery migratory patterns.

Response 1.7: r) None anticipated. Any impacts to wildlife are expected to be beneficial.

s) land loss, erosion and subsidence.

Response 1.7: s) None anticipated as the projects would plant forest species

- t) increases in the potential for flood, hurricane or other storm damage, or increases in the likelihood that damage will occur from such hazards.

Response 1.7: t) None anticipated

- u) reductions in the long-term biological productivity of the coastal ecosystem.

Response 1.7: u) The proposed project would actually increase the long-term biological productivity of the coastal ecosystem.

Guideline 1.8 In those guidelines in which the modifier "maximum extent practicable" is used, the proposed use is in compliance with the guideline if the standard modified by the term is complied with. If the modified standard is not complied with, the use will be in compliance with the guideline if the permitting authority finds, after a systematic consideration of all pertinent information regarding the use, the site and the impacts of the use as set forth in guideline 1.6, and a balancing of their relative significance, that the benefits resulting from the proposed use would clearly outweigh the adverse impacts resulting from non-compliance with the modified standard and there are no feasible and practical alternative locations, methods and practices for the use that are in compliance with the modified standard and:

- a) significant public benefits will result from the use, or;
- b) the use would serve important regional, state or national interests, including the national interest in resources and the siting of facilities in the coastal zone identified in the coastal resources program, or;
- c) the use is coastal water dependent.

The systematic consideration process shall also result in a determination of those conditions necessary for the use to be in compliance with the guideline. Those conditions shall assure that the use is carried out utilizing those locations, methods and practices which maximize conformance to the modified standard; are technically, economically, environmentally, socially and legally feasible and practical and minimize or offset those adverse impacts listed in guideline 1.7 and in the guideline at issue.

Response 1.8: Acknowledged.

Guideline 1.9 Uses shall to the maximum extent practicable be designed and carried out to permit multiple concurrent uses which are appropriate for the location and to avoid unnecessary conflicts with other uses of the vicinity.

Response 1.9: Acknowledged.

Guideline 1.10 These guidelines are not intended to be, nor shall they be, interpreted to allow expansion of governmental authority beyond that established by La. R.S. 49:213.1 through

213.21, as amended; nor shall these guidelines be interpreted so as to require permits for specific uses legally commenced or established prior to the effective date of the coastal use permit program nor to normal maintenance or repair of such uses.

Response 1.10: Acknowledged.

If the CEMVN was unable to implement the Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet Restoration project, then the CEMVN would purchase sufficient in-kind mitigation bank credits to mitigate 72.04 Average Annual Habitat Units (AAHUs) of FS BLH-Wet impacts. This purchase would occur in basin unless sufficient in-kind, in-basin credits are lacking. If sufficient in-kind, in-basin credits are unavailable; in-kind, out of basin credits within the Louisiana coastal zone would be utilized. The actual mitigation banks available at the time of credit purchase are uncertain: Some banks may not have enough credits remaining, some may close, and other banks may come on line. As such, the particular mitigation bank(s) to be utilized is (are) unknown at this time. Since the impacts from constructing any permitted bank have been assessed through NEPA compliance achieved during the Regulatory permitting process and as such, exist as reasonably foreseeable projects in the Future Without Project (FWOP) conditions, no new direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to significant resources in the coastal zone would be incurred from the purchase of these credits for the WBV HSDRRS mitigation.

GUIDELINES FOR LEVEES

These guidelines are not applicable as the proposed action does not include any levee work.

GUIDELINES FOR LINEAR FACILITIES

These guidelines are not applicable as the proposed action does not include any linear facilities

GUIDELINES FOR DREDGED MATERIAL DEPOSITION

These guidelines are not applicable as the proposed action for construction does not include dredged material deposition

GUIDELINES FOR SHORELINE MODIFICATION

These guidelines are not applicable as the proposed action would not occur along shorelines therefore does not include shoreline alteration.

GUIDELINES FOR SURFACE ALTERATIONS

Guideline 6.1 Industrial, commercial, urban, residential, and recreational uses are necessary to provide adequate economic growth and development. To this end, such uses will be encouraged in those areas of the coastal zone that are suitable for development. Those uses shall be consistent with the other guidelines and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, take place only:

- a) on lands five feet or more above sea level or within fast lands; or

- b) on lands which have foundation conditions sufficiently stable to support the use, and where flood and storm hazards are minimal or where protection from these hazards can be reasonably well achieved, and where the public safety would not be unreasonably endangered; and
 - 1) the land is already in high intensity of development use, or
 - 2) there is adequate supporting infrastructure, or
 - 3) the vicinity has a tradition of use for similar habitation or development

Response: Not applicable. The proposed action would be wetland habitat restoration.

Guideline 6.2 Public and private works projects such as levees, drainage improvements, roads, airports, ports, and public utilities are necessary to protect and support needed development and shall be encouraged. Such projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, take place only when:

- a) they protect or serve those areas suitable for development pursuant to Guideline 6.1; and
- b) they are consistent with the other guidelines; and
- c) they are consistent with all relevant adopted state, local and regional plans.

Response: Not applicable. The proposed action would be wetland habitat restoration.

Guideline 6.4 To the maximum extent practicable wetland areas shall not be drained -or filled. Any approved drain or fill project shall be designed and constructed using best practical techniques to minimize present and future property damage and adverse environmental impacts.

Response: Acknowledged. The areas that would be altered are agricultural lands and forested areas that are predominantly tallow. No draining or filling is necessary for implementation of the project.

Guideline 6.5 Coastal water dependent uses shall be given special consideration in permitting because of their reduced choice of alternatives.

Response: Not Applicable.

Guideline 6.6 Areas modified by surface alteration activities shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be re-vegetated, refilled, cleaned and restored to their predevelopment condition upon termination of the use.

Response: Acknowledged. The project includes planting of BLH and swamp species.

Guideline 6.7 Site clearing shall to the maximum extent practicable be limited to those areas immediately required for physical development.

Response: Acknowledged. The only areas to be cleared are the areas that would be planted with swamp and BLH species.

Guideline 6.8 Surface alterations shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be located away from critical wildlife areas and vegetation areas. Alterations in wildlife preserves and management areas shall be conducted in strict accord with the requirements of the wildlife

management body.

Response: Not Applicable. No surface alterations would take place within critical wildlife areas, wildlife preserves or management areas.

Guideline 6.9 Surface alterations which have high adverse impacts on natural functions shall not occur, to the maximum extent practicable, on barrier islands and beaches, isolated cheniers, isolated natural ridges or levees, or in wildlife and aquatic species breeding or spawning areas, or in important migratory routes.

Response: Not Applicable. No surface alterations would take place on barrier islands and beaches, isolated cheniers, isolated natural ridges or levees, or in wildlife and aquatic species breeding or spawning areas, or in important migratory routes.

Guideline 6.10 The creation of low dissolved oxygen conditions in the water or traps for heavy metals shall be avoided to the maximum extent practicable.

Response: Not Applicable. All work would take place on land.

Guideline 6.11 Surface mining and shell dredging shall be carried out utilizing the best practical techniques to minimize adverse environmental impacts.

Response: Not Applicable.

Guideline 6.12 The creation of underwater obstructions which adversely affect fishing or navigation shall be avoided to the maximum extent practicable.

Response: Not Applicable.

Guideline 6.13 Surface alteration sites and facilities shall be designed, constructed, and operated using the best practical techniques to prevent the release of pollutants or toxic substances into the environment and minimize other adverse impacts.

Response: Concur. Best management practices will be used.

Guideline 6.14 To the maximum extent practicable only material that is free of contaminants and compatible with the environmental setting shall be used as fill.

Response: Concur, although no use of fill is anticipated.

GUIDELINES FOR HYDROLOGIC AND SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS

These guidelines are not applicable as the proposed action does not include hydrologic and sediment transport modifications.

GUIDELINES FOR DISPOSAL OF WASTES

The proposed action would not involve the disposal of wastes and, therefore, these guidelines are not applicable.

GUIDELINES FOR USES THAT RESULT IN THE ALTERATION OF WATERS DRAINING INTO COASTAL WATERS

These guidelines are not applicable as the proposed action would not involve the alteration of waters draining into coastal water.

GUIDELINES FOR OIL, GAS, AND OTHER MINERAL ACTIVITIES

The proposed action would not involve oil, gas, and other mineral activities and, therefore, these guidelines are not applicable

OTHER STATE POLICIES INCORPORATED INTO THE PROGRAM

Section 213.8A of Act 361 directs the Secretary of DOTD, in developing the LCRP, to include all applicable legal and management provisions that affect the coastal zone or are necessary to achieve the purposes of Act 361 or to implement the guidelines effectively. It states:

The Secretary shall develop the overall state coastal management program consisting of all applicable constitutional provisions, laws and regulations of this state which affect the coastal zone in accordance with the provisions of this Part and shall include within the program such other applicable constitutional or statutory provisions, or other regulatory or management programs or activities as may be necessary to achieve the purposes of this Part or necessary to implement the guidelines hereinafter set forth.

The constitutional provisions and other statutory provisions, regulations, and management and regulatory programs incorporated into the LCRP are identified and described in Appendix 1. A description of how these other authorities are integrated into the LCRP and coordinated during program implementation is presented in Chapter IV. Since all of these policies are incorporated into the LCRP, federal agencies must ensure that their proposed actions are consistent with these policies as well as the coastal use guidelines. (CZMA, Section 307)

CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION

This Coastal Zone Consistency determination has been completed on the mitigation for the constructible features of the WBV HSDRRS MTSMP; namely the construction of the Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet and swamp Restoration project, the Bayou Segnette BLH-Dry project or the purchase of in-kind mitigation bank credits to mitigate impacts to 72.04 AAHUs of BLH-Wet habitat, 134.52 AAHUs of swamp habitat and 193 AAHUs of BLH-Dry habitat. Since the TSMMP would restore approximately 137 acres of BLH-Wet habitat, 330 acres of swamp habitat, 920 acres of BLH-Dry habitat and reconnect such acreage with the coastal zone or optionally, since the impacts from constructing any permitted bank have been assessed through NEPA compliance achieved during the Regulatory permitting process no new direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to significant resources in the coastal zone would be incurred from mitigating the WBV HSDRRS FS BLH-Wet and swamp and PS BLH-Dry impacts.

Coastal Zone Consistency determinations on the constructible features covered in the TIERs (currently programmatic features in this SPIER) would be submitted at the time of TIER completion.

Based on this evaluation, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, has

determined that the implementation of the proposed action is consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with the State of Louisiana's Coastal Resources Program.




Figure 1. WBV HSDRRS TSMMP



Figure 2: Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet and Swamp Restoration Project



Figure 3: Bayou Segnette (Avondale Gardens) BLH-Dry Enhancement





Figure 4: Jean Lafitte FS Fresh Marsh Restoration Project Mitigation Project (not recommended for construction)



NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	DATE	SCALE	NO.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA	DATE PLOTTED: _____ DATE REVISION: _____ DATE SCALE: _____ DATE DRAWING: _____
--	---

WWW.MITIGATION JEAN LAFITTE PARISH/DC NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT JEAN LAFITTE PARISH AND BLH WET RESTORATION FEATURES PER DESIGN

SHEET IDENTIFICATION C-XX

Figure 6: Jean Lafitte BLH-wet/Swamp Restoration (JL14A, JL14B, and JL7) Project Mitigation Project (not recommended for construction)




Figure 7: Jean Lafitte Swamp Restoration (JL8 and JL9) Mitigation Project (not recommended for construction)




Figure 8: Jean Lafitte Marsh Restoration (JL1B4) Mitigation Project (not recommended for construction)

BOBBY JINDAL
GOVERNOR



STEPHEN CHUSTZ
SECRETARY

State of Louisiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT

September 15, 2015

Tammy Gilmore
Corps of Engineers- New Orleans District
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

RE: **C20140014 mod 02**, Coastal Zone Consistency – Time Extension
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers
Direct Federal Action
SPIER # 37a for Bayou Segnette enhancement project and two Bayou Boeuf restoration projects
Jefferson and Lafourche Parishes, Louisiana

Dear Ms. Gilmore:

This office has received the above referenced federal application for consistency review with the approved Louisiana Coastal Resources Program in accordance with Section 307(c) of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended. NOAA Regulations on Federal Consistency, at 15 CFR Section 930.41(a), allow 60 days for the review of Direct Federal Activities, and at Section 930.41(b) allow an additional 15 days with appropriate applicant notification. Please be advised that, by this letter, Interagency Affairs/Field Services Division is requesting the 15 day time extension.

A final determination will be made within the authorized time period, ending October 2, 2015. If you have any questions concerning this matter please contact Carol Crapanzano of the Consistency Section at (225) 342-9425 or 1-800-267-4019.

Sincerely yours,

/S/ Don Haydel
Acting Administrator
Interagency Affairs/Field Services Division

DH/SK

BOBBY JINDAL
GOVERNOR



STEPHEN CHUSTZ
SECRETARY

State of Louisiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT

October 2, 2015

Tammy Gilmore
Corps of Engineers- New Orleans District
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

RE: **C20140014 mod 02**, Coastal Zone Consistency
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers
Direct Federal Action
SPIER # 37a for Bayou Segnette enhancement project and two Bayou Boeuf restoration projects
Jefferson and Lafourche Parishes, Louisiana

Dear Ms. Gilmore:

This office has received the above referenced federal application for consistency review with the approved Louisiana Coastal Resources Program in accordance with Section 307(c) of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended. NOAA Regulations on Federal Consistency, at 15 CFR 930.41(a), allow 60 days for the review of Direct Federal Activities. An additional 15 days with appropriate applicant notification along with mutually agreed upon, additional time are allowed at 930.41(b). The Office of Coastal Management is hereby requesting an additional 45-day review time in accordance with your email dated October 1, 2015.

A final determination will be made within the authorized time period ending November 17, 2015. If you have any questions concerning this matter please contact Carol Crapanzano of the Consistency Section at (225) 342-9425 or 1-800-267-4019.

Sincerely yours,

/S/ Don Haydel
Acting Administrator
Interagency Affairs/Field Services Division

DH/SK

Post Office Box 44487 • Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-4487
617 North Third Street • 10th Floor • Suite 1078 • Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802
(225) 342-7591 • Fax (225) 342-9439 • <http://www.dnr.louisiana.gov>
An Equal Opportunity Employer

BOBBY JINDAL
GOVERNOR



STEPHEN CHUSTZ
SECRETARY

State of Louisiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT

December 7, 2015

Tammy Gilmore
Corps of Engineers- New Orleans District
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

RE: **C20140014 mod 02**, Coastal Zone Consistency
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers
Direct Federal Action
SPIER # 37a for Bayou Segnette enhancement project and two Bayou Boeuf restoration projects
Jefferson and Lafourche Parishes, Louisiana

Dear Ms. Gilmore:

The above referenced modification has been reviewed for consistency with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program in accordance with Section 307 (c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended. The project, as proposed in this application, is consistent with the LCRP.

If you have any questions concerning this determination please contact Carol Crapanzano of the Consistency Section at (225) 342-9425 or 1-800-267-4019.

Sincerely yours,

/S/ Don Haydel

Acting Administrator
Interagency Affairs/Field Services Division

DH/SK

cc: Libby Behrens, COE-NOD
Dave Butler, LDWF
Frank Cole, OCM
Kirk Kilgen, OCM
Jason Smith, Jefferson
Amanda Voisin, Lafourche

Post Office Box 44487 • Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-4487
617 North Third Street • 10th Floor • Suite 1078 • Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802
(225) 342-7591 • Fax (225) 342-9439 • <http://www.dnr.louisiana.gov>

An Equal Opportunity Employer



United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

646 Cajundome Blvd.

Suite 400

Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

July 9, 2015

Colonel Richard L. Hansen
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Hansen:

Please reference your office's Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (SPIER #37) that is being prepared under the approval of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and that will partially fulfill the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (83 Stat. 852, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347). Individual Environmental Reports are CEQ-approved alternative arrangements for compliance with NEPA that would allow expedited implementation of improved hurricane protection measures in Louisiana. Work proposed under this SPIER would mitigate impacts resulting from the improved hurricane protection measures and would be conducted under the authority of Public Law 109-234, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Supplemental 4). That law authorized the Corps to upgrade two existing hurricane protection projects (i.e., the Westbank and Vicinity of New Orleans [WBV] and the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity [LPV]) in the Greater New Orleans area in southeast Louisiana.

The Fish and Wildlife Service provides the enclosed report to assist your staff in fulfilling mitigation needs associated with those efforts in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.). This report does not constitute the report of the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 2(b) of that Act. Furthermore, additional comments are provided in accordance with provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (54 Stat. 250, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 668a-d), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (40 Stat. 755, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.). Copies of this draft report were provided to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and their comments will be incorporated into the final report.

We will continue to work closely with your staff to ensure that fish and wildlife resources are conserved. Toward that end, please have your staff advise Mr. David Walther (337/291-3122) if you or your staff has any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Brad S. Rieck".

Brad S. Rieck
Deputy Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office

- cc: Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve, New Orleans, LA
National Marine Fisheries Service, Baton Rouge, LA
Environmental Protection Agency, Dallas, TX
LA Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries, Baton Rouge, LA
LA Dept. of Natural Resources (CMD), Baton Rouge, LA
LA CPRA, Baton Rouge, LA



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

200 Dulles Drive
Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

May 31, 2019

Colonel Michael N. Clancy
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Clancy:

Please reference your office's Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA 572) for the West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (WBV) Bottomland Hardwood – Wet and Swamp Mitigation, Lafourche Parish. That SEA evaluates changes to the previously proposed mitigation plan for that project presented in the Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report 37a. This Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) addresses the current mitigation plan for West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction project-associated impacts to forested wetlands and estuarine marsh by the US Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) for activities associated with implementation of the WBV 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 based on surveys and analyses of project impacts and potential improvement of mitigation areas for fish and wildlife resources. This report constitutes the final report of the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 2(b) of that Act. Furthermore, additional comments are provided 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), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (40 Stat. 755, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 703 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 are incorporated into this final report.

Hurricane Katrina, a Category 3 storm, made landfall on the west bank of the Mississippi River and continued northeastward with the eye crossing Plaquemines, St. Bernard, Orleans and St. Tammany parishes in Louisiana. Hurricane surge inundated lower elevation areas in southeast Louisiana, and overtopped hurricane and flood control levees. As a result and under the authority of Public Law 109-234, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (4th Supplemental) and Public Law 110-28, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (5th Supplemental), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) improved two existing

hurricane protection projects (i.e., WBV and Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity) in the Greater New Orleans area. The USACE prepared Individual Environmental Reports (IER) under the approval of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Those IERs partially fulfilled USACE compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4321- 4347). IERs were a CEQ-approved alternative arrangement for compliance with NEPA that has allowed expedited implementation of improved hurricane protection measures.

The USACE has prepared SEA # 572 to evaluate changes to the Recommended Mitigation Plan (RMP) for mitigating the impacts associated with construction of the WBV 100-year Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) as presented in the Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report #37a Mitigation for Protected Side Bottomland Hardwoods Dry, West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Jefferson Parish, Louisiana (SPIER #37a) with a Decision Record (DR) signed on March 4, 2016. SEA #572 identifies substitute projects for the flood side (FS) bottomland hardwoods wet (BLH-Wet) and swamp features of the RMP found in SPIER #37a and provides an assessment of the revised compensatory mitigation plan for the WBV HSDRRS impacts using the selected replacement projects.

This report supplements our November 26, 2007, Draft FWCA Report that provided twenty-six programmatic recommendations for the HSDRRS authorized work to help avoid and minimize impacts to fisheries, wetlands, forested habitats, migratory birds, and public lands, and incorporates, and supplements the numerous FWCA Reports provided for the work authorized under 4th and 5th Supplemental for the WBV Hurricane Protection Project only (i.e., IERs 11-17, including supplemental documents). This report also supplements our May 27, 2014 and July 2015, reports that addressed proposed mitigation features in the USACE Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (PIER) 37 and SPIER #37a for WBV impacts, respectively. Those reports addressed impacts caused during construction of the WBV HSDRRS. The original projects to mitigate FS BLH-Wet and swamp are not implementable and therefore must be substituted.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE AREA'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

As previously mentioned, the Service has provided several FWCA Reports for the entire HSDRRS project. Those reports contain a thorough discussion of the significant fish and wildlife resources (including those habitats) that occur within the study area. For brevity, that discussion is incorporated by reference herein but the following brief descriptions are provided to update the previously mentioned information.

The study area is located within the Mississippi River Deltaic Plain of the Lower Mississippi River Ecosystem. The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of current or abandoned agricultural fields.

Higher elevations occur on the natural levees of the Mississippi River and its distributaries. Developed lands are primarily associated with natural levees, but extensive wetlands have been

leveed and drained to accommodate residential, commercial, and agricultural development. Federal, State, and local levees have been installed for flood protection purposes, often with negative effects on adjacent wetlands. Navigation channels such as the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), including the Harvey Canal portion, the Bayou Segnette Waterway and the Barataria Bay Waterway are also prominent landscape features, as are extensive oil and gas industry access channels and pipeline canals, all of which have altered the landscapes hydrology. Extensive wetlands and associated shallow open waters dominate the landscape outside the flood control levees. Major water bodies include Lakes Cataouatche and Salvador, Lac des Allemands and the Mississippi River.

Habitat types in the project area include forested wetlands [i.e., bottomland hardwoods (BLH) and/or swamps], non-wet BLH, open water, and developed areas. Due to urban and agricultural 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.

Factors that will strongly influence future fish and wildlife resource conditions outside of the protection levees include freshwater input and loss of coastal wetlands. Depending upon the deterioration rate of marshes, the frequency of occasional short-term saltwater events may increase. Under that scenario, tidal action in the project area may increase gradually as the buffering effect of marshes is lost, and use of that area by estuarine-dependent fishes and shellfish tolerant of saltwater conditions would likely increase. Regardless of which of the above factors ultimately has the greatest influence, freshwater wetlands and forested areas within and adjacent to the project area will probably experience losses due to development, subsidence, and erosion.

The ongoing loss of coastal Louisiana wetlands (approximately 1,149 square miles between 1956 and 2004; average loss rate of 24 square miles per year) was exacerbated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. Those hurricanes caused an initial loss of wetlands equivalent to 9 years (approximately 217 square miles) of mean annual losses (Barras 2007). Louisiana wetlands provide 26 percent of the seafood landed in the conterminous United States and over 5 million migratory waterfowl utilize those wetlands every year. In addition, those wetlands provide protection to coastal towns, cities and their infrastructure, as well as important infrastructure for the nation's oil and gas industry.

Non-wet BLH within the project area also provide habitat for wildlife resources. Between 1932 and 1984, the acreage of BLH in Louisiana declined by 45 percent (Rudis and Birdsey 1986). By 1970, Jefferson Parish was classified as entirely urban or non-forested in the U.S. Forest Service's forest inventory with most of this loss resulting from development within drained, potentially non-wet areas inside the hurricane protection levees. A large percentage of the

original BLH within the Mississippi River floodplain in the Deltaic Plain are located within levees. However, losses of that habitat type are not regulated or mitigated with the exception of impacts resulting from USACE projects as required by Section 906(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and Section 2036 (a) of the Water Resource Development Act of 2007.

Mammals known to occur in the project-area BLH and marsh habitats include mink, raccoon, swamp rabbit, nutria, river otter, and muskrat. Those habitats also support a variety of birds including herons, egrets, ibises, least bittern, rails, gallinules, neotropic cormorant, white pelican, pied-billed grebe, black-necked stilt, sandpipers, gulls, and terns. Forested and scrub-shrub habitats within the study area also provide habitat for many resident passerine birds and essential resting areas for many migratory songbirds including warblers, orioles, thrushes, vireos, tanagers, grosbeaks, buntings, flycatchers, and cuckoos (Lowery 1974). Many of these and other passerine birds have undergone a decline in population primarily due to habitat loss.

Given the extent of development and drainage, waterfowl use within the hurricane protection system is likely minimal, except in the adjacent wetlands outside the levees. Swamps, fresh and intermediate marshes usually receive greater waterfowl utilization than brackish and saline marshes because they generally provide more waterfowl food.

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 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 USACE should completed an on-line evaluation (<https://www.fws.gov/southeast/our-services/eagle-technical-assistance/>) 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.

Open water habitat in the study area consists of drainage canals; previously mentioned major waterways and lakes. Drainage canals do not support significant fishery resources because of dense vegetation, poor water quality, and often inadequate depth. Freshwater sport fishes present in the project area, but outside of the levees, include largemouth bass, crappie, bluegill, redear sunfish, warmouth, channel catfish, and blue catfish. Other fishes likely to be present include yellow bullhead, freshwater drum, bowfin, carp, buffalo, and gar. Estuarine-dependent fishes and shellfishes such as Atlantic croaker, red drum, spot, sand seatrout, spotted seatrout, southern flounder, Gulf menhaden, striped mullet, brown shrimp, white shrimp, and blue crab are found in the intermediate to saline marshes of Lakes Cataouatche and Salvador and adjacent waterbodies.

Some of the waterbodies in the project area meet criteria for primary and secondary contact recreation and partially meets criteria for fish and wildlife propagation, while others do not meet the criteria for fish and wildlife propagation (LDEQ 2012). Causes determined by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) for not fully meeting fish and wildlife propagation criteria include excessive nutrients, organic enrichment, low dissolved oxygen levels, flow and habitat alteration, pathogens and noxious aquatic plants. Indicated sources of those problems include hydromodification, habitat modification, recreational activities, and unspecified upstream sources. Municipal point sources, urban runoff, storm sewers, and onsite wastewater treatment systems are also known contributors to poor water quality in the 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 substrates. Close coordination with the NMFS is recommended because mitigation for those impacts is necessary.

Endangered and Threatened Species

Currently there are no listed threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. 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.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Project impacts resulted primarily from the expansion of levee right-of-way (ROW) and construction of levees, borrow pits, floodwalls, navigable floodgates, and associated features. Because development is ongoing within the hurricane protection levees and Task Force Guardian (TFG) restored hurricane protection to pre-Hurricane Katrina levels, the Service has assumed that project-induced development is insignificant and that implementation of the HSDRRS

project would not further induce development to areas not already developed or planned for development. Construction and implementation of the WBV hurricane protection project improvements resulted in impacts to BLH-Wet and swamp (Table 1). In addition to impacts related to the construction of the HSDRRS project, impacts to fish and wildlife habitats during the construction of mitigation projects may occur. Impacts that would occur within the footprint of the mitigation feature have been evaluated in the Wetland Value Assessment (WVA) and the mitigation area will be reconfigured to offset those impacts. However, the location of access ROWs and staging areas have not been finalized nor assessed by the resource agencies at this time. Coordination with the natural resource agencies during advanced design (e.g., post 35% design) is recommended in order to ensure that the agencies are granted adequate time to provide input into the design. This will ensure that unnecessary impacts are avoided and mitigation project are designed to effectively offset impacts.

FWCA reports and supplemental reports were provided as project designs changed or post-construction impacts were calculated. This report derives lost AAHUs from the latest impact acreage calculations utilizing Geographic Information System ROW data provided by the USACE and recent aerial photography.

Table 1. WBV HSDRRS Modified Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan (MTSMP)

Habitat Type	MTSMP Project	AAHUs Impacted	Mitigation Project Acres
General FS BLH-Wet ¹	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	72.04	130.00
General FS Swamp ¹	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	134.52	330.00

¹Use of mitigation banks to fully mitigate impacts is a constructible alternative.

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 impacted. For impacts that occurred entirely within the existing ROW (i.e., maintained, non-wet grassland) and/or impacted low quality non-wet or prevalent habitats (e.g., open water without aquatic vegetation, dry fields, etc.) the Service did not recommend mitigation as they are Category 4 Resources. Considering the high value of forested wetlands for fish and wildlife and the relative scarcity of that habitat type, those wetlands were designated as Resource Category 2, the mitigation goal for which is no net loss of in-kind habitat value. Degraded (i.e., non-wet) BLH forests and any wet pastures that were impacted were placed in Resource Category 3 due to their reduced value to wildlife, fisheries and lost/degraded fish and wildlife functions. The mitigation goal for Resource Category 3 habitats is no net loss of habitat value. To ensure no net loss of in-kind habitat value the mitigation plan includes the restoration of BLH-wet and swamp habitat.

Habitat Assessments

To quantify project impacts to fish and wildlife resources and anticipated benefits resulting from the proposed mitigation the WVA methodology was utilized. Habitat units fluctuate in response to changes in habitat quality, represented by the Habitat Suitability Index (HSI), and/or quantity

(acres); those changes are predicted for various target years over the project life (i.e., 50 years), for future without-project and future with-project scenarios. Target years (TY) were selected for this analysis to capture the effects of important biological events. Values for model variables were obtained from site visits to the area, previous wetland assessments in similar habitats, communication with personnel knowledgeable about the study area and similar habitats, and review of aerial photographs and reports documenting fish and wildlife habitat conditions in the study area and similar habitats. For all the habitat assessments, the products of the resulting HSI values and acreage estimates were then summed and annualized for each habitat type to determine the AAHUs available. The net change (increase or decrease) in AAHUs under future with-project conditions, compared to future without-project conditions, provides a quantitative comparison of anticipated project impact/benefits in AAHUs. By dividing the AAHU by the proposed mitigation project acreage a management or mitigation potential per acre is determined which can then be used to resize the project once mitigation needs are refined. Refinement is limited by the level of design, with each increasing detailed design level resulting in a more detailed WVA analysis. The final refinement should result in an equal replacement of impacted AAHUs with mitigated AAHUs (i.e., one to one ratio). Contractors for the USACE conducted the WVA analysis for some mitigation sites with review by state and federal natural resource agencies; the Service conducted the remaining WVAs. Further explanation of how impacts/benefits are assessed with the WVA and an explanation of the assumptions affecting HSI values are available from the USACE. Impact assessments and mitigation benefit assessments considered sea-level rise, subsidence, accretion, and historic loss trends.

The Service encourages the USACE to finalize mitigation plans and proceed to mitigation construction so that it will be concurrent with construction of remaining storm damage reduction project features and revising the impact and mitigation period-of-analysis to reflect additional temporal losses will not be required.

TENTATIVELY SELECTED PLANS

The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes and would mitigate for 72.04 average annual habitat units (AAHUs) of FS BLH-Wet and 134.52 AAHUs of FS swamp impacted by the construction of the WBV HSDRRS. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of currently farmed or abandoned agricultural fields. Within the 521 acres, approximately 150 acres would be used for BLH-wet and 360 acres for FS swamp restoration. Elevations within the portion of the project area where BLH-Wet and swamp would be restored are either at or above the elevation conducive to BLH-Wet swamp establishment, therefore no outside borrow would be required for this proposed restoration action. The entire project area is contained within a small perimeter levee, certain portions of which would be degraded to reconnect the restoration project with adjacent swamp/BLH habitat. Internal ditches adjacent to the dikes would be filled or partially filled during dike degrading. It is envisioned that the majority of the acres required could simply be planted at the existing elevation within the site once the water retention dikes have been degraded. As the vast majority of the potential project footprint is existing agricultural fields, little to no vegetative clearing is anticipated. What little woody or vegetative debris which requires removal would be stockpiled and burned on site. Once any required earthwork is complete, the project site would be planted with BLH-Wet and swamp species.

Other alternatives considered are 1) the purchase of mitigation bank credits for both FS BLH-Wet and FS Swamp features of the mitigation plan, or 2) a combination of either the FS BLH-Wet or FS Swamp USACE constructed project and the purchase of mitigation bank credits.

For all BLH and swamp, plantings the Service recommends that the USACE continue working with the natural resource agencies to refine that document and incorporate all changes in the current mitigation and monitoring plans.

If implementation of Hwy 307 becomes infeasible or if it cannot provide sufficient credits to mitigate all FS swamp impacts the USACE would purchase credits from an active mitigation bank; see the following.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION MEASURES

The goal of the mitigation plan is to provide for equal replacement of the habitat units lost due to improvements to the hurricane protection project. The equal replacement compensation goal specifies that the gain of one habitat unit can be used to offset the loss of one habitat unit. Achieving this goal would re-establish and maintain BLH and bald cypress habitats. The objectives of the mitigation measures for the forested areas would be to establish and maintain a high diversity of native mast- and fruit-producing trees and shrubs, maximize herbaceous and shrub-layer canopy cover while maintaining a semi-mature to mature age structure.

Current benefits projected for the MTSMP are based on general assumptions of the project area and design. As the USACE further refines proposed mitigation features, detailed designs should be provided to the natural resource agencies so that recommendations can be provided in an appropriate timeframe and more accurate habitat assessments can be completed. Further, as mitigation plans are refined, the USACE, the Service and other natural resource agencies would need to evaluate the plans against the accrued and anticipated benefits and the effect of implementing the proposal on achievement of the mitigation plan goal. Any changes that would prevent the mitigation goal from being achieved would not be recommended for implementation. Furthermore, the following activities are not permitted within a mitigation area for the life of the project:

1. Placing, filling, storing, or dumping of refuse, trash, vehicle bodies or parts, rubbish, debris, junk, waste, or other such items on the property.
2. Mechanized land clearing or deposition of soil, shell, rock or other fill on the property without prior request for approval, excluding the existing ROWs.
3. Cutting, removal or destruction of vegetation on the property except in accordance with the mitigation plan.
4. Grazing of cattle or other livestock on the property that has been restored or enhanced.
5. Commercial, industrial, agricultural, or residential uses of the property.
6. No other human activities that result in the material degradation of habitat within the area shall occur.

However, it is understood that the mitigation plan shall not prohibit hunting, fishing, trapping, non-consumptive recreational pursuits and exploration and production of minerals. Exploration and production of minerals shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. The Service acknowledges that such activities have the potential to reduce the ability of the area to achieve the mitigation goal, depending on the extent of the impacts to the mitigation lands.

Specific success criteria and monitoring for the Hwy 307 FS BLH-Wet and FS Swamp Restoration Projects will be based on criteria that was previously developed and is currently being updated.


The purpose of adaptive management activities in the life-cycle of the project is to address ecological and other uncertainties that could prevent successful implementation of a project. Adaptive management (AM) also establishes a framework for decision making that utilizes monitoring results and other information, as it becomes available, to update project knowledge and adjust management/mitigation actions. Hence, early implementation of AM and monitoring allows for a project that can succeed under a wide range of conditions and can be adjusted as necessary. Furthermore, careful monitoring of project outcomes both advances scientific understanding and helps adjust operations changes as part of an iterative learning process.

Each USACE constructed MTSMP would have a contingency plan for taking corrective actions in cases where monitoring demonstrates that the mitigation feature is not achieving ecological success in accordance with its success criteria. If credits are purchased from a mitigation bank, the mitigation bank must be in compliance with the requirements of the USACE Regulatory Program and its MBI, which specifies the management, monitoring, and reporting required to be performed by the bank. Purchase of mitigation bank credits relieves the USACE and non-Federal local sponsor (NFS) of the responsibility for monitoring and of demonstrating mitigation success.

An effective monitoring program is required to determine if the project outcomes are consistent with the identified success criteria (WRDA 2007, Section 2036). A monitoring plan has been developed for each USACE constructed feature within the TSMMP. The plan identifies success criteria and targets, a general schedule for the monitoring events and the specific content for the monitoring reports that measure progress towards meeting the success criteria. A site specific monitoring plan including transects, sampling plots, gage locations (if needed), and monitoring frequency would be developed once designs are complete.

The proposed mitigation action includes construction, with the NFS responsible for operation and maintenance of functional portions of work as they are completed. On a cost shared basis, USACE should monitor completed mitigation to determine whether additional construction, invasive species control and/or planting are necessary to achieve mitigation success. USACE should undertake additional actions necessary to achieve mitigation success in accordance with cost sharing applicable

Figure 1: Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet and Swamp Restoration Site (Corps of Engineers)



to the project and subject to the availability of funds. Once USACE determines that the mitigation has achieved initial success criteria, monitoring would be performed by the NFS as part of its operations and maintenance plan obligations. If, after meeting initial success criteria, the mitigation fails to meet its intermediate and/or long-term ecological success criteria, USACE would consult with the Service and other agencies and the NFS to determine whether operational changes would be sufficient to achieve ecological success criteria. If structural changes are deemed necessary to achieve ecological success, USACE would implement appropriate adaptive management measures.

SERVICE POSITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS


The Service supports the USACEs' current mitigation features and the USACEs' plan to mitigate impacts to fish and wildlife resources associated with WBV HSDRRS provided that the following fish and wildlife conservation recommendations are incorporated into future project planning and implementation efforts:

1. USACE should coordinate with the Service and other natural resource agencies to ensure that necessary information to conduct detailed project planning/design and finalize the WVA analysis is developed and available. Final sizing of mitigation must be based on revised WVAs conducted on advanced project designs
2. 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 and other natural resource agencies. The Service should be provided an opportunity to review and submit recommendations on all of the work addressed in those reports.
3. If applicable, a General Plan for mitigation lands should be developed by the USACE, the Service, and the managing natural resource agency in accordance with Section 3(b) of the FWCA.
4. We recommend that when evaluating the mitigation bank alternative the USACE consider the availability of credits at a bank and within a hydrologic unit to avoid exhausting credits available for individual landowners/permittees within a particular hydrologic unit.
5. If mitigation credits are purchased from a mitigation bank the Service requests that a copy of the letter from the banker acknowledging the acquisition be provided to the Service for our files.
6. If the local project-sponsor is unable to fulfill the financial mitigation requirements for operation and/or maintenance of mitigation lands, then the USACE should provide the necessary funding to ensure mitigation obligations are met on behalf of the public interest.
7. Any proposed change in mitigation features or plans should be coordinated in advance with the Service, NMFS, LDWF, EPA and LDNR.

8. The Service encourages the USACE to 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
9. The Service recommends that the USACE maintain full responsibility for any BLH mitigation project for a minimum of 4-years post planting. The USACE should maintain full responsibility for all marsh mitigation projects until monitoring guidelines to be developed are completed and demonstrate the projects are fully compliant with success and performance requirements. Documentation should be provided and referenced to demonstrate funding obligation for the USACE to fulfill initial success criteria at a minimum.
10. The Service recommends that all mitigation planning documents should describe in detail actions needed by the USACE and/or the local sponsor if mitigation is not succeeding as planned.
11. The USACE should avoid adverse impacts to bald eagle and osprey nesting locations and wading bird colonies through careful design 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.
12. 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.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist the USACE and look forward to further cooperation in the development/implementation of the mitigation project. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. David Walther (337-291-3122) of this office.

Sincerely,



Joseph A. Ranson
Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office

cc:

National Marine Fisheries Service, Baton Rouge, LA
CPRA, Baton Rouge, LA
LA Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries, Baton Rouge, LA
LA Dept. of Natural Resources, Baton Rouge, LA

LITERATURE CITED

- Barras, J.A. 2007. Land area changes in coastal Louisiana after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, in Farris, G.S., Smith, G.J., Crane, Mp., Demas, C.R., Robbins, L.L., and Lavoie, D.L., eds. Science and the storms – The USGS response to the hurricanes of 2005: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1306. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/circ/1306>
- Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ). Accessed November 15, 2012. <<http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/DIVISIONS/WaterPermits/WaterQualityAssessment/WaterQualityInventorySection305b.aspx>>
- Lowery, A.H. 1974. Louisiana birds. La. State Univ. Press. 651 pp.
- Rudis, Victor A., and Birdsey, R. A. 1986. Forest Resources and Current Conditions in the Lower Mississippi Valley. Resour. Bull. SO-116. New Orleans, La: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. 7 p.
- US Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District. May 2019. Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System, Flood Side BLH-Wet and Swamp Mitigation. Lafourche Parish, Louisiana. Draft SEA #572. Appendix E



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

200 Dulles Drive
Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

May 31, 2019

Colonel Michael N. Clancy
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Clancy:

Please reference your office's Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA 572) for the West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (WBV) Bottomland Hardwood – Wet and Swamp Mitigation, Lafourche Parish. That SEA evaluates changes to the previously proposed mitigation plan for that project presented in the Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report 37a. This Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) addresses the current mitigation plan for West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction project-associated impacts to forested wetlands and estuarine marsh by the US Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) for activities associated with implementation of the WBV 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 based on surveys and analyses of project impacts and potential improvement of mitigation areas for fish and wildlife resources. This report constitutes the final report of the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 2(b) of that Act. Furthermore, additional comments are provided 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), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (40 Stat. 755, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 703 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 are incorporated into this final report.

Hurricane Katrina, a Category 3 storm, made landfall on the west bank of the Mississippi River and continued northeastward with the eye crossing Plaquemines, St. Bernard, Orleans and St. Tammany parishes in Louisiana. Hurricane surge inundated lower elevation areas in southeast Louisiana, and overtopped hurricane and flood control levees. As a result and under the authority of Public Law 109-234, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (4th Supplemental) and Public Law 110-28, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (5th Supplemental), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) improved two existing

hurricane protection projects (i.e., WBV and Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity) in the Greater New Orleans area. The USACE prepared Individual Environmental Reports (IER) under the approval of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Those IERs partially fulfilled USACE compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4321- 4347). IERs were a CEQ-approved alternative arrangement for compliance with NEPA that has allowed expedited implementation of improved hurricane protection measures.

The USACE has prepared SEA # 572 to evaluate changes to the Recommended Mitigation Plan (RMP) for mitigating the impacts associated with construction of the WBV 100-year Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) as presented in the Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report #37a Mitigation for Protected Side Bottomland Hardwoods Dry, West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Jefferson Parish, Louisiana (SPIER #37a) with a Decision Record (DR) signed on March 4, 2016. SEA #572 identifies substitute projects for the flood side (FS) bottomland hardwoods wet (BLH-Wet) and swamp features of the RMP found in SPIER #37a and provides an assessment of the revised compensatory mitigation plan for the WBV HSDRRS impacts using the selected replacement projects.

This report supplements our November 26, 2007, Draft FWCA Report that provided twenty-six programmatic recommendations for the HSDRRS authorized work to help avoid and minimize impacts to fisheries, wetlands, forested habitats, migratory birds, and public lands, and incorporates, and supplements the numerous FWCA Reports provided for the work authorized under 4th and 5th Supplemental for the WBV Hurricane Protection Project only (i.e., IERs 11-17, including supplemental documents). This report also supplements our May 27, 2014 and July 2015, reports that addressed proposed mitigation features in the USACE Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (PIER) 37 and SPIER #37a for WBV impacts, respectively. Those reports addressed impacts caused during construction of the WBV HSDRRS. The original projects to mitigate FS BLH-Wet and swamp are not implementable and therefore must be substituted.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE AREA'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

As previously mentioned, the Service has provided several FWCA Reports for the entire HSDRRS project. Those reports contain a thorough discussion of the significant fish and wildlife resources (including those habitats) that occur within the study area. For brevity, that discussion is incorporated by reference herein but the following brief descriptions are provided to update the previously mentioned information.

The study area is located within the Mississippi River Deltaic Plain of the Lower Mississippi River Ecosystem. The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of current or abandoned agricultural fields.

Higher elevations occur on the natural levees of the Mississippi River and its distributaries. Developed lands are primarily associated with natural levees, but extensive wetlands have been

leveed and drained to accommodate residential, commercial, and agricultural development. Federal, State, and local levees have been installed for flood protection purposes, often with negative effects on adjacent wetlands. Navigation channels such as the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), including the Harvey Canal portion, the Bayou Segnette Waterway and the Barataria Bay Waterway are also prominent landscape features, as are extensive oil and gas industry access channels and pipeline canals, all of which have altered the landscapes hydrology. Extensive wetlands and associated shallow open waters dominate the landscape outside the flood control levees. Major water bodies include Lakes Cataouatche and Salvador, Lac des Allemands and the Mississippi River.

Habitat types in the project area include forested wetlands [i.e., bottomland hardwoods (BLH) and/or swamps], non-wet BLH, open water, and developed areas. Due to urban and agricultural 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.

Factors that will strongly influence future fish and wildlife resource conditions outside of the protection levees include freshwater input and loss of coastal wetlands. Depending upon the deterioration rate of marshes, the frequency of occasional short-term saltwater events may increase. Under that scenario, tidal action in the project area may increase gradually as the buffering effect of marshes is lost, and use of that area by estuarine-dependent fishes and shellfish tolerant of saltwater conditions would likely increase. Regardless of which of the above factors ultimately has the greatest influence, freshwater wetlands and forested areas within and adjacent to the project area will probably experience losses due to development, subsidence, and erosion.

The ongoing loss of coastal Louisiana wetlands (approximately 1,149 square miles between 1956 and 2004; average loss rate of 24 square miles per year) was exacerbated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. Those hurricanes caused an initial loss of wetlands equivalent to 9 years (approximately 217 square miles) of mean annual losses (Barras 2007). Louisiana wetlands provide 26 percent of the seafood landed in the conterminous United States and over 5 million migratory waterfowl utilize those wetlands every year. In addition, those wetlands provide protection to coastal towns, cities and their infrastructure, as well as important infrastructure for the nation's oil and gas industry.

Non-wet BLH within the project area also provide habitat for wildlife resources. Between 1932 and 1984, the acreage of BLH in Louisiana declined by 45 percent (Rudis and Birdsey 1986). By 1970, Jefferson Parish was classified as entirely urban or non-forested in the U.S. Forest Service's forest inventory with most of this loss resulting from development within drained, potentially non-wet areas inside the hurricane protection levees. A large percentage of the

original BLH within the Mississippi River floodplain in the Deltaic Plain are located within levees. However, losses of that habitat type are not regulated or mitigated with the exception of impacts resulting from USACE projects as required by Section 906(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and Section 2036 (a) of the Water Resource Development Act of 2007.

Mammals known to occur in the project-area BLH and marsh habitats include mink, raccoon, swamp rabbit, nutria, river otter, and muskrat. Those habitats also support a variety of birds including herons, egrets, ibises, least bittern, rails, gallinules, neotropic cormorant, white pelican, pied-billed grebe, black-necked stilt, sandpipers, gulls, and terns. Forested and scrub-shrub habitats within the study area also provide habitat for many resident passerine birds and essential resting areas for many migratory songbirds including warblers, orioles, thrushes, vireos, tanagers, grosbeaks, buntings, flycatchers, and cuckoos (Lowery 1974). Many of these and other passerine birds have undergone a decline in population primarily due to habitat loss.

Given the extent of development and drainage, waterfowl use within the hurricane protection system is likely minimal, except in the adjacent wetlands outside the levees. Swamps, fresh and intermediate marshes usually receive greater waterfowl utilization than brackish and saline marshes because they generally provide more waterfowl food.

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 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 USACE should completed an on-line evaluation (<https://www.fws.gov/southeast/our-services/eagle-technical-assistance/>) 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.

Open water habitat in the study area consists of drainage canals; previously mentioned major waterways and lakes. Drainage canals do not support significant fishery resources because of dense vegetation, poor water quality, and often inadequate depth. Freshwater sport fishes present in the project area, but outside of the levees, include largemouth bass, crappie, bluegill, redear sunfish, warmouth, channel catfish, and blue catfish. Other fishes likely to be present include yellow bullhead, freshwater drum, bowfin, carp, buffalo, and gar. Estuarine-dependent fishes and shellfishes such as Atlantic croaker, red drum, spot, sand seatrout, spotted seatrout, southern flounder, Gulf menhaden, striped mullet, brown shrimp, white shrimp, and blue crab are found in the intermediate to saline marshes of Lakes Cataouatche and Salvador and adjacent waterbodies.

Some of the waterbodies in the project area meet criteria for primary and secondary contact recreation and partially meets criteria for fish and wildlife propagation, while others do not meet the criteria for fish and wildlife propagation (LDEQ 2012). Causes determined by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) for not fully meeting fish and wildlife propagation criteria include excessive nutrients, organic enrichment, low dissolved oxygen levels, flow and habitat alteration, pathogens and noxious aquatic plants. Indicated sources of those problems include hydromodification, habitat modification, recreational activities, and unspecified upstream sources. Municipal point sources, urban runoff, storm sewers, and onsite wastewater treatment systems are also known contributors to poor water quality in the 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 substrates. Close coordination with the NMFS is recommended because mitigation for those impacts is necessary.

Endangered and Threatened Species

Currently there are no listed threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. 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.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Project impacts resulted primarily from the expansion of levee right-of-way (ROW) and construction of levees, borrow pits, floodwalls, navigable floodgates, and associated features. Because development is ongoing within the hurricane protection levees and Task Force Guardian (TFG) restored hurricane protection to pre-Hurricane Katrina levels, the Service has assumed that project-induced development is insignificant and that implementation of the HSDRRS

project would not further induce development to areas not already developed or planned for development. Construction and implementation of the WBV hurricane protection project improvements resulted in impacts to BLH-Wet and swamp (Table 1). In addition to impacts related to the construction of the HSDRRS project, impacts to fish and wildlife habitats during the construction of mitigation projects may occur. Impacts that would occur within the footprint of the mitigation feature have been evaluated in the Wetland Value Assessment (WVA) and the mitigation area will be reconfigured to offset those impacts. However, the location of access ROWs and staging areas have not been finalized nor assessed by the resource agencies at this time. Coordination with the natural resource agencies during advanced design (e.g., post 35% design) is recommended in order to ensure that the agencies are granted adequate time to provide input into the design. This will ensure that unnecessary impacts are avoided and mitigation project are designed to effectively offset impacts.

FWCA reports and supplemental reports were provided as project designs changed or post-construction impacts were calculated. This report derives lost AAHUs from the latest impact acreage calculations utilizing Geographic Information System ROW data provided by the USACE and recent aerial photography.

Table 1. WBV HSDRRS Modified Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan (MTSMP)

Habitat Type	MTSMP Project	AAHUs Impacted	Mitigation Project Acres
General FS BLH-Wet ¹	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	72.04	130.00
General FS Swamp ¹	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	134.52	330.00

¹Use of mitigation banks to fully mitigate impacts is a constructible alternative.

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 impacted. For impacts that occurred entirely within the existing ROW (i.e., maintained, non-wet grassland) and/or impacted low quality non-wet or prevalent habitats (e.g., open water without aquatic vegetation, dry fields, etc.) the Service did not recommend mitigation as they are Category 4 Resources. Considering the high value of forested wetlands for fish and wildlife and the relative scarcity of that habitat type, those wetlands were designated as Resource Category 2, the mitigation goal for which is no net loss of in-kind habitat value. Degraded (i.e., non-wet) BLH forests and any wet pastures that were impacted were placed in Resource Category 3 due to their reduced value to wildlife, fisheries and lost/degraded fish and wildlife functions. The mitigation goal for Resource Category 3 habitats is no net loss of habitat value. To ensure no net loss of in-kind habitat value the mitigation plan includes the restoration of BLH-wet and swamp habitat.

Habitat Assessments

To quantify project impacts to fish and wildlife resources and anticipated benefits resulting from the proposed mitigation the WVA methodology was utilized. Habitat units fluctuate in response to changes in habitat quality, represented by the Habitat Suitability Index (HSI), and/or quantity

(acres); those changes are predicted for various target years over the project life (i.e., 50 years), for future without-project and future with-project scenarios. Target years (TY) were selected for this analysis to capture the effects of important biological events. Values for model variables were obtained from site visits to the area, previous wetland assessments in similar habitats, communication with personnel knowledgeable about the study area and similar habitats, and review of aerial photographs and reports documenting fish and wildlife habitat conditions in the study area and similar habitats. For all the habitat assessments, the products of the resulting HSI values and acreage estimates were then summed and annualized for each habitat type to determine the AAHUs available. The net change (increase or decrease) in AAHUs under future with-project conditions, compared to future without-project conditions, provides a quantitative comparison of anticipated project impact/benefits in AAHUs. By dividing the AAHU by the proposed mitigation project acreage a management or mitigation potential per acre is determined which can then be used to resize the project once mitigation needs are refined. Refinement is limited by the level of design, with each increasing detailed design level resulting in a more detailed WVA analysis. The final refinement should result in an equal replacement of impacted AAHUs with mitigated AAHUs (i.e., one to one ratio). Contractors for the USACE conducted the WVA analysis for some mitigation sites with review by state and federal natural resource agencies; the Service conducted the remaining WVAs. Further explanation of how impacts/benefits are assessed with the WVA and an explanation of the assumptions affecting HSI values are available from the USACE. Impact assessments and mitigation benefit assessments considered sea-level rise, subsidence, accretion, and historic loss trends.

The Service encourages the USACE to finalize mitigation plans and proceed to mitigation construction so that it will be concurrent with construction of remaining storm damage reduction project features and revising the impact and mitigation period-of-analysis to reflect additional temporal losses will not be required.

TENTATIVELY SELECTED PLANS

The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes and would mitigate for 72.04 average annual habitat units (AAHUs) of FS BLH-Wet and 134.52 AAHUs of FS swamp impacted by the construction of the WBV HSDRRS. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of currently farmed or abandoned agricultural fields. Within the 521 acres, approximately 150 acres would be used for BLH-wet and 360 acres for FS swamp restoration. Elevations within the portion of the project area where BLH-Wet and swamp would be restored are either at or above the elevation conducive to BLH-Wet swamp establishment, therefore no outside borrow would be required for this proposed restoration action. The entire project area is contained within a small perimeter levee, certain portions of which would be degraded to reconnect the restoration project with adjacent swamp/BLH habitat. Internal ditches adjacent to the dikes would be filled or partially filled during dike degrading. It is envisioned that the majority of the acres required could simply be planted at the existing elevation within the site once the water retention dikes have been degraded. As the vast majority of the potential project footprint is existing agricultural fields, little to no vegetative clearing is anticipated. What little woody or vegetative debris which requires removal would be stockpiled and burned on site. Once any required earthwork is complete, the project site would be planted with BLH-Wet and swamp species.

Other alternatives considered are 1) the purchase of mitigation bank credits for both FS BLH-Wet and FS Swamp features of the mitigation plan, or 2) a combination of either the FS BLH-Wet or FS Swamp USACE constructed project and the purchase of mitigation bank credits.

For all BLH and swamp, plantings the Service recommends that the USACE continue working with the natural resource agencies to refine that document and incorporate all changes in the current mitigation and monitoring plans.

If implementation of Hwy 307 becomes infeasible or if it cannot provide sufficient credits to mitigate all FS swamp impacts the USACE would purchase credits from an active mitigation bank; see the following.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION MEASURES

The goal of the mitigation plan is to provide for equal replacement of the habitat units lost due to improvements to the hurricane protection project. The equal replacement compensation goal specifies that the gain of one habitat unit can be used to offset the loss of one habitat unit. Achieving this goal would re-establish and maintain BLH and bald cypress habitats. The objectives of the mitigation measures for the forested areas would be to establish and maintain a high diversity of native mast- and fruit-producing trees and shrubs, maximize herbaceous and shrub-layer canopy cover while maintaining a semi-mature to mature age structure.

Current benefits projected for the MTSMP are based on general assumptions of the project area and design. As the USACE further refines proposed mitigation features, detailed designs should be provided to the natural resource agencies so that recommendations can be provided in an appropriate timeframe and more accurate habitat assessments can be completed. Further, as mitigation plans are refined, the USACE, the Service and other natural resource agencies would need to evaluate the plans against the accrued and anticipated benefits and the effect of implementing the proposal on achievement of the mitigation plan goal. Any changes that would prevent the mitigation goal from being achieved would not be recommended for implementation. Furthermore, the following activities are not permitted within a mitigation area for the life of the project:

1. Placing, filling, storing, or dumping of refuse, trash, vehicle bodies or parts, rubbish, debris, junk, waste, or other such items on the property.
2. Mechanized land clearing or deposition of soil, shell, rock or other fill on the property without prior request for approval, excluding the existing ROWs.
3. Cutting, removal or destruction of vegetation on the property except in accordance with the mitigation plan.
4. Grazing of cattle or other livestock on the property that has been restored or enhanced.
5. Commercial, industrial, agricultural, or residential uses of the property.
6. No other human activities that result in the material degradation of habitat within the area shall occur.

However, it is understood that the mitigation plan shall not prohibit hunting, fishing, trapping, non-consumptive recreational pursuits and exploration and production of minerals. Exploration and production of minerals shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. The Service acknowledges that such activities have the potential to reduce the ability of the area to achieve the mitigation goal, depending on the extent of the impacts to the mitigation lands.

Specific success criteria and monitoring for the Hwy 307 FS BLH-Wet and FS Swamp Restoration Projects will be based on criteria that was previously developed and is currently being updated.


The purpose of adaptive management activities in the life-cycle of the project is to address ecological and other uncertainties that could prevent successful implementation of a project. Adaptive management (AM) also establishes a framework for decision making that utilizes monitoring results and other information, as it becomes available, to update project knowledge and adjust management/mitigation actions. Hence, early implementation of AM and monitoring allows for a project that can succeed under a wide range of conditions and can be adjusted as necessary. Furthermore, careful monitoring of project outcomes both advances scientific understanding and helps adjust operations changes as part of an iterative learning process.

Each USACE constructed MTSMP would have a contingency plan for taking corrective actions in cases where monitoring demonstrates that the mitigation feature is not achieving ecological success in accordance with its success criteria. If credits are purchased from a mitigation bank, the mitigation bank must be in compliance with the requirements of the USACE Regulatory Program and its MBI, which specifies the management, monitoring, and reporting required to be performed by the bank. Purchase of mitigation bank credits relieves the USACE and non-Federal local sponsor (NFS) of the responsibility for monitoring and of demonstrating mitigation success.

An effective monitoring program is required to determine if the project outcomes are consistent with the identified success criteria (WRDA 2007, Section 2036). A monitoring plan has been developed for each USACE constructed feature within the TSMMP. The plan identifies success criteria and targets, a general schedule for the monitoring events and the specific content for the monitoring reports that measure progress towards meeting the success criteria. A site specific monitoring plan including transects, sampling plots, gage locations (if needed), and monitoring frequency would be developed once designs are complete.

The proposed mitigation action includes construction, with the NFS responsible for operation and maintenance of functional portions of work as they are completed. On a cost shared basis, USACE should monitor completed mitigation to determine whether additional construction, invasive species control and/or planting are necessary to achieve mitigation success. USACE should undertake additional actions necessary to achieve mitigation success in accordance with cost sharing applicable

Figure 1: Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet and Swamp Restoration Site (Corps of Engineers)



to the project and subject to the availability of funds. Once USACE determines that the mitigation has achieved initial success criteria, monitoring would be performed by the NFS as part of its operations and maintenance plan obligations. If, after meeting initial success criteria, the mitigation fails to meet its intermediate and/or long-term ecological success criteria, USACE would consult with the Service and other agencies and the NFS to determine whether operational changes would be sufficient to achieve ecological success criteria. If structural changes are deemed necessary to achieve ecological success, USACE would implement appropriate adaptive management measures.

SERVICE POSITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS


The Service supports the USACEs' current mitigation features and the USACEs' plan to mitigate impacts to fish and wildlife resources associated with WBV HSDRRS provided that the following fish and wildlife conservation recommendations are incorporated into future project planning and implementation efforts:

1. USACE should coordinate with the Service and other natural resource agencies to ensure that necessary information to conduct detailed project planning/design and finalize the WVA analysis is developed and available. Final sizing of mitigation must be based on revised WVAs conducted on advanced project designs
2. 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 and other natural resource agencies. The Service should be provided an opportunity to review and submit recommendations on all of the work addressed in those reports.
3. If applicable, a General Plan for mitigation lands should be developed by the USACE, the Service, and the managing natural resource agency in accordance with Section 3(b) of the FWCA.
4. We recommend that when evaluating the mitigation bank alternative the USACE consider the availability of credits at a bank and within a hydrologic unit to avoid exhausting credits available for individual landowners/permittees within a particular hydrologic unit.
5. If mitigation credits are purchased from a mitigation bank the Service requests that a copy of the letter from the banker acknowledging the acquisition be provided to the Service for our files.
6. If the local project-sponsor is unable to fulfill the financial mitigation requirements for operation and/or maintenance of mitigation lands, then the USACE should provide the necessary funding to ensure mitigation obligations are met on behalf of the public interest.
7. Any proposed change in mitigation features or plans should be coordinated in advance with the Service, NMFS, LDWF, EPA and LDNR.

8. The Service encourages the USACE to 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
9. The Service recommends that the USACE maintain full responsibility for any BLH mitigation project for a minimum of 4-years post planting. The USACE should maintain full responsibility for all marsh mitigation projects until monitoring guidelines to be developed are completed and demonstrate the projects are fully compliant with success and performance requirements. Documentation should be provided and referenced to demonstrate funding obligation for the USACE to fulfill initial success criteria at a minimum.
10. The Service recommends that all mitigation planning documents should describe in detail actions needed by the USACE and/or the local sponsor if mitigation is not succeeding as planned.
11. The USACE should avoid adverse impacts to bald eagle and osprey nesting locations and wading bird colonies through careful design 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.
12. 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.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist the USACE and look forward to further cooperation in the development/implementation of the mitigation project. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. David Walther (337-291-3122) of this office.

Sincerely,



Joseph A. Ranson
Field Supervisor
Louisiana Ecological Services Office

cc:

National Marine Fisheries Service, Baton Rouge, LA
CPRA, Baton Rouge, LA
LA Dept. of Wildlife and Fisheries, Baton Rouge, LA
LA Dept. of Natural Resources, Baton Rouge, LA

LITERATURE CITED

- Barras, J.A. 2007. Land area changes in coastal Louisiana after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, in Farris, G.S., Smith, G.J., Crane, Mp., Demas, C.R., Robbins, L.L., and Lavoie, D.L., eds. Science and the storms – The USGS response to the hurricanes of 2005: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1306. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/circ/1306>
- Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ). Accessed November 15, 2012. <<http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/DIVISIONS/WaterPermits/WaterQualityAssessment/WaterQualityInventorySection305b.aspx>>
- Lowery, A.H. 1974. Louisiana birds. La. State Univ. Press. 651 pp.
- Rudis, Victor A., and Birdsey, R. A. 1986. Forest Resources and Current Conditions in the Lower Mississippi Valley. Resour. Bull. SO-116. New Orleans, La: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. 7 p.
- US Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District. May 2019. Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System, Flood Side BLH-Wet and Swamp Mitigation. Lafourche Parish, Louisiana. Draft SEA #572. Appendix E

**Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report
for the
Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS),
Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (SPIER) 37
West Bank and Vicinity (WBV)
Mitigation Plans**



PROVIDED TO
NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

PREPARED BY
DAVID WALTHER

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
ECOLOGICAL SERVICES
LAFAYETTE, LOUISIANA
JULY 2015

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE – SOUTHEAST REGION

CORPS OF ENGINEERS
HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION SYSTEM
SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC INDIVIDUAL REPORT 37
WEST BANK AND VICINITY
MITIGATION PLANS

FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT REPORT

Prepared by
David Walther
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Lafayette, Louisiana

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION.....	1
DESCRIPTIONS OF THE AREA’S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES.....	2
Essential Fish Habitat.....	4
Endangered and Threatened Species.....	5
Public/Protected Lands	5
PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION	6
Public/Protected Lands	8
Habitat Assessments	9
TENTATIVELY SELECTED PLANS	9
FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION MEASURES	15
SERVICE POSITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
LITERATURE CITED	20
Appendix A Draft Borrow Design and General Marsh Creation Guidelines for WBV Mitigation.....	1
Appendix B Modification of Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination	1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) documents proposed mitigation measures for impacts to forested areas and fresh marsh resulting from the Corps of Engineers' (Corps) activities associated with implementation of the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), West Bank and Vicinity (WBV) project. Our findings and recommendations are presented in accordance with the FWCA (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 report does not constitute the final report of the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 2(b) of that Act. 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.

This report addresses the mitigation plan for the WBV hurricane protection project and it also supplements our November 26, 2007, Draft FWCA Report that provided twenty-six programmatic recommendations for the HSDRRS authorized work to help avoid and minimize impacts to fisheries, wetlands, forested habitats, migratory birds, and public lands, and incorporates and supplements the numerous FWCA Reports provided for the work authorized under 4th and 5th Supplemental Appropriations Acts. This report also supplements our May 27, 2014, report that addressed proposed mitigation features in the Corps Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (PIER) 37 for WBV impacts. Impacts and mitigation needs resulting from government- (IER 18) and contractor-provided borrow areas have been addressed in an October 25, 2007, and a November 1, 2007, FWCA reports, respectively, therefore this report will not address those project features.

The Corps is preparing Individual Environmental Reports (IER) under the approval of the Council on Environmental Quality to partially fulfill compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4321- 4347). IERs are an alternative arrangement for NEPA compliance that has allowed expedited implementation of improved hurricane protection measures.

The Corps has previously prepared PIER 37 to identify mitigation plans for WBV HSDRRS impacts. The Corps is now preparing a Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (SPIER) to address modifications to mitigation plans presented in the PIER; that modified mitigation plan is the subject of this report. The Corps is also currently drafting a tiered IER (TIER) from PEIR 37 that will address mitigation for impacts to the Jean Lafitte National and Historical Park and Preserve (JLNHPP) and the Environmental Protection Agency Final Determination under the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404(c) referred to as the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area. Because that TIER will present changes and more details regarding those mitigation plans and we are preparing a FWCA report for that TIER this report will not address any of those mitigation features. In addition, impacts to fresh marsh that were not located on JLNHPP will be mitigated within the same mitigation site as the impacts to JLNHPP fresh marsh impacts. Therefore, non-park fresh marsh impacts will also be addressed in that TIER and not in this report.

The SPIER addresses the implementation of the modified tentatively selected mitigation plan (MTSMP) which consists of a combination of elevation manipulation and reforestation on existing agricultural fields at the Highway 307 Bayou Boeuf site and replacement of invasive species dominated forests with native BLH species at the Bayou Segnette site to fully offset the loss of bottomland hardwood (BLH)-Wet, BLH-Dry and swamp habitats. Use of mitigation banks to partially or fully achieve mitigation needs is considered a constructible alternative to the MTSMP. The following table displays the WBV HSDRRS impacts and mitigation projects that make up the MTSMP. Those mitigation features being constructed on the JLNHPP are not part of the constructible features of this SPIER. Once feasibility level of design for the mitigation features is complete, NEPA compliance for those projects would be documented in IERs tiering (TIERs) off the PIER. ESA coordination on the constructible features covered in the TIERs would be submitted at the time of TIER completion. Continued coordination with the interagency team is essential throughout the finalization of engineering and design of the mitigation features. Additional Service recommendations may be provided in supplemental reports as those plans are more fully developed.

WBV HSDRRS Modified Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan

Habitat Type	MTSMP Project	AAHUs Impacted	Mitigation Project Acres
General PS BLH-Wet/Dry ¹	Bayou Segnette	200.27	920.00
General FS BLH-Wet ¹	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	72.04	130.00
General FS Swamp ¹	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	134.52	330.00
General FS Fresh Marsh	JLNHPP	65.92	138.00
Park/404(c) FS BLH-Wet ²	JLNHPP	3.12	12.16
Park/404(c) FS Swamp ²	JLNHPP	7.19	20.44
Park/404(c)FS Fresh Marsh ²	JLNHPP	3.03	20.40

¹Use of mitigation banks to fully mitigate impacts is a constructible alternative.

² These programmatic features are only being addressed in the Service's report for TIER 1.

Implementation of the proposed mitigation plans is predicted to improve and maintain the habitat value of the BLH and swamp habitat for fish and wildlife to ensure adverse impacts are fully offset. Mitigation-area habitat values would increase due to the increased quantity and quality of mast-producing trees, and moderate increases in shrub and herbaceous cover after planting of forested areas.

For work authorized within the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) outlined terms and conditions in a 2009 Modification of the Bayou aux Carpes Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404(c) Final Determination. Alterations to the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area would be ameliorated through the construction of mitigation and augmentation features. Selection and implementation of the final augmentation features and development of a long-term monitoring plan remain to be accomplished.

The Service supports the Corps' current mitigation features and recognizes that additional Tiered IERs may be needed to address individual mitigation features that are still in early design phases. We support the Corps' plan to mitigate impacts to fish and wildlife resources associated with

WBV HSDRRS provided that the following fish and wildlife conservation recommendations are incorporated into future project planning and implementation and outstanding issues are adequately resolved via ongoing planning efforts:

1. Prior to beginning work on IERs tiered off of this SPIER the Corps should coordinate with the natural resource agencies to ensure that necessary information to conduct detailed project planning/design and finalize the WVA analysis is developed and available. Final sizing of mitigation must be based on revised WVAs conducted on advanced project designs
2. 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.
3. 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 coordinated with the NMFS regarding this need and maintain an account of all EFH habitats (e.g., openwater, marsh) impacted and mitigated.
4. Impacts to wetland habitat (including SAV habitat) and non-wet BLH associated with the construction of the mitigation features should be avoided and minimized to the greatest extent possible. The Corps shall fully compensate for any unavoidable losses of wetland habitat or non-wet BLH caused by mitigation features through sizing (i.e., boundary adjustments) of the mitigation features in close coordination with the natural resource agencies.
5. Sediment borrow sites for the marsh creation areas should be designed to avoid and minimize impacts to water quality. The general guidelines for borrow design found in Appendix A should be incorporated into project design, and close coordination with the natural resource agencies should continue since borrow design can be case specific and influenced by a number of factors.
6. If applicable, a General Plan for mitigation lands should be developed by the Corps, the Service, and the managing natural resource agency in accordance with Section 3(b) of the FWCA.
7. A fully defined mitigation plan should be included in the authorizing report and Decision Record. The mitigation plan should be developed including locations and AAHUs vetted through the natural resource agencies. Only existing mitigation banks and existing credits released by Corps Regulatory Branch may be considered.

8. We recommend that the Corps consider the availability of credits at a bank and within a hydrologic unit when evaluating the mitigation bank alternative to avoid exhausting credits available for individual landowners/permittees within a particular hydrologic unit.
9. If mitigation credits are purchased from a mitigation bank the Service requests that a copy of the letter from the banker acknowledging the acquisition is provided to the Service for our files.
10. If mitigation lands are purchased for inclusion within publicly managed lands, those lands may need to meet certain requirements. Land-managing natural resource agencies may have requirements that must be met prior to accepting mitigation lands; therefore, if they are proposed as a manager of a mitigation site they should be contacted early in the planning phase regarding such requirements. The local sponsor should also be made aware of the above requirements should it be their responsibility to transfer mitigation lands to the land-managing agency.
11. The Corps should continue to coordinate with land managing agencies during planning of mitigation features that may be built on their lands or lands to be turned over to them for management. Coordination should continue until construction of the projects are complete and prior to any subsequent maintenance. Please contact Mr. John Lavin at 1-888-677-1400 regarding work on the Bayou Segnette State Park which is operated by the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Office of State Parks areas.
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 Service encourages the Corps to 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.
15. The Service recommends that the Corps immediately finalize selection and approval of mitigation and augmentation features in coordination with federal and state natural resource agencies and with required approval from EPA. All necessary studies for the mitigation and augmentation features have been completed and agencies have reached agreement on those features. Further, the Service recommends that all such mitigation and augmentation features be implemented as soon as possible. All terms and conditions specified in the EPA

2009 Modification to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination should be followed with regard to mitigation and augmentation requirements.

16. The Corps should immediately develop a long-term monitoring plan for the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area, as required under the EPA 2009 Modification to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination. The plan should be coordinated with the natural resources agencies and approved by EPA. All terms and conditions specified in the EPA 2009 Modification to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination with regard to the long-term monitoring and operation plan should be followed. Once approved, that plan should be implemented as soon as possible.
17. The Service recommends that all of the terms and conditions outlined in the EPA Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) 2009 modification be implemented without delay. The Corps is responsible for funding all mitigation and augmentation features in this agreement. A link to the 2009 final modified determination may be found at www.nolaenvironmental.gov under the EPA heading for IER 12.
18. The Service recommends that the Corps work with the natural resource agencies to refine the “GUIDELINES – WET BLH HABITAT ENHANCEMENT, SWAMP HABITAT RESTORATION, AND SWAMP HABITAT ENHANCEMENT” and incorporate all changes in the Mitigation Success Criteria and Mitigation Monitoring: Marsh Mitigation Features from the LPV PIER 36 and the Bayou Sauvage Task Force Guardian BLH mitigation monitoring plan.
19. The Service recommends a two month period between herbicide application and mechanical clearing of invasive species. The proposed one month period may not allow sufficient time for herbicides to travel into the root system and work, thus encouraging greater stump sprouting which may increase the amount of future herbicide applications.
20. The Service recommends that the Corps maintain full responsibility for any BLH mitigation project for a minimum of 4-years post planting. The Corps should maintain full responsibility for all marsh mitigation projects until monitoring guidelines to be developed are completed and demonstrate the projects are fully compliant with success and performance requirements. Documentation should be provided and referenced to demonstrate funding obligation for the Corps to fulfill initial success criteria at a minimum.
21. The Service recommends that all mitigation planning documents should describe in detail actions needed by the Corps and/or the local sponsor if mitigation is not succeeding as planned.

22. The Corps should avoid adverse impacts to bald eagle and osprey nesting locations and wading bird colonies through careful design 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.
23. We recommend that the Corps re-initiate ESA consultation with this office to ensure that the proposed project would not adversely affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat. Subsequently, ESA consultation should be reinitiated should the proposed project features change significantly or are not implemented within one year of the last ESA consultation with this office to ensure that the proposed project does not adversely affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat.

INTRODUCTION

This Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) addresses the mitigation plan for project-associated impacts to forested wetlands and estuarine marsh by the Corps of Engineers' (Corps) for activities associated with implementation of the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), West Bank and Vicinity (WBV) 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 report does not constitute the final report of the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 2(b) of that Act. Furthermore, additional comments are provided 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), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (40 Stat. 755, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 703 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.

Hurricane Katrina, a Category 3 storm, made landfall on the west bank of the Mississippi River and continued northeastward with the eye crossing Plaquemines, St. Bernard, Orleans and St. Tammany parishes in Louisiana. Hurricane surge inundated lower elevation areas in southeast Louisiana, and overtopped hurricane and flood control levees. As a result and under the authority of Public Law 109-234, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (4th Supplemental) and Public Law 110-28, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (5th Supplemental), the Corps improved two existing hurricane protection projects [i.e., Westbank and Vicinity of New Orleans (WBV) and Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV)] in the Greater New Orleans area. The Corps is preparing Individual Environmental Reports (IER) under the approval of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Those IERs will partially fulfill the Corps compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4321- 4347). IERs are a CEQ-approved alternative arrangement for compliance with NEPA that has allowed expedited implementation of improved hurricane protection measures.

The Corps is preparing a Supplemental Programmatic IER (SPIER) to address additional mitigation plan modifications for project-associated impacts. The SPIER addresses the implementation of the modified tentatively selected mitigation plan (MTSMP) which consists of a combination of elevation manipulation and reforestation on existing agricultural fields at the Highway 307 Bayou Boeuf site and replacement of invasive species dominated forests with native BLH species at the Bayou Segnette site to fully offset the loss of bottomland hardwood (BLH)-Wet, BLH-Dry and swamp habitats. Use of mitigation banks to partially or fully achieve mitigation needs is considered a constructible alternative to the MTSMP. The other mitigation features of the plan will be addressed in subsequent NEPA documents, or Tiered Individual Environmental Reports (TIERs).

This report supplements our November 26, 2007, Draft FWCA Report that provided twenty-six programmatic recommendations for the HSDRRS authorized work to help avoid and minimize impacts to fisheries, wetlands, forested habitats, migratory birds, and public lands, and incorporates, and supplements the numerous FWCA Reports provided for the work authorized under 4th and 5th Supplemental for the WBV Hurricane Protection Project only (i.e., IERs 11-17, including supplemental documents). This report also supplements our May 27, 2014, report that addressed proposed mitigation features in the Corps Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (PIER) 37 for WBV impacts. Impacts and mitigation needs resulting from government and contractor provided borrow areas (IER 18) have been addressed in an October 2007, a November 2007, and an October 2013 FWCA reports, respectively, therefore this report will not address those project features.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE AREA'S FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

As previously mentioned, the Service has provided several FWCA Reports for the entire HSDRRS project. Those reports contain a thorough discussion of the significant fish and wildlife resources (including those habitats) that occur within the study area. For brevity, that discussion is incorporated by reference herein but the following brief descriptions are provided to update the previously mentioned information.

The study area is located within the Mississippi River Deltaic Plain of the Lower Mississippi River Ecosystem. Portions of Jefferson, Orleans, St. Charles and Plaquemines Parishes are included in the study area. Higher elevations occur on the natural levees of the Mississippi River and its distributaries. Developed lands are primarily associated with natural levees, but extensive wetlands have been leveed and drained to accommodate residential, commercial, and agricultural development. Federal, State, and local levees have been installed for flood protection purposes, often with negative effects on adjacent wetlands. Navigation channels such as the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), including the Harvey Canal portion, the Bayou Segnette Waterway and the Barataria Bay Waterway are also prominent landscape features, as are extensive oil and gas industry access channels and pipeline canals, all of which have altered the landscapes hydrology. Extensive wetlands and associated shallow open waters dominate the landscape outside the flood control levees. Major water bodies include Lakes Cataouatche and Salvador located south of the project area and the Mississippi River which bisects the project area.

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.

Factors that will strongly influence future fish and wildlife resource conditions outside of the protection levees include freshwater input and loss of coastal wetlands. Depending upon the deterioration rate of marshes, the frequency of occasional short-term saltwater events may increase. Under that scenario, tidal action in the project area may increase gradually as the buffering effect of marshes is lost, and use of that area by estuarine-dependent fishes and shellfish tolerant of saltwater conditions would likely increase. Regardless of which of the above factors ultimately has the greatest influence, freshwater wetlands and forested areas within and adjacent to the project area will probably experience losses due to development, subsidence, and erosion.

The ongoing loss of coastal Louisiana wetlands (approximately 1,149 square miles between 1956 and 2004; average loss rate of 24 square miles per year) was exacerbated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. Those hurricanes caused an initial loss of wetlands equivalent to 9 years (approximately 217 square miles) of mean annual losses (Barras 2007). Louisiana wetlands provide 26 percent of the seafood landed in the conterminous United States and over 5 million migratory waterfowl utilize those wetlands every year. In addition, those wetlands provide protection to coastal towns, cities and their infrastructure, as well as important infrastructure for the nation's oil and gas industry.

Non-wet BLH within the project area also provide habitat for wildlife resources. Between 1932 and 1984, the acreage of BLH in Louisiana declined by 45 percent (Rudis and Birdsey 1986). By 1970, Jefferson Parish was classified as entirely urban or non-forested in the U.S. Forest Service's forest inventory with most of this loss resulting from development within drained, potentially non-wet areas inside the hurricane protection levees. A large percentage of the original BLH within the Mississippi River floodplain in the Deltaic Plain are located within levees. However, losses of that habitat type are not regulated or mitigated with the exception of impacts resulting from Corps projects as required by Section 906(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and Section 2036 (a) of the Water Resource Development Act of 2007.

Mammals known to occur in the project-area BLH and marsh habitats include mink, raccoon, swamp rabbit, nutria, river otter, and muskrat. Those habitats also support a variety of birds including herons, egrets, ibises, least bittern, rails, gallinules, neotropic cormorant, white pelican, pied-billed grebe, black-necked stilt, sandpipers, gulls, and terns. Forested and scrub-shrub habitats within the study area also provide habitat for many resident passerine birds and essential resting areas for many migratory songbirds including warblers, orioles, thrushes, vireos, tanagers, grosbeaks, buntings, flycatchers, and cuckoos (Lowery 1974). Many of these and other passerine birds have undergone a decline in population primarily due to habitat loss.

Given the extent of development and drainage, waterfowl use within the hurricane protection system is likely minimal, except in the adjacent wetlands outside the levees. Swamps, fresh and intermediate marshes usually receive greater waterfowl utilization than brackish and saline marshes because they generally provide more waterfowl food.

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 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 completed an on-line evaluation (<http://www.fws.gov/southeast/es/baldeagle>) 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.

Open water habitat in the study area consists of drainage canals; major waterways including the GIWW, Barataria Waterway, and Mississippi River; and Lakes Cataouatche and Salvador. Drainage canals do not support significant fishery resources because of dense vegetation, poor water quality, and inadequate depth. Freshwater sport fishes present in the project area, but outside of the levees, include largemouth bass, crappie, bluegill, redear sunfish, warmouth, channel catfish, and blue catfish. Other fishes likely to be present include yellow bullhead, freshwater drum, bowfin, carp, buffalo, and gar. Estuarine-dependent fishes and shellfishes such as Atlantic croaker, red drum, spot, sand seatrout, spotted seatrout, southern flounder, Gulf menhaden, striped mullet, brown shrimp, white shrimp, and blue crab are found in the intermediate to saline marshes of Lakes Cataouatche and Salvador and adjacent waterbodies.

Some of the waterbodies in the project area meet criteria for primary and secondary contact recreation and partially meets criteria for fish and wildlife propagation, while others do not meet the criteria for fish and wildlife propagation (LDEQ 2012). Causes determined by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) for not fully meeting fish and wildlife propagation criteria include excessive nutrients, organic enrichment, low dissolved oxygen levels, flow and habitat alteration, pathogens and noxious aquatic plants. Indicated sources of those problems include hydromodification, habitat modification, recreational activities, and unspecified upstream sources. Municipal point sources, urban runoff, storm sewers, and onsite wastewater treatment systems are also known contributors to poor water quality in the 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, and rock substrates.

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, white mullet, killifish, 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). Portions of the WBV study area have been designated as EFH for post-larval, juvenile, and sub-adult life stages of brown shrimp, white shrimp, and red drum. Under future without project conditions there would be no change to EFH.

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. Tracking of all designated EFH marsh and tidal water impacts to help NMFS assess impacts to that resource is recommended.

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 coastal parishes of the New Orleans District in a June 22, 2011, electronic mail transmittal to the Corps. The Corps made a "no effect" determination in a July 7, 2015, letter to the Service for all mitigation projects included in SPIER 37. The Service concurred with that determination because there are no known threatened or endangered species or critical habitat in the proposed mitigation project areas. Should a proposed project be modified the Service requests that the Corps re-consult regarding potential impacts to any listed species or their critical habitat.

Public/Protected Lands

Lands within public ownership/oversight impacted by the WBV project include the Barataria Preserve unit of JLNHPP managed by the National Park Service (NPS), some lands within the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area which also has Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) oversight, and the Bayou Segnette State Park which is managed by the Louisiana Office of State Parks.

Because mitigation for impacts to the JLNHPP and Bayou aux Carpres 404(c) area are currently being addressed in a tiered document to the PIER those mitigation features for which the Service is preparing a supplemental Coordination Act Report will not be addressed in this document.

Located in the IER 15 project area is the Bayou Segnette State Park which is operated by the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Office of State Parks. Please contact Mr. John Lavin at 1-888-677-1400 regarding proposed mitigation in or on property that may be turned over to that park for management.

The Service continues to recommend and support the mitigation of public lands impacts to be done on public lands within the managing agencies jurisdiction. If mitigation lands are purchased for inclusion within a managed area, those lands may have to meet certain requirements; individual agencies may have different requirements therefore each agency should be contacted. If an agency is proposed as a manager of a mitigation site they should also be contacted early in the planning phase regarding such requirements and costs.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Project impacts resulted primarily from the expansion of levee right-of-way (ROW) and construction of levees, borrow pits, floodwalls, navigable floodgates, and associated features. Because development is ongoing within the hurricane protection levees and Task Force Guardian (TFG) restored hurricane protection to pre-Hurricane Katrina levels, the Service has assumed that project-induced development is insignificant and that implementation of the HSDRRS project would not further induce development to areas not already developed or planned for development. Construction and implementation of the WBV hurricane protection project improvements resulted in impacts to forested wetlands and estuarine and non-estuarine emergent marsh some of which occurred on public lands (Table 1). In addition to impacts related to the construction of the HSDRRS project, impacts to fish and wildlife habitats during the construction of mitigation projects may occur. Impacts that would occur within the footprint of the mitigation feature have been evaluated in the Wetland Value Assessment (WVA) and the mitigation area will be reconfigured to offset those impacts. However, the location of access ROWs, staging areas, and borrow areas have not been finalized nor assessed by the resource agencies at this time. Coordination with the natural resource agencies during advanced design (i.e., post 35% design) is recommended in order to ensure that the agencies are granted adequate time to provide input into the design. This will ensure that unnecessary impacts are avoided and mitigation project are designed to effectively offset impacts.

FWCA reports and supplemental reports were provided as project designs changed or post-construction impacts were calculated. This report derives lost AAHUs from the latest impact acreage calculations utilizing Geographic Information System ROW data provided by the Corps and recent aerial photography.

The Service's Mitigation Policy (Federal Register, Volume 46, No. 15, January 23, 1981)

Table 1. WBV Mitigation Required.

Habitat Type	AAHUs Impacted
General PS BLH-Wet/Dry ¹	261.96 AAHUs
General FS BLH-Wet ²	121.78 AAHUs
General FS Swamp	134.52 AAHUs
General FS Fresh Marsh	65.92 AAHUs
Park/404(c) FS BLH-Wet	3.08 AAHUs
Park/404(c) FS Swamp	7.19 AAHUs
Park/404(c) FS Fresh Marsh	3.20 AAHUs

¹PS signifies the protected side of the levee.

²FS signifies the flood side of the levee.

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 impacted. For impacts that occurred entirely within the existing ROW (i.e., maintained, non-wet grassland) and/or impacted low quality non-wet or prevalent habitats (e.g., open water without aquatic vegetation, dry fields, etc.) the Service did not recommend mitigation as they are Category 4 Resources. Considering the high value of forested wetlands for fish and wildlife and the relative scarcity of that habitat type, those wetlands were designated as Resource Category 2, the mitigation goal for which is no net loss of in-kind habitat value. Degraded (i.e., non-wet) BLH forests and any wet pastures that were impacted were placed in Resource Category 3 due to their reduced value to wildlife, fisheries and lost/degraded fish and wildlife functions. The mitigation goal for Resource Category 3 habitats is no net loss of habitat value. To ensure no net loss of in-kind habitat value the mitigation plan includes the restoration and enhancement of BLH habitat and the restoration of marsh and swamp habitat.

Impacts to open water bottoms are anticipated as a result of borrow activities. Regardless of depth, open water bottoms with no submerged aquatic vegetation (SAVs) will remain a Category 4 Resource; impacts to those areas are discouraged, if feasible, and measures to minimize impacts to water quality from borrow sites should be incorporated. Appendix A provides general guidelines for borrow design; however, close coordination with the resource agencies should continue during the design of borrow sites. SAV beds are currently considered a Category 2, and lost functions and values should be replaced. However, because of the relatively low success rate of SAV replanting, mitigating in-kind may not be practicable. Potential impacts to any SAVs should first go through the mitigation sequencing of avoidance, minimization, and rectification, prior to compensation of impacts.

Because open water bottoms without SAVs are considered a Category 4 Resource for our trust resources the Service does not recommend mitigation. However, some tidally-influenced unvegetated water bottoms are designated as EFH, and the conversion of that habitat to a non-tidal elevation would result in a loss of EFH. Should EFH be impacted, coordination with the NMFS is recommended as mitigation for impacts to these areas is necessary.

Public/Protected Lands

For work authorized by IER 12 and within the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area, EPA outlined terms and conditions in a 2009 Modification of the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination. The Corps is responsible for funding and implementing all mitigation and augmentation features approved in accordance with the stipulations of this agreement. The Corps must also seek final approval from EPA for any mitigation feature offsetting impacts to the 404(c) area as stipulated in that determination. A link to the 2009 final modified determination may be found at www.nolaenvironmental.gov under the EPA heading for IER 12 and an excerpt of the determination is attached in Appendix B.

Mitigation procedures and requirements regarding impacts within the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area are being coordinated with the EPA, Service, USGS, NMFS, NPS, and other state representatives on the interagency review team. The District Commander for the Corps, in a letter to the Regional Administrator for EPA Region 6 dated November 4, 2008, committed to mitigate for all unavoidable adverse impacts to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) area within the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) area and/or Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve, as determined by EPA and the resource agencies. Furthermore, the Corps committed that mitigation projects will be designed and implemented concurrently with the design and construction of the project. The District Commander in that letter also stated that “full mitigation within this unique environment may require mitigation in addition to acres indicated by the Wetland Value Assessment.”

Based on the minimum mitigation that the Corps has committed to and is required to perform pursuant to Section 2036 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, as well as on the Corps’ commitment to provide additional mitigation and augmentation features, EPA believes that the discharges of dredged or fill material associated with the Corps’ West Closure Complex (a HSDRRS project feature) would not result in unacceptable adverse effects to the Bayou aux Carpes wetland resources. Additionally, EPA expects the final mitigation plan to be adequate to offset unavoidable impacts consistent with mitigation regulations (33 CFR 332) with the goal to ensure no net loss of either wetland acres or functions. EPA must agree with the proposed mitigation plan prior to the plan being finalized. In addition to mitigation, project augmentation measures will be considered by the interagency team to enhance the wetland functions and values of the site and provide added compensation for any unavoidable impacts.

The Corps is required to develop a long-term site monitoring plan, to be approved in writing by EPA, after consulting with the federal and state natural resource agencies on the interagency review team. EPA will make the determination as to whether the monitoring plan is adequate and appropriate, and that plan will be documented in a Memorandum of Agreement signed by the interagency review team. The Corps is responsible for ensuring implementation of the plan for the first 50 years of the project life. The long-term monitoring plan will focus on both the mitigation and augmentation features, as well as the impacts of the floodwall. The plan should provide for making adjustments if the mitigation or augmentation features prove not to perform as expected. Though it is not expected that the Corps would need to make future adjustments to the floodwall, the effects of the floodwall are to be monitored to determine unexpected impacts which may warrant other corrective actions.

Habitat Assessments

To quantify project impacts to fish and wildlife resources and anticipated benefits resulting from the proposed mitigation the WVA methodology was utilized. Habitat units fluctuate in response to changes in habitat quality, represented by the Habitat Suitability Index (HSI), and/or quantity (acres); those changes are predicted for various target years over the project life (i.e., 50 years), for future without-project and future with-project scenarios. Target years (TY) were selected for this analysis to capture the effects of important biological events. Values for model variables were obtained from site visits to the area, previous wetland assessments in similar habitats, communication with personnel knowledgeable about the study area and similar habitats, and review of aerial photographs and reports documenting fish and wildlife habitat conditions in the study area and similar habitats. For all the habitat assessments, the products of the resulting HSI values and acreage estimates were then summed and annualized for each habitat type to determine the AAHUs available. The net change (increase or decrease) in AAHUs under future with-project conditions, compared to future without-project conditions, provides a quantitative comparison of anticipated project impact/benefits in AAHUs. By dividing the AAHU by the proposed mitigation project acreage a management or mitigation potential per acre is determined which can then be used to resize the project once mitigation needs are refined. Refinement is limited by the level of design, with each increasing detailed design level resulting in a more detailed WVA analysis. The final refinement should result in an equal replacement of impacted AAHUs with mitigated AAHUs (i.e., one to one ratio). Contractors for the Corps conducted the WVA analysis for some mitigation sites with review by state and federal natural resource agencies; the Service conducted the remaining WVAs. Further explanation of how impacts/benefits are assessed with the WVA and an explanation of the assumptions affecting HSI values are available from the Corps New Orleans District. Impact assessments and mitigation benefit assessments considered sea-level rise, subsidence, accretion, and historic marsh loss trends and were coordinated with other state and federal agencies.

The Service encourages the Corps to finalize mitigation plans and proceed to mitigation construction so that it will be concurrent with construction of remaining storm damage reduction project features and revising the impact and mitigation period-of-analysis to reflect additional temporal losses will not be required.

TENTATIVELY SELECTED PLANS

Screening and selection criteria used by the Corps and the natural resource agencies has been previously provided in IERs and previous Service reports, therefore, they will not be provided in this report. The project delivery team (PDT) evaluated the final array of alternatives; through the alternative evaluation process (AEP) the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) (Table 2) for mitigating impacts for the WBV hurricane protection project was identified.

However, after identifying the TSP the Corps came to a determination that lands within the CIT Tract would not be considered impacts occurring on JLNHPP. Because mitigation on NPS lands were sized to included mitigation for impacts in the CIT Tract the Corps re-assessed impacts to

the JLNHPP and the mitigation requirement for both Park/404(c) and Non- Park/404(c) BLH and swamp were adjusted accordingly.

Table 2. Previous Proposed Mitigation for HSDRRS WBV Impacts.

Habitat Type Impacted	TSP
Non-Park PS BLH-Wet/Dry	General Mitigation Bank
Non-Park FS BLH-Wet	Lake Boeuf FS BLH-Wet Restoration
Non- Park FS Swamp	Lake Boeuf FS Swamp Restoration
Non- Park FS Fresh Marsh	JLNHPP FS Marsh Restoration
Park/404(c) FS BLH-Wet	JLNHPP FS BLH-Wet Restoration
Park/404(c) FS Swamp	JLNHPP FS Swamp Restoration
Park/404(c) FS Fresh Marsh	JLNHPP FS Marsh Restoration

Additional changes to proposed mitigation features resulted from the reassessment of impacts using the 95-100% HSDRRS design plans, as well as available HSDRRS as-built plans. This resulted in a change in the mitigation requirement for most habitat types. The proposed projects mitigating for general BLH and swamp, as well as Park/404(c) BLH and swamp impacts were affected the most. This resulted in some projects previously evaluated in the AEP being dropped from further consideration because the mitigation sites could no longer contain all proposed mitigation due to the increased requirement.

Modified Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan

To be in compliance with mitigation requirements (i.e., concurrent with construction) in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 86) the District Commander required all mitigation alternatives to have begun construction prior to December 2016. This resulted in the elimination of additional mitigation alternatives that were identified in PIER 37 (Table 3).

Changes to the previously authorized WBV Hurricane Protection Project as assessed in Environmental Assessment (EA) 437 entitled “West Bank and Vicinity, New Orleans, Louisiana Hurricane Protection Project, Lake Cataouatche Levee Enlargement Highway 90 to Cataouatche Pump Stations” and EA 439 entitled “West Bank and Vicinity, New Orleans, Louisiana Hurricane Protection Project: Westwego to Harvey Canal Highway 45 Borrow Pits, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana” incurred impacts requiring mitigation. Because the impacts assessed in those EAs used a 100-year period of analysis and because the mitigation plan for those impacts was not fully developed, a decision was made to re-assess those impacts using a 50 year period of analysis and to mitigate them along with the WBV HSDRRS impacts (which were also assessed using a 50 year period of analysis).

The mitigation plan as presented in SPIER 37 would be further modified by substituting the Lake Boeuf project with the Highway (Hwy) 307 project for the FS BLH-Wet feature; that plan is being referred to as the WBV Modified Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan as displayed in Table 4.

Table 3. Previous Proposed Revised WBV Mitigation TSP.

Habitat Type	TSPA Project(s)	Status
Non-Park PS BLH-Wet	Mitigation Bank	Implemented on February 11, 2015
Non-Park PS BLH-Dry	Mitigation Bank	Eliminated: lack of in-kind mitigation bank credits
Non-Park FS BLH-Wet	Lake Boeuf, Plaquemines, and Dufrene Ponds	Eliminated: Implementation schedule extends beyond December 2016 ¹
Non-Park FS Swamp	Lake Boeuf, Plaquemines, and Simoneaux Ponds	Eliminated: Implementation schedule extends beyond December 2016 ¹

¹ District Commander required all mitigation alternatives to have begun construction prior to December 2016 to be in compliance with WRDA 86 requiring mitigation to be implemented prior to or concurrent with construction.

Table 4. WBV HSDRRS Modified Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan (MTSMP).

Habitat Type	MTSMP Project	AAHUs Impacted	Mitigation Project Acres
General PS BLH-Wet/Dry	Mitigation Bank/ Bayou Segnette	200.27	920.00
General FS BLH-Wet	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	72.04	130.00
General FS Swamp	Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf	134.52	330.00
General FS Fresh Marsh	JLNHPP	65.92	138.00
Park/404(c) FS BLH-Wet*	JLNHPP	3.12	12.16
Park/404(c) FS Swamp*	JLNHPP	7.19	20.44
Park/404(c)FS Fresh Marsh*	JLNHPP	3.03	20.40

* These programmatic features are currently being addressed in the Service's report for TIER 1.

Wetland value assessments were conducted to determine each project's mitigation potential. As the project is refined the mitigation potential may be adjusted. Should further development of feature designs result in a lower mitigation potential, a supplemental FWCA report may be necessary.

For all BLH and swamp, plantings should be done in accordance with the GUIDELINES – WET BLH HABITAT ENHANCEMENT, SWAMP HABITAT RESTORATION, AND SWAMP HABITAT ENHANCEMENT” however those guidelines are still in draft form and need to be finalized. The Service recommends that the Corps work with the natural resource agencies to

refine that document and incorporate all changes in the Mitigation Success Criteria and Mitigation Monitoring: Marsh Mitigation Features from the LPV PIER 36 and the Bayou Sauvage Task Force Guardian BLH mitigation monitoring plan.

Bayou Segnette Protected Side BLH-Dry

This alternative would involve enhancing an existing degraded forest habitat (populated with invasive species) as mitigation for BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry protected side impacts. The alternative would be located adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Bayou Segnette State Park, on the protected side of the hurricane protection levee in Jefferson Parish. Two locations have been identified within that area. The two options are identified as BLH West and BLH East. BLH West is currently 1,000 acres and BLH East is 993 acres. The mitigation goal is to enhance approximately 920 acres by removing the existing invasive trees and planting the same area with native BLH tree and mid-story species to generate approximately 193 AAHUs.

Due to the high density of invasive plant species, the project area would receive multiple herbicidal treatments prior to the initial planting of native, high-quality BLH canopy and midstory species. Initially the entire area would be aerial sprayed in late summer or early fall. Approximately one month after the initial aerial spraying, the mitigation features would be mechanically cleared without grubbing. Starting the following spring, multiple inspections and additional herbicidal treatments would be performed to ensure the project site is properly treated through the entire growing season. Large native trees and shrubs would be preserved during the mechanical clearing process when practicable. Woody debris generated during the clearing operations would be chipped and left within the mitigation features. Following the clearing activities, the features would be planted with high quality native BLH tree and shrub species. Ongoing invasive species control would be necessary. It is estimated that this phase would require approximately two to three years for completion. However, if sufficient mitigation bank credits become available in basin, consistent with the mitigation plan identified in PIER 37, those credits would be purchased before building the Bayou Segnette mitigation project.

If implementation of the Bayou Segnette site becomes infeasible or if it cannot provide sufficient credits to mitigate all impacts the Corps would purchase credits from an active mitigation bank; see following section entitled Mitigation Bank Alternative for both sites regarding this constructible alternative.


Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf Restoration

The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Hwy 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes. The proposed area consists of approximately 521 acres of agricultural fields. Within the 521 acres, approximately 137 acres would be used for BLH-Wet restoration. All proposed footprint elevations are at or above that desired for BLH-Wet restoration (+2.5 feet to 3.25 feet North American Vertical Datum 1988), therefore no outside borrow is required for this proposed restoration action. If sites that are above desired elevations fall within the final selected footprint for BLH-Wet restoration, these areas will be degraded, and material will be

Figure 1: Bayou Segnette BLH-Wet/Dry Enhancement Mitigation Site (Corps of Engineers)



Figure 2: Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet and Swamp Restoration Site (Corps of Engineers)



moved to lower areas within the project footprint. All such earth moving efforts will be achieved with dozers, trucks, and backhoes.

The entire proposed footprint is contained within a low elevation perimeter dike, certain portions of which would be degraded to reconnect the restoration project with adjacent swamp/BLH habitat. Ditches adjacent to the dikes would be filled or partially filled during dike degrading.

Once cultural surveys are complete, layout of the project features would be based on existing LIDAR data, which can be mapped to confirm existing elevations. In general the features will be laid out (1) to avoid cultural sites, (2) to minimize required earth moving from high to low areas, (3) maximize the remaining higher elevations for ongoing farming, (4) minimize the need for levee realignment to maintain the integrity of remaining agricultural fields, and (5) accommodate the potential for swamp restoration which is also being considered within this footprint. In general, the most work intensive scenario would require scraping of approximately 1.5' to 0.5' of topsoil in the higher areas to achieve elevations within the desired range. This material would remain on-site, to be truck hauled or pushed by dozer to areas of existing lower elevations. It is envisioned that the majority of the acreage required could simply be planted at the existing elevation once the water retention dikes have been degraded. As the vast majority of the potential project footprint(s) is existing agricultural fields, little to no anticipated clearing would be required. What little woody or vegetative debris which requires removal would be stockpiled and burned on site. The project would then be planted with native, high-quality BLH canopy and midstory species.

If implementation of Hwy 307 becomes infeasible or if it cannot provide sufficient credits to mitigate all FS swamp impacts the Corps would purchase credits from an active mitigation bank; see the following section regarding this constructible alternative.

Mitigation Bank Alternative for both sites

If implementation of either or both MTSMP features (i.e., Bayou Segnette/Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf) becomes infeasible the Corps could purchase credits from an active mitigation bank that is in compliance with the requirements of the Corps Regulatory Program, which includes monitoring and reporting by the owner/operator. Selection of the mitigation bank would occur through a "Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposal" process, through which any mitigation bank having the appropriate number and resource type of credits available could submit a proposal for selling credits. In order to qualify, a bank would have to be in compliance with an approved mitigation banking instrument, including an approved mitigation plan and appropriate real estate and financial assurances. The Corps would utilize in basin banks, however, depending on credit availability, credit purchase could occur outside the basin but still within the Louisiana coastal zone. The certified version of the WVA would be run on the mitigation banks to ensure that the assessment of the functions and services provided by the mitigation bank would fully replace the lost functions and services.

FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION MEASURES

The goal of the mitigation plan is to provide for equal replacement of the habitat units lost due to improvements to the hurricane protection project. The equal replacement compensation goal

specifies that the gain of one habitat unit can be used to offset the loss of one habitat unit. Achieving this goal would re-establish and maintain BLH and bald cypress habitats and fresh marsh. The objectives of the mitigation measures for the forested areas would be to establish and maintain a high diversity of native mast- and fruit-producing trees and shrubs, maximize herbaceous and shrub-layer canopy cover while maintaining a semi-mature to mature age structure. The objective of the marsh mitigation measures should include a design goal to develop intertidal marsh as early as possible and for it to remain above water for as long as possible.

Current benefits projected for the MTSMP are based on general assumptions of the project area and design. As the Corps further refines proposed mitigation features, detailed designs should be provided to the natural resource agencies so that recommendations can be provided in an appropriate timeframe and more accurate habitat assessments can be completed. Further, as mitigation plans are refined, the Corps, Service, EPA, LDWF, and NMFS would need to evaluate the plans against the accrued and anticipated benefits and the effect of implementing the proposal on achievement of the mitigation plan goal. Any changes that would prevent the mitigation goal from being achieved would not be recommended for implementation. Furthermore, the following activities are not permitted within a mitigation area for the life of the project:

1. Placing, filling, storing, or dumping of refuse, trash, vehicle bodies or parts, rubbish, debris, junk, waste, or other such items on the property.
2. Mechanized land clearing or deposition of soil, shell, rock or other fill on the property without prior request for approval, excluding the existing ROWs.
3. Cutting, removal or destruction of vegetation on the property except in accordance with the restoration plan.
4. Grazing of cattle or other livestock on the property that has been restored or enhanced.
5. Commercial, industrial, agricultural, or residential uses of the property.
6. No other human activities that result in the material degradation of habitat within the area shall occur.

However, it is understood that the mitigation plan shall not prohibit hunting, fishing, trapping, non-consumptive recreational pursuits and exploration and production of minerals. Exploration and production of minerals shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. The Service acknowledges that such activities have the potential to reduce the ability of the area to achieve the mitigation goal, depending on the extent of the impacts to the mitigation lands.

Modification and finalization of the "GUIDELINES – WET BLH HABITAT ENHANCEMENT, SWAMP HABITAT RESTORATION, AND SWAMP HABITAT ENHANCEMENT" is needed. This plan addresses restoration and enhancement techniques such as reforestation planting, Chinese tallow tree removal and control methods; monitoring guidelines, schedule and responsibilities; success criteria; and some remedial actions. The Service has provide recommendations to the tree species list and the percentages proposed for planting to ensure successful reforestation, while some modifications have been made some revisions are still needed. In a 2005 report the Service provided Chinese tallow tree removal and control methods for WBV mitigation, since that time the methodology has changed to improve the success of such efforts. The Service also provided recommendations for the plan in our

September 25, 2013, comment letter on the Draft Programmatic IER for the LPV mitigation. These revised methods should be incorporated into the mitigation reforestation plan. The methodology proposed to determine reforestation and restoration of jurisdictional wetland success should be modified to more closely reflect those standards utilized by mitigation banks.

The Service recommends that the Corps maintain full responsibility for any mitigation project for a minimum of 4-years post planting. That would allow the 4-year success criteria to be evaluated, prior to turning operation and maintenance responsibilities over to the local sponsor. Based on our experience, it would be virtually impossible to reasonably forecast the likely future success of the mitigation project based solely on mitigation activities accomplished prior to this time. The second monitoring event, performed 4 years after the initial mitigation activities, would provide significantly more insight into the continued development, success, and effectiveness of the implemented features.

At this time the mitigation planning documents do not describe in detail actions needed by the Corps and/or the local sponsor if mitigation is not succeeding as planned. The Service recommends that this important component of the mitigation plan be immediately developed.

The Service encourages the Corps to finalize mitigation plans and proceed to mitigation construction so that it will be concurrent with project construction and revising the impact and mitigation period-of-analysis to reflect additional temporal losses would not be required.

While we are generally in support of the Modified Tentatively Selected Mitigation Plan alternative which includes using mitigation banks, we are concerned that selecting the mitigation bank alternative could have negative repercussions. The Corps has the opportunity and resources to construct a “permittee-responsible” mitigation project. By going to a mitigation bank, the Corps could exhaust credits available in any one mitigation bank thus creating a hardship on an individual landowner/permittee. Mitigation banks provide a cost savings and feasible mitigation alternative for the individual landowner. A mitigation bank serves the individual landowner who does not have the resources to construct a mitigation project or whose project typically does not require the amount of mitigation that warrants a self-mitigation project. We recommend that the Corps consider the availability of credits at a bank and within a hydrologic unit when evaluating the mitigation bank alternative to avoid exhausting all credits available within a hydrologic unit for individual landowners/permittee.

SERVICE POSITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Service supports the Corps’ current mitigation features and recognizes that additional Tiered IERs will further address individual mitigation features that are still in early design phases. We support the Corps’ plan to mitigate impacts to fish and wildlife resources associated with WBV HSDRRS provided that the following fish and wildlife conservation recommendations are incorporated into future project planning and implementation efforts:

1. Prior to beginning work on IERs tiered off of this SPIER the Corps should coordinate with the natural resource agencies to ensure that necessary information

to conduct detailed project planning/design and finalize the WVA analysis is developed and available. Final sizing of mitigation must be based on revised WVAs conducted on advanced project designs

2. 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.
3. If applicable, a General Plan for mitigation lands should be developed by the Corps, the Service, and the managing natural resource agency in accordance with Section 3(b) of the FWCA.
4. A fully defined mitigation plan should be included in the authorizing report and Decision Record. The mitigation plan should be developed including locations and AAHUs vetted through the natural resource agencies. Only existing mitigation banks and existing credits released by Corps Regulatory Branch may be considered.
5. We recommend that the Corps consider the availability of credits at a bank and within a hydrologic unit when evaluating the mitigation bank alternative to avoid exhausting credits available for individual landowners/permittees within a particular hydrologic unit.
6. If mitigation credits are purchased from a mitigation bank the Service requests that a copy of the letter from the banker acknowledging the acquisition is provided to the Service for our files.
7. If mitigation lands are purchased for inclusion within publicly managed lands, those lands may need to meet certain requirements. Land-managing natural resource agencies may have requirements that must be met prior to accepting mitigation lands; therefore, if they are proposed as a manager of a mitigation site they should be contacted early in the planning phase regarding such requirements. The local sponsor should also be made aware of the above requirements should it be their responsibility to transfer mitigation lands to the land-managing agency.
8. The Corps should continue to coordinate with land managing agencies during planning of mitigation features that may be built on their lands or lands to be turned over to them for management. Coordination should continue until construction of the projects are complete and prior to any subsequent maintenance. Please contact Mr. John Lavin at 1-888-677-1400 regarding work on the Bayou Segnette State Park which is operated by the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism, Office of State Parks areas.

9. 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.
10. Any proposed change in mitigation features or plans should be coordinated in advance with the Service, NMFS, LDWF, EPA and LDNR.
11. The Service encourages the Corps to 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
12. The Service recommends that the Corps immediately finalize selection and approval of mitigation and augmentation features in coordination with federal and state natural resource agencies and with required approval from EPA. All necessary studies for the mitigation and augmentation features have been completed and agencies have reached agreement on those features. Further, the Service recommends that all such mitigation and augmentation features be implemented as soon as possible. All terms and conditions specified in the EPA 2009 Modification to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination should be followed with regard to mitigation and augmentation requirements.
13. The Corps should immediately develop a long-term monitoring plan for the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) area, as required under the EPA 2009 Modification to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination. The plan should be coordinated with the natural resources agencies and approved by EPA. All terms and conditions specified in the EPA 2009 Modification to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination with regard to the long-term monitoring and operation plan should be followed. Once approved, that plan should be implemented as soon as possible.
14. The Service recommends that all of the terms and conditions outlined in the EPA Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) 2009 modification be implemented without delay. The Corps is responsible for funding all mitigation and augmentation features in this agreement. A link to the 2009 final modified determination may be found at www.nolaenvironmental.gov under the EPA heading for IER 12.
15. The Service recommends that the Corps work with the natural resource agencies to refine the “GUIDELINES – WET BLH HABITAT ENHANCEMENT, SWAMP HABITAT RESTORATION, AND SWAMP HABITAT ENHANCEMENT” and incorporate all changes in the Mitigation Success Criteria and Mitigation Monitoring: Marsh Mitigation Features from the LPV

PIER 36 and the Bayou Sauvage Task Force Guardian BLH mitigation monitoring plan.

16. The Service recommends a two month period between herbicide application and mechanical clearing of invasive species. The proposed one month period may not allow sufficient time for herbicides to travel into the root system and work, thus encouraging greater stump sprouting.
17. The Service recommends that the Corps maintain full responsibility for any BLH mitigation project for a minimum of 4-years post planting. The Corps should maintain full responsibility for all marsh mitigation projects until monitoring guidelines to be developed are completed and demonstrate the projects are fully compliant with success and performance requirements. Documentation should be provided and referenced to demonstrate funding obligation for the Corps to fulfill initial success criteria at a minimum.
18. The Service recommends that all mitigation planning documents should describe in detail actions needed by the Corps and/or the local sponsor if mitigation is not succeeding as planned.
19. The Corps should avoid adverse impacts to bald eagle and osprey nesting locations and wading bird colonies through careful design 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.
20. We recommend that the Corps re-initiate ESA consultation with this office to ensure that the proposed project would not adversely affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat. Subsequently, ESA consultation should be reinitiated should the proposed project features change significantly or are not implemented within one year of the last ESA consultation with this office to ensure that the proposed project does not adversely affect any federally listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat.

LITERATURE CITED

- Barras, J.A. 2007. Land area changes in coastal Louisiana after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, in Farris, G.S., Smith, G.J., Crane, M., Demas, C.R., Robbins, L.L., and Lavoie, D.L., eds. Science and the storms – The USGS response to the hurricanes of 2005: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1306. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/circ/1306>
- Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ). Accessed November 15, 2012. <<http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/DIVISIONS/WaterPermits/WaterQualityAssessment/WaterQualityInventorySection305b.aspx>>

Lowery, A.H. 1974. Louisiana birds. La. State Univ. Press. 651 pp.

Rudis, Victor A., and Birdsey, R. A. 1986. Forest Resources and Current Conditions in the Lower Mississippi Valley. Resour. Bull. SO-116. New Orleans, La: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station. 7 p.

Appendix A

Draft Borrow Design and General Marsh Creation Guidelines for WBV Mitigation

1. Fill elevations - settlement curves should be provided during PED
2. Access corridors across marsh should be backfilled prior to demobilization
3. Earthen Containment and Shoreline Protection (if any) constructed on marsh ultimately would need to be assessed in direct impacts.
4. Earthen Containment in open water - upland portions will not be credited as marsh
5. Degrading/Gapping plan would need to be development and should be tailored case specifically. The following is offered as a general design of dike gapping :
 - A. If total dike degradation is not feasible, at a minimum, 1, 25-foot (ft) gap (bottom width) no less than every 1,000 ft, every 500 ft is preferred
 - B. Depth of gap dependent on if it is in open water or on marsh,
 - C. if on a high wave energy or protected energy shoreline:
 - a. Open Water - should be to the pre-project water depth;
 - b. Marsh - on both sides - should be to average marsh elevation
 - c. If scour aprons are included, the bottom should be grubbed out so that the depth is measured to the installed top of the armoring.
 - d. Degraded material should be placed on adjacent remaining dikes and not marsh.
6. Spill boxes should be directed into adjacent deteriorating marsh to the greatest extent practicable.
7. Staging areas should be located to avoid and minimize impacts.
8. Borrow Impact Assessment - generically 2,000 ft from shore is sufficient to avoid inducing wave impacts. Further development with the interagency team should be conducted post 35% and AEP and prior to finalization of the IERs.
9. Monitoring of dissolved oxygen and rate of infilling is recommended for the borrow site. It is recommended that monitoring plans used by the USGS for the MRGO Ecosystem Restoration Study and IER 11 be considered as models for developing that monitoring effort.
10. Borrow Pit Design should be case specific but should also consider the following:
 - a. Avoidance of oyster reefs to the maximum extent practicable
 - b. Avoidance of submerged aquatic vegetation
 - c. Avoidance of induced slope failure
 - d. Avoidance of induced wave refraction/diffraction erosion of shoreline
 - e. Avoidance of pipelines
 - f. Avoidance of inducing hypoxia – close coordination with the resource agencies is recommended as this is case specific and influenced by a number of factors such as water column stratification, current velocities and patterns, infilling rates, and urban discharge, etc. Other factors will need to be considered such as impacts to threatened or endangered species habitat and SAVs.

Appendix B

Modification of Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) Final Determination

Excerpt Only – This is not a complete document

B. Modification and Conditions

The October 16, 1985, Bayou aux Carpes Final Determination is hereby modified, subject to conditions specified below, by adding the following: The US Army Corps of Engineers may discharge dredged or fill material for the purpose of constructing the West Closure Complex alternative, as described by Colonel Alvin B. Lee, District Commander for the New Orleans District, in the November 4, 2008, letter requesting modification of the 1985 Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) FD. In this letter (Appendix 1), Colonel Lee requested modification of the 404(c) designation of the site to allow for the construction of a 4,200 foot floodwall and earthen berm within a 100 ft by 4,200 ft corridor along the eastern boundary of the Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) site, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana.

As stated above, this modification is subject to the specific conditions that EPA found were necessary in order for the Agency to grant this modification. The conditions are consistent with EPA and Corps regulations for mitigation and must be implemented in order for any discharges of dredged or fill material to comply with the terms of the 1985 Bayou aux Carpes 404(c) Final Determination. Not-with-standing the fact that the conditions contained in the Final Determination are binding requirements on the Corps, in order to demonstrate the high level of inter-agency cooperation and commitment that compensatory mitigation projects will be provided and maintained, a letter agreeing to the conditions below must be provided by the Corps to EPA (e.g., a formal, documented commitment from a government agency or public authority) (33 CFR 332.3 (n)), as soon as possible and in any event prior to any construction activities authorized by this Final Determination modification. The District Commander for the New Orleans Corps District must provide in writing to EPA AAOW a commitment to plan, design, ensure full funding, implement and monitor all mitigation, augmentation and monitoring measures that are conditions on which this modification was based to the satisfaction of EPA. EPA recognizes that full funding of the mitigation, augmentation and monitoring measures is subject to the availability of appropriated funds, however the District Commander for the New Orleans Corps District would agree to request through the Corps' budget process the funding that is necessary to fully implement and monitor the mitigation, augmentation and monitoring measures as detailed below.

As set forth in this modification, this action is reflective of a unique set of circumstances. The modification granted today does not have any bearing on any other CWA Section 404(c) designations or modification requests. Each CWA Section 404(c) designation represents a unique situation that responds to a specific set of parameters unlike any other.

i. Project Design and Construction

1. During final project design, the New Orleans District of the Corps (Corps) shall utilize all feasible engineering and construction practices to reduce impacts to the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) wetlands.¹

2. During project construction, the Corps shall comply with the conservation recommendations as specified in the “Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report, Individual Environmental Report (IER) 12, Harvey to Algiers” (February 18, 2009), or as they may be amended by the USFWS, Ecological Service, Lafayette.

ii. Mitigation

1. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall insure full funding and implementation of mitigation measures to compensate for the unavoidable adverse impacts of the project. EPA will make the final determination as to whether compensation is adequate, appropriate, and satisfactorily implemented in a timely manner.

2. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall obtain written approval from EPA Region 6, after consulting with the Greater New Orleans Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (GNOHSDRRS) interagency review team, prior to implementing any mitigation feature. At a minimum, the Corps shall document for EPA Region 6 the concurrence or non-concurrence on each mitigation feature by the National Park Service (Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve), US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), US Geological Survey (USGS), Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, and Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

3. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and conducting all required regulatory coordination and approvals prior to implementing any mitigation feature. The Corps shall coordinate with the Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve to determine the appropriate lead agency for conducting the interagency coordination and approval processes and shall obtain all necessary National Park Service permits.

iii. Augmentation Features

1. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall insure full funding and implementation of augmentation features to enhance the wetland functions and values of the site. EPA will make the determination as to whether augmentation features are adequate, appropriate, and satisfactorily implemented in a timely manner.

2. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall obtain written approval from EPA Region 6, after consulting with the GNOHSDRRS interagency review team, prior to implementing any

¹ This commitment was stated in a November 4, 2008, request for Section 404(c) modification letter to Mr. Lawrence E. Starfield, Deputy Regional Administrator EPA Region 6 from Colonel Alvin B. Lee, District Commander for the New Orleans District for the US Army Corps of Engineers (Appendix 1). Note: enclosed documents referenced in this letter are not attached in Appendix 1, but can be found in EPA Region 6 Recommended Determination dated April 2, 2009.

augmentation feature. At a minimum, the Corps shall document for EPA Region 6 the concurrence or non-concurrence on each augmentation feature by the NPS (Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve), USFWS, NMFS, USGS, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, and Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

3. The Corps shall be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and conducting all required regulatory coordination and approvals prior to implementing any augmentation feature. The Corps shall coordinate with the Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve to determine the appropriate lead agency for conducting the interagency coordination and approval processes and shall obtain all necessary National Park Service permits.

iv. Long-term Monitoring and Operation

1. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall coordinate the development of a long-term site monitoring plan, to be approved in writing by EPA, after consulting with the GNOHSDRRS interagency review team. EPA will make the determination as to whether the monitoring plan is adequate and appropriate.

2. The New Orleans District of the Corps and EPA Region 6 shall develop and sign a Memorandum of Agreement with those willing and active State, federal, and local participants with natural resource management missions who have participated on the IER # 12² interagency review team. The Memorandum of Agreement shall document the commitment to participate in the planning and analyses specified by the long-term monitoring plan.

3. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall obtain written approval from EPA Region 6, after consulting with the GNOHSDRRS interagency review team, prior to implementing the long-term monitoring plan. At a minimum, the Corps shall document for EPA Region 6 the concurrence or non-concurrence on the long-term monitoring plan by the NPS (Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve), USFWS, NMFS, USGS, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, and Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

4. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of a long-term site monitoring plan, to extend no less than the first 50 years of the Corps project life, unless otherwise addressed in a long-term agreement with another party approved by EPA.³ The long-term monitoring plan for the Bayou aux Carpes Modification mitigation and augmentation

² The Corps has divided the study area for the GNOHSDRRS into 17 project component areas. Each of these component areas will report on plans for those areas in Individual Environmental Reports (IERs). The proposed plans for the Bayou aux Carpes CWA Section 404(c) area are reported in IER #12.

³ The ultimate responsibility to plan, design, fully fund, implement and monitor all mitigation, augmentation and monitoring measures that are conditions on which this determination was based are the responsibility of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Although the Corps may enter into long term agreements with another party with respect to the work authorized by this modification, such agreements do not obviate the Corps' responsibility for meeting the conditions of this modification, and any concerns EPA may have will be raised with the Corps, not other involved parties.

features will focus on monitoring both the mitigation and augmentation features, as well as the impacts of the floodwall. The plan should provide for making adjustments if the mitigation or augmentation features prove not to perform as expected. Though it is not expected that the Corps would need to make future adjustments to the floodwall, the effects of the floodwall are to be monitored to determine unexpected impacts which may warrant other corrective actions.

5. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall provide EPA Region 6 with digital aerial photography of the site (season and flood stage to be determined jointly) prior to constructing the floodwall along the perimeter of the site and annually for the first five years after its construction, and at other times as specified by EPA Region 6.

6. The New Orleans District of the Corps shall gather the monitoring data and report results to EPA Region 6 annually, on a schedule to be specified by EPA Region 6, each year for the first five years, and at other times as specified by EPA Region 6.

7. Throughout the life of the project, the New Orleans District of the Corps shall ensure that any necessary adaptive construction modifications, including removal or repair, of any mitigation or augmentation feature is instituted based on the recommendations of EPA.

8. In the event that EPA determines during the life of the project that operation, maintenance, or long-term management by the Corps of the flood protection/risk reduction features, mitigation features, or augmentation features is causing unanticipated and unacceptable wetland impacts, EPA may modify the terms of these conditions.

ESA MEMO

This project has been reviewed for effects to Federal trust resources under our jurisdiction and currently protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act). The project, as proposed, Will have no effect on those resources. Is not likely to adversely affect those resources. This finding fulfills the requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Act.


Acting Supervisor
Louisiana Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

27 July 2015
Date

To: Jeff Weller, USFWS
646 Cajundome Blvd., Suite 400
Lafayette, LA 70506
Fax: (337) 291-3139

From: Tammy Gilmore
FAX: (504) 862-2088
Date: June 22, 2015

Subject: ESA coordination for SPIER 37, West Bank and Vicinity (WBV), Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Mitigation Project Jefferson, St. Charles, Lafourche, and Plaquemines Parishes, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Weller:

Attention: David Walther

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New Orleans District (MVN), is preparing to perform the work described in Supplemental Programmatic Individual Environmental Report (SPIER) #37, "West Bank and Vicinity (WBV), Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Mitigation Project Jefferson, St. Charles, Lafourche, and Plaquemines Parishes, Louisiana." We are requesting concurrence with our threatened and endangered species determination of "No Effect".

Project Description

The SPIER #37 modified tentatively selected mitigation plan (MTSMP) consists of a combination of pump and fill operations in interior open water areas to create fresh marsh, swamp, and BLH-Wet habitat on and adjacent to Jean Lafitte National Historic Park and Preserve (JLNHPP); elevation manipulation and reforestation on existing agricultural fields to enhance/restore/create BLH-Wet, BLH-Dry and swamp habitats, and the purchase of BLH-Wet/Dry and swamp mitigation bank credits to address the WBV HSDRRS mitigation requirement. The following are the WBV HSDRRS mitigation projects that make up the MTSMP, however, only the construction of the Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf project, the Bayou Segnette project or the purchase of mitigation bank credits for general FS BLH-Wet, FS swamp and PS BLH-Dry impacts are being recommended as constructible features of the plan and proposed for implementation at this time. Following the SPIER, designs for the projects identified as Programmatic Features of the mitigation plan would be completed. Once feasibility level of design for the programmatic features is complete, NEPA compliance for those projects would be documented in IERs tiering off the PIER (TIERs). ESA coordination on the constructible features covered in the TIERs would be submitted at the time of TIER completion.

CONSTRUCTIBLE FEATURES

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK PS BLH-DRY AND BLH-WET

As part of the approved mitigation plan in PIER 37, MVN purchased credits from 1 bank (Enterprise Woodlands) in the WBV basin for non-Park/404c PS BLH-Wet impacts. The purchase of mitigation bank credits for non-Park/404c PS BLH-Dry impacts is awaiting sufficient in basin credit availability.

Under SPIER 37, Bayou Segnette PS BLH-Dry enhancement (figure 1) is the tentatively selected project for the PS BLH-Dry feature and a constructible feature of the WBV HSDRRS Mitigation Plan. The proposed project is located adjacent to the Bayou Segnette State Park, on the protected side of the hurricane protection levee in Jefferson Parish. The proposed site is bounded to the south by the existing Westbank Hurricane Protection Levee (HPL) and to the north by Nicolle Boulevard and the NOLA Motorsports Park.

Two locations have been identified within the Bayou Segnette area. Both sites are currently populated with invasive tree species. The two options are identified as BLH West and BLH East. BLH West is currently 1,000 acres and BLH East is 993 acres. Target mitigation effort is to enhance approximately 920 acres by removing the existing invasive trees and planting the same area with desired high quality trees to mitigate 193 AAHUs.

Due to the high density of invasive plant species, the project area would receive multiple herbicidal treatments prior to the initial planting of native, high-quality species. Initially the entire area would be aerial sprayed in late summer or early fall. Approximately one month after the initial aerial spraying, the mitigation features would be mechanically cleared without grubbing. Large native trees and shrubs would be preserved during the mechanical clearing process to the greatest degree practicable. Woody debris generated during the clearing operations would be chipped and left within the mitigation features. Following the clearing activities, the features would be planted with high quality native BLH tree and shrub species.

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK/404 (c) FS BLH -WET

Under SPIER 37, Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet Restoration (figure 2) is the tentatively selected project for the FS BLH-Wet feature and a constructible feature of the WBV HSDRRS Mitigation Plan. The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of current or abandoned agricultural fields. Within the 521 acres, approximately 137 acres would be used for BLH-Wet restoration. All proposed footprint elevations are at or above that desired for BLH-Wet restoration (+2.5 feet to 3.25 feet NAVD88), therefore no outside borrow is required for this proposed restoration action. If sites that are above desired elevations fall within the final selected footprint for BLH-Wet restoration, these areas will be degraded, and material will be hauled to lower areas within the project footprint. All such earth moving efforts will be achieved with dozers, trucks, and backhoes.

The entire proposed footprint is contained within a perimeter water retention dike, certain portions of which would be degraded to reconnect the restoration project with adjacent swamp/BLH habitat. There are ditches adjacent to the dikes that would be filled or partially filled during dike degrading.

Once cultural surveys are complete, layout of the project features would be based on existing LIDAR data, which can be clearly mapped to confirm existing elevations. In general the features will be laid out (1) to avoid cultural sites, (2) to minimize required earth moving from high to low areas, (3) maximize the remaining higher elevations for ongoing farming, (4) minimize the need for retention dike realignment to maintain the integrity of remaining agricultural fields, and (5) accommodate the potential for swamp restoration which is also being considered within this

footprint.

In general, the worst case scenario would require scraping of approximately 1.5' to 0.5' of topsoil in the higher areas to achieve elevations within the desired range. This material would remain on-site, to be truck hauled or pushed by dozer to areas of existing lower elevations. It is envisioned that the majority of the acres required could simply be planted at the existing elevation once the water retention dikes have been degraded. As the vast majority of the potential project footprint(s) is existing agricultural fields, little to no anticipated clearing would be required. What little woody or vegetative debris which requires removal would be stockpiled and burned on site. The project would then be planted with BLH species.

or

MVN would purchase credits from an active mitigation bank that is in compliance with the requirements of the USACE Regulatory Program, which include monitoring and reporting by the owner/operator. Selection of the mitigation bank would occur through a "Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposal" process, through which any mitigation bank having the appropriate number and resource type of credits available could submit a proposal for selling credits. In order to qualify, a bank would have to be in compliance with an approved mitigation banking instrument, including an approved mitigation plan and appropriate real estate and financial assurances. CEMVN would utilize in basin banks, however, depending on credit availability, credit purchase could occur outside the basin. If credits are purchased from a mitigation bank, non-Park/404c flood side BLH-Wet impacts would be mitigated with the purchase of BLH-Wet credits equaling 72.04 Average Annual Habitat Units (AAHUs).

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK/404 (c) FLOOD SIDE SWAMP IMPACTS

Under SPIER 37, Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf Swamp Restoration (figure 2) is the tentatively selected project for the FS Swamp feature and a constructible feature of the WBV HSDRRS Mitigation Plan. The proposed project is located in Lafourche Parish along Highway 307 between Raceland and Des Allemandes. The entire footprint consists of approximately 521 acres of current or abandoned agricultural fields. Within the 521 acres, approximately 330 acres would be used for swamp restoration. All proposed footprint elevations are at or above that desired for swamp restoration (+2.5 feet to 0.0 feet NAVD88), therefore no outside borrow is required for this proposed restoration action. If sites that are above desired elevations fall within the final selected footprint for swamp restoration, these areas will be degraded, and material will be hauled to lower areas within the project footprint. All such earth moving efforts will be achieved with dozers, trucks, and backhoes.

The entire proposed footprint is contained within a perimeter water retention dike, certain portions of which would be degraded to reconnect the restoration project with adjacent swamp/BLH habitat. There are ditches adjacent to the dikes that would be filled or partially filled during dike degrading.

Once cultural surveys are complete, layout of the project features would be based on existing LIDAR data, which can be clearly mapped to confirm existing elevations. In general the features will be laid out (1) to avoid cultural sites, (2) to minimize required earth moving from high to

low areas, (3) maximize the remaining higher elevations for ongoing farming, (4) minimize the need for retention dike realignment to maintain the integrity of remaining agricultural fields, and (5) accommodate the potential for swamp restoration which is also being considered within this footprint.

In general, the worst case scenario would require scraping of approximately 1.0' to 0.5' of topsoil in the higher areas to achieve elevations within the desired range. This material would remain on-site, to be truck hauled or pushed by dozer to areas of existing lower elevations. It is envisioned that the majority of the acres required could simply be planted at the existing elevation once the water retention dikes have been degraded. As the vast majority of the potential project footprint(s) is existing agricultural fields, little to no anticipated clearing would be required. What little woody or vegetative debris which requires removal would be stockpiled and burned on site. The project would then be planted with swamp species.

or

MVN would purchase credits from an active mitigation bank that is in compliance with the requirements of the USACE Regulatory Program, which include monitoring and reporting by the owner/operator. Selection of the mitigation bank would occur through a "Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposal" process, through which any mitigation bank having the appropriate number and resource type of credits available could submit a proposal for selling credits. In order to qualify, a bank would have to be in compliance with an approved mitigation banking instrument, including an approved mitigation plan and appropriate real estate and financial assurances. CEMVN would utilize in basin banks, however, depending on credit availability, credit purchase could occur outside the basin. If credits are purchased from a mitigation bank, non-Park/404c flood side swamp impacts would be mitigated with the purchase of swamp credits equaling 134.52 AAHUs.

PROGRAMMATIC FEATURES

MITIGATION FOR NON-PARK/404 (c) FLOOD SIDE FRESH MARSH IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte FS Fresh Marsh Restoration Project mitigation project would involve restoration of FS fresh marsh habitats. Two restoration features are proposed. Feature JL1B5 would be built in an open water portion of Yankee pond (29° 51' 09.52"N 90° 10' 27.90W), would occupy approximately 91.2 acres, and would be located within the Park (figure 4). Feature JL15 (figure 5) would be situated in an area along the shoreline of Lake Salvador (29° 46' 45.47"N 90° 09' 05.70W) where prior work has already largely established a marsh platform that was previously an open water portion of the lake. Feature JL15 would encompass a total of approximately 55.5 acres. Portions of this feature would overlap Park property, while the remaining portions would overlap lands not currently owned by NPS. Both of the marsh restoration features would be located in Jefferson Parish.

Approximately 8,400 linear feet of retention dike would be required for JL1B5. Of the total 8,400 linear feet of dikes, approximately 3,100 linear feet would be armored/capped with stone. This armored dike segment would be located along the eastern boundary of feature of JL1B5 adjacent to Bayou Segnette.

Marsh restoration would require approximately 600,000 cubic yards of material hydraulically dredged from Lake Cataouatche. The borrow site would be approximately 1,200 feet x 1,500 feet (roughly 42.0 acres) with a maximum cut of 10 feet. The pipeline would be approximately 18,000 linear feet and routed adjacent to the western bank of Bayou Segnette. As the pipeline would need to cross a portion of Lake Cataouatche, a small segment of submerged pipeline would be installed at the crossing with appropriate signage to ensure safe passage of vessels over the line. Throughout the initial construction phase, project construction would be coordinated with the US Coast Guard.

The initial target marsh elevation in JL1B5 would be +3.5 feet with a final target elevation of approximately +1.0 to +1.5 feet. It is estimated that the initial project construction activities discussed above would require approximately 5 to 6 months. The final construction phase would begin following settlement and dewatering of the created marsh platform.

Fish dips (essentially armored gaps) would be constructed in the armored dike segment. The fish dips would allow water exchange and provide aquatic organism access to the marsh feature. It is anticipated that the final phase of construction activities (degrading dikes, constructing trenasses and fish dips, installation of dike armoring) would require approximately 3 to 4 months.

As part of the proposed project, the JL15 footprint would be degraded to design grade elevation of +1.0 to +1.5 feet. Fish dips would be constructed in this dike. The fish dips would allow water exchange and provide aquatic organism access to the marsh feature. It is anticipated that the final phase of JL15 construction activities (re-grading the marsh platform, refurbishment of rock dike, constructing fish dips) would require approximately 4 to 5 months.

MITIGATION FOR PARK/404 (c) BLH-WET IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte BLH-Wet Restoration Project would involve restoring native BLH-Wet habitats in an existing open water area (an existing borrow pit). The project would be located in Jefferson Parish. The proposed restoration features would include JL14A (approximately 6.28 acres), and JL14B (approximately 5.88 acres), as shown in figure 6. Both features would be located within the Park, adjacent to the West Bank HPL (29° 50' 37.43"N 90° 07' 40.43"W).

Features JL14A and JL14B would be constructed by placing fill material in the borrow pit to establish earthen platforms for the restored habitats. The mitigation features would be filled with an estimated 18 feet of sand to elevation -0.0 feet. A 4-foot clay cap to elevation +3.5 feet would then be placed on top of the sand fill. It is anticipated that it would take approximately 1 year for the fill materials to settle to the desired final target grade of elevation +2.0 feet.

Approximately 400,000 cubic yards of sand fill and 80,000 cubic yards of the clay cap would be required to fill the 12.2 acres being restored to BLH-Wet habitats. These borrow materials would be obtained from off-site government furnished and/or contractor furnished borrow pits.

Project access would be via two roadways extending west from Barataria Boulevard. An appropriate traffic control plan would be implemented during the initial construction phase to minimize traffic congestion and safety hazards. Establishment of the construction access routes would require clearing a corridor, roughly 20-foot wide, through existing wetland habitats.

The initial construction phase would last roughly 9 to 10 months. Plantings would be in accordance with the BLH-Wet planting guidelines. This secondary construction phase, would likely last approximately 3 to 4 months.

MITIGATION FOR PARK/404 (c) SWAMP IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte Swamp Restoration Project would involve restoring native swamp habitats in primarily existing open water areas. The project would be located in Jefferson Parish. The proposed restoration features would include JL7 (29° 50' 59.34" N 90° 08' 17.87" W) (approximately 11.31 acres) as shown in figure 6, and JL8 (29° 47' 39.71" N 90° 04' 11.82" W) (approximately 5.00 acres) and JL9 (29° 47' 18.21" N 90° 04' 04.32" W) (approximately 4.13 acres) as shown in figure 7. All three features would be located in the Park, while features JL8 and JL9 would also be located within the 404c area.

Proposed feature JL7 would encompass a segment of an existing man-made canal, although the far eastern end of this feature would encompass a previously filled and disturbed upland area. A portion of an existing spoil berm running along the north side of JL7 would be cleared and degraded (excavated) to use as a source of fill to establish feature JL7. The existing upland area within the eastern end of JL7's footprint would also be cleared and degraded.

Another component of the JL7 swamp restoration would involve excavating "gaps" in the existing spoil berms adjacent to both sides of Millaudon Canal. Each gap would be degraded to approximately elevation 1.0 feet to match the existing grades typically found in nearby swamp habitats.

The quantity of fill that would be obtained from the degrading of the spoil berm adjacent to JL7 and from degrading the existing upland portion of JL7 is approximately 35,000 cubic yards. Combining this with the material obtained from degrading the Millaudon Canal gaps would yield a total of roughly 36,600 cubic yards that would be placed in the existing canal portion of JL7 to establish the platform for the proposed JL7 swamp. However, it is estimated that an additional 140,000 cubic yards of fill (borrow) would be required to bring the canal portion of JL7 to the initial target grade elevation.

Project access would be via two roadways extending west from Barataria Boulevard. Due to the anticipated volume of dump truck traffic, an appropriate traffic control plan would be implemented during the initial construction phase to minimize traffic congestion and safety hazards.

The initial construction phase to establish feature JL7 would require an estimated 8.5 to 9.5 months. Once settled, the restoration feature would be planted native swamp canopy and midstory species.

The proposed restoration features JL8 and JL9 would encompass existing canals that would be filled and planted to restore native swamp habitat. Two construction access corridors would be required to build features JL8 and JL9. There are existing spoil berms on the north and south sides of both restoration features which would be "gapped" to improve surface flow and exchange. Each gap would be degraded to approximately elevation 1.0 feet to match the existing

grades typically found in nearby swamp habitats.

It is estimated that approximately 3,600 cubic yards of fill would be obtained through construction of the spoil berm gaps. However, it is estimated that an additional 135,000 cubic yards of fill would be required to establish the earthen platforms for the restored swamp features. This borrow material would be bucket dredged from the GIWW. The proposed borrow area would be approximately 70 feet wide and 5,000 feet long (17.2 acres) and would be dug to 4 feet below existing grade with an allowable 1 foot of overdepth. All activities within the GIWW would be coordinated with the US Coast Guard as to not impede navigation.

The initial construction of JL8 and JL9 would require about 3 to 4 months. The final construction phase (e.g. initial planting of features JL8 and JL9) would require roughly 2 to 3 weeks.

MITIGATION FOR PARK/404 (c) FRESH MARSH IMPACTS

The Jean Lafitte FS Fresh Marsh Restoration mitigation project would involve restoring fresh marsh habitat from open water. The single proposed marsh restoration feature, JL1B4 (figure 8), would encompass approximately 20.4 acres, located in Jefferson Parish within the Park (29° 50' 53.05"N 90° 10' 37.92"W). Restoration work would involve establishing a land platform for the new marsh habitat proposed.

Approximately 3,780 linear feet of retention dike would be required. Of the total 3,780 linear feet of dikes, approximately 1,780 linear feet would be armored/capped with stone during the second project construction phase. Fish dips would be constructed in the armored dike segment. The initial target marsh elevation (elevation of slurry fill) would be +3.5 feet. It is estimated that the initial project construction activities discussed above would require approximately 3 to 4 months. The final target elevation of this feature is approximately +1.0 to +1.5 feet. The final construction phase would begin following settlement and dewatering of the created marsh platform. In conjunction with this dike degrading effort, trenasses would be constructed as necessary to serve as tidal creeks to facilitate water exchange and create shallow water interspersed features within JL1B4. It is anticipated that the final phase of construction activities (degrading dikes, constructing trenasses and fish dips, installation of dike armoring) would require approximately 3 to 4 months.

Marsh restoration would require approximately 150,000 cubic yards of material from Lake Cataouatche. The borrow site would be approximately 1,500 feet by 300 feet (roughly 10.3 acres) with a maximum cut of 10 feet. The pipeline would be routed adjacent to the western bank of Bayou Segnette. Throughout the initial construction phase, project construction would be coordinated with the US Coast Guard.

Occurrence of Protected, Threatened and Endangered Species

None of the listed species, under the jurisdiction of USFWS, for Lafourche and Jefferson parish are found in the project areas (USFWS 2015). Bald eagles and migratory birds may be present within the project areas; however, no known nests or rookeries exist at this time. Surveys will be conducted prior to construction to determine if any nests become active within the project area.

If nests are found, no work would take place within 660 feet for bald eagles and 1,000 feet for colonial nesting birds.

Conclusion and Determination

We believe that the project, as planned, would have no effect on any federally-listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat as none exist within the project areas. Please review this plan and inform us whether or not you agree with our determination. If you have any questions about the project or need additional information please telephone me at (504) 862-1002.

Literature Cited

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS). Endangered Species Program. 2015.
http://www.fws.gov/lafayette/pdf/LA_T&E_Species_List.pdf



Figure 1: Bayou Segnette BLH-Wet/Dry Enhancement



Figure 2: Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH-Wet and Swamp Restoration Project

APPENDIX E

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT #572

MONITORING PLAN AND SUCCESS CRITERIA

**FLOOD SIDE BOTTOM LAND HARDWOOD FORESTS
FLOOD SIDE SWAMP**

Contents

INTRODUCTION 2

MITIGATION SUCCESS CRITERIA..... 3

 Success Criteria-Bottomland Hardwood Forest - Highway 307 3

 Success Criteria-Swamp Habitat Restoration-Highway 307 Site..... 6

MITIGATION MONITORING GUIDELINES 10

 Bottomland Hardwood Forest - Highway 307 10

 Baseline Monitoring Report 10

 Additional Monitoring Reports 12

 Swamp Restoration-Highway 307..... 15

 Baseline Monitoring Report 15

 Additional Monitoring Reports 17

 Monitoring Reports Involving Timber Management Activities 20

 Monitoring Reports Following Re-Planting Activities 20

MONITORING SCHEDULE, RESPONSIBILITIES AND COSTS..... 20

 Bottomland Hardwood Forest Enhancement- Highway 307..... 20

 Swamp Restoration-Highway 307 25

INTRODUCTION

This document follows the monitoring and success criteria guidelines developed for the West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane Storm Damage and Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) Mitigation Program. The guidelines were developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in coordination with an Interagency Team and the non-Federal project sponsor (NFS), collectively known as the Interagency Review Team (IRT). The original general guidelines for plantings, success criteria, and monitoring were included as Appendix L in PIER 37 and are included here by reference. The general mitigation guidelines are currently under revision by the IRT. Once the revisions are complete, the project specific monitoring, reporting and success criteria will be revised as applicable. This appendix outlines the refined project specific monitoring, reporting and success criteria for the mitigation features included in SEA #572. The specific mitigation features are fully described in SEA #572 and include the following:

- Flood Side Bottomland Hardwoods (BLH) Wet
 - Mitigation Banks
 - Highway 307
- Flood side Swamp
 - Mitigation Banks
 - Highway 307

It should be noted that even though the proposed mitigation actions under SEA #572 include the potential purchase of credits from a mitigation bank this appendix only details the project specific information for the constructible mitigation features at Highway 307. In the event that mitigation bank credits are purchased the mitigation success criteria, mitigation monitoring and reporting requirements, and mitigation management and maintenance activities for will be set forth in the Mitigation Banking Instrument (MBI) for each particular bank. The bank sponsor (bank permittee) will be responsible for these activities rather than the USACE and/or the local Sponsor. USACE Regulatory staff will review the mitigation bank monitoring reports and conduct periodic inspections of mitigation banks to ensure compliance with mitigation success criteria stated in the MBI.

The proposed mitigation actions under SEA #572 Highway 307 site include construction of Swamp and BLH habitat with the NFS responsible for operation and maintenance of functional portions of work as they are completed. On a cost shared basis, the USACE will monitor completed the mitigation to determine whether additional construction, invasive species control and/or plantings are necessary to achieve mitigation success. The USACE will undertake additional actions necessary to achieve mitigation success in accordance with cost sharing applicable to the project and subject to the availability of funds. Once the USACE determines that the mitigation has achieved initial success criteria, monitoring will be performed by the NFS as part of its OMRR&R obligations. If, after meeting initial success criteria, the mitigation fails to meet its intermediate and/or long-term ecological success criteria, USACE will consult with other agencies and the NFS to determine whether operational changes would be sufficient to achieve ecological success criteria. If, instead, structural changes are deemed necessary to achieve ecological success, USACE will implement appropriate adaptive management measures

in accordance with the contingency plan and subject to cost sharing requirements, availability of funding, and current budgetary and other guidance.

The respective responsibilities for the construction, monitoring and maintenance of the mitigation features at Highway 307 are as follows:

1. Construction and planting (the “construction phase”) - performed by the USACE per applicable cost-sharing;
2. After construction and planting, the USACE issues Notice of Construction Complete (NCC) and provides the Draft Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation manual to the NFS (the “O&M phase”);
3. Notwithstanding NCC, the USACE will monitor the project on a cost-shared basis until it reaches its Initial Success Criteria;
4. If, after NCC but before Initial Success Criteria are achieved, the project needs additional construction, invasive species control or planting, the USACE will perform these items subject to applicable cost-sharing and availability of funds;
5. After Initial Success Criteria are achieved, the NFS will monitor project;
6. If, after Initial Success Criteria are achieved, there is a problem that can be corrected through a change in operation, the NFS will be responsible to change its operation of the project; and
7. If, after Initial Success Criteria are achieved, there is a problem that requires structural changes, USACE will implement adaptive management according to applicable cost-sharing and subject to availability of funds.

MITIGATION SUCCESS CRITERIA

The success criteria for the BLH and Swamp project features were initially included in the PIER Appendix L and are presented below. The general success criteria are currently under revision by the IRT and these project specific criteria will be updated upon completion.

Success Criteria-Bottomland Hardwood Forest - Highway 307

The success (performance) criteria for BLH-Wet (Highway 307) are included.

1. General Construction

Complete all necessary initial earthwork and related construction activities in accordance with the mitigation work plan and the final project plans and specifications. The necessary activities will vary with the mitigation site and may include, but are not limited to: clearing, grubbing, and grading activities; construction of new water management features (weirs, flap-gates, diversion ditches, etc.); modifications or alterations to existing water control structures and surface water management systems; plantings; eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species. These requirements classify as initial construction requirements.

2. Native Vegetation

- A. Complete initial planting of canopy and midstory species in accordance with the authorized initial planting plan described in PIER 37 Appendix L and SEA #572 Appendix H. This requirement classifies as an initial success criterion.
- B. A. 1 year following successful completion of plantings
- Achieve a minimum average survival of 50% of planted canopy species (i.e. achieve a minimum average canopy species density of 269 seedlings/ac.).
 - The surviving plants must approximate the species composition and the species percentages specified in the initial plantings component of the authorized planting plan.
 - These criteria will apply to the initial plantings as well as any subsequent re-plantings necessary to achieve this initial success requirement.
 - The requirements above classify as initial success criteria.
- B. 3 Years Following Achievement of 2.A
- Achieve a minimum average density of 269 living native canopy species per acre (planted trees and/or naturally recruited native canopy species).
 - Achieve a minimum average density of 135 (50% of 269) living hard-mast producing species in the canopy stratum (planted trees and/or naturally recruited native canopy species). The remaining trees in the canopy stratum must be comprised of soft-mast producing native species. This hard mast criteria will thereafter remain in effect for the duration of the overall monitoring period. Modifications to these criteria could be necessary for reasons such as avoidance of tree thinning if thinning is not warranted and the long-term effects of sea level rise on tree survival. Proposed modifications must first be approved by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team.
 - For BLH-Wet habitats only -- Demonstrate vegetation satisfies USACE hydrophytic vegetation criteria (Plant community must exhibit characteristics and diversity indicative of a viable native forested wetland community, i.e. vegetation community where more than 50% of all dominant species are facultative (FAC) or wetter).
- C. Within 6 Years Following Completion of 2.B and for the duration of the overall monitoring period
- Attain a minimum average canopy cover of 80% by planted and/or naturally recruited native canopy species. This criterion will thereafter remain in effect for the duration of the overall monitoring period. This requirement classifies as long term success criteria.
 - Achieve a minimum average density of 135 (50% of 269) living hard-mast producing species in the canopy stratum (planted trees and/or naturally recruited native canopy species). The remaining trees in the canopy stratum must be comprised of soft-mast producing native species. This requirement classifies as long term success criteria.
 - For BLH-Wet habitats only -- Demonstrate vegetation satisfies USACE hydrophytic vegetation criteria (Plant community must exhibit characteristics and diversity indicative of a viable native forested wetland community, i.e. vegetation community where more than 50% of all dominant species are facultative (FAC) or wetter). This requirement classifies as long term success criteria.

Note: The requirement that the above criteria remain in effect for the duration of the overall monitoring period may need to be modified later due to factors such as the effect of sea level rise on vegetative cover. Proposed modifications must first be approved by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team. If doesn't meet 80% 6 Years Following Completion of 2.C, the interagency review team (IRT) would meet and discuss path forward. Greater flexibility for species composition may be allotted after multiple years of not meeting initial success criteria.

Note: There are no success criteria for understory species, but data will be collected every 5 years.

3. Invasive and Nuisance Vegetation

Maintain all areas such that the total average vegetative cover accounted for by invasive and nuisance species each constitute less than 5% of the total average plant cover per acre for the duration of the project life.

Note: Yearly inspections to determine the need for invasive/nuisance control would be conducted until the long term success criteria for vegetation is achieved. After it is achieved, the frequency of inspections to determine the need for invasive/nuisance control would be adjusted based on site conditions.

4. Topography

A. For mitigation features requiring earthwork to attain desired grades (excluding areas restored from existing open water features) – Following completion of general construction criteria 1A, demonstrate that at least 80% of the total graded area within each feature is within approximately ± 0.25 feet of the proposed target soil surface elevation (e.g. the desired soil surface elevation). This requirement classifies as an initial success criterion.

B. For mitigation features restored from existing open water areas:

- (1) One year after placement of fill material is complete, demonstrate that at least 80% of the total graded area within each feature is within approximately +0.5 feet of the projected settlement curve elevation for that year, and;
- (2) Two years after placement of fill material is complete, demonstrate that at least 80% of the total graded area within each feature is within approximately +0.5 feet of the projected settlement curve elevation for that year. These requirements classify as initial success criteria.

5. Thinning of Native Vegetation (Timber Management)

The USACE, in cooperation with the Interagency Team, may determine that thinning of the canopy and/or midstory strata is warranted to maintain or enhance the ecological value of the site. This determination will be made approximately 15 to 20 years following completion of initial plantings. If it is decided that timber management efforts are necessary, the NFS will develop a Timber Stand Improvement/Timber Management Plan, and associated long-term success criteria, in coordination with the USACE and Interagency Team. Following approval of the plan, the NFS will perform the necessary thinning operations and demonstrate these operations have been

successfully completed. Timber management activities will only be allowed for the purposes of ecological enhancement and maintenance of the mitigation site.

6. Hydrology

4 years after successful completion of plantings, site hydrology will be assessed to determine that the property meets the wetland criterion as described in the 1987 manual and applicable regional supplement. The NFS will provide the CEVMN with a wetland delineation to accompany the monitoring report. This requirement classifies as an intermediate and long-term success criteria.

Success Criteria-Swamp Habitat Restoration-Highway 307 Site

The general success criteria are currently under revision by the IRT and these project specific criteria will be updated upon completion.

1. General Construction

- A. As applicable, complete all necessary initial earthwork and related construction activities in accordance with the mitigation work plan as well as the final project plans and specifications. Examples include, but are not limited to: grading and clearing activities; modifications/alterations to existing perimeter dikes. These requirements classify as initial success criteria.

2. Native Vegetation

- A. Complete initial planting of canopy and midstory species in accordance with the authorized initial planting plan. This requirement classifies as an initial success criterion.
- B. 1 Year Following Completion of Initial Plantings (at end of first growing season following the year plants are first installed) –
 - Achieve a minimum average survival of 50% of planted canopy species (i.e. achieve a minimum average canopy species density of 269 seedlings/ac.). The surviving plants must approximate the species composition and the species percentages specified in the initial planting plan. These criteria will apply to the initial plantings as well as any subsequent replantings necessary to achieve this initial success requirement.
 - Achieve a minimum average survival of 80% of planted midstory species (i.e. achieve a minimum average midstory species density of 108 seedlings/ac.). The surviving plants must approximate the species composition percentages specified in the initial plantings component of the Mitigation Work Plan. These criteria will apply to the initial plantings as well as any subsequent replantings necessary to achieve this initial success requirement.
 - The requirements above classify as initial success criteria.
- C. 4 Years Following Completion of Initial Plantings –
 - Achieve a minimum average density of 250 living native canopy species per acre (planted trees and/or naturally recruited native canopy species).

- Achieve a minimum average density of 125 living baldcypress trees (planted trees and/or naturally recruited native canopy species). The species composition of the additional native canopy species present must be generally consistent with the planted ratios for such species.
 - Achieve a minimum average density of 85 living native midstory species per acre (planted midstory and/or naturally recruited native midstory species).
 - Demonstrate that vegetation satisfies USACE hydrophytic vegetation criteria. This criterion will thereafter remain in effect for the duration of the overall monitoring period.
 - The requirements above classify as intermediate success criteria; with the exception that the requirement to demonstrate vegetation satisfies USACE hydrophytic vegetation criteria throughout the duration of the overall monitoring period classifies as a long-term success criterion.
- D. Within 15 Years Following Completion of Initial Plantings –
- Achieve one of the two following vegetative cover requirements:
 1. The average percent cover by native species in the canopy stratum is at least 50%, and; the average percent cover by native species in the midstory stratum exceeds 33%, and; the average percent cover by native species in the ground cover stratum (herbaceous cover) exceeds 33%.
 2. The average percent cover by native species in the canopy stratum is at least 75%, and:
 - (a) the average percent cover by native species in the midstory stratum exceeds 33%, or;
 - (b) the average percent cover by native species in the ground cover stratum (herbaceous cover) exceeds 33%.
 - The requirements above classify as intermediate success criteria.
- E. Within 45 Years Following Completion of Initial Plantings –
- Demonstrate that the average diameter at breast height (DBH) of living trees exceeds 10 inches. This criterion will thereafter remain in effect for the duration of the overall monitoring period.

3. Invasive and Nuisance Vegetation

- A. Complete the initial eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species. This requirement classifies as an initial success criterion.
- B. Maintain all areas such that they are essentially free from invasive and nuisance plant species immediately following a given maintenance event and such that the total average vegetative cover accounted for by invasive and nuisance species each constitute less than 5% of the total average plant cover during periods between maintenance events. These criteria must be satisfied throughout the duration of the overall monitoring period. Until such time that monitoring responsibilities are transferred from the USACE to the NFS, this requirement classifies as an initial success criterion. Following the transfer of monitoring responsibilities, this requirement classifies as a long-term success criterion.

4. Topography

- A. Following completion of initial construction activities, demonstrate that at least 80% of the total area within each feature is within approximately 0.5 feet of the proposed target soil surface elevation (e.g. the desired soil surface elevation). This requirement classifies as an initial success criterion.

5. Thinning of Native Vegetation (Timber Management)

The USACE, in cooperation with the Interagency Team, may determine that thinning of the canopy and/or midstory strata is warranted to ensure the achievement of success criteria within the plan. This determination would be made approximately 15 to 20 years following completion of initial plantings. If, under normal climatic conditions, two or more successive monitoring reports do not indicate average growth rates for the species installed and site conditions are being achieved then remedial actions will be discussed with the resource agencies. If it is decided that timber management efforts are necessary, the NFS would develop a Timber Stand Improvement/Timber Management Plan, and associated long-term success criteria, in coordination with the USACE and Interagency Team. Following approval of the plan, the NFS would perform the necessary thinning operations and demonstrate that these operations have been successfully completed. Timber management activities would only be allowed for the operations that have been successfully completed.

6. Hydrology

As outlined in the Appendix L of PIER 37, the optimal hydrologic regime for baldcypress/tupelogram swamps involves both seasonal flooding and good surface water exchange between a particular swamp and adjacent systems. The typical hydroperiod should include several periods of flooding (inundation) and drawdown, or a “pulsing” hydrology. Surface water should be present for extended periods, especially during portions of the growing season, but should be absent (water table at or below the soil surface) by the end of the growing season in most years. At a minimum, standing surface water should be absent for approximately 2 months during the growing season once every 5 years. Abundant and consistent freshwater

input from riverine systems is most desirable, as is relatively consistent surface water flow through the swamp during flooded periods. However, other sources of sheetflow into the swamp can be similarly beneficial. The main objective is to have sufficient surface water exchange between the swamp and adjacent habitats. Situations involving permanent flooding and/or no surface water exchange should be avoided when possible.

General Hydrologic Guidelines -The following provides some general hydrologic guidelines for the mitigation project since altering the existing hydrologic regime by modifying the perimeter dikes is a component of the mitigation work plan. It is emphasized that 1-4 below are not the required success criteria they are merely guidelines and the attainment of one or more of these guidelines may not be possible in some situations. The required success criteria are outlined below these guidelines.

1. Strive for a minimum of about 200 consecutive days but no more than roughly 300 consecutive days of inundation (flooding). This period of inundation should overlap a portion of the growing season (preferably the early portion or late portion).
2. Strive for a minimum of roughly 40 to 60 consecutive days during the growing season where the water table is at or below the soil surface (i.e. non-inundated period). This non-inundated period should preferably occur during the middle portion of the growing season. The non-inundated period should not exceed approximately 90 to 120 days.
3. Strive to achieve an average maximum (peak) water table elevation that ranges between approximately 1.0 feet to 2.0 feet above the soil surface (i.e. depth of average peak inundation is 1.0 to 2.0 feet). Water table elevations greater than 2 feet above the soil surface may occur, however such occurrences should be of relatively short duration (i.e. brief “spikes” in the depth of inundation).
4. Locate the mitigation area such that it naturally receives freshwater inputs via surface flow from adjacent lands and such that, during periods of inundation, there is good sheet flow through the mitigation area including a means for surface water discharge from the mitigation area. If the mitigation area cannot be located to attain these goals naturally, then mitigation activities should include actions to achieve these goals to the greatest degree practicable (e.g. include measures to provide for good surface water exchange between the swamp and adjacent systems), while at the same time not jeopardizing hydrology objectives pertaining to the swamp’s hydroperiod.

Hydrologic Success Criteria- The following criteria will be used to determine hydrologic success of the mitigation feature.

- A. Ground surface elevations must be conducive to establishment and support of hydrophytic vegetation, and re-establishment and maintenance of hydric soil characteristics.
- B. Two years following attainment of the one-year survivorship criteria, site hydrology will be restored such that the Property meets the wetland criterion as described in the 1987 Manual as well as the November 2010 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers wetland Delineation Manual: Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region Version 2.0 (USACE 1987, 2010). Data demonstrating that wetland hydrology is being or has been re-established is to be presented in the monitoring report.

MITIGATION MONITORING GUIDELINES

Reference Document for Monitoring

All project monitoring would follow the procedures detailed within this monitoring plan in concert with the procedures outlined in the following document: A Standard Operating Procedures Manual for the Coast-wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS)– Wetlands: Methods for Site Establishment, Data Collection, and Quality Assurance/Quality Control, prepared by the Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, January 27, 2012. The referenced document is specific to coastal Louisiana wetlands and provides very detailed methodology for conducting field. The detailed methods provided in the CRMS Standard Operating Procedures Manual are incorporated by reference and are intended to supplement the procedures documented within this monitoring plan.

Bottomland Hardwood Forest - Highway 307

The general monitoring guidelines are currently under revision by the IRT and these project specific monitoring plan will be updated upon completion.

Baseline Monitoring Report

The mitigation site would be monitored and a baseline monitoring report prepared after final construction is complete. Monitoring and reporting requirements for the baseline report include the following items:

- A. A detailed discussion of all mitigation activities completed.
- B. A description of the various features and habitats within the mitigation site.
- C. A plan view drawing of the mitigation site showing the approximate boundaries of the mitigation features (ex. planted areas, areas only involving eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species; surface water management features, etc.), monitoring plots, monitoring transect locations, sampling quadrats locations, photo station locations and, if applicable, piezometer and staff gage locations. The proposed locations for the permanent monitoring transect locations, sampling plot locations, quadrats, photo station locations, and piezometer and staff gage locations will be identified once the final designs for the mitigation site are completed. The final locations will be determined and documented during the initial site visit and baseline monitoring report. Once finalized the final monitoring design will need to be coordinate with the USACE. If available aerial imagery of the mitigation site will also be included.
- D. An as-built survey of finished grades for any relatively large areas subject to topographic alterations and an as-built survey of any surface water drainage features, drainage culverts, and/or water control structures constructed. Detailed surveys of topographic alterations simply involving the removal of existing linear features such as

berms/spoil banks, or involving the filling of existing linear ditches or canals, will not be required. However, the as-built survey will include spot cross-sections of such features sufficient to represent typical conditions. The as-built survey must include a survey of areas where existing berms, spoil banks, or levees have been breached in sporadic locations.

- E. A detailed inventory of all canopy and midstory species planted, including the number of each species planted and the stock size planted. In addition, provide a breakdown itemization indicating the number of each species planted in a particular portion of the mitigation site and correlate this itemization to the various areas depicted on the plan view drawing of the mitigation site.
- F. Photographs documenting conditions in the mitigation feature at the time of monitoring would be included. Photos would be taken at permanent photo stations within the mitigation feature. The number of photo stations required as well as the locations of these stations will vary depending on the mitigation site and will be determined once the specific mitigation features for BLH within the Avondale Gardens site and Highway 307 sites have been identified. The USACE will make this determination in coordination with the Interagency Team and will specify the requirements in an updated monitoring plan. At least two photos would be taken at each station with the view of each photo always oriented in the same general direction from one monitoring event to the next.
- G. Various qualitative observations would be made in the mitigation site to help assess the status and success of mitigation and maintenance activities. These observations would include: General estimate of the average percent cover by native plant species; general estimates of the average percent cover by invasive and nuisance plant species; general observations concerning colonization of the mitigation site by volunteer native plant species; general condition of native vegetation; trends in the composition of the plant community; wildlife utilization as observed during monitoring; observations regarding general surface inundation indicators. General observations made during the course of monitoring would also address potential problem zones and other factors deemed pertinent to the success of the mitigation program.
- H. For BLH-Wet habitats only -- A summary of rainfall data collected during the year preceding the monitoring report based on rainfall data recorded at a station located on or in close proximity to the mitigation site. Once all hydrology success criteria have been achieved, collection and reporting of rainfall data will no longer be required.
- I. For BLH-Wet habitats only -- Water level elevation readings would be collected at the time of monitoring from staff gauges. The monitoring report would provide the staff gauge data along with mean high and mean low water elevation data. The report would further address estimated mean high and mean low water elevations at the mitigation site based on field indicators. The exact location of the proposed staff gauges would be determined during the initial site visit and the baseline monitoring event.

- J. A summary assessment of all data and observations along with recommendations as to actions necessary to help meet mitigation and management/maintenance goals and mitigation success criteria.
- K. A brief description of anticipated maintenance/management work to be conducted during the period from the current monitoring report to the next monitoring report.

Additional Monitoring Reports

All monitoring reports generated after the initial baseline report would provide the following information unless otherwise noted:

- L. All items listed for the baseline monitoring report with the exception of: (a) the topographic/as-built survey, unless additional topographic/as-built surveys are available; (b) the inventory of planted species; although such an inventory must be provided in any monitoring report generated for a year in which a feature is re-planted to meet applicable success criteria.
- M. Quantitative plant data collection and results. Methodology includes a combination of various sized plots for measuring the canopy, midstory, and understory/groundcover.
 - Permanent Plots: Quantitative plant data collected from permanent monitoring plots measuring approximately 90 feet X 90 feet in size or from circular plots having a radius of approximately 53 feet. The permanent monitoring plots will be located within mitigation areas where initial planting of canopy and midstory species is necessary. Whichever method is chosen for the initial monitoring report must be followed for all subsequent reports. The number of plots necessary as well as the location and length of each transect will vary depending on the mitigation site will be determined once the specific mitigation features have been identified.
 - Data recorded in each permanent plot will include:
 - number of living planted canopy species present and the species composition;
 - number of living planted midstory species present and the species composition;
 - average density of all native species in the canopy stratum,
 - the total number of each species present the canopy stratum,
 - the wetland indicator status of each species the canopy stratum;
 - average cover by native species in the canopy stratum;
 - average density of all native species in the midstory stratum,
 - the total number of each species present midstory stratum,
 - and the wetland indicator status of each species midstory stratum;
 - average cover by native species in the midstory stratum

- average percent cover accounted for by invasive plant species (all vegetative strata combined)
 - average percent cover accounted for by nuisance plant species (all vegetative strata combined).
- Transects: Quantitative plant data collected from either: (1) permanent transects sampled using the point-centered quarter method with a minimum of 20 sampling points established along the course of each transect, or; (2) permanent belt transects approximately 50 feet wide. The methodology chosen for the initial monitoring report must be followed for all subsequent reports. The number of transects necessary as well as the location and length of each transect will vary depending on the mitigation site and will be determined once the specific mitigation features have been identified.

Data recorded from the sampling transects will include:

- average density of living planted canopy species present and the species composition;
 - average density of living planted midstory species present and the species composition;
 - average density of all native species in the canopy stratum along with the species composition and the wetland indicator status of each species;
 - average percent cover by all native species in the canopy stratum; average height of native species in the canopy stratum;
 - average density of native species in the midstory stratum, the total number of each species present, and the wetland indicator status of each species;
 - average percent cover by native species in the midstory stratum;
 - average height of native species in the midstory stratum;
 - if present, average percent cover accounted for by invasive species present in the canopy and midstory strata (combined).
- Quadrats: Quantitative data concerning plants in the understory (ground cover) stratum and concerning invasive and nuisance plant species will be gathered from sampling quadrats. These sampling quadrats will be established either along the axis of the belt transects discussed above, or at sampling points established along point-centered quarter transects discussed above, depending on which sampling method is used. Each sampling quadrat will be approximately 2 meters X 2 meters in size. The methodology chosen for the initial monitoring report must be followed for all subsequent reports. The number of quadrats necessary as well as the location and length of each quadrat will vary depending on the mitigation site and will be determined once the specific mitigation features for BLH have been identified.

Data recorded from the sampling quadrats will include:

- average percent cover by native subcanopy species;
- composition of native subcanopy species and the wetland indicator status of each species;

- average percent cover by invasive plant species;
 - average percent cover by nuisance plant species.
- N. A brief description of maintenance and/or management work performed since the previous monitoring report along with a discussion of any other significant occurrences would be included.
- O. A summary of water elevation data (NAVD88 or current) collected from a water level recorder in the same immediate hydrologic area of the mitigation site. As determined by the USACE and the IET, if a nearby Coastwide Reference Monitoring System [CRMS] station is available, its data may be used. If no CRMS station is available, a data logger must be installed immediately adjacent to the project. Water level data will be collected to provide average annual mean, high and low water levels as determined by the USACE and the IET. Once hydrology success criteria have been satisfied, water level monitoring will no longer be required. However, monitoring reports generated subsequent to the attainment of success criteria will include a general discussion of water levels and hydroperiod based on qualitative observations (e.g., wrack lines, water marks, etc.) and CRMS or other publicly available water level data in the same immediate hydrologic area.
- P. A brief description of maintenance and/or management work performed since the previous monitoring report along with a discussion of any other significant occurrences would be included.
- Q. In addition to the above items, the monitoring report prepared upon completion of the final mitigation construction activities and the monitoring report prepared for 3 years following completion of final mitigation construction activities would include a topographic survey of each restoration feature. These surveys would cover the same components as described for the topographic survey conducted for the baseline monitoring report. In addition to the surveys themselves, each of the two monitoring reports involving topographic surveys would include an analysis of the data as regards attainment of applicable topographic success criteria. If the second survey indicates topographic success criteria have not been achieved and supplemental topographic alterations are necessary, then another topographic survey may be required following completion of the supplemental alterations. This determination would be made by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team and NFS.
- R. Re-planting of certain areas within the mitigation site may be necessary to ensure attainment of applicable native vegetation success criteria. Any monitoring report submitted following completion of a re-planting event must include an inventory of the number of each species planted and the stock size used. It must also include a depiction of the areas re-planted, cross-referenced to a listing of the species and number of each species planted in each area.

Swamp Restoration-Highway 307

The general monitoring guidelines are currently under revision by the IRT and these project specific monitoring plan will be updated upon completion.

Baseline Monitoring Report

Shortly after completion of all initial mitigation activities (e.g. initial eradication of invasive and nuisance plants, first/initial planting of native species, completion of initial earthwork, grading, surface water management system alterations/construction, etc.), the mitigation site will be monitored and a baseline or monitoring report will be prepared. Monitoring and reporting requirements for the baseline report include the following items:

- A. A detailed discussion of all mitigation activities completed.
- B. A description of the various features and habitats within the mitigation site.
- C. A plan view drawing of the mitigation site showing the approximate boundaries of different mitigation features (ex. planted areas, areas only involving eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species; surface water management features, etc.), monitoring transect locations, sampling plot locations, photo station locations, and piezometer and staff gage locations. The proposed locations for the permanent monitoring transect locations, sampling plot locations, quadrats, photo station locations, and piezometer and staff gage locations will be identified once the final designs for the mitigation site are completed. The final locations will be determined and documented during the initial site visit and baseline monitoring report.
- D. If applicable, an as-built survey of finished grades for any relatively large areas subject to topographic alterations and an as-built survey of any surface water drainage features, drainage culverts, and/or water control structures constructed. Detailed surveys of topographic alterations simply involving the removal of existing linear features such as berms/spoil banks, or involving the filling of existing linear ditches or canals, will not be required. However, the as-built survey will include spot cross-sections of such features sufficient to represent typical conditions. The as-built survey must include a survey of areas where existing berms, spoil banks, or levees have been breached in sporadic locations.
- E. A detailed inventory of all canopy and midstory species planted, including the number of each species planted and the stock size planted. In addition, provide a breakdown itemization indicating the number of each species planted in a particular portion of the mitigation site and correlate this itemization to the various areas depicted on the plan view drawing of the mitigation site.
- F. Various qualitative observations will be made in the mitigation site to help assess the status and success of mitigation and maintenance activities. These observations will include: general estimates of the average percent cover by native plant species in the canopy, midstory, and ground cover strata; general estimate of the average percent

cover by invasive and nuisance plant species; general estimates concerning the growth of planted canopy and midstory species; general observations concerning the colonization by volunteer native plant species; general observations regarding the growth of non-planted native species in the canopy and midstory strata. General observations made during the course of monitoring will also address potential problem zones, general condition of native vegetation, trends in the composition of the plant communities, wildlife utilization as observed during monitoring, and other pertinent factors.

- G. Photographs documenting conditions in the mitigation site at the time of monitoring. Photos will be taken at permanent photo stations within the mitigation site. At least two photos will be taken at each station with the view of each photo always oriented in the same general direction from one monitoring event to the next. The number of photo stations required as well as the locations of these stations will vary depending on the final mitigation site design. The USACE will make this determination in coordination with the Interagency Team and will specify the requirements in an updated monitoring plan. Permanent photo stations will primarily be established in areas slated for planting of canopy and midstory species.
- H. A summary of rainfall data collected during the year preceding the monitoring report based on rainfall data recorded at a station located on or in close proximity to the mitigation site. Once all hydrology success criteria have been achieved, collection and reporting of rainfall data will no longer be required.
- I. A summary of water table elevation data collected from staff gages installed within the mitigation site. The number of gages required as well as the locations of these devices will vary depending on the final design of the mitigation site. The USACE will make this determination in coordination with the Interagency Team and will specify the requirements in an updated monitoring plan. Data (water table elevations) will be collected at least bi-weekly throughout the year. For mitigation areas involving swamp enhancement where hydrologic enhancement is not a component of the mitigation program, it may also be necessary to collect water table elevations on a daily basis over the course of 3 to 4 weeks in order to demonstrate that the water table is less than or equal to 12 inches below the soil surface for a period of at least 14 consecutive days during the growing season. Once it is demonstrated that all applicable hydrology success criteria have been satisfied, water table monitoring will no longer be required. However, monitoring reports generated subsequent to the attainment of success criteria will include a general discussion of water levels and hydroperiod based on qualitative observations.
- J. A summary assessment of all data and observations along with recommendations as to actions necessary to help meet mitigation and management/maintenance goals and mitigation success criteria.
- K. A brief description of anticipated maintenance/management work to be conducted during the period from the current monitoring report to the next monitoring report.

Additional Monitoring Reports

In addition to the items required in the baseline monitoring report all monitoring reports generated after the initial baseline report will typically provide the following information unless otherwise noted:

- L. Quantitative plant data collected from permanent monitoring plots measuring approximately 80 feet X 80 feet in size. The permanent monitoring plots will typically be located within mitigation areas where initial planting of canopy and midstory species is necessary. The number of plots required as well as the locations of these plots will vary depending on the final design of the mitigation site. The USACE will make this determination in coordination with the Interagency Team and will specify the requirements in an updated monitoring plan.

Data recorded in each plot will include:

- number of living planted canopy species present and the species composition;
- number of living planted midstory species present and the species composition;
- average density of all native species in the canopy stratum,
- the total number of each species present, and the wetland indicator status of each species;
- average percent cover by native species in the canopy stratum;
- average density of all native species in the midstory stratum, the total number of each species present, and the wetland indicator status of each species;
- average percent cover by native species in the midstory stratum;
- average percent cover accounted for by invasive plant species (all vegetative strata combined);
- average percent cover accounted for by nuisance plant species (all vegetative strata combined).

In addition to these data, the following information will be recorded for native tree species in the canopy stratum:

- the average diameter at breast height (DBH; expressed in inches) of baldcypress trees;
- average DBH of all other native tree species excluding baldcypress;
- the average total basal area of living native trees (expressed in square feet per acre).

The DBH of planted canopy species will not need to be documented until the average DBH of these trees reaches approximately 2 inches. Total basal area data will also not need to be documented until such time that the average total basal area is estimated to exceed approximately 100 square feet per acre.

M. Quantitative data concerning plants in the understory (ground cover) stratum and concerning invasive and nuisance plant species will be gathered from permanent sampling quadrats nested within the permanent monitoring plots described above. There will be a total of 4 quadrats with each quadrat measuring approximately 2 meters X 2 meters in size.

Data recorded from the sampling quadrats will include:

- average percent cover by native ground cover species;
- composition of native ground cover species and the wetland indicator status of each species;
- average percent cover by invasive plant species;
- average percent cover by nuisance plant species.

N. Quantitative plant data collected from either: (1) permanent transects sampled using the point-centered quarter method with a minimum of 20 sampling points established along the course of each transect, or; (2) permanent belt transects approximately 50 feet wide. The number of transects necessary as well as the location and length of each transect will vary depending on the final design of mitigation site. The USACE will make this determination in coordination with the Interagency Team and will specify the requirements in an updated monitoring plan. The methodology chosen for the initial monitoring report must be followed for all subsequent reports.

Data recorded from the sampling transects will include:

- average density of living planted canopy species present and the species composition;
- average density of living planted midstory species present and the species composition;
- average density of all native species in the canopy stratum along with the species composition and the wetland indicator status of each species;
- average percent cover by all native species in the canopy stratum;
- average density of native species in the midstory stratum, the total number of each species present, and the wetland indicator status of each species;
- average percent cover by native species in the midstory stratum; if present, average percent cover accounted for by invasive and nuisance species present in the canopy and midstory strata (combined).

In addition to these data, the following information will be recorded for native tree species in the canopy stratum:

- the average diameter at breast height (DBH; expressed in inches) of baldcypress trees;
- average DBH of all other native tree species excluding baldcypress;
- the average total basal area of living native trees (expressed in square feet per acre).

The DBH of planted canopy species will not need to be documented until the average DBH of these trees reaches approximately 2 inches. Total basal area data will also not need to be documented until such time that the average total basal area is estimated to exceed approximately 100 square feet per acre.

- O. Quantitative data concerning plants in the understory (ground cover) stratum and concerning invasive and nuisance plant species will be gathered from sampling quadrats. These sampling quadrats will be established either along the axis of the belt transects discussed above, or at sampling points established along point-centered quarter transects discussed above, depending on which sampling method is used. Each sampling quadrat will be approximately 2 meters X 2 meters in size. The total number of sampling quadrats needed along each sampling transect will be determined by the USACE with the Interagency Team and will specify be specified in an updated monitoring plan. The methodology chosen for the initial monitoring report must be followed for all subsequent reports.

Data recorded from the sampling quadrats will include:

- average percent cover by native ground cover species;
 - composition of native ground cover species and the wetland indicator status of each species;
 - average percent cover by invasive plant species;
 - average percent cover by nuisance plant species.
- P. In addition to the above items, the monitoring report prepared upon completion of the final mitigation construction activities and the monitoring report prepared for 3 years following completion of final mitigation construction activities would include a topographic survey of each restoration feature. These surveys would cover the same components as described for the topographic survey conducted for the baseline monitoring report. In addition to the surveys themselves, each of the two monitoring reports involving topographic surveys would include an analysis of the data as regards attainment of applicable topographic success criteria. If the second survey indicates topographic success criteria have not been achieved and supplemental topographic alterations are necessary, then another topographic survey may be required following completion of the supplemental alterations. This determination would be made by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team and NFS.
- Q. Re-planting of certain areas within the mitigation site may be necessary to ensure attainment of applicable native vegetation success criteria. Any monitoring report submitted following completion of a re-planting event must include an inventory of the number of each species planted and the stock size used. It must also include a depiction of the areas re-planted, cross-referenced to a listing of the species and number of each species planted in each area.

Monitoring Reports Involving Timber Management Activities

In cases where timber management activities (thinning of trees and/or shrubs in the canopy and/or midstory strata) have been approved by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team, monitoring would be required in the year immediately preceding and in the year following completion of the timber management activities (i.e. pre-timber management and post-timber management reports). These reports must include data and information that are in addition to the typical monitoring requirements. The NFS's proposed Timber Stand Improvement/Timber Management Plan must include the proposed monitoring data and information that would be included in the pre-timber management and post-timber management monitoring reports. The proposed monitoring plan must be approved by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team prior to the monitoring events and implementation of the timber management activities.

Monitoring Reports Following Re-Planting Activities

Re-planting of certain areas within the mitigation site may be necessary to ensure attainment of applicable native vegetation success criteria. Any monitoring report submitted following completion of a re-planting event must include an inventory of the number of each species planted and the stock size used. It must also include a depiction of the areas re-planted, cross-referenced to a listing of the species and number of each species planted in each area.

MONITORING SCHEDULE, RESPONSIBILITIES AND COSTS

Bottomland Hardwood Forest Enhancement- Highway 307

Monitoring for BLH will typically take place in late summer of the year of monitoring, but may be delayed until later in the growing season due to site conditions or other unforeseen circumstances. Monitoring reports will be submitted by December 31 of each year of monitoring. Monitoring reports will be provided to the USACE, the NFS, and the agencies comprising the Interagency Team. See Table 3 for a schedule of the currently proposed monitoring events. The timing of these events may be modified or shifted once the final project design and construction schedule have been identified.

The USACE will be responsible for conducting the monitoring events and preparing the associated monitoring reports until such time that the following mitigation success criteria are achieved (criteria follow numbering system used in success criteria section):

1. General Construction – 1.A
2. Native Vegetation – 2.A and 2.B.
3. Invasive & Nuisance Vegetation – 3A, plus 3B until such time as monitoring responsibilities are transferred to the NFS.
4. Topography – 4A

Monitoring events associated with the above will include the first or baseline monitoring event plus annual monitoring events thereafter until the monitoring responsibilities are transferred to the NFS. The NFS will be responsible for conducting the required monitoring events and

preparing the associated monitoring reports after the USACE has demonstrated the mitigation success criteria listed above have been achieved. The overall responsibility for management, maintenance, and monitoring of the mitigation will typically be transferred to the Sponsor during the first quarter of the year immediately following submittal of the monitoring report that demonstrates attainment of said criteria, subject to the provisions identified in the Introduction section.

Once monitoring responsibilities have been transferred to the NFS, the next monitoring event will typically take place during the year that attainment of success criterion 2.C (native vegetation criterion applicable 4 years after completion of initial plantings) must be demonstrated. Thereafter, monitoring will typically be conducted every 5 years throughout the 50-year period of analysis. See 3 for the currently proposed monitoring events. The timing of these events may be shifted once the final project design and construction schedule have been identified.

If the initial survival criteria for planted canopy and midstory species are not achieved (i.e. the 1-year survival criteria specified in native vegetation success criteria 2.B), a monitoring report will be required for each consecutive year until two annual sequential reports indicate that all survival criteria have been satisfied (i.e. that corrective actions were successful). The USACE will be responsible for conducting this additional monitoring and preparing the monitoring reports. The USACE will also be responsible for the purchase and installation of supplemental plants needed to attain this success criterion, subject to the provisions mentioned in the Introduction section.

If the native vegetation success criteria specified for 4 years following completion of initial plantings are not achieved (i.e. native vegetation success criteria 2.C), a monitoring report will be required for each consecutive year until two annual sequential reports indicate that these criteria have been satisfied. The NFS will be responsible for conducting this additional monitoring and preparing the monitoring reports. The NFS will also be responsible for the purchase and installation of supplemental plants needed to attain these success criteria.

Once monitoring responsibilities have transferred to the NFS, the NFS will retain the ability to modify the monitoring plan and the monitoring schedule should this become necessary due to unforeseen events or to improve the information provided through monitoring. Twenty years following completion of initial plantings, the number of monitoring plots and/or monitoring transects that must be sampled during monitoring events may be reduced substantially if it is clear that mitigation success is proceeding as anticipated. Any significant modifications to the monitoring plan or the monitoring schedule must first be approved by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team.

Table 3 provides a cost estimate based on the currently available information and may need to be revised in the future as additional information regarding the mitigation feature designs and construction schedule become available.

Table 3. Mitigation Monitoring Report Schedule and Costs for BLH at the Highway 307 Mitigation Site

Target			Estimated
Year	Work Item	Work Item Description	Cost

0	Begin Construction	Start of mitigation construction activities	
1	Complete Construction	Finish clearing, grubbing, grading (excavation; ditch & berm removal), drainage alterations, etc.	
	Topographic/As-Built Survey	Perform as-built topographic survey of areas in enhancement features requiring significant grading. Includes survey of any structures installed plus cross-sections of significant ditches or berms removed, and for any new drainage features. Results documented in mitigation monitoring report.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Initial eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
2	Initial Plantings*	Install canopy and midstory species	
	Nutria Guards	Install nutria guards for all initial plantings.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	
3	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Analysis for Notice of Construction Complete	Review As-Built and O&M manual. Review monitoring report from prior year and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
	NCC	Transfer (turn-over) project to the Non-Federal Sponsor. The USACE will continue to monitor and conduct activities necessary to ensure initial success criteria are met	
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	
4	Additional Plantings*	Re-plant restoration features where plant survival success criteria not achieved	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Monitoring & Report*	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31. This monitoring required only if area had to be replanted in TY4 per success criteria requirements.	
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report from prior year and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
5	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31. Report also accomplished added monitoring needed due to re-planting.	
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report from prior year and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
6	Analysis for Success Criteria	Review monitoring report from prior year and other data to make initial success criteria determination and to turn over monitoring to Non-Federal Sponsor.	

		Transfer (turn-over) project monitoring to Non-Federal Sponsor. Note: transfer occurs this year unless additional plantings needed in TY5 or canopy/midstory densities not achieved in TY5 per success criteria.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
7	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 35,118
	Analysis for satisfaction of initial success criteria	Review monitoring report from TY7 and other data as compared to success criteria. Make determination to completely turn over project to Non-Federal Sponsor.	\$ 5,000
10	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Transfer to NFS	Transfer (turn-over) project to Non-Federal Sponsor (Feb. thru April?) for all OMRR&R. Note: transfer occurs early this year unless topographic corrections and/or marsh planting required.	
12	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 24,050
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report from TY12 and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
17	Aerial Photography	Obtain rectified aerial photo of restoration features. Provide as part of mitigation monitoring report.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 35,118
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
22	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 24,050
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
27	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 24,050
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
32	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$24,050
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
37	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400

	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$27,830
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
42	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$24,050
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
47	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 24,050
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
52	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 27,400
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 24,050
	Review and Coordination	Review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
		TOTAL	\$1,467,952
		TOTAL + 15% Contingency	\$1,688,144
NOTES:			
<p>*The costs for topographic/as-built surveys needed for monitoring are NOT included in the cost for the "monitoring and report" events.</p> <p>*Cost for initial plantings should already be in Engineering's cost estimate; thus not repeated herein.</p> <p>*Assume mitigation features will require 1 re-planting event to meet vegetation success criteria. For cost, assume that 20% of the total quantity of plants used in the initial planting will be the quantity needed for re-planting.</p> <p>*The contract to obtain plants for initial planting will need to be issued at least 13 to 14 months prior to the date that plants will be installed since the plants must be 1 year old at the time of installation (must start growing the plants at the nursery).</p> <p>*Cost estimates are based on the required monitoring to determine performance is met on 137 acres of BLH wet habitat.</p>			

Swamp Restoration-Highway 307

Monitoring for swamp will typically take place in late summer of the year of monitoring, but may be delayed until later in the growing season due to site conditions or other unforeseen circumstances. Monitoring reports will be submitted by December 31 of each year of monitoring. Monitoring reports will be provided to the USACE, the NFS, and the agencies comprising the Interagency Team. The various monitoring and reporting responsibilities addressed in this section are all subject to the provisions set forth in the Introduction section. See Table 4 for a schedule of the currently proposed monitoring events. The timing of these events may be modified or shifted once the final project design and construction schedule have been identified.

The USACE will be responsible for conducting the monitoring events and preparing the associated monitoring reports until such time that the following mitigation success criteria are achieved (criteria follow numbering system used in success criteria section):

1. General Construction – 1.A
2. Native Vegetation – A and B.
3. Invasive & Nuisance Vegetation – A, plus B until such time as monitoring responsibilities are transferred to the NFS.
4. Topography – 4.A.

Monitoring events associated with the above will include the “time zero” (first or baseline) monitoring event plus annual monitoring events thereafter until the mitigation monitoring responsibility is transferred to the NFS. The NFS will be responsible for conducting the required monitoring events and preparing the associated monitoring reports after the USACE has demonstrated the mitigation success criteria listed above have been achieved. The overall responsibility for management, maintenance, and monitoring of the mitigation will typically be transferred to the NFS during the first quarter of the year immediately following submittal of the monitoring report that demonstrates attainment of said criteria.

Once monitoring responsibilities have been transferred to the NFS, the next monitoring event will take place during the year that attainment of success criterion 2.C (native vegetation criterion applicable 4 years after completion of initial plantings) must be demonstrated. Thereafter, monitoring will typically be conducted every 5 years throughout the 50-year period of analysis. See Table 4 for a schedule of the currently proposed monitoring events. The timing of these events may be modified or shifted once the final project design and construction schedule have been identified.

If the initial survival criteria for planted canopy and midstory species are not achieved (i.e. the 1-year survival criteria specified in native vegetation success criterion 2.B), a monitoring report will be required for each consecutive year until two annual sequential reports indicate that all survival criteria have been satisfied (i.e. that corrective actions were successful). The USACE will be responsible for conducting this additional monitoring and preparing the monitoring reports. The USACE will also be responsible for the purchase and installation of supplemental plants needed to attain this success criterion.

If the native vegetation success criteria specified for 4 years following completion of initial plantings are not achieved (i.e. native vegetation success criterion 2.C), a monitoring report will be required for each consecutive year until two annual sequential reports indicate that these criteria have been satisfied. The NFS will be responsible for conducting this additional monitoring and preparing the monitoring reports. The NFS will also be responsible for the purchase and installation of supplemental plants needed to attain this success criterion.

If timber management activities conducted in the mitigation features by the NFS, the NFS will be responsible for conducting the additional monitoring and preparing the associated monitoring reports necessary for such activities (e.g. one monitoring event and report in the year immediately preceding timber management activities and one monitoring event and report in the year that timber management activities are completed).

Once monitoring responsibilities have transferred to the NFS, the NFS will retain the ability to modify the monitoring plan and the monitoring schedule should this become necessary due to unforeseen events or to improve the information provided through monitoring. Twenty years following completion of initial plantings, the number of monitoring plots and/or monitoring transects that must be sampled during monitoring events may be reduced substantially if it is clear that mitigation success is proceeding as anticipated. Any significant modifications to the monitoring plan or the monitoring schedule must first be approved by the USACE in coordination with the Interagency Team.

Table 4 also provides a cost estimate based on the currently available information and may need to be revised in the future as additional information regarding mitigation feature designs and the construction schedule becomes available. Additional cost savings may be found when combining the monitoring of BLH-Wet and Swamp at the Highway 307 site.

Table 4. - Mitigation Monitoring Report Schedule and Costs for Swamp Restoration at the Highway 307 Site

Target Year	Work Item	Work Item Description	Estimated Cost
0	Begin Construction	Start of mitigation construction activities.	
1	Complete Construction	Finish clearing, grubbing, grading (excavation; ditch & berm removal), drainage alterations, etc.	
	Topographic/As-Built Survey	Perform as-built topographic survey of areas in enhancement. Includes survey of any structures installed plus cross-sections of significant ditches or berms removed, and for any new drainage features. Results documented in mitigation monitoring report.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Initial eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
2	Initial Plantings*	Install canopy and midstory species	
	Nutria Guards	Install nutria guards for all initial plantings.	

	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
3	Topographic/As-Built Survey	Perform topographic survey. Includes survey of any structures installed plus cross-sections of significant ditches or berms removed, and for any new drainage features. Results documented in mitigation monitoring report.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	
	Analysis for Notice of Construction Complete	Review As-Built and O&M manual. Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report from prior year and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
	NCC	Transfer (turn-over) project to the Non-Federal Sponsor. The USACE will continue to monitor and conduct activities necessary to ensure initial success criteria are met.	
4	Additional Plantings*	Re-plant restoration features where plant survival success criteria not achieved (Feb. thru mid-March).	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Monitoring & Report*	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31. This monitoring required only if area had to be replanted in TY4 per success criteria requirements.	
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report from prior year and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
5	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31. Report also accomplished added monitoring needed due to re-planting.	

	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report from prior year and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	
6	Analysis for Success Criteria	Review monitoring report from prior year and other data to make initial success criteria determination and to turn over monitoring to Non-Federal Sponsor.	
		Transfer (turn-over) project to Non-Federal Sponsor. Note: transfer occurs this year unless additional plantings needed in TY5 or canopy/midstory densities not achieved in TY5 per success criteria.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
7	Aerial Photography	Obtain rectified aerial photo of restoration features if available. Provide as part of mitigation monitoring report.	
	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Analysis for satisfaction of initial success criteria.	Review monitoring report from prior year and other data to make determination to completely turn over project to Non-Federal Sponsor. Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
	Transfer to NFS	Transfer (turn-over) project to Non-Federal Sponsor for all OMRR&R. Note: transfer occurs early this year unless topographic corrections and/or plantings required.	
10	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
12	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
17	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
22	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982

	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
27	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
32	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
37	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
42	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
47	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report from prior year and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
52	Invasive/Nuisance Plant Eradication	Follow-up eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species in enhancement features. Ground application.	\$ 59,600
	Monitoring & Report	Perform field mitigation monitoring. Submit report by Dec. 31.	\$ 40,982
	Review and Coordination	Review ongoing activities, review monitoring report and other data as compared to success criteria. Coordination with Interagency Team as needed.	\$ 5,000
		TOTAL	\$ 2,686,098
		TOTAL + 15%	\$ 3,089,013
NOTES			

*The costs for topographic/as-built surveys needed for monitoring may not all be included in the cost for the "monitoring and report" events and may be covered by some engineering costs.

*Cost for initial plantings should already be in Engineering's cost estimate; thus not repeated herein.

*Assume mitigation features will require 1 re-planting event to meet vegetation success criteria. For cost, assume that 20% of the total quantity of plants used in the initial planting will be the quantity needed for re-planting.

*The contract to obtain plants for initial planting will need to be issued at least 13 to 14 months prior to the date that plants will be installed since the plants must be 1 year old at the time of installation (must start growing the plants at the nursery).

DRAFT

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (SEA #572)

ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

FLOOD SIDE BOTTOM LAND HARDWOOD FORESTS AND SWAMP

1.0. Introduction

This Adaptive Management (AM) Plan is for Highway 307 mitigation sites included in SEA #572 which are designed to mitigate for bottomland hardwood and swamps impacts. The mitigation features are fully described in SEA #572. The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007, Section 2036(a) and U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) implementation guidance for Section 2036(a) (CECW-PC Memorandum dated August 31, 2009:

“Implementation Guidance for Section 2036 (a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA 2007) – Mitigation for Fish and Wildlife and Wetland Losses”) require adaptive management be included in all mitigation plans for fish and wildlife habitat and wetland losses.

It should be noted that even though the proposed mitigation actions under SEA #572 include the potential purchase of credits from a mitigation bank this appendix only details the Adaptive Management planning for Highway 307. In the event that mitigation bank credits are purchased the mitigation management and maintenance activities for the mitigation bank credits will be set forth in the Mitigation Banking Instrument (MBI) for each particular bank. The bank sponsor (bank permittee) will be responsible for these activities rather than the USACE and/or the local Sponsor. USACE Regulatory staff reviews mitigation bank monitoring reports and conducts periodic inspections of mitigation banks to ensure compliance with mitigation success criteria stated in the MBI.

2.0. Adaptive Management Planning

Initial adaptive management planning was conducted during the planning process for the SPIER 37a. Adaptive management planning elements included: 1) development of a Conceptual Ecological Model (CEM), 2) identification of key project uncertainties and associated risks, 3) evaluation of the mitigation projects as a candidate for adaptive management and 4) the identification of potential adaptive management actions (contingency plan) to better ensure the mitigation project meets identified success criteria. The adaptive management plan is a living document and will be refined as necessary as new mitigation project information becomes available.

2.1. Conceptual Ecological Model

A CEM was developed to identify the major stressors and drivers affecting the proposed mitigation projects under SEA #572 (see Table 1). The CEM does not attempt to explain all possible relationships of potential factors influencing the mitigation sites; rather, the CEM presents only those relationships and factors deemed most relevant to obtaining the required acres/average annual habitat units (AAHUs). Furthermore this CEM represents the current understanding of these factors and will be updated and modified, as necessary, as new information becomes available.

Table 1. Conceptual Ecological Model

Alternatives/Issues/Drivers	Flood Side BLH Highway 307	Flood Side Swamp Highway 307	Mitigation Banks
Freshwater Input	+/-	+/-	*
Salinity Impacts	-	-	*
Subsidence	-	-	*
Sea Level Rise	-	-	*
Runoff	-	-	*
Vegetative Invasive Species	-	-	*
Herbivory	-	-	*
Hydrology	+/-	+/-	*
Topography (elevation)	+/-	+/-	*

Key to Cell Codes:

- = Negative Impact/Decrease

+ = Positive Impact/Increase

+/- = Duration Dependent

*Issues and drivers assumed to be addressed by Mitigation Bank sponsors

2.2. Sources of Uncertainty and Associated Risks

A fundamental tenet underlying adaptive management is decision making and achieving desired project outcomes in the face of uncertainties. There are many uncertainties associated with restoration of the coastal systems. The project delivery team identified the following uncertainties during the planning process.

- A. Climate change, such as relative sea level rise, drought conditions, and variability of tropical storm frequency, intensity, and timing
- B. Subsidence and water level trends at the mitigation sites
- C. Uncertainty Relative to Achieving Ecological Success:
 - i. Water, sediment, and nutrient requirements for BLH and Swamp
 - ii. Magnitude and duration of wet/dry cycles for BLH and Swamp
 - iii. Nutrients required for desired productivity for BLH and Swamp
 - iv. Growth curves based on hydroperiod and nutrient application for BLH and Swamp
 - v. Tree litter production based on nutrient and water levels for BLH and Swamp

- vi. Tree propagation in relation to management/regulation of hydroperiod for BLH and Swamp
- D. Loss rate of vegetative plantings due to herbivory
- E. Long-Term Sustainability of Project Benefits

2.3. Adaptive Management Evaluation

The project sites were evaluated and planned to develop a project with minimal risk and uncertainty. The items listed below were incorporated into the mitigation project implementation plan and Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) plans to minimize project risks.

- Specified success criteria (i.e., mitigation targets)
- Detailed planting guidelines for BLH and Swamp
- Invasive species control
- Supplementary plantings as necessary (contingency)
- Corrective actions to meet topographic and hydrologic success as required (contingency)

Subsequently, as part of the adaptive management planning effort the mitigation project features were re-evaluated against the CEM and sources of uncertainty and risk were identified to determine if there was any need for additional actions and costs under the adaptive management plan to ensure that the project meets the required success criteria. Based on the uncertainties and risks associated with the project implementation the following contingency actions have been identified to be implemented if needed to ensure the required AAHUs are met.

Potential Action #1. Additional vegetative plantings as needed to meet identified success criteria.

Uncertainties addressed: A,B,C,D, E

Potential Action #2. Additional earthwork at mitigation sites (by adding sediment or degrading) to obtain elevations necessary for BLH and Swamp vegetative establishment and maintenance.

Uncertainties addressed: A,B,C,E

Potential Action #3. Invasive species control to ensure survival of native species and meet required success criteria.

Uncertainties addressed: E

Potential Action #4. Potential need to adjust the gapping in the water retention dikes at the Highway 307 site in the future to maintain swamp hydrology and connectivity.

Uncertainties addressed: A,B,C,E

Actions 1, 3 & 4 are not recommended as separate adaptive management actions since they are already built into the mitigation plan and success criteria identified. In the event that monitoring reveals the project does not meet the identified vegetation, or hydrologic success criteria, additional plantings or construction activities are already accounted for and would be conducted under the mitigation project. Specific measures to implement Action 2, if determined necessary to achieve project benefits, would be coordinated with the NFS and other agencies to determine the appropriate course of action. If it is determined that the project benefits are significantly compromised because of improper elevation, additional fill material may need to be pumped into or removed from the project area. Due to the impact the addition of fill to the mitigation projects once they have been planted would incur, lifts to the projects are not currently considered as a viable remedial action. Instead, increasing the size of the existing mitigation project or mitigating the outstanding balance of the mitigation requirement elsewhere or through the purchase of mitigation bank/ILF credits would be options that could be considered through additional coordination with the NFS and the IET. However, such options would have to undergo further analysis in a supplemental NEPA document.

Actions 2 and 4 are potentially very costly actions. Before implementing such an action, the Corps would coordinate with the NFS and other agencies to determine if other actions, such as purchasing of credits in a mitigation bank or building additional mitigation elsewhere, would be more cost-effective options to fulfill any shortfalls in the overall project success. The USACE would be responsible for performing any necessary corrective actions, but the overall cost would be shared with the NFS according to the project cost-share agreement.

The USACE would be responsible for the proposed mitigation construction and monitoring until the initial success criteria are met. Initial construction and monitoring would be funded in accordance with all applicable cost-share agreements with the NFS. The USACE would monitor (on a cost-shared basis) the completed mitigation to determine whether additional construction, invasive/nuisance plant species control, and/or plantings are necessary to achieve initial mitigation success criteria. Once the USACE determines that the mitigation has met the initial success criteria, monitoring would be performed by the NFS as part of its OMRR&R obligations. If after meeting initial success criteria, the mitigation fails to meet its intermediate and/or long-term ecological success criteria, the USACE would consult with other agencies and the NFS to determine the appropriate management or remedial actions required to achieve ecological success. The USACE would retain the final decision on whether or not the project's required mitigation benefits are being achieved and whether or not remedial actions are required. If structural changes are deemed necessary to achieve ecological success, the USACE would implement appropriate adaptive management measures in accordance with the contingency plan and subject to cost-sharing requirements, availability of funding, and current budgetary and other guidance.

APPENDIX F
WVA ASSUMPTIONS AND RESULTS

Date: 12 June 2019

Prepared by: USFWS, Lafayette Field Office and USACE, New Orleans District

File location: F:\Digital_Records\Fed_Projects\NOD\HSDRRS New Orleans\IERs\IER 37 WBV Mitigation\EA 572\HWY 307 or Bayou Boeuf\BLH

Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH WVA

Notes: The Service used LiDAR data from 2002 and water elevations to determine blh and swamp areas based on existing conditions. However, the natural elevations of the site preclude the Corps from obtaining sufficient swamp mitigation credits from the site. Thus the Corps intends to recontour and/or remove soil to obtain sufficiently low enough elevations that swamp species and their hydrology could be established and persist. Currently the site has elevations high enough to restore 354.3 acres of blh and 169.9 acres of swamp. However, the WVAs were run based on the recontouring of elevations to support a total of 257 acres of swamp and restoration of 116 acres of BLH.

Water level gauges used in determining swamp elevations were the two closest CRMS site (See Water Level Analysis at end of this document). Field observations and aerial photographs of the site and surrounding lands were also used. Areas greater than 2.5 feet in elevation were believed to be sufficiently high enough in elevation to support bottomland hardwood species for the 50 year period-of-analysis. Elevations lower than that should be suitable for swamp species.

The Service used satellite imagery to determine boundaries of the mitigation area; the Corps also provided a perimeter boundary. Most of the boundaries lines fell within close proximity of each other. A buffer around Highway 307 was also used; when visible the distal side of the drainage ditch was used as the buffer to avoid encroaching into the highway right-of-way. The above represents potential sources of differences in acreage calculations for the entire site.

NET CHANGE IN AAHUs DUE TO PROJECT	
A. Future Without Project AAHUs =	0.00
B. Future With Project AAHUs =	72.11
Net Change (FWP - FWOP) =	72.11

72.11 AAHUS/116 acres = 0.62 Mitigation Potential

FUTURE WITHOUT PROJECT

For the FWOP it was assumed that the area would remain in some form of agricultural production for the period-of-analysis, therefore, all variables remained constant and the area was determined to not provide any bottomland hardwood habitat values.

FUTURE WITH PROJECT

V1 – Species Association

The site would be replanted with species suited to the site and anticipated flooding regime. A minimum of 60% of the trees planted would be hardmast. It was not anticipated that hydrology would be restored till TY 2 thus ensuring initial success criteria is met. See LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for detailed explanation of remaining values. This guidance was developed via an interagency team.

V2 – Maturity

The site would be planted with 1 year old seedlings; see LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for additional explanation of values.

V3 – Understory/Midstory %

Assumptions developed in the LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) were used for this variable.

V4 – Hydrology

LiDAR elevations were compared to CRMS gauge data to determined frequency of flooding. . See LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for explanation of values.

V5 – Contiguous Forest Size

2017 DOQQ photographs were used to determine contiguous forest size.

V6 - Surrounding Land

Arc GIS was used to create a 0.5 mile buffer around the perimeter of the mitigation area over a 2017 DOQQ satellite photograph. Most of the surrounding area is forested wetlands with some development, highways and a railway in the southern portion. While some development could occur in the southern portion along US Highway 90 during the period-of-analysis, the area is anticipated to remain largely undeveloped thus the overall percentages would remain relatively unchanged.


Surrounding Land Use	Values %
----------------------	----------

Forest / marsh	86
Abandoned Ag	0
Pasture / Hay	0
Active Ag	6
Development	8

V7 – Disturbance

FWOP & FWP: 2017 DOQQ photographs were used to determine the disturbance. While intersected by a highway the area has relatively few high disturbance areas (see above table).

Water Level Analysis



CRMS data from stations 0192 and 0268 were used to help verify elevations. Station 0192 is located approximately 4 miles north east of the project area while station 0268 is located approximately 2 miles due west of the northern most terminus. Gauge data from 0192 and 0268 indicated that the 90 percentile readings over the last years reached or exceeded 2 feet, 4 times with the in the last 11 years (highest being 2.11) and 5 times in the last 10 years (highest being 2.35), respectively (see first two tables below). A more detail analyses of gauge 0268 was done and it showed that the maximum stage reached was 3.5 feet while stages for the 95, 90, 80 and 75, percentile were 2.2, 2, 1.79, and 1.7, respectively; note that the data range for this analysis was from August 2006 to January 2015.

Examination of data from gauge 0206 located approximately 5 miles northwest of the northern terminus revealed that the maximum stage reached was 3.2 feet while stages for the 95, 90, 80 and 75, percentile were 2, 1.92, 1.7, and 1.61, respectively; note that the data range for this analysis was from March 2010 to January 2015. The lower stages are probably a result of its location farther from the connected main drainage open water bodies to the east.

Station_Id	Tide_Amp (ft NAVD88)	water_year	90th%Upper _water_level (ft NAVD88)	10%thLower _water_level (ft NAVD88)	avg_water _level (ft NAVD88)	avg_flood ing (ft)	90%thUpper _flooding (ft)	10%thLower _flooding (ft)	GEOID
CRMS0192-M01	0.0008513	2008	2.05	1.25	1.64	0.16	0.44	-0.07	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0016507	2009	1.89	1.07	1.42	0.04	0.4	-0.23	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.004475	2010	2.07	1.21	1.7	0.25	0.65	-0.2	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0406275	2011	1.85	0.5	1.28	-0.03	0.23	-0.38	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0375502	2012	2.19	0.91	1.56	0.24	0.64	-0.08	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0335834	2013	2.11	0.94	1.56	0.28	0.52	0.09	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0395495	2014	1.16	-0.1	0.54	0	0.39	-0.33	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0331677	2015	1.19	-0.09	0.52	0.1	0.488	-0.212	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0270969	2016	1.64	0.49	1.07	0.49	0.884	0.067	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0264072	2017	1.44	0.25	0.92	0.36	0.626	0.129	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0381963	2018	1.33	-0.08	0.61	0	0.432	-0.407	GEOID12A

Station_Id	Tide_Amp (ft NAVD88)	water_year	90th%Upper_ water_level (ft NAVD88)	10%thLower_ water_level (ft NAVD88)	avg_water _level (ft NAVD88)	avg_flooding (ft)	90%thUpper_ flooding (ft)	10%thLower_flood ing (ft)	GEOID
CRMS0268-M01	0.006033784	2007	1.82	0.71	1.28	-0.64	-0.22	-1.01	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.00712179	2008	2	0.88	1.45	-0.53	-0.02	-0.95	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.01046393	2009	2.01	0.6	1.28	-0.77	-0.16	-1.18	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.005994151	2010	2.35	1.08	1.7	-0.13	0.73	-0.73	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.01197277	2011	1.68	0.41	1.14	-0.18	0.24	-0.64	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.008874149	2012	2.3	0.82	1.5	0.24	0.97	-0.3	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.008729368	2013	2.06	0.91	1.53	0.2	0.65	-0.25	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.01159636	2014	1.19	0	0.6	-0.01	0.45	-0.44	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.0116523	2015	1.18	-0.04	0.54	-0.07	0.54	-0.44	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.006942967	2016	1.78	0.56	1.23	0.29	0.951	-0.123	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.006600255	2017	1.65	0.34	1.03	0.04	0.337	-0.205	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.01568561	2018	1.43	0.1	0.7	-0.13	0.147	-0.406	GEOID12A

Analysis of Gauge 0268

	Feet	Meters
Average	1.389208396	0.423431
Max	3.58292	1.092074
Min	-0.205833	-0.06274
STD	0.52255133	0.159274
" + 1 STD	1.911759726	0.582704
" - 1 STD	0.866657066	0.264157
1st quartile (25%)	1.05458	0.321436
2nd (50%)	1.38208	0.421258
3rd (75%)	1.703125	0.519113
60 percentile	1.508916	0.459918
65 percentile	1.604293	0.488989
70 percentile	1.63692	0.498933
80 percentile	1.791998	0.546201
85 percentile	1.904622	0.580529
90 percentile	2.016834	0.614731
95 percentile	2.21133	0.674013
99 percentile	2.8477862	0.868005
# of readings	3085	
08_2006 to 01_2015	data period	
" + 2 STD	2.434311057	0.741978
" + 3 STD	2.956862387	0.901252

Analysis of Gauge 2060

	Feet	Meters
Average	1.25630209	0.382920877
Max	3.27708	0.998853984
Min	-0.461667	-0.140716102
STD	0.542878846	0.165469472
" + 1 STD	1.799180936	0.548390349
" - 1 STD	0.713423244	0.217451405
1st quartile (25%)	0.89	0.271272
2nd (50%)	1.27375	0.388239
3rd (75%)	1.61292	0.491618016
60 percentile	1.41667	0.431801016
65 percentile	1.47667	0.450089016
70 percentile	1.54083	0.469644984
80 percentile	1.70792	0.520574016
85 percentile	1.813335	0.552704508
90 percentile	1.92	0.585216
95 percentile	2.08875	0.636651
99 percentile	2.497751	0.761314505
# of readings	1769	
March 2010 - Jan 2015	data range	
" + 2 STD	2.342059782	0.713859822
" + 3 STD	2.884938628	0.879329294

Date: 12 June 2019

Prepared by: USFWS, Lafayette Field Office and USACE, New Orleans District

File location: F:\Digital_Records\Fed_Projects\NOD\HSDRRS New Orleans\IERs\IER 37 WBV Mitigation\EA 572\HWY 307 or Bayou Boeuf\Swamp

Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf Swamp WVA

Notes: The Service used LiDAR data from 2002 and water elevations to determine blh and swamp areas based on existing conditions. However, the natural elevations of the site preclude the Corps from obtaining sufficient swamp mitigation credits from the site. Thus the Corps intends to recontour and/or remove soil to obtain sufficiently low enough elevations that swamp species and their hydrology could be established and persist. Currently the site has elevations high enough to restore 354.3 acres of blh and 169.9 acres of swamp. However, the WVAs were run based on the recontouring of elevations to support a total of 257 acres of swamp and restoration of 116 acres of BLH.

Water level gauges used in determining swamp elevations were the two closest CRMS site (See Water Level Analysis at end of this document). Field observations and aerial photographs of the site and surrounding lands were also used. Areas greater than 2.5 feet in elevation were believed to be sufficiently high enough in elevation to support bottomland hardwood species for the 50 year period-of-analysis. Elevations lower than that should be suitable for swamp species.

The Service used satellite imagery to determine boundaries of the mitigation area; the Corps also provided a perimeter boundary. Most of the boundaries lines fell within close proximity of each other. A buffer around Highway 307 was also used; when visible the distal side of the drainage ditch was used as the buffer to avoid encroaching into the highway right-of-way. The above represents potential sources of differences in acreage calculations for the entire site.

NET CHANGE IN AAHUs DUE TO PROJECT	
A. Future With Project AAHUs =	134.71
B. Future Without Project AAHUs =	0.00
Net Change (FWP - FWOP) =	134.71

134.71 AAHUS/257 acres = 0.52 Mitigation Potential

FUTURE WITHOUT PROJECT

For the FWOP it was assumed that the area would remain in some form of agricultural production for the period-of-analysis, therefore, all variables remained constant and the area was determined to not provide any swamp habitat values.

FUTURE WITH PROJECT

V1 – Stand Structure


The site would be replanted with swamp species suited to the site and anticipated flooding regime. It was not anticipated that hydrology would be restored till TY 2 thus ensuring initial success criteria is met. See LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for detailed explanation of remaining values.

V2 – Stand Maturity

The site would be planted with 1 year old seedlings and were assumed to grow at a rate consistent with other measured swamp species rates; see LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for additional explanation of values.

V3 – Water Regime


LiDAR elevations were compared to CRMS gauge data to determined frequency of flooding. . See LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for explanation of values.




V4 – Mean High Salinity during the growing season


Mean salinity data from CRMS stations 0192, 0211, and 0268 were examined (see tables below and map in the water level analysis). That data indicated that the mean growing season salinity was 0.13, 0.17 and 0.11, respectively. Highest salinities during the growing season were all below 1 part per thousand (ppt) and the 0.11 values was used because this CRMS station was closest to the site. It was assumed that the operation of Davis Pond Diversion would help reduce any future increase in salinities over the period-of-analysis, but an increase to 0.3 was projected by TY 35 and by TY 50 a 0.5 was estimated. Assumptions followed information provided in the LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012).

Salinity



Salinity





V5 – Size of Contiguous Forest Size

2017 DOQQ photographs were used to determine contiguous forest size.

V6 - Surrounding Land Uses


Arc GIS was used to create a 0.5 mile buffer around the perimeter of the mitigation area over a 2017 DOQQ satellite photograph. Most of the surrounding area is forested wetlands with some development, highways and a railway in the southern portion. While some development could occur in the southern portion along US Highway 90 during the period-of-analysis, the area is anticipated to remain largely undeveloped thus the overall percentages would remain relatively unchanged.

Surrounding Land Use	Values %
Forest / marsh	86
Abandoned Ag	0
Pasture / Hay	0
Active Ag	6
Development	8

V7 – Disturbance

FWOP & FWP: 2017 DOQQ photographs were used to determine the disturbance. While intersected by a non-major highway the area has relatively few high disturbance areas (see above table).

Water Level Analysis



CRMS data from stations 0192 and 0268 were used to help verify elevations. Station 0192 is located approximately 4 miles north east of the project area while station 0268 is located approximately 2 miles due west of the northern most terminus. Gauge data from 0192 and 0268 indicated that the 90 percentile readings over the last years reached or exceeded 2 feet, 4 times with the in the last 11 years (highest being 2.11) and 5 times in the last 10 years (highest being 2.35), respectively (see first two tables below). A more detail analyses of gauge 0268 was done and it showed that the maximum stage reached was 3.5 feet while stages for the 95, 90, 80 and 75, percentile were 2.2, 2, 1.79, and 1.7, respectively; note that the data range for this analysis was from August 2006 to January 2015.

Examination of data from gauge 0206 located approximately 5 miles northwest of the northern terminus revealed that the maximum stage reached was 3.2 feet while stages for the 95, 90, 80 and 75, percentile were 2, 1.92, 1.7, and 1.61, respectively; note that the data range for this analysis was from March 2010 to January 2015. The lower stages are probably a result of its location farther from the connected main drainage open water bodies to the east.

Station_Id	Tide_Amp (ft NAVD88)	water_year	90th%Upper_water_level (ft NAVD88)	10%thLower_water_level (ft NAVD88)	avg_water_level (ft NAVD88)	avg_flooding (ft)	90%thUpper_flooding (ft)	10%thLower_flooding (ft)	GEOID
CRMS0192-M01	0.0008513	2008	2.05	1.25	1.64	0.16	0.44	-0.07	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0016507	2009	1.89	1.07	1.42	0.04	0.4	-0.23	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.004475	2010	2.07	1.21	1.7	0.25	0.65	-0.2	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0406275	2011	1.85	0.5	1.28	-0.03	0.23	-0.38	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0375502	2012	2.19	0.91	1.56	0.24	0.64	-0.08	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0335834	2013	2.11	0.94	1.56	0.28	0.52	0.09	GEOID99
CRMS0192-M01	0.0395495	2014	1.16	-0.1	0.54	0	0.39	-0.33	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0331677	2015	1.19	-0.09	0.52	0.1	0.488	-0.212	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0270969	2016	1.64	0.49	1.07	0.49	0.884	0.067	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0264072	2017	1.44	0.25	0.92	0.36	0.626	0.129	GEOID12A
CRMS0192-M01	0.0381963	2018	1.33	-0.08	0.61	0	0.432	-0.407	GEOID12A

Station_Id	Tide_Amp (ft NAVD88)	water_year	90th%Upper_water_level (ft NAVD88)	10%thLower_water_level (ft NAVD88)	avg_water_level (ft NAVD88)	avg_flooding (ft)	90%thUpper_flooding (ft)	10%thLower_flooding (ft)	GEOID
CRMS0268-M01	0.006033784	2007	1.82	0.71	1.28	-0.64	-0.22	-1.01	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.00712179	2008	2	0.88	1.45	-0.53	-0.02	-0.95	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.01046393	2009	2.01	0.6	1.28	-0.77	-0.16	-1.18	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.005994151	2010	2.35	1.08	1.7	-0.13	0.73	-0.73	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.01197277	2011	1.68	0.41	1.14	-0.18	0.24	-0.64	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.008874149	2012	2.3	0.82	1.5	0.24	0.97	-0.3	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.008729368	2013	2.06	0.91	1.53	0.2	0.65	-0.25	GEOID99
CRMS0268-M01	0.01159636	2014	1.19	0	0.6	-0.01	0.45	-0.44	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.0116523	2015	1.18	-0.04	0.54	-0.07	0.54	-0.44	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.006942967	2016	1.78	0.56	1.23	0.29	0.951	-0.123	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.006600255	2017	1.65	0.34	1.03	0.04	0.337	-0.205	GEOID12A
CRMS0268-M01	0.01568561	2018	1.43	0.1	0.7	-0.13	0.147	-0.406	GEOID12A

Analysis of Gauge 0268

	Feet	Meters
Average	1.389208396	0.423431
Max	3.58292	1.092074
Min	-0.205833	-0.06274
STD	0.52255133	0.159274
" + 1 STD	1.911759726	0.582704
" - 1 STD	0.866657066	0.264157
1st quartile (25%)	1.05458	0.321436
2nd (50%)	1.38208	0.421258
3rd (75%)	1.703125	0.519113
60 percentile	1.508916	0.459918
65 percentile	1.604293	0.488989
70 percentile	1.63692	0.498933
80 percentile	1.791998	0.546201
85 percentile	1.904622	0.580529
90 percentile	2.016834	0.614731
95 percentile	2.21133	0.674013
99 percentile	2.8477862	0.868005
# of readings	3085	
08_2006 to 01_2015	data period	
" + 2 STD	2.434311057	0.741978
" + 3 STD	2.956862387	0.901252

Analysis of Gauge 2060

	Feet	Meters
Average	1.25630209	0.382920877
Max	3.27708	0.998853984
Min	-0.461667	-0.140716102
STD	0.542878846	0.165469472
" + 1 STD	1.799180936	0.548390349
" - 1 STD	0.713423244	0.217451405
1st quartile (25%)	0.89	0.271272
2nd (50%)	1.27375	0.388239
3rd (75%)	1.61292	0.491618016
60 percentile	1.41667	0.431801016
65 percentile	1.47667	0.450089016
70 percentile	1.54083	0.469644984
80 percentile	1.70792	0.520574016
85 percentile	1.813335	0.552704508
90 percentile	1.92	0.585216
95 percentile	2.08875	0.636651
99 percentile	2.497751	0.761314505
# of readings	1769	
March 2010 - Jan 2015	data range	
" + 2 STD	2.342059782	0.713859822
" + 3 STD	2.884938628	0.879329294

Date: 9 July 2015

Prepared by: USFWS, Lafayette Field Office and USACE, New Orleans District

File location: G:\FWS Program Files\Corps Projects\New Orleans District\HSDRRS New Orleans\WBV_Mitigation\2015_Revised_HSDRRS_projects\

Hwy 307 Bayou Boeuf BLH

Notes: (1) The Service used LiDAR data (2013) and water elevations to determine blh and swamp areas. These elevations was used to separate the wet from dry blh and swamp. Water levels were examined to determine the correct classification. Gauges used in this determination were the closest CRMS site. Field observations and aerial photographs of the site and surrounding lands were also used.

Mitigation Potential: 0.61

V1 – Species Association

FWOP: Existing conditions from a site visit were used.

FWP: See LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for explanation of values.

V2 – Maturity

FWOP: Existing conditions from a site visit were used.

FWP: See LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for explanation of values.

.

V3 – Understory/Midstory %

FWOP: Existing conditions from a site visit were used.

FWP: See See LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE (Revised/Updated: 3 March 2012) for explanation of values.

V4 – Hydrology

FWOP: Flood duration was observed condition; leveed and pumped.

FWP: LiDAR elevations were compared to CRMS gauge data to determined frequency of flooding.

V5 – Contiguous Forest Size

FWOP & FWP: 2013 DOQQ photographs were used.

V6 - Surrounding Land

FWOP & FWP: 2013 DOQQ photographs were along with National Wetland Inventory data to

V7 – Disturbance

FWOP & FWP: 2013 DOQQ photographs were used

NET CHANGE IN AAHUs DUE TO PROJECT	
A. Future Without Project AAHUs =	0
B. Future With Project AAHUs =	62.3
Net Change (FWP - FWOP) =	-62.3
Project Acres	101.5

Gauge Data from CRMS station:

	Feet	Meters
Average	1.25630209	0.382920877
Max	3.27708	0.998853984
Min	-0.461667	-0.140716102
STD	0.542878846	0.165469472
" + 1 STD	1.799180936	0.548390349
" - 1 STD	0.713423244	0.217451405
1st quartile (25%)	0.89	0.271272
2nd (50%)	1.27375	0.388239
3rd (75%)	1.61292	0.491618016
60 percentile	1.41667	0.431801016
65 percentile	1.47667	0.450089016
70 percentile	1.54083	0.469644984
80 percentile	1.70792	0.520574016
85 percentile	1.813335	0.552704508
90 percentile	1.92	0.585216
95 percentile	2.08875	0.636651
99 percentile	2.497751	0.761314505
# of readings 2006 to 2014	1769	

LPV & WBV HSDRRS MITIGATION: WETLAND VALUE ASSESSMENT (WVA) MODEL ASSUMPTIONS AND RELATED GUIDANCE

PREFACE

CEMVN works closely with the resource agencies on the Interagency Environmental Team (IET) to accurately assess the habitat impacts resulting from HSDRRS construction and the anticipated benefits to be expected from construction of the mitigation projects. In cooperation with CEMVN, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service) performs these habitat assessments. To quantify anticipated project impacts to fish and wildlife resources and benefits resulting from the proposed mitigation, the Service uses the WVA model approved by HQ USACE.

The WVA model quantifies the net change (improvement or destruction) in habitat by assessing a series of variables based on current and anticipated future site conditions. Habitat units fluctuate in response to changes in habitat quality, represented by the Habitat Suitability Index (HSI), and/or quantity (acres); those changes are predicted for various target years over the project life (i.e., 50 years), for future without-project and future with-project scenarios. Target years (TY) were selected for this analysis to capture the effects of important biological events. Values for model variables were obtained from site visits to the area, previous wetland assessments in similar habitats, communication with personnel knowledgeable about the study area and similar habitats, and review of aerial photographs and reports documenting fish and wildlife habitat conditions in the study area and similar habitats. In some instances where existing information regarding a particular variable is not available, the Service uses its professional judgment and experience to assess the expected conditions. For all the habitat assessments, the products of the resulting HSI values and acreage estimates are then summed and annualized for each habitat type to determine the AAHUs available. The net change (increase or decrease) in AAHUs under future with-project conditions, compared to future without-project conditions, provides a quantitative comparison of anticipated project impact/benefits in AAHUs. By dividing the AAHU by the proposed mitigation project acreage a mitigation potential per acre is determined. Impact assessments and mitigation benefit assessments considered sea-level rise, subsidence, accretion, and historic marsh loss trends and were coordinated with other State and Federal agencies.

Several of the assumptions set forth in this document are based on mitigation implementation schedules. Many sections include specified WVA model target years (TYs) and calendar years applicable to assumptions, and a few sections outline anticipated mitigation construction (i.e. mitigation implementation) schedules. It is critical for the WVA analyst to understand that this document has not been revised to account for changes to the mitigation implementation/construction schedules. It is therefore imperative for the analyst to obtain the most recent mitigation implementation/construction schedule for a particular mitigation project from CEMVN prior to running WVA models. The analyst may then need to modify some of the WVA model assumptions and guidelines presented herein to account for differences between the present mitigation implementation/construction schedule and the schedule(s) that were assumed in generating this document.

This document supersedes the WVA model assumptions/guidance document that was used when WVA models were first run for the final array of mitigation alternatives addressed in the LPV and WBV Engineering Alternatives Report. It should be applied when conducting WVA analyses for the Tentatively Selected Plans (TSPs) selected for meeting LPV and WBV mitigation needs. A separate document will be generated to address model assumptions applicable to evaluating impacts to open water habitats.

1.1 BOTTOMLAND HARDWOOD MODEL – GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

V1 – Tree Species Association/Composition (in canopy stratum – percentage of trees that are hard mast or other edible-seed producing trees and percentage that are soft mast, non-mast/inedible seed producing trees)

BLH-Wet restore, FWP scenario:

- Of the total trees initially planted, 60% will be hard mast-producing species and 40% will be soft mast-producing species. Assume this species composition ratio (i.e. 60% of trees are hardmast-producing

and 40% are soft mast-producing) will remain static over the entire period of analysis (i.e. remains the same from time of planting throughout all subsequent model target years).

- Assume Class 5 is achieved once the planted trees are 10 years old. This class remains the same thereafter (i.e. Class 5 for all subsequent target years). Note that trees will be approximately 1 year old at the time they are initially planted. Thus, Class 5 is achieved 9 years after the time of initial planting.

General Notes:

- Do not classify Chinese tallow as a “mast or other edible-seed producing tree”. Consider it a non-mast producing tree. Although it is an invasive species, one must still include this species regarding its contribution to percent cover in the canopy, midstory, and ground cover strata when it is present on a site (applicable to FWP scenario at TY0 and applicable to FWOP scenario for all model target years).

V2 – Stand Maturity (average age or dbh of dominant and codominant canopy trees)

BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry restore and enhance, FWP scenario -----

- Guidance as to how factors like subsidence and sea level rise might affect this variable (especially if the mitigation site becomes flooded for long durations, since the growth of trees may be adversely affected and certain tree species could die) -----
If the mitigation feature (polygon) is designed such that flooding at the end of the project life will not impact tree survival, i.e. flooding is <12% of the growing season (33 days) and is no more than 20% to 30% of the non-growing season, then trees should not be adversely affected. However, if the site design does not achieve this goal, then adjust the tree growth spreadsheet such that typical growth is reduced by at least 10% once flooding exceeds 20-30% of the non-growing season or is 12% or more of the growing season (Conner et al.; Francis 1983).

General Notes:

- Include the DBH of Chinese tallow when working with this variable (for FWOP scenario in all model target years and for FWP scenario at TY0). The same guidance would apply to other invasive species in the canopy stratum.
- For planted trees – You can use the age of the trees in lieu of their DBH when running the model (applies to all target years from time of planting throughout model run). Assume trees planted will be approximately 1 year old when they are first installed.

V3 – Understory/Midstory (percent cover)

BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features built in existing open water areas and for any restoration features that require deposition of fill to achieve target grades:

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Understory = 0% // Midstory = 0% Refer to Note 1
1	2014	Understory = 0% // Midstory = 0%
2	2015	Understory = 100% // Midstory = 0%
20	2033	Understory = 25% // Midstory = 60%
50	2063	Understory = 35% // Midstory = 30% Refer to Note 2

Notes:

1. This assumption is applicable to restoration features built in existing open water areas. For restoration polygons built in other areas that are not open water or are only partially open water, values for cover in the understory and midstory strata must be based on site-specific conditions existing prior to the start of construction.
2. The specified values are based on the assumption that normal flooding conditions are present (i.e. desirable depth and duration of inundation). These values will need to be adjusted if sea-level rise is anticipated to increase flooding of the particular mitigation polygon to a degree whereby growth and/or survival of plant species in the understory and/or midstory strata are adversely impacted.
3. Keep in mind that canopy and midstory species will not be planted in restoration features built in open water areas until 1 year after the initial fill (borrow) has been placed in the mitigation feature. This allows 1 year of fill settlement prior to plantings.

BLH-Wet restore and BLH-Dry restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features that do not require deposition of fill to achieve target grades:

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Refer to Note 1
1	2014	Understory = 100% // Midstory = 0%
20	2033	Understory = 25% // Midstory = 60%
50	2063	Understory = 35% // Midstory = 30% Refer to Note 2

Notes:

1. Values for cover in the understory and midstory strata must be based on site-specific conditions existing prior to the start of construction.
2. The specified values are based on the assumption that normal flooding conditions are present (i.e. desirable depth and duration of inundation). These values will need to be adjusted if sea-level rise is anticipated to increase flooding of the particular mitigation polygon to a degree whereby growth and/or survival of plant species in the understory and/or midstory strata are adversely impacted.

General Notes:

- Cover accounted for by Chinese tallow and other invasive and nuisance plant species must be included in the percent cover data (applicable to FWOP scenario in all model target years and to FWP scenario at TY0).
- Changes in hydrology could result from factors such as sea-level rise and subsidence. An increase in the duration of flooding will typically decrease the understory cover and, to a lesser degree, decrease the midstory cover.

V4 – Hydrology (flooding duration and water flow/exchange)

BLH-Wet restore, FWP scenario -----

Assumptions applicable to restoration features built in existing open water areas and for restoration features that require deposition of fill to achieve target grades.

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Baseline conditions (score based on existing hydrology)
1	2014	Duration = dewatered // Exchange = none
2	2015	Duration = temporary Refer to Note 1
20	2033	Duration = temporary Refer to Note 1
50	2063	Duration = temporary Refer to Notes 1 and 2

Notes:

1. Scoring of water flow/exchange component of hydrology must be based on site-specific conditions anticipated.
2. The specified value for flooding duration is based on the assumption that normal flooding conditions are present (i.e. desirable depth and duration of inundation). This value will need to be adjusted if sea-level rise is anticipated to significantly increase the duration of flooding in the particular mitigation polygon. In many cases, it is probable that the duration may shift from temporary to seasonal.

BLH-Wet restore & BLH-Wet enhance, FWP scenario -----

Assumptions applicable to restoration features that do not require deposition of fill to achieve target grades and to BLH-Wet enhancement features where hydrologic enhancement is a component of the mitigation design.

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Baseline conditions (score based on existing hydrology)
1	2014	Duration = temporary Refer to Note 1
2	2015	Duration = temporary Refer to Note 1
20	2033	Duration = temporary Refer to Note 1
50	2063	Duration = temporary Refer to Notes 1 and 2

Notes:

1. Scoring of water flow/exchange component of hydrology must be based on site-specific conditions anticipated.

2. The specified value for flooding duration is based on the assumption that normal flooding conditions are present (i.e. desirable depth and duration of inundation). This value will need to be adjusted if sea-level rise is anticipated to significantly increase the duration of flooding in the particular mitigation polygon. In many cases, it is probable that the duration may shift from temporary to seasonal.
3. For BLH-Wet enhancement features that do not include measures to enhance existing hydrology as part of the mitigation design, the scoring of variable V4 must be based on site-specific conditions hence no general assumptions are applicable.

BLH-Dry restore or enhance, FWP scenario -----

- Score flooding duration as “dewatered” during all target years used in the model.

V5 – Size of Contiguous Forested Area

BLH-Wet & BLH-Dry restore, FWP scenario:

- Do not consider the mitigation polygon to classify as “forested” until the planted trees are 10 years old. Remember that trees will be 1 year old when they are first installed; hence, the mitigation polygon would classify as forested 9 years following the year of initial planting. Prior to this target year, the trees initially planted in the mitigation polygon will be considered as either understory or midstory cover. For the target year when the planted trees reach 10 years old and for all model target years thereafter, the planted trees will be considered large enough for the mitigation polygon to be considered a forest. Hence at the target year planted trees reach 10 years old and all target years thereafter, the mitigation polygon can be included in the calculation of forested acreages (along with contiguous forested areas outside the mitigation polygon).

BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry restoration or enhancement, FWP and FWOP scenarios:

- For areas outside the mitigation polygons, assume the conditions present at TY0 will remain unchanged throughout the life of the mitigation project. As used here, the term “mitigation polygons” refers to all proposed mitigation polygons regardless of the target habitat proposed. For example, a particular mitigation site could contain both a BLH-wet restoration polygon and a swamp restoration polygon. Under the FWP scenario, one would assume that the 2 restoration polygons would become forested over time but existing forested areas outside the limits of these polygons would remain forested throughout the period of analysis. Under the FWOP scenario, existing conditions would prevail in both the 2 restoration polygons and in the areas outside the limits of these polygons throughout the period of analysis.

General Notes:

- When scoring this variable for the FWP scenario, the area within the mitigation polygon itself as well as the adjacent “non-mitigation” areas are combined to generate the total forested acreage. However, remember the assumption that planted trees in restoration features will not be considered large enough for the feature to classify as a forest until the planted trees are 10 years old.
- When evaluating the size of contiguous forested areas, non-forested corridors <75 feet wide will not constitute a break in the forest area contiguity.

V6 – Suitability and Traversability of Surrounding Land Uses (within 0.5 mile of site perimeter)

BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry restoration or enhancement, FWP scenario:

- When scoring a given BLH mitigation polygon, include the nearby or adjacent mitigation polygons in your assessment of land use types by assuming their land use type is the habitat type proposed (i.e. the target habitat type). However, one must consider the TY that the nearby/adjacent mitigation polygon will actually shift from its existing habitat type to the target habitat type. For example, if the adjacent mitigation polygon is a marsh restoration feature then the change from the existing habitat type (open water typically) to the target marsh habitat would not occur until TY2 (2015).

BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry restoration or enhancement, FWP and FWOP scenarios:

- When evaluating this variable, typically assume that land uses in lands outside the mitigation polygons will score the same under the FWP and FWOP scenarios. In other words, typically assume that the existing conditions present in TY0 will remain unchanged over the life of the mitigation project. One

would typically not consider potential future land development rates when scoring this variable due to the uncertainty of long-term development trends. Exceptions to this general approach would include:

- Situations where there is a high level of confidence that a particular area is slated for a significant change in land use (ex. construction of I-49 through the Dufrene Ponds mitigation site).
- Situations where it is anticipated that the "land use" (habitat type) will significantly change over time due to the effects of sea-level rise and land loss (ex. existing adjacent marsh lands rated as highly suitable/traversable changing to open water, a much lower score, due to shoreline erosion or other land loss factors).

V7 – Disturbance (sources of disturbance vs. distance from site perimeter to disturbance source)

BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry restoration or enhancement, FWP and FWOP scenarios:

- For consistency purposes, assume baseline conditions affecting the scoring of this variable will not change over time. In other words, typically assume that the existing conditions present in TY0 will remain unchanged over the life of the mitigation project. For the WBV mitigation alternatives, there will be two exceptions to this general approach:
 - Bayou Signette – The variable score will need to change over time to account for building the nearby racetrack project.
 - Dufrene Ponds -- The variable score will need to change over time to account for the construction of the I-49 highway.

General Notes:

- When scoring this variable, all distances are measured from the perimeter of the BLH mitigation polygon itself.

1.2 NOTES REGARDING CONSTRUCTION & PLANTING OF BLH MITIGATION AREAS

Typical Estimated Project Construction Timelines -----

All projects – Begin construction around September 2013.

For BLH restoration areas built in existing open water features and for any other BLH restoration areas that require deposition of fill material as part of the construction process:

- Sept. 2013 – Begin construction.
- May 2014 – Complete construction.
- May 2015 – Initial grade settles to desired target grade (1 year after end of construction). If applicable, perimeter dikes constructed are degraded or gapped at this time.
- Dec. 2015 – Install plants (or could be installed in Jan. or Feb. of 2016).

For BLH restoration that do not require deposition of fill as part of the construction process:

- Sept. 2013 – Begin construction.
- Feb. 2014 – End construction (but could be as late as March or April of 2014 if much is earthwork required).
- March. 2014 – Install plants (earliest scenario for site requiring minimal earthwork).
- Dec. 2014 – Install plants (earliest scenario for site requiring substantial earthwork).

For BLH enhancement areas:

- Sept. 2013 – Begin construction (includes start of invasive plant eradication).
- Jan. 2014 – End construction (but could be as late as Feb. or March of 2014).
- March 2014 – Install plants.

Notes:

1. All of the above timelines are preliminary and are subject to refinement as plans are refined for a particular mitigation site.
2. Planting of canopy and midstory species in March should be avoided if possible since conditions could be adversely dry, thereby decreasing the survival of plantings.

- Chemical eradication of invasive/nuisance hardwood species such as Chinese tallow should be done during the growing season. Greatest effectiveness may be realized if chemical treatment is applied from August through October when most energy is being used for root development.

Planting of BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry Restoration Areas -----

Initial plantings will be:

- Canopy species: plant on 9-foot centers (538 trees/acre); of total trees planted, 60% will be hard mast-producing species and 40% will be soft mast-producing species.
- Midstory species (shrubs and small trees): plant on 20-foot centers (109 seedlings per acre).
- Stock size (canopy and midstory species): 1 year old, 1.5 feet tall (minimum).

Planting of BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry Enhancement Areas -----

Initial plantings will follow the same guidelines as for BLH-Wet and BLH-Dry restoration areas regarding the general density of installed plants and the stock used. Where initial enhancement activities include the eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species, significant numbers of native canopy and/or midstory species may remain, but in a spatial distribution that leaves relatively large “gaps” in the canopy stratum and/or the midstory stratum. In such cases, areas measuring approximately 25 feet by 25 feet that are devoid of native canopy species should be planted and areas measuring approximately 45 feet by 45 feet that are devoid of native midstory species should be planted.

The typical guideline of having 60% of the canopy species planted be hard mast-producing and 40% of the canopy species planted be soft mast-producing may be altered in situations where several native trees remain after eradicating invasive/nuisance species. For example if the remaining native trees are predominantly soft mast-producing species, then a greater proportion of the planted trees would be hard-mast producing. The objective would be to have the ultimate canopy composition (planted trees after reaching canopy strata plus existing trees) be close to a 60%:40% ratio of hard mast to soft mast species.

1.3 BOTTOMLAND HARDWOOD WVA MODEL – TARGET YEARS FOR MODELS

Use the target years specified below when analyzing BLH restoration polygons built in existing open water features and for any other BLH restoration polygons that require deposition of fill material as part of the construction process:

TY	Year	
0	2013	Baseline conditions (assume construction starts in 2014 even though anticipated start is late 2013)
1	2014	Initial construction activities begin and are completed. No plants installed.
2	2015	Restoration feature settles to desired target grade. Any associated perimeter containment dikes are degraded or gapped. Plants installed. Temporary flooding duration (target flooding duration/target hydroperiod) achieved.
11	2024	Class 5 is achieved re V1. Planted areas class as forested re V5.
20	2033	For V3, Understory = 25% // Midstory = 60%
50	2063	End of project life for a HSDRRS mitigation feature.

Use the target years specified below when analyzing BLH restoration polygons that do not require deposition of fill material as part of the construction process, and when analyzing BLH enhancement polygons:

TY	Year	
0	2013	Baseline conditions (assume construction starts in 2014 even though anticipated start is late 2013)
1	2014	Initial construction activities begin and are completed. Initial eradication of invasive & nuisance plant species is started and completed.

		Plants are installed (either in March or in December depending on construction activities. Appropriate planting season extends from November through February). Temporary flooding duration (target flooding duration/target hydroperiod) achieved.
10	2023	Class 5 is achieved re V1. Planted areas class as forested re V5.
20	2033	For V3, Understory = 25% // Midstory = 60%
52	2065	End of project life for a HSDRRS mitigation feature (adjusted end to be consistent with final TY used in impact WVAs).

NOTE:

The user of these guidelines is cautioned that the construction schedule for proposed mitigation features may not follow the construction schedule assumed in the preceding sections. If this is the case, the model target years and their associated model assumptions may have to be adjusted accordingly.

2.1 SWAMP MODEL – GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

V1 – Stand Structure (percent closure or Cover: overstory, midstory, herbaceous)

Swamp restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features built in existing open water areas and for any restoration features that require deposition of fill to achieve target grades. If construction involves substantial excavation and grading rather than filling, use the next assumptions table rather than this one.

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Baseline conditions (site-specific)
1	2014	Class 1
2	2015	Class 1
3	2016	Class 2
15	2028	Class 6
35	2048	Class 6
50	2063	Refer to Note 1

Notes:

- Over time, sea-level rise and possibly subsidence could adversely affect the hydrologic regime (increased flooding duration, increased depth of inundation). Salinity could increase in some areas concurrent with sea-level rise. These factors are anticipated to adversely affect plant growth and survival. Thus, cover in the midstory and herbaceous (ground cover) strata are anticipated to decrease over time, as could percent cover in the canopy stratum to a lesser degree. This potential reduction must be evaluated on a site-specific basis, factoring in considerations such as the proposed grade of the mitigation polygon relative to the projected sea-level rise elevation, changes in salinity, etc. As a general “rule of thumb”, one may anticipate the stand structure to decrease from Class 6 in TY35 to Class 4 by TY50. However, it is emphasized that the decrease in class score over time must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Swamp restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features involving substantial excavation and grading as part of the initial construction efforts. If fill is required via pumping of sediments into the feature, use the preceding assumptions table.

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Baseline conditions (site-specific)
1	2014	Class 1
2	2015	Class 1
15	2028	Class 6
35	2048	Class 6
52	2065	Refer to Note 1 in preceding assumptions table

General Notes:

- Include the cover accounted for by Chinese tallow and other invasive plant species when working with this variable (for FWOP scenario in all model target years and for FWP scenario at TY0).
- For swamp enhancement features, FWP scenario --- The evaluation of existing canopy, midstory, and understory will be done via field data collection for this variable. The growth of planted species will be estimated from a growth calculator that is based on pertinent research. Assumptions will have to be made about the correlation between plant growth and observed coverage. The values will be averaged to get a single HSI for this variable. Planted canopy species should not be factored into the overstory coverage estimate until TY15. They will be considered either as part of understory cover (earlier) or midstory cover (later) prior to TY15.

V2 – Stand Maturity (average DBH of canopy trees; plus total basal area all trees)

Swamp restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features built in existing open water areas and for any restoration features that require deposition of fill to achieve target grades. If construction involves substantial excavation and grading rather than filling, use the next assumptions table rather than this one.

TY	Year	Assumptions – Density of Trees	Assumptions – DBH of Planted Trees
0	2013	Baseline conditions.	N/A
1	2014	0 trees/ac.	N/A
2	2015	538 trees/ac. (trees installed, initial density)	Cypress = 0.2" // Tupelo = 0.3"
3	2016	269 trees/ac. (50% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 0.2" // Tupelo = 0.5"
4	2017	258 trees/ac. (48% survival of planted trees)	
15	2028	215 trees/ac. (40% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 3.5" // Tupelo = 4.1"
35	2048	161 trees/ac. (30% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 8.2" // Tupelo = 9.6"
50	2063	161 trees/ac. (30% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 11.9" // Tupelo = 14.0"

Swamp restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features, or the portions thereof, involving substantial excavation and grading as part of the initial construction efforts. If fill is required via pumping of sediments into the feature, use the preceding assumptions table concerning tree densities.

TY	Year	Assumptions – Density of Trees	Assumptions – DBH of Planted Trees
0	2013	Baseline conditions.	N/A
1	2014	538 trees/ac. (trees installed; initial density)	Cypress = 0.2" // Tupelo = 0.3"
2	2015	269 trees/ac. (50% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 0.2" // Tupelo = 0.5"
3	2016	258 trees/ac. (48% survival of planted trees)	
15	2028	215 trees/ac. (40% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 3.5" // Tupelo = 4.1"
35	2048	161 trees/ac. (30% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 8.2" // Tupelo = 9.6"
52	2065	161 trees/ac. (30% survival of planted trees)	Cypress = 11.9" // Tupelo = 14.0"

Swamp restore, FWP scenario ---

- Assume 70% of the trees planted will be cypress and that 30% of the trees planted will be tupelo or other non-cypress species. Assume that this ratio will remain constant over time once the trees are planted.

Swamp enhance, FWP scenario ---

- Do not factor planted trees into the site DBH calculations until TY15. Prior to TY15, the planted trees will be considered as being in the understory or midstory strata.

General Notes:

- Factors such as sea-level rise and increased salinity over time may adversely affect the growth and/or survival of planted trees and existing trees. These factors must be considered when assessing this variable and may require adjustments to the assumed density of planted trees (as regards survival of trees) and the assumed dbh of planted trees indicated in the preceding tables. The FWS spreadsheet used to predict tree growth (reference the "BLH Site Ingrowth" spreadsheet) includes correction factors

used to adjust typical growth rates to account for trees subject to stressors like excessive inundation or salinity. These correction factors should be used for target years in which one anticipates the stress factors may be significant enough to affect tree growth. The stage in the project life that the effects become significant must be determined on a case-by-case basis.

V3 – Water Regime (flooding duration and water flow/exchange)

Swamp restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features built in existing open water areas and for any restoration features that require deposition of fill to achieve target grades. If construction involves substantial excavation and grading rather than filling, use the next assumptions table rather than this one.

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Baseline conditions (score based on existing hydrology)
1	2014	Duration = permanent // Exchange = none
2	2015	Duration = seasonal Refer to Note 1
15	2028	Duration = seasonal Refer to Note 1
35	2048	Duration = seasonal or semi-permanent Refer to Notes 1 and 2
50	2063	Duration = semi-permanent or permanent Refer to Notes 1 and 2

Notes:

1. Scoring of water flow/exchange component of hydrology must be based on site-specific conditions anticipated.
2. During the latter portions of the project life, flooding duration may be affected by sea-level rise. Swamp mitigation features are designed to have seasonal flooding once the features are constructed and have reached the desired target grade elevation. Sea-level rise will likely increase the duration of flooding. This effect will be site-specific and must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Sea-level rise will also likely affect the water flow/exchange. For a site that has limited exchange during early years, this may actually improve exchange for a period of years (ex. increase from low exchange in TY2 to moderate exchange in TY15). As the sea-level rise continues over time, however, the effect may be to reduce exchange (ex. decrease from moderate exchange in TY35 to low exchange in TY50). The degree to which sea-level rise affects flow/exchange over time must also be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Swamp restore, FWP scenario --

Assumptions applicable to restoration features, or the portions thereof, involving substantial excavation and grading as part of the initial construction efforts. If fill is required via pumping of sediments into the feature, use the preceding assumptions table.

TY	Year	Assumption
0	2013	Baseline conditions (score based on existing hydrology)
1	2014	Duration = seasonal Refer to Note 1
2	2015	Duration = seasonal Refer to Note 1
15	2028	Duration = seasonal Refer to Note 1
35	2048	Duration = seasonal or semi-permanent Refer to Notes 1 and 2
50	2063	Duration = semi-permanent or permanent Refer to Notes 1 and 2

Notes:

Notes 1 and 2 are the same as in the preceding table.

V4 – Mean High Salinity During the Growing Season (salinity re baldcypress & other trees)

General Notes:

- For current and near-term salinities, use the Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) data (website <http://www.lacoast.gov/crms%5Fviewer/>) and USGS gage data (website <http://waterdata.usgs.gov/la/nwis/rt>) where available. Future salinities should be forecast using

reasonable estimates and best professional judgment (in the absence of hydrologic and hydrodynamic modeling).

Other WVA Swamp Model Guidance

The WVA procedural manual and Swamp Community Model text advises that habitat classification data and aerial photos should be used to determine a conversion rate of swamp to marsh. Based on this evaluation, the guidance states that areas of swamp converting to fresh marsh should be evaluated as open water habitat using the fresh marsh model. The determination of appropriate conversion rates would be quite complicated in the project area. Hence, this issue will not be addressed as part of the WVA analyses.

2.2 NOTES REGARDING CONSTRUCTION & PLANTING OF SWAMP MITIGATION AREAS

Typical Estimated Project Construction Timelines -----

All projects – Begin construction around September 2013.

For swamp restoration areas built in existing open water features and for any other swamp restoration areas that require deposition of fill material as part of the construction process:

- Sept. 2013 – Begin construction.
- May 2014 – Complete construction.
- May 2015 – Initial grade settles to desired target grade (1 year after end of construction). If applicable, perimeter dikes constructed are degraded or gapped at this time.
- Dec. 2015 – Install plants (or could be installed in Jan. or Feb. of 2016).

For swamp restoration areas involving extensive excavation and earthwork but that do not require deposition of fill as part of the construction process:

- Sept. 2013 – Begin construction.
- March 2014 – End construction (but could be as late as May of 2014; also, subsequent grading may be required in some areas after an as-built survey completed in order to correct any deficiencies).
- Dec. 2014 – Install plants.

For swamp enhancement areas:

- Sept. 2013 – Begin construction (includes start of invasive plant eradication).
- Jan. 2014 – End construction (but could be as late as Feb. or March of 2014).
- March 2014 – Install plants.

Note: All of the above timelines are preliminary and are subject to refinement as plans are refined for a particular mitigation site.

Planting of Swamp Restoration Areas -----

Initial plantings will be:

- Canopy species: plant on 9-foot centers (538 trees/acre); of total trees planted, approximately 70% will be cypress while the remaining trees will consist of tupelo and other non-cypress species.
- Midstory species (shrubs and small trees): plant on 20-foot centers (109 seedlings per acre).
- Stock size (minimums): Canopy species = 1 year old, 3 feet tall, 0.5" root collar; Midstory species = 1 year old, 3 feet tall.

Planting of Swamp Enhancement Areas -----

Initial plantings will follow the same guidelines as for swamp restoration areas regarding the general density of installed plants and the stock used. Where initial enhancement activities include the eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species, significant numbers of native canopy and/or midstory species may remain, but in a spatial distribution that leaves relatively large "gaps" in the canopy stratum and/or the midstory stratum. In such cases, areas measuring approximately 25 feet by 25 feet that are devoid of native canopy species should be planted and areas measuring approximately 45 feet by 45 feet that are devoid of native midstory species should be planted.

The typical guideline of having roughly 70% of the canopy species planted be cypress and 30% of the canopy species planted be tupelo and other non-cypress species may be altered in situations where several native trees remain after eradicating invasive/nuisance species. For example, if the remaining native trees are almost all cypress, then a greater proportion of the planted trees may consist of non-cypress species. Similarly, the composition of the species planted might also be altered to be more representative of the species composition present in nearby healthy swamp habitats.

2.3 SWAMP WVA MODEL – TARGET YEARS FOR MODELS

Typically use the target years specified below when analyzing swamp restoration polygons built in existing open water features and for any other swamp restoration polygons that require deposition of fill material as part of the construction process:

TY	Year	
0	2013	Baseline conditions (assume construction starts in 2014 even though anticipated start is late 2013)
1	2014	Initial construction activities begin and are completed. No plants installed. V1 = Class 1; V3 = permanent duration.
2	2015	Restoration feature settles to desired target grade. Any associated perimeter containment dikes are degraded or gapped. Plants installed. V1 = Class 1; V2 = 538 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
3	2016	V1 = Class 2; V2 = 269 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
4	2017	V1 = Class 2; V2 = 258 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
15	2028	V1 = Class 6; V2 = 215 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
35	2048	V1 = Class 6; V2 = 161 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal or semi-permanent duration.
50	2063	End of project life for a HSDRRS mitigation feature. V2 = 161 trees/ac.; V3 = semi-permanent or permanent duration.

Typically use the target years specified below when analyzing swamp restoration polygons that do not require deposition of fill material as part of the construction process, and when analyzing BLH enhancement polygons:

TY	Year	
0	2013	Baseline conditions (assume construction starts in 2014 even though anticipated start is late 2013)
1	2014	Initial construction activities begin and are completed. Initial eradication of invasive & nuisance plant species is started and completed. Plants are installed (either in March or in December depending on construction activities. Appropriate planting season extends from November through February). V1 = Class 1; V2 = 538 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
2	2015	V1 = Class 2; V2 = 269 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
3	2016	V1 = Class 2; V2 = 258 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
15	2028	V1 = Class 6; V2 = 215 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal duration.
35	2048	V1 = Class 6; V2 = 161 trees/ac.; V3 = seasonal or semi-permanent duration.
50	2063	End of project life for a HSDRRS mitigation feature (adjusted end to be consistent with final TY used in impact WVAs). V2 = 161 trees/ac.; V3 = semi-permanent or permanent duration.

The user of these guidelines is cautioned that the construction schedule for proposed mitigation features may not follow the construction schedule assumed in the preceding sections. If this is the case, the model target years and their associated model assumptions may have to be adjusted accordingly.

APPENDIX H
PROTECTED SPECIES PROTECTION MEASURES

NATIONAL BALD EAGLE MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

May 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR THE BALD EAGLE	2
The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.....	2
The Migratory Bird Treaty Act	3
State laws and regulations	3
Where do bald eagles nest?	4
When do bald eagles nest?	5
Chronology of typical reproductive activities of bald eagles in the United States.....	6
How many chicks do bald eagles raise?	7
What do bald eagles eat?.....	7
The impact of human activity on nesting bald eagles.....	7
The impact of human activity on foraging and roosting bald eagles	8
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AVOIDING DISTURBANCE AT NEST SITES	9
Existing Uses	10
ACTIVITY-SPECIFIC GUIDELINES	10
Alternate nests.....	11
Temporary Impacts	11
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AVOIDING DISTURBANCE AT FORAGING AREAS AND COMMUNAL ROOST SITES	14
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO BENEFIT BALD EAGLES	15
CONTACTS	16
GLOSSARY	17
RELATED LITERATURE	19

INTRODUCTION

The bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) is protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (Eagle Act) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The MBTA and the Eagle Act protect bald eagles from a variety of harmful actions and impacts. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) developed these National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines to advise landowners, land managers, and others who share public and private lands with bald eagles when and under what circumstances the protective provisions of the Eagle Act may apply to their activities. A variety of human activities can potentially interfere with bald eagles, affecting their ability to forage, nest, roost, breed, or raise young. The Guidelines are intended to help people minimize such impacts to bald eagles, particularly where they may constitute “disturbance,” which is prohibited by the Eagle Act.

The Guidelines are intended to:

- (1) Publicize the provisions of the Eagle Act that continue to protect bald eagles, in order to reduce the possibility that people will violate the law,
- (2) Advise landowners, land managers and the general public of the potential for various human activities to disturb bald eagles, and
- (3) Encourage additional nonbinding land management practices that benefit bald eagles (see Additional Recommendations section).

While the Guidelines include general recommendations for land management practices that will benefit bald eagles, the document is intended primarily as a tool for landowners and planners who seek information and recommendations regarding how to avoid disturbing bald eagles. Many States and some tribal entities have developed state-specific management plans, regulations, and/or guidance for landowners and land managers to protect and enhance bald eagle habitat, and we encourage the continued development and use of these planning tools to benefit bald eagles.

Adherence to the Guidelines herein will benefit individuals, agencies, organizations, and companies by helping them avoid violations of the law. However, the Guidelines themselves are not law. Rather, they are recommendations based on several decades of behavioral observations, science, and conservation measures to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to bald eagles.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service strongly encourages adherence to these guidelines to ensure that bald and golden eagle populations will continue to be sustained. The Service realizes there may be impacts to some birds even if all reasonable measures are taken to avoid such impacts. Although it is not possible to absolve individuals and entities from liability under the Eagle Act or the MBTA, the Service exercises enforcement discretion to focus on those individuals, companies, or agencies that take migratory birds without regard for the consequences of their actions and the law, especially when conservation measures, such as these Guidelines, are available, but have not been implemented. The Service will prioritize its enforcement efforts to focus on those individuals or entities who take bald eagles or their parts, eggs, or nests without implementing appropriate measures recommended by the Guidelines.

The Service intends to pursue the development of regulations that would authorize, under limited circumstances, the use of permits if “take” of an eagle is anticipated but unavoidable. Additionally, if the bald eagle is delisted, the Service intends to provide a regulatory mechanism to honor existing (take) authorizations under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

During the interim period until the Service completes a rulemaking for permits under the Eagle Act, the Service does not intend to refer for prosecution the incidental “take” of any bald eagle under the MBTA or Eagle Act, if such take is in full compliance with the terms and conditions of an incidental take statement issued to the action agency or applicant under the authority of section 7(b)(4) of the ESA or a permit issued under the authority of section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA.

The Guidelines are applicable throughout the United States, including Alaska. The primary purpose of these Guidelines is to provide information that will minimize or prevent violations only of *Federal* laws governing bald eagles. In addition to Federal laws, many states and some smaller jurisdictions and tribes have additional laws and regulations protecting bald eagles. In some cases those laws and regulations may be more protective (restrictive) than these Federal guidelines. If you are planning activities that may affect bald eagles, we therefore recommend that you contact both your nearest U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office (see the contact information on p.16) and your state wildlife agency for assistance.

LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR THE BALD EAGLE

The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

The Eagle Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668c), enacted in 1940, and amended several times since then, prohibits anyone, without a permit issued by the Secretary of the Interior, from “taking” bald eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. The Act provides criminal and civil penalties for persons who “take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell, purchase or barter, transport, export or import, at any time or any manner, any bald eagle ... [or any golden eagle], alive or dead, or any part, nest, or egg thereof.” The Act defines “take” as “pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, molest or disturb.” “Disturb” means:

"Disturb means to agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, 1) injury to an eagle, 2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or 3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior."

In addition to immediate impacts, this definition also covers impacts that result from human-induced alterations initiated around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present, if, upon the eagle=s return, such alterations agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that injures an eagle or substantially interferes with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering habits and causes, or is likely to cause, a loss of productivity or nest abandonment.

A violation of the Act can result in a criminal fine of \$100,000 (\$200,000 for organizations), imprisonment for one year, or both, for a first offense. Penalties increase substantially for additional offenses, and a second violation of this Act is a felony.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The MBTA (16 U.S.C. 703-712), prohibits the taking of any migratory bird or any part, nest, or egg, except as permitted by regulation. The MBTA was enacted in 1918; a 1972 agreement supplementing one of the bilateral treaties underlying the MBTA had the effect of expanding the scope of the Act to cover bald eagles and other raptors. Implementing regulations define “take” under the MBTA as “pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, possess, or collect.”

Copies of the Eagle Act and the MBTA are available at: <http://permits.fws.gov/ltr/ltr.shtml>.

State laws and regulations

Most states have their own regulations and/or guidelines for bald eagle management. Some states may continue to list the bald eagle as endangered, threatened, or of special concern. If you plan activities that may affect bald eagles, we urge you to familiarize yourself with the regulations and/or guidelines that apply to bald eagles in your state. Your adherence to the Guidelines herein does not ensure that you are in compliance with state laws and regulations because state regulations can be more specific and/or restrictive than these Guidelines.

NATURAL HISTORY OF THE BALD EAGLE

Bald eagles are a North American species that historically occurred throughout the contiguous United States and Alaska. After severely declining in the lower 48 States between the 1870s and the 1970s, bald eagles have rebounded and re-established breeding territories in each of the lower 48 states. The largest North American breeding populations are in Alaska and Canada, but there are also significant bald eagle populations in Florida, the Pacific Northwest, the Greater Yellowstone area, the Great Lakes states, and the Chesapeake Bay region. Bald eagle distribution varies seasonally. Bald eagles that nest in southern latitudes frequently move northward in late spring and early summer, often summering as far north as Canada. Most eagles that breed at northern latitudes migrate southward during winter, or to coastal areas where waters remain unfrozen. Migrants frequently concentrate in large numbers at sites where food is abundant and they often roost together communally. In some cases, concentration areas are used year-round: in summer by southern eagles and in winter by northern eagles.

Juvenile bald eagles have mottled brown and white plumage, gradually acquiring their dark brown body and distinctive white head and tail as they mature. Bald eagles generally attain adult plumage by 5 years of age. Most are capable of breeding at 4 or 5 years of age, but in healthy populations they may not start breeding until much older. Bald eagles may live 15 to 25 years in the wild. Adults weigh 8 to 14 pounds (occasionally reaching 16 pounds in Alaska) and have wingspans of 5 to 8 feet. Those in the northern range are larger than those in the south, and females are larger than males.

Where do bald eagles nest?

Breeding bald eagles occupy “territories,” areas they will typically defend against intrusion by other eagles. In addition to the active nest, a territory may include one or more alternate nests (nests built or maintained by the eagles but not used for nesting in a given year). The Eagle Act prohibits removal or destruction of both active and alternate bald eagle nests. Bald eagles exhibit high nest site fidelity and nesting territories are often used year after year. Some territories are known to have been used continually for over half a century.

Bald eagles generally nest near coastlines, rivers, large lakes or streams that support an adequate food supply. They often nest in mature or old-growth trees; snags (dead trees); cliffs; rock promontories; rarely on the ground; and with increasing frequency on human-made structures such as power poles and communication towers. In forested areas, bald eagles often select the tallest trees with limbs strong enough to support a nest that can weigh more than 1,000 pounds. Nest sites typically include at least one perch with a clear view of the water where the eagles usually forage. Shoreline trees or snags located in reservoirs provide the visibility and accessibility needed to locate aquatic prey. Eagle nests are constructed with large sticks, and may be lined with moss, grass, plant stalks, lichens, seaweed, or sod. Nests are usually about 4-6 feet in diameter and 3 feet deep, although larger nests exist.



Copyright *Birds of North America*, 2000

The range of breeding bald eagles in 2000 (shaded areas). This map shows only the larger concentrations of nests; eagles have continued to expand into additional nesting territories in many states. The dotted line represents the bald eagle’s wintering range.

When do bald eagles nest?

Nesting activity begins several months before egg-laying. Egg-laying dates vary throughout the U.S., ranging from October in Florida, to late April or even early May in the northern United States. Incubation typically lasts 33-35 days, but can be as long as 40 days. Eaglets make their first unsteady flights about 10 to 12 weeks after hatching, and fledge (leave their nests) within a few days after that first flight. However, young birds usually remain in the vicinity of the nest for several weeks after fledging because they are almost completely dependent on their parents for food until they disperse from the nesting territory approximately 6 weeks later.

The bald eagle breeding season tends to be longer in the southern U.S., and re-nesting following an unsuccessful first nesting attempt is more common there as well. The following table shows the timing of bald eagle breeding seasons in different regions of the country. The table represents the range of time within which the majority of nesting activities occur in each region and does not apply to any specific nesting pair. Because the timing of nesting activities may vary within a given region, you should contact the nearest U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office (see page 16) and/or your state wildlife conservation agency for more specific information on nesting chronology in your area.

Chronology of typical reproductive activities of bald eagles in the United States.

Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.
SOUTHEASTERN U.S. (FL, GA, SC, NC, AL, MS, LA, TN, KY, AR, eastern 2 of TX)											
Nest Building											
		Egg Laying/Incubation									
				Hatching/Rearing Young							
					Fledging Young						
CHESAPEAKE BAY REGION (NC, VA, MD, DE, southern 2 of NJ, eastern 2 of PA, panhandle of WV)											
				Nest Building							
					Egg Laying/Incubation						
						Hatching/Rearing Young					
								Fledging Young			
NORTHERN U.S. (ME, NH, MA, RI, CT, NY, northern 2 of NJ, western 2 of PA, OH, WV exc. panhandle, IN, IL, MI, WI, MN, IA, MO, ND, SD, NB, KS, CO, UT)											
				Nest Building							
					Egg Laying/Incubation						
						Hatching/Rearing Young					
								Fledging Young			
PACIFIC REGION (WA, OR, CA, ID, MT, WY, NV)											
				Nest Building							
					Egg Laying/Incubation						
						Hatching/Rearing Young					
								Fledging Young			
SOUTHWESTERN U.S. (AZ, NM, OK panhandle, western 2 of TX)											
				Nest Building							
					Egg Laying/Incubation						
						Hatching/Rearing Young					
								Fledging Young			
ALASKA											
					Nest Building						
							Egg Laying/Incubation				
								Hatching/Rearing Young			
Ing Young										Fledg-	
Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.

How many chicks do bald eagles raise?

The number of eagle eggs laid will vary from 1-3, with 1-2 eggs being the most common. Only one eagle egg is laid per day, although not always on successive days. Hatching of young occurs on different days with the result that chicks in the same nest are sometimes of unequal size. The overall national fledging rate is approximately one chick per nest, annually, which results in a healthy expanding population.

What do bald eagles eat?

Bald eagles are opportunistic feeders. Fish comprise much of their diet, but they also eat waterfowl, shorebirds/colonial waterbirds, small mammals, turtles, and carrion. Because they are visual hunters, eagles typically locate their prey from a conspicuous perch, or soaring flight, then swoop down and strike. Wintering bald eagles often congregate in large numbers along streams to feed on spawning salmon or other fish species, and often gather in large numbers in areas below reservoirs, especially hydropower dams, where fish are abundant. Wintering eagles also take birds from rafts of ducks at reservoirs and rivers, and congregate on melting ice shelves to scavenge dead fish from the current or the soft melting ice. Bald eagles will also feed on carcasses along roads, in landfills, and at feedlots.

During the breeding season, adults carry prey to the nest to feed the young. Adults feed their chicks by tearing off pieces of food and holding them to the beaks of the eaglets. After fledging, immature eagles are slow to develop hunting skills, and must learn to locate reliable food sources and master feeding techniques. Young eagles will congregate together, often feeding upon easily acquired food such as carrion and fish found in abundance at the mouths of streams and shallow bays and at landfills.

The impact of human activity on nesting bald eagles

During the breeding season, bald eagles are sensitive to a variety of human activities. However, not all bald eagle pairs react to human activities in the same way. Some pairs nest successfully just dozens of yards from human activity, while others abandon nest sites in response to activities much farther away. This variability may be related to a number of factors, including visibility, duration, noise levels, extent of the area affected by the activity, prior experiences with humans, and tolerance of the individual nesting pair. The relative sensitivity of bald eagles during various stages of the breeding season is outlined in the following table.

Nesting Bald Eagle Sensitivity to Human Activities

Phase	Activity	Sensitivity to Human Activity	Comments
I	Courtship and Nest Building	Most sensitive period; likely to respond negatively	Most critical time period. Disturbance is manifested in nest abandonment. Bald eagles in newly established territories are more prone to abandon nest sites.
II	Egg laying	Very sensitive period	Human activity of even limited duration may cause nest desertion and abandonment of territory for the breeding season.
III	Incubation and early nestling period (up to 4 weeks)	Very sensitive period	Adults are less likely to abandon the nest near and after hatching. However, flushed adults leave eggs and young unattended; eggs are susceptible to cooling, loss of moisture, overheating, and predation; young are vulnerable to elements.
IV	Nestling period, 4 to 8 weeks	Moderately sensitive period	Likelihood of nest abandonment and vulnerability of the nestlings to elements somewhat decreases. However, nestlings may miss feedings, affecting their survival.
V	Nestlings 8 weeks through fledging	Very sensitive period	Gaining flight capability, nestlings 8 weeks and older may flush from the nest prematurely due to disruption and die.

If agitated by human activities, eagles may inadequately construct or repair their nest, may expend energy defending the nest rather than tending to their young, or may abandon the nest altogether. Activities that cause prolonged absences of adults from their nests can jeopardize eggs or young. Depending on weather conditions, eggs may overheat or cool too much and fail to hatch. Unattended eggs and nestlings are subject to predation. Young nestlings are particularly vulnerable because they rely on their parents to provide warmth or shade, without which they may die as a result of hypothermia or heat stress. If food delivery schedules are interrupted, the young may not develop healthy plumage, which can affect their survival. In addition, adults startled while incubating or brooding young may damage eggs or injure their young as they abruptly leave the nest. Older nestlings no longer require constant attention from the adults, but they may be startled by loud or intrusive human activities and prematurely jump from the nest before they are able to fly or care for themselves. Once fledged, juveniles range up to ¼ mile from the nest site, often to a site with minimal human activity. During this period, until about six weeks after departure from the nest, the juveniles still depend on the adults to feed them.

The impact of human activity on foraging and roosting bald eagles

Disruption, destruction, or obstruction of roosting and foraging areas can also negatively affect bald eagles. Disruptive activities in or near eagle foraging areas can interfere with feeding, reducing chances of survival. Interference with feeding can also result in reduced productivity (number of young successfully fledged). Migrating and wintering bald eagles often congregate at specific sites for purposes of feeding and sheltering. Bald eagles rely on established roost sites because of their proximity to sufficient food sources. Roost sites are usually in mature trees where the eagles are somewhat sheltered from the wind and weather. Human activities near or within communal roost sites may prevent eagles

from feeding or taking shelter, especially if there are not other undisturbed and productive feeding and roosting sites available. Activities that permanently alter communal roost sites and important foraging areas can altogether eliminate the elements that are essential for feeding and sheltering eagles.

Where a human activity agitates or bothers roosting or foraging bald eagles to the degree that causes injury or substantially interferes with breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior and causes, or is likely to cause, a loss of productivity or nest abandonment, the conduct of the activity constitutes a violation of the Eagle Act's prohibition against disturbing eagles. The circumstances that might result in such an outcome are difficult to predict without detailed site-specific information. If your activities may disturb roosting or foraging bald eagles, you should contact your local Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office (see page 16) for advice and recommendations for how to avoid such disturbance.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AVOIDING DISTURBANCE AT NEST SITES

In developing these Guidelines, we relied on existing state and regional bald eagle guidelines, scientific literature on bald eagle disturbance, and recommendations of state and Federal biologists who monitor the impacts of human activity on eagles. Despite these resources, uncertainties remain regarding the effects of many activities on eagles and how eagles in different situations may or may not respond to certain human activities. The Service recognizes this uncertainty and views the collection of better biological data on the response of eagles to disturbance as a high priority. To the extent that resources allow, the Service will continue to collect data on responses of bald eagles to human activities conducted according to the recommendations within these Guidelines to ensure that adequate protection from disturbance is being afforded, and to identify circumstances where the Guidelines might be modified. These data will be used to make future adjustments to the Guidelines.

To avoid disturbing nesting bald eagles, we recommend (1) keeping a distance between the activity and the nest (distance buffers), (2) maintaining preferably forested (or natural) areas between the activity and around nest trees (landscape buffers), and (3) avoiding certain activities during the breeding season. The buffer areas serve to minimize visual and auditory impacts associated with human activities near nest sites. Ideally, buffers would be large enough to protect existing nest trees and provide for alternative or replacement nest trees.

The size and shape of effective buffers vary depending on the topography and other ecological characteristics surrounding the nest site. In open areas where there are little or no forested or topographical buffers, such as in many western states, distance alone must serve as the buffer. Consequently, in open areas, the distance between the activity and the nest may need to be larger than the distances recommended under Categories A and B of these guidelines (pg. 12) if no landscape buffers are present. The height of the nest above the ground may also ameliorate effects of human activities; eagles at higher nests may be less prone to disturbance.

In addition to the physical features of the landscape and nest site, the appropriate size for the distance buffer may vary according to the historical tolerances of eagles to human activities in particular localities, and may also depend on the location of the nest in relation

to feeding and roosting areas used by the eagles. Increased competition for nest sites may lead bald eagles to nest closer to human activity (and other eagles).

Seasonal restrictions can prevent the potential impacts of many shorter-term, obtrusive activities that do not entail landscape alterations (e.g. fireworks, outdoor concerts). In proximity to the nest, these kinds of activities should be conducted only outside the breeding season. For activities that entail both short-term, obtrusive characteristics and more permanent impacts (e.g., building construction), we recommend a combination of both approaches: retaining a landscape buffer *and* observing seasonal restrictions.

For assistance in determining the appropriate size and configuration of buffers or the timing of activities in the vicinity of a bald eagle nest, we encourage you to contact the nearest U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office (see page 16).

Existing Uses

Eagles are unlikely to be disturbed by routine use of roads, homes, and other facilities where such use pre-dates the eagles' successful nesting activity in a given area. Therefore, in most cases *ongoing* existing uses may proceed with the same intensity with little risk of disturbing bald eagles. However, some *intermittent, occasional, or irregular* uses that pre-date eagle nesting in an area may disturb bald eagles. For example: a pair of eagles may begin nesting in an area and subsequently be disturbed by activities associated with an annual outdoor flea market, even though the flea market has been held annually at the same location. In such situations, human activity should be adjusted or relocated to minimize potential impacts on the nesting pair.

ACTIVITY-SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

The following section provides the Service's management recommendations for avoiding bald eagle disturbance as a result of new or intermittent activities proposed in the vicinity of bald eagle nests. Activities are separated into 8 categories (A – H) based on the nature and magnitude of impacts to bald eagles that usually result from the type of activity. Activities with similar or comparable impacts are grouped together.

In most cases, impacts will vary based on the visibility of the activity from the eagle nest and the degree to which similar activities are already occurring in proximity to the nest site. Visibility is a factor because, in general, eagles are more prone to disturbance when an activity occurs in full view. For this reason, we recommend that people locate activities farther from the nest structure in areas with open vistas, in contrast to areas where the view is shielded by rolling topography, trees, or other screening factors. The recommendations also take into account the existence of similar activities in the area because the continued presence of nesting bald eagles in the vicinity of the existing activities indicates that the eagles in that area can tolerate a greater degree of human activity than we can generally expect from eagles in areas that experience fewer human impacts. To illustrate how these factors affect the likelihood of disturbing eagles, we have incorporated the recommendations for some activities into a table (categories A and B).

First, determine which category your activity falls into (between categories A – H). If the activity you plan to undertake is not specifically addressed in these guidelines, follow the recommendations for the most similar activity represented.

If your activity is under A or B, our recommendations are in table form. The vertical axis shows the degree of visibility of the activity from the nest. The horizontal axis (header row) represents the degree to which similar activities are ongoing in the vicinity of the nest. Locate the row that best describes how visible your activity will be from the eagle nest. Then, choose the column that best describes the degree to which similar activities are ongoing in the vicinity of the eagle nest. The box where the column and row come together contains our management recommendations for how far you should locate your activity from the nest to avoid disturbing the eagles. The numerical distances shown in the tables are the closest the activity should be conducted relative to the nest. In some cases we have included additional recommendations (other than recommended *distance* from the nest) you should follow to help ensure that your activity will not disturb the eagles.

Alternate nests

For activities that entail permanent landscape alterations that may result in bald eagle disturbance, these recommendations apply to both active and alternate bald eagle nests. Disturbance becomes an issue with regard to alternate nests if eagles return for breeding purposes and react to land use changes that occurred while the nest was inactive. The likelihood that an alternate nest will again become active decreases the longer it goes unused. If you plan activities in the vicinity of an alternate bald eagle nest and have information to show that the nest has not been active during the preceding 5 breeding seasons, the recommendations provided in these guidelines for avoiding disturbance around the nest site may no longer be warranted. The nest itself remains protected by other provisions of the Eagle Act, however, and may not be destroyed.

If special circumstances exist that make it unlikely an inactive nest will be reused before 5 years of disuse have passed, and you believe that the probability of reuse is low enough to warrant disregarding the recommendations for avoiding disturbance, you should be prepared to provide all the reasons for your conclusion, including information regarding past use of the nest site. Without sufficient documentation, you should continue to follow these guidelines when conducting activities around the nest site. If we are able to determine that it is unlikely the nest will be reused, we may advise you that the recommendations provided in these guidelines for avoiding disturbance are no longer necessary around that nest site.

This guidance is intended to minimize disturbance, as defined by Federal regulation. In addition to Federal laws, most states and some tribes and smaller jurisdictions have additional laws and regulations protecting bald eagles. In some cases those laws and regulations may be more protective (restrictive) than these Federal guidelines.

Temporary Impacts

For activities that have temporary impacts, such as the use of loud machinery, fireworks displays, or summer boating activities, we recommend seasonal restrictions. These types of activities can generally be carried out outside of the breeding season without causing disturbance. The recommended restrictions for these types of activities can be lifted for alternate nests within a particular territory, including nests that were attended during the current breeding season but not used to raise young, after eggs laid in another nest within the territory have hatched (depending on the distance between the alternate nest and the active nest).

In general, activities should be kept as far away from nest trees as possible; loud and disruptive activities should be conducted when eagles are not nesting; and activity between the nest and the nearest foraging area should be minimized. If the activity you plan to undertake is not specifically addressed in these guidelines, follow the recommendations for the most similar activity addressed, or contact your local U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Field Office for additional guidance.

If you believe that special circumstances apply to your situation that increase or diminish the likelihood of bald eagle disturbance, or if it is not possible to adhere to the guidelines, you should contact your local Service Field Office for further guidance.

Category A:

- Building construction, 1 or 2 story, with project footprint of ½ acre or less.
- Construction of roads, trails, canals, power lines, and other linear utilities.
- Agriculture and aquaculture – new or expanded operations.
- Alteration of shorelines or wetlands.
- Installation of docks or moorings.
- Water impoundment.

Category B:

- Building construction, 3 or more stories.
- Building construction, 1 or 2 story, with project footprint of more than ½ acre.
- Installation or expansion of marinas with a capacity of 6 or more boats.
- Mining and associated activities.
- Oil and natural gas drilling and refining and associated activities.

	<i>If there is no similar activity within 1 mile of the nest</i>	<i>If there is similar activity closer than 1 mile from the nest</i>
<i>If the activity will be visible from the nest</i>	660 feet. Landscape buffers are recommended.	660 feet, or as close as existing tolerated activity of similar scope. Landscape buffers are recommended.
<i>If the activity will not be visible from the nest</i>	Category A: 330 feet. Clearing, external construction, and landscaping between 330 feet and 660 feet should be done outside breeding season. Category B: 660 feet.	330 feet, or as close as existing tolerated activity of similar scope. Clearing, external construction and landscaping within 660 feet should be done outside breeding season.

The numerical distances shown in the table are the closest the activity should be conducted relative to the nest.

Category C. Timber Operations and Forestry Practices

- Avoid clear cutting or removal of overstory trees within 330 feet of the nest at any time.
- Avoid timber harvesting operations, including road construction and chain saw and yarding operations, during the breeding season within 660 feet of the nest. The distance may be decreased to 330 feet around alternate nests within a particular territory, including nests that were attended during the current breeding season but not used to raise young, after eggs laid in another nest within the territory have hatched.
- Selective thinning and other silviculture management practices designed to conserve or enhance habitat, including prescribed burning close to the nest tree, should be undertaken outside the breeding season. Precautions such as raking leaves and woody debris from around the nest tree should be taken to prevent crown fire or fire climbing the nest tree. If it is determined that a burn during the breeding season would be beneficial, then, to ensure that no take or disturbance will occur, these activities should be conducted only when neither adult eagles nor young are present at the nest tree (i.e., at the beginning of, or end of, the breeding season, either before the particular nest is active or after the young have fledged from that nest). Appropriate Federal and state biologists should be consulted before any prescribed burning is conducted during the breeding season.
- Avoid construction of log transfer facilities and in-water log storage areas within 330 feet of the nest.

Category D. Off-road vehicle use (including snowmobiles). No buffer is necessary around nest sites outside the breeding season. During the breeding season, do not operate off-road vehicles within 330 feet of the nest. In open areas, where there is increased visibility and exposure to noise, this distance should be extended to 660 feet.

Category E. Motorized Watercraft use (including jet skis/personal watercraft). No buffer is necessary around nest sites outside the breeding season. During the breeding season, within 330 feet of the nest, (1) do not operate jet skis (personal watercraft), and (2) avoid concentrations of noisy vessels (e.g., commercial fishing boats and tour boats), except where eagles have demonstrated tolerance for such activity. Other motorized boat traffic passing within 330 feet of the nest should attempt to minimize trips and avoid stopping in the area where feasible, particularly where eagles are unaccustomed to boat traffic. Buffers for airboats should be larger than 330 feet due to the increased noise they generate, combined with their speed, maneuverability, and visibility.

Category F. Non-motorized recreation and human entry (e.g., hiking, camping, fishing, hunting, birdwatching, kayaking, canoeing). No buffer is necessary around nest sites outside the breeding season. If the activity will be visible or highly audible from the nest, maintain a 330-foot buffer during the breeding season, particularly where eagles are unaccustomed to such activity.

Category G. Helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft.

Except for authorized biologists trained in survey techniques, avoid operating aircraft within 1,000 feet of the nest during the breeding season, except where eagles have demonstrated tolerance for such activity.

Category H. Blasting and other loud, intermittent noises.

Avoid blasting and other activities that produce extremely loud noises within 1/2 mile of active nests, unless greater tolerance to the activity (or similar activity) has been demonstrated by the eagles in the nesting area. This recommendation applies to the use of fireworks classified by the Federal Department of Transportation as Class B explosives, which includes the larger fireworks that are intended for licensed public display.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AVOIDING DISTURBANCE AT FORAGING AREAS AND COMMUNAL ROOST SITES

1. Minimize potentially disruptive activities and development in the eagles' direct flight path between their nest and roost sites and important foraging areas.
2. Locate long-term and permanent water-dependent facilities, such as boat ramps and marinas, away from important eagle foraging areas.
3. Avoid recreational and commercial boating and fishing near critical eagle foraging areas during peak feeding times (usually early to mid-morning and late afternoon), except where eagles have demonstrated tolerance to such activity.
4. Do not use explosives within ½ mile (or within 1 mile in open areas) of communal roosts when eagles are congregating, without prior coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and your state wildlife agency.
5. Locate aircraft corridors no closer than 1,000 feet vertical or horizontal distance from communal roost sites.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO BENEFIT BALD EAGLES

The following are additional management practices that landowners and planners can exercise for added benefit to bald eagles.

1. Protect and preserve potential roost and nest sites by retaining mature trees and old growth stands, particularly within ½ mile from water.
2. Where nests are blown from trees during storms or are otherwise destroyed by the elements, continue to protect the site in the absence of the nest for up to three (3) complete breeding seasons. Many eagles will rebuild the nest and reoccupy the site.
3. To avoid collisions, site wind turbines, communication towers, and high voltage transmission power lines away from nests, foraging areas, and communal roost sites.
4. Employ industry-accepted best management practices to prevent birds from colliding with or being electrocuted by utility lines, towers, and poles. If possible, bury utility lines in important eagle areas.
5. Where bald eagles are likely to nest in human-made structures (e.g., cell phone towers) and such use could impede operation or maintenance of the structures or jeopardize the safety of the eagles, equip the structures with either (1) devices engineered to discourage bald eagles from building nests, or (2) nesting platforms that will safely accommodate bald eagle nests without interfering with structure performance.
6. Immediately cover carcasses of euthanized animals at landfills to protect eagles from being poisoned.
7. Do not intentionally feed bald eagles. Artificially feeding bald eagles can disrupt their essential behavioral patterns and put them at increased risk from power lines, collision with windows and cars, and other mortality factors.
8. Use pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and other chemicals only in accordance with Federal and state laws.
9. Monitor and minimize dispersal of contaminants associated with hazardous waste sites (legal or illegal), permitted releases, and runoff from agricultural areas, especially within watersheds where eagles have shown poor reproduction or where bioaccumulating contaminants have been documented. These factors present a risk of contamination to eagles and their food sources.

CONTACTS

The following U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Field Offices provide technical assistance on bald eagle management:

<u>Alabama</u>	Daphne	(251) 441-5181	<u>New Hampshire</u>	Concord	(603) 223-2541
<u>Alaska</u>	Anchorage	(907) 271-2888	<u>New Jersey</u>	Pleasantville	(609) 646-9310
	Fairbanks	(907) 456-0203	<u>New Mexico</u>	Albuquerque	(505) 346-2525
	Juneau	(907) 780-1160	<u>New York</u>	Cortland	(607) 753-9334
<u>Arizona</u>	Phoenix	(602) 242-0210		Long Island	(631) 776-1401
<u>Arkansas</u>	Conway	(501) 513-4470	<u>North Carolina</u>	Raleigh	(919) 856-4520
<u>California</u>	Arcata	(707) 822-7201		Asheville	(828) 258-3939
	Barstow	(760) 255-8852	<u>North Dakota</u>	Bismarck	(701) 250-4481
	Carlsbad	(760) 431-9440	<u>Ohio</u>	Reynoldsburg	(614) 469-6923
	Red Bluff	(530) 527-3043	<u>Oklahoma</u>	Tulsa	(918) 581-7458
	Sacramento	(916) 414-6000	<u>Oregon</u>	Bend	(541) 383-7146
	Stockton	(209) 946-6400		Klamath Falls	(541) 885-8481
	Ventura	(805) 644-1766		La Grande	(541) 962-8584
	Yreka	(530) 842-5763		Newport	(541) 867-4558
<u>Colorado</u>	Lakewood	(303) 275-2370		Portland	(503) 231-6179
	Grand Junction	(970) 243-2778		Roseburg	(541) 957-3474
<u>Connecticut</u>	(See New Hampshire)		<u>Pennsylvania</u>	State College	(814) 234-4090
<u>Delaware</u>	(See Maryland)		<u>Rhode Island</u>	(See New Hampshire)	
<u>Florida</u>	Panama City	(850) 769-0552	<u>South Carolina</u>	Charleston	(843) 727-4707
	Vero Beach	(772) 562-3909	<u>South Dakota</u>	Pierre	(605) 224-8693
	Jacksonville	(904) 232-2580	<u>Tennessee</u>	Cookeville	(931) 528-6481
<u>Georgia</u>	Athens	(706) 613-9493	<u>Texas</u>	Clear Lake	(281) 286-8282
	Brunswick	(912) 265-9336	<u>Utah</u>	West Valley City	(801) 975-3330
	Columbus	(706) 544-6428	<u>Vermont</u>	(See New Hampshire)	
<u>Idaho</u>	Boise	(208) 378-5243	<u>Virginia</u>	Gloucester	(804) 693-6694
	Chubbuck	(208) 237-6975	<u>Washington</u>	Lacey	(306) 753-9440
<u>Illinois/Iowa</u>	Rock Island	(309) 757-5800		Spokane	(509) 891-6839
<u>Indiana</u>	Bloomington	(812) 334-4261		Wenatchee	(509) 665-3508
<u>Kansas</u>	Manhattan	(785) 539-3474	<u>West Virginia</u>	Elkins	(304) 636-6586
<u>Kentucky</u>	Frankfort	(502) 695-0468	<u>Wisconsin</u>	New Franken	(920) 866-1725
<u>Louisiana</u>	Lafayette	(337) 291-3100	<u>Wyoming</u>	Cheyenne	(307) 772-2374
<u>Maine</u>	Old Town	(207) 827-5938		Cody	(307) 578-5939
<u>Maryland</u>	Annapolis	(410) 573-4573			
<u>Massachusetts</u>	(See New Hampshire)				
<u>Michigan</u>	East Lansing	(517) 351-2555			
<u>Minnesota</u>	Bloomington	(612) 725-3548			
<u>Mississippi</u>	Jackson	(601) 965-4900			
<u>Missouri</u>	Columbia	(573) 234-2132			
<u>Montana</u>	Helena	(405) 449-5225			
<u>Nebraska</u>	Grand Island	(308) 382-6468			
<u>Nevada</u>	Las Vegas	(702) 515-5230			
	Reno	(775) 861-6300			

<p><u>National Office</u> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Migratory Bird Management 4401 North Fairfax Drive, MBSP-4107 Arlington, VA 22203-1610 (703) 358-1714 http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds</p>
--

State Agencies

To contact a state wildlife agency, visit the Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies' website at http://www.fishwildlife.org/where_us.html

GLOSSARY

The definitions below apply to these National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines:

Communal roost sites – Areas where bald eagles gather and perch overnight – and sometimes during the day in the event of inclement weather. Communal roost sites are usually in large trees (live or dead) that are relatively sheltered from wind and are generally in close proximity to foraging areas. These roosts may also serve a social purpose for pair bond formation and communication among eagles. Many roost sites are used year after year.

Disturb – To agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, 1) injury to an eagle, 2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or 3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior.

In addition to immediate impacts, this definition also covers impacts that result from human-caused alterations initiated around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present, if, upon the eagle=s return, such alterations agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that injures an eagle or substantially interferes with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering habits and causes, or is likely to cause, a loss of productivity or nest abandonment.

Fledge – To leave the nest and begin flying. For bald eagles, this normally occurs at 10-12 weeks of age.

Fledgling – A juvenile bald eagle that has taken the first flight from the nest but is not yet independent.

Foraging area – An area where eagles feed, typically near open water such as rivers, lakes, reservoirs, and bays where fish and waterfowl are abundant, or in areas with little or no water (i.e., rangelands, barren land, tundra, suburban areas, etc.) where other prey species (e.g., rabbit, rodents) or carrion (such as at landfills) are abundant.

Landscape buffer – A natural or human-made landscape feature that screens eagles from human activity (e.g., strip of trees, hill, cliff, berm, sound wall).

Nest – A structure built, maintained, or used by bald eagles for the purpose of reproduction. An **active** nest is a nest that is attended (built, maintained or used) by a pair of bald eagles during a given breeding season, whether or not eggs are laid. An **alternate** nest is a nest that is not used for breeding by eagles during a given breeding season.

Nest abandonment – Nest abandonment occurs when adult eagles desert or stop attending a nest and do not subsequently return and successfully raise young in that nest for the duration of a breeding season. Nest abandonment can be caused by altering habitat near a nest, even if the alteration occurs prior to the breeding season. Whether the eagles migrate during the non-breeding season, or remain in the area throughout the non-breeding season, nest abandonment can occur at any point between the time the eagles return to the nesting site for the breeding season and the time when all progeny from the breeding season have

dispersed.

Project footprint – The area of land (and water) that will be permanently altered for a development project, including access roads.

Similar scope – In the vicinity of a bald eagle nest, an existing activity is of similar scope to a new activity where the types of impacts to bald eagles are similar in nature, and the impacts of the existing activity are of the same or greater magnitude than the impacts of the potential new activity. Examples: (1) An existing single-story home 200 feet from a nest is similar in scope to an additional single-story home 200 feet from the nest; (2) An existing multi-story, multi-family dwelling 150 feet from a nest has impacts of a greater magnitude than a potential new single-family home 200 feet from the nest; (3) One existing single-family home 200 feet from the nest has impacts of a lesser magnitude than three single-family homes 200 feet from the nest; (4) an existing single-family home 200 feet from a communal roost has impacts of a lesser magnitude than a single-family home 300 feet from the roost but 40 feet from the eagles' foraging area. The existing activities in examples (1) and (2) are of similar scope, while the existing activities in example (3) and (4) are not.

Vegetative buffer – An area surrounding a bald eagle nest that is wholly or largely covered by forest, vegetation, or other natural ecological characteristics, and separates the nest from human activities.

RELATED LITERATURE

Andrew, J.M. and J.A. Mosher. 1981. Bald eagle nest site selection and nesting habitat in Maryland. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 46:382-390.

Anonymous. 1977. Bald Eagle Habitat Management Guidelines, Forest Service – California Region. U.S Forest Service, San Francisco, CA.

Anthony, R.G. 2001. Low productivity of bald eagles on Prince of Wales Island, southeast Alaska. *Journal of Raptor Research* 35:1-8.

Anthony, R.G., R.W. Frenzel, F.B. Isaacs, and M.G. Garrett. 1994. Probable causes of nesting failures in Oregon's bald eagle population. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 22:576-582.

Anthony, R.G. and F.B. Isaacs. 1989. Characteristics of bald eagle nest sites in Oregon. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53:148-158.

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 1999. Bald Eagle Conservation Assessment and Strategy (draft).

Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC). 1996. Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: The State of the Art in 1996. Edison Electric Institute, Raptor Research Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Bangs, E.E., T.N. Bailey and V.D. Berns. Ecology of nesting bald eagles on the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska. (USFWS staff)

Becker, J.M. 2002. Response of wintering bald eagles to industrial construction in southeastern Washington. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 30:875-878.

Brauning, D.W. and J.D. Hassinger. 2000. Pennsylvania Recovery and Management Plan for the Bald Eagle (draft). Pennsylvania Game Commission. Harrisburg, PA.

Brown, B.T., G.S. Mills, C. Powels, W.A. Russell, G.D. Therres and J.J. Pottie. 1999. The influence of weapons-testing noise on bald eagle behavior. *Journal of Raptor Research* 33:227-232.

Brown, B.T. and L.E. Stevens. 1997. Winter bald eagle distribution is inversely correlated with human activity along the Colorado River, Arizona. *Journal of Raptor Research* 31:7-10.

Buehler, D.A. 2000. Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*). In *The Birds of North America*, No. 506 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.

Buehler, D.A., T.J. Mersmann, J.D. Fraser, and J.K.D. Seegar. 1991. Effects of human activity on bald eagle distribution on the northern Chesapeake Bay. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 55:282-290.

Buehler, D.A., T.J. Mersmann, J.D. Fraser, and J.K.D. Seegar. 1991. Nonbreeding bald eagle communal and solitary roosting behavior and roost habitat on the northern Chesapeake Bay. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 55:273-281.

- Chandler, SK., J.D. Fraser, D.A. Buehler and J.K.D. Seegar. 1995. Perch trees and shoreline development as predictors of bald eagle distribution on the Chesapeake Bay. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 59:325-332.
- Cline, K. 1985. Bald Eagles in the Chesapeake: A Management Guide for Landowners. National Wildlife Federation. Washington, D.C.
- Dell, D.D. and P.J. Zwank. 1986. Impact of a high-voltage transmission line on a nesting pair of southern bald eagles in southeast Louisiana. *Journal of Raptor Research* 20(3/4):117-119.
- Dunwiddie, P.W. and R.C. Kuntz. 2001. Long-term trends of bald eagles in winter on the Skagit River, Washington. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 65(2):290-299.
- Fletcher, R.J. et. al. 1999. Effects of recreational trails on wintering diurnal raptors along riparian corridors in a Colorado grassland. *Journal of Raptor Research* 33(3):233-239.
- Fraser, J.D. 1981. The breeding biology and status of the bald eagle on the Chippewa National Forest. PhD. Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Fraser, J.D., LD. Frenzel and J.E. Mathisen. 1985. The impact of human activities on breeding bald eagles in north-central Minnesota. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 49(3):585-592.
- Garrett, M.G., J.W. Watson, and R.G. Anthony. 1993. Bald eagle home range and habitat use in the Columbia River Estuary. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 57(1):19-27.
- Gerrard J.M. and G.R. Bortolotti. 1988. *The Bald Eagle: Haunts and Habits of a Wilderness Monarch*. Smithsonian Institution Press. Washington, D.C.
- Grier, J.W. 1969. Bald eagle behavior and productivity responses to climbing to nests. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 33:961-966.
- Grier, J.W. and J.E. Guinn. 2003. Bald eagle habitats and responses to human disturbance in Minnesota. Report to the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.
- Grubb, T.G. 1976. Survey and analysis of bald eagle nesting in western Washington. M.S. thesis, Univ. of Washington, Seattle.
- Grubb, T.G. and R.M. King. 1991. Assessing human disturbance of breeding bald eagles with classification tree models. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 55:500-511.
- Grubb, T.G., W.L. Robinson and W.W. Bowerman. 2002. Effects of watercraft on bald eagles nesting in Voyagers National Park, Minnesota. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 30:156-161.
- Grubb, T.G. and W.W. Bowerman. 1997. Variations in breeding bald eagle response to jets, light planes and helicopters. *Journal of Raptor Research* 31:213-222.

Grubb, T.G., W.W. Bowerman, A.J. Bath, J.P. Giesy, D.V.C. Weseloh. 2003. Evaluating Great Lakes bald eagle nesting habitat with Bayesian inference. RMRS-RP-45. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO, 10 pp.

Hansen, J.A. 1977. Population dynamics and night roost requirements of bald eagles wintering in the Nooksack River Valley, WA. Huxley College of Environmental Studies, Western Washington State College, Bellingham, WA. (Problem Series)

Hansen, J.A., M.V. Stalmaster and J.R. Newman. 1980. Habitat characteristics, function, and destruction of bald eagle communal roosts in western Washington. Huxley college of Environmental Studies, Western Washington University.

Hunt, W.G., D.E. Driscoll, E.W. Bianchi, and R.E. Jackman. 1992. Ecology of bald eagles in Arizona. Report to U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Contract 6-CS-30-04470. BioSystems Analysis Inc., Santa Cruz, California.

Isaacs, F.B and R.G. Anthony. 1987. Abundance, foraging, and roosting of bald eagles wintering in the Harney Basin, Oregon. Northwest Science 61(2), pp. 114-121.

Juenemann, B.G. 1973. Habitat evaluations of selected bald eagle nest sites on the Chippewa National Forest. M.S. thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Keister, G.P., R.G. Anthony and E.J. O'Neill. 1987. Use of communal roosts and foraging area by bald eagles wintering in the Klamath Basin. Journal of Wildlife Management 51(2):415-420.

Knight, R. and S.K. Knight. 1984. Responses of wintering bald eagles to boating activity. Journal of Wildlife Management 48:999-1004.

Linscombe, J.T., T.J. Hess, Jr., and V.L. Wright. 1999. Effects of seismic operations on Louisiana's nesting bald eagles. Proceedings of the Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 54:235-242.

Maine (State of) Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Rules. Chapter 8.05 Essential Habitat for Species Listed as Threatened or Endangered.

Mathisen, J.E. 1968. Effects of human disturbance on nesting bald eagles. Journal of Wildlife Management 32(1): 1-6.

McGarigal, K., R.G. Anthony and F.B. Isaacs. 1991. Interactions of humans and bald eagles on the Columbia River estuary. Wildlife Monographs 115:1-47.

McKay, K.J., J.W. Stravers, B.R. Conklin, U. Konig, S. Hawks, C.J. Kohrt, J.S. Lundh and G.V. Swenson. 2001. Potential human impacts on bald eagle reproductive success along the Upper Mississippi River.

McKewan, L.C. and D.H. Hirth. 1979. Southern bald eagle productivity and nest site selection. Journal of Wildlife Management 43:585-594.

- Millsap, B.A. Status of wintering bald eagles in the conterminous 48 States. 1986. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 14:433-440.
- Millsap, B.A, T. Breen, E. McConnell, T. Steffer, L. Phillips, N. Douglass, and S. Taylor. In Press. Comparative fecundity and survival of bald eagles fledged from suburban and rural natal areas in Florida. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 68(4).
- Montana Bald Eagle Working Group. 1986. Montana Bald Eagle Management Plan. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Billings, MT.
- Nesbitt, S.A., M.J. Folk and D.A. Wood. 1993. Effectiveness of bald eagle habitat protection guidelines in Florida. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Southeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies*.
- Newman, J.R., W.H. Brennan and L.M. Smith. 1977. Twelve-year changes in nesting patterns of bald eagles on San Juan Island, Washington. *The Murrelet* 58(2)37-39.
- Postapulsky, S. 1974. Raptor reproductive success: some problems with methods, criteria, and terminology. Pages 21-31 *in* F.N. Hammerstrom, Jr., B.E. Harrell, and R.R. Olendorff, eds. *Management of raptors*. Raptor Res. Found., Vermillion, S.D.
- Rodgers, J.A. and Schwikert, S.T. 2003. Buffer zone distances to protect foraging and loafing waterbirds from disturbance by airboats in Florida. *Waterbirds* 26(4): 437-443.
- Russell, D. 1980. Occurrence and human disturbance sensitivity of wintering bald eagles on the Sauk and Suiattle Rivers, Washington. In R.L. Knight, G.T. Allen, M.V. Stalmaster and C.W. Servheen [eds.]. *Proceedings of the Washington Bald Eagle Symposium*. Nature Conservancy, Seattle, Washington, pp. 165-174.
- Shapiro, A.E., F. Montalbano, and D. Mager. 1982. Implications of construction of a flood control project upon bald eagle nesting activity. *Wilson Bulletin* 94(1), pp. 55-63.
- Skagen, S.K. 1980. Behavioral responses of wintering bald eagles to human activity on the Skagit River, Washington. In R.L. Knight, G.T. Allen, M.V. Stalmaster and C.W. Servheen [eds.]. *Proceedings of the Washington Bald Eagle Symposium*. Nature Conservancy, Seattle, Washington, pp. 231-241.
- Skagen, S.K., R.L. Knight and G.J.H. Orians. 1991. Human disturbance of an avian scavenging guild. *Ecological Applications* 1:215-225. (Internet)
- Stalmaster, M.V. 1976 Winter ecology and effects of human activity on bald eagles in the Nooksack River Valley, Washington. MS Thesis, Western Washington State College, Bellingham.
- Stalmaster, M.V. 1980. Management strategies for wintering bald eagles in the Pacific Northwest. *Proceedings of the Washington Bald Eagle Symposium*, pp 49-67.
- Stalmaster, M.V. and J.L. Kaiser. 1998. Effects of recreational activity on wintering bald eagles. *Wildlife Monographs* 137:1-46.

- Stalmaster, M.V. and J.L. Kaiser. 1997. Flushing responses of wintering bald eagles to military activity. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 61:1307-1313.
- Stalmaster, M.V. and J.R. Newman. 1978. Behavioral responses of wintering bald eagles to human activity. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 42:506-513.
- Steenhof, K. 1978. Management of Wintering Bald Eagles. FWS/OBS-78/79. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington D.C.
- Steidl, R.J. and R.G. Anthony. 2000. Experimental Effects of Human Activity on Breeding Bald Eagles. *Ecological Applications* 10(1), pp. 258-268.
- Therres, G.D., M.A. Byrd and D.S. Bradshaw. 1993. Effects of development on nesting bald eagles: case studies from Chesapeake Bay. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference* 58:62-69.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1979. Bald Eagle Management Guidelines: Oregon – Washington. Portland. OR.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1983. Northern States bald eagle recovery plan. Appendices E, F, and G. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6, Denver, CO.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1987. Habitat Management Guidelines for the Bald Eagle in the Southeast Region. U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 4. Atlanta, GA.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1993. Bald Eagle Basics. Anchorage, AK.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1993. Habitat Management Guidelines for Bald Eagles in Texas. Austin, TX.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. 2001. Bald Eagle Protection Guidelines for Virginia. Gloucester and Richmond, VA.
- Watson, J.W. 1993. Responses of nesting bald eagles to helicopter surveys. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 21:171-178.
- Watson, J.W. 2004. Responses of nesting bald eagles to experimental pedestrian activity. *Journal of Raptor Research* 38:295-305.
- Wood, P.B. 1999. Bald eagle response to boating activity in northcentral Florida. *Journal of Raptor Research* 33:97-101.
- Wood, P.B., T.C. Edwards Jr. and M.W. Collopy. 1989. Characteristics of bald eagle nesting habitat in Florida. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53(2):441-449.
- Young, L.S. 1980. A quantitative evaluation of human disturbance impacts on breeding eagle ecology of bald eagles in the San Juan Islands, Washington. Washington Department of Game, Olympia.

APPENDIX H
Planting Guidelines

Appendix H: Planting Guidelines

MITIGATION PLANTING GUIDELINES

PLANTING GUIDELINES FOR BOTTOMLAND HARDWOOD (BLH) HABITATS

Canopy species will be planted on 9-foot centers (average) to achieve a minimum initial stand density of 538 seedlings (trees) per acre. Midstory species will be planted on 18-foot centers (average) to achieve a minimum initial stand density of 134 seedlings per acre. Stock will be at least 1 year old, at least 2 feet in height, have a minimum root collar diameter of 3/8 inch, have a root length of at least 8 to 10 inches with at least 4 to 8 lateral roots, and must be obtained from a registered licensed regional nursery/grower and of a regional eco-type species properly stored and handled to ensure viability. The plants will typically be installed during the period from December through March 15 (planting season/dormant season); however, unanticipated events such as spring flooding may delay plantings until late spring or early summer. The seedlings will be installed in a manner that avoids monotypic rows of canopy and midstory species (i.e. goal is to have spatial diversity and mixture of planted species). If herbivory may threaten seedling survival, then seedling protection devices such as wire-mesh fencing or plastic seedling protectors will be installed around each planted seedling.

Species for Wet Bottomland Hardwood Habitats (BLH-Wet Habitats)

The canopy species installed will be in general accordance with the species lists provided in Tables 1A and 1B. Plantings will be conducted such that the total number of plants installed in a given area consists of approximately 60% hard mast-producing species (Table 1A) and approximately 40% soft mast-producing species (Table 1B). The species composition of the plantings for each of the two groups of canopy species (e.g. hard mast species and soft mast species) should mimic the percent composition guidelines indicated in Tables 1A and 1B. However, site conditions (factors such as hydrologic regime, soils, composition of existing native canopy species, etc.) and planting stock availability may necessitate deviations from the species lists and/or the percent composition guidelines indicated in these tables. In general, a minimum of 3 hard mast species and a minimum of 3 soft mast species should be utilized.

The midstory species installed will be selected from the species list provided in Table 1C. Plantings will consist of at least 3 different species. The species used and the proportion of the total midstory plantings represented by each species (percent composition) will be dependent on various factors including site conditions (composition and frequency of existing native midstory species, hydrologic regime, soils, etc.) and planting stock availability.

Table 1A: Preliminary Planting List for Wet Bottomland Hardwood Habitat, Hard Mast-Producing Canopy Species (60% of Total Canopy Species)

Common Name	Scientific name	Percent Composition
Nuttall oak	<i>Quercus nuttalli</i> , <i>Q. texana</i>	30% - 40%
Willow oak	<i>Quercus phellos</i>	30% - 40%
Water oak	<i>Quercus nigra</i>	5%
Overcup oak	<i>Quercus lyrata</i>	10% - 20%
Swamp chestnut oak	<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	10% - 20%
Water hickory	<i>Carya aquatica</i>	10% - 20%

Table 1B: Preliminary Planting List for Wet Bottomland Hardwood Habitat, Soft Mast-Producing Canopy Species (40% of Total Canopy Species)

Common Name	Scientific name	Percent Composition
Drummond red maple	<i>Acer rubrum</i> var. <i>drummondii</i>	15% - 25%
Sugarberry	<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	15% - 25%
Green ash	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	15% - 25%
Sweetgum	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	10% - 20%

Appendix H: Planting Guidelines

American elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	10% - 20%
Bald cypress	<i>Taxodium distichum</i>	5% - 15%

Table 1C: Preliminary Planting List for Wet Bottomland Hardwood Habitat, Midstory Species

Common Name	Scientific name	Percent Composition
Saltbush	<i>Baccharis halimifolia</i>	TBD
Buttonbush	<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	TBD
Roughleaf dogwood	<i>Cornus drummondii</i>	TBD
Mayhaw	<i>Crataegus opaca</i>	TBD
Green hawthorn	<i>Crataegus viridis</i>	TBD
Common persimmon	<i>Diospyros virginiana</i>	TBD
Honey locust	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	TBD
Possumhaw	<i>Ilex decidua</i>	TBD
Dahoon holly	<i>Ilex cassine</i>	TBD
Red mulberry	<i>Morus rubra</i>	TBD
Wax myrtle	<i>Myrica cerifera</i>	TBD

TBD = To Be Determined

Deviations from Typical Planting Guidelines

Proposed mitigation features that involve restoration will commonly require planting the entire feature using the prescribed planting guidance addressed in the preceding sections. In contrast, mitigation features that involve enhancement will often require adjustments to the typical plant spacing/density guidelines and may further require adjustments to the guidelines pertaining to species composition.

Where initial enhancement activities include the eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species, significant numbers of native canopy and/or midstory species may remain, but in a spatial distribution that leaves relatively large “gaps” in the canopy stratum and/or the midstory stratum. In such cases, areas measuring approximately 25 feet by 25 feet that are devoid of native canopy species should be planted and areas measuring approximately 45 feet by 45 feet that are devoid of native midstory species should be planted.

The initial enhancement actions involved within a particular mitigation site could include a variety of measures such as the eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species, topographic alterations (excavation, filling, grading, etc.), and hydrologic enhancement actions (alterations to drainage patterns/features, installation of water control structures, etc.). These actions may result in areas of variable size that require planting of both canopy and midstory species using the typical densities/spacing described previously. There may also be areas where several native canopy and/or midstory species remain, thus potentially altering the general guidelines described as regards the spacing of plantings, and/or the species to be planted, and/or the percent composition of planted species. Similarly, areas that must be re-planted due to failure in achieving applicable mitigation success criteria may involve cases where the general guidelines discussed above will not necessarily be applicable.

Given these uncertainties, initial planting plans specific to enhancement features will be required and must be specified in the Mitigation Work Plan for the mitigation site. The initial planting plans will be developed by the USACE in cooperation with the Interagency Team. Initial plantings will be the responsibility of the USACE. If re-planting of an area is necessary following initial plantings, a specific re-planting plan must also be prepared and must be approved by the USACE in cooperation with the Interagency Team prior to re-planting. With the exception of any re-planting actions necessary to attain the initial survivorship success criteria (i.e. survival required 1 year following completion of initial plantings), the NFS will be responsible for preparing re-planting plans and conducting re-planting activities, subject to the provisions mentioned in the Introduction section. Re-planting necessary to achieve the initial survivorship criteria will be the responsibility of the USACE, subject to the provisions mentioned in the Introduction section.

Appendix H: Planting Guidelines

PLANTING GUIDELINES FOR SWAMP HABITATS

Canopy species will be planted on 9-foot centers (average) to achieve a minimum initial stand density of 538 seedlings (trees) per acre. Midstory species will be planted on 18-foot centers (average) to achieve a minimum initial stand density of 134 seedlings per acre. Stock used for canopy species will be at least 1 year old, at least 3 feet tall, and have a root collar diameter that exceeds 0.5 inch. Stock used for midstory species will be at least 1 year old and will be at least 3 feet tall. All stock must be obtained from a registered licensed regional nursery/grower and of a regional eco-type species properly stored and handled to ensure viability. The plants will typically be installed during the period from December through March 15 (planting season/dormant season); however, unanticipated events may delay plantings until late spring or early summer. The seedlings will be installed in a manner that that avoids monotypic rows of canopy and midstory species (i.e. goal is to have spatial diversity and mixture of planted species). If herbivory may threaten seedling survival, then seedling protection devices such as wire-mesh fencing or plastic seedling protectors will be installed around each planted seedling.

The canopy species installed will be in general accordance with the species lists provided in Table 3A. The species composition of the plantings should mimic the percent composition guidelines indicated in this table. However, site conditions (factors such as hydrologic regime, soils, composition of existing native canopy species, etc.) and planting stock availability may necessitate deviations from the species lists and/or the percent composition guidelines indicated. In general, a minimum of 3 canopy species should be utilized, the plantings must include baldcypress and tupelogum (water tupelo), and baldcypress should typically comprise at least 50% of the total number of seedlings installed.

The midstory species installed will be selected from the species list provided in Table 3B. Plantings will consist of at least 2 different species. The species used and the proportion of the total midstory plantings represented by each species (percent composition) will be dependent on various factors including site conditions (composition and frequency of existing native midstory species, hydrologic regime, soils, etc.) and planting stock availability.

Table 3A: Preliminary Planting List for Swamp Habitat, Canopy Species

Common Name	Scientific name	Percent Composition
Bald cypress	<i>Taxodium distichum</i>	60% - 75%
Tupelogum	<i>Nyssa aquatic</i>	20% - 25%
Green ash	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	10% - 15%
Drummond red maple	<i>Acer rubrum var. drummondii</i>	5%
Bitter pecan	<i>Carya x lecontei</i>	5% - 10%

Table 3B: Preliminary Planting List for Swamp Habitat, Midstory Species

Common Name	Scientific name	Percent Composition
Buttonbush	<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	TBD
Roughleaf dogwood	<i>Cornus drummondii</i>	TBD
Swamp privet	<i>Forestiera acuminata</i>	TBD
Possumhaw	<i>Ilex decidua</i>	TBD
Virginia willow	<i>Itea virginica</i>	TBD
Wax myrtle	<i>Myrica cerifera</i>	TBD
Swamp rose	<i>Rosa palustris</i>	TBD
American snowbell	<i>Styrax americanus</i>	TBD

TBD = To Be Determined

Deviations from Typical Planting Guidelines

Appendix H: Planting Guidelines

Proposed mitigation features that involve restoration will commonly require planting the entire feature using the prescribed planting guidance addressed in the preceding sections. In contrast, mitigation features that involve enhancement will often require adjustments to the typical plant spacing/density guidelines and may further require adjustments to the guidelines pertaining to species composition.

For swamp enhancement projects that include the eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species, significant numbers of native canopy and/or midstory species may remain, but in a spatial distribution that leaves relatively large “gaps” in the canopy stratum and/or the midstory stratum. In such cases, areas measuring approximately 25 feet by 25 feet that are devoid of native canopy species should be planted and areas measuring approximately 45 feet by 45 feet that are devoid of native midstory species should be planted.

The initial enhancement actions involved within a particular swamp enhancement mitigation site could include a variety of measures such as the eradication of invasive and nuisance plant species, topographic alterations (excavation, filling, grading, etc.), and hydrologic enhancement actions (alterations to drainage patterns/features, installation of water control structures, etc.). These actions may result in areas of variable size that require planting of both canopy and midstory species using the typical densities/spacing described above. There may also be areas where several native canopy and/or midstory species remain, thus potentially altering the general guidelines described as regards the spacing of plantings, and/or the species to be planted, and/or the percent composition of planted species. Similarly, areas that must be re-planted due to failure in achieving applicable mitigation success criteria may involve cases where the general guidelines discussed above will not necessarily be applicable.

Given these uncertainties, initial planting plans specific to a mitigation site will be required and must be specified in the Mitigation Work Plan for the site. The initial planting plans will be developed by the USACE in cooperation with the Interagency Team. Initial plantings will be the responsibility of the USACE. If re-planting of an area is necessary following initial plantings, a specific re-planting plan must also be prepared and must be approved by the USACE in cooperation with the Interagency Team prior to re-planting. With the exception of any re-planting actions necessary to attain the initial survivorship success criteria (i.e. survival required 1 year following completion of initial plantings), the NFS will be responsible for preparing re-planting plans and conducting re-planting activities, subject to the provisions contained in the Introduction section. Re-planting necessary to achieve the initial survivorship criteria will be the responsibility of the USACE, subject to the aforementioned provisions.

APPENDIX I

INTERAGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL TEAM

Stephanie Zumo	Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board
Barry Bleichner	Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board
Elizabeth Davoli	Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board
Jeffrey Harris	Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
Frank Cole	Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
Tim Killeen	Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
Kyle Balkum	Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries
Heather Finley	Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries
Clifford Melius	Louisiana Office of State Parks
Patrick Williams	National Marine Fisheries Service
Richard Hartman	National Marine Fisheries Service
David Walther	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Angela Trahan	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
David Castellanos	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Catherine Breaux	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Barbara Keeler	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
John Ettinger	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Guy Hughes	U.S. National Park Service
Dusty Haigler	U.S. National Park Service
Elizabeth Behrens	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Tammy Gilmore	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

APPENDIX J
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Cecil Sumners Comment:

Thanks Tammy for providing the link to your 281 page document and the SEA #572 report that includes our land as an alternative and the notice that there is a 30 day public review period that began on April 29.

I waded thru the report and found this as your rationale for eliminating our land from further analysis:

"The Sunset Ridge project is located in St. Charles Parish adjacent to Hwy 306, south of Paradis and east of Des Allemands (see figure A-6). This project offers approximately 250 acres of pasture land that would be available for FS BLH-wet mitigation. There are approximately 85 acres of BLH-Wet habitat and an existing local levee to the east and adjacent to the property. In order to restore the site's hydrologic connection to other flood side habitats while maintaining storm risk reduction to the surrounding communities, this levee would need to be rerouted around the site and the current levee either gapped or degraded. The neighborhood adjacent to the mitigation site has an existing drainage system that goes through the property. Once hydrology is restored, the water surface elevations within the project area would increase and therefore would negatively impact the ability of drainage from the adjacent neighborhoods to enter the project area. Since the site is currently under the influence of forced drainage, the elevations within the site are too low to support BLH once the site is reconnected to other FS habitats. As such, up to several feet of material would need to be added to the site such that elevations conducive to BLH establishment could be obtained. Once the existing levee is gapped/degraded, the 85 acres of BLH-Wet between the mitigation site and the local levee would be flooded to such an extent that the existing trees could not survive. Executive Order (E.O.) 11990 states that "Each agency shall take action to minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands, and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands." Additionally, EP 1165-2-502 states that projects should be formulated and designed to avoid any requirement for compensatory fish and wildlife mitigation. For these reasons, this alternative has been eliminated from further analysis."

Since this is my first time to this particular rodeo I'm trying to understand the above and best I can tell you have been able to do something that I had been unable to do, get a solution on how to handle tidal exchange. I found no one with the answer when I tried 8 years ago and I tried rather hard.

The tidal exchange you envision must be rather extensive since you're looking at rerouting the main Sunset levee around my land and then breeching the levee. Breeching/gaping the levee in turn would kill the existing BLH stand of trees on 85 acres.

In recent conversations with state & local authorities I'm convinced that the extent/size of a tidal exchange system seems at best still a rather fluid "definition". As such I believe the task of providing for "enough" tidal exchange can be solved by a very small gap in the existing Sunset levee that would empty/exchange into an elevated holding area/pond. Overflow from this pond could be routed into Canal #10 which runs north-south and is eventually pumped into Bayou Des Allemands.

Chevron's massive mitigation bank (7,102 acres) that surrounds me on two sides has done well in their plantings of BLH without breaching or degrading the main Sunset levee or having to hold back water from the main canal #1 with a flap gate. There must be enough water to go around.

It would be great if we could find a way we can work together to see how we could get back into this and/or your other projects.

I look forward to discussing this further with you & Libby, Maybe we could set up a meeting?

Thanks for your time and efforts.

USACE Response:

Mr. Sumners,

The impacts we are mitigating are not only impacts to the habitat type (BLH) but also to the Coastal Zone. To be considered as a project that mitigates Coastal Zone impacts, it cannot be within a leveed system as it must provide full tidal connection which involves free passage of aquatic organisms and detritus into and out of the site. Re-routing the levee around your site to provide free access for aquatic organisms and detritus would incur the impacts Tammy has stated in the EA. As such, your site is un-suitable for our current efforts. In the future, if we have impacts that can be mitigated within the leveed system, we will revisit your site as a potential opportunity. Thanks for the hospitality you extended to us during our field investigations of your site and your interest in our mitigation program.

Libby

Cecil Sumners Comment:

Hi Libby,

Thanks for the reply. We are disappointed that we were not able to meet your specifications but appreciate your taking the time to visit and inspect our property. Hopefully there will be another project you're researching where we will get a second chance.

Regards,

Cecil Sumners

Dave Butler Comment (LDWF):

To Whom It may Concern:

Could we please have a few more days to review this SEA? We are awaiting signature on comments.

USACE Response:

Dave,

When do you think you could get us your comments? We are in the process of addressing some comments received during the public review. I imagine we will be finished addressing

comments by close of business Monday, June 3. If you could get us your comments by then we could hopefully address them within a day or so without it being a big deal.

Thanks!

Tammy Gilmore

Dave Butler Comment (LDWF):

Tammy,

We sent the letter last Thursday after all. Our comment is below.

" It is anticipated that the proposed activity will have minimal or no long-term adverse impacts to wetland functions and, therefore, we find a FONSI is appropriate."



State of Louisiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT

May 30, 2019

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch
Corps of Engineers- New Orleans District
7400 Leake Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70118
Via email: marshall.k.harper@usace.army.mil

RE: **C20140014 mod 05**, Coastal Zone Consistency
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers (COE)
Direct Federal Action
Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment (DSEA) #572, West Bank and Vicinity
Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System BLH-Wet and Swamp Mitigation
Lafourche Parish, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Harper:

The Office of Coastal Management (OCM) has reviewed the above-referenced document, and offers the following comments for consideration in finalizing the EA.

The EA describes changes to the Recommended Mitigation Plan for the subject levee system, and evaluates the potential impacts of the Hwy 307 BLH-Wet and Hwy 307 Swamp mitigation projects. These projects were earlier submitted for consistency review, and OCM concurred with that consistency determination on December 7, 2015 (C20140014 mod 02).

The 2015 consistency determination described the construction of 330 ac. of swamp and 137 ac. BLH-wet. DSEA #572 assesses the construction of 360 ac. of swamp and 150 ac. of BLH-wet, an increase of 43 ac. The reasons for this 43 ac. increase are not explained. The coastal effects on the larger area have not been reviewed for consistency with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program.

The overall project site is 521 ac., and the project will construct 510 ac. of new wetland habitat. The impacts to the remaining 11 ac. is unclear and should be addressed in the final document. These impacts were not considered in the 2015 consistency determination.

DSEA #572 and C20140014 mod 02 both propose to degrade water control dikes, but neither shows where this work will occur, the size of the gaps, where the material will be placed, and other significant project elements.

DSEA #572 makes reference to future project changes which may result from completion of final WVAs and final engineering design, and specifically mentions establishing maintenance corridors and realigning retention dikes as features that may yet be changed. There is no indication that these adjustments to the project will be evaluated for their potential impacts, and they have not been subjected to consistency review.

OCM has not had the opportunity to review the final WVAs for the project. Language in DSEA #572 suggests that they may not be complete, which implies that the proposed mitigation may require further modification. Also, the anticipated AAHUs which will result from the proposed projects are not presented in the DSEA. Without this information it is difficult to determine whether the proposed mitigation will adequately offset the impacts of the levee construction.

In light of the variations noted above, between the project as described in the 2015 consistency determination and that presented in DSEA #572, the statement that coastal zone consistency has been completed is inaccurate. At the appropriate point in the planning process, an additional consistency determination should be submitted for all project features which have not been previously reviewed. This should include final WVAs so that OCM may ensure that Louisiana's mitigation requirements are met.

If you have any questions concerning this determination please contact Jeff Harris of the Consistency Section at (225) 342-7949 or jeff.harris@la.gov.

Sincerely,

/S/ Charles Reulet

Administrator

Interagency Affairs/Field Services Division

CR/SK/jdh

cc: Tammy Gilmore, COE-NOD
Dave Butler, LDWF
Kelley Templet, OCM
Kirk Kilgen, OCM
Amanda Voisin, Lafourche



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT
7400 LEAKE AVENUE
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

Regional Planning and Environment
Division South

Charles Reulet
Interagency Affairs - LADNR
Field Services Division
P.O. Box 44487, Capital Station
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4487

Dear Mr. Reulet:

Thank you for your review of and comments on Supplemental Environmental Assessment #572 titled "West Bank and Vicinity Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System BLH-Wet and Swamp Mitigation, Lafourche Parish, Louisiana". Attached are US Army Corps of Engineer's responses to your comments. Hopefully, these responses address all of your agency's concerns. Feel free to contact me with any further concerns or questions you might have.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Marshall K. Harper".

Marshall K. Harper
Chief, Environmental Planning Branch

Encls.

USACE Responses to OCM comments

SEA #572

OCM comment: DSEA #572 assesses the construction of 360 ac. of swamp and 150 ac. of BLH-wet, an increase of 43 ac. The reasons for this 43 ac. increase are not explained. The coastal effects on the larger area have not been reviewed for consistency with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program.

USACE Response: Page 2-3 of SEA #572 states “Within the 521 acres, approximately 150 acres would be used for BLH-Wet restoration (Appendix A-5). The 150 acres includes additional acreage to account for any potential changes in project size due to the completion of final WVAs, final engineering design, and required maintenance corridors.”

Page 2-6 of SEA #572 states “Within the 521 acres, approximately 360 acres would be used for FS swamp restoration. The 360 acres includes additional acreage to account for any potential changes in project size due to the completion of final WVAs, final engineering design, and required maintenance corridors.”

Page 2-10 of SEA #572 states “However, additional acreage was included in both BLH-Wet and swamp projects in an effort to account for any potential increase in project size that may be necessary with completion of final WVAs.”

OCM comment: The overall project site is 521 ac., and the project will construct 510 ac. of new wetland habitat. The impacts to the remaining 11 ac. is unclear and should be addressed in the final document. These impacts were not considered in the 2015 consistency determination.

USACE Response: Within the entire 521 acre site, approximately 116 acres of BLH and 257 acres of swamp habitat will be planted in unknown locations within that 521 acres. The remaining acres could potentially be utilized for project features such as mowing corridors, access corridors, drainage ditches, etc. The USACE would not purchase any lands not needed for project features.

OCM comment: DSEA #572 and C20140014 mod 02 both propose to degrade water control dikes, but neither shows where this work will occur, the size of the gaps, where the material will be placed, and other significant project elements.

USACE Response: The entire dike on both sides of the project area would be degraded. This dike is located around the perimeter of the land within the agricultural site. As stated in SEA #572, the material generated would be used to fill the ditches adjacent to the dikes.

OCM comment: DSEA #572 makes reference to future project changes which may result from completion of final WVAs and final engineering design, and specifically mentions establishing maintenance corridors and realigning retention dikes as features that may yet be changed. There is no indication that these adjustments to the project will be evaluated for their potential impacts, and they have not been subjected to consistency review.

USACE Response: The final WVAs have been received and are attached. The acreages needed based on those WVAs are 116 acres (72.11 AAHUs) of BLH and 257 acres (134.71 AAHUs) of swamp. A 10% contingency has been added to these numbers for possible engineering and design changes. The maintenance corridors would be minimal and would include such things as tractor turning points and mowing lanes. The dikes would be degraded and not realigned, this is stated in SEA #572 pages 2-3 and 2-6.

OCM comment: OCM has not had the opportunity to review the final WVAs for the project. Language in DSEA #572 suggests that they may not be complete, which implies that the proposed mitigation may require further modification. Also, the anticipated AAHUs which will result from the proposed projects are not presented in the DSEA. Without this information it is difficult to determine whether the proposed mitigation will adequately offset the impacts of the levee construction.

USACE Response: The final WVAs are attached for your review. The AAHUs generated by the proposed action would be approximately 134.71 for swamp and 72.11 for BLH.