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COLONEL CONNER:

I'd like to welcome you all to tonight's public meeting. This public meeting is on the Industrial Lock Replacement Project for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. If you're here for the post-Superbowl party, you're in the wrong room. My name is Colonel Bill Conner. I'm a Commander of the New Orleans Office of the Corps of Engineers, and I want to officially welcome you to tonight's proceedings.

The agenda for this evening is on the slide posted to your right. We'll follow this agenda to the conclusion of the meeting. With me at the head table for this evening is Mr. Pat Gallwey, representing our partner for this project, which is the Port of New Orleans, and also at the table for the evening's proceedings is Mr. Joe Dicharry, who is the project manager for this project out of my office. At this time, I'd like to turn the microphone over to Pat for his opening comments.

MR. GALLWEY:

Thanks very much, Colonel. Good evening to everyone and welcome. Mr. Brinson, our President and CEO, is not able to be here tonight. He's at home with the flu. He sends his apologies and he asked me to present our remarks tonight.

The Port of New Orleans supports the construction of the new lock project and further strongly supports the concept of providing mitigation in the form of community improvements, projects, programs and compensation. We believe this project should be and will be sensitive to the community's needs and concerns and the mitigation programs should also be designed and administered by the people it directly impacts.

Our record on this issue has been clear. Almost six years ago when this project was last proposed, it would have demolished over 200 homes and relocated some 800 people. The voice of the residents was heard and the project was revamped so that there are now no residential relocations. The ideas of the neighborhood residents have been incorporated into the project. The project has been vastly improved through listening to the concerns of the residents and through advances in construction technology. Concerns about access, design features of bridges, community housing, job training, beautification, recreation projects and many others have been incorporated into the project. We have listened to the concerns about isolation and the need for better access, and we believe that this project will provide safe and secure and convenient access to the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward, the Holy Cross area and the St. Bernard area well into the future.

The impacts and the benefits have been documented. We believe that it is possible to build this project so that everyone benefits. The lock is...
[1] the single busiest lock in the nation, and
[2] the delays associated with it increase the
[3] cost of moving goods used to make this
[4] nation strong and competitive. And so we
[5] come together tonight again this evening
[6] to hear your concerns, the concerns of the
[7] people on this most recent plan, and to
[8] listen so that this project can help in
[9] the revitalization of the communities
[10] bordering along the canal. Thank you very

[12] COLONEL CONNER:
[13] Thank you. Before we get
[14] to the main portion of the meeting, which
[15] is to hear your comments, the comments of
[16] the public, for purposes of summarizing
[17] the Corps' current idea of what the
[18] project would look like and bringing us
[19] a little bit to the scope of the project and our current
[20] plan for design. So if I could ask that
[21] you turn your attention to the screen.

(Videotape played.)

[22] COLONEL CONNER:
[23] That's the plan that we
[24] have right now. Except there is one change
[25] that we've just recently worked out. I
[26] don't expect you to be able to identify
[27] exactly what that is, but we have
[28] available some photocopies of this slide
[29] that were at the front door when you
[30] walked in, and if you want additional
[31] copies, we can hand those out to you at
[32] this time.

What happened is last
[33] Wednesday, I met with some of the local
[34] interest groups, neighborhood residents
[35] from the community, to talk about the
[36] project a little bit to kind of get me
[37] smart, since I'm new here, and one thing
[38] that was loud and clear to me as a result
[39] of that meeting was that the closure of
[40] the St. Claude Avenue bridge is easily, if
[41] not the biggest sticking point of the
[42] project, one of the biggest. And right
[43] now or up until last Wednesday, we were
[44] talking about that bridge being closed for
[45] a period of two years, which would mean
[46] that St. Claude Avenue would not be
[47] available to the communities for that
[48] two year period. And that seemed to be
[49] pretty unacceptable. So what we did after
[50] Wednesday is we got together and sketched
[51] out a solution to that particular issue,
[52] and that's what you're looking at here,
[53] which is a temporary bridge which will be
[54] put in at St. Claude Avenue. And the idea
[55] is that we would buy an erector set kind
[56] of kit that's available. It's been used a
[57] lot in the Northeast on the interstate
[58] there. We'd buy that. We'd build it next
[59] to the existing bridge and then we'd build
[60] a little tie-in road that would go into
[61] St. Claude Avenue, and that's what that
[62] red line is on the slide. On your
[63] handouts, it's all in black because that's
[64] all we could get to reproduce was black
[65] and not red. And so what that would mean
[66] is that the St. Claude Avenue would only
[67] be closed during the time it would take us
[68] to physically tie in this new road and
[69] bridge with the existing St. Claude

[70] Avenue. And so we're guessing at this time that that would probably take a
[71] couple or three months had to do.

[72] Probably, if we could swing it right, we'd
[73] even want to go ahead and have that happen
[74] over the summer months period so as not to
[75] impact on the school session for the folks
[76] attending Holy Cross School. That may or
[77] may not happen. That's kind of toward the
[78] end of the whole project anyway so it
[79] would be kind of hard to tell at this time
[80] exactly when it would. So that's the only
[81] change from the video is the concept of
[82] attempting to at least keep St. Claude
[83] Avenue open, if not the whole time during
[84] the project, at least a period of time or
[85] most of the time and only have it closed
[86] for a couple of months.

[87] Now, this hasn't been approved yet. This isn't part of the
[88] 511-million-dollar program. But I have
[89] checked with my bosses and they indicate
[90] that it sounds like a pretty good idea to
[91] them and they're going to go ahead and
[92] carry the torch forward to Washington to
We also are planning to make all of this work tie in with existing programs that are ongoing, and we are familiar with the ones that are shown here on this slide. As we get more familiar with the area and learn of other initiatives, either ongoing or ones that begin after the project does, we will attempt to tie in or work with those as well so there's no duplication of effort. This is the schedule that we're going to be working off of for this project, and I'd like to spend a minute to go over that with you before we go to the public comment period. Tonight we have this public meeting, and this is required by law but this is not the end of the official public comments. We will take everything that you say this evening and we will include that in for the record. Now, the official for-the-record proceedings is the audio tapes that are being made to your front here, to the gentleman on my left. That's the official record for the meeting. Now, behind you is a video camera that's being run but it will be turned on and off during the course of the evening. It's just there to provide us some additional assistance. So you can rest assured that 100 percent of your comments will be recorded. They'll be recorded audibly and every single person who wants to speak will have that submitted as part of the record for the transcript we'll make for the record.

In addition, if you have written comments that need to be submitted, someone handed me one this evening just before the meeting started, that's fine, too, and we will accept those this evening. If you want to read your comments into the record and then hand them to us, that's okay. And then after that, you have until the 24th of February to submit your written comments to my office in mail. And so if you don't have your comments written out tonight but you want to write them up, that's fine but you got to get them to me by the 24th. After the 24th, the comment period for this meeting is officially closed. And the reason for that is that I then have to submit a report through my chain of command that has to leave my office by the end of March. So that gives me from the end of February to the end of March to put that report together.
During that time, I will also be preparing a written response to every question that’s raised either here at the meeting tonight verbally or through your written comments, and so you’ll all be receiving answers to your questions that way. I don’t have the time tonight to be able to go ahead and put together an oral dialogue nor do I know enough about the project to be able to answer all your questions this evening, so you’ll receive written responses to every question that you have.

That report then goes up through my chain of command and gets to Washington, at which time we expect a response by June of this year. And once that response is made, that is effectively the end of the Corps of Engineers’ involvement for this period of time. What will then happen is the report will be sent over to the Congress for decision, and the Congress is the one that decides as to whether or not this project will go. Let me explain that.

Everything that you saw in the video, everything you’ve ever read about this project, every discussion point that will be made here tonight, these are all based on an idea and only an idea. This project does not have any money right now assigned to it for the work to be done. That must be done by the Congress and it has not been done yet. And, therefore, the Congress will make one of several decisions as to what to do with this project after they receive all of the input. They’ll either decide to go ahead and fund it or they’ll decide to fund it with some changes or they’ll decide not to fund it at all. Those are basically their options. I’m sure there are a lot of other permutations and combinations of those ideas, but that’s basically the gist of what will happen to it.

That will take place from the period of June of this year until October of ’98. The 1st of October of ’98 is what the government calls the beginning of fiscal year ’99, and if the project in its current configuration or some small modification of that configuration, if that project is to go forward, then that will happen with the period that begins October of ’98 or what we call fiscal year ’99. If the project is not funded for that period of time, then effectively it goes into limbo and we start over again.

So that’s why this meeting tonight is so important, because this is a very key opportunity for everyone here to voice their opinions about this project. And it’s certainly no secret to the folks at this table that there is a very strong local opposition to the project, and we expect to hear that tonight. In fact, I demand of you to provide your opposition tonight because it’s very important as part of the political process that you have the opportunity to have your say. So please make your say known, please speak up, speak clearly, speak as coherently, get your point across.

Now, you’ll notice that every question that’s raised either here or through the official comment received by individuals who have asked to speak, they look like this and they were at the table available to you when you came in the front door. If you didn’t fill out a card and you would like to fill out a card and speak, you’re free to do that any time during the course of the evening. We won’t leave here until everybody who has asked to speak is given the opportunity to do that. Therefore, I sincerely ask you to limit your comments.
Okay. So at this time, we'll begin. Right now, Joe tells me that none of the federal U.S. officials from the National Congress have asked to speak. Are there any members in the audience at this time or the representatives who would like to make a statement? Okay. Very good, sir. We will get to you. All right. With no one from the federal government here to speak, then, we will turn it over to the state government for their comments. Who's the first speaker?

MR. DICHRARY:

The first speaker will be Senator John Johnson.

SENATOR JOHNSON:

I'd like to start off by expressing my appreciation to all of the residents and the constituents and the individuals who are out on tonight to listen to the presentation. I would imagine to many, many people who are here on tonight, this is not new. You've probably been through this more times than you want to come and voice your opinion on this particular project. I was at a meeting here last week, and I said to a small group of individuals on last week that I can remember when I was 17 years old, the largest community meeting that I called down here in the Lower Ninth Ward had to do with the Industrial Canal and the possibility of replacing those locks. Most of you know how old I am today, so I don't need to tell you my age, but it was long time ago. So we've been discussing this project now for a long time, and I would assume every time we get a new district engineer, we're going to have to go through the process of discussing this project all over again. This is the first time that this colonel has had an opportunity to listen to the community on this project, so, Colonel, I would imagine you have to go back and dig up the old reports and see what they said, and what you're probably going to find is that the reports are going to be pretty consistent with what the people in this community have said in the past. And I think, and I'm going to allow the people to speak for themselves, but I think pretty profoundly comprehensively, people are going to say in this community that they don't want this project. Now, I frankly don't know how many times we're going to have to say that, but I would assume we will say it as many times as you all want to hear it.

Now, I've been through this many times and I'm not going to spend a lot of time

(rehashing what I said in the past so many times. I know that one of my colleagues in the Senate, Senator Dean - Is Senator Dean here tonight? I know that Senator Lynn Dean is going to want to have some comments and some things that he's going to want to say. He's a newly elected senator from the St. Bernard-Paquemines area and he's going to have some very strong comments to make on this project on tonight. I hope you all would give him the time to make his presentation and to listen to what he has to say. But I just want to say, as the senator whose district that the project or the proposed project is located in and as the state senator in whose senatorial district the present locks are located in, I am going to represent the views, the needs and the concerns of my constituents. And I think from having represented this district and this community in the state legislature for a number of years, I know how the people feel.}
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I Now, I frankly think as one voter in this district that it is an insult for the Corps of Engineers to come into this community and talk about the possibility of bringing a half-a-billion-dollar project into this community and by the time the project is developed, if it were to be developed, which it won't, but if it were to be developed, it would be a billion-dollar project, at least a billion-dollar project, and to talk about a mediation program of 33 million dollars, that is an insult. 33 million dollars would not even pay for the problem and the losses that the businesses will lose or experience in this community over the 10 years to 12 years that they would be negatively impacted. And I see Miss Morris over here clapping, who is a business lady in this community. She knows what I'm talking about. And there are several small business people in this community who own small businesses who have worked all of their lives to get their businesses to where they are today. 33 million dollars wouldn't even come close to helping those people experience the kind of losses that they would experience if this project were to become a reality.

So I would strongly suggest to you that if, with the crooked letters, if you want to continue to talk about this project, and I'm not suggesting in any way, shape or form that I support the project, but if you want to continue to talk about it, you talk about putting at least 500 million dollars on the table so that every house in this community that needs to be renovated or replaced will be replaced, every street that needs to be replaced, so that this community can look like a model community, then you might be able to do a little talking. And I would think that it would take at least a half a billion dollars in order to do that. At least 500 million dollars, at least. Now, that's the point that I want to make to you all as the Port of New Orleans and the Corps of Engineers, and let me just say that you all are my friends. The Port of New Orleans is a state agency. I'm a state senator. I work very closely with the Port of New Orleans. Any time they need money to enhance the port in order to create jobs and economic development, I try to work with them in order to get the money because I know what that port means to this community and to this state. The Corps of Engineers, which is a federal agency, as a state elected official, I try to work with them. But let's stop hassling the community. Let's stop insulting the people in this community with this project. If the people have said unequivocally that they don't want the project, leave it alone.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, Senator.

Appreciate those comments.

At the meeting last Wednesday that the Senator refers to, the comment was made that this discussion has gone on through 15 Corps of Engineers colonels who have sat in my chair. And I'm here to tell you tonight that that's not true. There were 16 because I counted them today. So it was pretty close though.

Who is the next speaker?

MR. DICHDARY:

Next speaker will be Senator Lynn Dean.

SENRATOR DEAN:

Good evening, gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen. Thanks for the privilege. I have some comments here that's written down. They take me a little over five minutes. I hope that's allowed.

Why don't we start off with saying I'm strongly disappointed that with all the technology we have in the world today, all the engineering we have in the world today, that we say we're going to do a project like this that's going to take 12 years and that for a couple of years' period a certain bridge may be down, a couple years' period another bridge may be down, and when you
Most of us do not want change, yet the only way to improve our society is by meaningful change. I started to say many citizens of St. Bernard, but after talking to them a few days, I'd have to say most of the citizens or all of the citizens of St. Bernard do not want a canal, a cut if you will, in St. Bernard Parish. We remember the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, that nasty erosive cut that daily proves it was a mistake. St. Bernard citizens were promised industry with good-paying jobs for our citizens and our children. I just now heard you all talking about promising some jobs. You didn't mention the fact that you're going to wipe out the Galvez Street dock and all these areas in there that's furnishing jobs and they'll be gone. But we can forget about all the investment we got in the Galvez Street dock, and as a little boy about 12 years old back in the '40s, the '50s, I used to see 50 to 100 barges tied there, the Mississippi Valley Barge Line, the Federal Barge Line, loading and unloading barges there all the time, and I was working for a company called the Red River Barge Line and we'd come in there and picked up cargo there. But that's going to be all gone and dead. Today, over 30 years later, not one industry is on the MRGO. Not one job came from the MRGO. But we had to build an expensive levee to provide us protection in St. Bernard from hurricane flooding. The MRGO still harmed our parish where the levee was never built at Reggio, Florissant, Ycleskey and Hopedale. These are people live there. Sometimes school buses pick up children or do not pick up children due to flood waters caused by high tides coming up the MRGO. The taxpayers of our parish have paid over four million dollars to build some levees out there that we didn't need before, and now we still owe about seven million dollars that the federal government hasn't forgiven that extra debt.

And St. Bernard got nothing for all of that. St. Bernard does not want another cut. Neither does St. Bernard want 11 years of delay caused by construction on three bridges at St. Claude, Claiborne Avenue and Florida Avenue.

And you've made a nice little statement. You're saying, well, only one bridge will be shut down at that particular time. That's the delay you'll have. You forgot to mention how much you're going to jam the traffic on them.

other bridges, which means there will be jammed traffic in there for several years on all the bridges you make. People's time are worth money and the fuel and oil in the cars are worth money, and I don't know how many hundreds of millions that will be before it's over with but that adds up to quite a bit. In the final analysis, we'll still have, the final result, we'll still have to stop for raised bridges when the ships and equipment goes through.

Yet, if we want progress and the jobs and a better living which comes with it, some changes must be made. History accords that in 1825, the Erie Canal in New York State was the first canal built in the United States. And it made New York State all the greater, helping to develop the economy all the way to the Great Lakes. It was so successful, it was made wider and deeper several times. One of the greatest engineering feats that was done by the United States was when it built the Panama Canal, a
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[1] canal cut on a continental scale as it cut
[3] But the United States did the job, and the
[4] same can be said for the Suez Canal. The
[5] United States built the Gulf Intracoastal
[6] Waterway which extends from Brownsville,
[7] Texas and New Orleans to St. Marks,
[8] Florida. That canal system carries
[9] several hundred times probably more
[10] freight than people ever dreamed it would.
[11] It had proved a great advantage to our
[12] economy of the United States and
[13] particularly was beneficial to the
[14] economies of Texas, Louisiana,
[16] helped our nation’s economy grow and has
[17] furnished thousands of people good jobs
[18] all the way around.
[19] So, if done right, we can
[20] benefit from such new canals. We need more
[21] bigger and better locks and waterways to
[22] handle the increased traffic and large
[23] barges and ships which in turn employ more
[24] people and reduce the price of goods you
[25] buy at the store.
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[1] You know, today we’re
[2] talking about fixing this lock, and we’re
[3] going to go back to the technology and the
[4] faults of transportation of World War II.
[5] But since that time the ships have gotten
[6] bigger, they draw more water, but the
[7] canals on the other side of this lock are
[8] not deep enough so you’re not going to do
[9] that. So we’re going to do a patch-up job
[10] or a band-aid job on a thing that’s
[11] outdated when the modern day’s
[12] transportation with the RO-RO ships and
[13] the big container ships, some of them that
[14] draws 50 to 60 foot of water, the big
[15] tankers, nothing’s going to be done about
[16] that kind of thing at all. We’re not even
[17] talking about the Mississippi River, which
[18] should carry traffic from the Gulf of
[19] Mexico all the way up to Baton Rouge or
[20] ships drawing 60 feet. We’re not doing
[21] anything about that.
[22] So we’re going to let the
[23] New Orleans area, our port, the greatest
[24] in the world, should be, lag behind and
[25] try to do the same thing from World War
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[1] II. It’s like we tried to fight World War
[2] II with the equipment of World War I till
[3] we got our tanks and stuff and got out
[4] there about it. We need to modernize
[5] ourselves. As a state senator, as an
[6] industrialist, as a consumer and as an
[7] American, I realize that good changes
[8] should be made.
[9] First let us consider
[10] truly the proposed changes on the
[11] Industrial Canal locks is a poor band-aid
[12] for a massive problem. The problem is the
[13] delay all citizens of the Ninth Ward and
[14] Orleans Parish and St. Bernard have to
[15] endure while waiting on the bridges that
[16] go up. That problem is reflected in the
[17] cost we as motorists bear in wasted time
[18] or in wasted gasoline spent idling in
[19] line, the cost of wasted time for towboats
[20] and ships waiting for locks to open and
[21] close and for bridges to raise and lower.
[22] We all share those costs in the way of
[23] higher prices for our electric power,
[24] manufactured goods and food, and yes, the
[25] loss of our valuable time spent in
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[1] waiting. We need a solution that
[2] eliminates all three costs, if possible,
[3] and it is possible.
[4] For instance, let us
[5] raise the St. Claude bridge to the height
[6] of the Claiborne bridge and, likewise,
[7] raise the Florida Avenue bridge to the
[8] height of the Claiborne bridge and then
[9] weld all three bridges shut so it will
[10] never open and close again. That way
[11] automotive traffic will never stop because
[12] some boat or some barge goes through
[13] there. That’s no big technology to do
[14] that.
[15] Of course, at the same
[16] time or before you do that, you need to
[17] build a canal that the taller ships and
[18] marine equipment can go through. And if
[19] you do that though, you should design this
[20] new canal with a high-rise, never-to-open
[21] bridge in place before we start digging
[22] the canal so that people that live on the
[23] other side of that canal, if it ever gets
[24] dug, will never have one hour’s delay at
[25] all to get across it. This, simply said,
When you build the locks,

When you build the locks, make your lock gates strong enough to carry bridge traffic right across them. The way you operate locks always, with very few exceptions, one set of lock gates are closed. So if you have two sets of lock gates and you tie the roads in right, a little old red light and a green light will tell the guy which one’s open and he can always drive through and never have to wait.

So what you do, you build your locks first, your gates first. You build your bridges first. Get all that work. And then after all that’s done right, then you go dig your canal. And there wouldn’t be any delay. In the meantime, all the people up in Orleans and Ninth Ward or whatnot would never see a delay whatsoever and their economy and their business could go right on growing.

Before the canal is dug, build the lock gates so designed as to carry two-way traffic on either lock gate so if one gate is open, the traffic could go to the other gate, and when it is turned open, the traffic go onto the other gate. This means never will both gates be open at the same time, which helps traffic always.

When all this is done, then and only then will we dig the canal or the cut, if you will. Of course you must have two levees which prevent a rising river or a hurricane from harming the people. The levees must be far enough apart so the fabricating plants and other businesses needing deep-water transportation can locate on each side so we can have good-paying jobs for our citizens without harm to our environment. This goes back to the MRGO. We promised them all those plants and equipment. Yet the Corps of Engineers and others made regulations where you couldn’t have the land on either side to build a dock, only thing you let the ships go by, but yet you had promised people all these good-paying jobs with these big plants. Of course, today they have no faith in what we say or you say or even me, I guess, because of how we’ve been lied to, they’ve been lied to in the past.

To mitigate the anxiety and improve the looks of the area, we could use this area also to build some nice parks and such for the benefit of people. And most important is when that canal cut is made, if it’s made in St. Bernard Parish, the money will have to be certified in advance to close off and dam up the MRGO cut forever. In fact, unless that money’s tied up where it cannot be siphoned off somewhere else, I will fight it till the end. But we should start, after the canal’s in there, at the mouth of the MRGO and dam it off with a dam and cover the rocks so it could never wear through. Then we should go upstream on that MRGO to the old Bayou le Loutre and build a dam on both sides of that near the MRGO and let Bayou la Loutre go on out in the Gulf like it always did. And then we should come up that canal to the Bayou Ycloskey. At Bayou Ycloskey, when the MRGO is cut, you cut a road in two and you make the value of people’s property go to pot. We should build two dams across it at that point. The dam on the eastern side should then be the new road built on it and repair that road that’s already there, put the water lines and things back in so that piece of property all the way out to Lake Borgne could be used again. That would only be fair.

I can remember when we built the canal back there then, and these
people that own land that the canal was
dug on got paid for it. There was one
wise gentleman, name of Joe Meraux, since
deceased, made a headline in the Picayune
that he got paid more for a little piece
of property he had near the Violet Canal
for the MRGO cut than all the other land
owners combined. That was injustice to
the other land owners I'm sure. I'm sure
Mr. Meraux got fair treatment. But the
point is, we should correct those wrongs
and make those people's land back valuable
again.

And then, finally, we'll
close off the MRGO next to where your cut
is, and when that's done, you'll have a
bunch of freshwater lakes in there that
the tide cannot go back and forth and
crode away. If you'll remember right, I
believe my figure's correct, that channel
was at one time 36 foot deep and about 500
foot wide. Today you've got places 2,000
foot wide. Today it's gotten so bad
you'll be able to eat into that levee and
the whole levee will collapse, so now

you're spending multi-millions of dollars
to put rocks around them to protect them.
And we're going to have to do more of
that,
Ladies and gentlemen, I
will support such construction only if all
the financing is arranged so that it is
completed to eliminate the dangers to our
citizens, to stop the waste of their time
and stop the economic waste to our economy
of a canal that frustrates all of us, some
on a daily basis. I will rigorously
oppose a new Industrial Canal lock that
will destroy the Galvez Street dock, and
the same thing goes for the other side.
Industry should be allowed to work there
to give good-paying jobs to people,
industry that doesn't hurt the
environment, doesn't pollute the air or
what have you. But when you put this big
set of locks in there the way you're
talking about doing it, it's a mess-up.
If you did it the way I'm talking about
it, then you could weld down those bridges
and people could say forever they don't
have to wait for a bridge to go through
there. Isn't it terrible to talk about
the advanced economy of the United States
of America, the richest nation on earth,
that we're telling people, you got to come
up and stop every day of your life at that
bridge if a boat has to go through there.
And then you're telling boats, who should
keep our economy going and keep our costs
down in transportation costs, you have to
come up there and wait, like you said, 10
hours to 30 hours. Some of those boats
are worth $200, $500 an hour. And if you
hold one ten hours for two, that's just
$2,000. If you've got piles and piles of
them all the time, that adds up to that
billion dollars in a few years' time that
could easily do all this right.

So if we use our
technology and engineering correct, we can
do all these jobs without hurting these
people at all, without harming their
businesses, and at the same time make it
so that they'd never have to wait for
another bridge to go up and down. And if
we do the job right in St. Bernard, if
that's where you put this cut, put those
bridges in advance. Make it a crime for
anybody to start to dig a cut until those
bridges are in place, those locks are in
place, where the traffic could go through.

Certainly I didn't speak
about it, there's a railroad bridge that's
got to be taken care of there. He can't
be the high-level thing but you can put
lock gates there where he goes through the
levee and he comes on across there to keep
that economy going down the river
where they need that kind of traffic. All
these things can be done by your ability
of engineering and technology and bring
back to the people some faith in our
government that's that so severely
stressed them when they did that MRGO. I
thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:
Thank you, sir.

Appreciate it. Who is our next speaker?

MR. DICHRAY:
State Representative
Sherman Copeland,  
Representative Copeland:

To the Colonel and the
Dock Board and all of my constituents and
all the visitors from St. Bernard, you
know, I started not to come up here, and
the reason why I started not to come up
here is because I’ve been doing this for
32 years now. And I really think that you
ought to just shut that screen down and
leave. Now, the problem I have with this
whole process is that you stand here and
I’d like for you at some point in the
discussion to tell everybody in here how
much it cost to produce that film that we
saw for 15 minutes at the beginning. I’m
willing to bet you’ve already spent 50
million dollars trying to shove it down my
constituents’ throat for the last 32 plus
years. Now, before you came, Colonel, we
had these public hearings. I have videos
produced by your shop. I have audio and
tape where there was a complete process
and everybody unanimously said no, and
then you come back. The film talks about

(1) authorizations. There’s no authorization.
(2) The Congress didn’t put a dime into this,
(3) not one nickel into this. And if they’re
(4) going to balance the budget, they’re
(5) surely not going to balance it by starting
(6) new projects like this for some special
(7) interest group that happens to have a trust
(8) fund somewhere. It’s only going to have a
(9) 15 percent impact on the state from what I
(10) understand. That’s all.

Now, I know you weren’t
here, but some of the people in this room
remember 1965. Hurricane Betsy. They
remember that and all of the promises that
were made with that. This project is
going to make the land-based casino look
like kindergarten. Ten years? Twenty
years. Five hundred million dollars?
Probably two billion.

Now I want to tell you,
when it got time to fix Tennessee Street
from Florida to Claiborne, it was a
nightmare. It was a nightmare. Can you
imagine what this is going to do to this
neighborhood? I’ll be dead and gone and

If it was a billion dollars, unless the
money was in the bank, no deal. I mean,
this is ridiculous. This is an insult.
It’s like taking trees off St. Charles
Avenue, or what happened to Claiborne
Avenue. How many false promises? You all
ought to quit, go home, stop. Just leave
the people alone. Now, either you think
you got the most awesome power in the
world or we have none, and my position is
now, I’m not coming to any more public
hearings. You can call them all you want.
The next public hearing I’m going to is
going to be in Washington, D.C. I mean,
you take all these fancy stuff and books
and package them up and send them to the
United States Congress and the United
States senators. Those folks in this room
are not at those meetings. And if you
look at this, you’d think it was a great
project. Why don’t you send them the
tapes of the last 30 years? Any
congressman with good sense would say,
"Hey, we ought not continue to waste our
money like this."
Now, I'd just like to hear the
special interest power. I understand the
shipping industry, I understand everybody, I understand all the
consultants in here who can make some
pretty good bucks off this. But I also
understand people in my district. I
understand Mrs. Leontine Luke who called
me last week, said, "Sherman, I'm ill. I
can't come. We've been fighting this
thing half my lifetime. Please don't let
it happen."

Now, I'd just like for
you to tell us before you leave, publicly,
with the cameras rolling, if in fact it's
documented that a majority of the people
in this district do not want this project,
that you will go before the United States
Congress, Colonel, and say, "We should
cease and desist, abandon the mission. No
go." Now, if you're not prepared to say
that tonight, then we're all just kind of
being taken for a ride, because no matter
what we say, you're going to package your
dog-and-pony show and try to argue along
with the shipping industry to the Congress
that they ought to just level the road and
run over us.

Now, I got to tell you,
that won't happen. It will not happen.
But it's an insult for you to even attempt
it on whatever banner you want to put it.
15 colonels later, or is it 16? You're
But it's an insult to send 16 military
colonels to my little district to try and
wipe it out like it's the Guadal Canal or
something. I mean, what's the deal?
There's got to be something else going on
that we haven't heard about. I don't
understand it. I mean, people need to
talk a little louder.

I mean, let's put all the
cards on the table and not that. I don't
understand that. And I would hope that we
have those kinds of discussions because
sooner or later, we're going to have them.
If we don't have them tonight, we're going
to have them somewhere. I'm on a crusade
now. I used to be objective about it. I

think an elected official ought to be
objective. I have been objective for the
last decade. I am no longer objective. I
want it stopped. If you want to go put it
somewhere else, that's fine. If you want
to pack your bags and go home, that's
fine. Not personally. I mean, I hope you
love our beautiful town and your wife and
family enjoys it and you stay here and we
have a great time. Just fold the
briefcase that says widen the Industrial
Canal in this area. That's all.

Now, I'm going to close
by saying this. I think also when you put
that film, because I understand that some
of the churches, they were saying there
would be no relocation. What happened
was, the first plan didn't want to
interrupt the traffic, so they were going
to wipe out everything from Deslonde on
over to Caffin or Forstall, which was
completely foolish. And then they say,
"Oop, too much opposition." So all of a
sudden, I think your Hyde-Ebasco - Is
that the name of the firm? Ebasco, paid
them all this money and they came up with
that brilliant idea, we're going to float
the lock in. Well, if they knew that, why
didn't they do that in the first place?

But that's not where the
displacement takes place. It's the
bridges. Nobody's talk - I didn't see
one thing on there about bridges. Tell me
how you expand Florida, St. Claude and/or
Clalborne without disruption. That's the
disruption. That's the displacement that
nobody talks about. It's impossible. You
know it and I know it. You've got two
choices. Either you have the displacement
and you have an antiquated project the day
you finish, or you do not have the
displacement - or you do have the
displacement and you do it right. In
order to do it right, you've got to wipe
out the neighborhood. You can't
compromise it.

Now, we have money in the
budget. You need to understand this. We
put money in the budget. Nothing to do
with the feds, state general fund money,
to build a new bridge at Florida. And
guess what I found out at a meeting up at
the Corps last week? Unless the
legislature reauthorizes the time program,
which means raising some more taxes or
extending taxes, they don't even have
equitable money to finish that one. Now,
remember what happened? If you have this
penny sales tax on gas, never again will
you have to come up with another nickel to
fix the highways in Lousiana. It didn't
work then and it's not going to work now.
Any congress at any time can come anywhere
and change anything they want to do.
My good friend, Bob
Livingston, was a freshman United States
congressman when this thing first started.
Now he's Chairman of the Appropriations
Committee. You know how long that's been.
And then he introduced an amendment to the
bill so it couldn't go down to St. Bernard
or Senator Dean. Smart move. Well, maybe
we ought to start a little disruptions and
some introductions.
Now, my five minutes is

up but I really want to hear what others
are going to say, so I'm going to sit down
and shut up. But I want you to just keep
it simple and go to Congress and just say
no. Can you say that? Do you all know
how to say that? Just say no. Just say
no. Say no.

COLONEL CONNER:
Thank you, sir. Eloquent
as always. Do we have any other state
officials, Joe?

MR. DICHRARY:
State Representative
Tommy Warner.

REPRESENTATIVE WARNER:
Thank you. I'll be much
briefer, I promise. You won't have to
worry about that.
Basically, I came to
listen. I wasn't going to say a whole
lot. My main objective was to make sure
that we play a little defense here for St.
Bernard Parish because I heard some things
could happen as far as St. Bernard Parish
goes. So I didn't hear that. I didn't
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Mr. DICHARRY:

Representative Ken Odinet.

REPRESENTATIVE ODINET:

Thank you, gentlemen, for giving me this opportunity to speak. I'm a little younger than Sherman is. I've only been at this for about ten years so I've been making some notes on your dates that you intend to have your plan to Washington. We met last week with some of the delegation from Washington, some of their representatives, in an attempt to go ahead and get the Florida Avenue project under way and get a high-rise bridge at Florida so we can tie in the intermodal highway from 610 all the way to 510 and ultimately across the river. So we think, if we can get this moving by the dates you have in here or some type of commitment that you could probably have this high-rise in ready to go before you start displacing the existing bridges and causing some inconvenience, I think that would make your project a lot more palatable and it would keep your project out of Bayou Yeloskey. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you.

MR. DICHARRY:

Edward Johnson, Legislative Assistant, State Representative District 101.

MR. JOHNSON:

Good evening. I represent the representative from District 101 out of 101, and that abuts District 99, Sherman Copeland's district.

Effectively, the Florida Avenue high-rise will come through our district. The representative in that district, Naomi Farve, has instructed me to inform all of you here in the Holy Cross area that we generally support the constituents of Holy Cross but, at the same time, no mention was made in the presentation as to what happens to the so-called high-rise as it leaves the Industrial Canal and comes into our district. That's totally unacceptable to us. We want it stated on the record here tonight that we oppose any high-rise coming into District 101 to disrupt the community we have at Florida Avenue. We do not want our businesses along that corridor killed by a high-rise. Those people have been there for years. There's absolutely nothing on your presentation that addressed them. Nothing. High-rise, absolutely not. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, sir.

MR. DICHARRY:

State Representative Arthur Morrell.

REPRESENTATIVE MORRELL:

Good evening, Colonel, other guests and constituents. Colonel, I've been standing in the back there and listening to what some of the speakers have been saying, but I've been looking around and trying to look at the reaction of the people sitting out here. And let me say, this is a prime example, of the seriousness of what you plan to do. Look at the people out here now. This is a serious gathering here. This is a real expression of whether or not they want to have those locks enlarged, moved or what have you. You know I've been living in this city for 53 years and I look at progress as something that's going to help the community. But I'm still waiting for that progress to help the community.

You know, years ago, and someone mentioned it before, down Claiborne Avenue used to be one of the thriving small business areas in the city. 25 years ago, they had almost a million people in New Orleans only. Now it's less than a half a million. Why? Progress. They brought in I-10, I-610. They put high-rises. They come into the city, they work and they leave. You're looking at people here who live here. This is their community. All they want you to do is
MR. DICHARRY:

I have one more.

COUNCILWOMAN HAEZUR-DISTANCE:

Good evening, Colonel,

I know this is going to be a very tough feat for you, but in case you didn’t know, here in New Orleans, we have a little saying about lagniappe and it usually means that when you get something, you get a little something extra. But when I look at this plan that you give me, I don’t see anything extra on here. I just see basic, quality-of-life issues that people should have anyway. And if Congress really wants to do something to help this community, make the bridges high-rise from the beginning. Put more money in here for housing rehab, for better playgrounds and parks. Don’t try to hold a community hostage for 10 to 20 years for things that they should be getting anyway.

I don’t know if any of you have much contact or daily experience in the Lower Ninth Ward or any of the other neighborhoods, but if you ride through here, you will see new homes being built, you will see homes being renovated. You will see streets being resurfaced and others are going to be completely redone. You will see lights on playgrounds where there have not been lights before. Now, when we make all these improvements, how are people who have struggled here for years, their property values are going to suffer because of this project. How are we supposed to bring new home owners into this community when you want a 10- to 20-year construction project? And the saddest thing is, when it’s all over, those millionaire ship owners and those big industry people are going to have a wider lot and we’re going to be starting from ground zero all over again.

I see that you briefly listed some of the mitigation plan features, but some of the things I don’t see on here and maybe you didn’t have room, but it was in the big book that you gave me. And first of all, Senator...

You’re going to anphmg. Just please.They that it’s a...and report it, not progress, what the community wants, and these people are speaking now. Thank you very much.

COlONEL CONNOR:

Thank you. Are there any other state legislators in attendance that would like to say something? Any other elected officials, representatives?

I used to live a half a mile from here in 1965 when Betsy came and they were talking about the locks then.

Nothing has happened. I know you’re just one of a succession that may come in, and I made the crack early on that maybe if you get an approval, you may make general, and that’s just a comment. But because of the seriousness of it, you got to take what these people are saying just by being here. They don’t have to get up and say anything. Just by being here is showing that it’s a concern enough for them to come out here in this hot building and really express their views on what is planned. I’m here because this is going to touch on a part of my district. I’m here because this is my city. I’m here because if any progress is going to be done, let it be for the communities, not for anyone else.

We’re talking about the Florida corridor. What is that going to do? That’s progress. All that’s going to be is another escape route for people to leave New Orleans. But people really want to stay here, make this their home. It’s a good city and it’s one of the few cities that have generations after generations staying in the city, not growing up and moving out.

So if anything, please remember this. The community is speaking. Listen to what we’re saying and go back and report it, not progress, what the community wants, and these people are speaking now. Thank you very much.
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[1] Johnson said 33 million dollars is just, I
[2] guess that's lunch money for the people
[3] who are going to build this thing. But
[4] 1.5 million approximately was for a
[6] I don't consider that to be mitigation for
[7] the community, and that wasn't laid out on
[8] here. But that's things people need to
[9] know. How is that going to help us?
[10] We're the ones and the people who live
[11] here every day are the ones who are going
[12] to have to be stuck in the traffic jams,
[13] not even you guys, this community.
[14] And when we talk about
[15] mitigation, I guess we're just supposed to
[16] believe that even though this Congress
[17] seriously considered cutting Medicaid and
[18] affecting millions of senior citizens,
[19] they're supposed to care so much about
[20] four little old neighborhoods in the Ninth
[21] Ward that they're going to give us 33
[22] million dollars? I don't think so. We
don't want it, and that's just the bottom
[23] line.

COLONEL CONNER:

[1] Thank you, ma'am. Do we
[2] have any other elected officials or their
[3] designated representatives in the room at
[4] this time who would like to speak? Last
call before we open it to the public.
[5] Okay, Joe, who is the
[6] first public speaker?

MR. BROWN:
[7] I'm Lloyd Brown,
[8] President of the Lower Ninth Ward
[9] Neighborhood Council and also part of the
[10] working group with the widening of the
[11] Industrial Canal locks. As was mentioned
[12] before, and I did talk about who was
[13] Sherman Copeland and also Senator Johnson
[14] who is the one who was the
[15] representative from the Lower Ninth Ward
[16] Neighborhood Council, that we totally
[17] opposed it.

As I may quote from one
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[1] one for St. Bernard Parish, thin as my
[2] finger. So what I'm saying is that we
[4] [5] We want to be compensated for when Betsy
[6] was. We flooded out in this area. We
[7] suffered. We walked this walk. We know
[8] what it is. We know what the problem is.
[10] You are fleecing Louisiana, the Lower
[12] go on record as saying that we totally
[13] oppose this project. Thank you.
[14]
[16] Linda Potts?
[17] Linda Potts?
[18] (No response.)
[20] My name is Elizabeth
[21] Blaise and I do live at 5033 North Rampart
[22] Street in the Holy Cross Historic District
[23] and I've been a resident-
[24] You can't hear? It's too

[2] better? Should I go closer? Is this
[4] I've lived here just
[5] about all my life. I was born here, spent
[6] a few years in Chicago when my family
[7] moved there and then came back, and I'm
[8] still living on property that my
[9] grandparents farmed on in the early 1900s.
[10] I've been a member of the Holy Cross
[11] Neighborhood Association since its
[12] inception in 1981, and I am against the
[13] widening of the canal. And most of these
[14] very eloquent speakers stole three-fourths
[15] of my speech, but this is such a
[16] monumental undertaking and the people who
[17] are going to feel it the most are those
[18] who live near the bridges, live near the
[19] levee where a lot of the work is going on,
[20] and I have no idea how they're going to
[21] blow up the St. Claude bridge to remove
[22] all that concrete. Please, don't even
[23] think about a high-rise bridge at St.
[24] Claude. Many people don't have
[25] transportation, and when Betsy hit us,
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[1] already exist, it is disgusting. We don't [2] want to have to leave our homes because of [3] the noise and the vibration heavy [4] equipment produces. We don't want to lose [5] Holy Cross School, a mainstay and support [6] of our neighborhood because the students [7] can't get to school with, at this time, it [8] was only one bridge was going to be open [9] at a time.

[26] COLONEL CONNER:
[27] Thank you, ma'am.

[28] MR. DICHAURY:

[29] MR. WELLS:
[30] Good evening. Thank you

[31] for letting me comment tonight. My name [32] is Ken Wells. I represent the American
[33] Waterways Operators. We are the trade [34] association, national trade association [35] for the barge and towing industry. I will [36] be brief as much as anything else because [37] I don't want to inflict this voice on [38] anybody tonight. I also think I'm going [39] to lose it pretty soon.
[40] Obviously this is an [41] important project for our industry. I [42] won't bore you tonight by going into the [43] detail of what it means to our industry. [44] I'll reserve that for my written comments. [45] If I could though, tonight I want to talk [46] about the real beneficiaries of this [47] project, companies that don't own barges, [48] people that don't work on towboats. This [49] isn't just a lock that lets towboats and

[50] barges move back and forth out of the
[51] Mississippi River. This is an economic
[52] development tool that benefits the entire
[53] southeastern United States. When people
[54] in Florida and Alabama flick on a light
[55] switch, it's very likely that the coal
[56] that produced that power moves through
[57] this lock. When people in Mississippi gas
[58] up their cars, it's very likely that the
[59] raw product that made that gasoline moved
[60] through this lock, moved up to Baton
[61] Rouge, moved across to Mobile. It's all
[62] part of an economic chain.
[63] The reason this is such a
[64] busy lock, one of the busiest in the
[65] nation, is because it serves the economic
[66] needs of six states. This makes this
[67] transportation link an important part of
[68] our entire regional development here in
[69] the South. And the Corps has done a very
[70] good job, a great job, of measuring the
[71] impact that this lock will have on
[72] existing businesses and existing
[73] industries as well as the impact that the
[74] new lock could have.

[75] But one thing is missing
[76] from the analysis. And rather than go
[77] into the statistics of the existing
[78] business, the Corps has done that, I'd
[79] like to talk about what the statistics do
[80] not capture. That is the role that a new
[81] lock could play in the future development
[82] of our area, not only Louisiana but the
[83] entire South. If you're thinking about
[84] the costs and benefits of locating an
[85] industry are, then you have to weigh the
[86] transportation costs. You have to weigh
[87] the reliability. Right now, this is not a
[88] reliable lock on which you'd base an
[89] entire facility on the Gulf Coast. It's
[90] old. It's cranky. It breaks down a lot.
[91] In our industry, we live with that every
[92] day, but if you're thinking about moving a
[93] new industry in, you're going to think
[94] twice about pinning your hopes on this
[95] lock. However, if this lock is replaced
[96] and if suddenly we have available
[97] inexpensive transportation in a reliable
[98] manner, if we have a reliable way to move
[99] products into the Mississippi River up
[1] into the Louisiana Industrial Canal, if
[2] you will, that's going to be one of the
[3] biggest selling points that this region
[4] can have nationally and internationally.
[5] If you build this lock, you are setting a
[6] course of economic development for the
[7] next century. If we don't build it, we
[8] will never have a way to measure how much
[9] economic opportunity was lost, how many
[10] jobs never came to the Gulf Coast, to the

[12] And finally, I'd like to
[13] speak a little bit to some of the members
[14] of the community who have come out for
[15] this meeting, whose parents came out for
[16] meetings, whose parents' parents came out
[17] for meetings. In terms of our industry,
[18] you've earned our respect. I think you've
[19] earned everyone's respect. On and on and
[20] on the projects have come, and each time
[21] you've said back, it has to work for this
[22] community. The earlier plans didn't work
[23] for this community, but I think if you
[24] will look coolly at these plans, they do
[25] work for the community.

[1] You've said you needed
[2] jobs and job training being more important
[3] than anything. This program has job
[4] training. You've said the roads here need
[5] to be fixed up. We all drove over them to
[6] get here. There's money here to fix the
[7] roads. The houses here do need repair,
[8] renovation. A lot of people in this
[9] community don't have air conditioning. A
[10] lot of them don't have weather-proofed
[11] houses. There is money here for those
[12] things. In other words, you won. It may
[13] not seem like it, but you won, especially
[14] if you consider that there is not a pot of
[15] cash out there at the federal level. The
[16] senators, representatives, have all been
[17] very clear. They understand that. We
[18] understand that. I mean, we can all agree
[19] on that. The federal government is
[20] cutting back. The state is cutting back.
[21] If you want to talk about shield the
[22] money, the money is here. There may not
[23] be another program to come for some time.
[24] It's a victory for the neighborhood, I
[25] think. It's a victory for us. It's a
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[1] victory for the South and the economic
[2] development in this area. And thank you
[3] for letting me speak tonight.

[4] COLONEL CONNER:

[6] MR. DICHAURY:

[8] MS. THOMPSON:
[9] My name is Mary Penny

[10] Thompson. I am a student attorney at the
[12] not, however, appearing today on behalf of
[13] Tulane Law School or the university but
[14] I'm instead appearing solely on the behalf
[16] and the Louisiana Environmental Action

[18] My clients oppose this
[19] project because it fails to comply with
[20] the law, namely, the National
[21] Environmental Policy Act and its
[22] implementing regulations. The Corps of
[23] Engineers and the local sponsor, the Port
[24] of New Orleans, are pushing this project
[25] through the neighborhood surrounding the
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[1] Industrial Canal without adequately

[3] First, the project does
[4] not adequately analyze the different
[5] alternatives for expanding the Industrial
[6] Canal. It has tentatively selected a
[7] channel 1200 feet long by 36 feet deep
[8] over a shorter, shallower draft channel
[9] which the Corps picked as an overall cost-
[10] effective one with benefits outweighing
[11] the costs. The deeper channel was
[12] selected, as noted in your report, due to
[13] the sponsorship of the Port of New
[14] Orleans. The Port will pay the
[15] construction costs of increasing the depth
[16] and length. But why go forward with an
[17] alternative that will cause more adverse
[18] impacts than produce benefits just because
[19] the Port dumps additional money into it?
[20] If the true goal is to solve a so-called
[21] bottleneck in navigation and the Corps'
[22] chosen alternative will do that, why are
[23] we being bought off by the Port?

[24] Second, the project
[25] cannot move forward without the
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[1] replacement of the Florida Avenue bridge, yet the project fails to include any detailed analysis of the replacement process in its report or draft Environmental Impact Statement. It then goes on to use the replaced bridge as part of its transportation plan for relieving congestion in the affected areas. If the City's and State's plan for relieving congestion in this construction area is so important and so crucially interrelated to the Corps' planned project, why is there no detailed analysis of how it will be funded, how it will proceed or how that construction will impact this area?

Third, the project's adverse impacts are severe, yet the analysis of those impacts is incomplete. For example, construction will impact two neighborhoods on the National Register of Historic Places, the Holy Cross neighborhood and Bywater neighborhood, for approximately ten years. Also, the St. Claude Avenue bridge as well as the current lock are both eligible for historic listings and they will be destroyed. A memorandum of agreement required by the National Historic Preservation Act has not yet been executed. Nowhere are the impacts of piledriving or other construction activities analyzed and their effect on these fragile districts.

Another example of the Corps' analysis, air quality, consists only of old air quality samples and the EPA regs. There is no analysis of projected increase of pollutants during the construction phase arising from the emissions of construction vehicles in the area, like traffic due to traffic congestion, or simply the amount of dust generated. There is no analysis of projected increase of pollutants which will arise from the anticipated increase in water traffic or the Industrial Canal after construction. This is just a sampling. The Corps' report is riddled with holes when it comes to analysis of adverse impacts. As required under the National Environmental Policy Act, it should be clear that the full impacts have never been analyzed or comprehensively addressed. Since the impacts are so severe, the Corps of Engineers recognizes in its own report that full mitigation of impacts is impossible. What can compensate for a five-foot flood wall erected upon the open green area of the current levee, cutting off visual access to the water for all residents of the nearby areas? What can compensate for emergency response time delays, including fire, rescue, ambulance and police, due to at least one of three bridges connecting the neighborhoods to these services being out of commission during construction time?

The Corps admits that urban mitigation is a unique case, far different from the Corps' accustomed natural resources mitigation, yet the Corps ignores its own contractor's conclusions regarding preconstruction phase mitigation and proceeds with its own mitigation plan. This plan consists of only 34 pages of vague, flexible promises and a budget of only two pages for a plan of spending 33 million dollars. Is this adequate planning by anyone's standards? Until the details of this plan are fixed, analyzed and in black and white, how can they be considered adequate?

Finally, the project will occur in an area consisting of an overwhelmingly minority population. Why must the neighborhoods of the Lower Ninth Ward, Bywater, St. Claude and Holy Cross bear the severe impacts of this project which will certainly result in further decline of the residential areas, further blight, slower emergency response time, loss of access to the city and a flood wall barricading them in like a prison? Is this another replay of the improvements of Claiborne Avenue, which was built to facilitate vehicular traffic? Have these residents been targeted because they have less political clout than other previously considered sites? The draft
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[1] mitigation plan. This plan consists of only 34 pages of vague, flexible promises and a budget of only two pages for a plan of spending 33 million dollars. Is this adequate planning by anyone's standards? Until the details of this plan are fixed, analyzed and in black and white, how can they be considered adequate?

Finally, the project will occur in an area consisting of an overwhelmingly minority population. Why must the neighborhoods of the Lower Ninth Ward, Bywater, St. Claude and Holy Cross bear the severe impacts of this project which will certainly result in further decline of the residential areas, further blight, slower emergency response time, loss of access to the city and a flood wall barricading them in like a prison? Is this another replay of the improvements of Claiborne Avenue, which was built to facilitate vehicular traffic? Have these residents been targeted because they have less political clout than other previously considered sites? The draft
[1] Evaluation Report and draft Environmental
[2] Impact Statement does little to answer the
[3] questions asked here. There can be no
[4] meaningful public comment until the report
[5] is supplemented with a detailed analysis
[6] required by the National Environmental
[8] These neighborhoods
[9] deserve more than what you’ve given them.
[10] There needs to be details and we urge you
[11] to reconsider and reevaluate this project
[12] and these terms. Thank you.
[13] COLONEL CONNER:
[15] MR. DICHARRY:
[16] Brother Stephen Walsh.
[17] BROTHER WALSH:
[18] My name is Brother
[19] Stephen Walsh of the congregation of Holy
[20] Cross. While I am a resident of the Holy
[21] Cross Historic District neighborhood, I
[22] address you this evening as headmaster of
[23] Holy Cross Middle School and High School.
[24] The first members of the congregation of
[25] Holy Cross came to New Orleans from the

[1] University of Notre Dame 148 years ago to
[2] assume responsibility for St. Mary’s
[3] Orphan Asylum located in the present-day
[4] Bywater neighborhood. The present site of
[5] Holy Cross has been in continuous
[6] educational use since its purchase in
[7] 1859. However, the land is not our
[8] legacy. Our true legacy are the lives of
[9] generations of Holy Cross men and their
[11] I should like to remark
[12] on two aspects of your plans to renovate
[13] the locks which will adversely affect Holy
[14] Cross Middle School and High School.
[15] Despite the emergence at the 12th hour
[16] this evening of a proposed bridge over St.
[17] Claude, I would like to enter into the
[18] record my concern and our concern of the
[19] proposed two-year closure of the St.
[20] Claude Street bridge which is projected
[21] for the eighth year of the construction
[22] project. Presently, 65.7 percent of the
[23] students enrolled reside west of the
[24] Industrial Canal, passing most of our
[25] compactor schools on the way to Holy

[1] Cross. Nearly half of our students ride a
[2] Holy Cross-owned bus to school, some
[3] happily beginning their day at 6:15 a.m.
[4] in order to attend the same school as
[5] their great grandfather, grandfather,
[6] father, brothers, uncles and cousins have
[7] attended or now attend. Rerouting of
[8] buses or delays due to revised traffic
[9] patterns would result in inconvenient,
[10] unacceptable and unsafe ride times for our
[12] would negatively affect student
[13] participation in our athletic and music
[14] programs and impede parent accessibility
[15] and participation in school events. In a
[16] word, your plans threaten our family
[17] legacy.
[18] The accompanying
[19] mitigation proposes a modest dollar amount
[20] to compensate for the possible loss of
[21] enrollment. For us, the loss of one
[22] student is intolerable. You present an
[23] extensive list of temporary jobs this
[24] project will create. And, I suggest
[25] that these may be at the expense of lost

[1] permanent jobs, such as teachers and
[3] In the course of the past
[4] several years, as virtually every element
[5] of this plan has been altered, the one
[6] thing that has remained constant is the
[7] closure of the St. Claude bridge for two
[8] years. Your video this evening proudly
[9] boasts that during the construction, there
[10] will be no interruption in navigational
[11] traffic. We want nothing less, an
[12] uninterrupted flow of students across the
[13] St. Claude bridge. For generations of
[14] Holy Cross men, a time-worn if
[15] unacceptable escape for tardiness has
[16] been, “Brother, the bridge was up.” The
[17] irony now is that the bridge is down will
[18] very likely be the reason for the absence
[20] It has not escaped our
[21] attention that the original construction
[22] of the Industrial Canal dispossessed
[23] Ursuline Academy and Convent, causing it
[24] to be relocated elsewhere in the city in
[25] 1912 to make way for the canal. After
years of discussion and despite this
evening's temporary proposed bridge, what
evidence is there that you have seriously
considered alternatives to the two-year
closure of St. Claude? Is it not time to
disregard conventional wisdom and are you
really aware of the adverse consequences
of your actions? It is one thing to learn
to live beyond the bridge and now, with
these new plans, we find that we are
destined to live behind a wall, albeit a
sea wall, proposed to replace the
graceful, sloping levee on the southern
eend of our campus and beyond. Are you
aware that this stretch is virtually the
only part of the city's levee from which
one can approach the river without
crossing a railroad track? Have you taken
into consideration that ours is a national
historic neighborhood and this imposing
wall erodes our historical integrity and
robs of us an asset that makes the
neighborhood attractive to home owners?
As Robert Frost has
suggested, 'Fences do not good neighbors
make.' Trees and lawns on top do not
soften the offensive nature of what is
perceived to be a barrier by those of us
destined to live at the bottom of your sea
wall. Will you please justify the
necessity of extending this sea wall or
flood wall downstream from the canal?
I should like to conclude
with the words of Daniel Webster when he
argued the landmark Danforth College case
before the United States Supreme Court.
Applying these words to our school and our
neighborhood, "It is, sir, a small school
but there are those of us who love it."
Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, sir.

MR. DICHARRY:

Neil Armingeon.

MR. ARMINGEON:

Good evening. My name is
Neil Armingeon. I'm the Environmental
Director for the Lake Pontchartrain Basin
Foundation and I am here tonight on behalf
of our members. The Lake Foundation's

mission is the protection and restoration
of the Pontchartrain Basin, and in that
capacity, we have reviewed the draft
Environmental Impact Statement in regards
to its impacts on the water quality and
habitat of Lake Pontchartrain. We do
also, however, recognize that there are
many other potential impacts to the
neighborhoods surrounding this proposed
project, neighborhoods that the Foundation
has worked closely with since our creation
over eight years ago. We appreciate,
understand and support each of the
neighborhood's concerns and we do believe
that we can best serve the needs of the
community by focusing our attention on the
environmental impacts of the proposed
project. In our role as a public entity,
we will gladly share any information we
obtain on the potential environmental
impacts with the various community groups
as we continue to review this project.
From our preliminary
review of the EIS, it is apparent there is
a significant problem with contaminated
sediments in and around the area of the
Inner Harbor Navigation Canal. In
addition, we believe that the dredging and
disposal of these materials as described
in the Corps' plan has the potential to
spread these toxic materials to other
areas within the Pontchartrain Basin. It
is our opinion that the New Orleans
District has failed to adequately address
the subsequent potential human and
environmental health concerns related to
the removal and disposal of these
contaminated sediments and we believe this
work must be addressed before any review
process can move forward.

I have a few initial
remarks I'd like to enter into the record.
Some of the sediment core samples taken by
the Corps from within the canal show very
high levels of heavy metals, specifically
mercury contained in the sediments. Some
of these sediments had levels of mercury
of 20 parts per million or 40 times the
level considered safe by the State of
Louisiana. Many other samples contained
We question the Corps and ask, how will these facilities be maintained? Will they contain settling ponds? Will they contain water quality treatment? How will they be maintained? Who will maintain them? How often will they be monitored? Who will monitor them? Will the information be shared with the affected communities?

Finally, we question the Corps' disposal site choice. Why would you place hazardous material next to the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet in Orleans and St. Bernard Parish, one of the most dynamic areas in the Postchartrain Basin? What would happen if a hurricane hit St. Bernard or lower Orleans Parish? Would the polluted sediments be spread all over the Lower Ninth Ward and St. Bernard marshes? That is not even addressed. The contaminated materials must be contained in a way that would protect not only human health but environmental quality. We will submit further comments at the end of the period. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, sir.

MR. DICHARRY:

Carl Gonzales.

MR. GONZALES:

Good evening, Colonel.

Thank you for allowing us to speak tonight. Can you hear me now? Thank you.

I'm here in a dual capacity. First off, I am President of the Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association. Our association is comprised of 56 member companies. Many of these members are towboat operators that push the barges through the locks. Also, many of our members are fleet operators, the barges that, as you see in the diagram or picture here, are fletted in locations from the mouth of the river north to Baton Rouge and many fleets are located in the Industrial Canal and the Harvey Canal areas. Combined, these 56 companies employ in excess of 6,000 individuals.

Through all the data that has been...
compiled by both the Corps and our
association, we would like to reserve the
right concerning this matter and file
appropriate memorandums to you by the
February date.
Secondly, I am executive
vice-president of Gulf South Marine
Transportation Company. We are a local
towboat operator. Three-quarters of our
towing is done on the Mississippi River
and the East Canal. This area is from New
Orleans, the Industrial locks, east of St.
Marks, Florida. Our vessels service the
many ports located in Louisiana,
Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. We have
for many years - we've been in business
for 15 years - provided this service to
many of the barge lines throughout the
country.
With this in mind, we
also would like to reserve our right to
file the appropriate data to you and the
members here if they wish the tonnage and
so forth and the economic development that
our business provides to the greater New
Orleans area in the whole. Thank you very
much.

Thank you.

David Gegenheimer.
I apologize if I mispronounce your name.
Quite all right. I'd
like to salute the tenacity of the
opposition of this project. I know you
all have been fighting it for a long time.
And I certainly wouldn't advocate the
trusting of the Army Corps of Engineers.
The Corps is an arm of the Army who knows
nothing but dredge and fill. But as a
resident of St. Bernard Parish who has
seen what the Mississippi River Gulf
Outlet has done, excuse me, my obnoxious
orange T-shirt says, "Mr. Go Must Go."
This project, and I'm afraid it came to
fruition in the late '50s when public
comment had no weight, but this project
was shoved down our throats along with the
promise of economic development which we
have had none of. There is no development
along the "Mr. Go" from its mouth all the
way to the city, none whatsoever, over 60
miles through St. Bernard Parish. We've
lost almost all of our cypress swamp. Our
marshes that were fresh to intermediate
have been turned into salt marshes. We've
lost thousands of acres, all for the
benefit of the Port of New Orleans.
But be that as it may,
I'm not like Senator Dean. I do not want
to see a cut through St. Bernard. St.
Bernard does not need to be cut in half.
And I have to support the Corps' project,
although I would like to see a lot of your
interests and concerns addressed a little
bit better. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:
Thank you, sir.

MR. DICHRARY:
Chris Holmes.

MR. HOLMES:
My name is Chris Holmes.
I'm a resident of St. Bernard Parish. Is
this where St. Bernard applies for the
mitigation money for the MRGO tonight?
We've got a big concern.
I'm currently chairman of the St. Bernard
Parish Coastal Zone Advisory Board. Our
board did not get to meet in time to
discuss this because we just found out
about this, but I will say that I'm
certain we'll have serious concerns on the
disposal of this dredge material out of
the channel. You're looking at 1,400,000
cubic yards of what the Corps designates
as moderately contaminated and they want
to come put that on the banks of the
channel in our parish. Well, please don't
do us any more favors with that.
The other thing, I'm a
daily commuter. I travel St. Claude every
day. And the purpose of this thing is to
build a bigger lock that's going to
facilitate increased maritime traffic and
you're going to put another low-level
bridge that's going to have to open for
every vessel that goes through, it's
ridiculous. Common sense. I mean, I
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[1] don't know how it escapes the equation.
[2] You've got the second bridge at Claiborne
[3] you're going to put back at the same
[4] height. You're also making this project
[5] 36 feet deep. It's going to be able to
[7] Everyone that spoke
[8] tonight, the presentation in here tonight,
[9] the gentleman that spoke on the maritime
[10] unit, everybody talked about barges and
[11] tows. I don't know of any barges and tows
[12] that are drawing 36 feet of water. This
[13] thing is increased and added to because
[14] the Port wants to use it to get container
[15] ships through there. A second bridge will
[16] have to open also to get a ship through.
[17] You might get a few tows under it. You'll
[18] never get a ship under it. The thing is,
[19] as usual, it's not thought out. You've
[20] got engineers and scientists that look at
[21] it but for some reason, there's no common
[22] sense. Please address some of that.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, sir.

MR. DICHDARY:
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[2] Gentlemen at the head
[3] table, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me a
[4] real pleasure to come back down to this
[5] area after having spent 27 years here,
[6] very enjoyable years. I was fishing,
[7] swimming, playing ball alongside the
[8] Industrial Canal banks, crawfishing,
[9] hunting killdeer with 12-gauge shotguns,
[10] really enjoying myself. But it pains me
[11] to see plans going ahead with replacing
[12] the present locking system with much
[13] larger locks, 1200 feet. Is this the
[14] right direction? We need improvements in
[15] the locking area. There's no question
[16] about it. I appreciate the barge traffic,
[17] but please, only for barge traffic. The
[18] Gulf Outlet was built mainly for ships'
[19] use. Let's keep it that way, not have the
[20] large vessels using the Gulf Outlet and
[21] the Industrial Canal to get to Centreport.
[22] The above is nothing new, just another
[23] phase of Centreport, as outlined in "Port
[24] of New Orleans Forges Ahead" dated 1950,

[1] and in another publication of March 1970
[2] prepared by the Bechtel Corporation for the
[3] Board of Commissioners, Port of New
[4] Orleans, an agency of the State of
[5] Louisiana. The above book is a rubber
[6] stamp of the Dock Board's publication of
[7] 1950. I have both publications here with
[8] me tonight if anybody wants to review
[9] them. It's exactly a rubber stamp. The
[10] Port paid Bechtel Corporation for planning

Now, if Coleman Warner,

that's from the Times-Picayune, I see

they've folded up and left, or his

co-workers are here tonight, would like to

read an editorial that I sent to the

editor in December 1969, so you fellows

aren't bringing out anything new. This is

dated 1969, December. This is to the

editor of the TP: "Dear sir: Off-center

Centreport." If you all are not familiar

with the term "Centreport," that's that

location at the head of the Gulf Outlet.

"Yes, I agree. There is an urgency for

revolutionary improvements for our greater
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[1] New Orleans area in order to catch up,
[2] stay abreast and proceed ahead of world
[3] progress in the maritime field, but is the
[4] proposed location of Centreport the proper
[6] survey company, that is: "recommend
[7] giving up sites on the broad, deep,
[8] wonderful Mississippi River for a location
[9] on the Gulf Outlet that will take years
[10] and I'm sure a billion dollars" — Now,
[12] "to bring up to the present standard of
[13] our great river? No amount of money will
[14] change a body of water to equal in any
[15] respects the father of all waters.

[1] Congestion. Congestion. This is what I
[2] really envision in the year 2000 or much
[3] sooner. At the carefully selected
[4] proposed site, in addition to heavy
[5] congestion, can we possibly build dykes,
[6] sorry, levees, substantial enough to hold
[7] back tidal waters that will use an
[8] improved waterway to flood the whole damn

[20] "Please don't abandon the muddy Miss. The

Min-U-Script®
January 27, 1977
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[1] potential is there along her solid banks.
[2] Not only in Orleans Parish but adjoining
[3] parishes, the possibilities are unlimited.
[4] Let's reconsider, please."
[5] Now, that was in
[6] 1969. This is my ideas on that Centreport
[7] or that Gulf Outlet. Now, it really
[8] heartens me to see a meeting like this
[9] with the elected officials really speaking
[10] out. When this was going on in 1969,
[11] 1970, I was one making this noise and I
[12] was trying to contact everybody, Long, the
[13] engineers, that was Harr & Hunt, there was
[14] Senator Nunez from down here, the St.
[16] referenced. And no one paid any
[17] attention. This was a done deal. It was
[18] going to get built regardless.

"To those familiar with
[19] the term 'Centreport,' I would like to
[20] briefly explain it. The New Orleans Dock
[21] Board, upon advice of the Bectel
[22] Corporation, proposed, "this was over the
[23] next 30 years, "the wonderful Port of New
[24] Orleans presently located on the great
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[1] Mississippi River in Orleans Parish to a
[2] location in the eastern part of town
[3] alongside the congested Industrial Canal
[4] in the low-lying ditch called the Gulf
[5] Outlet. The SI agree there is an urgency
[6] for revolutionary improvements for our
[7] greater New Orleans area in order to catch
[8] up, stay abreast and proceed ahead of real
[9] progress in the maritime field. But is
[10] the proposed location of Centreport the
[12] the Bectel Corp. recommend giving up sites
[13] on the broad, deep Mississippi River for a
[14] location on a waterway that will take
[15] years and I'm sure billions of dollars to
[16] bring up to the present standard of our
[17] great river?"

"You can see I'm really an
[18] advocate of the Mississippi River. Why
[19] would they want to go back in the ditch
[20] like that where I swam as a boy and build
[21] this Gulf Outlet and then, with this 50-
[22] foot draft and 1200-foot lock, you know
[23] that's going to be used for ships and
[24] that's totally wrong. If they went ahead
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[1] and built that Gulf Outlet, which was a
[2] big mistake, let them use it now. If they
[3] want to come to New Orleans, let them use
[4] our Southwest Pass. I can understand the
[5] American Waterways' idea about the barge
[6] traffic. I appreciate there's a lot of
[7] barge traffic in there, going through
[8] there, but it is all this 1200-feet locking
[9] and 50-foot depth necessary?
[10] "Not only is the
[11] Centreport location congested and
[12] vulnerable to floods, there's a long-range
[13] plan, by the time the location is totally
[14] usable, which includes a wider and deeper
[15] channel and locking system "- think now,
[16] this was in '69-'70 I had written this -
[17] "the Mississippi River and Gulf Outlet,
[18] all the business will be located
[19] elsewhere. Mr. Barkington" - I'm sure
[20] you remember that name there, an executive
[21] Port director and general manager of New
[22] Orleans Dock Board - "is doing a fine
[23] job" - I'm using present tense because
[24] that was present tense - "of coordinating
[25] and directing local groups for a single
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[1] purpose but it's in the wrong direction.
[2] The proper direction is not back at
[3] Centreport but alongside the grand banks
[4] of the Mississippi River, not only in
[5] Orleans but all the parishes. They're
[6] doing a wonderful job up around Nashville
[7] Avenue and above there. Let's develop
[8] what we have now, not plans for 30 years
[9] from now. The potential is here on the
[10] great, deep, broad Mississippi River."
[12] remember that.
[13] Okay, Just a few
[14] references I talked about. This is also
[16] Nunez, Mr. Roy from your St. Bernard paper
[17] down here, Helen Bentley, she was chairman
[18] of Federal Maritime, and radio talk shows.
[19] I was on them whenever I could get on
[20] them, a letter from the Canal Barge
[21] Company, letters from the state senators,
[22] Russell Long, Elender, my correspondence
[23] was going back and forth, Harr and other
[24] people I just won't take your time with.

COLONEL CONNER:
MR. SAVOIE:

My name is Charles Savoie. My friends call me "Pete." It's kind of a tough act to follow, but he had a lot on the ball. Forty-one years ago, some prominent politicians directed to develop their land in the France Road corridor. To do this, they decided to dig a straight cut for 43 miles through St. Bernard Parish. This cut is known as the "Mr. Go." This was the reason St. Bernard and New Orleans was flooded in 1965. I had the unfortunate experience of going around plucking people off the roof of their houses, so I know what damage it can cause. Where we once had an 8,000-acre buffer zone to protect us from hurricanes, we now have 67 billion gallons of water waiting to be pushed into St. Bernard and New Orleans.

We were promised economic development and industry in St. Bernard. It did not happen. St. Bernard Parish has lost over 27,000 acres of land. When "Mr. Go" was dug, the spoil was dumped on the outside of the channel, destroying all of the estuaries. Now the Corps wants to dump contaminants on the north side and destroy another 270 acres of estuaries. All of this wetland laws is to accommodate two ships a day. Now, this is hard to believe, but that's how many ships a day use "Mr. Go," two. Of the 400 container ships, only 20 ships draw over 33 feet of water. This means we spend over seven million dollars per year to accommodate 22 ships. We also know that if the ships' speed was slowed down from 14 miles per hour to 10 miles per hour, erosion would be cut by 50 percent. This would cost the shipping industry two million three hundred thousand dollars a year, so they will not slow down the ships.

Now, they want to build a lock at the cost of 500 million dollars to accommodate vessels that draw 36 feet of water. Most of us know that the fourth-generation ships will draw in excess of 40 feet of water. Are we willing to agree to
January 27, 1997
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[1] build a lock that will be obsolete before it's completed? All of the waste and destruction of our wetlands and neighborhoods can be eliminated by relocating the container industry to the riverfront where it rightfully belongs.

[2] Let's not put our faith in the hands of the Corps. They have a poor track record. Their concern with jobs for the future. They're concerned. They are not concerned with the environment and the lives of the people who are paying their salaries, we, the taxpayers. Thank you.

[3] COLONEL CONNER:


[5] MR. DICHAIRY:


[7] MR. KINSLER:

[8] Colonel Conner, my name is Bill Kinsler. I'm the vice-president and general manager of Gulf Operations for American Commercial Barge Line. American Commercial is the largest inland river carrier in the United States and, as such,
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[9] we are keenly interested in any system improvement that positively, cost effectively and safely impacts and will enhance the waterways system. In order to ensure that fellow participants have an opportunity to present their opinions, my comments will be very brief. American Commercial Barge Line Company will forward to your office a more detailed written

[10] comment by the closing date.

[11] As each member of this assembly is aware, the Industrial Canal lock is outdated and represents a severe bottleneck to not only waterway interests but also to the consuming public of the United States. Many statistics are readily available, so I will not endeavor to repeat for this group the facts that will become part of the official document. I can say that delays at the Industrial Lock which have averaged 11 and a half hours per tow for the last ten years, the increasing development and importance of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal east and the escalating repair costs of the current
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[12] facility preclude the need for the prompt, cost-effective replacement of this structure.

[13] In August 1996, the Inland Waterway Users Board sent to the Secretary of the Army and Congress simultaneously its prioritized recommendations for water resource development projects in the United States.

[14] In this report, the board listed the replacement of Industrial Lock second only to the replacement of Marmet Lock on the Kanawha River in West Virginia.

[15] American Commercial Barge Line Company is in agreement with these recommendations and strongly supports the Corps of Engineers for the development and the construction of a new navigation facility at the earliest possible time.

[16] Thank you.

[17] COLONEL CONNER:

[18] Thank you.

[19] MR. DICHAIRY:


[21] MR. COOPER:
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[22] My name is Mark Cooper, 3929 Chartres Street, member of the board of directors, Bywater Neighborhood Association. And I didn't agree with everything they said but I want to know where I can get one of those orange T-shirts.

[23] On a letter dated 10 December 1996, you stated that a public hearing would be conducted mid-January, mid-January, and public review process would conclude January 27th. I think that's today. Why did I not receive notice of this hearing until January 14th?

[24] When were the notices sent out? How many notices were mailed? How many notices were sent out with the wrong date, Wednesday, January 27th? How many corrected notices were sent out and when?

[25] I never got one. How many churches are there within a 20-block radius of the project and how many notices were sent to churches in time to publish in their parish newsletters? How many and to whom were notices sent to neighborhood civic
How many jobs may be
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they would probably end up firewood when

in fact it was the Bywater Neighborhood

Association that raised this very issue

years ago? And that's documentable. Why

are the trees alongside the canal dying?

Has the Corps done an inventory and

assessment of these trees and is there a

program in place to fertilize, prune and

protect these trees until they might be

relocated if the project moves forward?

Has the Corps consulted with the Disney

Company about their successful transplant

of mature live oaks in Orlando, a project

brought to the Corps' attention why the

Bywater Neighborhood Association? And, if

so, why was this report not shared with

the Neighborhood Working Group?

How many jobs may be

transferred out of our neighborhood if the

Coast Guard station is relocated? What

will be the net loss to our neighborhood

economy, i.e., restaurants, lumber,

hardware and other stores, if this station

is moved? Has the Society for the

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals at 1319

effects of this project on area property

values? Why has the District C councilman

which covers the west side of the

Industrial Canal and Bywater historically

been excluded from the planning process,

though it has included other elected

officials?

On Page 25 of the Draft

Evaluation Report Mitigation Plan, it's

stated that the New Orleans District does

not expect net improvements to result. If

this is so, why should we be partners for

this project? Why did the project

engineer seem surprised at this

attribution when it was raised at the

January 22nd Neighborhood Working Group

meeting? The same point was raised on May

2, 1995, as documented in the minutes,

Page 4, last paragraph, referring to the

April draft of the mitigation plan. Does

the Corps just record the minutes and then

ignore the questions or points that are

raised there in? And what good will rails

be on the new St. Claude bridge that's

proposed if there is no system of mass
Good evening. My name is Dick Watson.

Mr. Watson:

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Dicharry:

Dick Watson and I'm speaking tonight in my capacity as the chairman of the board of directors of Holy Cross School, whose members have authorized me to speak in behalf of their concerns regarding the adverse effects of the lock project on the Holy Cross School.

As a native of New Orleans, one whose family, grandparents and parents have lived in this neighborhood as residents and businessmen for over 75 years, both my father and I were born and raised within a dozen blocks of this school and the locks, I have witnessed and was an unwilling participant in the physical and economic devastation inflicted by Hurricane Betsy, the negative economic repercussions of which are still being felt today. I know firsthand the real-life frustration caused by living in the isolated neighborhood bounded by the river and the canal, cut off from the city by the bridges and separated from the parish by both municipal boundaries and the Jackson Barracks.

We may be an orphan but we have a history. For nearly 140 years, Holy Cross, the religious congregation and the school, have been an anchor of stability for the community, so much so that this National Historic District has taken Holy Cross as its name. I would like to share with you a resolution passed by our board on January 16th, 1997. I quote: "While we appreciate the economic significance of the locks improvement project to the city, the region, the nation and the maritime industry, we likewise believe that it will have an adverse economic impact on Holy Cross School and the neighborhood which we do not believe has been adequately documented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in its various studies. Therefore, the board of directors of Holy Cross School respectfully respect that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers initiate and fully fund an independent economic impact study to be conducted by a panel of local experts to quantify the adverse economic impact of this project on Holy Cross School and the Holy Cross District. It is our belief that objective data from such a study is essential to ensure the economic stability of Holy Cross School and the Holy Cross District neighborhood and to provide adequate mitigation funds for appropriation and allocation."

The adverse economic impact of this project to Holy Cross School is far more reaching than simply the loss of tuition income during the construction phase due to inconvenience and safety concerns of parents, Holy Cross School is the only all-male middle and high school in the greater New Orleans area. Consequently, the loss of a fifth-grader represents the loss of a student for eight years. In his remarks, Brother Stephen Walsh spoke of the family legacy of Holy Cross. Allow me to illustrate.

My father was economically unable to attend Holy Cross but as his only child could send me and I began in seventh grade, which was the earliest grade at that time. As a result of the satisfaction expressed by my parents, my five cousins also graduated from Holy Cross School, all beginning in the fifth grade. My two sons have since graduated and they plan to send their sons as well. Finally, my parents and I have also recommended as a result of my success to Holy Cross at least five neighborhood sons who have either graduated or are currently enrolled, each entering Holy Cross in the fifth grade.

The net result is, had I not attended Holy Cross because of the bridge or problems with the locks, the
[1] economic impact to this school would have
[2] been the loss of 13 students spanning over
[3] a 30-year period of time. Quantitatively,
[4] if you do the math, the loss would have
[5] been about 102 years of tuition payments
[6] or an amount well in excess of $350,000
[7] simply from the loss of one student. This
[8] is historical fact, not fiction. A five
[9] percent decline in enrollment could impact
[10] Holy Cross for the next 30 to 50 years
[11] with economic consequences totaling in the
[12] millions of dollars. Correspondingly,
[13] reduced enrollment will result in
[14] immediate loss of revenues for the
[15] transportation services of the school, the
[16] cafeteria, the bookstore, athletic gate
[17] receipts, band and choral concerts, summer
[18] camps and all other summer activities.
[19] Accompanying all of this will likely be a very uncertainty
[20] about the future of this school which
[21] could also erode donor confidence and
[22] result in decrease in philanthropic
[23] giving. Reduced enrollment would also
[24] have an associated economic loss to the

[1] community in terms of reduced jobs for
[2] teachers, administrators, coaches, bus
[3] drivers, cafeteria workers, maintenance
[4] security and clerical staff. This project
[5] will create temporary jobs during the
[6] construction phase but may very well cost
[8] None of these concerns in
[9] our opinion of Holy Cross and other
[10] businesses along St. Claude Avenue have
[11] been adequately addressed or documented in
[12] your reports today. For this reason, we
[13] respectfully request the independent

COLONEL CONNER:

MR. DICHARRY:
[16] Thank you, sir.

Dean Shapiro. Dean

[18] (No response.)

Raymond King.

[19] Good evening. My name is
[20] Raymond King. I'm past president of the

[1] lived down here for 12 years. I owned a
[2] house on Royal Street. And I want to talk
[3] to you, Colonel, about the 15 predecessors
[4] that you had here that literally committed
[5] rape on this neighborhood. Every time you
[6] announce this in the newspaper, the
[7] property values go clean to hell. I sold
[8] my house for eight bucks a square foot,
[9] $8,000 for a home. I venture to say, if
[10] you bought a home here in New Orleans
[11] right now, you're going to spend $45 to
[12] $50 a square foot. That is rape, albeit
[13] economic rape nonetheless. And
[14] gentlemen, this has been ongoing for 40
[15] years. The value of the homes here in
[16] Holy Cross neighborhood is lower than $20
[17] a square foot, every house it's
[18] ridiculous. And it's caused by the
[19] constant announcements by the Corps of
[20] Engineers that they're going to come down
[21] here and displace a bunch of people, widen
[22] the canal, cut out transportation for two
[23] years or more, and the people will not
[24] come here. So you cannot sell a home. If
[25] you bought one, you're stuck with it or

[1] you sell it at a great loss.
[2] Rape, albeit economic,
[3] it's rape nonetheless and it's a damn

COLONEL CONNER:

Sal Doucette.

MR. DOUCETTE:
[7] First, it's the consensus
[8] of all three neighborhood groups that we
[9] do not support or want this project.
[10] Secondly, we do not know what to believe,
[11] the video or the mitigation plan. The
[12] video leads you to believe that there are
[13] jobs and training for the locals. As for
[14] the mitigation plan, it is not effectively
[15] implemented with full consideration for
[16] the people living on either side of the
[17] canal. It offers a $500,000 training
[18] assistance for jobs. How will they do it?
[19] Who will get this training? What is the
[20] criteria they will use to pick these
[21] people for this job? What about the
[22] people who have the skills as needed to do
January 27, 1997
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[1] these jobs now? What about the control of
[2] these jobs? We question the sincerity of
[3] the Port and the Corps. Thank you very
[5] [6]
[7] COLONEL CONNER:
[8] [9]
[11] MR. DICHHARY:
[13] MS. GRILL:
[14] [15]
[17] [18] My name is Geneva Grill, I'm the District
[19] [20] Design Engineer for the Department of
[21] Transportation and Development. I'm here
[22] representing Frank M. Denton, Secretary of
[23] the Department of Transportation &
[25] [26] Mr. Denton feels like
[27] [28] this is a very important project to both
[29] the City of New Orleans and the State of
[30] Louisiana. The Department fully supports
[31] the Corps of Engineers and the Port of New
[32] Orleans in constructing this project. We
[33] will try to assist the City of New Orleans
[34] in getting additional funds for the
[35] Florida Avenue bridge if the time program
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[1] is extended. Right now, there is
[2] insufficient funds in the time program to
[3] construct that bridge. The amount
[4] appropriated for the bridge was for a
[5] grade-level structure, not a
[6] semi-high-rise or a high-rise bridge. But
[7] we fully support the Corps in doing this
[8] project. Thank you.
[9] [10] COLONEL CONNER:
[11] [12]
[14] MR. DICHHARY:
[17] [18] Brendan Gallagher.
[19] [20] (No response.)
[21] [22] Captain Dean Bruch
[23] I know I mispronounced that one.
[24] MR. BRUCH:
[25] [26] I'm Dean Bruch. I've
[27] been residing in Louisiana here since
[28] 1951, other than seven years' break as a
[29] Panama Canal pilot. I'm married and have
[31] started chasing her when she was a
[32] passenger on a ship back then. Caught her
[33] twice, got two kids and four
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[1] grandchildren. I still live in River
[2] Ridge and I piloted on the Gulf Outlet
[3] from '66 to '77 and also on the river up
[4] to Baton Rouge. My last assignment was on
[5] the AMERICAN QUEEN going out the Houma
[6] Navigation Canal and up the river. I've
[7] been associated with the maritime industry
[8] for 53 years, being a graduate of
[10] [11] I'm not in support of
[12] [13] this proposed lock replacement project,
[14] foremost reason being it would be a
[16] believe an organized port development and
[17] efficient marine traffic management
[18] coupled with long-range planning would
[19] serve the Port of New Orleans' needs for
[20] the next hundred years.
[21] [22] I wish to quote a letter
[23] I wrote to the Times-Picayune dated
[24] December the 10th, and it wasn't printed.
[25] It was, "I read with interest your
[26] excellent TP article of December the 8th
[27] entitled 'Industrial Upgrade.' I'm in
[28] accord with State Representative Sherman
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[1] Copeland, let them put the new locks
[2] somewhere else. The most practical
[3] solution to this problem is to build new
[4] locks as planned over 30 years ago at the
[5] Violet site. A lock in the Violet area
[6] with a channel over to the "Mr. Go" will
[7] allow the environmental disaster known as
[8] the "Mr. Go" to be closed below the
[9] intersection of the lock channel with the
[10] outlet and stop the saltwater intrusion
[11] into Lake Pontchartrain. Additionally,
[12] this will eliminate vessel wake from
[13] destroying the remainder of the marshland
[14] in lower St. Bernard Parish. It is true
[15] there will be an outcry from the maritime
[16] industry, their allies, the Port of New
[17] Orleans and the Louisiana Department of
[18] Transportation & Development, the Corps of
[19] Engineers, the Coast Guard, and last but
[21] Unfortunately, these groups has
[22] consistently through the years refused to
[23] establish common sense speed limits in the
[24] "Mr. Go" channel which has greatly
[25] contributed to these eroding wetlands.
"With a new lock channel built and established speed limits to protect the banks in the lock channel, it will add to the transit time of vessels between sea and Industrial Canal complex but I see this as a viable alternative to the bottleneck. The positive side for construction of the lock at Violet I believe would be shorter time and would create obviously less environmental impact for residents in that area than in Orleans Parish. Leaving the Industrial Canal lock in place, having a large ship within twin chambers at Violet, that's in case when you overhaul where you can be using your other chamber, will certainly enhance navigation flow between the Mississippi River and Intracoastal Waterway as well as the Industrial Canal complex. However, I don't believe the citizens of St. Bernard should allow the Violet lock to be constructed without closure of the "Mr Go" to protect the lock canal waters from saltwater intrusion and area flooding."

My brief comments on the lock here, designing and building locks, the Corps of Engineers are past masters of this art. The Panama Canal locks built in 1913, first time an engineering accomplishment without parallel. This model 110 feet by 1,000 feet was even used for the 26 locks on the upper Mississippi River between St. Louis and Minneapolis. I have been through every one of them on the DELTA QUEEN. I'm sure the proposed new lock as far as engineering will be of the same quality. The environmental issues associated with this proposed new lock is not my expertise. And I'm sure the pros and cons will be adequately addressed at this public meeting, and how. However, from an overall navigation environmental standpoint, in my opinion, the proposed lock replacement site does not answer the maritime industry and general public needs. An alternate site should be addressed.

Thank you for allowing me to offer these comments. Please don't throw rocks at Lucy and I after we leave.

We are lovers and not fighters and only trying to present what we think is in the best interests of the Port of New Orleans, and, most of all, the general public who we dearly love.

Thank you, sir.

My name is John Koeferl.

I live at 415 Tupelo Street. I am chairperson of the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association. I see that a lot of our members have grown weary of the proceedings. I think they wanted to have more chance to speak than we're allowed here and more time to read these ponderous volumes.

I would like to make just a comment before I make my remarks about the video, which has my name in it and the names of other people of the working group. This implies that we are in favor of this project, that we worked hand in hand with the Corps and the other City Planning Commission to develop this project. In fact, I think that we are against this project. As we learned more about it, we said, "Hey, this is crazy. We're not going to do this." And yet our name is up here touting this project. And I think, Colonel, rather than removing our name, I think you should tell the truth. We are not in favor of this project. The group, the Neighborhood Working Group, is all the people that came to the meetings, against this project.

I would like to just talk briefly about the historic aspect of this project. You know, we live in the Crescent City, and this is a city that people love to visit. We like to consider it a really special city. But, you know, it's not that big. When we talk about the growth of our city into the next 50 years, the next 100 years, 200 years, we can't be lopping off parts of them and seeing them be destroyed because we're having these highways of the river come through with
these huge ships over our neighborhood
with the noise not just for the project
time, not just for 10 or 15 years, but
forever.

Have you ever been
through Treme on the Claiborne Expressway?
This is a federal project, okay, the
Claiborne Expressway in Treme. And not
only has this neighborhood been destroyed,
but can you believe that it was not part,
the destruction of this neighborhood, part
of the project cost. And yet it is a cost
that our city has borne with this project
and many other projects and will continue
to bear for the life of the city until
more — more costs is going to be when
they go to want to do something else with
the I-10. What will there be, another
project, or will that just be a dinosaur
left there in our midst?
We are concerned that our
neighborhood is going to be disabled and
destroyed, property values down. Nobody
wants to live here. The big sea wall, a
danger from unknown cargoes, and also this
project with deep draft and widening of
the canal enhances the use — enhances —
intensifies the use of "Mr. Go." And we
know about the continued destruction of
the marshland and what kind of project
cost was that? Who has borne the project
cost for that? Not the Corps of Engineers
obviously.

We would rather have the
old Ursuline Convent and the Andrea
Plantation than we would have the St.
Claude bridge and the locks. But that is
all that we're left with. And we don't
want to see them go. If you can't live
with the canal being the way it is, then
we feel that you should close it. It's as
simple as that. We are tired of this.

You know, sometimes, what
I would like to see is a form of request,
the Corps of Engineers in this project
make a true project cost of what hundreds
of years, fifty years, a hundred years,
many hundreds of years' loss of the
neighborhoods of our city are going to be
for tourism and for other things besides

this linear transportation scheme. And
what's going to happen in 50 years to this
canal? Is it going to be updated? Is it
going to be junked? What's going to
happen in a hundred years? We're going to
go to Violet anyway maybe. What's going
to happen? Has anybody thought of this?
You know, if we tear our neighborhoods
apart, and we just have a small window of
opportunity right now to fix up our
neighborhoods and save them and bring them
into the next century, this isn't
something that we can spend all our time
fighting this canal on and see it happen
without our participation. We've got work
to do and we keep fighting this thing. It
just is aggravating.

A true cost to this city,
that's what this project needs to develop,
and there hasn't been any treatment of the
historic cost except $300,000 for some
documentation of the St. Claude bridge
being taken down and the locks. But
there's no project cost for continued tens
of years of our having to have a depleted
neighborhood because of that. I want to
say that this study is not complete, it's
not effective, it's not efficient, and
it's not acceptable.

COLONEL CONNER:
Thank you, sir.

MR. DICHBARR:
Pam Dashiell.

MS. DASHIELL:
Joe, Pat, Colonel, it's
good to see you again, I guess. We've
been meeting all these years and here we
are back at the same place. And the way
we feel has not changed. We don't want
this project. We're not going to have
this project. The rules seem to have
changed right in the middle of the game.
At one point, we were told that if the
community didn't want it, we wouldn't have
it. If the community stood fast against
it, it, it would not happen. That's not what
you're saying now. There has been a real
change in this, and it's unfair. It makes
us mistrust you and it just intensifies
the fact that we do not want this project.
A good example of this is this process itself. As Mark Cooper and some others have mentioned, the dates were shifted on this. There was not good notification. It's scheduled for the day after Superbowl. A lot of people, most of the people down here work in service industries. They've just come off of a week of double shifts. People cannot come out and stay until 10:00 o' clock at some meeting. The times were terrible for this.

You said that the people, the working groups were part of this process as shown in your video. That's not true. Yes, we met. We met a lot. But that does not mean that we condone what the result is, absolutely not.

There are also some other issues. The projects that are correlated with this appear to be just pie in the sky. You talk about the Florida bridge being completed before it's even started. The lady from the Transportation Department just said that there's no money for the Florida bridge. It's just, it's talk. All it is is talk. There are no real, concrete plans. The transportation studies are incomplete. The studies on the toxicity that you will expose when you do the digging, those things are not well documented. The people who are working with us can't make heads or tails of it in some senses. It's not real. Your costs and benefits are all mixed up. You're saying that what our benefits – rather, you are saying that what is good is bad. You're saying that the benefits are the costs, that the costs are the benefits.

It's all mixed up. Apparently you're intentionally trying to confuse people down here.

As far as the mitigation plan itself, outrageous. Looking at that budget, you've got 1.5 million going back to the RTA. You've got three million for debris removal. These are project costs, payments to institutions. That's not mitigation for us.

The damage that you'll do with the plans are not calculateable. The levee, that's something that we all enjoy. That would be gone. That would be gone. A seawall on top of the levee! Even looking at what you had in that video, it was ugly. And a real good example of that is what's happened on top of the St. Claude bridge right now. There's a fence up there, it looks like Auschwitz. It's terrible. It's dangerous. It's terrible. It was done without input from the community. There was no good reason for it except your own liability. You didn't think about us at all.

The noise abatement that you talk about in the mitigation plan seems like it's not enough. Maybe it will work. Maybe not. But it seems like it's more pie in the sky. The deep-draft shipping, that's outrageous, too.

Remember the Riverwalk. Remember the Riverwalk. What would happen if a big ship like that hit our levee? What would happen?

You were right about one thing the other night, Colonel. the approval or disapproval for this project is now in the hands of Washington, our congresspeople, all of our elected officials. We need to call them. We need to write them. We need to go there. But we can't let this happen.

Thank you, ma'am.

MR. DICHAFFY:


(No response.)

Joseph Cannaliato?

(No response.)

Al Hanzo.

I've been a lifetime resident of the Holy Cross area right here in the neighborhood and I want to talk about "Mr. Go." From the very first time I heard the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet was going to be dredged, I felt and still feel the whole project was one of the biggest mistakes the Corps of Engineers...
and the federal government brought upon all the residents of this area. We were told by the federal authorities that the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet was a very much-needed project. It was supposed to open up new wharfage and business spaces along the outlet. But in the span of over 30 years, hardly any of this has become a reality. The "Mr. Go" project has brought a great deal of fear in the minds and hearts of most of the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward.

Best example was Hurricane Betsy in September of 1965. The water came straight up the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet from the Gulf into the Industrial Canal where we were told the levee broke near the Claiborne bridge. We had about 11 feet of water at Florida Avenue to about one foot of water on Dauphine Street. It extended from the Industrial Canal well into St. Bernard Parish.

The point that I am trying to get across is, I feel the federal government should have had enough foresight and knowledge to be able to see what dangers this waterway has brought upon all the people of the Lower Ninth Ward, also, the tremendous erosion problems that were caused by the outlet from the Gulf to the Intracoastal Waterway, literally eating up miles and miles of our marshland.

If and when this bridge and lock project would become a reality, I hope you will give the residents of this area a lot more consideration than you did with the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet. I am against the new bridges at St. Claude and Claiborne. I have lived in the neighborhood, in the Holy Cross neighborhood, all of my 68 years and can look back at all the many good times and friends that were made. I always hoped I could spend the balance of my life in this good old neighborhood. I'm certainly not ready to give up nine or ten years of the inconveniences that this bridge and lock project will bring.
federal law to come up with a positive
benefit-cost ratio which means that it
benefits all of the communities, local,
state and regional, more than it costs.
Some projects have benefit-cost ratios of
a favorable nature of four or five or six
to one. Other projects range from eight,
nine, ten to one. There is one particular
project in Vermilion Parish that the New
Orleans District is working on with our
industry right now which has a favorable
benefit-cost ratio of 25 to 37 to one.
Now, that's a good expenditure of federal
money.
In the economic analysis
that your district has done of the
replacement of this lock, there are four
principal commodities that I have noticed
that are important to the Gulf South
region of the United States. One is coal.
Another is crude oil. Another is refined
crude oil or refined petroleum products,
motor gasoline, jet fuel, diesel, naphtha,
et cetera, and the fourth is chemicals,
industrial chemicals. Those four
commodities transit the Industrial Lock.
They come from upriver. They come from
east, Mobile. They come from west. But
they are all key ingredients in the
generation of electricity, in the
production of motor gasoline and jet fuel,
and in the production of industrial
chemicals that are used probably to make
things such as that screen, that
basketball backboard, any number of
plastic products that are in this room
that make our life much more convenient
and provide us that convenience at very
cheap cost. That's the benefits to the
economy.
We're going to supplement
or at least I'm going to supplement this
statement for the record by your date of
the 24th, but I just wanted to make those
points about the overall value and benefit
of the waterway.
And incidentally, to
point out that there is a real risk right
now in terms of delays to transportation,
higher cost to consumers, and safety
factors in the condition in which we find
the Industrial Lock today. It's broken.
I had an old car one time. It kept
starting every morning. My wife told me I
needed to get a new one and I said no, I
don't. It still goes ten blocks. Well, a
light failed on it, and then the generator
went out and then another belt broke. And
I kept getting it fixed and finally I
decided it wasn't worth fixing. You just
have to build a new one. And that's what
has to be done with this facility.
The last thing I want to
say is this: I've been sitting here for
three hours. I've learned a good lesson.
It is real excruciatingly difficult to
come into somebody else's neighborhood and
tell them how things ought to be. I live
in Lafayette right now. That's where the
offices of GICA are located, although in
about two or three months I'm moving to
New Orleans where I, too, can be favorably
disadvantaged by your project but I'll
still support it.
In Lafayette, the way
that that community has developed -- I
just want to cite this as an example that
I can understand the feelings that these
people have -- half of the city is on the
east side of the Vermilion River. The
other half of Lafayette is on the west
side. And there aren't enough bridges.
There's a bridge way over to the west and
a bridge way over to the east. So you
find traffic making big oval loops to get
around from one part of the city to the
next because there's no bridge here in the
middle where it needs to be. There's a
beautiful street called Camellia Avenue
that runs from one of the main
thoroughfares towards the Vermilion River.
It has beautiful homes on it, big live oak
trees, and Camellia is proposed to be
essentially condemned and widened so that
a new bridge can be built across the
Vermilion River. The residents don't like
it in that neighborhood one single bit,
but the bridge is going to be built
because there is a recognition of a
greater need of the city and the community
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[2] COLONEL CONNER:
[4] MR. DICHAURY:
[5] Thank you. The Florida
[6] Avenue bridge and corridor at the Paris
[7] Road has been talked about since the WPA
[8] days; still not there. The St. Claude
[9] tunnel used to be the campaign promises
[10] from a governor nearly 50 years ago. They
[11] finally gave up having it as a campaign
[12] promise. Now, the Mississippi River Gulf
[13] Outlet I think was a big mistake. And I
[14] have to give credit to the Colonel at that
[15] time of the Corps of Engineers, talking to
[16] him after that hearing we had down in St.
[17] Bernard, he said, "That was the worst
[18] location because they will never be able
[19] to keep it deep enough because it will
[20] keep caving in from Paris Road down to
[21] past Violet." And he was correct about
[22] it. That was before it was dug. And I
[23] said, "Well, why are they doing it?" I
[24]
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[1] said, "To give more wharfage to the Dock
[2] Board in New Orleans?" He said, "That's
[3] politics." That was after the meeting.
[4] He couldn't say it during the meeting.
[5] I'm sure you can't say it either.
[6] Now, what you say about
[7] breakwater, like with all the trees before
[8] the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet in
[9] Betsy? Most of the trees was killed by
[10] the saltwater, and that's why that water
[11] rushed in and we got flooded in the Ninth
[12] Ward and St. Bernard. And now it has
[13] become even worse and New Orleans is
[14] worried about getting flooded because now
[15] they won't even put a Red Cross shelter in
[16] New Orleans. They said they wouldn't be
[17] protected if a real hurricane came and hit
[18] the right way because there's nothing to
[19] stop the water from coming in. So the
[20] outlet is a joke, a failure.
[21] Now, the Intracoastal
[22] waterways, which is the Industrial Canal,
[23] that's for barge traffic and it's in the
[24] center of where the Algiers locks and the
[25] Harvey locks are. Now, those on the
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[1] Westbank, those two canals has tunnels
[2] underneath. Why can't we put a tunnel
[3] under the St. Claude Avenue bridge? They
[4] talked about it for years. You put it on
[5] the Westbank on the two Intracoastal
[6] waterways. They even made a tunnel from
[8] make this tunnel with the neutral ground;
[9] wouldn't disturb anything for traffic
[10] around the area here. And you can put the
[11] new locks, if you look at your plans, you
[12] have room to put it right next to the old
[13] locks. You have a tunnel there. Put the
[14] new locks right next to it, and you can
[15] move the barge traffic between in both
[16] locks and you wouldn't have to disturb the
[17] other bridges, you wouldn't have to
[18] disturb the neighborhoods. And it's meant
[19] for the Intracoastal Waterways, not for
[20] ships. And if you use it for the barge
[21] traffic and put that new locks next to the
[22] present locks, if you look on your plan,
[23] you wouldn't have to move houses. You
[24] wouldn't even have to change the Claiborne
[25] bridge. But you do need a high-level
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[1] bridge at Florida, and it would be a lot
[2] less costly, lot less inconvenient to the
[3] people in the neighborhood. It would help
[4] out all kind of ways and keep it just for
[5] barge traffic which is needed as part of
[6] the Intracoastal Waterways. And you look
[7] at your plan. You could put it next to
[8] the present locks and wouldn't have to
[9] disturb any homes or anything and it
[10] wouldn't cost the taxpayers much money.
[12] COLONEL CONNER:
[14] MR. DICHAURY:
[16] UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
[17] My name isn't Georgia
[18] Gray. I'm Georgia (inaudible - away from
[19] microphone). And I'd just like to say one
[20] thing. We've been promised on a national
[21] level that there would be no more
[22] destruction of our wetlands. We were
[23] going to save the wetlands. The president
[24] has said so. Everybody has said so. But
[25] yet we launch these irresponsible plans,
plans where we don’t know the
repercussions. We know what happened in
St. Bernard Parish and the damage that has
been done. All this petroleum this
gentleman is talking about transporting
and all the great things it’s going to
make, like this video, I mean this screen,
will it make a cypress tree? In
Louisiana, we have more wetlands, we have
more wildlife, we used to at least, but
now everything is getting destroyed.
Who’s going to look out for us? Who’s
going to look out for the wildlife? You
know, everybody likes to go duck hunting
up in Minnesota or wherever, but those
birds have to migrate down here somewhere,
and if they don’t have their habitat, if
that is all destroyed, then, you know,
we’re losing a great part of nature, not
just neighborhoods, not to mention the
fact that we have a great historic
neighborhood here. The city of New
Orleans is a small place but it has a
great history, and we are going to destroy
this – The Battle of New Orleans was
fought right in between, right there on
the river. Now, let’s find another place
for this. You know, let’s quit picking on
Louisiana. Just find another way. But
stop destroying the nature. Stop
destroying the environment. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, ma’am. Excuse
me, ma’am, could you tell us your last
name again so we could put it in the
record? Could you spell that?
(Answer inaudible - speaker
away from microphone.)

Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

MR. DICHRAY:

Edith Leibe?
(No response.)
D. L. Bell?
(No response.)
Philip Daley?
(No response.)
Marietta Williams?
MS. WILLIAMS.
My name is Marietta

Williams. I live at 6116 North Roman
Street and I’ve lived in the Lower Ninth
Ward except for, well, since 1957 or
thereabouts except for two years and I
moved back, we moved back in about
1991, I believe. At any rate, I had some
concerns that I wanted to register
tonight.

One is regarding the
bridge. Several of the people from St.
Bernard mentioned about the bridge that
would come through there that would put an
exit in the Lower Ninth Ward but not an
entrance. As I’ve told you before, when
I’ve attended some of your meetings, this
is one of my biggest concerns. I was here
in 1965 during the hurricane. We did have
to walk out in waist-high water.

One of my biggest
concerns is safety, the fact that if we
are going to look at any type plan at all,
that it must include something where we
have a high-rise through here that
provides an entrance and an exit for the
Lower Ninth Ward, not just an exit. I do
feel that we are deserving of this. We
leave, although when you hear the radio
announcement, it will say like St. Bernard
or something like that, but we all, many
of us work in this area, too, and we have
to get out to get to work and get our
children to school. So I think this is
one of the things that we have to look at.
The other thing, just as
an aside, I wish you’d let all the
residents speak before you let the
councillors speak, too. I thought it
would have been better.

The other thing, I feel
that that bridge entrance and exit has
everything, and I know we continue to hear
people say it that it has nothing to do
with that, but I feel it has everything to
do with it when you’re dealing with
safety, whichever part of this Lower Ninth
Ward you live in.
The other thing is that I
do think we have to look at the economics
that are there. Unfortunately, if you
come down St. Claude, I live on the other
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OLONEL CONNER:
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1. Thank you, ma'am.

MR. DICHRAY:
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1. My name is Geneva Morris.

MS. MORRIS:

1. I've been in the Ninth Ward since 1961.

1. First of all, I'm on St. Claude Street right near the bridge, and these pamphlets I got here tonight from someone, nobody received this. This was, they put all of the pamphlets at St. Maurice Villa where all the old people there are. Nobody that really needed to get this got it. So I'm not prepared tonight with any written statement or anything like that because if it wasn't for Father Hall, I wouldn't even know this meeting was going on here tonight. And then I wouldn't have known you all had this little meeting with some of the people in the neighborhood. And I

1. whatever it is that you would do there, when those snows start to melt in other places, would it mean that we would be like a cup sitting in the bottom of a, you know, a saucer or a cup sitting at the bottom, just sitting at the bottom? I would like to know that to wonder whether if you dredge, would those waters go underneath the houses that are by the levee? What kind of protections would be provided for that?

1. One other thing that you mentioned was 33 million dollars for mitigation which I really don't think is anywhere near what would be needed, but your initial thing said Holy Cross/Bywater/Lower 9, I may have it wrong, I think I may have left out one part, but then it said 8.5 million or 8.4 million towards St. Bernard. So it doesn't even leave 33 million that you're talking about. You're talking about one third of 33 million dollars, which is even less. And those are my comments. Thank you.

1. think that I should have known about the private meeting because I have property on St. Claude between Forstall and Lizardi and that's right in the midst of everything that you're going to be doing. And you know, you just don't put any information out where it should be. So I don't know who you expect to be at the meetings, you know. I see you had all these other folk here that does not even live in the area, and they're only concerned about their welfare. And then we comes after everybody gone. We've we to give our concern about our neighborhood and here we live here. We're going to be greatly affected.

1. You were talking about the jobs and, you know, that the people in the neighborhood would have jobs. They won't be there to do the work. Where would you place them? They won't be even be in the neighborhood, you know, because you're going to - they're going to have to move out before they would even be there to get a job. And what I'm
[1] concerned about is all of the people in
[2] the area, and especially the people that
[3] have their livelihoods there. I put all
[5] St. Claude Avenue. I have four businesses on
[6] St. Claude Avenue in the same area. And I
[7] have grandchildren. I have a grandson
[8] that's a barber that's come into the
[9] beauty salon with me. I have my other
[10] grandson who opened the business next door
[11] there. We're opening another little
[12] business on the other side. You're trying
[13] to do things, at least you can employ
[14] people and train people to be employed but
[15] then you can't. There are monies that we
[16] need to even just repair some of the
[17] things that you have. You're not going to
[18] get a bank to give you any monies to put
[19] in the Lower Ninth Ward or anybody to give
[20] you any money or to loan you any money to
[21] even repair your places because they know
[22] that you all keep threatening us and
[23] you're holding I'd say a hammer over our
[24] heads that any minute you'll just lower
[25] the boom.

[1] So then I don't know what
[2] you expect for people to do. Poor people,
[3] the Lower Ninth Ward is already, just is
[4] barricaded off like a prison. And we
[5] don't have much activities down there
[6] anyway and people go down there. When
[7] Betsy came, a lot of people left the
[8] neighborhood, and it's been going down
[9] ever since. I was in Betsy. I'm not that
[10] tall but I'm 5'2" and I had to be carried
[11] out because the water was over my head.
[12] And I had my children. And I think it's
[13] not fair for you to come in a neighborhood
[14] and say, well, we're going to just come
[15] here and this is where I meant, you had
[16] St. Bernard. You could have put it down
[17] there. And I understand that you said,
[18] you know, like this lady doesn't want the
[19] wetlands and all of that discussed, the
[20] fisheries and the crabs and everything
[21] else. So I don't know what we're
[22] considered as in the neighborhood. You
[23] know, so you say, well, no, I won't do St.
[24] Bernard. I'll come and do the Lower Ninth

[1] business and you're going to run me away
[3] I don't think you want me
[4] down here, you know. And I feel really
[5] bad about that. And I have - my
[6] grandchildren are coming along and saying,
[7] well, maybe my grandmother, because my
[8] husband died 19 months ago, so it leaves
[9] me there fighting you all by myself.
[10] I hate even to talk to anybody about it
[11] because I say, well, I'm a big girl. I
[12] can handle whatever has to be done. But
[13] look like you all are kind of bigger than
[14] us with the money and all, you know, and
[15] being able to come and just push us out._
[16] Now, one thing you didn't
[17] say on there is, I remember years ago when
[18] we had Mayor Morial in office, you talked
[19] about the widening of the Industrial Canal
[20] and the bridge. You said that the bridge
[21] would come and it would come down at
[22] Caffin Avenue. If it comes down at Caffin
[23] Avenue, well, I'm going to be under the
[24] bridge. And then they talked then about
[25] not giving you anything because they won't
[1] I'm just telling you what I have on my
[3] And then, I was looking
[4] at, wondering what was your plans for, you
[5] know, like we're right there at the
[6] Industrial Canal. When you start, if you
[7] ever get to that point, and you're going
[8] to be building the bridge, what kind of
[9] monies—Are you going to move us
[10] someplace else, pay cash for the building
[11] that we're going to go in, give us a lot
[12] of money to hold us until we build another
[13] business and then pay us for our
[14] aggravation? The money you're talking
[15] about is not enough just for me and
[16] because, you know, I worked hard. I
[17] worked hard. I worked scraping windows,
[18] cleaning toilets, selling real estate,
[19] going to college, trying to get an
[20] education, trying to send my children to
[21] school. I did all of that, and then I put
[22] my money on St. Claude Street and then you
[23] come and tell me that I can't stay there.
[24] I don't think that's fair.

[25] COLONEL CONNER:
I had hoped not to have
This

And. I don't know, I'm

inexpensive. For example, reversing some
of the stop signs to go ahead and have
traffic Ts out into St. Claude as opposed
to allowing for thoroughfare traffic
between the CBD and the Bywater
eighborhood, for example, could be done.
But I believe that because of the fact
that your project will impact St. Claude
to a greater extent, clearly there's going
to be damage, is it to the neighborhoods,
is it west of the Industrial Canal based
upon traffic effects, and I would like to
say as an additional is that street work
be done in terms of analysis, perhaps some
signage and hopefully some additional
resurfacing. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, sir.

MR. DICHARRY:

Cynthia Sumner.

MS. SUMNER:

I had hoped not to have
to speak here tonight. It's not something
I'm entirely comfortable with. But seeing
as so many people have had to leave, I

feel that I have to come up here and say
something. I moved to Holy Cross because
it is unlike any other place that I know
of in New Orleans. It is a little piece
of country out here. I look out my window
and I see green grass. You're going to
take that away. Not only do I see green
grass, I see kids playing on it. In an
urban environment like this, like we have
in New Orleans, that is rare for those
children to have that. Would you want
your kids to be robbed of that? Would you
wait your children to be breathing the
kind of dust and be exposed to the sorts
of toxic things that are going to be
floating around in the air when this kind
of construction is going on? Do you have
children? Does anybody up there have
children? Okay. Would you want
supertankers and would you want barges
with toxic materials going through your
neighborhood where they could possibly be
exposed to those kinds of things? Would
you want that to happen to you? Thank
about the people who live here. Who is it
going to impact? It's quality of life.
It's not just about money. There's no way
that you can replace that. There's no way
that you can compensate for what you're
about to take away.

And, I don't know, I'm
just curious right now with you all who
are left, because I'm thinking time's
running out tonight. Everybody's tired.
We all want to go home. I would like to
hear a round of applause for those people
who are opposed because I think you need
to hear who's left, who's stuck it out to
show you that they don't want this here.
Could I hear that from you all?

(Applause.)

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, ma'am.

MR. DICHARRY:

Celestine Walker.

(No response.)

Kenneth Robinson.

(No response.)

Kathy Randells.

(No response.)

Charles Jones.

(No response.)

Mark Brink.

MR. BRINK:

I'm Mark Brink. I
represent Mark's Muffler Shop right up the
street.

This project will have a
direct economic slowdown to my business.
Three-quarters of my business is across
the bridge and in other parishes.
Difficult access to my business will
substantially hurt sales. In the past,
when the Claiborne bridge was broken, my
sales were cut more than half. I have a
14-year established location. This
project would interrupt my business
terribly. I'm afraid my business, Miss
Moore's business, Holy Cross, we'd have to
get up and leave or go out of business. I
just wanted to state. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you.

MR. DICHARRY:

James Williams.
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[1] (No response.)
[3] (No response.)

[5] MR. LEWIS:
[6] Gentlemen, at this point,
[7] it's kind of like winning a lottery when
[8] your name comes up. I am a real estate
[9] agent. I have only one question. That
[10] question is, what will the effects be of
[11] 11 years of work on the canal on real
[12] estate values in the areas near the canal?
[13] A friend of mine who lives very close here
[14] called me and said, "Danny, I've got a
[15] copy of the draft report. I'd like for
[16] you to look it over. It's the real estate
[17] supplement." And I suppose he called me
[18] because I was a real estate agent, not
[19] because I like to read technical reports.
[20] But in any case, many of you may have seen
[21] this, New Lock and Connecting Channel
[22] Draft Elevation Report, Real Estate
[23] Supplement. So what my friend asked me to
[24] do was look over this and dredge through
[25] the figures and see exactly what the Corps

[1] said the effect on real estate values
[2] would be of these proposed 11 years of
[5] comfortable and I read this from cover to
[6] cover, and there is one thing on Page 15.
[7] It's the first paragraph. It says, "There
[8] are no problems anticipated with the land
[9] owners." "There are no problems
[10] anticipated with the land owners."
[11] Now, it's possible I got
[12] the wrong report. This is a real estate
[13] supplement. Maybe there's another one,
[14] and if there is, naturally I'd like to see
[15] that. And I'm confident the Corps would
[16] make this report available to any of you
[17] that want it. But, you know, if you just
[18] take Holy Cross here, you've got about
[19] 2500 homes in Holy Cross. About 2,000 of
[20] them are occupied; the other 500 are
[21] vacant. Their property is worth millions
[22] of dollars.
[23] Now, I'm not telling you
[24] anything you don't know when I tell you
[25] that it's a fairly good time for real

[1] estate in New Orleans. Things are not
[2] booming but we all know oil's pretty good,
[3] the port's pretty good. You can't even go
[4] downtown because of visitors. It's a
[5] fairly good time. The average home owner
[6] or business owner can expect a reasonable
[7] appreciation on his or her property in
[8] this town.
[9] Now, you know, what's
[10] reasonable, two percent, three percent,
[11] five percent a year. That depends on who
[12] you ask. Nobody's got a crystal ball on
[13] this. But the average home owner can
[14] expect an increase in the value of their
[15] property. Well, I think in this case,
[16] with this particular work on the horizon
[17] around the canal, that the average home
[18] owner in Holy Cross and Bywater and St.
[19] Claude and Plaquemine and St. Bernard can
[20] expect a serious report on what the effect
[21] on real estate values will be. And they
[22] don't have that. Thanks.

[22] MR. DICHRARY:

[2] MS. MWENDO:
[5] area. The maritime industry, the United
[6] States government and particularly the
[7] Corps of Engineers and the Port of New
[8] Orleans are all going to benefit
[9] tremendously from this project. It's
[10] estimated that it would generate billions
[11] of dollars in increased revenue over a
[12] period of time. The people of the four
[13] communities affected by this project
[14] should also benefit. This is an
[15] opportunity for a win-win situation, yet
[16] the government is offering crumbs in
[17] return for major disruption, upheaval and
[18] inconvenience to the people, to the
[19] families in these communities for at least
[20] 10 to 15 years. There will be various
[21] negative effects, physically,
[22] economically, socially and
[23] psychologically, as a result of this
[24] project.
[25] What is the mitigation
I can come to a meeting.

say two words, and you can say I have participated. It did not matter how many times in how many ways we said we did not want this project. They kept trying and got from many the vision for this community. "Give us your vision," they continued to say, not that the vision would be realized but so they could put on paper and say we participated, end of story.

This feeling I had following these few meetings triggered unpleasant memories of documented historical facts which the government has been involved in, and I said to myself, here we go again. Representative Sherman Copeland gave examples of recent unkept promises. I have a few more dramatic ones, some that go way back.

For example, we can go back as far as to nearly the end of slavery when ex-slaves were promised their 40 acres and a mule as an economic base upon which to establish themselves and to recoup some of the payment for many years of free labor. As you know, we are still fighting for our 40 acres and a mule through the Reparations Movement, repairs for damages incurred from slavery due to the exploitation, discrimination and oppression of African Americans to this present day.

Other examples, the syphilis-injected experiments on prisoners, the conscious smallpox spread to Native Americans, the Jim Crow laws of the South; more recently, the payment of 4.8 million dollars to the 12 human guinea pigs who in the 1940s were injected with uranium and plutonium without their knowledge and the U.S. government finally admitting to its involvement in 1996, after years of denial; the building of hundreds of prisons a year to house those who are and who will be the discarded of society due to welfare reform, drugs, cutbacks in education and lack of jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities.

With such a history, it is difficult to believe that the government is for the people, for the good of the people beyond its own agenda and gain. Do I add the IHNC project to the list of examples of the Mississippi treatment of the common man, woman and child, the family?

Let me bring it down here to this situation. In the summer of 1995, I submitted a written proposal to the Port and Corps as a suggested mitigation plan. Its basis was to promote self-sufficiency and self-determination within the four communities. The proposal was not included in the Corps' and the Port's minutes or in any of their mitigation plans, including this latest one. A portion of a line was included, totally out of the proposal's context, saying that this was one of the suggestions that the community wanted. Sounds familiar?

Briefly, the proposal was this. Additional to the direct mitigation plans that already exist, this would be the proposal: All vessels that use the Industrial Canal would pay a fee. By the way, this is not a new practice. In the 1920s when the Port owned the locks, each vessel that used the canal was charged a fee or a toll. Anyway, a portion of that fee goes to the City of New Orleans for the four communities' infrastructure and the remainder would be divided among the four communities, with the highest percentage earmarked for the communities suffering the greatest impact. Committees from each community would determine how the money would be spent in specific delineated areas in education, economic development, healthcare, housing, crime prevention.
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[1] prevention and recreation. This idea will
[2] allow the communities affected by this
[3] major disruption to become more
[5] I believe the proposal I
[6] just briefly outlined would encourage and
[7] maintain the human dignity and respect of
[8] the families in our communities as well as
[9] provide economic growth and development
[10] for the government and the maritime
[11] industry. Again, it could be a win-win
[12] situation. We do not accept the present
[13] mitigation plan delineated in the IHNC

    COLONEL CONNER:


    MR. DICHARRY:


[17] (No response.)

[18] I have to apologize. I

[19] don't know the first name here. But it's

[20] "Loubolton." "Loubolton" is the last

[21] name, from living on Flood Street.

[22] (No response.)

[23] Kelly Despau or Despau?

[24] (No response.)

[25] The last name is

[26] M-E-G-I-N, living on Dauphine Street,

[27] Rudolfo Megin?

[28] (No response.)

[29] Erroll Damimi (phonetic)?

[30] (No response.)

[31] I'm sorry, did I--

[32] must have really butchered that one.

    MR. BEAN:

[33] That's quite all right.

[34] I'm not him anyway. My name is Gary Bean

[35] and I'm not a stone's throw away from the

[36] St. Claude. I'm in the ten hundred block.

[37] And to me, this comes down to not just the

[38] community, because to me the community is

[39] one, and each one of us, each and every

[40] one of us, is one when we're looking at

[41] this project that you're trying to thrust

[42] down our throat. And I'm not only going

[43] to be impacted directly. I'm pretty

[44] certain I would be displaced. And my idea

[45] of purchasing a home in the Bywater area

[46] is like many of the people in the

[47] community's, in the old community's, that

[48] my vision is to live there, enjoy my life,

[49] and also have the opportunity to help

[50] raise my grandchildren and leave them some

[51] form of legacy of mine's.

[52] I would like to know, you

[53] know, because the mitigation money to me

[54] is definitely not enough. You'd have to

[55] give it all to me for me to be satisfied.

[56] But at the same time, what am I going to

[57] gain out of the mitigation? In the ten

[58] hundred block right there on Poland

[59] Avenue, certainly my place will not

[60] remain. Can the Corps of Engineers give

[61] me back my 18 months of labor, not just by

[62] myself, also with my fiancée, that I've

[63] labored in my residence to build it and to

[64] bring it back up, to build that community

[65] back up? The Corps cannot pay me enough

[66] for that. Will the Corps take and move my

[67] home, not just give me money to go and

[68] purchase somewhere else where--and

[69] incidentally, I may be displacing someone

[70] again, too. Will the Corps take and

[71] remove my home, period? That means brick

[72] for brick, board for board, tile for tile,

[73] and put it in a place of my choosing.

[74] because if the Corps cannot do that for

[75] me, then the Corps is not doing any good

[76] for me nor is the Corps doing any good for

[77] the community. If I have to leave the

[78] community, the community little by little

[79] just starts to die off. It'll be gone.

[80] The legacy of the Historic District, it'll

[81] disappear. What's next?

[82] And this is a big problem

[83] with big government. It's always what's

[84] next. You are not beyond the people. The

[85] people is the government, or should I say

[86] the people are the government. When are

[87] you all going to listen to us? I didn't

[88] purchase in the Bywater for this project

[89] to come to me and say, well, you were able

[90] to obtain a piece of your goal but you

[91] must go. I'm not interested in going.

[92] That is the reason that I purchased there.

[93] I want to live a fruitful life in that

[94] area, in that community, with the

[95] neighbors. I haven't been in there long

[96] enough to learn my neighbors. I want that

[97] opportunity to do that.
I'm going to say, an average of two years. I don't want to be living in my home, because the ambience of my home, the Neighborhood Association — until such time as all parties come to an agreement as to if and what they want. Do they want a project, do they want a project. We went through the whole — we had the usuals. We had the industry. We had the Corps. We had the Port. We had the neighborhood associations. And everybody that wanted to participate participated.

Since that first initial meeting, everyone from the businesses in the community, the neighborhood associations, the churches, the general everyday citizen, has been saying no. Tonight, I got here when you all started and every speaker, political, business association, just Joe Blow citizen that has walked up to this Mike, has said no. The only folk I have seen come up here and said yes was the barge industry and all the people who's going to be using this facility grossing about a million dollars a day of the fruits of our suffering, because that's what you're going to have. Okay? What you will have here, and let's not play games about the economy and all the good things it's going to do for New Orleans, because what it's going to do for New Orleans is minimal. It's minimal because what's going to come through that lock is going to go Memphs, Tennessee, Baton Rouge or wherever up the Mississippi they need to go. It's a short route for container ships. And for jobs? The industry as it is right now will handle whatever's coming through those locks without any infusion of jobs.

Be real about it. Let's take the mirrors, you know, and turn them backwards, put the fan on and blow the smoke out the room. Okay? The
Now, you want to come here and throw sand and peanuts at me and say 33 million dollars. I’m not going to rehash the points that were made whereas half of this mediation plan is actually a part of the operation plan, but we’re going to dispense with that. We're not going to go there. It’s been there. We’ve been there. When you go to Congress and present this wonderful package of yours, these folk, if they agree to it, there is nothing in that mediation plan that you could promise me to happen to my community because if you go to Congress with my blessing and Congress say, well, it’s do the project, we don’t have to do mediation. Everybody in here talking about losing your job and all this, all that’s going down the tubes.

You don’t have a penny. You cannot put a dime in no bank for no mediation. Okay? You want to sell us something? You want to be real with us? If, and I'm totally distanced by that, but if it should happen, here’s the mediation plan I have in plan. You go to the folk who are going to make the money, the shipping industry, tell them to put a billion dollars in an account and sit it on that table and say, here’s your mediation plan, four communities, do what you want with it and have your community. But this whole mediation thing is just like them folks with "Mr. No" got caught, it’s smoke. You cannot tell me you’re going to air condition nobody’s house or do nothing in nobody’s house because you don’t have a dime to do it and if Congress don’t give it to you, you can’t do it. So don’t sit here and tell me about all the things you’re going to do for these folks when you ain’t got a dime to back it up with. In one year’s period, the
 mitigation to compensate for the
disintegration of a neighborhood which has
gradually deteriorated? The lady who has
the business on St. Claude, it's going to
go. The people who have mentioned all the
other things that might happen to the
neighborhood and described to you the
poverty in this neighborhood, your
organization created that. You made a
handicapped neighborhood. You brought
this neighborhood a handicap. Do you
really want to be part of a group now that
not only continues the handicap but makes
it a quadriplegic? Do you really want to
do that?
And I ask you, sir, isn't
this a done deal anyway? If it isn't, why
were the politicians, the political people
and the major maritime interests allowed
to speak before the people had time to do
their say? They have had to leave. They
have businesses and careers and
professions and jobs and work to run to
tomorrow. They had to leave. And so I
ask you again, are you going to make this
a quadriplegic area? If you are, why not
just take the whole community and tell us
now. Thank you.

COLONEL CONNER:
Thank you.

MR. DICHTARRY:
Eddie Latte (phonetic)?
(No response.)
Gilbert, Gilbrecht Coker?
(No response.)
Mark Gonzales?
(No response.)
Mary Fatsy Story.
(No response.)
That's all the cards.
(No response.)
Does anybody else have anything to say or
want to -

COLONEL CONNER:
Give us your full name,
please.

MS. STANLEY:
I'm Evelyn Stanley. I
live at 723 Caffin Avenue. I've been a
resident in this neighborhood for 70 years
in the same house. I would just like to
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Thank you, ma'am. Do we find and And 

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, ma'am. Do we have other folks in the audience who would like to address the group?

MR. CHANDLER:

My name’s Chris Chandler and I’d like to congratulate the Colonel and anyone else in the room that was involved in the production of the video. I think that it was one of the finest pieces of propaganda that this army or any other army has ever produced. And I’d also like to say that if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is about protecting big business, then you are doing a great job. But I personally feel that the United States of America is about a much higher ideal about protecting the lives of everyday people. And so, therefore, I’d like to recommend that if this video is used in the United States Congress to pitch this project, that I would like to recommend that whoever was involved in the production of it go on trial for lying to Congress. Thanks.

COLONEL CONNER:

Thank you, Yes, ma’am.

MS. CRUZ:

My name’s Kathleen Cruz and I live on the end of Jourdan Avenue at the river and I’m here because I’m afraid. I came to this neighborhood only like a year and a half ago, and the minute I moved here, I already met neighbors five blocks away. And more neighborhoods and cities, you barely know the person beside you except to nod. And I’ve never felt a sense of community anywhere except for way out in the country that we have here. And I think it’s really important to have like neighbors and friends, and that’s what makes you safe in a city is to know the people around you.

And I’ve had several of the people who are the neighbors that I know say that if anything goes down here, like if the bridges are moved or anything, that they will move out. And I know for sure that 90 percent of the people that I know that rent, anyone who can afford to, will leave and live somewhere else and that will leave most of the community empty because there’s a lot of rental units here. And if people move out, then the few of us who can’t go anywhere else will be stuck here with 90 percent abandoned houses, and we all know what happens when that’s like. It’s like the crime will skyrocket and I’ll be afraid to go home or to leave my home.

And also, about the bridge, and a lot of people have talked about putting in higher bridges and everything, and I also know that most of the people I know are very poor and they have bicycles or they walk and there’s no way to walk or bicycle across the mid-range bridges and there’s no proposal for people with bikes to go, like if they took out the bridge, to be able to get across the canal. And you can’t just, you know, take the bus and then walk if you’re used to your people that go all the way Uptown on their bicycles like twice a day. I mean, it sounds crazy to those of us with cars, but a lot of people survive by their bicycle. And there’s, you know, no way for them to be able to get across the bridge.

And also I wanted to I was going to say again about the levee being grass and just how like there’s a sense of peace here and it’s, you know, again, a very special thing for a city to have peace. And people bring their kids, they drive their kids from other parts of the city to come to our small section of the levee that has the grass so they can fish. They show them the boats. And all different kinds of people come. It’s not just one group. It’s not just the people who live right there. People drive their kids over to play like in front of my house. And it’s a beautiful thing and it helps keep the neighborhood safe and it...
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[1] We didn't get
[2] I name. Could we get that, please?
[3] Cruz?
[4] Other speakers?

MS. RICE:
[5] Good evening. My name is
[6] Julianna Christiani Rice and I live in the
[8] one of my main concerns is, when the
[9] Claiborne bridge was down a couple of
[10] years ago, I was walking in different
[11] areas in the morning just trying to get to
[12] work. We don't have big executives in
[13] this community like other areas. We have
[14] poor people trying to raise their
[15] families. I could have made a deal with
[16] my boss so that I can go in later and work
[17] later. There's a lot of people down here

[1] who can't do that. And I know
[2] subsequently lots of people probably will
[3] lose their jobs, their little $4.75-an-
[4] hour job. What is going to happen with
[5] those people?

[6] My other concern is, I
[7] have a few pieces of property in this
[8] area. When the construction goes and my
[9] tenants decide to go, who is going to
[10] reimburse me when I - loss of income? I
[11] would like to know that, because I don't
[12] want a handout from anybody. I'm a
[13] foreigner and I come here and I work hard.
[14] I don't want you to do anything for me.
[15] Just give me the opportunity. And all I'm
[16] saying, this is a wonderful neighborhood
[17] since I live - I lived in New York and I
[18] moved down here 13, 14 years ago, I lived
[19] on the same street. I have four or five
[20] pieces of property on the same street. I
[21] want you to take your project and shove it
[22] somewhere else. We don't want it here.
[23] I don't want to inhale the toxic stuff that
[24] is going to be coming down with those
[25] tankers. My husband does work, is

[1] merchant seaman, he does work on a ship.
[2] I don't want them in my neighborhood.
[3] And that's all I have to
[4] say. But I'm just thinking about the poor
[5] people who will have to go because there
[6] were mornings when I was walking from home
[7] across the bridge to get, trying to get to
[8] work, and not a lot of people would
[9] able to say, well, I can tell my boss,
[10] well, I'm coming in at 9:00 and I'll work
[11] until 6:00 in the afternoon. A lot of
[12] people can't do that. They don't have
[13] that option. It's either you get here on
[14] time or go. So that's all I have to say.

COLONEL CONNER:
[16] Thank you.
[17] Anyone else care to speak
[18] tonight? Yes, ma'am?

MS. GRAF:
[19] I think we've talked a
[20] lot about what could happen and most of
[21] it, all of it, has been negative except
[22] for the maritime interests. I just wanted
[23] to say that this was a neighborhood that

[1] had a quality of life to it. Many of the
[2] people, the last young lady that spoke of
[3] the quality of life on the levee, I was
[4] blessed to grow up with that in spite of
[6] had grown up with more of that because she
[7] could get on the streetcar at Dauphine and
[8] Flood and go all the way up to Canal
[9] Street and the Central Business District
[10] on Dauphine Street because there was no

I think the only thing
[12] that the Corps really needs to think about
[13] is, if you do have to go through with such
[14] a project and it does have to be in this
[15] four-district community or four historic
[16] neighborhood area, can you really return
[17] the quality of life that existed here?
[18] Can you really return that? I don't think
[19] you can, putting in that kind of a
[20] project. And I think that's important to
[21] every one of these people that are are
[22] here still yet tonight and that have been
[23] here this evening. It's quality of life
[24] we're talking about. On one side of the
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[1] ledger, and it's maritime, monetary
[3] And I'll leave you with a
[4] question again. Which would you be proud
[5] to go saying that you had achieved? Thank
[7] \textbf{COLONEL CONNER:}
[9] Senator?
[10] \textbf{SENIOR JOHNSON:}
[11] Colonel, let me - I know
[12] we're about to close down. I just want to
[13] try and close down tonight by saying
[14] something. You've heard an awful lot from
[15] Holy Cross and Bywater, but I certainly
[16] want the record to reflect that it is not
[17] just those two neighborhoods that are
[18] adamantly opposed to this project. The
[19] neighborhoods over on the other side of
[20] St. Claude, on the other side of Claiborne
[21] Avenue, you frankly didn't hear an awful
[22] lot from those neighborhoods on tonight.
[23] \textit{But those of us, and}
[24] there are a couple or three people who
[25] came up and said something about elected
[26] \textit{officials speaking first and it's a done
[27] deal. You know, I want the record to
[28] clearly reflect where all of us are as
[29] elected officials that I know of,
[30] including the Mayor of the City of New
[31] Orleans. I'm not attempting to speak for
[32] the Mayor but I have spoken to him. There
[33] is no question about where we stand on
[34] this issue. And I want to make it
[35] perfectly clear, perfectly clear, because
[36] I don't want the record to reflect
[37] anything that is not the case. Every
[38] elected official I know who represents the
[39] people in this district, every elected
[40] official I know that represents the people
[41] in this district, is opposed to this
[42] project, is adamantly opposed to it. The
[43] people who live on the other side of St.
[44] Claude, the people who live on the other
[45] side of Claiborne Avenue, I live on the
[46] other side of Claiborne Avenue. I live at
[47] 2223 Desloge Street. Those people are
[48] adamantly opposed to this project. And I
[49] just want the record to clearly reflect
[50] that because you heard an awful lot from
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[1] Bywater, you heard an awful lot from Holy
[2] Cross, and you didn't hear an awful lot or
[3] that much from the other communities.
[4] \textbf{UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:}
[5] \textbf{I just wanted to say one}
[6] thing that Representative Copeland, he
[7] really opposed it. Now, he's our
[8] representative for the other side of St.
[9] Claude all the way to Florida. I spoke
[10] with him the other day. And he and the
[11] other group of people does not want this
[12] project to go through.
[13] \textbf{COLONEL CONNER:}
[14] Yes, ma'am. Thank you.
[15] Senator?
[16] \textbf{SENIOR DEAN:}
[17] \textbf{I wish you had let us}
[18] speak last. I would like the record to
[19] show I'm still here. I've had an earful.
[20] I've learned a lot. Thank you.
[21] \textbf{COLONEL CONNER:}
[22] Thank you, sir. Other
[23] comments? Yes, sir.
[24] \textbf{UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:}
[25] \textbf{I would like to say one}
[26] more thing. Have you thought about what
[27] this project is going to do to your
[28] reputation as the Corps of Engineers if
[29] it's a very unpopular project which you
[30] try to push through in spite of the will
[31] of the people here? Have you thought also
[32] of the project cost, how increased it
[33] might be if 50,000 people don't want it?
[34] What a struggle that will be, as project
[36] \textbf{COLONEL CONNER:}
[37] \textbf{I want to thank you all}
[38] for coming tonight and especially for
[39] those of you that stuck it out till the
[40] bitter end here. My hat's off to you for
[41] that, I truly appreciate your comments.
[42] I learned a lot this evening and I
[43] guarantee that I will take each and every
[44] one of your comments to heart as I review
[45] this project. And I remind you that the
[46] public review period is not over, and if
[47] you have additional people that you know
[48] that didn't have the opportunity to be
[49] here this evening or if you yourselves
[50] have additional thoughts, you still have
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until the 24th of February to get that information to me. So I encourage you to exercise that avenue.

Being no further comments from the floor, I call this meeting adjourned.
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RESPONSES TO ISSUES RAISED
Responses to pertinent comments made at the IHNC Lock public meeting held at Holy Cross School on January 27, 1997.

Senator Johnson

Page 22, Lines 5 - 22. Impacts of the project are not commensurate with the suggested amount of mitigation.

Senator Dean

Page 32, Lines 4 - 14. A low-rise bridge was chosen as the replacement bridge at St. Claude Avenue as a result of meetings with adjacent residents who were concerned with visual impacts and externalities associated with elevated roadways through residential neighborhoods. In addition, displacement of residents and businesses was a major concern that is avoided by retaining a low-rise bridge at St. Claude Avenue.

Representative Copelin

Comments noted.

Representative Warner

Page 51, Line 13 - Page 53, Line 2. While we agree that a new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Avenue for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal, we do not have the authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of years. It is assumed that a new bridge there is in the without project condition.

Representative Odinet

Page 53, Line 16 - Page 54, Line 7. While it is agreed that a new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Ave. for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal, the Corps does not have the authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of years. It is assumed that a new bridge there is in the without project condition.

Mr. Johnson (representing Representative Naomi Farve)

Comments noted.

Representative Morrell

Comments noted.
Councilwoman Hazeur-Distance

Comments noted.

Mr. Brown

Comments have been considered in the reformulated community impact mitigation plan.

Ms. Blaise

Comments noted.

Mr. Wells

Comments noted.

Ms. Penny Thompson

Page 76, Lines 16-23. The difference in impacts between a shallow-draft lock and a deep-draft lock are minor, relative to the overall impacts of either plan. Construction time, right-of-ways required, noise generated, sizes of bridges, emissions from construction equipment, levee/floodwall realignments, and effects on cultural resources and recreational opportunities would be the same. There would be some additional dredging required for the deep-draft plan, but this construction item would not cause additional impacts to the nearby communities. The major difference between the shallow and deep-draft lock plans, that would be noticeable by local residents, would be the periodic presence of large ships moving through the lock and canal with the deep-draft lock in place. The ships would likely carry similar types of products as the barges currently using the lock. An additional impact would be the vehicular delays caused by bridge openings for each ship that transits the canal.

Page 76, Lines 24 thru Page 77, Line 15. The plans for bridge improvements at Florida Avenue are somewhat complicated. The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) has declared the existing Florida Avenue Bridge a hazard to navigation. The USCG has issued an Order to Alter to the Port of New Orleans for replacement of the bridge. The replacement bridge will provide greater horizontal clearance than the existing bridge, but will provide for the same level of rail and vehicular traffic - two rail lines and two traffic lanes. The bridge would improve vehicular traffic by providing a more reliable crossing. The USCG is handling the bridge replacement under their categorical exclusion authority, therefore no Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact or Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared.

The Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LDOTD) and the City of New Orleans have been planning for a new bridge across the IHNC at Florida Avenue for many years. A preliminary draft environmental assessment was prepared by the LDOTD in 1994, but was not released to the public. Since then, modifications to the design of the planned bridge have been proposed. As of now, we understand that some state funds are available for construction of a new bridge, but not enough for completion of the project. In the draft version of our report, the tentatively selected plan relied upon a new Florida Avenue bridge to pass detoured traffic across the IHNC during periods when the St. Claude Avenue and Claiborne Avenue crossings were out of service. The recommended plan in the final report includes a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue. In addition, a more detailed investigation of the replacement bridge at Claiborne has reduced the outage for vehicular traffic to a few weeks.
These bridges eliminate the reliance on a new bridge at Florida Avenue to handle detoured traffic.

Page 77, Line 16 thru Page 78, Line 8. An intensive effort was made over a number of years to identify all potential historic properties to be impacted by this project. A small library of reports was produced by professional cultural resource firms including historical research, architectural studies, visual and aesthetic studies, and archeological investigations. These reports were coordinated with the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). A representative of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the SHPO visited the area and discussed the project with the Corps of Engineers and neighborhood groups. A memorandum of agreement will be executed at the appropriate time. Social impacts of construction of the new lock on the neighborhoods were addressed in social impact studies.

Both the IHNC Lock and the St. Claude Bridge are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Mitigation for their destruction will be recordation to the standards of the Historic American Engineering Record. This is a standard mitigation method that is used frequently throughout the United States.

Page 78, Line 9 - 22. Estimations of volatile organic compound emissions from construction equipment have been added to the EIS and Environmental Appendix. The emissions have been determined to be below the threshold which would require a determination of conformity with the State Implementation Plan.

Page 79, Line 12. The wall that was envisioned in the draft report is necessary to protect residents from riverine flooding, given the constraints of not relocating any residents. While the final design will not be decided until the detailed engineering and design phase, the Corps plan has changed to include a "fold-down" floodwall that wouldn't obscure the view during most of the year. It would have to be raised when the gauge at Carrollton reaches 15 feet. This is estimated to occur about 23 days each year on average. Such a design would maintain the flood protection required for the Mississippi River.

Page 79, Lines 12-19. Revisions to the plan as a result of comments received during the review period include a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue. As a result, we do not expect a loss in efficiency. In other words, traffic will continue to flow over the canal during construction of the project. Response times will not be significantly impacted.

Page 79, Line 19 thru Page 80, Line 8. The Corps is planning to recommend that monies for mitigation be appropriated up front and that mitigation be accomplished from the very beginning of the project. Preconstruction mitigation is a very real possibility. The reality is that actual implementation of mitigation will be governed by appropriations from Congress. During the NWG process we attempted to develop a conceptual framework for the plan. We will continue to develop the plan. The details with community participation will be developed once funding is approved for the construction of the project.

Page 80, Lines 23 - 25. The location for the proposed lock at the IHNC site was selected because it is the best from both an economic and environmental standpoint, not because of political clout.

Brother Walsh

Page 84, Lines 8-13. As a result of these comments and similar comments from some of the businesses, the plans have been revised to provide for a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue which will provide uninterrupted traffic across the canal for Holy Cross students. Innovative
construction methods that result in shorter vehicular outages at Claiborne Avenue will significantly minimize the disruptions there.

Page 85, Line 3 thru Page 86, Line 7. The floodwall is required to provide the protection necessary to prevent the Lower Ninth Ward from river flooding. A “fold-down” floodwall has been incorporated into the revised plan to minimize the visual obstruction for all but one month out of the year, on average. The Corps will evaluate alternative methods of protection for that area in the engineering and design phase of the project.

Mr. Armingeon

Reviewers should be directed to the January 27, 1997 letter from the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation for responses.

Mr. Gonzales

Comments noted.

Mr. Gegenheimer

See response on p 9 (Mr. Hanzo). The Corps is addressing some of the more critical areas of erosion along the MRGO under different authorities. The lock project is a separable element of the MRGO authority.

Mr. Holmes

Page 96, Lines 11-16. The limits of the dredged material disposal site along the MRGO have been refined. No dredged material would be deposited in St. Bernard Parish.

Page 96, Line 19 thru Page 97, Line 6. The reason a low-level bridge is being proposed at St. Claude is because of the concerns by the Holy Cross and Bywater neighborhoods. They insisted that they would only accept a low-level bridge that accommodates the current level of traffic. They wanted to preserve the neighborhood character and not induce more traffic along the St. Claude Avenue where there are numerous school zones not far from the canal and in close proximity to the bridge.

Page 97, Lines 7-22. Although it is only a very small portion of the waterborne traffic, ship traffic is expected to increase in the future, even with the existing lock. Additional deep draft traffic induced by the new lock amounts to one additional ship every three days on an average annual basis.

Mr. Larsen

Comments noted.
Mr. Savoie

Page 108, Lines 3-5. The area proposed for dredged material disposal is on the south bank of the MRGO, inside of the hurricane protection levee system. The limits of the disposal site has been refined and it is all within Orleans Parish.

Page 108, Line 20 thru Page 109, Line 6. The purpose of deepening the lock to 36 feet is to allow access to ships expected to utilize Port facilities. However, the overriding justification for replacing the existing lock is to accommodate existing and future shallow draft traffic.

Mr. Kinsler

Comments noted.

Mr. Cooper

Page 112, Lines 13-14. Notices of the public meeting were mailed out as soon as arrangements were confirmed for the subject public meeting. Actual receipt of the notices is beyond the control of this agency.

Page 112, Line 15. The notices were mailed out on January 9 and January 10, 1997.

Page 112, Line 15-16. Approximately 850 notices were mailed out. In addition news releases were sent to all of the local media (radio, television and the print media).

Page 112, Lines 16-18. Some notices were sent out with the right date listed but the wrong day of the week identified. A news article with the right information appeared in the local newspaper shortly after the error was brought to our attention.

Page 112, Lines 20-24. All churches (approximately 100) in the zip code 70117 were sent notices. However the notices may not have reached them in time for publication in their bulletins as some bulletins are preprinted a couple of weeks ahead of time.

Page 112, Line 24 thru Page 113, Line 3. Notices were sent to elected officials in the area, representatives of organizations, members of the neighborhood working group, the navigation working group, and numerous organizations including environmental organizations, libraries, and universities.

Page 113, Lines 8-10. The public meeting was scheduled at a time when key personnel were available, and a facility large enough to accommodate the expected crowd was available. The review period was extended until February 24 initially and later until March 3, 1997.

Page 113, Lines 10-14. The meeting held on the 22nd of January was originally scheduled for the "Huddle" at Holy Cross School. It was changed at the last minute by Holy Cross School because of a conflict with one of their fund-raising activities. The school did have someone helping direct people to the new meeting location in another building.

Page 113, Lines 17-19. The Times Picayune was sent copies of the news releases in conjunction with the meeting. The Corps does not control the timing of publication of news items in the Times Picayune.
Page 113, Lines 19-20. News releases were furnished to the local newspapers, television and radio stations.

Page 113, Lines 21-23. Transplanting of trees is addressed in Table 1 (page EIS-10), Section 5.3.20.1 (page EIS-83), Section 5.3.20.4.1. (page EIS-84), and section 5.3.20.4.2. (page EIS-85) of the draft report. The trees are addressed in the same sections, but not necessarily on the same pages in the final EIS.

Page 113, Lines 21 thru Page 114, Line 4. The mitigation plan recognizes that the trees along the existing lock are considered to be visually part of the community green/open space. The report recognizes that the Bywater Neighborhood Association made the recommendation that the trees be saved if at all possible. The only way of doing that would be to attempt to transplant them. According to local arborists, they indicate that they can save some of the trees.

Page 114, Lines 4-5. There are two reasons why the trees are dying. First, there was a ruptured water line under two of the trees that caused them to die and second many of the trees are infested with Formosan termites. Upon site investigation by one of the district's landscape architects and the New Orleans Park and Parkways personnel in 1996, it was noticed. They recommended that the infested trees be treated by a licensed pest control company with a pesticide.

Page 114, Lines 6-10. The Corps conducted an inventory and assessment of the trees in August 1995. It included mapping the location, documenting the circumference, diameter, and condition at that time. The trees were fertilized and pruned in 1996.

Page 114, Lines 11-15. Yes, our landscape architect did contact the Disney horticultural department in 1994. At that time they indicated that they have saved large trees with mixed success. Trees over 24" in diameter have not been moved with full success. The trees over 24" have suffered and not fully recovered. They suggested calling a local tree company in the New Orleans area. The New Orleans District then contacted a local tree company (Bayou Tree Service, Inc.).

Page 114, Lines 15-17. A formal report was not prepared. Telephone inquiries with appropriate local tree experts were made.

Page 114, Lines 18-24. The Coast Guard currently employs 300 persons. Most of their employees patronize the on-site cafeteria and other government-sponsored services. Because of this, the impact of their relocation would be minimal to nearby merchants. In addition, the Coast Guard is looking at other sites along the canal, and may relocate close to their current location.

Page 114, Line 24 - Page 115, Line 3. The SPCA was not specifically notified of the public meeting. The project should not significantly impact the SPCA.

Page 115, Lines 4-11. It is possible that the apprenticeship programs will benefit from the lock project in that the demand for trained personnel will increase. Monies have been included in the mitigation plan for training, and Mr. Gaudet's facility is one of several facilities that could benefit from the program.

Page 115, Lines 11-15. The Bywater station of the US Post Office delivered many of the notices for the public meeting.

Page 115, Lines 15-17. This project is not expected to adversely impact their operations. Likewise, mail service should not be adversely impacted.
Page 115, Lines 18-21. Mr. Williams was sent a notice of availability of the report and a copy of the report was furnished to his office in response to a request from his office.

Page 115, Line 21 thru Page 116, Line 2. No, Mr. Williams has not been asked to provide professional advice concerning property values.

Page 116, Line 8-20. The final report does not include that statement.

Page 116, Line 23 thru Page 117, Line 2. Mass transit is beyond the scope of the authority of the Corps and the project. The provision of rail on the bridge would allow the RTA to eventually accomplish their long range plan of providing a streetcar line down to the Parish line. The Corps is providing a capability for this to happen at some point in time in the future.

Mr. Watson

Page 122, Lines 8-14. Concern for business and residential disruptions due to bridge closures prompted more detailed investigation into bridge replacement options. A temporary bridge has been added for St. Claude Avenue that will prevent the outage described in the draft report. Inclusion of innovative construction methods at the Claiborne Avenue bridge has lowered costs and minimized vehicular outages to a few weeks.

Mr. King

We have recognized the perception of local residents that real estate values have been negatively impacted and have considered that in formulating the final mitigation plan.

Mr. Doucette

Page 124, Lines 20 thru Page 125, Line 3. The implementation of the training programs have not yet been determined, but contact has been made with community colleges, vo-tech schools, and other training programs. The actual program would be established after the project is approved and funded. Criteria for selection would also be determined at that time. People who already have the required skills would not require additional training. Control of the jobs will lie with the Corps as the agency responsible for constructing the project.

Ms. Grille

Comments noted.

Mr. Bruch

The IHNC site was determined to be (etc. The location for the proposed lock at the IHNC site was selected because it is the best from both an economic and environmental standpoint, not because of political clout.
Mr. Koeferl

Page 131, Line 20 thru Page 132, Line 13. The video did not have any specific names of people from the community identified in it. There was a slide in the presentation following the video with people from the community listed as participants in the neighborhood working group. The listing of names on a slide in no way was intended to mean an endorsement of the project but was intended to illustrate that local citizens did participate in the formulation of the mitigation plan.

Page 135, Lines 18-23. Many social costs are very difficult to quantify in any widely accepted format. However, the mitigation plan acknowledges their existence and attempts to redress the damages.

Ms. Dashiell

Page 137, Line 22 thru Page 138, Line 3. Concerning the Florida Avenue Vehicular Bridge being proposed by the State and/or City, the bridge is not an essential element required for construction of the lock project. The draft report included the Florida Avenue bridge as part of the detour route because money had been appropriated for its construction by the Louisiana Legislature and active planning and design has taken place.

Construction of the replacement railroad bridge at Florida Avenue is scheduled to begin in the summer of 1996.

Page 138, Lines 18-24. Compensation to RTA was included in the draft plan. Due to revisions in the bridge replacement scheme, vehicular outages have been largely eliminated. For this reason, the current mitigation plan no longer includes remuneration to RTA. The cost for debris removal included in the mitigation was the additional cost to remove material by barge in lieu of trucking which would be cheaper.

Page 139, Lines 1-10. The flood protection system of which the levee is a part will require modification in order to provide the required protection. Because of the congestion in the area and our desire to protect the lives and property of the residents, it will be necessary to include flood walls as part of the protection system. A fold-down floodwall has been incorporated into the project for areas along the Industrial Canal that currently have only levees.

Other comments noted.

Mr. Hanzo

Page 143, Lines 2-6. The Corps is addressing some of the more critical areas of erosion along the MRGO under different authorities. The lock project is a separable element of the MRGO authority.

Mr. Svenson

Comments noted.
Mr. Henry Ponstein

Page 151, Lines 10 thru Page 152, Line 10. There is not enough area available to construct a new lock adjacent to the existing lock without relocating a significant number of residents. A tunnel under the canal is conceptually sound but the reality is that to construct a tunnel there would be a tremendous number of people impacted by the large excavation that would be required. If it were possible to put a lock adjacent to the existing lock, the Claiborne Avenue bridge would still need to be realigned with the new lock.

The existing lock is a deep draft lock and was constructed with an historical view of eventually having a connecting channel to the Gulf. Historical studies since the early settlement of New Orleans bear this out. This is well documented in the historical records.

Ms. Georgianna Gray

Comments noted.

Ms. Marietta Williams


Page 157, Line 24 thru Page 158, Line 11. The Mississippi River and tributaries project which includes the channel and flood control levees provide adequate protection for the New Orleans area. It is accurate to compare our situation to being like a sitting at the bottom of a cup. Most of New Orleans would flood without the levees that protect the area from both riverine flooding and tidal flooding during hurricanes.

Page 158, Lines 12-25. The dollar amount identified for mitigation has already been approved by Congress in the WRDA 1996. The distribution of dollars is not based on this much for Orleans and that much for St. Bernard but is for the area impacted whether it be in Orleans or St. Bernard.

Ms. Morris

Page 166, Lines 6-14. The plans for bridge replacement have been revised to minimize outages for vehicular traffic. In addition, a business assistance program will be funded to offer advice and assistance in overcoming disruptive conditions due to project construction.

Mr. Reimer

Page 168, Lines 4-23. We agree that traffic would also be impacted on streets adjacent to St. Claude Avenue. However, the revised plan includes a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue that should lessen the impact on traffic. The only time there could be a slight impact is when the bridge is restricted to two lanes of traffic when the new bridge is being connected to the existing approaches. That should only be for a couple of months.

Ms. Sumner

Comments noted.
Mr. Brink

Page 172, Lines 8-21. Obviously, businesses would have been impacted by closure of the St. Claude bridge. However, with the revised plan that includes a temporary bridge at St. Claude, there should be no significant impact as traffic will continue to move during the construction of the project. This change has been made as a result of comments voiced at the public meeting.

Mr. Lewis

We have recognized the perception of local residents that real estate values have been negatively impacted and have considered that in formulating the final mitigation plan.

Ms. Mwendo

Page 180, Line 7 - Page 181, Line 4. Tolls on waterways would have to be specifically authorized by Congress. At present, there are no tolls on Federal waterways. At present there are user fees for the inland waterway system. These fees are in the form of a fuel tax for vessels. Those fees go into the Inland Waterway Trust Fund and that is overseen by the Inland Waterways Users Board. The Users Board makes recommendations on how those monies are to be spent. The funds are used to construct new facilities or replace existing facilities on the inland waterway system of the nation.

Mr. Bean

Page 182, Line 21 thru Page 183, Line 24. There is no relocation of residents required for implementing this project.

Mr. Spencer

Comments noted.

Ms. Graf

Comments noted. It should be pointed out that the Industrial Canal and lock were not constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

Ms. Stanley

Comments noted.

Mr. Chandler

Comments noted.
Ms. Cruz

Page 199, Line 16 - Page 200, Line 9. The plan has been revised to include a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue. Both the temporary and permanent new bridges at St. Claude will include provisions for pedestrian and bicycle access across the bridge.

Ms. Rice

Page 201, Lines 14-20. The plan has been revised to include a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue. Both the temporary and permanent new bridges at St. Claude will include provisions for pedestrian and bicycle access across the bridge.

Ms. Graf

Comments noted.

Senator Johnson

Comments noted.

Senator Dean

Comments noted.
SECTION 2

INDIVIDUAL LETTERS AND BRIEF RESPONSES
LETTERS OF COMMENT RECEIVED ON THE IHNC LOCK REPORT

Officials

[State]
1 Secretary Frank Denton, LADOTD (on behalf of Governor Foster)
2 Dean, SEN Lynn (statement handed in at public meeting)
3 Odinet, REP Kenneth L., Sr.

[Local]
4 Di Fatta, Joseph S., Jr. (St. Bernard Parish Councilman, District C)
5 Hazeur-Distance, Ellen (New Orleans City Councilperson, District E)
6 Ponstein, Charles (St. Bernard Parish President)

Agencies

[Federal]
7 EPA Region 6
8 US Coast Guard
9 US Department of Agriculture
10 US Dept of Commerce (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)
11 US Dept of Interior
12 US Department of Transportation (Federal Highway Administration)

[State]
13 Governor's Task Force on Maritime Industry
14 Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
15 Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries

[Local]
16 New Orleans International Airport
17 New Orleans Public Schools

Organizations

18 American Waterway Operators
19 Chamber of Commerce (New Orleans and the River Region)
20 Christmas in October (A Preservation Resource Center Program)
21 Consulting Engineers Council of Louisiana
22 Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association, Inc.
23 Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association
24 Holy Cross Board
25 Holy Cross Community Development Corporation
26 Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
27 Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation
28 New Orleans Board of Trade
29 New Orleans Steamship Association
30 Preservation Resource Center of New Orleans
31 St. Bernard Wetlands Foundation
32 Tulane Environmental Law Clinic (representing the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association, LA Environmental Action network, and the Sierra Club - New Orleans Group)
33 World Trade Center

Businesses

34 Canal Barge Company, Inc.
35 Capitol Marine Supply Inc.
36 Chaffe, McCall, Phillips, Tolar, & Sarpy
37 Colle Towing Co., Inc.
Businesses (continued)
38 Gulf South Marine Transportation, Inc.
39 H. C. Freight Systems
40 Higman Barge Lines
41 Hollywood Marine, Inc.
42 Holnam, Inc.
43 Holy Cross School
44 IMC Consulting Engineers
45 Jones, Walker, Poitevent, Carrere & Denegre
46 Lafarge Corporation
47 Magnolia Marine Transport
48 Mark's Muffler Shop
49 Maryland Marine, Inc.
50 McDonough Marine Service
51 Milling, Benson, Woodward, Hillyer, Pierson & Miller
52 National Marine
53 Navios Ship Agencies, Inc.
54 Waldemar S. Nelson and Company
55 Sizeler Architects
56 Stolt Transportation Services, Inc.
57 Tidewater, Inc.
58 Vulcan/ICA

Individuals
59 Allen, Gary R.
60 Blaise, Elizabeth
61 Bruch, CAPT Dean (Statement handed in at the public meeting)
62 Budd, Edward P.
63 Cady, Francis F., Jr
64 Christiansen, CAPT Ejnar
65 Cooper, Marc (Statement handed in at the public meeting)
66 Cummings, Eugene
67 Dashiell, Pam
68 Duracher, Louis and Sally
69 Ernst, Laurentine
70 Hanzo, Albert
71 Heine, Edwin A.
72 Hobson, Neal
73 Hogan, Mary Clare
74 Koeferl, John
75 Kraus, Kathleen
76 Leonard, David
77 Michon, Linda
78 Munster, Cynthia
79 Muse, Kathy
80 Ohlsen, M. Thomas and Patricia
81 Ohlsen, Troy and Denise
82 Ponstein, Henry P.
83 Quintini, David
84 Quintini, Mr. & Mrs. Frank
85 Rubin, Billy and Denise
86 Story, Mary
87 Williams, Marietta
88 Wilson, Shelby
89 Leblanc (?) & family
This is in response to your recent request for comments on the proposed Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, New Lock and Connecting Channel (I-10 Port of New Orleans). We believe that improvements to our navigation system are of great benefit and importance to the citizens of Louisiana. In order to continue to compete in the global market and ensure our nation's continued economic growth, it is imperative that we modernize and expand our navigable waterways. The existing lock structure has been in operation since 1933 and is in need of major rehabilitation to continue to handle the current level of service. Additionally, it is too small to handle the volume of vessels crossing the canal further compounded by the problem of navigation labels. The Corps of Engineers' proposal to construct a 14-foot draft lock structure as well as bridge modifications has a positive impact on the existing system of deep draft lock structure as well as vital economic development in Louisiana. On behalf of Governor Mike Foster, Jr., the State of Louisiana, I am pleased to support this project.

Frank D. Denton, Secretary

p.o. Governor Mike Foster, Jr.
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON INDUSTRIAL CANAL
LOCK CHANGES - PEOPLES' RIGHTS - NINTH WARD

ALL GREATER NEW ORLEANS - ST. BERNARD PARISH & AMERICA

Most of us do not want change; yet the only way to improve our society is by meaningful change.

Many citizens of St. Bernard do not want a canal (a cut, if you will) in St. Bernard parish.

We remember the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) - that nasty eroding cut that daily proves it was a mistake.

St. Bernard citizens were promised industry with good paying jobs for our citizens and our children. Today over thirty years later not one industry is on the MRGO - not one job came from the MRGO - but we had to build an expensive levee to provide us protection from hurricane flooding. The MRGO still harms our parish where the levee was never built at Reggio, Florissant, Yscloskey, and Hopedale. Sometimes, school busses cannot pick up children due to flood waters caused by the MRGO. The taxpayers of our parish have paid over FOUR MILLION DOLLARS and still owe nearly SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS to the federal government, if it is not forgiven.

So St. Bernard does not want another cut. Neither does St. Bernard want eleven years of delay caused by construction on three bridges at St. Claude, Claiborne Avenue and Florida Avenue, with the final result that we will still have to stop for raised bridges when ships and equipment goes through.

Yet if we want progress - and the jobs and a better living which comes with it - some changes must be made.

History records that in 1825 the Erie Canal in New York State was the first canal...
built in the United States and it made New York state all the greater, helping develop the economy all the way to the Great Lakes. It was so successful it was made wider and deeper several times.

One of the greatest engineering feats of all time was done by the United States when it built the Panama Canal, a canal "cut" on a continental scale, as it cut North and South America in two but made a better world for all, including the United States as well as the people of Panama. The same can be said of the St. Lawrence, etc.

The United States built the Gulf Intracoastal waterway which extends from Brownsville, Texas to New Orleans to St. Marks, Florida. That canal system carries several times more freight than anyone ever imagined before its building. It has proved a great advantage to the economy of the United States and particularly has benefited the economies of the states of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. It has helped our nation's economy grow and has furnished thousands of good jobs to our people.

So - if done right we can benefit from new canals. We need more and bigger locks and waterways to handle the increased traffic and larger barges and ships which in turn employs more people and reduces the price of goods you buy at the store.

As a state senator, as an industrialist, as a consumer and as an American I realize the good changes which should be made.

FIRST - let us consider truly the proposed changes on the Industrial Canal locks is a poor bandaid for a massive problem. That problem is the delay all citizens in the Ninth Ward of Orleans Parish and St. Bernard have to endure when waiting on bridges to go up. That problem is reflected in the cost we as motorists bear in wasted time or in wasted gasoline spent idling in line; the cost of wasted time for tow boats and ships waiting for locks to open and close, and for bridges to raise and lower. We all share those costs in the
way of higher prices for our power, manufactured goods and food, and yes, the loss of our valuable time spent in waiting!

We need a solution that eliminates all these costs if possible and it is possible! For instance:

(1) Let us raise the St. Claude bridge to the height of the Claiborne bridge and likewise raise the new Florida Avenue bridge to the height of the Claiborne bridge.

(2) Then weld all three bridges shut so they never open to bother automotive traffic ever again. At the same time we build a canal that tall ships can pass through. So, we will never will have to weld the bridges in place before we start digging the canal so that traffic will NEVER be held up, not one minute, during construction and thereafter.

(3) Design a new canal with high-rise, never-to-open bridges in place before we start digging the canal so that traffic will NEVER be held up, not one minute, during construction and thereafter.

(4) Before the canal is dug build the lock gates so designed as to carry two-way traffic on either lock gate, so that if one gate is open the traffic can go over the other gate, and when it is in turn open, the traffic can go over the other gate. (This means we will never will both gates open at the same time which helps highway traffic.)

When all is done then and only then will we dig the canal or the cut, if you will.

Of course you must have two levees which will prevent a rising river or a hurricane from harming the people. These levees must be far enough apart that fabricating plants and other businesses needing deep water transport can locate on each side so we can have the good paying jobs for our citizens without harm to the environment. To mitigate the anxiety and improve the looks of the area we could use this area also to build some nice parks and such for the benefit of the people.

And most important is when that cut - canal is made, it is made in St. Bernard Parish the money will have been set aside to close off and dam up the MRGO forever,

Proposal No. 1 - Raise the St. Claude Ave. bridge to the height of the Claiborne Ave. bridge and likewise raise the new Florida Ave. bridge to the same height as the Claiborne Ave. bridge.

Response - This would be a benefit to St. Bernard Parish, but raising these bridges would cause significant disruptions and/or residential relocations to the surrounding areas in the lower Ninth Ward, which has been a goal of this project to avoid.

Proposal No. 2 - Then weld all three bridges shut so they never open to bother automotive traffic ever again.

Response - His assumption for this proposal is that all shallow draft navigation traffic, that would continue to use the existing canal and lock, can pass under these bridges without opening them. That is totally false. Under existing conditions, with 99% of the traffic being large tows, the existing Claiborne Ave. bridge has to open on average of five times a day. As the navigation traffic volume increases over time, the number of openings would increase to an average of 5 times a day by the year 2020.

Proposal No. 3 - At the same time, we build a canal that taller ships can pass through. Design a new canal with high-rise, never-to-open bridges in place before we start digging the canal so that "automotive" traffic will NEVER be held up, not one minute, during construction and thereafter.

Response - Even though his proposal is not site-specific, this proposal can be reasonably assumed to be the Violet Plan, which has been eliminated from further consideration because of the significant impacts of that plan would have on our natural environment. The previous Violet Plan did have a high rise bridge.

Proposal No. 4 - Before the canal is dug build the lock gates so designed as to carry two-way traffic on either lock gate, so that if one gate is open the traffic can go over the other gate, and when it is in turn open, the traffic can go over the other gate. (This means never will both gates open at the same time which helps highway traffic.) When all is done then and only will we dig the canal or the cut, if you will.

Response - It is assumed that this proposal would be "in line" of Proposal 3 above because that proposal would include a high rise bridge that would be built first before the lock gates are constructed, which would then eliminate the need to provide for vehicular traffic across the lock gates. If this proposal were selected, it would require the construction of lock gates wide enough for two way vehicular traffic (approximately 25 feet wide). Lock gates are normally wide enough for only pedestrian traffic (about 4-5
starting at its mouth in Breton Sound. Then we must close off and dam up permanently both sides of old Bayou LaLoure so it will flow like it did 50 years ago. Then we must close off and dam up permanently both sides of Bayou Yscloskey so it will flow as it did before MRGO. When we dam the east side of Bayou Yscloskey we must restore all the power lines, telephone lines, waterlines and gas lines, and restore the old road which once ran to Lake Borgne. We must seal off MRGO near the new canal you may build.

When finished we will have three or four long, narrow lakes, and we will no longer have a salt water tide flowing in and out and eroding away our land.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would support such construction only if all the financing is arranged so that it is all completed to eliminate the dangers to our citizens, to stop the waste of their time and stop the economic waste to our economy of a canal that frustrates all of us - some on a daily basis.

I also will rigorously oppose a new industrial canal lock that will destroy the Galvez Street dock. We should sell this dock to the highest bidder so we will have environmentally safe businesses to operate from so we can furnish good jobs to our economy.

I would be glad to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
February 26, 1997

Colonel William Connor
Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160

RE: Industrial Canal Lock Replacement

Dear Colonel Connor:

I have reviewed the Army Corps of Engineers' proposal to replace the Industrial Canal locks and would like at this time to express my endorsement of the project.

I feel the overall project would be an asset to all concerned. However, residents of St. Bernard Parish have expressed a legitimate concern regarding traffic flow during construction. Because St. Claude Avenue and Claiborne Avenue are the main arteries in and out of St. Bernard Parish the safety and traffic concerns of St. Bernard Parish residents should be seriously addressed.

Constituents and I both agree that the temporary bridges recently added to your project at those locations will relieve the situation somewhat; however, all would like to see the lock project incorporate the high level Florida Bridge as a permanent solution to the age-old problem. All would like to see this project address the Florida Expressway from Interstate to LA 47 as an intermodal and evacuation route for lower Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes.

We trust that the foregoing will meet with your approval to be entered in the minutes of record. Should any additional information be required, please advise.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Odinet, Sr.

cc: Walter Boasso, St. Bernard Chamber, Transportation Comittee
Charles Ponstein, Chairman, Regional Planning Commission
If you require any additional information, please feel free to contact the office of the
responsible Division. Potential changes and additions to the project will be considered.

I would like to know more about the project and its potential impact on the
residential area. As a resident of the neighborhood, I am concerned about the effects
of the proposed development. I understand that the project is in its early stages,
but I would like to know more about the timeline and the estimated cost.

Please feel free to provide any additional information that you may have.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

Attachments:

[Note]

Communityตลาด

[Note]

[Note]

[Note]
Dear Colored Commissar:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the current conditions at the Indian Creek Road Detention Facility. As you know, my committee has been monitoring the facility for some time now, and we have observed significant issues with overcrowding, inadequate medical care, and poor living conditions. These conditions not only pose a threat to the health and well-being of the detainees but also undermine the fairness and justice of our justice system.

I am particularly concerned about the reports of widespread mistreatment and neglect of detainees, including instances of physical abuse and sexual harassment. These incidents are not only morally abhorrent but also illegal and constitute a violation of the rights of detainees.

In light of these serious concerns, we urge you to take immediate action to address these issues. We suggest that you conduct a thorough investigation into the allegations and take appropriate measures to ensure the safety and well-being of the detainees. Additionally, we urge you to consider the possibility of transferring some of the detainees to facilities that can provide better care.

We are committed to ensuring that our justice system upholds the principles of fairness and equality for all. We believe that it is in the best interest of our society to provide adequate resources to address these issues and to ensure that every individual is treated with dignity and respect.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Position]
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Colonel William L. Conner  
January 27, 1997

Additionally, St. Bernard Parish enjoys considerable business trade with the City of New Orleans and when vehicular traffic is restricted by the construction, we anticipate that a loss in retail sales will result. The vast majority of public services provided in St. Bernard Parish are fully or partially funded through sales taxes; therefore, we would like the Corps of Engineers to address these shortfalls should they be realized. I know of no way to quantify this exposure through the mitigation program prior to construction so I would request that a contingency fund be established should these losses in fact occur.

As Parish President, I support the Lock Replacement Project as I feel it is desperately needed and long overdue. This lock helps facilitate international commerce and serves the United States from Texas throughout the New England states. I am happy to see that the new plan calls for no displacement of residences and provides for improvements within the impacted area through the proposed mitigation program. St. Bernard Parish is a community of hard working citizens who expect to be allowed to commute to and from the greater New Orleans area with minimal delays. This expectation is not unreasonable as most other towns, counties or parishes who are adjacent to a large city require and enjoy similar accommodations.

I stand ready to work with the Corps of Engineers, the State of Louisiana and the City of New Orleans to help facilitate the Lock Replacement Project. Please consider my remarks and do your best to minimize the adverse impacts on St. Bernard Parish and the City of New Orleans.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (504) 278-4227.

Sincerely,

CHARLES PONSTEIN,
PARISH PRESIDENT

CP:JLC/dan
January 17, 1997

R.H. Schroeder, Jr.
Chief, Planning Division
Department of the Army
New Orleans District
Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 602367
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

In accordance with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing NEPA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 office in Dallas, Texas has completed its review of your agency's Draft Evaluation Report/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, New Lock and Connecting Channels Study for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal in New Orleans, Louisiana.

The North of Claiborne Avenue plan is the tentatively selected plan (TSP) of navigational improvement. The plan includes construction of a precast, floated-in, concrete lock 110 feet wide by 1,200 feet long with a depth of 36 feet; replacement of the St. Claude Avenue bridge with a new, low-level, double bascule bridge; replacement of the lift span; and raising the towers on the Claiborne Avenue Bridge; and implementation of selected project mitigation features.

We do not oppose implementation of the TSP. We find the DEIS and the impact assessment to be thorough, comprehensive, and to fully comply with the requirements of NEPA and the CEQ Regulations. The broad-based socioeconomic mitigation package presented as part of the plan is commendable. This plan calls for specific actions to minimize and compensate for adverse impacts to the local community that are expected from project construction, mainly in the areas of vehicular traffic, noise, and fire protection, community cohesion, aesthetics and pedestrian access. EPA asks that the mitigation measures described in the DEIS be implemented and given equal consideration in the interest of environmental resource protection, safety, and navigation.
The EPA rates your DEIS as "LO," i.e., EPA has "Lack of Objections" to the tentatively selected plan of action. Our classification will be published in the Federal Register according to our responsibility under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, to inform the public of our views on proposed Federal actions.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the DEIS. We request that you send our office one copy of the Final EIS at the same time that it is sent to the Office of Federal Activities, (2251A), EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20044.

Sincerely yours,

Michael P. Jansky, P.E.
Regional Environmental Review Coordinator
Mr. R.H. Schroeder
Chief, Planning Division
Department of the Army
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 50267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

We have reviewed the draft evaluation report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, New Lock and Connecting Channels Study, and we have the following comment.

Page 101, paragraph 2, item 3 of the report and page 21, paragraph 4.1.3.8. of the EIS state that, as part of the Corps of Engineers' preferred plan, a U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) Station housing 50 USCG employees will have to be relocated. The EIS does not specify the cost of relocating the station or who will be responsible for funding the relocation. We would like the EIS to delineate the specific cost of the USCG relocation and state that the Corps of Engineers will fund the relocation.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft report and environmental impact statement. If you have any questions on our comments, please contact David Reese of my staff on 202-267-1942.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The project will fund the relocation of the Coast Guard facilities. The Corps has estimated the cost of relocating the US Coast Guard facility at about $10 million.
Mr. R. H. Schroeder, Jr.
Chief, Planning Division
Environmental Analysis Branch
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

Re: Evaluation Report/EIS for Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, New Lock and Connecting Channel

In response to your letter dated December 6, 1996, requesting our comments on the above, this project will not impact any work of the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

E. J. Ciering III, P.E.
State Conservation Engineer

cc: Britt Paul, Water Resources Planning Staff Leader, NRCS,
Alexandria, LA
Mr. R. H. Schroeder, Jr., Chief
Planning Division, New Orleans District
Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160

Dear Mr. Schroeder:


Based on our review, we find that the documents adequately address potential alternatives, impacts to living marine resources and their habitats, and mitigation of unavoidable adverse impacts to wetland resources. Accordingly, we have no comments or recommendations to offer.

Thank you for this review opportunity.

Sincerely,

Andreas Mager, Jr.
Assistant Regional Director
Habitat Conservation Division

Comments noted.
The U.S. Department of the Interior has reviewed the Draft Evaluation Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, New Lock and Connecting Channels, Louisiana. In this regard, the following comments are provided for your consideration.

General Comments:

The documents are generally well-written and contain adequate descriptions of the proposed alternatives and their impacts. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has provided an October 1996 draft Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report for the proposed project. Their recommendations contained in the FWCA Report have also been adequately addressed in the subject documents. We suggest, however, that the final document be revised to include the following specific information.

Specific Comments:

Page 83, paragraph 3 - The section on biological impacts should include a description of the impacts to fish and wildlife resources resulting from construction and operation of the graving site.

Page 115-116, Table 5 - The section under “Plans 3a through 3f, Flood Protection Systems,” should note that construction of the graving site will require a realignment of the hurricane protection levees around that site.

Page 12-3, paragraph 1 - This paragraph is confusing in that it states “No [additional] steps to minimize adverse impacts] are planned within the confined disposal site...”. The text should clarify to which confined disposal site it refers (i.e., marsh creation site or the MRGO site). At the MRGO site, the FWS recommended that the Corps minimize spoil impacts to existing wetlands within that confined disposal facility (CDF); to accomplish that...
end, special site selection and confinement measures may be required. On page EIS-105 (6.5.3.), however, the Corps has agreed to work with the FWS to identify areas where disposal impacts would be minimal. This section should, therefore, acknowledge that future detailed site selection and confinement measures may be used to minimize adverse spill disposal impacts to wetlands in the MRGO CDF.

Thank you for the opportunity to review these documents. We trust these comments will assist you in the development of the final documents.

Sincerely,

Glenn B. Sekavec
Regional Environmental Officer
January 23, 1997

IN REPLY REFER TO
Draft Evaluation Report/
Environmental Impact
Statement for the Mississippi
River Gulf Outlet, New Lock
and Connecting Channels Study

Mr. R. H. Schroeder, Jr.
Chief, Planning Division
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Mr. Schroeder:


We only received Volume I titled Draft Evaluation Report - Main Report and Environmental Impact Statement.

It is evident that there has been a good deal of work and effort put into the development of the project. The areas that concern this office the most are the funding and handling of traffic during the replacement and modification of the St. Claude Avenue and North Claiborne Avenue Bridges as part of the New Lock construction.

The closure of either bridge will have a significant impact on the traffic flow in an area that is already experiencing congestion. The document relies on the proposed Florida Avenue Expressway as a means of reducing the impact of the Lock project on traffic circulation during construction. Although the State TIME program includes this project, it is our understanding that there presently are not enough funds in the program for implementing the expressway. Even if funds become available for the Florida Avenue Expressway, the development of the project is expected to take substantial time due to the needed coordination, potential controversy and related impacts. If the Lock project relies on the Florida Avenue Expressway as a means of addressing traffic impacts, the status of its development and implementation needs to be closely coordinated with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD).

Funding for the proposed mitigation for the traffic impacts needs to be considered as part of the proposed project. That would include the handling of detoured traffic and maintenance of roads...
for redirected traffic, permanent detour roads and, if necessary, temporary bridge crossings of
the navigation canal. The document refers to other sources of funding for portions of this work. It
should be noted that the availability of State and Federal funding is based upon priorities that are
determined by the State DOTD and the New Orleans Regional Planning commission. We
encourage continued coordination with these agencies as well as the City of New Orleans to
identify availability of appropriate funding for essential parts of the detour routes.

If there are any questions regarding our comments, please contact Mr. William Farr of this office
at (504-389-0465) or Mr. Robert Mahoney (504-389-0568).

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

William A. Kasimmann
Division Administrator
Yours very truly,

Chairman

[Signature]
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January 24, 1997

R.H. Schroeder, Jr.
Chief, Planning Division
Environmental Analysis Branch
Department of the Army
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Mr. Schroeder:

This is in response to the notice and request for comments on the draft evaluation report/Environmental Impact Statement of November 1996, for the Mississippi River - Gulf Outlet New Lock and Connecting Channels project.

The project activity is to take place in the parishes of Orleans and St. Bernard, which are designated by U.S. EPA as ozone attainment parishes operating under a full maintenance plan. The project is subject to the conformity regulations in 40 CFR 33; Chapter 14, Subchapters A (general conformity) and B (transportation conformity); and federal conformity regulations at 40 CFR Part 31, Subparts T and W. The Corps is responsible for assessing applicability of the regulations to the project for general conformity, and if necessary, to perform a general conformity determination and provide enforceable mitigation commitments prior to beginning any activity on the project. Activity resulting in on-road mobile emissions must be coordinated with the designated metropolitan planning organization, which is the New Orleans Regional Planning Commission.

DEQ's comments which follow are based on the published draft evaluation report, Volume 1; the Corps' submittals to DEQ-AQD of estimated annual volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from equipment to be used during construction of the project; and conversations with the New Orleans Corps of Engineers environmental staff.

COMMENTS:

1. Submitted annual VOC emissions for equipment to be used during construction are estimated by the Corps to be below the 100 ton per year threshold that would require a full conformity determination under the general conformity regulation. Before it can be determined that VOC emissions are below the threshold, estimation of all direct and indirect emissions must be determined.
2. It is the department's understanding that mobile emissions from the highway improvement portion of the project are included in state/city transportation plans in compliance with transportation conformity procedures and criteria of LAC 33:III, Chapter 14, Subchapter B and federal regulations at 40 CFR Part 51, Subpart T. Any mobile VOC emissions resulting directly or indirectly from the project (including such emissions during construction) which are not subject to transportation conformity are subject to general conformity requirements and must be considered in the general conformity applicability assessment and any subsequent conformity determination.

3. Should mitigation action be determined necessary, the air quality mitigation action suggested in the draft evaluation report at 5.3.16.4.2, will not mitigate criteria air pollutant ozone which is the only pollutant currently regulated under conformity. The mitigation action described in the report would control particulate matter (PM) only. Also, air quality monitoring performed at the construction site would not in itself qualify as a mitigation action, though it might be possible to design mitigation action in conjunction with the use of monitors.

The DEQ is available for consultation to assist you with implementation of the general conformity and transportation conformity regulations. Please contact Pat Salvaggio at (504) 769-0918 for assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gustave Von Bodungen, P.E.
Assistant Secretary

CVB/PS

c: Richard Boe, Corps of Engineers
    Bennett Farrier, DEQ Engineering Section
    John Behnam, EPA Region 6

Comments 1 and 2. The estimates on volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions previously submitted have been revised. The revised estimates are contained in Volume 6, Section 7. The data indicates that the emissions from construction equipment would total about one-half of the threshold level (100 tons/year). That would require a conformity determination. The only indirect emissions that appear to be applicable to this project are those associated with potential vehicular traffic detours and delays during project construction. The emissions from these mobile sources will be coordinated with the Regional Planning Commission to determine conformity with the Transportation Implementation Plan.

Comment 3. The mitigation action proposed in the report was meant to address the potential increase in airborne particulate matter (dust) from project construction. The proposed mitigation was not meant to mitigate for ozone.
February 26, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 6026
New Orleans, LA 70166-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

As a member of the Transportation Committee of the World Trade Center in New Orleans, I would like to add my endorsement to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plans to replace the lock on the industrial Canal in the city. This project is a critical part of the national inland waterways system.

Although this project will not directly affect the movement of air passengers or cargo, it will have an important impact on the movement of increased quantities of goods. The elimination of this bottleneck will allow increased transportation of goods. The elimination of this bottleneck will allow increased cooperation between and ships, rail and truck transportation in assisting a major role in the state's economy. Significant numbers of people employed in the waterborne transportation sector had a $20 billion spending impact in Louisiana by the port industry, and port users have generated over $10 billion in state and local taxes for Louisiana.

Based on the positive impact on the Louisiana economy that will result from the removal of this obstacle to marine navigation, I wholeheartedly support the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, plans to replace the navigation lock on the Industrial Canal.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Director of Aviation
February 24, 1987

Col. William Cooper
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
F.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160

Dear Col. Cooper,

Subj: Draft EIS, N.O. Industrial Canal Widening

The New Orleans Public Schools has not yet taken a formal position on the canal widening project. However, the following areas are of particular concern to the School District:

1. The plan acknowledges significant erosion of the swamp flora and fauna in the area and the development of growth strategies are proposed. However, they are incomplete with respect to adverse impacts on the public schools.

2. The plan includes the provision for additional school crossing guards stationed on each side of the canal on designated routes where school crossing guards are currently not used. In addition, the use of temporary traffic control measures may be considered where school crossing guards are not used.

3. The biggest impact from construction noise will occur during the driving of piles for the new bridge piers. School crossing guards will need to be in place for this period.

4. The plan acknowledges expected delays in school building. However, it seems to be more concerned about the loss of tuition revenue for the Holy Cross School with additional funds for any loss in revenues for Holy Cross. Explicit provisions for mitigating many public school losses are lacking.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
5. The plan does promise to give additional funds for all local neighborhood schools, presumably including the public schools, for reimbursement for the higher costs of operating buses that would have to travel longer distances using detour routes. Public school costs should be explicitly included.

6. The assessment of impacts includes recognition that attendance of residents in public magnet schools may be significantly impacted by the transportation delays. However, the plan does not specifically propose any compensation for that impact but does include the issue in a list of impacts for which compensation would be justified.

7. The Noble Center, a citywide special education center, will be impacted just as the Holy Cross School. It is mentioned in the plan.

8. The report does not specifically mention anticipated problems of disrupting access of teachers, support staff, enrichment programs, and deliveries to the schools.

9. The environmental assessment makes vague references to the impact that the construction activities will have upon "community cohesion." It proposes a program of general mitigation in order to restore the community level of well-being. That plan includes some funds that would be used for a neighborhood revitalization program including educational programs. It also includes some funding for community facilities, such as supervised playgrounds during the construction. This mitigation should include compensation to provide additional after-school tutoring, recreational or co-curricular programs for the students.

Paragraph 9. The school system will be invited to participate in the Partnering Agreement and community-based task force that will help decide where best to expend the community impact mitigation funds. Some of those funds could be used for additional education opportunities.

Sincerely,

Kenneth J. Ducote
Director, Facility Planning

/ibe
Mrs. Maudelle Cade
Dr. Morris L. Holmes
Dr. Linda Fortenberry
Mr. Reginald Zeno
Mr. Earl Livingston
Ms. Stephanie Polk
Mr. Ronald Gearing
Ms. Shirley Taylor (Lawless High School)
Mrs. Dora Hicks (Martin Luther King Elem.)
Ms. Glenda Kemp (Hardin Elem.)
Ms. Thelva Brown (Armstrong Elem.)
Ms. Patricia McFarlin (Noble Center)
Ms. Rosemary Martin (Edison Elem.)
February 28, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
New Orleans District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Re: Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement

Dear Col. Conner:

The American Waterways Operators (AWO) is the national trade association representing the inland and coastal barge and towing industry. As such, we want to express our support for the planned replacement of the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, more commonly known as the Industrial Canal Lock.

As the economic analysis included in volume 7 of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Draft Evaluation Report clearly shows, the lock is a part of a very important waterway for barge and towing companies. Roughly 10,000 tows use the lock every year, or more than one tow per hour. There is no other all-weather, year-round route for tows moving east and west between New Orleans and the eastern half of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The economic well-being of many companies rests on the availability and reliability of the lock. Excessive delays affect the profitability of those companies as well as their ability to effectively manage vessel utilization. Lock closures threaten the livelihood of some companies and the resulting shift of vessels onto other waterways can disrupt the rate structure of those waterways.

Beyond the importance of the lock to the towing industry, it serves as an important link in the inland waterway transportation system of ports, shippers and industries. The lock is used by barges carrying cargo from every inland waterway in America's heartland. The Draft Evaluation Report - Vol. 7 very clearly documents the role of the lock in connecting the major river systems and facilitating the movement of agricultural, chemical and petroleum products. It should be noted that the time sensitive nature of many of these cargos, such as chemical and petroleum products, means that an untimely lock closure could severely impact facility operations. Additionally, the lock allows for the safe and controlled movement of large volumes of potentially hazardous and environmentally sensitive liquid cargo. The option of moving that product by rail or road would be less than desirable from a civil defense, emergency response or highway planning standpoint.

The Barge and Towing Industry Association

Comments noted.
In determining the future of the Industrial Canal Lock, we would urge the Corps to also look at the impact that a new lock could have on future growth over a multi-state area of the southern United States. The economic analysis in the evaluation report focuses on the potential growth in traffic based on the current industrial and commercial base of the region. However, it does not look at the businesses and facilities which may move to the region if the lock is replaced. The availability of inexpensive and reliable transportation is a determining factor in the decision to locate or expand a business. Conversely, uncertainty over the availability of that transportation has a negative impact on future development. The state of the current lock — aging, unreliable and prone to breakdown — most certainly has a chilling effect on economic development along the eastern Gulf Coast. More than three decades of debate over replacing the lock has sent an extremely negative signal to prospective industries. Prolonging the debate only hurts the prospects for regional economic development.

If, on the other hand, the lock is replaced with a more efficient, reliable structure, it will become one of the selling points for the entire region. Companies making site selection decisions will be able to factor in their ability to transport fuel for their energy needs, raw materials and finished products inexpensively. Potentially, this project could drive economic development well into the next century.

The engineers involved in planning this lock replacement have attempted to be as responsive to the needs of the local community as they have been to the needs of the lock users. It is time to move forward and replace the Industrial Canal Lock. Thank you for allowing us to comment on this project. I am enclosing a stamped self-addressed envelope and would appreciate a response to indicate that these comments were received.

Sincerely,

Ken Wells
Vice President - Southern Region
February 18, 1997

Colonel William L. Conner
Attn: CELMN-PM-M
New Orleans District Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner,

This letter is in response to the request for review by interested parties of the draft evaluation report and Environmental Impact Statement for Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, New Lock and Connecting Channels study.

On January 14, 1997, The Chamber Board of Directors voted unanimously to endorse the Army Corps of Engineers feasibility study for the Tentatively Selected Plan of the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal Lock Replacement Project. We believe the lock replacement is a critical intermodal project that will enhance economic competitiveness of our region.

The Chamber leadership is of the opinion that the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal Lock project is a wise use of scarce infrastructure capital. Ultimately it will improve the ability to compete as a region in a global economy and ensure a secure waterway for national defense. The IHNC lock is a vital link in an intermodal system that impacts the maritime, rail, and trucking industries and ultimately the users of these services nationwide. If the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal Lock is not replaced, it will undermine efforts to produce full regional integration in transportation infrastructure and constitute a major setback for regional economic success.

Comments noted.
February 18, 1997
Colonel William L. Conner
page 2

It is evident to us that the planning process comprehensively looked at all possible scenarios, fulfilling planning mandates and environmental considerations in determining the best alternative. Given the long history of the planning process and the urgent need to ensure a stable waterborne route which will service the future needs of the region, it is imperative that the project proceed without further delay.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact Bob Gayle, the Chamber’s President and CEO, phone 527-6920.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Coleman
Chairman of the Board

cc:  Joe Dicarry
     Les Waguespack
     Jack Walker
The other main concern is the construction of the floodwalls. Within the Army Corps survey, there appears to be no serious study on the impact that this wall will have on the basic floodplain. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, however, has conducted an informal study on page D-4 of the statement labeled "conflict" itself. We are aware that this study concluded that the need for alteration or destruction of public use and concern was "conflict". The report presented in that section would be adversely impacted. In addition, there was no diagram of the relation of this wall to the neighborhood.

This oversight should be addressed and its impact on the neighborhood should be fully studied.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mufijn Bakat
Chairman

cc: Leslie S. Waggoner
Richard Boa
Stephen Walsh
ACEC
CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL OF LOUISIANA

February 26, 1997

US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Attention: Colonel William Conner, P.E.
District Engineer

A Resolution Adopted By The
Consulting Engineers Council Of Louisiana
In Support Of The Proposed Lock At The
Inner Harbor Navigation Canal In
New Orleans, Louisiana

Colonel Conner, we understand that the US Army Corps of Engineers (COE) is soliciting public input on the proposed Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement project. The Consulting Engineers Council of Louisiana (CEC/L) recognizes that this is an important and beneficial project. Therefore, the New Orleans Chapter adopted the following resolution in favor of the project.

WHEREAS, the US Army Corps of Engineers is planning to construct a new lock at the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal in New Orleans, Louisiana;

WHEREAS, a new lock is badly needed because the present lock is obsolete and too small;

WHEREAS, the construction of a new lock will benefit the users of the lock;

WHEREAS, the construction of a new lock will provide great economic benefits to the Port of New Orleans, the greater New Orleans region, and southeast Louisiana;

WHEREAS, the US Army Corps of Engineers has taken steps to ensure that the residents and businesses in the area of construction will not be adversely affected;

WHEREAS, the members of the New Orleans Chapter of the Consulting Engineers Council of Louisiana have taken all of the above into consideration;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the New Orleans Chapter of the Consulting Engineers Council of Louisiana at their regularly scheduled meeting of February 25, 1997, in Metairie, Louisiana, unanimously agreed to support the construction of a new lock at the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal in New Orleans, Louisiana.

The foregoing is certified to be a true and correct copy.

David E. Lourie, P.E., President
Consulting Engineers Council of Louisiana
New Orleans Chapter

"...serving engineers in private practice"
RE: INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK (INDUSTRIAL CANAL LOCK) PROJECT

Colonel William L. Conner
District Engineer
Corps of Engineers
New Orleans District
Post Office Box 62267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

On behalf of the Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association, Inc. (G.N.O.B.F.A.), I would like to thank you for allowing me to speak at the public hearing that was held in New Orleans on January 17th, 1997 regarding the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock (Industrial Canal Lock) Project.

As I indicated at the meeting on January 17th, our organization is comprised of fifty-six (56) member companies, which may have fleeting operations located from the mouth of the Mississippi River north to Baton Rouge, Louisiana as well as operations located on the Harvey and Industrial Canal. They also own and operate barges of all types, provide transportation services, and own and operate tow-boat vessels which provide marine services that may be required.

As a result of the frequent long delays at the Industrial locks, these companies are sustaining millions of dollars in losses every year. Consequently, for this and many other reasons indicated to you at prior occasions, it is imperative that a new lock structure be constructed as soon as possible.

For the record, the Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association, Inc. is in favor of the project for the construction of a new Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock and related improvements as proposed during the Corps of Engineers presentation of January 17th, 1997.

Comments noted.
Thanking you in advance for your attention and considerations concerning this matter, I remain,

Very truly yours,

GREATER NEW ORLEANS BARGE FLEETING ASSOCIATION, INC.

By:

Karl C. Gonzales
President

KCG:kg
February 4, 1997

Colonel William L. Conner
Commander & District Engineer
New Orleans District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160

Dear Colonel Conner:

GICA requests you include these written comments in the record on IHNC, due February 24, 1997. Our focus will be to address arguments against replacement.

1. **It will provide no jobs.** Freight moves through New Orleans on the way to or from other locations. While there are no Wal-Marts, 7-Elevens, or gas stations planned for the site, navigation structures are never intended to provide these kinds of jobs. There will be construction jobs, and there will be permanent ports and waterways jobs in New Orleans, the state, and region, due to low cost transportation made available for coal, crude oil, refined products, and industrial chemicals. These represent the heart of producer/manufacturer cost advantages in our region of the country. Cost advantages mean jobs.

2. **Dangerous cargo moving through our neighborhood poses unacceptable risks.** Delays with the current old lock mean these volatile cargoes sit around on location sometimes for days awaiting passage. Delays will be significantly reduced with a new lock, meaning on site presence, and neighborhood risk will be reduced.

Comments noted.
3. **IMNC project is a waste of taxpayer's money and only the big shipping companies will profit.** Only Corps of Engineers projects, out of a $1.7 Trillion Federal budget, must establish a favorable benefit/cost ratio, meaning that taxpayer's dollars are not wasted. Barge companies and other shipping companies pass the transportation cost saving through to the producer/manufacturer, or other shipper. These reduced costs benefit society as a whole through less expensive electricity, less expensive jet fuel, diesel, motor gasoline and thousands of ordinary, everyday plastic based products derived from the chemical industry.

Sincerely,

Doug Svendsen, Jr.

DS/tlt
Dear: January 27, 1997

Dear [Recipient],

I would like to share with you a recommendation passed on January 16, 1997:

I would like to declare that you are a resident and I would like to recommend the following:

- Stockton Elementary School - 1993
- Sanborn Elementary School - 1994
- Berkeley Heights School - 1995
- Newark High School - 1996
- Yonkers High School - 1997

I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to you for your continued support in these matters.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
March 3, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
US Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, La. 70160-0267

Re: HINC Draft Proposal MRGO

Dear Col. Conner,

On February 19, 1997, at a board meeting, the Holy Cross Community Development Corporation passed a unanimous resolution opposing the U.S. Corps of Engineer's proposal to widen the Industrial Canal.

This is to go on record confirming this opposition.

Sincerely,

Allen Powell
President
March 2, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
US Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, La. 70160-0267

Rev. HAMC Trust Proposal MS/CO

Dear Col. Conner,

On Thursday, March 14, 1996, at a full membership meeting the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association passed a unanimous resolution opposing the U.S. Corps of Engineer's proposal to widen the Industrial Canal.

This is to go on record confirming this opposition. The resolution is attached to this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Koenker
Chairperson, Holy Cross Neighborhood Association Board
415 Troupe Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70117
The Board of Directors of the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association recommends to the general membership that they reject the proposed widening of the Industrial Canal. This recommendation is based on the following rationale.

1. The Holy Cross Neighborhood has negotiated in good faith with the Corps of Engineers since the inception of the project.

2. We have participated in every committee structure formed throughout the community input phase of the project. Committee members have dutifully reported to the general membership keeping everyone informed.

3. The Holy Cross Neighborhood Association wrote a mitigation proposal. This proposal was approved by the general membership and submitted to the Corp of Engineers.

4. Very little if any of our mitigation plan was accepted by the Corps and included in the final mitigation plan.

5. We feel that the length of the project (6 to 10 yrs) will seriously compromise our health and safety as we have no assurances of 24 hour police or fire protection.

6. Since the interception of the project the neighborhood has made great strides both in community planning (UNO study) and community action (HCCDC, Christmas in October, Mayor's Strike Force, Community garden, etc.) We feel the widening of the canal and resulting limited access to the community would seriously jeopardize the progress we have made. In order to maintain and expand our progress we need to attract new residents who are willing to invest in our historic community and encourage existing residents to maintain, renovate and/or improve their property. To this end we participate in the Live in a Landmark Program sponsored by the Preservation Resource Center. A major disruption in traffic patterns and city services for 6 to 10 years would virtually strangle our community and its future.

Submitted to the general membership March 14, 1996.
Approved unanimously.


Comments 1 & 2. Comments noted.

Comments 3 & 4. The Association's proposal includes some elements considered to be appropriate and within the scope of the mitigation plan for the project. Many of the items included in the proposal have merit but are beyond the scope of the mitigation plan for this project and beyond the authority of the Corps. The Neighborhood Association's efforts are commendable and should be pursued in tandem with the lock replacement project.

Comment 5. The plan does address the impacts of the project. Fire and police protection are functions normally provided for by local government. Coordination with the City of New Orleans to insure that the level of these services is not diminished by the implementation of the project will be required.

Comment 6. The community is to be commended for its efforts in community planning. In response to comments received from the public at the public meeting and in subsequent comments provided during the public review period, the plan has been revised to include a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue. This should alleviate the concerns about disruption of traffic patterns as traffic will continue to flow during the construction of the project. Impacts to vehicular transportation will be minor.
Air quality is monitored on a regional basis in Louisiana by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality through the Louisiana Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Network.

The final EIS and Environmental Impact Statement contain an analysis of emissions from construction-related equipment. The analysis shows the quantity of volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions is about one-fifth of the threshold level which would require mitigating action.

You are correct in stating that the Corps has not yet released the air quality report. Such an effort is beyond the scope of our responsibilities.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Waguespack,

The Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation (LPBF) enters the following comments into the administrative record for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement. These are preliminary comments prepared for the January 27, 1997 public hearing. The Lake Foundation will be submitting additional, more detailed, comments before the comments period ends.

The LPBF’s mission is the protection and restoration of the Pontchartrain Basin. In that capacity, we have reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in regards to its impacts on the water quality and habitat of Lake Pontchartrain.

We do, however, recognize that there are many other potential impacts to the neighborhoods surrounding the proposed projects. Neighborhoods that the Foundation has worked closely with since our creation over eight years ago. While we appreciate and understand each neighborhood’s concerns, we believe we can best serve the needs of the community by focusing our attention on the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

In our role as a public entity, we will gladly share any information we obtain on the potential environmental impacts with the various community groups as we continue our review.

From our preliminary review of the EIS, it is apparent that there is a significant problem with contaminated sediments in the area around the current lock facility. In addition, we believe the dredging and disposal of these materials, as described in the EIS, has the potential to spread these toxic materials to other areas within the Pontchartrain Basin.

Page 2, item 1. Canal sediments analyzed for mercury (Hg) yield total concentrations ranging from <0.1 mg/kg through <0.9 mg/kg which are far below the proposed Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) 1995 Risk Based Corrective Action (RBCA) Program Soil Corrective Action Level (SCAL) criteria of 4 mg/kg (inorganic Hg) and 22 mg/kg (organic Hg) which is soil level criteria protective of the groundwater, based on leach ability.

As the LPBF indicated in their letter, dredging does stir up bottom sediments, which may release constituents into the water column. As such, NOD conducted appropriate testing (water, bulk sediment, and elutriate) to determine the possible effects of dredging the bottom sediment. Elutriate testing is a simplified simulation of the dredging and disposal process wherein predetermined amounts of dredging site water and sediment are mixed together to approximate a dredged material slurry. This test was developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station (WES). Historically, numerous studies have compared elutriate constituent levels to actual constituent levels measured during dredging operations. These studies have proven that the elutriate test is an accurate approximation of the constituent levels which could be expected to occur during actual dredging and disposal operations. For each constituent, the elutriate levels are compared to the ambient water levels. For mercury, it can be seen that the elutriate levels (those which would approximate levels to be expected in the water column during dredging and disposal operations) are not elevated above the applicable LDEQ acute criteria. Therefore, it can be shown that neither degradation of the water quality due to elevated levels of mercury in the water column, nor exceeding of the water quality criteria for mercury, is expected as a result of dredging the bottom sediments of the IHNC.

It appears that the LPBF may have mistakenly confused the Canal sediments with soil samples collected from the Bypass Channel site, on the east bank of the canal. A total of 79 soil samples, collected from shallow and deep (35 feet) soil borings on the east bank of the canal and analyzed for targeted metals, yielded mercury concentrations at detectable levels. Only one soil sample yielded a total concentration of 20.8 mg/kg. This sample (IC-2-1) was collected from the Indian Towing site. IC-2-1 is a soil sample collected on dry ground and is not a canal sediment sample. A duplicate (IC-2-8) of sample IC-2-1 yielded mercury total concentration of 1.2 mg/kg reflecting either heterogeneous distribution of mercury in the same soil sample or laboratory analytical error.

A total of 16 soil samples were collected from the Indian Towing site alone. Out of these 16 samples, 8 samples were collected from 8 different soil borings locations within the site as well as 8 samples (1 duplicate included) collected at different depths from one deep boring (IC-2). Total concentration of mercury in the 8 shallow soil samples at the Indian Towing site range from 0.046 mg/kg to 1.5 mg/kg, while, except for sample IC-2-1 and its duplicate (IC-2-8), the other 6 samples from boring IC-2-1 yield mercury total concentrations from 0.003 mg/kg to 0.13 mg/kg. Overall, the above data indicate that the singular high mercury value detected in IC-2-1 is an isolated occurrence. If the mercury level of 20.8 mg/kg in IC-2-1 is real and considering low mercury levels in the other soil samples surrounding (below and near) IC-2-1, the volume of soil with a mercury level of about 20 mg/kg is small. The LPBF's assertion that 1.36 million cu yd of sediments is contaminated with mercury at 20 ppm is a gross overestimation of the volume of soils. Because soil sample IC-2-1 is also co-located within an area delineated for special handling due to high levels of lead (Pb), soil from this site would be removed to an industrial landfill.

Page 2, item 2. The sampling and testing strategy at the IHNC is a cost-effective tiered (or phased) approach that involved a discovery phase of environmental anomalies or questionable areas followed by detailed investigations of these anomalies. Compasting of samples is
Generally, we believe the New Orleans District need to do additional work to address the levels and areal extent of contamination and subsequent potential human and environmental health concerns related to the removal and disposal of contaminated material. This work must be completed before the review process can move forward.

Our initial remarks on the proposed project are as follows:

1) Some of the sediment core samples indicated that there were very high levels of heavy metals, specifically mercury, contained in the sediments in and around the lock.

Many of the pollutants entering our waterways settle to the bottom, creating toxic reservoirs in the sediments. Dredging contaminated areas stirs up bottom sediments, releasing toxic materials into the water where they are ingested or absorbed by living creatures.

To measure the levels of sediment contamination in the inner harbor canal, the Army Corps collected sediment samples. One of the samples contained a mercury level of 20 parts per million (ppm), 40 times the level considered “safe” by the State of Louisiana. Many other samples continued high levels of heavy metals. Yet, in the public notice, the New Orleans District describes the levels of contamination as “moderate”. This designation is based upon faulty science (see below).

The proposed project will require the removal and disposal of 1,364,000 yd³ of contaminated sediments, over 130,000 dump truck loads. Clearly, there is a public health issue involved with the removal and safe disposal of these materials that must be addressed in greater detail.

2) The EIS uses questionable methodology to describe the sediment quality.

For example, the EIS lists the “average” level of mercury in a nine foot sediment core as 9 ppm, a level below the federal safe standard. Yet, we question how the Corps reached this determination. In our opinion, by averaging the readings of the entire sample one invalidates the findings. If the upper section contains high levels, one cannot say it is not contaminated, it is simply a misuse of statistics, and it calls into question the use of the data to make broad based assumptions.

We believe that each segment of the core should be carefully analyzed for contaminants, especially the top foot which logically contains the greatest level of contamination. Using more acceptable scientific practices, some of the contamination levels listed would be described as hazardous material and would require disposal in hazardous material deposit sites rather than the proposed Confined Disposal Facilities.

In the EIS, the Corps uses both RCRA (Hazardous) and TCLP (toxic) designations to discuss disposal alternatives. Both of these methods are used for disposal frequently undertaken during the initial phases of investigations when the presence or absence of pollutants on a large volume or package of sediment / soil material is being verified. Grab samples taken from various portions of a sediment / soil package or core sample are composited into a single sample which is assumed to be an unbiased representative of that particular volume of sediment / soil package or core sample. This same technique of compositing is used as an exploratory strategy in the mining industry where chemical anomalies are sought for profit. The analytical result of the composite sample should theoretically represent the chemical concentration(s) in the soil / sediment package or core sample.

In the case of the sediment samples collected from the bottom of the IHNC, compositing of the entire core sample was done only for the core sample collected for Site A (between the existing lock and the river). The core sample taken at Site C (between existing lock and Claiborne Avenue) was composited into three segments: 0-1 foot depth, 1-4 foot, and 4-9 foot depth. The core sample taken at Site G (adjacent to the Galvez Street Wharf) was also composited into three segments: 2-6 foot depth, 6-4 foot depth, and 4-9 foot depth. There were two core samples taken at Site E (turning basin south of Florida Avenue). They were composited into two segments for the first core (1.5 foot depth) and 1.5-4 foot depth) and two segments for the second core (0-1 foot, 1-4 foot depth). By looking at the mercury levels in the following table, it can be seen that there is no evidence of stratification of mercury in the bottom sediments of the IHNC. The two core samples at Sites C and G, which composited the first foot of sediment, would not lead one to believe that mercury levels in the sediments of the IHNC are stratified. From this, it can be seen that the Corps did use acceptable scientific practices in evaluating the sediment quality of the IHNC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Depth of Composite</th>
<th>Hg, Bulk Sediment (ug/kg)</th>
<th>Elutriate Hg (ug/L)</th>
<th>Applicable Criteria Hg (ug/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0-9 feet</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0-1 feet</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 feet</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 feet</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0-1 foot</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 feet</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 feet</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (1st core)</td>
<td>1.5-6 feet</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (2nd core)</td>
<td>2-12 feet</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Section 404(OY)1 Evaluation addressed, in detail, the potential environmental impacts of sediment disposal. Utilizing the data collected during the 1993 sampling effort, the effects on chemical and physical properties (including toxic metals) in the water column were evaluated.
alternatives, but rather adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts of the proposed disposal facilities.

Rather than utilizing a method that inadequately describes potential health risks to humans and wildlife, the EIS should include a methodology that will clearly identify the extent and locations of contaminated sediments.

The EIS fails to clearly indicate the extent and locations of the contaminated sediments.

A map with sampling sites clearly identified should be included in the document.

We question the effectiveness of proposed CDSs to adequately protect the public and the environment from the potential impacts from contaminated sediments.

The Corps proposes to use this methodology in a manner that is not comparable to the actual contamination levels. This may require additional steps to better understand the impact to the environment.

The Corps proposes to use this methodology in a manner that is not comparable to the actual contamination levels. This may require additional steps to better understand the impact to the environment.

According to the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers' report entitled, "Review of Contaminated Sediments in the Great Lakes," a CDF designated to receive hydraulic fill is to provide appropriate sediment disposal facilities. The Corps' CDFs are intended to provide a facility that can be used for sediment disposal and treatment.

Will the proposed CDFs contain settling ponds? Water quality treatment systems?
CDPs? How often will they be monitored? By whom? What is the facility’s life-expectancy?

We question the Corp’s choice of a disposal site. Why place hazardous material next to the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, one of the most dynamic areas in the Pontchartrain Basin? What happens when a hurricane hits St. Bernard Parish? Will the polluted sediments spread all over the St. Bernard marshes?

Contaminated dredged material remain active sources of pollution, even after they are deposited in CDFs. Some of the toxins, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and other organic contaminants, such as the ones identified in the sediments samples from the inner harbor, enter the atmosphere as gases.

LSU and the U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station are conducting research to define the conditions that lead to the release of pollutants in CDFs.

Is the New Orleans District familiar with this research? Has District personnel contacted these scientists to get their input on the design of the proposed CDFs?

Clearly, the discussion of the CDFs raises more questions that it answers. The public deserves an answer to all these questions before the process can be allowed to move forward.

5) The dredging of the IHNC could allow contaminated sediments to enter Lake Pontchartrain.

The proposed construction would stir up a tremendous volume of material, much of it contaminated. What procedures will be put into place to prevent these materials from entering the Lake?

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. The Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation will be submitting additional comment in the near future.

For the Lake and Basin

Neil A. Armingeon
Environmental Director

Page 3, item 4. The 1,364,000 cubic yards of material referred to in LPBP’s comment will come primarily from the IHNC bottom channel (1,158,000 cubic yards), with a small portion from the east bank of the IHNC (206,000 cubic yards). Therefore, 85% of the material to be disposed of in the MRGO site will be from the IHNC channel bottom. The suitability of the IHNC channel bottom material for wetland disposal has been discussed in the responses to comments 1-3 above. Analysis of the bulk sediment results obtained for the east bank of the IHNC, the shows that the additional 15% from the east bank of the IHNC also will not pose a threat to the environment. In addition to the fact that the MRGO site is isolated from the tidal system by its elevation, this conclusion is based on the fact that the bulk sediment analysis of the IHNC bank sediments were comparable to moderately higher than the bulk sediment analysis for the channel bottom.

As with any disposal action, the Corps will follow the direction of regulatory agencies such as LDEQ in designing and carrying out the disposal of dredged material. The disposal site in question, the MRGO site, is a previously used Corps of Engineers dredged disposal site. The site was originally subdivided into four cells, each individually diked. The Corps plans to strengthen the exterior dikes to prevent release of the dredged material into Bayou Bienvenue and other tidal waters. The interior dikes will also be reinforced as necessary, to aid in lengthening the detention time of the dredging effluent. This site is not tidally influenced and is surrounded by confinement dikes and a hurricane protection levee. Any additional requirements considered necessary will be included in the disposal plan developed in the design memorandum to be prepared for the dredging of channels to ensure that the effluent from the disposal site will not pose a threat to the environment or public. An appropriate water quality monitoring plan will be developed and will be conducted during dredging and disposal operations to ensure that the public and environmental health are not threatened.

The disposal site is within the hurricane protection system. Erosion from the MRGO would not be allowed to compromise the hurricane protection levee. The disposal site is located in what could be considered a “dead-end” system, near the headwater of Bayou Bienvenue, also known as the Main Outfall Canal. All dredging and disposal would occur in Orleans Parish. The canal receives urban stormwater runoff from a pumping station at the head of the canal. During any anticipation of abnormal high tidal stages (winter storms, tropical storms, or hurricanes) the floodgates at Bayou Bienvenue and Ducre are closed, preventing tidal surges from entering the large area where the disposal site is located. Therefore, any contaminants in the soils would not be mobilized.

Page 4, item 5. The contaminant levels of the IHNC sediments and soils have been addressed in responses to comments 1-3, above, and in the HTRW appendix. The sediments and soils to be dredged have been shown to be not hazardous. Some of the questionable soils, based on lead contamination, would be hauled to an industrial landfill. The portion of the IHNC south of the MRGO, where all of the dredging would occur, is virtually a dead end system, with the inflow and outflow produced from the small amount of exchange from the Mississippi River through the existing lock during lockages. A relatively small amount of tidal flushing also occurs with the rise and fall of tides in the canal. A significant amount of tidal current flows from Lake Pontchartrain through the northern half of the IHNC to the MRGO, and vice versa. The sluggish water movement in the southern half of the IHNC would severely limit the amount of sediments and associated suspended and dissolved constituents from being flushed into Lake Pontchartrain and the MRGO. Therefore, the effects of dredging operations on the Lake and MRGO are considered to be minimal.

The proposed disposal area is on the protected side of a section of the hurricane protection levee along the south bank of MRGO. The potential of leachate migration from the proposed disposal site to Lake Pontchartrain should be minimal to non-existent. The MRGO is structurally separated from the disposal site by a hurricane protection levee while the surface drainage flow in the disposal area should be southward and away from MRGO and Lake Pontchartrain. However, the northern channel segment of the IHNC remains as a direct pollutant pathway from the dredging area to the lake.
February 25, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

The New Orleans Board of Trade, representing 200 members engaged in the commerce of the port, endorses the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans at the existing IHNC site.

Our members appreciate the fact that the present lock is 73 years old and unable to perform the level of service expected in 1997 with 1924 hardware.

We also appreciate that the Corps considered seven sites for a new lock and concluded that the most environmentally acceptable site was Mississippi River Mile 92.6. The selection of this site serves to re-affirm your judgement in selecting this same site for the first lock in 1923.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas L. Westfeldt
President
RE: INNER HARBOR NAVIGATIONAL CANAL LOCK REPLACEMENT

February 27, 1997

Col. William L. Cooper
Corps of Engineers
New Orleans, LA 70116-2227

Dear Col. Cooper:

The New Orleans Steamship Association (NOSA) represents 67 owners, operators, agents and stevedores, and through them, thousands of vessels that call on the lower Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico. Among our many activities on behalf of our members, NOSA is involved in matters that promote safety on the lower Mississippi River and the Mississippi River system as a whole. Also, NOSA promotes development needed for the safe movement of commerce.

We support the construction of the new Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock (Industrial Lock) at New Orleans because it will provide for the safe and efficient movement of commerce on the river. The lock is an integral part of our nation's transportation system. It is the major east-west connector for shallow-draft commerce, but its current dimensions cause congestion, which is neither efficient nor safe. The lock's inefficiency delays traffic, increasing the cost of doing business for our members. The new lock will provide the economic benefits that are vital to keep our country's goods flowing in both directions of commerce and move us to the 21st Century. From a local standpoint, a new lock will strengthen the ability of Louisiana's ports to remain among the major ports in the country. It will support the jobs that are already generated through the current lock, and it will support new jobs in the future. The new lock will also help to ensure that our ports remain competitive.

The new lock will provide a smoother and more efficient flow of traffic. This will improve the efficiency of the Gulf Coast, particularly the New Orleans area, and indirectly related to port activity.

The new lock will provide a smoother and more efficient flow of traffic, improving the efficiency of the Gulf Coast, particularly the New Orleans area, and indirectly related to port activity.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
The construction of the new industrial canals for the purposes of providing our industry with an increased port will improve the economy and the job opportunities in the area. It will promote economic growth and the success of the port, ultimately leading to more revenue for the area. The canals will also help to reduce congestion and improve the flow of goods to and from the port. The construction of the canals is crucial for the economic growth of our area.

February 20, 1999

Colonel William L. Cameron
facing the levee. Although the plan allows for lighting and landscaping to offset the negative impact of cement ramps, property values will nevertheless decline where bridge approaches reach into and further divide the neighborhood. In addition, the plan does not adequately study the impact that a monolithic floodwall will have upon the revitalization of this area. On page 13-3-8 of the report, the finding of no adverse affect on public parks, shoreline access points or other areas of public use and concern is not accurate. The levee functions as a public park, offering residents a visually attractive view of the river and a much used recreational space. In fact, the levee is one of the most significant amenities of Holy Cross.

Thank you for taking the time to address our concerns, and we look forward to hearing from you regarding further PRC involvement in revitalization of both neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patricia H. Gay

PG/ad

cc: Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
    Bywater Improvement Association
    Mayor Marc Morial
    Councilman Troy Carter
    Councilman Ellen Hazeur-Distance
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COMMENTS OF HOLY CROSS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, LOUISIANA ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NETWORK, AND SIERRA CLUB - NEW ORLEANS GROUP ON U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS' DRAFT EVALUATION REPORT FOR NEW LOCK AND CONNECTING CHANNELS FOR MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET

1. INTRODUCTION

The Holy Cross Neighborhood Association ("Holy Cross"), Louisiana Environmental Action Network (LEAN), and Sierra Club - New Orleans Group ("Sierra Club"), through undersigned counsel, submit these comments on the Draft Evaluation Report for the New Lock and Connecting Channels, Mississippi River - Gulf Outlet ("Draft Evaluation") to the Inner Harbor Navigational Canal (IHNC). The purposes of Holy Cross, LEAN, and Sierra Club include the protection and preservation of the community, the historical buildings, and the natural environment found on the levee bordering the Industrial Canal. Their purposes also include the protection of their members from pollution, as well as health and environmental threats. Members of these groups live in the neighborhoods surrounding the proposed project and take advantage of the community and recreational opportunities provided in the area and on the levees. Conditions during and after the proposed IHNC project will adversely affect the quality of community life, the surrounding environment, and the health and welfare of members of these groups and their families.

The project proposes to replace two bridges over the IHNC, deepen the canal itself, and install a new lock in the canal. The IHNC serves as the navigational connection between the Mississippi River, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet. Studies suggest that a high volume of vessel traffic and the closure of the bridges due to vehicular traffic have lead to delays in navigation at the IHNC lock. The Draft Evaluation purports to compare two main alternatives: the existing IHNC site in New Orleans and a site at

---

1The Tulane Environmental Law Clinic submits these comments on behalf of the above-listed groups, and not on behalf of Tulane University or the Tulane Law School.
Violet, Louisiana. The evaluation concludes with a recommendation for a new float-in lock of
110 x 36 x 1200 feet at a site north of Claiborne Avenue with a low St. Claude Avenue Bridge
and a replacement of the existing Claiborne Avenue Bridge.

The effects of the proposed project are wide-ranging, implicating numerous concerns,
many of which the draft evaluation fails to deal with whatsoever or addresses only superficially.
The following specific comments attempt to illuminate points at which the draft evaluation fails
to satisfy statutory requirements of the National Environmental Protection Act, the National
Historic Preservation Act, and the Fair Housing Act, among other federal and state laws and
regulations. The comments address each volume or issue in turn.

II. COMMENTS

A. VOLUME ONE: MAIN REPORT AND EIS

1. Main Report

On page 29, the Draft Evaluation notes that the use of the II INC lock by deep draft
vessels has remained "stable or diminished in the past decade." This evidence does not indicate
a need for more deep draft vessel capacity, and, in fact, argues against the recommended
alternative which includes a deeper lock. No further evidence is adduced to indicate that
building such a deeper draft lock will result in greater use by deep draft vessels and, therefore,
greater economic benefits than possible with the existing lock.

On page 34, the Evaluation considers future conditions without the lock and makes at
least two questionable predictions. First, it foresees a "proliferation of gambling casinos.”
Considering the recent legal fights and flights of much of the riverboat gambling industry to more
lucrative sites, it seems unrealistic to continue to expect any growth in this industry in this part of
the state or to imply any economic or employment gains from the industry. Second, the
Evaluation notes that the population in the New Orleans Metropolitan Area is growing, while the

Page 2, item 1. Based on Federal criteria, construction of the deep draft increment is
not warranted. While 95 percent of the savings are shallow draft, the Port of New Orleans has
requested that the Corps construct a deep draft project as the locally preferred plan. This
increment is being constructed at non-Federal expense.

Page 2, item 1, para 2. The report has been revised to more accurately reflect current
conditions relative to casinos. Provisions in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986
require that preference be given to local residents in the construction of the project.
population in Orleans Parish is declining. It then projects that employment conditions in Orleans Parish will improve. It fails to note, however, that it is more likely that what jobs are created will go to non-Orleans parish residents.

On page 42, the Evaluation analyzes the National Economic Development (NED) Impacts. However, its analysis is skewed in favor of the chosen project. The NED cost estimate fails to include the $46 million estimated for social and environmental mitigation costs. These costs are clearly foreseeable and required by Section 326 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 303 of the 104th Congress, which states that “[u]sing funds made available . . . the Secretary shall implement a comprehensive community impact mitigation plan, as described in the evaluation report of the New Orleans District Engineer.” Clearly, adding this cost to the NED would reduce the chimerical economic benefit of $75.8 million and the average annual benefits ratio.

On page 43, the Draft Evaluation suggests that the material dredged from the Industrial Canal in the creation of the deep draft lock will be dumped into open water to create new wetlands. Considering the possible toxicity and the almost definite high salinity of the material that will be retrieved from the bottom of a canal that has been used continuously for heavy industry since its creation in 1923, this plan is unrealistic. There is no suggestion, and certainly no cost estimate, for how this dredged material will be treated if too toxic or too highly salinated to form the basis of sustainable wetlands. Further, considering the possibility that the material dredged may be for the most part unusable, the Evaluation fails to answer whether there is sufficient room for all of the dredged material at the previously existing fill area.

Page 43 of the Evaluation also purports to address the impacts on cultural resources. However, it says nearly nothing about the impacts except to promise a memorandum of agreement with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer. The project is likely to have wide-ranging and seriously adverse effects on cultural resources.
historic resources. The failure to address these effects at this point is a critical deficiency. Certainly, mitigation plans should include extensive recognition of the need to preserve the historic resources and character of the surrounding communities (rather than simply that of particular structures). Moving one historic building or documenting another historic structure fails to properly mitigate for otherwise destroying the historic and aesthetic qualities, "tout ensemble," of a community.

In the discussion on page 44 regarding the proposed mitigation measures, specifically addressing impacts on individual homes, the Draft Evaluation does not clearly explain what the nature of the "impacts" on the homes will be. Will there only be noise or noise, dust, and vibrations? The Draft further does not discuss the costs and possibilities of permanent relocation if requested by the community members. The dislocation of 620 individuals and the "[s]everal neighborhood businesses" also should be mentioned in the Real Estate Supplement (Volume 7). Such disjunction occurs continuously in the Draft Evaluation. The Evaluation also offers no cross-references to other sections or volumes of the evaluation. Its use is, therefore, difficult and such difficulty hinders its ability to meet its duty of informing the public about the proposed project. Home and business owners concerned about the effects on their properties who read the Real Estate Supplement would be haled into a false sense of ease belied by the Main Volume.

On page 44-45, the Draft Evaluation discusses the National Economic Development impacts. In this discussion, the Corps includes the cost of environmental mitigation for the Violet site but not for the IHNC site. Further, the lack of maintenance for the old Violet lock is not included as a benefit for the NED while the lack of maintenance at the IHNC lock is. The NED for the IHNC site needs to include the social mitigation costs as required by law. The proffered NED comparison is one of apples and oranges. Costs are included or discarded as suits the conclusion the Corps seeks. The same costs must be included in both NED cost analyses to fairly determine the ratios and the economic benefits possible. This deficiency is among the

Page 4, para 1. The reference is to preliminary screening for a plan that was eliminated. It is not required in the Real Estate Supplement which presents information on the recommended plan.

Page 4, para 2 - Page 5 para 2. For the preliminary screenings referred to in these paragraphs, the Corps used the best information available at the time. The proposal for social and cultural mitigation was not yet being considered for either site. However, the Violet site had such severe and devastating impacts to the natural environment that even if those mitigation costs were included at that time, the recommendation to eliminate the Violet site would not have changed. It was believed that alternatives existed at the IHNC site that could be developed with appropriate mitigation that would be less environmentally damaging that the Violet site. The recommended plan at the North of Claiborne Avenue location, including the community impact mitigation plan, is such a plan.
most egregious of the Evaluation, but is also indicative of the nature of the Draft Evaluation: the conclusions are foregone and the discussions merely rationalize the desired project.

Page 46 of the Draft Evaluation assesses social and cultural impacts of the Violet site. These impacts are considerably lower than those estimated for the IHNC site. This disparity of impact should have been taken into account in comparing the projects, not only in the economic sense as noted in the paragraph above, but also politically. While the Evaluation notes many times the public opposition to the Violet site, it notes only once the equally strong resistance of the community to the IHNC site. Further, it never directly compares the two sites in terms of cultural impacts to indicate that the community opposition at the IHNC site is not theoretical or NIMBY (Not In My backyard) based, but rather is based on a desire to protect their homes and their immediate quality of life. The resistance of the Violet community should not be given greater weight than that of the individuals trying to preserve their homes near the IHNC.

Further, the Comparison of Sites on page 46 of the Draft Evaluation should address the impacts on social and cultural resources as required by federal statutes. The National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4331, recognizes “the profound impact of man’s activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, particularly the profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource exploitation, and new and expanding technological advances,” and makes it the “continuing responsibility” of the Federal Government “to use all practicable means” “to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may . . . assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.”

The Corps is also under a duty to ensure that the goals of environmental justice are met in the planning of projects. The Fair Housing Act, Presidential Executive Order No. 12,898, 59 Fed. Reg. 7629-33 (Feb. 11, 1994) and the Department of Defense’s Environmental Justice

Page 5, para 3. See Section 1.1.8 of the EIS.
Strategy require that "each federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing... disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations." Executive Order 12,898 also requires analysis of environmental justice impacts of federally funded projects. At no point in the Draft are environmental justice considerations addressed, although the Draft admits that the affected communities are largely minority. In failing to recognize the disparate social and cultural impacts of the IHNC and Violet projects, the Draft Evaluation fails to meet the requirements of the law and the Executive Order.

Page 60 of the Evaluation discusses pre-construction mitigation but proposes no pre-construction mitigation for the north Claiborne bridge. There will be a great deal of traffic dislocation caused by the temporary removal of this bridge, especially considering that the current North Claiborne bridge accommodates approximately fifty-one percent of current traffic (see p. 33), and these impacts must be identified and fully analyzed.

The allocation of funds indicated by the table on page 64 reflects little consideration of the neighborhoods impacted by the IHNC project. While only $51,000 is allocated for job training, despite the grandiose promises in the mitigation plan, $600,000 is allocated to document a bridge and lock that will be torn down. This is an outrageous sum for documentation of historic value when compared with the picayune sum allocated to job training. More outrageous, however, is the comparison of the almost $3 million offered to Orleans Parish for lost sales tax revenue to the pittance $35,533 to compensate homeowners for decreased property value. The estimation of decreased property value compensation is ridiculous. The table estimates housing compensation for only one year when the project itself is to continue for seven years beyond two years of pile driving. Property values will be decreased not only for the duration of pile-driving but permanently from the disfigurement of the Holy Cross and Bywater communities (such as replacing green levees with high concrete floodwalls) that the IHNC lock replacement will bring.

Page 6, para 1. Preconstruction mitigation is being proposed in the current plan. In addition, because of innovative construction techniques, the service outage of the Claiborne Avenue bridge would be limited to a short period of time (currently estimated between 1 to 4 weeks).

Page 6, para 2 - page 7, para 1. Preliminary numbers used in the table reflect early estimates in the mitigation planning effort. The text is being changed to clarify information in the report reference.
The table on page 64-67 has several other failings. It indicates nine months of utility assistance to pay for air conditioners, and the provision of air conditioners to some community members, to drown the noise of pile driving (a questionable mitigation in and of itself). However, estimates for pile driving are twenty-four months. There is no explanation of the disparity in the times. Further, if the construction is to continue for nine years, no mention is made of mitigating for noise, air, and other pollution for the other eight years and three months. The table further fails to indicate the mitigation costs required for providing emergency and police services to the communities during construction. On page 67 of the table, it indicates mitigation for pedestrian and public transportation but does not include any plans or compensation for the huge numbers of private commuters who will be affected. If those commuters are included in the pedestrian and public transportation, the table fails to account for what will be a huge increase in the number of public commuters.

In describing Impact Avoidance on page 77, the Draft Evaluation indicates no resurfacing of roads near the construction area, only resurfacing of outlying roads. The impacts of the construction will be greatest on the roads bordering the project area. These roads should be resurfaced, not, as the Evaluation offers elsewhere, fixed on an as-needed basis. The worse shape these roads are in, the more vibrations and noise in the surrounding communities.

On page 98 the Draft Evaluation states that textured surfaces will be used on floodwalls to improve aesthetics. There is no proof adduced in the Draft Evaluation that textured surfaces makes them somehow less unsightly or more resistant to vandalism, despite the fact that the report constantly touts textured walls as a mitigation or neighborhood improvement. If there is proof of such beneficial effects, it should be produced. If there is no proof, then realistic measures should be offered to improve the aesthetic problems posed by tall concrete walls.

The direct mitigation measures suggested on page 99 present numerous problems. The "Aesthetics" paragraph promises "new plantings" adjacent to the lock and "landscaping" in...
impossible to need

then because the competition is worthless if the amount of profit to show financial decline is
lose in value. If these businesses are not tracked, the information may accrue to this

methodologies. A very high the Case study may imply another expansion appearance to indicate

should not be the eventual generated (non-patent, in the Front Case and Project

establishments will be able to demonstrate with decades. Further, the ones of demonstration loss
clear. However, the expansion does not indicate how individuals and commercial
be commercialize momentarily for demonstration declines in sales and thus during periods of bridge
On page 99 there, the evaluation meets their standards and commercial establishments will

must be well-grounded and well-funded, as well as properly implemented.

behindhand. The transmission procedures used by this process are to place the proliferation

allows (see p. 45). If these are really possibilities, the funds needed to be devoted
transmission fees (never "hit", but) money is expected to many of these ideas in the hands
On page 99, the expansion also promises many direct proliferation measures to

will not be a proliferation of the expansion of a parent, but safety first.

will be a proliferation of the expansion of a parent, but safety first.

impossible to need

then because the competition is worthless if the amount of profit to show financial decline is
lose in value. If these businesses are not tracked, the information may accrue to this

methodologies. A very high the Case study may imply another expansion appearance to indicate

should not be the eventual generated (non-patent, in the Front Case and Project

establishments will be able to demonstrate with decades. Further, the ones of demonstration loss
clear. However, the expansion does not indicate how individuals and commercial
be commercialize momentarily for demonstration declines in sales and thus during periods of bridge
On page 99 there, the evaluation meets their standards and commercial establishments will

must be well-grounded and well-funded, as well as properly implemented.

behindhand. The transmission procedures used by this process are to place the proliferation

allows (see p. 45). If these are really possibilities, the funds needed to be devoted
transmission fees (never "hit", but) money is expected to many of these ideas in the hands
On page 99, the expansion also promises many direct proliferation measures to

will not be a proliferation of the expansion of a parent, but safety first.

will be a proliferation of the expansion of a parent, but safety first.

impossible to need

then because the competition is worthless if the amount of profit to show financial decline is
lose in value. If these businesses are not tracked, the information may accrue to this

methodologies. A very high the Case study may imply another expansion appearance to indicate

should not be the eventual generated (non-patent, in the Front Case and Project

establishments will be able to demonstrate with decades. Further, the ones of demonstration loss
clear. However, the expansion does not indicate how individuals and commercial
be commercialize momentarily for demonstration declines in sales and thus during periods of bridge
On page 99 there, the evaluation meets their standards and commercial establishments will

must be well-grounded and well-funded, as well as properly implemented.

behindhand. The transmission procedures used by this process are to place the proliferation

allows (see p. 45). If these are really possibilities, the funds needed to be devoted
transmission fees (never "hit", but) money is expected to many of these ideas in the hands
On page 99, the expansion also promises many direct proliferation measures to

will not be a proliferation of the expansion of a parent, but safety first.

will be a proliferation of the expansion of a parent, but safety first.
On page 99, the Evaluation also offers supervised playgrounds. Again, funds are not allocated for this proposal. The report does not indicate who will provide such playgrounds, who will supervise them and where they will be created when there is so little green space in the area, much of which will itself be destroyed by the lock expansion project.

2. **Environmental Impact Statement**

It is unclear why this is a separate section. If this is the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), what is the rest of the document? Taken alone, the EIS skims too many issues without providing real answers. The form in which it presents the alternative proposals, for example, fails to “sharply defin[e] the issues and provid[e] a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public” as required by the § 1502.14 of the Council on Environmental Quality regulations. If the other parts of the evaluation are meant to be incorporated by reference into the EIS, then they are also required to meet the statutory requirements for an EIS. The use of a separate EIS should be explained and the conformity of the rest of the report to all statutory requirements for an EIS should be confirmed.

Returning to more specific issues, EIS Section 1.1.1.3 mentions, as did the Main Report, the opposition of the Violet community to the Violet site without mentioning the opposition of the Bywater and Holy Cross neighborhoods to the IHNC site. This creates the impression that the community opposition in Violet is greater than at the IHNC site, and that the community in Violet is more directly affected than the community at the IHNC site. As neither of these conclusions is correct, the information should be given in an impartial and accurate way.

EIS section 1.1.3.1 suggests that the soil dredged from the canal and taken from the banks will be uncontaminated. This is highly unlikely considering the continuous use of the canal by industry since its opening in 1923. The report should address the likely contamination of the soil as well as the costs to mitigate such contamination. Considering the likelihood of contamination, it is also unlikely that the soil will make a good basis for a new marsh. If such soil is

Page 9, para 1. The mitigation plan includes the provision of facilities. It is anticipated that supervision and maintenance will be a non-Federal responsibility.

Page 9, 2nd full para. The format of the report/EIS follows the "combined" format addressed in 40 CFR 1506.4 as reflected in the Corps' Engineering Regulation (ER) 200-2-2 Procedures for Implementing NEPA, Paragraph 13 and in the Corps' Planning Guidance Notebook (ER 1105-2-100), Appendix F.

Page 9, 3rd full para. Section 1.1.1. has been modified to reflect the socioeconomic impacts and community opposition to the recommended plan.

Page 9, 4th full para. The soils and sediments to be excavated and disposed have been extensively tested for the presence of contaminants. The testing analyses are summarized in the EIS and described in great detail in the Engineering Investigations (Volume 5), the Navigation (Volume 2), and the Environmental Appendix (Volume 6). Investigations show that the soil on the east bank of the IHNC, below 5 feet in depth, which is to be excavated for the bypass channel, contains only background levels of contaminants. This is the only material proposed for marsh development.
contaminated and, therefore, unsuitable to form the basis for a new marsh, the use of wetlands for the graving site will not be mitigated by the creation of said marsh.

Section 4.2.1, EIS page 26, fails to address the declining use of the IHNC by deep draft vessels. Such usage surely needs to be taken into account in any consideration of need for a new lock.

Sections 4.2.2 and 4.3.4.4, along with many other sections of the Main Report and the EIS, do not address the numerous problems associated with the reconstruction of the Florida Avenue Bridge. The Draft Evaluation comments often on the role that the Florida Avenue Bridge will play in the construction of the new lock and the management of traffic problems created by the closure of the North Claiborne Bridge and the St. Claude Avenue Bridge. However, reliance on a reconstructed Florida Avenue Bridge is misplaced. That project faces many political and financial hurdles before realization. No plans are indicated for rerouting traffic if the Florida Avenue Bridge is not reconstructed by the beginning of the project. The new IHNC lock evaluation is required by the regulations to address the effects of a "crucially interrelated project," such as the Florida Avenue Bridge project.

Section 4.2.4, EIS page 29, does not acknowledge or discuss the current, and reasonably successful, community efforts to strengthen and stabilize the Bywater and Holy Cross neighborhoods. The failure to recognize these improvements both creates the impression that there is not much to be lost for these neighborhoods and allows the Evaluation to avoid recognition of the full impacts of the project on these newly revitalized communities. The report also does not address the fact that part of the problem in the area has been the black cloud of a possible lock project such as this hanging over all neighborhood revitalization efforts.

Section 4.3.4.3 does not indicate to where the Coast Guard facility and its attendant jobs will be removed. The Evaluation in general fails to account for jobs that will be lost because of the removal of employers such as the Galvez Street Wharf, the Society for the Prevention of
Cruelty to Animals, and commercial establishments. In a delicate economy, the removal of each employer and source of community revenue is felt powerfully. Such removal should be acknowledged in the report and accounted for in the Evaluation.

Section 5.3.7.4.2 promises a temporary housing revitalization program. However, such a temporary plan cannot compensate for the permanent destruction of a neighborhood. Furthermore, even if the neighborhood were not permanently destroyed by the aesthetic and visual changes brought about by the new lock, there might be no community left to revitalize at the end of a nine year construction period. Any viable revitalization project requires more of a commitment of time and resources.

Section 5.5.7.4.2, EIS page 63 addresses mitigation for vehicular traffic obstruction. However, there is no guarantee that the traffic from the work site and other rerouted traffic will follow the designated routes. It is common knowledge that many detoured trucks going to and from the Thoroughlouis Corridor project take whichever up town road they fancy. The Corps needs to plan for the likely possibility that heavy and regular vehicles will take any of the smaller roads surrounding the project area. These roads should be resurfaced. It is insufficient to fill potholes as they develop. Such piecemeal work inevitably is long in coming and short in success.

Section 4.13.14, EIS page 65, offers no mitigation plans for impacts on community cohesion even though the EIS recognizes that the construction will have significant deleterious effects on community cohesion (see 5.3.14.4). None of the mitigation plans offered reveal a plan that can truly assist community cohesion in the face of a project this large and destructive.

Section 5.3.18.1, on EIS page 74, addresses the impacts to wetlands. In this section, in contrast to the 25 acres quoted by EIS section 1.1.3.1, the EIS states that the graving site will affect 103 acres of wetlands. Which number of affected acres is it and what are the differing impacts, if any, to the 25 and the 103 acres? This section also mentions that much of the

Page 11, 1st full para. Comments noted.

Page 11, 2nd full para. The mitigation for vehicular traffic impacts has been substantially modified due to the reduction in bridge closure periods with the inclusion of a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue and the less-extensive modifications proposed for Claiborne Avenue. The new plan includes extensive improvements to community streets.

Page 11, 3rd full para. While there is no specified mitigation item to directly address impacts to community cohesion, the entire project construction plan and mitigation plan is designed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts to the adjoining neighborhoods (communities).

Page 11, 4th full para. The 103 acre area is the total area of wetlands within which the graving site would be built. The impacts of the graving site would be limited to 25 acres. Section 5.3.18.1 describes the wetland habitats of all areas to be affected by dredging and disposal. The areas affected by urban runoff from pumping stations and possibly by leachate from landfills are the proposed mitigation area and the proposed disposal area along the south bank of the MRG. The graving site is within the forced drainage area on the north bank of the MRG, isolated from the south bank of the MRG and the mitigation site. Please refer to Plate 23 showing the locations of the dredging and disposal areas. The term "ample dredged material" refers to the soil from the east bank of the IHNC below 5 feet in depth which has been determined to not be contaminated. More of this material is available than is required to mitigate for impacts of the graving site.
wetlands in this area are also subject to storm runoff from two pumping stations, as well as runoff from landfills and a sewerage treatment plant. The report fails to indicate clearly the effects these have had on the wetlands and what impact the addition of the graving site will have on the area. Surely an area such as this is already delicately situated and should not be subjected to further danger from a graving site in a forced drainage area. At section 5.3.18.4.2 the EIS states that the dredged material from the East Bank of the IHNC can be used to create 41 acres of wetland. Even were this soil usable as a basis for creating wetlands, the EIS does not explain how further wetlands would be created from the “ample dredged material,” considering that such material is most likely toxic and highly saline.

Section 5.3.19.5 fails to explain what effects the construction would have on the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet project and how the two projects are related. Considering the vast impacts of this plan, it is necessary to address the effects on the MR-GO channel in terms of sediment, toxics, metals, salinity, water temperature, and suspended sediment, as well as impacts on MR-GO traffic and erosion.

Section 5.3.20.4.2, on page 86, addresses mitigation for the adverse effects to aesthetic values. Again it mentions the ever-present and unconvincing textured surfaces for floodwalls and bridges. Again the section fails to mention real aesthetic mitigation plans such as creation of specific green areas in the community and continued maintenance of these areas in terms of landscaping and supervision. In discussing the removal of the old stand of oak trees currently on the levee, the EIS fails to state specifically to where these venerable trees will be moved and what kinds of plants will replace them; a tallow tree is not a live oak. As in other mitigation sections, the mitigation offerings are more illusory than helpful. A path next to a concrete floodwall does not compensate for the loss of a path following a levee. Observation points on top of the floodwall are invitations to drug dealers. Compensation is limited to a four-block area despite the fact that the project will impact the communities on either side of the Canal for a much greater distance.

Page 12, 1st full para. Impacts of the listed items on the MRGO are not explained because only minor, temporary increases in turbidity would be expected. Predicted changes in vessel traffic on the MRGO are shown in Section 5.4.3.5.

Page 12, 2nd full para. Texturing of floodwalls and bridges has been deleted from the mitigation plan and is now part of project construction. The mitigation plan provides a specified funding amount for construction of playgrounds and parks. The specific areas where these would be constructed would be worked out during detailed project design. Likewise, the specifics of mitigating for the loss of the oak trees at the old lock site has not been subjected to detailed design. The specific details of these items are not undertaken during the feasibility phase, which is where we are now. The mitigation plan has been modified substantially to expand mitigation outside of a four-block area on each side of the IHNC. A “fold-down” floodwall has been incorporated into the plan. For all but less than one month out of the year (on average), the wall will be horizontal and out of sight. This wall is planned for areas along the canal that currently have only levee. This will allow for an unobstructed view of the river and canal.
been written because it is filled only with empty paragraphs. The subject matter of the document is not given or cannot be discerned from the information provided. It is not clear what the focus or purpose of the document is, nor is it clear what the content of the paragraphs is. The paragraphs appear to be random and disconnected, with no clear structure or organization. The text is difficult to read and makes little sense. It is not possible to accurately transcribe or interpret the content of this document.
On page 18, the Mitigation volume fails to address the maintenance of the landscaping that it suggests will be provided. Plans chosen for landscaping should be appropriate and maintainable. A certain number of plant species is to be replaced. It is unclear who will pay to maintain the new plantings and how much this will cost. This should be spelled out in the communities in a manner that those responsible will be aware of the cost.

The direct notification for noise impacts states on page 19 that ‘soundproofing measures could include installing sound panels on houses or adding air conditioning units to houses.’ It is not clear that these measures will be effective in reducing noise impacts. The language is conditional and so not reassuring. The noise impacts will be great on the surrounding communities, not just on the study area.

Page 10 addresses transportation measures. It suggests that there will be van shuttle service to accommodate pedestrian traffic during closure of the St. Claude Bridge. There is no suggestion that any such service will be available during the closure of the North Claiborne Avenue Bridge. Further, van shuttle service can take an unreasonable amount of time for many pedestrians to get to work or to their destination. Such information should be included in a Comprehensive Traffic Management Plan. The unknown value of the van shuttle again illustrates why this Draft Evaluation is deemed insufficient in so many ways.

On page 21, section 2.2 of Transportation mitigation, the Draft Evaluation acknowledges the expected delays in school buses for Holy Cross School. The language of the proposed mitigation is conditional. Further, it suggests that funds would only be compensated for the delayed buses. This is misleading and not fully transparent. The language of the proposed transportation mitigation is insufficient.
school will have to demonstrate losses. The funds offered are not certain, but conditional. Such a mitigation plan leaves too much to agency discretion. For the residents of these communities and for Holy Cross School, this promise and the money is too chimerical.

Page 23 of the Mitigation volume addresses mitigation for impacted aesthetic resources. As in other discussions regarding the old oak trees and their removal, the Evaluation fails to state specifically to where the trees will be moved, citing only vaguely “available public land within the community.” The Evaluation needs to state specifically where this public land is.

The mitigation proposed for community cohesion purposes on pages 26 and 27 have numerous problematic issues. First, the Evaluation indicates that lighting and drainage improvements will be made to the four blocks surrounding each side of the project. Such mitigation is minimal when the effects from the new lock project will extend well beyond a four block area. This section also proposes to put lighting within the vacant areas under the current Claiborne Avenue Bridge approaches. The benefits of this additional lighting to the community are unclear. As with the textured floodwalls, this mitigation suggestion smacks more of gimmick than genuine compensation. Finally, recreational spaces are proposed, but as in other sections discussing recreation, it is unclear from where the funds or the supervision will come. The Evaluation offers only that the facilities will be turned over to “non-Federal interests for incorporation into existing programs.” If such interests exist and are willing to take on more recreational supervisory duties then they should be named and the commitments made clear and enforceable. If there are currently no such interested parties, then the Draft Evaluation should make that clear and come up with realistic proposals based on available resources.

C. VOLUME FIVE: TOXICS

Sediment core samples indicating high levels of heavy metals, specifically mercury, in the sediments surrounding the lock call for further study and planning prior to project approval.
Pollutants entering the main harbor canal settle to the bottom creating toxic reservoirs in the sediments. Dredging these contaminated areas stirs up the bottom sediments re-releasing toxic materials into the water where they may be ingested or absorbed by plants and animals. Such impacts should be considered and addressed in the Evaluation.

To measure the levels of sediment contamination in the inner harbor canal, the Corps collected sediment samples. One of the samples contained a mercury level of twenty parts per million (20 ppm). This level is forty times greater than the level considered "safe" by the State of Louisiana. Many other samples contained high levels of heavy metals. Yet, in the public notice, the Corps describes the levels of contamination as "moderate." This designation is based upon faulty science (see below). The proposed project will require the removal and disposal of 1,364,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediments, an equivalent of over 130,000 dump truck loads. Clearly, the removal and safe disposal of these materials involves a public health issue which should be addressed in greater detail.

The Corps relies upon faulty science in drawing its conclusions about heavy metal levels. The DFIS lists the "average" level of mercury in a nine foot sediment core as .9 ppm, a level below the federal safe standard. Averaging the readings of the entire sample invalidates the findings. If the upper section contains high levels of heavy metals, it is not possible to say the entire sample is uncontaminated. The averaging is a misuse of statistics and calls into question the use of the data to make broad-based assumptions. Each segment of the entire core sample should be carefully analyzed for contaminants, especially the top foot which logically contains the greatest level of contamination. Under more accepted scientific practices, some of the contamination levels listed would be described as hazardous and would require disposal in hazardous material deposit sites rather than the proposed Confined Disposal Facilities.

In addition, the Corps proposes to dispose of 1.3 million cubic yards of contaminated sediments in Confined Disposal Facilities (CDFs), despite the fact that CDFs historically have
had problems: they are poorly monitored, they have limited ability to keep toxins out of the environment, can allow fish and wildlife to come into contact with contaminated materials, and can leak contaminated leachate into surface and ground waters. The Corps proposes to use this technology in spite of the fact that a similar facility for disposal of contaminated sediments in the Calcasieu River has been shown to be leaking toxins into the environment. According to the Corps report entitled, Review of Removal, Containment and Treatment technologies for Remediation of Contaminated Sediment in the Great Lakes, a CDF designed to receive hydraulically dredged/disposed sediments (similar to the proposed project for the Industrial Canal) must provide adequate detention time for settling and be able to drain and treat large volumes of water. This may require larger facilities, sometimes divided into two or more components to allow for secondary settling. Will the proposed CDFs contain settling ponds? Will they contain water quality treatment systems? How long will the CDFs be maintained? Who will perform the maintenance on the CDFs? How often will they be monitored? By whom? What are the facilities life expectancies? Clearly, further analysis, planning, and opportunity for public comment on this issue of CDFs is needed before any further action can be taken on the Industrial Canal expansion project.

Further, the Corps' choice of a disposal site is problematic. Why place hazardous material next to the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, one of the most dynamic areas in the Pontchartrain Basin? Why place it near St. Bernard Parish, an area which was rejected for canal construction because of its environmentally sensitive locale? What happens when a hurricane hits St. Bernard Parish? Will the polluted sediments spread all over the St. Bernard marshes? Besides the impacts of contaminated dredged materials upon directly adjoining water and land, the materials remain active sources of pollution even after they are deposited in CDFs. Some of the toxins, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and other organic contaminants identified in the sediment samples from the inner harbor, enter the atmosphere as gases.

Louisiana State University and the U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station are
Corps should be familiar with this research or Corps personnel contacted these scientists to get their input on the design of the proposed CDFs. Clearly, the discussion of the CDFs makes more sense if one starts with the assumption that the Corps is not contaminated. The Corps needs to explain what procedures will be put in place to prevent these materials from entering Lake Pontchartrain, an area of aesthetic beauty and recreation.

Page D-3.4 fails to indicate what kind of protection will be afforded to the surrounding communities if there are any unexpected disasters during the construction of the lock. Page D-3.5 indicates that this was a tragedy during the building of the first lock; however, how can the Corps guarantee that, if all the necessary precautions were taken, there would still be no accident during the operation of the lock? The Corps needs to address these dangers before the lock is built. Corps needs to have emergency plans in place. The surrounding communities must be protected.

D. VOLME SIX: ENVIRONMENTAL

Page D-3.6 discusses the wetlands that were at one time Cypress swamps. However, the Corps fails to indicate how the swamps detract from the extent they have and what further effect the current project will have on this area.

Page D-3.10, the Evaluation discusses other problems too vaguely. It attempts to cover up that the creation of marshes at the site is likely during the project. If this is so, then this is an adverse impact that must be dealt with not only in terms of mitigation but also in terms of site comparison. The possible problems will occur only at the IJNC site. Then logic argues against this site. If both the IJNC and the Violet sites are likely to experience adverse effects due to CDF and the Violet site is surrounded by less residential area than logic again argues.

Page D-3.11, the Evaluation is not consistent with the Corps' own analysis. The Corps submitted the report to the Court on July 16th, 1995. The Corps' own analysis was done to determine the extent of the saltwater intrusion and the saltwater intrusion and to determine the extent to which the Corps' own analysis would differ from the Corps' own analysis. The Corps' own analysis was done with the Corps' own analysis and the Corps' own analysis included in all calculations.
against the IHNC site. Either way, the Corps needs to address the possible adverse effects due to odor because none of the mitigation measures proposed by the Corps address or decrease odors.

On page D-3-19 the Environmental volume states that the water quality effects are considered "minimal." This conclusion seems outrageous in the face of evidence that heavy metals will be dredged up and churned up from the floor of the Canal. The Corps needs to define what it means by minimal and what effect minimal heavy metal problems will have on surrounding communities and surrounding bodies of water such as the MR-GO channel, Lake Pontchartrain, and the Mississippi River.

Page D-3-21 supposedly addresses aesthetics but brings up some serious human health and water quality issues. If the water in the IHNC is churned up and possibly toxic materials or heavy metals are also churned up, then the water quality of not only the Industrial Canal is affected but also that of surrounding bodies of water. While such effects pose Clean Water Act permitting problems (a dredging material disposal operation would probably be a point source under current case law), they also pose dangers to fish and wildlife, and to the health of humans coming into contact with such contaminated water through recreational activities such as fishing. These adverse effects are not addressed anywhere else in the Evaluation but raise additional concerns for the communities surrounding the project areas, concerns that should be addressed in a fair and unbiased manner.

On page D-3-36 the Evaluation admits that the dredged material will have deleterious effects on commercial fisheries for two years. However, the Evaluation fails to recognize that the effects are not temporary. In this section, as in others, the Corps attempts to create a false window of temporary degradation rather than admitting the full impact of the project. Furthermore, returning conditions to current levels is insufficient when those levels are already deleterious to human health and welfare. The Corps has a responsibility to address the long term impacts of the project as well as a duty to protect the water quality of the state.

Page 19, 2nd full para. The issue of contaminants has been raised previously in your comments. Please refer back to the responses to previous comments concerning this issue.

Page 19, 3rd full para. The disposal of dredged material into the MRGO site and the mitigation site is expected to have adverse impacts to fisheries resources for a period (estimated as long as 2 years) because of turbidity associated with the dredging operations and runoff from unvegetated dredged material. Once the material becomes consolidated and vegetated, runoff from the MRGO site would no longer be turbid. This is what happens at all of the dredged material disposal areas along the MRGO. The mitigation site is expected to have an increased habitat value for fisheries resources (compared to the existing and future without-project conditions) because aquatic vegetation and marsh grasses would colonize the site.
The report has made the assumption that a vehicular bridge, high-rise or mid-rise, will be part of the project. Without further study of project impacts, the report notes that a two-lane bridge for a number of years would not be the most efficient use of land. A bridge of this type could be open for use by traffic for a limited time. The report does not make any recommendations for a comprehensive development plan.

Page 20, para. 3. The Bogue Chitto Historic District is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, including the Bogue Chitto Historic District. This is the first time that the Corps has held plans for a comprehensive development plan for this area. It is not clear whether the Corps will be incorporated into a memorandum of agreement at the appropriate time.

Page 20, para. 4. The Corps plans to incorporate into its study of this project a comprehensive development plan. The Corps will be responsible for providing a comprehensive development plan.

Page 21, para. 7. The Corps has made the assumption that the Bogue Chitto Historic District will be open for use by traffic for a limited time. The Corps notes that the Corps has not made a determination whether the Corps will be incorporated into a memorandum of agreement at the appropriate time.
these safety concerns in the Draft Evaluation, despite their crucial connection to the welfare of the communities surrounding the IHNC lock.

In discussing neighborhood opposition, the Corps never admits that the opposition to the project arises from the very people with whom it worked to develop a relationship. In fact, almost every community member who dealt with the Corps extensively during this project has come to view it as exceedingly destructive for the surrounding communities.

In early meetings, the Corps promised the surrounding communities that the IHNC project would not go forward without their approval and agreement to mitigation plans. Currently, however, the Corps has rejected its cooperative approach and has threatened to go forward with the project so long as it has the general approval of an undefined "community of reference." Further, the IHNC was originally established as a barge canal. Throughout the years it has grown along with national needs, such as wartime or MR-GO. However, the community has had increasingly little voice in the development surrounding its homes. The community cannot be expected to support a project by an agency that has increasingly disempowered the communities surrounding the lock while increasing its own power and reach. Despite the Corps' developmental designs for the Canal, the neighborhoods surrounding it have also grown and developed and homeowners have put care and resources into developing a cohesive community and a home for their families; a home and a community that are now put at great risk by the Corps' proposed project and inadequate Draft Evaluation.

The DEIS is incomplete without a thorough analysis of the Florida Avenue bridge replacement which is an integral and crucial step to the Corps' construction and mitigation plan. The Draft Evaluation continuously states that the first phase involves removal and then replacement of the current Florida Avenue bridge. Without the Florida Avenue bridge demolition, the lock replacement parts cannot be floated into place and construction cannot proceed. Yet, the Corps fails to analyze the impacts of such an action in its Draft Evaluation. In
The problem has never been more critical for the protection of the environment. The policy of the new government has focused on "green" initiatives, aiming to reduce pollution and promote sustainable practices.

In the context of environmental policies, it is essential to consider the impact of various initiatives on the ecosystem. The implementation of green energy solutions can significantly decrease the carbon footprint and contribute to a healthier environment.

The controversial issue of the SL Clean Airplane Bridge project has been extensively debated, with arguments both for and against the proposed construction. Public hearings have been held to address the concerns of the community, and the impact of the project on the surrounding area has been carefully examined.

In conclusion, the decision to proceed with the SL Clean Airplane Bridge is not without its challenges. Further research and monitoring will be necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in an environmentally friendly manner.

For more information, please refer to the NEPA documents.
State and local agencies present at the public hearing readily admitted that there was no plan to provide funds in the future for such a bridge. The Corps needs to provide an analysis of contingencies if State and local agencies are unable to replace the Florida Avenue bridge.

Despite the lack of information on impacts or alternatives regarding the Florida Avenue bridge replacement, the Corps relies on a new and improved Florida Avenue bridge in its bridge plans and traffic analysis. In the Evaluation, the Corps identifies " unresolved issues" including (1) resident opposition to construction because of traffic congestion, (2) the only bridge respectively. Yet, there is no analysis of the effect on an urban bridge during these times.

In drafting an Environmental Impact Statement or this Evaluation if it serves as a substitute for the EIS, the Corps has a duty to evaluate reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment. (40 C.F.R. § 1502.22 (1996).) "Reasonably foreseeable" includes impacts which have catastrophic consequences, even if their probability of occurrence is low, provided the analysis of the impacts is supported by credible scientific evidence. A hurricane landing on the coast of Louisiana would cause evacuation of the effects of an hurricane striking the residents east of the Industrial Canal is such a catastrophic consequence. The analysis must be

proposed at the January 27, 1997 public hearing. Notice and opportunity to comment were available during the hearing after the public hearing and the deadline for written comments.

Clearly, the new bridge proposal as well as analysis of each of the bridge replacements requires further analysis.
It is important to note at this point that the report on traffic analysis was unavailable during the public comment period. The Evaluation suggests that the report is being compiled, but is not included within the actual Evaluation itself. This is unacceptable to the purpose of NEPA and the compilation of an EIS. "If the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement." (40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a) (1996) (emphasis added). Without analysis of traffic congestion, especially emergency service and hurricane evacuation routes, the agency could not have made a reasoned choice among alternatives. As it stands, the Draft Evaluation is incomplete and insufficient as in an EIS under the law.

The Corps' failure to analyze this critical piece of information cripples the effectiveness of the Evaluation and suggests that a thorough analysis of this action is required. The Draft Evaluation must satisfy to the fullest extent possible the requirements established for final statements in § 102(2)(C) of NEPA. (40 C.F.R. 1502.9 (1996)). If an EIS is "so inadequate as to preclude meaningful analysis, the agency shall prepare and circulate a revised draft of the appropriate portion." (id.). The lack of analysis of the Florida Avenue bridge replacement could result in delay if not halting of the project. It affects not only the immediate environment of surrounding neighborhoods through traffic congestion and construction impacts, but also threatens the very safety of lives in these neighborhoods as well as nearby St. Bernard Parish by failing to examine hurricane evacuation in the absence of a Florida Avenue bridge replacement.

III. CONCLUSION

The Holy Cross Neighborhood Association, Louisiana Environmental Action Network, and Sierra Club - New Orleans Group request that the Army Corps of Engineers address and adopt each and every comment contained herein, as well as those by any other person or entity.
that has commented on the Draft Evaluation Report for the New Lock and Connecting Channels, Mississippi River - Gulf Outlet. In addition, these community groups request that the Corps provide them with a copy of the Final Evaluation Report as soon as it is available.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Theresa Urban-Gill
Mary Penny Thompson
Student Attorneys

[Signature]
Andree Jacques
Robert Kuehn
Supervising Attorneys
Tulane Environmental Law Clinic
6329 Freret Street
New Orleans, LA 70118
(504) 865-5789

March 3, 1997
After a careful review by our Transportation and Governor's Affairs Committees, the WTC's Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the WTC's 2,000 members, unanimously endorsed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans.

While we recognize that the project will require significant changes to the environment and will have an impact on the area, we are confident that the Corps of Engineers' plan is the best solution for the needs of the region.

Louisiana's transportation sector is critical to the state's economy. The Corps' plan will help ensure the competitiveness of the state's transportation infrastructure.

1. Employment: The total economic impact of the project is estimated to be $670 million in state and local tax revenues generated by the port industry and an estimated 4,500 jobs in state and local tax revenues generated by the port industry.

2. Tax Revenues: More than $21.9 billion in state and local tax revenues generated by the port industry and an estimated 4,500 jobs in state and local tax revenues generated by the port industry.

3. Time Savings: bloom: more than 90% of the time needed to travel from New Orleans to Baton Rouge, and a greater range of vessels to access those facilities.

The Corps' plan is a comprehensive solution that addresses the needs of the region and the state. It will help ensure that Louisiana remains a major transportation hub and a leader in the nation's transportation sector.
February 24, 1977

Colonel William Cooner
Commanding Officer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
PO Box 60271
New Orleans, LA 70189

Dear Colonel Cooner:

Canal Barge Company is a marine transportation company operating throughout the nation's inland waterways and canals. We are aware of the potential environmental damage that could result from the continued use of our community's waterways and canals. We are opposed to the construction of a lock at the industrial canal. This lock will create problems that will affect our company and the community in general.

Environmentalists are concerned about the potential damage to the environment. In addition, the construction of a lock will create problems for our company in terms of our ability to transport goods. Additionally, our company supports the need for lock replacement, but we oppose the construction of a lock at the industrial canal.

Sincerely,

President

Canal Barge Company
Col. William Conner  
District Engineer CLEMN-PD  
P.O. Box 50267  
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Col. Conner:

I first want to thank the Army Corps of Engineers for the work and effort that has been put into the proposed replacement of the Industrial Canal Lock. The age of the existing structure and the tremendous negative impact on industry tends as urgent message for this project to move forward. We as industry have in the past and are continuing to experience in excess of 24 hour delays and escalating lock breakdowns. The condition of this lock is impacting the economic stability of not only the New Orleans metropolitan area but also the Gulf Coast states of Florida, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. The uncertainty of the replacement of this lock has caused serious concerns over future industrial development. The only way to encourage this future development is by the placement of a new lock.

As a company that both operates and resides in the neighborhoods where this new lock will be placed we have a vested interest in both the community and industry concerns. While the neighborhoods and industry will experience traffic re-routing, noise, and other construction related situations, the mitigation money that the Corps of Engineers will build into this project offers the greatest likelihood for success. Along with this success comes the economic development that means all important jobs, road renewal, bridge replacement, and other infrastructure enhancements for the communities. This seems like a small price to pay for the benefits that will come from this project.

As a company who will be impacted economically as well as experience community inconvenience we urge the approval and immediate construction of a replacement lock. I respectfully request that this letter be included in the public comments for this very worthwhile project.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Capt. Robert F. Oy  
General Manager

cc: Sen. John Breaux  
Sen. Mary Landrieu  
Rep. Billy Tauzin  
Rep. William Jefferson  
Rep. Bob Livingston
February 18, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Re: Inner Harbor Navigation
Canal Lock Replacement Project

Dear Sir:

We are in favor of the locks because of economic impact and because they would help water-borne transportation in Louisiana.

Sincerely,

CHAFFE, McCALL, PHILLIPS,
TOLER & SARPY, L.L.P.

J. Dwight LeBlanc, Jr., APLC

JDL,Jr/alg
February 13, 1997

Colonel William L. Conner
Commander & District Engineer
New Orleans District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160

Dear Colonel Conner:

Colle Towing Company has operated tugs on the Mississippi Gulf Coast since 1878. Today, we operate a total of eighteen boats including ten dedicated to the delivery of 3,500,000 tons of coal annually to Port St. Joe, FL by way of the Industrial Locks and ICWW East. As a charter member of American Waterways Operators, and a member of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, we request that you include these written comments in the record on IHNC, due February 24, 1997.

On the surface it may appear to some neighborhood residents at or near the project site, that there are no direct benefits to the community. In fact, the adjacent residents and members along the entire route receive subtle benefits which directly affect their cost of living. Locally, numerous long-term construction jobs will be created, as well as, an increase in the number of permanent water related jobs. Without the removal and new construction of these antiquated locks, existing jobs supporting the local economy will in fact decrease over the coming years.

Regionally, the cost effectiveness of the project is even more significant. For example, barge traffic moving East out of New Orleans to Gulfport State Docks and Mississippi Power; Port of Pascagoula, Chevron USA, Mississippi Phosphate and International Paper Company; Ports of Mobile and Pensacola, and coal to Panama City, Florida, as well as, 1,200 coal barges Colle delivers annually to Port St. Joe, Florida for electrical power generation account for only some of the products and services provided by the existing waterway. All of this waterborne activity generates stable employment and product savings at the consumer level.

Comments noted.

Colle Tugs Since 1878
Although not publicized nationally, environmental incidents involving dangerous cargo moving by rail and road occur with greater frequency than that of water-related incidents. It is well known, however, that the likelihood of water-related accidents increases in areas of direct regulation and slow operation. As the anticipated system has contacts and personnel to accumulate in large numbers. To compound this problem, there are no longer adequate places to moor the tows while waiting locks turn. This situation exposes neighborhood residents to greater risk than a new lock system which would allow the efficient, safe transit of hazardous material tows.

It has been suggested by those opposing the HNC project that the effort is a waste of taxpayers' money and that only large shipping companies will profit. Nothing could be further from the truth. Barge companies, shipping companies and towboat operators simply pass along the increased transportation cost associated with excessive lock delays. These costs are eventually passed back to the product consumer, the very people opposing the project. Another irritant is that no benefits to be gained by the project as a whole.

Sincerely,

Charles McVey, Jr.

CMV/CM

cc: Mr. Ken Wells, ANW
    Mr. Doug Swenson, GICA
February 18th, 1997

Colonel William L. Conner
District Engineer
Corps of Engineers
New Orleans District
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

We wish to thank you and the Corps of Engineers for allowing Gulf South Marine to respond at the public hearing held on January 27, 1997.

Upon further review of the revised proposed replacement of the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock a/k/a Industrial Locks, we wish to state for the record that we are in full support of the project as outlined at the January 27th meeting in New Orleans.

Gulf South Marine is the owner and/or operator of inland towing vessels (pushboats) which three-quarters of our operation provides transportation services on the East Gulf of the I.C.W.W. Our vessels call upon such ports as Gulfport and Pascagoula, MS, Mobile, Alabama, Pensacola, Pascport, and Panama City, Florida, just to name a few. As a result of our company providing this service, we must use the Industrial Locks on a frequent basis. As a result, when the Industrial Locks are closed for repairs, or may have large delays, such as the fact at the locks today, the financial loss sustained by our company is substantial. We estimate that in 1996, Gulf South Marine loss in excess of $150,000.00 as a result of the closures and long delays.

Based upon the proposed new lock project, larger lock, etc., delays should be reduced and therefore, better services can and will be provided to the industry and the public.

Comments noted.
Colonel William L Conner  
District Engineer  
Corps of Engineers  
New Orleans District  
February 18th, 1997  
Page 2

With the construction of new bridges that cross the Industrial Canal, it seems that vehicular traffic will also benefit as well as the public and businesses in the area of the proposed projects.

Consequently, upon review of the entire project, not only from the marine aspect, but from private and business interest also, we wish to again state for the record our full support of the project as fully detailed in your report.

If you may be of any assistance concerning this matter please do not hesitate to contact us.

With kind regards, we remain,

Since epy,

GULF SOUTH MARINE TRANSPORTATION, INC.

By: [Signature]  

President

MPR, JR./kg
Colonel William Conner  
District Engineer  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O. Box 60267  
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267  

February 20, 1997  

Dear Colonel Conner,  

Please accept this letter as my support of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans. I am aware the various neighborhood organizations are opposed to this plan, and while I recognize there will be some auto traffic problems associated with this move, it is crucial for the economic survival of the Port.

We have to be forward thinking and we have to be willing to accept temporary discomfort in favor of the future benefit for our city and our port. I serve on numerous industry related boards and committees and am willing to help in any way I can. Please feel free to call upon me if there is anything I can do to help ensure approval of this important project.

Sincerely,  

Kathleen H. Norman  

Comments noted.
January 24, 1997

District Engineer, Celmn - PD.
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Re: Industrial Lock Replacement

Dear Sirs:

I have been employed in the Inland Towing Industry and have used the Industrial Lock regularly since 1965. Over the years, I have heard a lot of talk about replacing the Industrial Lock and the need to replace this Lock is well documented. The benefits far exceed the cost. Yet, over thirty-five years have passed and we are still discussing the replacement of the Industrial Lock.

Think about the thirty plus years of economic development resulting from improved marine traffic flows east of New Orleans that could have benefitted not just the local community in New Orleans, but, communities in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida and beyond.

Think about the countless days users have lost and the costly idle equipment waiting on this dilapidated and obsolete Lock.

Think about the money tax payers could have saved if this project had not been delayed so long.

Think about how much more it will cost tax payers to delay the decision again.

Do not ignore the local citizen's needs, but please replace the Industrial Lock now.

Very truly yours,

Preston N. Shuford
February 19, 1997

District Engineer, CELMD-PD
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner,

Replacement of the Industrial Lock in New Orleans should proceed because it is important for the economic health of the entire Gulf Coast. While the decision should be made with sensitivity to local conditions and local politics, the Corps should finally make its judgment based on facts and the long term effect of a decision to proceed or take no action.

The Corps has the numbers delineating the costs and benefits. You should exercise your judgment also recognizing the importance of this region to always keep improving its competitive edge versus other world markets. The Gulf Coast area competes in a worldwide marketplace and a failure to continually make incremental improvements in our competitiveness will finally leave us behind.

I trust you realize the inevitable delay that will result from, “starting all over again” at another location. The history of this project has been marred with one false start after another.

I strongly urge you to proceed with the replacement of the lock as currently proposed, not for the benefit of Hollywood Marine, but for the benefit of the manufacturers, farmers, energy producers and others that provide jobs and enrich the livelihood of Gulf Coast citizens.

Sincerely,

Les Sutton
Manager, Governmental Affairs

"THE RESPONSIBLE CARRIER"
February 24, 1997

District Engineer
CEILMS - FD
P.O. Box 62067
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Gentlemen:

Holnam, Inc. a major cement manufacturer with a large plant in Theodore, AL ships and receives material by water. Holnam would like to encourage the replacement of the Industrial Canal Lock at New Orleans with a new facility. The Industrial Lock is one of the five busiest locks in the country and a economic development tool for the Southeast United States.

Holnam's Theodore plant ships product by water through the Industrial Lock. This has enabled Holnam to expand its market share and offer its customers product at a competitive price due to the advantage of water transportation.

As already stated, Holnam is in favor of the plan to replace the present Industrial Lock with a new dependable lock. A new facility would enhance economic development throughout the Southeastern United States.

Sincerely,

Gary Ruff
Assistant Traffic Manager
January 31, 1997

Colonel William L. Conner  
District Engineer  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O. Box 80267  
New Orleans, LA 70169-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

Thank you for the opportunity which public hearing provided to express our concerns regarding the Industrial Lock Replacement Plan. Enclosed please find copies of the remarks made that evening by Mr. Dick Watson, Chairman of the Board of Directors of Holy Cross School, and myself. They may facilitate the transcription process.

Under separate cover, I shall submit a further written statement before the February 24 deadline so that it might be included in the public record.

Sincerely,

Brother Stephen V. Walsh, C.S.C., Ph.D.  
Headmaster
The Holy Cross men I speak for simply ask: after three years of discussion, what evidence is there that you have seriously considered alternatives to the two-year closure of the St. Claude Bridge? Is it not time to disregard conventional wisdom and to risk some "out of the box" thinking to address this critical issue? Are you really aware of the adverse consequences of your actions if you fail to act boldly?

It is one thing to learn to live "beyond the bridge" and now with these new plans we find that we are destined to "live behind a wall"--albeit a seawall--proposed to replace the graceful sloping levee on the southern end of our campus and beyond. Are you aware that this stretch is virtually the only part of the city's levee from which one can approach the river without crossing a railroad track? Have you taken into consideration that ours is a national historic neighborhood and this imposing wall erodes our historical integrity and robs of us of an asset that makes the neighborhood attractive to home owners? As Robert Frost suggests "fences do not good neighbors make." Trees and lawns on top do not soften the offensive nature of what is perceived to be a barrier by those of us destined to live at the bottom of your seawall. Will you please justify the necessity of extending this seawall down river from the canal?
Remarks Presented by Dick Watson
Public Hearing of Industrial Canal Lock Replacement Plan
January 27, 1997

My name is Dick Watson and I am speaking in my capacity as Chairman of the Board of Directors of Holy Cross School whose members have authorized me to speak in behalf of their concerns regarding the adverse affect of the IH-NC Lock Project on Holy Cross School.

As a native of New Orleans, one whose family—grandparents and parents—have lived in this neighborhood as residents and businessmen for more than 75 years, both my father and I were born and raised within a dozen blocks of this school and the locks. I have witnessed, and was an unwilling participant, in the physical and economic devastation inflicted by Hurricane Betsy, the negative economic repercussions, of which, are still felt today. I know first hand the real life frustration of living in this isolated neighborhood: bounded by the river and the canal, cut off from the city by draw bridges and separated from "The Parish" by both municipal boundaries and Jackson Barracks.

We may be an orphan but we have a history. For nearly 140 years Holy Cross—the religious congregation and the school—have been an anchor of stability. So much so, that this national historic district has taken Holy Cross as its name.

I should like to share with you a resolution passed by our Board on January 16, 1997:

While we appreciate the economic significance of the locks improvement project to the city, the region, the nation and the maritime industry, we likewise believe that it will have adverse economic impact on Holy Cross School and neighborhood which we do not believe has been adequately documented by the US Army Corps of Engineers in its various studies. Therefore, the Board of Directors of Holy Cross School respectfully request that the US Army Corps of Engineers initiate and fully fund an independent economic impact study to be conducted by a panel of local experts to quantify the adverse economic impact of this project on Holy Cross School and the Holy Cross Historic District. It is our belief that objective data from such a study is essential to assure the economic stability of Holy Cross School and the Holy Cross Historic Neighborhood and to provide adequate mitigation funds for appropriation and allocation.

The adverse economic impact of this project to Holy Cross is more far reaching than the loss of tuition income during the construction phase due to inconveniences and safety concerns. Holy Cross is the only all male middle and high school in the Greater New Orleans area. The loss of a fifth grader is the loss of a student for eight years.

In his remarks, Brother Stephen Walsh spoke of the family legacy of Holy Cross. Allow me to illustrate. My father was unable to attend Holy Cross but as his only child he could send me and I began in the seventh grade (the earliest grade at the time). As a result of the satisfaction expressed by my parents, my five (5) cousins all graduated from Holy Cross beginning in the fifth
grade. My two sons have since graduated and they plan to send their sons as well. Finally, my parents and I have recommended Holy Cross to at least five neighbor's sons who have either graduated or are currently enrolled each entering Holy Cross in the fifth grade.

Had I not attended Holy Cross, the economic impact to this school would have the loss of thirteen students over a thirty-year period. Quantitatively, the loss would have been 102 years of tuition payment or an amount in excess of $350,000 simply from the loss of one student. This is historical fact, not fiction. A five percent decline in enrollment could impact Holy Cross for the next 30 to 50 years with the economic consequence totaling millions of dollars.

Correspondingly, reduced enrollment will result in immediate loss of revenue for the transportation services, the cafeteria, bookstore, athletic gate receipts, band and choral concerts, and summer camps. Accompanying this all, there will very likely be an uncertainty about the future of this school which could erode donor confidence and result in a decrease in philanthropic giving.

Reduced enrollment could result in an associated economic loss to the Community in terms of reductions in jobs for teachers, administrators, coaches, bus drivers, cafeteria workers, maintenance, security and clerical staff. This project will create temporary jobs during the construction phase but may also cause the loss of permanent jobs.

None of these concerns of Holy Cross and other businesses located along the St. Claude Street corridor have been adequately addressed or documented in your report to date. For this reason we request an independent economic impact study.
February 20, 1997

Dear Colonel Conner:

At the public hearing on January 27, 1997, related to the Industrial Canal Lock Replacement Plan, the representatives of Holy Cross School and High School focused on the three themes:

1. The proposed two-year closure of the St. Claude Avenue Bridge beginning in the fall of 1997.
2. The potential impact of the bridge closure on the school and community.
3. The design and construction of the new bridge.

As a result of these discussions, we have decided to incorporate the following changes into the project:

- The opening date of the new bridge will be delayed by one year to 1998.
- Additional measures will be taken to mitigate the impact on students and residents during construction.
- The design will be reviewed to ensure it meets the needs of all stakeholders.

Finally, we urge the Corps of Engineers to consider the following suggestions:

- Conduct a comprehensive traffic study to assess the impact of the bridge closure on the surrounding area.
- Provide alternative transportation options for students and faculty during the closure.
- Ensure that the new bridge design is aesthetically pleasing and harmonious with the neighborhood.

We appreciate your attention to these important matters and look forward to working together to achieve the best possible outcome.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Colonel William L. Conner
District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 6087
New Orleans, LA 70160-0807

[Address]

[City, State ZIP Code]

[Phone Number]

[Email Address]
Page 3, Question 1. The HDLC has been involved in this project for a number of years. A representative of the HDLC participated in the Neighborhood Working Group meetings. Meetings were held with the Executive Director to discuss the project. Representatives of the HDLC were also involved in the tour of the project area in early 1992 with representatives of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Louisiana State Historic Preservation office. Both Marc Cooper and Laurnette Ernst, as representatives of the Bywater and Holy Cross neighborhood organizations and as members of the HDLC, have been informed of progress in planning this project.

The Preservation Resource Center is a private group with no official role in review of this project. Nevertheless, the Corps of Engineers sent them a copy of the proposed plans for their comment.

Page 3, Question 2. While the HDLC has no legal jurisdiction over Federal agencies, the Corps has consulted with the HDLC on this project over a number of years. The Corps plans to continue coordination with the HDLC to ensure that no adverse impacts result from any improvements to homes in the area.

Page 3, Question 3. Discussions with many local residents during an earlier phase of planning for this project indicated that neighborhood residents favored a floodwall instead of an enlarged levee. Levee expansion would have more serious impacts on houses near the levee and archaeological properties under the ground. The "fold down" floodwall was included in the final plan as a way to reduce potential impacts on the neighborhood and preserve the historical integrity. Most of the time the residents of the Holy Cross neighborhood will still have the same obstructed view that they currently have.
An Analysis of the Economic Impact of the Industrial Canal Lock Replacement Project on Holy Cross Middle School and High School

This report, prepared by the administrators of Holy Cross Middle School and High School at the direction of the Board of Directors, provides an assessment of the negative economic impact of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers plan to replace the locks of the Industrial Canal in New Orleans. At issue is the proposed two-year closure of the St. Claude Avenue Bridge scheduled for the eighth year of the construction project. Moreover, the Corps acknowledges that throughout the entire project a massive rerouting of vehicular traffic is necessary to accommodate construction. Both of these factors will have a debilitating effect on the enrollment and other economic generators of Holy Cross Middle School and High School.

*Establishing an Enrollment Baseline*

1. The current 1996-1997 enrollment for grades 5 through 12 located on the same campus is 785 students.

2. Presently, 65.7% of the students enrolled at Holy Cross live west of the Industrial Canal and depend on the St. Claude Avenue Bridge for access.

3. Twenty-nine percent of the students from the West Bank have already crossed the Crescent City Connection Bridge on their way to Holy Cross.

4. To get to Holy Cross all these students pass by our competitors: Shaw, Rummel, Jesuit, DeLaSalle and Brother Martin. Ours is a competitive marketplace. Let us also point out that each of these high schools includes the 8th grade. We already have evidence of one student who chose not to enroll for the coming year “because of the canal renovation” even though he would have enrolled and graduated before this construction project ever sees the light of day. The perception that the canal project will cut off Holy Cross is not alarmism; it is already a detrimental reality in our highly competitive marketplace.

5. Approximately 45%, of the students avail themselves of the Holy Cross Transportation system that runs sixteen routes with school-owned buses in five civil parishes. Some students are picked up as early as 6:30 a.m. An additional fifteen to thirty minutes of travel time would be untenable for many parents and students.
6. Holy Cross School was chartered 118 years ago and there is a strong family legacy with over half our students attending the same school as their great-grandfather, grandfather, father, brother(s), uncle(s), and cousin(s) have attended or who presently attend Holy Cross.

The Impact of Enrollment and Tuition Income

1. The construction project had taken effect at the beginning of this academic year, we might conservatively estimate that 10% of our new students would not have enrolled. If this were the case, we would see the following decline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th and 6th</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other boxes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130 students or a 17% decrease in enrollment.

2. Lost in 2007: Tuition increases over the past three years have ranged from 4% to 6%. If we assume the current rate of 4% per year, the cost of tuition for the 2020-2021 academic year would be $12,750. If we reduce the enrollment by 17%, the cost of tuition for each student would be $14,677.50 per year. This is an additional $1,927.50 per year.

3. True Long Term Loss: When we lose a customer, we lose them forever. He enrollment of a fifth-grade student in 2007 results in six years lost. This translates to a six-year loss of $75,675. This is an average of six dollars per year.

In 1997 dollars: 130 students @ $4,175 times six years equals $3,365,400

In 2007 dollars: 130 students @ $5,500 plus fees times six years is $4,622,700.
The projected annual loss over six years in current dollars is $54,770,400.

The amount is an 18.4% loss on the current annual budget of $2,662,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Loss of Support Income</th>
<th>Annual Loss of Transportation Income</th>
<th>Total Projected Annual Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>740,050</td>
<td>680,690</td>
<td>1,420,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240,910</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>306,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>80,600</td>
<td>141,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552,750</td>
<td>727,360</td>
<td>1,279,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary:

1. Annual loss of support income is $740,050 per year.
2. Annual loss of transportation income is $680,690 per year.
3. Total projected annual loss is $1,420,740 per year.

### Other Findings:

- Loss in personnel and support earnings of 17% of the current budget: $2,910 per year.
- Loss in transportation earnings: $560,000 per year.
- Annual loss of support income for the entire program: $2,470,000 per year.
The Intangible Impact

There are a variety of intangible factors that are difficult to calculate, but which will erode the quality and effectiveness of our educational program:

Erosion of our extracurricular programs in music and interscholastic and intramural athletics due to decreased enrollment or unwillingness of parents to have students involved after hours and driving in peak drive times which will be problematic as defined by the Corps itself. Add to this the loss of gate receipts for interscholastic athletics. We are a school dedicated to educating the whole man, and participation in these programs is considered integral to our mission.

We anticipate an erosion of parent participation in voluntary support activities or after hours activities such as grade report card counseling because of the inconvenience of travel to the school.

There will be an erosion of our family legacy due to diminished alumni confidence in the future of the school and a reluctance to recommend their alma mater to their families.

Erosion of faculty and staff morale: Anyone familiar with schools knows that kids intuitively pick their cues up from adults.

Erosion of effective management caused by the distractions of this project. One cannot underestimate the emotional and mental energy spent by administrators who are already presently distracted by having to explain and respond to hearsay and naysaying expressions such as, "You can't get there from here."

General Erosion of Confidence in the Future

Holy Cross and its historical antecedents have been in New Orleans since 1848. The school has been on the same site since 1859 and was chartered in 1879. The neighborhood which surrounds the school has chosen to call itself Holy Cross and is bounded by the canal which effectively cut it off from the city in the early part of this century. In fact, Ursuline Academy was dispossessed of its original site in 1912 to make way for the canal.

Clearly, Holy Cross Middle School / High School is an anchor in a neighborhood with declining property values. On Saturday, February 8, 1997, the real estate section of The Times Picayune carried an article with the headline "Home Values Surge." Yet the second lowest price per square foot reported was for the Lower Ninth Ward and this was a decline of 9.58% over 1995. Many of us believe that this is a direct result of this looming construction project and the prevailing uncertainties that surround it.

This is the environment in which we exist. It is a fact that in New Orleans east of Canal Street...
Street and west of the Orleans Parish line at Jackson Barracks in the St. Claude/Claiborne corridors there exist only three Catholic schools: Cathedral School in the French Quarter, St. David's Elementary and Holy Cross.

Over the past three years the Holy Cross school community has conscientiously increased its public service to the neighborhood with 60% of the faculty and staff joining 30% of the senior class painting and repairing nine homes (including five through Christmas in October) in the neighborhood. Furthermore, we helped build the new neighborhood playground and regularly participate in neighborhood clean up. We're doing our part.

The Bottom Line

It remains to be seen if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will now do its part to mitigate the true losses that this project will have on Holy Cross Middle School and High School. The Corps should accept our report as the basis for true mitigation.

If the Corps does not accept our report, it owes the Holy Cross men--785 students, their families, and the 8,000 alumni active in New Orleans area--a detailed explanation as to why it does not accept our analysis, and why it has chosen to proceed with a half-billion dollar project without first conducting an area-wide economic study.

Report prepared by Brother Stephen V. Walsh, C.S.C.
February 14, 1997
February 15, 1997

Colonel William Comer
District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Subject: Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement

Dear Colonel Comer:

After review of the article in the Times-Picayune and information received from the World Trade Center, IMC Consulting Engineers endorses the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans.

Obviously, a project of this magnitude will affect all of our lives, directly or indirectly. Some of us will experience inconvenience but all of us will benefit. The bottom line will result in a major improvement to our economy, both long and short term. Our Port needs this improvement and with it our potential for growth in World Trade will take a significant step forward.

As a business organization concerned with growth in the Port and the metropolitan area, along with our community's involvement in world trade, IMC is in support of the project.

Yours Very Truly,
IMC Consulting Engineers, Inc.

[Signature]

President

Comments noted.
Colonel William Conner  
District Engineer  
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
P. O. Box 60267  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

I am writing in connection with the replacement of the Industrial Canal locks. I have used the locks in a vessel and, of course, have crossed on the related bridges. A properly sized lock has been in need for as long as I can remember and seems to bog down in political problems which should not control this important interstate waterway. I urge the engineers to go forward with the replacement.

I am,

Yours very truly,

GD:ar

Comments noted.
February 28, 1997

Colonel William Conner
Commander, New Orleans District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70161-0267

RE: Industrial Canal Lock Replacement

Dear Colonel:

I am writing to you as the inland marine representative of Lafarge Corporation. Lafarge Corp. is a Reston, Virginia based construction materials company with considerable activities located along the U.S. Inland Waterways System. Among these activities are a large distribution facility located along the East Intercoastal Waterways and several ready mix concrete sites throughout the Greater New Orleans area.

Lafarge is in full support of the Army Corps of Engineers' current plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal. This lock, in its current state, creates tremendous delays in barges and ship traffic into and out of the Mississippi River channel. A new lock would greatly reduce traffic delays, improving shipping efficiencies therefore adding economic value to the City of New Orleans and the many businesses that operate along the waterways.

Lafarge is committed to rendering any support necessary to see that the Corps current plan for a new lock is implemented.

Respectfully,

LAFARGE CORPORATION

G. Michael Gordon
Director, Barge Operations

Comments noted.
March 3, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
New Orleans District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

Magnolia Marine Transport Co. (M.M.T.) a subsidiary of Exxon, Inc. operates a fleet of fifteen tugboats and sixty tank barges engaged in transportation of liquid petroleum products on both inland and coastal waterways. I am sending you this letter to express M.M.T.'s support for the planned replacement of the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, more commonly known as Industrial Lock.

Industrial Lock is part of a very important waterway for M.M.T. and many other towing companies. For towboats moving east and west between New Orleans and the eastern part of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, there is no alternate all-weather route that you can depend on year-round. With the existing lock in its present state of extreme wear from decades of service, the possibility of lock closures due to breakdown increases daily. In M.M.T.'s case, we supply several terminals in Alabama, Georgia and Florida that are accessible by sending the tow through Industrial Lock. Lock closures effect not only the economic well-being of M.M.T. but that of these many terminals as well. In some cases, these terminals cannot be supplied by truck, rail or reliable marine transportation, in which case, their existence is in jeopardy. In addition, support industries such as midstream leaders and suppliers are hurt by lock closures because they, too, are dependent on the marine transportation industry as their source of income.

One other point to consider regarding replacement of Industrial Lock should be the role the Lock plays in supporting industries located in the Southeast and how a new Lock could make the region more attractive to prospective industries. Many of the raw materials and fuels used by existing Southeastern industries are transported through Industrial Lock. A new Lock would make the region more attractive to future industries as inexpensive and reliable transportation such as marine transportation is often a determining factor in the decision to locate or expand a business.

I will close by again stating the M.M.T. supports the planned replacement of Industrial Lock as we believe a new Lock would be a true economic asset to the entire Southeast region. Thank you for allowing us to comment on this project.

Sincerely,

Emmett Neal
Director-Marine Operations
Mark’s Muffler Shop, Inc.

5229 St. Claude Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70117
(504) 944-7733

TO: R.H. Schroder, SR.
PLANNING DIVISION

I am writing concerning the new lock in the industrial canal. This project will have a direct economic slow down to my business. This is my business is across the bridge and from other mainland, difficult access to my business will substantially hurt sales. In the past when the Claiborne bridge was closed for 3 to 4 months for repair my sales were cut in half!

This is a 40 year established location. This project would interrupt my business in the critical years before my normal retirement.

Please keep me advised about comment from the time of removal the St. Claude and Claiborne bridges, or comment to purchase and establish a new business location if it would not affect me financially. I do own the property and the business.

THANK YOU

MARK E. BRINK
February 6, 1997

District Engineer
CLEMD-PD
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Sir,

Maryland Marine Inc. is involved in barging products along the Gulf Coast. In particular we carry chemicals and petrochemicals into and out of the New Orleans and Louisiana area. Our barges go through Industrial Locks on frequent basis while moving cargo into, out of and through Louisiana.

Industrial Lock is critical to the path of waterborne transportation. It is much more than a necessary obstacle to a shipper trying to move cargo. It is a consideration in the cost and benefit of locating facilities anywhere along the Gulf Coast. Our customers, producers of chemicals and refined petroleum products, would think twice about increasing their industry here if it had to rely on an old, unpredictable lock. Replacement is needed to provide a reliable, cost effective transportation route.

It's true that if you don't build the lock we will never know how many opportunities will be lost, how much growth will never happen and how many potential jobs will simply go somewhere else. But it is also true that we know this lock is generally viewed as a critical link along the Gulf Coast trade routes, a vital part of the economic development into the next century.

I urge you to support this project and do what will work for the good of us all.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Edward Wieliczkiewicz
Manager, Safety and
Environmental Affairs
February 13, 1977

Dear Colonel Conner:

For the past 52 years, our company has been in the business of leasing barges in the Port of New Orleans. For 40 of those years, our operations have been centered on the Industrial Canal near the referenced locks. Our field of business and geographic location give us a unique perspective on the need for this lock replacement.

An efficient and dependable lock between the Mississippi River and the GULF W is a necessity for the continued development of the local and regional economies. Commerce served by the Industrial Canal is vital to not only the local and regional economy but also national defense as well.

An efficient lock at this location could also encourage the commercial development of the Industrial Canal and the area, creating jobs and boosting the economy for both New Orleans East and St. Bernard Parish. The benefits of such a lock would be far-reaching.

Many companies have been reluctant to invest in waterfront facilities in this area due to the uncertainty associated with both the lock and the future of its proposed replacement.

It has been reported that some objection to the new lock involves concern about dangerous cargo. However, it has been reported that all dangerous cargo would move through the new locks are already moving through the old locks rather than risk being disturbed by the daily movement of river traffic.

I am confident that the location of the lock and the overall plan is designed to accommodate and protect the needs of the local community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Colonel William L. Conner
Commander and District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60307
New Orleans, LA 70160

Comments noted.

"The Barge People"
An argument has been advanced that a lock replacement is a "waste of tax payer's money." This ignores the fact that lowering the cost of transporting goods and commodities ultimately lowers costs to all consumers. What is truly a waste of taxpayer's money is the continued attempts to "patch" an outdated but vital navigation structure which may ultimately fail in a catastrophic way. When that happens, the proposed replacement lock will have to be built at a substantially higher emergency cost, the residents will have little to say concerning mitigation, and marine commerce will face unprecedented delays and costs until the project can be completed.

One must sympathize with objections to this project by local residents, to a point. Everyone has reason to fear disruption and the unknown. However, it appears that the Corps has made every reasonable effort to disseminate information and redesign this project to reduce, mitigate or eliminate local impact. The continued unequivocal objections to this project, in any form, has moved from negotiation to obstruction. It is time for the positive and larger local, state and national considerations to take their proper precedence against the unreasonable objections of a few, and for the project to move ahead.

Very truly yours,

John E. Graham
Executive Vice President

[Signature]
February 15, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

Please accept this letter in support of the plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans.

This Firm represents a large number of firms in the oil and gas industry as well as ship operators and exporters and importers who utilize the Port of New Orleans. All agree that the existing lock connecting the Industrial Canal (Inner Harbor Navigation Canal) with the Mississippi River is grossly inadequate and causes New Orleans to be in an unfavorable competitive position in international trade and also causes huge unneeded expenses to those engaged in intercoastal travel on the inland waterway system.

We urge approval of this project as soon as possible. We realize that there will be temporary inconvenience to thousands of citizens who reside below the Industrial Canal and may cause loss to those who live in the immediate vicinity of the locks. We strongly believe, however, that this relatively small number of citizens should be asked to make this sacrifice in return for the greater good which will result in increased trade to the City of New Orleans, increased employment to New Orleans citizens and overall benefits of lower transportation costs to the millions of United States citizens who utilize goods which move through the Port of New Orleans.

We urge early approval of this project.

MILLING, BENSON, WOODWARD, HILLYER, PIERSON & MILLER

By: NEAL D. HOBSON, ESQ.
February 21, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
PO Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Colonel Conner:

National Marine, Inc. fully endorses the USACE plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans. We are in full agreement with the Corps of Engineers' view that the lock is a major bottleneck to shipping on the national intracoastal transportation system.

NMI is a New Orleans-based marine transportation company that provides barge transportation and towing services throughout the national waterways. National Marine also provides freight and towing services to the Intracoastal East with over 420 boat and tow lockages through the Industrial Lock during 1996.

Replacing this lock with a more efficient and reliable structure will become not only a great improvement to all the marine industry, but a great regional economic stimulus as well.

I feel the Corps of Engineers has attempted to respond to the needs of the whole community, as well as to the lock users.

National Marine fully supports the efforts to replace the Industrial Canal Lock.

Sincerely,

Gary L. Reeves
Vice President
Transportation Services

GLR/mr
Dear Colonel,

We are writing in support of the Army Corps of Engineers' current plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal of the city of New Orleans. We have followed very closely the development of the lock and also have noted the impact of the lock on bordering areas. In addition, we have noted the impact of the lock on the local economic development of the city of New Orleans. The training of local businesses and residents has occupied a considerable amount of time and effort. We are pleased to have the opportunity to see the lock replaced.

This lock handles more traffic than any other lock in the country. This lock is a vital east-west and north-south link to the increased system of canals. The completion of this lock also has considerable benefit of the lock far outweigh the inconvenience and negative impact to the city of New Orleans and the residents residing alongside this waterway.

Comments noted.

VIA TELEFAX

February 17, 1997

Colonel William Comer
Commander, New Orleans District
D.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Navos Ship Agencies Inc.

Comments noted.
MR-Go and are involved in the barging of various cargoes to and from these ships.

The new lock will greatly reduce the delays and, therefore, help benefit the Louisiana maritime community which, in turn, will benefit the State. It is based on these facts whereby we fully support the Corps' plan for the new lock at the Industrial Canal in the Port of New Orleans.

Yours very truly,

NAVIOS SHIP AGENCIES INC.

[Signature]

Chris T. Kitsos
Vice President
February 17, 1997

Colonel William Conner  
District Engineer  
U.S Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O. Box 60267  
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Reference: Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock

Dear Colonel Conner:

This letter is to provide input and support for the Corps of Engineers plan to replace the inner harbor navigation canal lock on the “Industrial Canal” at New Orleans. As a corporation of professionals involved in design of major projects including marine infrastructure, we are intimately aware of the age limitations placed upon infrastructure components including highways, roads, bridges and complex facilities such as lockage which is heavily utilized in as rough an industry as marine shipping. The design process involves a balance between efficient, economical and safe designs, based on the design conditions existent at the time projects are planned, and considering those future conditions projected to exist during the life of the project. As part of the regional professional community, we have known for many years that the inner harbor navigation canal (IHNC) lock has performed well over its life span, but has become taxed heavily due to the volume of traffic and the changes in characteristics in barge traffic using the system. Barge transportation companies with whom we conduct business must deal daily with the restrictions in their logistic schedule caused by the size and operating characteristics of the IHNC lock.

Also as part of our corporate experience, we appreciate the need to accommodate the area residents in whose community the IHNC lock resides. We understand the Corps has studied extensively the options of alternate locations, and has concluded the best solution for the community, including state and intrastate users, is to upgrade the waterway at its current location rather than relocate to an alternate site. We know extensive investigation, research and study has underpinned this decision, and we are supportive of the conclusion.

In closing, we admire the thorough efforts of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in undertaking their studies, and we encourage your perseverance in working with the Holy Cross neighborhood, the Board of Commissioners at the Port of New Orleans and the numerous State and Federal agencies involved. We wish you success, steady achievement and progress in the goal to replace this vital part of our city’s infrastructure. Successfully carrying out its upgrade will provide benefits for the residents, businesses and users for many decades to come which will outpace the benefits gained to date from the existence of the original structure.

Comments noted.
We have attended the Holy Cross public information briefing, and participated in dialogue on the topic within the professional and business community. Should a specific forum be called in which our direct input would be useful, please let us know.

Very truly yours,

WALDEMAR S. NELSON AND COMPANY
Incorporated
Engineers and Architects

Charles W. Nelson, P.E.
President

CWN:bpp
February 20, 1997

Colonel William Conner  
District Engineer  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
P.O. Box 60267  
New Orleans, LA  70160-0267  

Re: Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement  

Dear Colonel Conner:

After review of the article in the Times-Picayune and information received from the World Trade Center, Sizeler Architects fully endorses the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans.

Obviously, a project of this magnitude will affect all of our lives, directly or indirectly. Some of us will experience inconvenience, but all of us will benefit. The bottom line will result in a major improvement to our economy, both long and short term. Our Port needs this improvement and with it our potential for growth in World Trade will take a significant step forward.

As a business organization concerned with growth in the Port and the metropolitan area, along with our community's involvement in world trade, Sizeler Architects is very much in support of the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

I.W. William Sizeler, AIA  
President  

IWS:vw
District Engineer
CELMD-PD
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Stolt-Nielsen is involved in shipping and barging products throughout the world. In particular, we barge chemicals and petrochemicals into and out of the New Orleans and Louisiana area. We use Industrial Locks on a frequent basis moving cargo into, out of and through Louisiana.

Industrial Lock is critical to the path of waterborne transportation. However, Industrial Lock goes much further than as a necessary obstacle to a shipper trying to move cargo. It is a consideration in the cost and benefit of locating facilities anywhere in the Gulf Coast. Our customers, producers of chemicals and refined petroleum products think twice about increasing their industry here if it has to rely on an old, unreliable lock. Replacing this lock would provide a reliable, inexpensive transportation route.

If you don’t build the lock, you will never know how many opportunities will be lost, how much growth will never happen, and how many potential jobs will simply go somewhere else. If you build this lock you are setting the course for economic development into the next century.

I urge you to support this project and do what will work for the good of all of us.

Regards,

[Signature]

William Boehm
Manager, Special Projects
and Planning

Comments noted.
February 19, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

RE: Inner Harbor Navigation Canal
Lock Replacement Project

Dear Colonel Conner:

In the mid-1970's, I was a member of the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans for approximately six years and served as its president for one year. During that tenure I became intimately aware of the above captioned project and worked very hard to assist its realization at that time. For many reasons, the project has languished over the past twenty years, but now is the time for it to be drawn into reality and tough decisions pertaining thereto should be made. As a private citizen, but one who has a strong interest in maritime activities and the general welfare of the city, state and region, I urge that you proceed with dispatch to get this project under way at the earliest possible time.

Most of the arguments that I have recently heard by neighborhood groups are looking toward big pay offs. I urge that fair and reasonable consideration be given to that but that some of the exorbitant demands that are being made be eliminated. The Mississippi River, the city, state and region all need this project to be completed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
March 3, 1997

Colonel William Conner
Commander, New Orleans District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

RE: Lock Replacement on the Industrial Canal

Dear Colonel Conner:

We are writing in support of the Army Corps of Engineers' current plan to replace the lock on the Industrial Canal. This project will dramatically improve traffic through the lock. This lock is vital to the movement of our limestone along the Gulf Coast. It will greatly reduce the delays and costs associated with passing through this area, which, in turn, will benefit the construction community, parish, and state with improved aggregate costs and services. The benefits of this lock replacement far outweigh the inconvenience and negative impact to the City of New Orleans and its residents next to the water.

Again, we support this lock replacement plan and recommend to the Louisiana congressional delegation that they support the funding required for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Edmund E. Redd
Sales Manager
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
FROM: GARY R. ALLEN
DATE: 2/1/97
RE: PROPOSED PROJECT TO WIDEN INDUSTRIAL CANAL

AS A RESIDENT OF THE HISTORIC HOLY CROSS DISTRICT (HCD) I WANT TO EXPRESS MY CONCERNS ABOUT THE PROPOSAL TO WIDEN THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL. THIS IS A FAR REACHING PROJECT THAT WILL AFFECT ALL THE HCD RESIDENTS FOR YEARS TO COME.

THE CURRENT PROPOSAL IN WHICH THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS (ACE) IS OFFERING "MITIGATION" FUNDS TO OFFSET THE SEVERE NEGATIVE IMPACT OF THE PROJECT IS SERIOUSLY SHORT SIGHTED BOTH IN SCOPE AND AMOUNT. THE AC OF E IS PROPOSING FUNDS TO ADDRESS SUCH ISSUES AS: TRAFFIC CONGESTION, NOISE / DUST POLLUTION, LOST TUTION TO THE HOLY CROSS SCHOOL, AND TO MAKE AESTHETIC IMPROVEMENTS (PARKS, ETC.). WHILE THESE ISSUES ARE CERTAINLY IMPORTANT THEY DO NOT AT ALL ADDRESS THE CRITICAL ISSUE OF REAL ESTATE VALUES.

AS ONE GENTLEMAN POINTED OUT AT THE RECENT MEETING AT THE HOLY CROSS SCHOOL, THE ARMY CORPS PROSPECTUS DOES NOT INCLUDE A PROJECTION OF THE IMPACT OF THIS PROJECT ON THE REAL ESTATE VALUES. IF THE ARMY CORPS IS SERIOUS IN ITS DESIRE TO "MITIGATE" THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND ISSUES MUST BE ADDRESSED:

1. WHAT "MITIGATION" WILL THERE BE FOR THOSE HOME OWNERS WHO NEED TO SELL THEIR HOMES AT SOME POINT DURING THE 8-10 YEARS OF CONSTRUCTION THAT IS PROPOSED? THE NEED TO SELL CAN ARISE FOR MANY REASONS:

   A. THE NOISE, DUST, TRAFFIC, ETC. PROVE TO BE INTOLERABLE AND A RESIDENT RELUCTANTLY NEEDS TO RELOCATE. THE MARKET VALUE OF HIS HOME, HOWEVER, HAS PLUMMETED AND HE CANNOT SELL HIS HOME.

   B. A HOMEOWNER IS FORCED TO RELOCATE TO FIND WORK ELSEWHERE ONLY TO FIND HE CANNOT SELL HIS HOME.

   C. A HOMEOWNER DIVORCES AND THE FAMILY NEEDS TO SELL THE HOME FOR ECONOMIC REASONS BUT CANNOT FIND A BUYER.

   D. A HOMEOWNER NEEDS TO RELOCATE BECAUSE HE FINDS THAT THE CRIME RATE HAS RISEN TO AN ALARMING RATE DUE TO THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT BUT FINDS HIS HOUSE UNSELLABLE.

Page 1, paras 2 and 3 - The complex forces that affect market value are numerous and cannot be isolated to a single issue such as the lock replacement project.

Page 1, number 1 - Many of the situations cited arise every day and have nothing to do with the Corps' project. (See answer above.)
2. WHAT MITIGATION WILL THERE BE FOR BUSINESS OWNERS OR LANDLORDS WHO FIND THAT THEIR BUSINESS IS DESTROYED AS A DIRECT RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

A. TRAFFIC RE-ROUTING OR THE PLACEMENT OF THE BRIDGE WILL SEVERELY IMPACT OR DESTROY SOME BUSINESSES.

B. TENANTS (WHO ARE NOT TIED TO THE AREA BY PROPERTY) WILL SIMPLY RELOCATE WHEN THE NOISE, DUST, TRAFFIC, OR CRIME BECOME TOO MUCH FOR THEM. THE LANDLORD WILL BE LEFT WITH EMPTY, DEVALUED PROPERTIES.

THE ARMY CORPS MUST REALIZE THAT HEAVY CONSTRUCTION, DUST, NOISE, AND TRAFFIC CONGESTION WILL HARDLY BE CONSIDERED A SELLING POINT TO ANY BUYER WHOSE ATTRACTIONS DURING THIS PERIOD. IN EFFECT, A BUYER'S MARKET WILL REIGN DURING THE COURSE OF THE PROJECT AND ANY HOME OWNER'S NEEDING TO SELL THEIR HOMES WILL BE TRAPPED. FURTHERMORE, THE NEGATIVE IMPACT TO REAL ESTATE VALUES IN THE CITIES OF THIS AREA. 

IN EFFECT, THE ARMY CORPS, IF THIS PROJECT IS APPROVED, WILL HAVE CREATED A SITUATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN WHEREIN THE LANDOWNERS WILL BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED AND WILL NOT BE COMPENSATED FOR THEIR LOSSES SHOULD THEY WISH TO RELOCATE OR NEED TO RELOCATE AT ANY TIME DURING THE PROJECT THEY WILL LIKELY BE TRAPPED BY THE ECONOMIC REALITY OF THEIR DEVALUED OR WORTHLESS PROPERTIES.

PROPOSAL:

ANY MITIGATION PLANS PROPOSED BY THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE REAL ESTATE VALUES IN THE HOLY CROSS HISTORIC DISTRICT AND OTHER AFFECTED NEIGHBORHOODS.

A PLAN SHOULD BE DEVELOPED WHEREBY THE RESIDENTS WHO WILL BE MOST AFFECTED BY THIS PROJECT WILL HAVE THE ASSURANCE THAT IF THEY SHOULD NEED TO SELL THEIR HOMES DURING THIS PERIOD THEY WILL BE COMPENSATED FOR ANY PROPERTY VALUE LOSSES CAUSED BY THE PROJECT.

FOR EXAMPLE, LET US SAY THAT BEFORE THE PROJECT A HOME IS APPRAISED AT $60,000 DOLLARS. FIVE YEARS LATER THE OWNER NEEDS TO SELL HIS HOME AND RELOCATE TO ANOTHER CITY, BUT FINDS THAT HIS HOUSE IS NOW WORTH ONLY $30,000 AND HE MAY HAVE TROUBLE FINDING A BUYER AT ANY THAT PRICE. WHY? THE HEAVY CONSTRUCTION, TRAFFIC CONGESTION, NOISE/DUST POLLUTION HAS KILLED THE HOUSING MARKET. WHY SHOULD THIS HOMEOWNER BE FORCED TO BEAR THE BURDEN OF THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL ULTIMATELY REAP HUGE PROFITS FOR OTHERS?
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(82) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(83) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(84) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(85) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(86) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(87) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(88) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(89) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(90) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(91) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(92) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(93) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(94) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(95) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(96) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(97) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(98) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(99) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.

(100) In support of the proposed nuclear weapons project.
Additional technical issues regarding establishing a lock at Violet:

(1) Vessels using the Mississippi River and proceeding to the Industrial Canal would involve approximately 115 miles with approximately 1 hour for locking time. This would include a 5 mile connecting canal between the river at Violet and MR-GO.

Presently the MR-GO passage is 75 miles. This of course don’t include passage time of vessels at sea being required on frequent occasions (one ship master told me “1/3 of the time”) of having to proceed to South Pass Entrance to board a pilot or to proceed to South Pass to disembark the pilot. This can be due to adverse weather conditions and other numerous reasons. Ships coming from Gulfport or Pascagoula and then proceeding to the east can involve as much as 80 miles additional distance when they are required to board and disembark a pilot at South Pass.

(2) The river has a 45 feet depth channel vs MR-GO which has to be continually dredged to maintain 36 feet depth and it is not uncommon to have draft restrictions on MR-GO. This is a serious problem for vessels who have loaded to say 35 feet and then when arriving off MR-GO or South Pass finds the depth of channel has been restricted to 33 feet.

(3) A operator and marinera’s dream would be to have a twin chamber lock with each chamber being 150 feet width and approximately 1200 feet length and 50 feet depth. This will allow large container ships and bulk carriers to use facilities in the Industrial Canal Complex including Michoud Canal for possibly the next hundred years. The proposed St. Bernard Canal, MR-GO and the Intracoastal Waterway would have to be deepened with the foremost problem being alongside the docks. You dredge to 50 feet alongside a dock that has been designed for 36 feet depth you can be faced with an unstable footing underneath the dock aprons. This is an engineering problem and has been solved in other ports throughout the world.

(4) To keep banks from caving in bulkheading the banks of the canal may be the answer. I have been through the Cape Cod, C & D and Kiel Canals. As I recall there was some bulkheading in each. The MR-GO and Intracoastal section of this waterway should possibly be bulkheaded as well. The Panama Canal has rock banks and with SPEED LIMITS enforced the banks remain stable.
The main advantage of a lift chamber lock is that vessels can proceed at a faster rate of speed. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates. A vessel can be loaded and unloaded while proceeding through the lock, and the lock can be used to control the rate of flow through the locks by controlling the gates.
(3) However from an overall navigation and environmental standpoint in my opinion the proposed IHNC Lock Replacement site does not answer the maritime industry and general public needs. An alternate site should be addressed.

Thanks for allowing me to offer these comments. Please don't throw rocks at Lucienna and I after we leave. We are lovers and not fighters and only trying to present what we think is in the best interest of the Port of New Orleans and most of all the general public who we dearly love.

Respectfully submitted by:

[Signature]

Dean Bruch

Phone (504) 737-4499
December 10, 1996

The Times-Picayune
3800 Howard Avenue
New Orleans, La. 70140

ATTN: Letters to the Editor  Sent Via FAX: (504) - 826-3369

I read with interest your excellent T-P article of Dec. 8th entitled "Industrial Upgrade."

I am in accord with State Rep. Sherman Copelin. "Let them put in a new lock somewhere else." The most practical solution to this problem is build a new lock as planned over 30 years ago at the Violet site.

A lock in the Violet area with a channel over to the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet will allow the environmental disaster known as the MR-GO to be closed below the intersection of the lock channel with the outlet and stop the salt water intrusion into Lake Pontchartrain. Additionally this will eliminate vessels wake from destroying the remainder of the marsh land in lower St. Bernard Parish.

It is true there will be an outcry from the maritime industry and their allies, the Port of New Orleans, the Louisiana DOTD, the Corps of Engineers, the Coast Guard and last but not least the St. Bernard Council. Unfortunately this group has consistently through the years refused to establish common sense speed limits in the MR-GO channel which has greatly contributed to these eroding wetlands.

With a new lock/channel built and establishing SPEED LIMITS to protect the banks in this lock channel it will add to the transit time of vessels between sea and the Industrial Canal complex but I see this as a viable alternative to this bottleneck. The positive side for constructing a lock at Violet is it can be completed in a shorter time frame and create less environmental impact for residents in the area than in Orleans Parish.

Leaving the Industrial Canal lock in place and having a large ship/barge lock with twin chambers at Violet will certainly enhance navigation flow between the Mississippi River and the Intracoastal Waterway as well as the Industrial Canal complex. However, I don't believe the citizens of St. Bernard should allow the Violet Lock to be constructed without closure of the MR-GO to protect the lock channel waters from salt water intrusion and area flooding.

Dean Bruch
316 Southern Road
River Ridge, La. 70123-2069

Phone: (504) 737-4499

12/11/96 Note to T-P staff-Attn: Joe.

This is my third and final recommended draft if you choose to print this letter. It will make waves in St. Bernard Parish but this group should share the misery with the rest of us when it comes to accepting needed waterway commerce development. Protecting the wetlands? Closure of the MR-GO with protection levees is the answer. Capt. Dean
Sirs:
I am in favor of the proposed Inner Harbor Canal Lock Program.
Our unique location as a crossroads of river and intracoastal waterway, with central access to the Gulf of Mexico, will always an economic asset to this area, therefore we should not allow our maritime facilities to deteriorate, or to become outdated.
I am a resident of Chalmette, and as a frequent user of both the St.Claude and Judge Seeber bridges, I would like to see the Florida Ave. high rise bridge plans be stepped up to alleviate future traffic congestion.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Ejnar G. Christiansen
Captain Ejnar G. Christiansen
(Retired Master, Lykes Bros. S.S. Co.)
27 Carroll Drive
Chalmette, LA 70043

A new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Avenue for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal. The Corps does not have the authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of years. It has been assumed that a new bridge there is in part of without project condition. In addition, a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue has been included with the same lane capacity as the existing bridge, thereby eliminating the need to close that bridge during construction. Only a couple of weeks closure will be required at Claiborne Avenue by using innovative construction methods.
QUESTIONS FOR THE CORPS - JANUARY 27, 1997

   A. Why did I not receive notice of this hearing until January 14?
   B. When were the notices sent out?
   C. How many notices were mailed?
   D. How may notices were sent out with the wrong date: "Wed. Jan 27..."?
   E. How many corrected notices were sent out and when? [I never got one.]
   F. How many churches are there within a six block radius of the project and how many notices were sent to churches in time to publish in parish newsletters? When were
   G. How many and to whom were notices sent to Neighborhood and civic association presidents, secretaries, board members, or newsletter editors within the project area? The Bywater Neighborhood Association newsletter has been a monthly for over 21 years and did not receive any notice of the public meeting
   H. Why did you schedule a hearing for the last day of the public review period?
   I. The District Engineer conducted a meeting for which notice received listed the "Huddle" at Holy Cross as the meeting room for a January 22 meeting of the Neighborhood Working group. Since the meeting was not held at the huddle, what individual was posted to direct people to the correct meeting room?
   J. Why was the notice of the meeting only published once in the Times Picayune newspaper?
   K. Which other media were contacted and on what date?

2. Tree relocation:
   A. Where in the EIS is the transplanting of the trees alongside the existing lock addressed?
   B. Why did the District Engineer purport to have raised the issue of saving these trees and receive the response that they would probably end up "firewood," when in fact the BNA raised this issue years ago?
   C. Why are the trees alongside the canal dying?
   D. Has the Corps done an inventory and assessment of these trees and is there a program in place to fertilize, prune, and protect these trees until they might be relocated if the project moves forward?
   E. Has the Corps consulted with Disney about their successful transplant of mature live oaks in Orlando [a project brought to their attention by BNA] and if so, why was this report not shared with the Neighborhood Working Group?

3. Coast Guard Station relocation:
   A. How many jobs may be transferred out of our neighborhood if the station is relocated?
   B. What will be the net loss to our neighborhood economy, i.e. restaurants, lumber/hardware and other stores if this station is moved?
4. SPCA
   A. Has the Society for the Prevention to the Cruelty to Animals at 1319 Japonica [in the shadow of the locks] been notified of this proposed project?
   B. What affect will this project have on the SPCA?
5. Union Training facility
   A. Has Mr. Ivy Gaudet, the head of the Carpenter’s Millwright and Piledriver Apprenticeship and Training Program at 1215 Japonica Street [in the shadow of the locks] been notified of this project?
   B. What affect will this project have on their operations?
6. USPS
   A. Has the Bywater station of the United States Postal Service [in the shadow of the existing St. Claude Avenue bridge ramps] been notified?
   B. What impact on their operations will this project bring to pass?
   C. Will our mail service be adversely affected?
7. Municipal Assessor
   A. Has Mr Errol Williams, the Assessor for the 3rd Municipal District, which covers both sides of the Canal been notified of this project?
   A. Has Mr. Williams, whose job it is to assess property value for the purposes of City and State ad valorem taxes been asked his professional opinion about the effects of this project on area property values?
8. District C Representation
   A. Why has the District C Councilman, which covers the west side of the Industria Canal in Bywater, historically been excluded from the planning process though it has included other elected officials?
9. Net improvements
   A. Page 25 of the Draft Evaluation Report Mitigation Plan states that “The New Orleans District does not expect net improvements to result” If this is so why should we be partners for this project?
   B. Why did the Project Engineer seemed surprised at this attribution when it was raised at the January 22 Neighborhood Working Group meeting?
   C. The same point was raised on May 2, 1995 as documented in the minutes page 4, last paragraph, referring to the April Draft of the mitigation plan. Does the Corps just record minutes and then ignore questions or points raised therein?
10. Mass Transit
   A. What good will rails be on the new St. Claude bridge as proposed if there is no system of Mass transit incorporated in the mitigation plan?
   B. Does the Corps really think that “If we build it, they will come?”
February 20, 1997

Col. William Canners
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 60267
New Orleans, La 70160-0267

Dear Col. Canners:

I am against the expansion of the Industrial Canal Lock. Enough information has been done on the environmental impact of this project on the surrounding community and on the marine life of the Mississippi River and the Gulf Outlet. Both will be affected drastically. Has the Corps of Engineers made provisions for any kind of chemical or marine disaster? No such information was provided in the Mitigation plan recently presented. The Holy Cross neighborhood borders the Mississippi River and the Industrial Canal and, every day, I see fuel and chemical barges waiting to proceed into the locks. This is a disaster waiting to happen. You want to make the canal bigger to provide access for large container ships along with increasing barge traffic but provide no plans for emergency situations.

We have already seen an environmental mess made by man in Lake Pontchartrain. How will you insure that this type of situation does not come up during and after construction? You do not address the effect the building will have on the marine life at all. How can you plan to expand the canal and not address these issues?

I go fishing by way of Bayou Bienvenu and see the erosion done to the Industrial canal and surrounding areas. Have you taken in consideration the erosion problems that will occur with this expansion? Were there any studies done to insure that there will not be a negative impact on the surrounding areas both land and water? Usually, plans are made after a disaster happens not before. We have seen the result after a barge hit the Clairborne Bridge several years ago of how emergency situations are handled after the fact. This is not acceptable if you plan to cut off this area for such a long period of time. You need to address plans for land emergency and marine emergency situations and make provisions for them. Has this been done yet?

Page 1, para 1. Comment on ship traffic

Page 1, para 2, and 3. Bottom sediments have been analyzed. There are no documented hazardous materials. The soils and sediments to be excavated and disposed have been extensively tested for the presence of contaminants. The testing analyses are summarized in the EIS and described in great detail in the Engineering Investigations (Appendix B), the HTRW Appendix (Appendix C), and the Environmental Appendix (Appendix D). Our investigations show that the soil on the east bank of the IHC, below 3 feet in depth, which is to be excavated for the bypass channel, contains only background levels of contaminants. This is the only material to note for marsh development.

Page 1, para 4. Erosion problems in the Industrial canal have been considered in the design of the project. The project as planned, will provide a safer, more efficient canal for waterway traffic. With the inclusion of a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue and the reduction of the closure time at Clairborne Avenue to a couple of weeks, the impacts to vehicular traffic should be minimized.
Also, what happens to the land people own due to erosion? Are there provisions to compensate the landowners for the property destroyed or changed by erosion due to the expansion of the Industrial Canal Plan? Erosion of the Intercostal Canal is a big problem that is currently being ignored. Are these concerns going to be ignored by the Corps of Engineers, also? I do not oppose the expansion of the Industrial Canal. This plan will destroy both my home and recreational environments without any kind of considerations. Nothing in your plan has addressed these important issues.

Sincerely,

Eugene Cummings, Sr.
4902 Dauphine Street
New Orleans, La 70117
2. Why are payments to local governments and municipalities (RTA) included as part of the community facilities under the Claiborne Avenue Bridge project? These items are typically considered in the total project costs as part of the community's investment in infrastructure. These facilities include parks, schools, libraries, and other public amenities that benefit the community.

3. In your opinion, what are the critical factors that will determine the success of the Claiborne Avenue Bridge project? The success of the project depends on several factors, including the quality of the construction, the implementation of community involvement, and the overall community satisfaction with the project.

4. Regarding the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP), how will the distribution of funds be determined? The NRP funds will be distributed based on the needs and priorities identified by the community, as well as the availability of funds.

5. What are the potential negative impacts of the Claiborne Avenue Bridge project on the local community? The potential negative impacts include increased traffic, noise pollution, and potential displacement of businesses and residents. However, these impacts can be mitigated through careful planning and community involvement.

6. Finally, how will the Claiborne Avenue Bridge project be monitored to ensure its success? The project will be monitored through regular progress reports, community meetings, and feedback from stakeholders. Additionally, independent evaluators will assess the project's impact on the community.

7. What role will the community play in the development of the Claiborne Avenue Bridge project? The community will play an active role in the development of the project through participation in decision-making processes, providing input on project design, and monitoring the progress of the project.

8. What are the potential benefits of the Claiborne Avenue Bridge project for the local community? The potential benefits include improved traffic flow, increased economic development, and enhanced transportation access for residents and businesses.

9. What measures will be taken to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Claiborne Avenue Bridge project? The project will be designed with sustainability in mind, incorporating environmentally friendly materials and energy-efficient technologies. Additionally, community education programs will be implemented to promote environmentally conscious behaviors and practices.
The language, format and content of the documents presented to the community as well as the blatant turnaround made by the Port and the USACE "it doesn't matter what the community wants, its in the national interest" all are reminiscent of the urban renewal programs of the 40's and 50's. The bureaucratic arrogance and contempt for cultures other than its own betrayed during this process are undoing the goodwill generated through years of working together with the neighborhood on this project. Pat Galwey, Ron Brinson, Joe D'cherry, Les Waguespack have all worked with us and respected and even helped our community (Holy Cross). Yet all that is about to be destroyed by megalomaniacal, insensitive, grasping bureaucracy.
DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BILLY TauZIN

I AM A 35 YEAR OLD FATHER OF 3 SONS AND HUSBAND. BOTH MY SELF AND MY WIFE WORK VERY HARD TO MAKE ENDS MEET. WE VOTE AT EVERY ELECTION. IN REFERENCE TO THE ARMY CORP OF ENGINEER'S PROPOSED PROJECT TO REPLACE THE TWO INDUSTRIAL CANAL BRIDGES AND MODERNIZING THE CANAL AND LOCK SYSTEM. THE PROPOSED COST OF THIS PROJECT IS $111 MILLION DOLLARS AND WILL PROBABLY DOUBLE OR TRIPLE BY THE TIME IT IS COMPLETED THE TAX PAYERS NEED A BREAK AND WE DESERVE ONE. BOTH MY SELF AND MY WIFE ARE AGAINST THIS PROJECT. THE MONEY COULD BE BETTER SPENT ON PORTS SOUTH OF NEW ORLEANS WHERE THERE ARE NO LOCKS, THE RIVER IS DEEPER AND WIDER, ALSO CLOSER TO THE GULF. LET'S REMEMBER THE RECENT ACCIDENT THAT HAPPENED AT THE RIVER WALK DUE TO RIVER TRAFFIC AT THE PORT OF NEW ORLEANS.

ANOTHER MULTIBILLION DOLLAR PROJECT THAT COMES TO MIND IS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET. IT IS MY OPINION THAT THE TAX PAYERS HAVE NOT RECEIVED A GOOD RETURN ON THEIR INVESTMENT. TO PUT IT SIMPLY, IT WAS A BAD BUY. IT HAS DESTROYED HABITATS, A COMMUNITY (OLD SHELL BEACH) AND INCREASED THE AREA'S VULNERABILITY TO HURRICANES. IT SHOULD BE CLOSED. A FRESHWATER DIVERSION PROJECT AT BAYOU BIENVENUE WOULD HELP TO RESTORE THIS AREA.

THANK YOU

Louis Duscher
Dally Duscher

CC: MR. CONWAY
SENATOR LYNN DEAN
PARISH PRESIDENT CHARLIE PONSTEIN
DISTRICT COUNCILMAN CLAY COSSE
COUNCILWOMAN NITA HUTTER

Comments noted.
February 22, 1996

After much involvement, thought and consideration, I find I must vote against the Industrial Canal Lock Project, New Orleans, Orleans Parish, Louisiana.

Explanations and Reasons:

Having the experience of analogous conditions and being aware of those in the area with similar problems, especially children.

I come to the conclusion and am firmly convinced the hardships of the environmental conditions that will occur in the neighborhood during the construction period, which all people will have to endure, could cause overwhelming stress to some with respiratory problems, which in many instances would be fatal.

Further, I feel a great injustice will be done to many (if a survey is not conducted) in this affected area, to find the number of persons who suffer from diabetes, high blood pressure, heart and other respiratory problems, etc.

Lawrence J. Ernst

Re: [Signature]

[Signature]

New Orleans, Orleans Parish, Louisiana
Dear Sir:

From the very first time I heard the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet was going to be dredged, I felt and still feel that the whole project was one of the biggest mistakes the Corp of Engineers and the Federal Government brought upon all the residents of this area.

We were told by the Federal authorities that the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet was a very much needed project. It was supposed to open up new warf and business spaces along this outlet, but in the span of 30 years hardly any of this has become a reality. It has caused tremendous erosion problems all along the outlet from the Gulf to the Intracoastal Waterway literally eating up miles & miles of our Marshland.

The Mississippi River Gulf Outlet has brought a great deal of "fear" in the minds and hearts of most of the residents of the lower ninth ward. Best example was Hurricane Betsy in September of 1965. The water came straight up the MRGO into the Industrial Canal where we were told the levee broke near the Claiborne Bridge. We had about 11 feet of water at Florida Ave. to about 1 foot on Dauphine St. It extended from the Industrial Canal well into St. Bernard Parish.

Comments noted.
I hope that every effort will be made to eliminate any inconvenience to all residents of the areas located east of the Industrial Canal before the inception of this project. Failure to do so will have a devastating impact on property values as well as our present lifestyles.

Sincerely,

Edwin A. Heine

Edwin A. Heine
201 Genet Drive
Arabi LA 70032
(504) 566-3471

cc: Congressman Billy Tauzin
    President Charles Ponstein
Dear Colored Commerce,

[Signature]

[Address]
New Orleans, Louisiana
300+ North 700th Street
Suite 2100
909 Poquer Street

Colored Commerce

[Date]
February 20, 1997

Col. William Comers
Corps of Engineers
P. O. Box 60267
New Orleans, La 70160-0267

RE: Replacement of the Industrial Canal Locks

Dear Col. Comers:

My family has already been victimized by the building of the original Industrial Canal and now, you wish to continue this tragedy for a second generation. My mother's life was changed dramatically in 1913 when, her family was uprooted, their property taken, and they had to move in with relatives while they searched for a place to live so waterborne commerce could be improved. My entire life has been lived under the shadow of an "expansion of the Industrial Canal" project and I a sick and tired of this threat hanging over my neighborhood. Living with the feeling that one day I may be "displaced" like my Mother has not been pleasant. It is an albatross always circling, creating insecurity, distrust and neglect in our area. Will you explain to my Mother IF she has to be uprooted again at 90 years old?

Your Mitigation Plan states that "the precise impacts of combined project impacts upon real estate prices is difficult to ascertain, if not possible." I maintain that you have not addressed the "property values" issue at all in your proposal. From as far back as 1977, the Corps of Engineers has undertaken planning studies. We have pictures of two replacement proposals dated 1977 and 1979 showing two different renditions, so do not tell me there hasn't been a negative effect on our neighborhood just by publishing these proposals. Explain to me how you cannot place a value on our property now, when you have been studying and reporting on "expanding the Canal" for over 20 years. Did you check the property values over the last 20 years and investigate them? - NOT ALL DETERIORATION CAN BE BLAMED ON HURRICANE BENTY - According to a UNG study, the Holy Cross neighborhood has remained a viable community for the past 10 years and has not seen as much a decline as other parts of New Orleans after the oil bust of the 1980's. Have you undertaken such as study?

Your statement "The area will probably continue in its declining trend without the project and without any major effort by the City of New Orleans or the State of Louisiana" is not supported in fact. Community plans and economic development are being done at this time. Your project details revitalisation project in effect now. How can we tell people to invest time and money in this area with the constant threat of declining property values brought on by another Corps of Engineers proposal for the
destruction of our neighborhood? What compensation does the Corps of Engineers have in place for this? Your plan does not detail enough information to compensate for the TOTAL ISOLATION that will result from being CUT OFF from the rest of the City of New Orleans. Do you plan to document how city services will continue to be provided for the residents below the Industrial Canal during the YEARS of construction?

There are a lot of questions that need to be addressed in the Mitigation Plan before it is submitted to Washington, D.C.

The BOTTOM LINE IS THIS: The Quinn-Hogan Family has already been affected by this once and DO NOT WISH TO ENDURE ANY PART OF THIS EXPANSION PLAN. You have built a monstracity once and wish to compound this mistake by making it bigger?

Sincerely,

Mary Clare Hogan
Mrs. Clare Quinn Hogan
4916 Dauphine Street
New Orleans, La 70117

Page 2 - As a result of the comments from the public made at the public meeting, we have included a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue. This would provide for the continuous flow of traffic during construction of the project. City services are expected to continue at their current levels.

Other comments noted.
Dear Colonel Connor,

Here is a list of questions submitted for your response in consideration of this project:

1. Delays to Barge Traffic
   a. How are delays to barge traffic logged?
   b. Are these figures based on actual record keeping and if so what are these records? (Or are they merely estimates, and if so, on what documentary evidence are they based?)
   c. "Delays to navigation at the IHNC lock are significant, averaging between 6.3 and 16.2 hours per lockage, annually, since 1984." What accounts for the variance in these delays?
   d. From what data is this information compiled? Are the written records estimates?

2. Looking at other solutions
   a. What other traffic management studies has the Port undertaken with the Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers and river pilots to increase efficiency and productivity of the industrial canal before assuming that physical increases of size were necessary?
   b. What innovative measures and state of the art techniques in communications have the managers of traffic and facilities brought to bear on the problems of traffic prior to proposing expansion of the canal?
   c. How has the problem been addressed prior to the current proposal?
   d. Is it possible these water traffic problems could be solved in some other way?

3. Location of the IHNC site
   a. "The IHNC site is located in a densely populated urban area." Is it suitable, appropriate and prudent for a water project of such magnitude and such predictable dire impact to be undertaken and situated in such an area?
   b. Is the Port particularly when the Corps has by its own admission little experience in urban projects and this one is opposed by a great and growing number of residents of the affected area?
   c. Due to the complex nature of this densely populated urban area, are there not very likely to be other major costs and impacts which have not been included in your report? Is it fair to dismiss the impact on residential real estate as mere "perception" of residents?
   d. Is it scientific to predict that real estate value will rise without evidence?
   e. Is it true that Corps of Engineers projects primarily take place in areas where the people are African American and how accurate? Is Rudolph Wise's letter to the editor (Times Picayune, December 1995), he asks if racism forms a guiding principle for the Corps? Col Clow replies in Feb 1996 that such a statement is "ridiculous". But is it? Is this response appropriate to a serious question?

Re: IHNC Draft Proposal MRGO

Page 1, item 1a. Information to calculate delays to barge traffic is logged at the lock. This information is then electronically transmitted to the Navigation Data Center (NDC) in Washington, DC, where it is maintained in the Lock Performance Monitoring System (LPMS) database. Statistics are published monthly for selected key locks, including the IHNC Lock, and annually for all locks.

b. Lock personnel record the actual time each vessel arrives at the lock and the time it starts its approach into the lock. The difference in these times represent the delay time for each vessel.

c. The variance in average delay per tow at the IHNC Lock is explained by the variation in the Mississippi River stages, which causes fluctuations in lockage times, variations in vessel traffic patterns, and lock downtime.

d. This data is compiled from information recorded by lock personnel.

Page 1, item 2a. IHNC Lock operates under a 'ready-to-serve' policy. This requires all towing requiring the vessels to move the additional tow segments through the lock chamber. This practice significantly increases lock efficiency.

b. Congestion problems at IHNC Lock are not the result of poor communication.

c. Prior investigations have considered lock replacement at various sites and "small scale" improvements such as replacement of St. Claude Avenue Bridge.

d. Replacing the existing St. Claude Avenue Bridge with a 700 foot bridge and removing bridge curvatures at St. Claude Avenue, Claiborne Avenue, and Florida Avenue Bridge, were considered as an alternative to lock replacement.

Page 1, item 3a. The project as revised after the public review period does not have the dire impacts.

b. The Corps has lots of experience in developing projects in urban areas. However, the type of projects is not normally a lock project.

c. It is possible, but not likely, that some impacts could be more severe than originally envisioned. Real estate property values are a very sensitive issue. The complex forces that impact market values are numerous and cannot be isolated to a single issue such as the lock replacement study. It is possible that some impacts could be more severe than envisioned.

Continued coordination will help ensure that impacts are offset.

d. Real estate values have generally risen in the New Orleans metropolitan area in the last few years. This was illustrated in a recent article in the Times Picayune talking about real estate values.

e. It is untrue that Corps projects take place primarily in areas where the people are primarily African-Americans.
f. At issue is not the personal feelings of Corps members but consistent verifiable project selection choices and impact, resting disproportionately on these populations. When these project plans are viewed with demographic overlays, it is evident that the Corps habitually selects positive for race. Whether these populations are intentionally targeted is beside the point. What is at issue is the fact that this pattern is consistent and does disproportionate harm to the community from the selection process overall.

4. Public Review

a. Have local residents been given full opportunity to ask questions and express their views about the project? Have there been many publicly announced meetings for comment on this draft proposal?

b. Does the accelerated timetable actually pursued by the Corps seem appropriate for achieving required public response?

c. Is one official public hearing on a week’s notice sufficient for a project in a densely populated urban area? Are affected parties, who live in this area more likely to have many differing time schedules, constraints and responsibilities making it more difficult to respond at one public hearing? Is this compounded by having this small response opportunity’s clock ticking during the less than two months that include the Christmas holidays, Sugar Bowl, Superbowl and Mardi Gras, and when great numbers of residents are working in the service industry so critical to the welfare of the larger community?

d. To expect the people here in this neighborhood to have adequate time to protect their own interest in this time period is unrealistic and a deprivation of basic civil right. Is it possible that decision makers are so driven by the need to complete this proposal that they cannot see this root injustice? Does the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in the pursuit of challenges and achievement for the nation, heap up challenges for the less well heeled and itself stray from the constitutional footing of Jefferson?

e. Is it true that the extension of the response period from February 27 to March 3, 1997, was granted not because of the many requests from this neighborhood but of people from St Bernard Parish and their congressmen?

f. Rights of the area residents aside, is it appropriate that the project itself be forced to consider all possible project costs that bear upon it directly and indirectly which the public will be called upon to assume?

g. Does stewardship of this project imply that the public interest be protected by giving sufficient time and opportunity to discover the greatest range of liabilities as well as the positive implications of the project?

h. Has appropriate consideration and weight been given to the years of community building and investment in homes, businesses, institutions in the neighborhoods adjacent to the canal? How many homes were expropriated for the original project when this neighborhood was a hundred years old? What happened to the Agnew Boys Home? Was not the Orleans Academy there a hundred years before the canal opened on its expropriated property? Have the neighborhoods adjacent to the canal been given sufficient and real opportunity to comment on the gradual expansion over the years from a simple barge canal to being a part of the intercoastal waterway system, pass from local to federal control, and then become a part of MROG?

i. Has the surrounding community grown during this eighty years and matured itself and its historic, cultural, physical and other resources? Is it so strange these neighborhoods are lost to give up what they and their forebears have spent their lives building and which they may wish to share with and pass down to coming generations? Can neighborhood development be overlooked as it time and space have stood still for the community while the canal expands as it in a vacuum?

j. Has the canal reached maximum size already, crowded against the neighborhood so that any move by one is destructive to the other? How prudent is it to consider such heavy public investment in a canal that already has no real expansion room without destroying the investments of whole communities of long standing and that has a design life of a mere 50 years? After all this what?

k. Perhaps it would be more prudent to consider the closing of this canal than its upgrading if it is indeed so obsolete?

f. The information presented here is unfounded and there is no basis for such allegations.

Page 2, Item 4a. Yes. In January 1995, two meetings were held to solicit comments on the community impact mitigation plan. In addition, a local project office was established to allow for input from local residents. The official public coordination period on the draft document which includes the EIS was extended to 90 days which is considerably more time than normally allowed.

b. Yes

c. The notice was widely distributed. The media was contacted and did present information about the public meeting. The 3 months allowed for public review of the document was significantly longer than the normal time allowed and required by law and administrative regulations.

d. No.

e. Yes.

f. All quantified costs have been included in the economic analysis and the benefit-to-cost ratio. The analysis also includes mitigation costs designed to account for unquantified project impacts.

g. The extended planning period for the project and public participation in developing the mitigation plan has allowed sufficient time to identify the greatest range of project liabilities.

h. Yes, appropriate consideration has been given to the institutions in the adjacent neighborhoods. Impacts relating to the original canal and lock project are not relevant to the current project.

(Note: No i.)

j. The report recognizes the recent improvements in the neighborhoods.

k. No.

l. This would not be a prudent action.
(7) Impact on Residential Real Estate
   a. Why has the decrease in property values, both real and anticipated, experienced in neighborhoods adjacent to the canal been characterized as “perception” rather than factual? This is not beyond the grasp of financial forecasting; it is certainly documentable statistically. Any study claiming to study the neighborhood impact should have undertaken this straight off. It has certainly been complained about long and loud enough by residents here. Wherever publicity about the canal comes, residential real estate drops. The real estate section does not broach this most obvious critical issue except to say that no impact is expected on landowners!
   b. Declining residential property values translates into a tremendous project cost which, by being ignored, is shifted to the neighborhood, isn’t it? This is not really fair, is it?
   c. Do you really expect that citizens who have been uncompensated for years for loss in property value would be willing to endure a clearly predictable but unanticipated further decline in values? These neighborhoods we are not willing to bear this financial brunt of the project and this, in addition to safety concerns, is a large part of the opposition to this endless canal project. We have lived with it for eighty years and more. The value of homes is all most people here have in savings for the future. This project needs to account for the fluctuation in that value and be willing to designate this as a real project cost.
   d. Would you be willing to buy a home and live here among us now, and even more, with this project?

(8) Threat to the Neighbors
   a. Widening and deepening the canal to increase the volume and type of water traffic poses very real and further threat to adjacent neighborhoods, does it not? This is true certainly of anticipated traffic in the canal, and canals like it on the river as well. Having bigger ships and more traffic in the river heading in and out of the canal along one of the busiest and most congested stretches of river increases the long term risk to neighborhoods along the water exponentially. Yet this study says that because the proposed project site is already a large canal there will be no increase in risk?
   b. What about the Bright Field? Suppose this ship had not been stopped by crushing the Riverwalk? Had it continued adrift downstream at a good speed with the same trajectory it would have cut deeply into the levees along Holy Cross. And this was a ship full of grain. Suppose it were full of ammonium nitrate or chlorates?
   c. Suppose in the fog such ships and barges of even higher traffic crash into the levee or wharf or into each other? Is the risk no greater?
   d. For the people living in the neighborhoods here this increase in the type and volume of river traffic is an unacceptable risk. Your proposal to turn a small barge canal into a major watercourse laden with a much higher probability of dangerous incidents does not even discuss this truly major impact. Because of the danger to our families’ lives, health and well-being we must consider it and reject this project because of it. There is no amount of compensation that can take care of this risk. No one would feel safe leaving their children and spouses home while they went into the city to work. And compensation after the fact of a disaster would never be sufficient. Would you expect us to let you build this so we could say “I told you so” after an accident which took our lives and those of our families? Would you ever respect us if we let you keep this risk on us?
   e. The dam at the Riverwalk, caused by the Bright Field hitting a structure that was built in barn’s way. The Holy Cross neighborhood, however, was not built in barn’s way. It far precedes the canal and these “improvements,” which by scooping out the old barge channel for deeper wider water, bring harm way to us increasingly. This is judged highly imprudent and unacceptable by the residents of this community.
   f. Using green sheet pilings and building up an ugly concrete seawall to lessen this risk is just as unacceptable, not only highlighting that risk, but essentially diminishing one of the most salient enjoyment and pride of the neighborhood and this, the open levees at Holy Cross.
   g. Would you—yourselves and yours—come to live among us now with confidence, even without fearing the long and ugly shadow of this proposal?
The Mitigation Plan

a. The Briggs Amendment mandates consultation with the neighborhoods affected by the project to ensure that the project is not only feasible but also beneficial to the community. The amendment requires the project to be reviewed and approved by the neighborhood residents, and any changes to the project must be agreed upon by all parties involved.

b. The HCMA mitigation plan is designed to ensure that the project is not only feasible but also beneficial to the community. The plan includes a series of measures to mitigate the potential impacts of the project on the environment and the community.

c. The process was temporarily stopped at the request of the Federal Highway Administration. The process was halted to allow for more detailed studies of the engineering design of the project. These studies were conducted to ensure that the project would not have any adverse impacts on the environment or the community.

d. It was never intended or stated that the neighborhood would have "voluntary power on this project." The Federal Highway Administration has the authority to determine the design and implementation of the project.

e. The Florida Avenue-Highland Road bridge will not impact the Highland Road Neighborhood. The bridge is located on the other side of the road, and there is no direct connection between the two areas.

f. Further predictions of coal exploitation account for the environmental impact of the coal burning plant that move coal through the FRNC.
Residents not keen about Industrial Canal plans

New Orleans
Re: the lead story on the front page of your Money section Oct. 25 by John Hall, titled "The Corps vision for the Industrial Canal," and a second article by Mr. Hall Nov. 7, titled "Changing of the guard."

One can only wonder why such a story is published in The Times-Picayune on the proposed Industrial Canal lock replacement plan, only the vision of the Port of New Orleans and the Army Corps of Engineers is cited.

As a concerned citizen, founder of the Holy Cross Community Development Corporation, business owner and property owner/resident of the Holy Cross Neighborhood, I can assure you that the vision of the more than 5,000 people who live and work in the four-mile footprint of this proposed project is very different.

This lock replacement plan is being submitted for approval despite the vociferous mandate that all concerned parties have a voice at the decision-making table, which has not been achieved to date. This proposal is being submitted for approval despite the facts listed below.

Never has a construction project of this magnitude been proposed in a fully developed urban community. Once approved, the property values of homes, businesses and institutions in the footprint of this project would be zero for at least a decade. Attempting to massage a household located in the middle of a construction site would be next to impossible.

The maritime industry stands to gain tremendous profits of minimally $1 million a day when the project is completed, but taxpayer dollars will undermine the so-called "mitigation plan." There's no equity in that.

When viewed on a cost-benefit basis, the maritime industry makes the money while the community is affected, in addition to paying the cost of the project, must suffer the consequences noted below.

The so-called "benefits" of a mitigation plan offered to the communities affected in the amount of some $30 million worth of "community projects" would not justify such costs to residents as decreases in property values, traffic congestion, noise and disruption of lifestyles.

Why devastate the three fully developed communities of Holy Cross, Bywater and the Lower Ninth Ward for the benefit of private industry?

Finally, why spend $30 million of taxpayers' money on so-called mitigation efforts at the Industrial Canal site when the mitigation cost at the Violet site would be only $1 million and the same results could be achieved?

Could the fact that the majority of property owners in the footprint of this proposed project are low- and moderate-income African-Americans have something to do with the targeting of this area as opposed to the Violet site?

Rudolph L. Muse
President, Holy Cross Community Development Corp.
Corps answers criticism of Industrial Canal plan

New Orleans

Re: the Nov. 29 letter from Rodolph J. Muse on the Industrial Canal Lock Replacement Study.

Mr. Muse, a 9th Ward resident involved in the discussions regarding the proposal for replacing the Industrial Canal lock for several years, made a number of comments that may reflect some misconceptions in the community about the work proposed at the lock. I would like to correct some of those assertions and advocate continued dialogue among the many people and organizations involved in this proposed project.

The "draft" evaluation report for this study was submitted to our headquarters in Washington to provide them with the opportunity to ensure that it reflects current federal policies and obtain their approval to release the draft report to the public for the official coordination period. After this period, the final report will be submitted with a recommendation that would reflect the views and comments of all concerned parties.

It is incorrect to say that all concerned parties have not had a voice in the formulation of the plans for this proposed project. We and the Port of New Orleans have worked closely with a neighborhood working group composed of local residents, representatives of the neighborhood associations and community development corporations in the area, local elected officials, the Regional Planning Commission, and city of New Orleans officials. This group has been meeting off and on since August 1981, with Mr. Muse being an active participant since that time.

I look forward to attending the meeting of the City Council subcommittee on Monday, March 16, at 5 p.m., and urge others to do the same. The meeting will be held at the City Hall board conference room located on the first floor of the William Frick Government Complex.

Kenneth H. Clay
President
Many object to Industrial Canal expansion plan

We have read in The Times-Picayune the revelation of precisely that which will occur if the Industrial Canal is expanded. Furthermore, we have seen the picture of the proposed expansion in the newspaper. The picture does not depict the full extent of the damage that will be done.

The expansion of the Industrial Canal will result in the flooding of many homes and businesses. The Army Corps of Engineers, who are responsible for the expansion, have stated that the floodwaters will rise to the level of the Industrial Canal. This means that homes and businesses located along the canal will be flooded.

We urge the Army Corps of Engineers to reconsider the proposed expansion of the Industrial Canal. The flooding of homes and businesses will cause significant damage and will result in the displacement of many people. We believe that there are alternative solutions to the problem of flooding along the Industrial Canal that do not involve the expansion of the canal.

We appeal to the Army Corps of Engineers to consider the well-being of the people who live and work along the Industrial Canal. The proposed expansion is not in the best interest of the community and should not be approved.

We urge the Army Corps of Engineers to take into account the concerns of the people who live and work along the Industrial Canal. The proposed expansion is not in the best interest of the community and should not be approved.
BUILT IN HARM'S WAY

Beneath the feet of passing tourists on the New Orleans riverfront is a solid concrete wall that marks the end of land and the beginning of water. Only one significant riverfront development disregards that line: the Riverwalk/Hilton Riverside Hotel complex, smashed by a freighter eight days ago. As developers rush to rebuild, some warn that it's time to pull back onto solid ground.

BY COLEMAN WARNER
Staff writer

Fifteen years ago, as architects for the 1984 world's fair toyed with the idea of building pavilions on Mississippi River barges tied up alongside the fair site, port director Edward Reed pitched a fit about the threat posed by passing river traffic.
A DANGEROUS PASSAGE
The Bright Field taught New Orleansians the dangers of mixing people with shipping. But those who pilot the giant vessels through the city have long known the river's treacheries. See A-6

SINCE 1983, 50 vessels have smashed into Port of New Orleans wharves. Most abused wharf: Gov. Nicholls Street, hit seven times.

The Bright Field devoured part of the Paydros Street Wharf and smashed several stores in the Riverwalk eight days ago. Some planners say the shopping center is built too far into the river channel.

STAFF PHOTO BY G. ANDREW BOYD

SHIP REGISTRY RULES may thwart safety. See F-4

“This appears to offer a realistic margin of protection,” Reed wrote in 1968, a year after his retirement.

But in establishing that safety guideline, one glaring

STAFF GRAPHIC BY SUSAN KOENIG

Toy story: Giveaway evokes 8,500 smiles

By BRUCE NOLAN
Staff writer

the boxes of dolls and gleaming on chromed toy motorcycles. Doll houses and
I am writing this because I am afraid. I am afraid of what will happen to the Holy Cross neighborhood if you choose to begin construction on the canal. The Holy Cross is a neighborhood like no other in the city. I moved here only a year and a half ago and felt so welcome I bought a house right down the street in September. I know neighbors five and eight blocks away, as well as everyone on my block. There is a sense of peace and history about this place. Several of my neighbors have lived here their entire lives. If the canal project goes through, many of these neighbors have already told me they would leave: be it due to the noise, hassle, or safety. The renters would definitely all move, leaving most of the houses vacant. We all are aware of the amount of crime, drugs, and danger involved in areas of high vacancy. Some, such as myself, would be unable to leave and would be left to deal with the fear and dangers of this once friendly neighborhood turned looting bin. I would be afraid to leave my house, and afraid to come home if away. A life in constant fear is not a life.

This area of the levee, around the lower 9th ward, is the only area where you can walk in the grass and watch the boats. People bring their children from all over the city to fish and play along the levee each day after school. This is the only safe outdoor experience many of these kids have. Please don’t take it away.

I also fear the rebuilding of the canal on another level, besides my immediate safety and quality of life. This fear is the deepening of the canal. Many statements were made during the hearing about Hurricane Betsy and how the canal waters reacted to the hurricane. I fear the increased amount of water force in the HRNC would be a danger to all the surrounding communities.

I chose the Holy Cross area as my home for it’s peaceful and friendly nature which is so rare in cities these days. I feel that the atmosphere is as much a part of it’s historic nature as the architecture, perhaps even more so as it becomes more rare. To disturb this area would be a great crime.

Sincerely,

Kathleen W. Kraus
2127 St. Maurice Avenue  
New Orleans, La. 70117  
March 2, 1997

Colonel William L. Conner  
Dept. of the Army  
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express my opinion regarding the Lock Replacement Project. I am in agreement with the project to this extent, 1. that the project address the issue of having the proposed high-rise accessible to residents of the Lower Ninth Ward. The high-rise is proposed for Florida Avenue. 2. I am in favor of the project if it will provide job training, good paying wages, and meaningful employment, with preference given to residents in this area.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

David Leonard
607 Flood Street  
New Orleans, La. 70117  
February 20, 1987  

Col. William Conner  
District Engineer  
Army Corp of Engineers  
7500 Prytania  
New Orleans, La.  

Dear Col. Conner:

When a barge hit the Claiborne Ave. bridge, the court declared the Dock Board neither owns the bridge nor were they responsible for protecting it. Now the Corp of Engineers wants to undertake another construction project for Dock Board replacing the St. Claude bridge with a high rise. Those of us who live in the neighborhood and who must use this bridge are expected to endure for ten years during this project. If another accident occurs, we, the tax payers may have to bear the burden.

The scheme to widen the industrial canal already has a corrosive effect. The threat of this project is eroding the value of the adjacent properties and will ruin us as a neighborhood. Just the shadow of this scheme has repelled potential home owners and prevented this historic neighborhood from attaining economic recovery. Furthermore, I don't believe that the St. Claude bridge is prone to malfunction, it is usually the only one working. We do not need a new bridge.

Other sites for the locks are possible but the Dock Board wants here. Active members of the maritime industry serve on the New Orleans Dock Board because of an exemption in the ethics code. It is the only port authority in the state that allows such an exemption. The members of the Holy Cross neighborhood have negotiated in good faith with the Corp of Engineers but the Corp continues to force this issue over our protests.

Your predecessor Col. Colw predicted benefits of $380,000 daily in for the navigation industry. The $30,000 as mitigation tactic is completely self serving and, since the strategy will pay for itself in under 100 days, it's not even a fair offer.

Yours truly,

Linda Michon  


Paragraph 1. The current plan is to replace the St. Claude bridge with a low-rise bridge, not a high-rise. A temporary bridge will allow the needed construction activity to take place without landslide vehicular outages.

Paragraph 3. The choice of locating the proposed lock at its current location was made because it is best from both economic and environmental standpoints.

Paragraph 4. The mitigation plan contains $33 million worth of activities, not $30,000.
February 23, 1997

Mr. Conner
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160

Dear Mr. Conner,

Thank you for getting an extension on the expansion of the Industrial Canal Project which includes Claiborne St. and St. Claude Avenue bridges. I will get right to the point of my letter.

First, I extremely object to the lower level bridge that is planned for St. Claude Avenue at this time. We are coming into the 21st Century with a model bridge that will be obsolete before it started. This is the same style bridge that is there now and it should have been replaced 35 years ago. Not even a small vessel will be able to go through this bridge without it opening. THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE OTHER THAN PUTTING A HIGHER BRIDGE AT THIS LOCATION IS TO PUT A HIGH RISE BRIDGE OVER THE FLORIDA AVENUE BRIDGE THAT WOULD TIE INTO I-510 AND WOULD BE SUFFICIENT FOR HEAVY LARGE SHIP TRAFFIC.

Second, I strongly object to the dumping of ANY waste dredged from the Industrial Canal being dumped into any area of St. Bernard Parish. Since the revenue from this project will be going to Orleans Parish, they should get the dredged mud also. Orleans Parish has the New Orleans East area, dump it there. Or maybe there is a location on the West Bank. But St. Bernard Parish doesn't want it no matter how low the level of contamination.

Whenever a project is planned for lower New Orleans, the St. Bernard Parish area generally gets the short end of the stick. IT IS TIME WE HAVE A POLITICIAN WHO WILL STAND UP FOR WHAT IS BEST FOR ST. BERNARD PARISH.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Para 2. The proposed low rise bridge at St. Claude Avenue was a compromise agreed on while working with the neighborhood working group. It meets the needs of the project as designed.

A new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Avenue for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal. The Corps does not have the authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of yeras. It has been assumed that a new bridge there is in part of without project condition. In addition, a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue has been included with the same lane capacity as the existing bridge, thereby eliminating the need to close that bridge during construction. Only a couple of weeks closure will be required at Claiborne Avenue by using innovative construction methods.

Para 3. The limits of the disposal area have been refined and all material will be placed in existing disposal areas in Orleans Parish.
February 28, 1997

District Engineer
CELMM-ED
P. O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70180-0267

Re: Widening of the Industrial Canal & Lock Replacement

To Whom It Should Concern:

I am a homeowner as well as business owner in the Holy Cross Neighborhood adjacent to the Industrial Canal. My husband and I moved to this area because of its proximity to the river with its wide open natural grass levee and pastoral setting - a quiet oasis in an urban environment. Just this morning I walked along the river and watched the fog chase itself across the levee. Peaceful, serene, special, unique and certainly worth preserving! We raised our teenaged daughter here, restored our home to its original splendor and started what is now a thriving business.

I am adamantly opposed to the widening of the Industrial Canal. The need for a new lock and wider canal to facilitate waterborne commerce is not in question - the need to accomplish this end at the Industrial Canal site is!!! A construction project of this size and duration in the midst of a heavily populated, residential area will have an irreversible effect on our community. It would severely erode our quality of life and level of health and safety; render our property values null and void; decrease and/or eradicate our business income; and bring to a screeching halt our ongoing neighborhood revitalization!

If Congress (as it has been known to do) does authorize this nonsensical project, my concerns are many:

1. Has a construction project of this magnitude ever been accomplished in such a heavily populated urban area? If so, where? When? What was the resulting effect on the vibrancy of that community? What was the impact socially, economically and environmentally? Was there a mitigation plan and was it carried out?

2. Have you established a concrete, graphic time line to illustrate the beginning and end of each stage of this project with exact dates?

1. Large scale projects in urban areas are not unheard of. Right here in the New Orleans area, the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity Hurricane Protection project has been under construction since the mid-1960s. Other projects have been constructed, or are under construction, in phases like Dallas, Chicago, and Kansas City. In some instances yes. No other project has mitigation to the extent that this project does.

2. No. The time line will become solidified when Congress approves the project and appropriates money for construction.
3) Have you considered the growth in population and its effect on traffic flow during this project?

4) How will the traffic congestion be alleviated?

5) Have you consulted with police, fire and medical facilities about access to our neighborhoods in cases of emergency? Has a plan been devised to insure immediate, life-saving, unhindered response?

6) Have you consulted with emergency evacuation agencies to devise a plan for evacuation of all of St. Bernard and the Lower Ninth Ward utilizing only one bridge in the event of a hurricane?

7) It is suggested in your video that the St. Claude Bridge has broken down a lot and is in need of replacement. In the 19 years that I have lived in this neighborhood, I can only remember a few occasions when the bridge has been closed for routine maintenance. How many times has the St. Claude Bridge actually been closed due to malfunctioning?

8) Will the proposed Florida Avenue Bridge actually be built prior to the start of construction? Will it be connected to the I-510?

9) What plan has been devised to deal with the continued (and I'm sure increased due to this project) erosion of the MRGO Canal?

10) What toxic substances lie at the bottom of the Industrial Canal which may be disturbed during construction and pose a safety hazard to our community? What plan is in place to deal with such a hazard?

11) Is there a threat of breaks in the levee as a result of construction and heavy equipment?

12) With the advent of deep draft shipping after the widening of the Canal, what is to prevent another "Riverwalk" disaster in our own backyard?

13) Will the magnificent oak trees be replaced if they die after transplanting? Is transplanting really feasible?

14) Why does a flood wall have to be constructed? Flood walls obscure the view of the river and the access thereto, attract graffiti, trash and crime. Is there an alternative which would retain the natural earthen levee?
15) How will landlords be compensated for loss of rental income as tenants move to other areas of the city due to this project's inconvenience and health and safety issues?

16) How will owners who wish to sell their property be compensated when they cannot sell due to reduction in property values and health and safety issues created by this project?

17) How will the community be compensated for the damage already done to its development by the cloud of uncertainty created by this proposed project?

18) How can you even think of causing such upheaval in the lives of so many people?

Seek another, more viable location for this project and we'll all win!

Hoping for rational thought to prevail, I am waiting...

Kathy Muse

15. Specific details of compensation will be determined when the implementation plan is developed by the community based partnering agreement.

16 and 17. Studies indicate that there are no health and safety issues created by the project.

We have recognized the perception of local residents that real estate values have been negatively impacted and have considered this in formulating the final mitigation plan.

18. The revised construction plan including a temporary bridge at St. Claude and innovative construction of the Claiborne Avenue bridge will minimize the disruption to the community.
February 23, 1997

Mr. Conner
O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA  70160

Dear MR. Conner,

Thank you for getting an extension on the expansion of the Industrial Canal Project which includes Claiborne St. and St. Claude Avenue bridges. I will get right to the point of my letter.

First, I extremely object to the lower level bridge that is planned for St. Claude Avenue at this time. We are coming into the 21st Century with a model bridge that will be obsolete before it started. This is the same style bridge that is there now and it should have been replaced 35 years ago. Not even a small vessel will be able to go through this bridge without it opening. THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE OTHER THAN PUTTING A HIGHER BRIDGE AT THIS LOCATION IS TO PUT A HIGH RISE BRIDGE OVER THE FLORIDA AVENUE BRIDGE THAT WOULD TIE INTO I-510 AND WOULD BE SUFFICIENT FOR HEAVY LARGE SHIP TRAFFIC.

Second, I strongly object to the dumping of ANY waste dredged from the Industrial Canal being dumped into any area of St. Bernard Parish. Since the revenue from this project will be going to Orleans Parish, they should get the dredged mud also. Orleans Parish has the New Orleans East area, dump it there. Or maybe there is a location on the West Bank. But St. Bernard Parish doesn't want it no matter how low the level of contamination.

Whenever a project is planned for lower New Orleans, the St. Bernard Parish area generally gets the short end of the stick. IT IS TIME WE HAVE A POLITICIAN WHO WILL STAND UP FOR WHAT IS BEST FOR ST. BERNARD PARISH.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

M. Thomas and Patricia Olsen
8501 Benjamin St.
Chalmette, LA  70043

Para 2. The proposed low rise bridge at St. Claude Avenue was a compromise agreed on while working with the neighborhood working group. It meets the needs of the project as designed.

A new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Avenue for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal. The Corps does not have the authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of years. It has been assumed that a new bridge there is in part of without project condition. In addition, a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue has not been included with the same lane capacity as the existing bridge, thereby eliminating the need to close that bridge during construction. Only a couple of weeks closure will be required at Claiborne Avenue by using innovative construction methods.

Para 3. The limits of the disposal area have been refined and all material will be placed in existing disposal areas in Orleans Parish.
February 23, 1997

Mr. Conner
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160

Dear Mr. Conner,

Thank you for getting an extension on the expansion of the Industrial Canal Project which includes Claiborne St. and St. Claude Avenue bridges. I will get right to the point of my letter.

First, I extremely object to the lower level bridge that is planned for St. Claude Avenue at this time. We are coming into the 21st Century with a model bridge that will be obsolete before it started. This is the same style bridge that is there now and it should have been replaced 35 years ago. Not even a small vessel will be able to go through this bridge without it opening. THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE OTHER THAN PUTTING A HIGHER BRIDGE AT THIS LOCATION IS TO PUT A HIGH RISE BRIDGE OVER THE FLORIDA AVENUE BRIDGE THAT WOULD TIE INTO I-510 AND WOULD BE SUFFICIENT FOR HEAVY LARGE SHIP TRAFFIC.

Second, I strongly object to the dumping of ANY waste dredged from the Industrial Canal being dumped into any area of St. Bernard Parish. Since the revenue from this project will be going to Orleans Parish, they should get the dredged mud also. Orleans Parish has the New Orleans East area, dump it there. Or maybe there is a location on the West Bank. But St. Bernard Parish doesn't want it no matter how low the level of contamination.

Whenever a project is planned for lower New Orleans, the St. Bernard Parish area generally gets the short end of the stick. IT IS TIME WE HAVE A POLITICIAN WHO WILL STAND UP FOR WHAT IS BEST FOR ST. BERNARD PARISH.

Yours truly,

Troy and Denise Ohlsen
3116 Mayflower Dr.
Meraux, LA 70075

Para 2. The proposed low rise bridge at St. Claude Avenue was a compromise agreed on while working with the neighborhood working group. It meets the needs of the project as designed.

A new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Avenue for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal. The Corps does not have the authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of years. It has been assumed that a new bridge there is in part of without project condition. In addition, a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue has been included with the same lane capacity as the existing bridge thereby eliminating the need to close that bridge during construction. Only a couple of weaks closure will be required at Claiborne Avenue by using innovative construction methods.

Para 3. The limits of the disposal area have been refined and all material will be placed in existing disposal areas in Orleans Parish.
Gentlemen,

This is in reference to the proposed replacement of the inner harbor navigation industrial canal lock.

I understand the high level bridge at Florida Avenue is already in the Louisiana state's plans. Hopefully, they are planning for the highway to extend to Paris Road in Chalmette, L.A. (note: This has been in the state's plan since before the WPA days.)

The intercostal waterway barge traffic is increasing all the time, which will mean the St. Claude Avenue low level bridge will have to be raised more often and for a longer time. About 50 years ago, before the Claiborne Avenue bridge was built, almost every candidate for state governor promised a tunnel under the industrial canal at St. Claude Avenue. If it was possible to build a tunnel 50 years ago—why not now? During the building of the tunnel, there would be no delay in traffic, as they could use the St. Claude Avenue neutral ground as excess to the building of the tunnel. A high level bridge would be acceptable at St. Claude Avenue, but would be more inconvenient while constructing.

There are tunnels under the intercostal waterways at the Harvey and Algiers canals. (It was possible to build a tunnel to cross the English Channel.) These two canals join together further west. The Harvey Canal locks are used for barge traffic going east down river with the current to the industrial canal. The Algiers Canal locks are used for barges going west down river from the industrial canal. The Mississippi River's current plays havoc to barge traffic.

I WOULD RECOMMEND PUTTING A TUNNEL AT ST. CLAUDE AVE.; LEAVE THE PRESENT LOCKS; BUILD THE NEW LOCKS (ON SITE) NEXT TO THE PRESENT LOCKS ON THE EAST SIDE. THIS WOULD ALLOW 2-WAY BARGE TRAFFIC AND WHEN REPAIRS ARE NEEDED, BARGE TRAFFIC WOULD ALWAYS BE AVAILABLE (LIKE THE PANAMA CANAL). THERE WOULD BE NO COSTLY NEED TO MOVE THE COAST GUARD FACILITY NOR ANY RESIDENTS. USE THE $33 MILLION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TO HELP THE STATE FINANCE THE HIGH-LEVEL FLORIDA AVE. BRIDGE. KEEP THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL AS A NATIONAL INTERCOSTAL WATERWAY.

Early in our planning studies, we considered a tunnel at St. Claude, but ruled it out as being unfeasible. The project is being proposed to accommodate deep draft vessels, which would require tunnels under the Industrial Canal to be very deep, unlike the Harvey and Belle Chasse tunnels.

We previously investigated a site for the replacement lock east of and adjacent to the existing lock and found it to be totally devastating to the local areas around the existing lock. We eliminated that site from further study.
THIS WOULD BE LESS COSTLY TO THE AMERICAN TAXPAYERS, LESS TRAFFIC PROBLEMS, AND LESS INCONVENIENCE TO THE PUBLIC AND THEIR SAFETY.

As for the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, it was a mistake from the start. The Corps of Engineers knew before it was built. It was all a political play to give additional wharfage for the Port of New Orleans. Claims were that it would help St. Bernard Parish, but it has only caused more flooding and destruction. It did not really save ship traffic time as promised. In addition, the salt water coming up the canal has destroyed the trees and marshes that were a natural breakwater for the protection of New Orleans & St. Bernard citizens. Even the Red Cross will no longer maintain shelters in New Orleans during Hurricane season.

Only the Mississippi River should be used for the large ship traffic. There is plenty wharfage space in St. Bernard & Plaquemines Parishes that ships can unload to railroads & trucking saving time. There is no need to place large ship facilities anywhere else but on the river. The nation’s tax payer’s money could be saved, along with their safety and inconvenience.

KEEP THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL AS PART OF THE INTERCOSTAL WATERWAY SYSTEM; CLOSE MRGO AND USE THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER FOR LARGE SHIPS TRAFFICING.

Sincerely,

Henry P. Ponstein
3511 Paris Road
Chalmette, LA 70043
504-271-4927

CC: Senator John Breaux
    Senator Trent Lott
    Congressman Billy Tauzin
    Congressman Bob Livingston

We are not addressing the closure of the MR-GO in this report.
Dear Col. Conner,

We oppose the bridge project for a number of reasons already stated to you such as the bridge being up for longer periods due to increased marine traffic; more hazardous materials transported through the canal and mostly because the St. Claude bridge has been the “most dependable” of all bridges and we feel it is a waste of tax payers money!

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Frank Quintin
6730 Dougla St.
Arabi, LA 70032

Comments noted.
Dear Col. America,

We do not usually interfere with our lines and ability to get to our job for the Corp. of Engineers. Any elsewhere.

Sincerely,
Billy Rod Winter
4491 Eastview Dr.
Chalmette, LA 70043

Comments noted.
About several years ago, our area was very
developed. Most of our rainfall went to
people watering our
bight. Rain is everywhere — no rain falls or
rains!
Fortunately, most of the area remained a
park (The old North’s Station). But, if you stayed - not because
it was affordable (that is unknown at New Kent Area,)
but because you loved the area, because of its
Specialties. You may consider it to loving a person,
because of their character, enduring fault (even if they’re
different—far off the beaten path). If that person
tries to change in many that the things you found
will no longer a part of their being, you’d be very
unhappy, especially if you were bound to marry
of them. It’s almost as if you were bound to marry
of them.

This is what your project would do to us,
our relationships. Our unhappy—those changed
neighbors. Your relationship with our neighborhoods.

As for the mitigation — $33,000 is not
the drop in the bucket compared to the losses
ty community would endure. It’s just a piece of
the issue: "Are you all in a dream world, do you think we are?"

$500 thousands for Holy Cross School! Absurd!
The doors to Holy Cross have been closed if this project
goes thru. Is it so some students will take the bus
from the West Side, must leave @ 5am to get to
school on time (assuming due to bridge opening up
is now a safe route). Flt bridges out.
(3)
Since then, fortunately, we have a strong neighborhood approach, the idea being to develop a stronger sense of community. We have many homes that have been and are still under development. Our neighborhood is rising, developing in its own way. We have a lot of people moving back, many artists, writers, and designers have discovered and are divided into this area. There are lots of friends who would never have thought to come into this area or if they were - not to visit friends here. How many times have we been? We don't believe that they see what they experience and ultimately end up moving here. The word is out, people let me know you see a place you want, you see the people that live here and great faces, knowing that - they're warmly greeted, many times with stories about the area. If you really come back to visit - not to stay - people pass them a question, a lush vegetation - I've known people who have never been to the area, or if all of them see that the area really where to stay there. This is a special place!

This is a special place!
First or last. Those of us who are free never be bored. The moon rises over the
wood and the neighborhood will never dim.

Sheer life again (all over) but the magic
will be good. Can't imagine falling away

Growth of the world's magic? too much?

Without the time kinds of spices.

I'm trying to say I'll try to stay home to
make it. My son is just a few miles in the
neighborhood where he was born into "home." He
will not want to if I could not be able to

pull up the change. It would have been able
to go to get what he has at an affordable

price.

That will you keep do for reasons who are
change? Put themental problems of the
stay tender to the noise past the death.

I force, that the magic simple is
 lets what it may be like, living at the
constant need. Change.

We don't want it.

Sincerely,
Mary Petty Stuy
February 20, 1997

Colonel William L. Conner
Dept of the Army
New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers
New Orleans, Louisiana 70110-0267

Dear Sir,

My name is Marietta Williams, and I am a resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, residing at 6116 N. Roman Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70117.

Please find written the issues that I expressed verbally, at the meeting, held at Holy Cross School, on January 27, 1997, regarding the Lock Replacement Project.

First, I feel that I can support this project, if the Corps can satisfactorily address the following issues:

1. That the Corps include monies to allow entrances and exits to the proposed High-Rise for Lower Ninth Ward residents. This proposed High-Rise is to come through the Lower Ninth Ward, from St. Bernard Parish. The proposed building site is on Florida Avenue. In your film, you addressed the issue of the High-Rise only in relation to St. Bernard Parish, calling it a By-pass, and proposing to use roughly $8.5 million dollars, of the $33 million dollars, for this purpose. In my opinion, this is a very serious safety issue for residents of the Lower Ninth Ward, as well, because we are currently landlocked, on all sides by "draw-bridges," and as you might well understand, should an evacuation crisis arise during the span of years, that this project in its effect, that such an event could prove disastrous for residents of this area.

I understand that you do not have a direct connection to the High-Rise, however, in light of the fact that you address the issue in the film indicates that it is an issue. I am requesting that you expand that plan of the proposed By-Pass/High-Rise, to include access to Lower Ninth Ward residents for entrances ON AND OFF of the High-Rise that are in the Lower Ninth Ward, and connects to the rest of the city.

This access to the High-Rise would prevent our having to depend just on draw-bridges, for entering and leaving the area. Access from our area to the High-Rise should be one of the long lasting and permanent effects of this lock widening project, for the residents of this area.

Possible sites for entrances and exits can be Tupelo St. and Caffin Ave. When I write of this area, I include the entire area that is below the bridge to the St. Bernard Parish line.

A new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Avenue for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal. The Corps does not have the authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of years. It has been assumed that a new bridge there is in part of without project condition. In addition, a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue has been included with the same lane capacity as the existing bridge, thereby eliminating the need to close that bridge during construction. Only a couple of weeks closure will be required at Claiborne Avenue by using innovative construction methods.
2. That you implement in your planning some concrete information regarding job training, types of jobs that will be available to residents who qualify, a written assurance that residents will be given a first chance at applying for contracts, and jobs, and be hired if they meet the criteria; that some type of job training be implemented through the public school system that would allow training for students who would like to move directly into the building/construction trades, after completing high school. These workers could provide an ongoing work force for the various jobs that will need to be done.

That there be some concrete information on the number of real jobs, that will be provided, the salary ranges, the duration of the jobs, in other words, as many specifics as possible.

Should the job training include students in the high school, for some training, that preference be given to the high schools that are in the immediate area, such as Alfred Lawless Sr. High, Douglas Sr. High, and Carver Sr. High, just as examples.

That monies also be set aside to train and re-train some of our hard-core "unemployables", who have a serious desire to change, and will need the extra supports in order to return to the workforce as productive workers.

3. That the Corps seriously look at the issue of Dredging, and its impact on our area, especially when the river waters rise. Will this affect our area adversely? Will the levee hold? Can waters seep under the levee system and cause it to erode beneath the surface?

This concludes my primary issues.

Second, I think that $33 million dollars is not enough to compensate the various areas that will be impacted by this project. I think that the mitigation monies should be higher.

Third, should the government proceed with this project, I would like to be one of the volunteers to serve on the committee for the dispensing of the funds. I would like to serve in the capacity of a resident.

Thank you for your attention to these issues, and thank you and the Corps for the public meeting(s).

Respectfully,

Marietta Williams (Ms.)
Book I covers the analysis of the factors behind the context of the present federal system. It gives its report on how the Mississippi River and the other waterways were impacted by the present federal system.

It also discusses the impact of the waterways on the industry that makes commercial trades and ensures the flow of commerce.

The book covers the importance of our area in the National interest.

The book also covers the possibility of site that was considered for expanding, and the issues related to the site.

The book reports that site was first wholly in the two, with the removal from and later regarded.

The chapter discusses the demand for the facility on the proposed site and the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, and the Mississippi Pinelands Complex
The book covers [text obscured by image].

The story begins with [text obscured by image].

Characters included [text obscured by image] and [text obscured by image].

The conflict centered around [text obscured by image], which threatened to destroy [text obscured by image].

The climax occurred when [text obscured by image].

[Signature]
Dear Sir:

We are adamantly opposed to widening the canal for these reasons:

1. Disrupting the fabric of many local neighborhoods.
2. Much less impact will be created.

Thank you,

[Handwritten signature]

The Corps has developed a plan for the replacement of the Industrial Canal Lock that minimizes the impacts to the surrounding communities to the maximum extent practicable. The proposed plan will not require any residential relocations by utilizing innovative construction methods that will occur within the confines of the existing canal. We have also recently developed plans for a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue that will keep that bridge open for vehicular traffic at all times. Additional studies have shown that the closure of the Claiborne Avenue bridge can be reduced to a couple of weeks.

The impacts to the Holy Cross Neighborhood have been significantly reduced because of these changes. However, there will still be impacts. Recognizing this, a $33 million community impact mitigation plan has been developed, which has already been authorized by Congress, that attempts to minimize and/or compensate for the direct and indirect impacts the project will have on their neighborhood.
SECTION 3

PETITIONS
Introduction

Holy Cross Petition and Petition sent from Alice Harte Elementary School. The Corps has developed a plan for the replacement of the Inner Harbor navigation Canal Lock (Industrial Canal Lock) that minimizes the impact to the surrounding communities to the maximum extent practicable. The proposed plan will not require any residential relocations by utilizing innovative construction techniques that will occur within the confines of the existing canal. We have also recently developed plans for a temporary bridge at St. Claude Avenue that will keep that bridge open to vehicular traffic at all times. Additional studies have shown that the closure of the Claiborne Avenue bridge can be reduced to about two weeks.

The impacts to the Holy Cross neighborhood have been significantly reduced because of these changes. However, there will still be impacts. Recognizing this, a $33 million community impact mitigation plan has been developed, which has already been authorized for implementation by Congress, that attempts to minimize or compensate for the direct and indirect impacts the project will have on their neighborhood.

Petition from St. Bernard Town Hall Meeting. The lock is considered a separable element under the MR-GO authority. This report does not address the MR-GO channel and related problems.

While we agree that a new vehicular bridge, mid-rise or high-rise, is needed at Florida Avenue for better traffic flow and improved hurricane evacuation over the Industrial Canal, we do not have authority under the lock replacement project to include any work at that location. The State of Louisiana has been planning for a new bridge at that location for a number of years. We have assumed that a new bridge there is in our without project condition.
March 3, 1997

Colonel William Conner
District Engineer
USAED, New Orleans
7400 Leake Avenue
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160

Dear Colonel Conner:

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal Expansion project of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, transportation that can not be compensated. In addition, we do not want to accommodate larger ship traffic.

We are attaching a signed petition that expresses our sentiments toward this upheaval which is not based on unfounded fears but on outrage rooted in awareness.

In affect, such a project will destroy this area, therefore, we strongly withstand the construction of this project in our neighborhood.

This project is not acceptable!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chairperson
Holy Cross Board of Directors
415 Tupelo Street
New Orleans, LA 70117

[Signature]

Dr. J. Thomas
Holy Cross Board of Directors
6115 Royal Street
New Orleans, LA 70117
(504) 279-2361, and

THE UNDERSIGNED PETITIONERS
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (PRINT)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter Tate</td>
<td>(WALTER TATE)</td>
<td>5137 Reyno</td>
<td>948-2811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvis J. Bernard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1222 Tulane ST</td>
<td>368-3171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel G. Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>500 Canal Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. N. Mano</td>
<td></td>
<td>3719 N RAMPART ST</td>
<td>943-9784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Fuller</td>
<td></td>
<td>3130 Claiborne</td>
<td>623-1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse F. Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td>345 S Dauphine St</td>
<td>943-4034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2540 Reyno</td>
<td>948-9738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>5731 N tonti</td>
<td>444-5477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Pellebon</td>
<td></td>
<td>5220 Royal St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>510 Canal Ave</td>
<td>444-5373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandi Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>5208 Burgundy</td>
<td>949-0508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Varnado</td>
<td></td>
<td>5331 Dauphine St</td>
<td>945-9476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>4239 Dauphine St</td>
<td>944-6752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>825 Tulane</td>
<td>276-0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine White</td>
<td></td>
<td>2234 Multani</td>
<td>348-0161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Michael Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>2909 Louisiana</td>
<td>897-0940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Fontenette</td>
<td></td>
<td>1037 Andry St</td>
<td>1437 Flood St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>6139/2 Burgundy St</td>
<td>948-2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>4119 Lee Da Bay Ave</td>
<td>361-0157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand Sterling</td>
<td></td>
<td>1215 Freeman St</td>
<td>277-4703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>2622 8th March St</td>
<td>276-4870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1019 Lemonade St</td>
<td>947-4048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822 Charlotte</td>
<td>945-1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td>418 Peme St</td>
<td>945-8958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Collie</td>
<td></td>
<td>1908 Talley St</td>
<td>276-4788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ruby</td>
<td></td>
<td>3324 Nabe</td>
<td>812-8892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty March</td>
<td></td>
<td>722 Fasor Ave</td>
<td>945-1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 St. Claude Ct</td>
<td>945-5553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattie Leslie Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1610 1/2 Andry St</td>
<td>948-6147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Wilson</td>
<td>Minor Wilson</td>
<td>926 Chabert Blvd</td>
<td>748-3399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Taylor</td>
<td>Daryl Taylor</td>
<td>1438 Lesters Blvd, NOLA</td>
<td>943-3622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Wintery</td>
<td>Gregory Wintery</td>
<td>4024 N Robertson St</td>
<td>945-9003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Harris</td>
<td>Clifton Harris</td>
<td>5461 St. Clarae</td>
<td>989-7088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Shish</td>
<td>Harry Shish</td>
<td>1707 Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrill Austin</td>
<td>Terrill Austin</td>
<td>915 Lamar St</td>
<td>945-0661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luria Prudhomme</td>
<td>Luria Prudhomme</td>
<td>5027 Burgundy St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Gilbert</td>
<td>Joan Gilbert</td>
<td>4826 N Rampart St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Johnson</td>
<td>Jacqueline Johnson</td>
<td>5613 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>915-5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Mosby</td>
<td>Rachel Mosby</td>
<td>5618 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>945-8171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lomax</td>
<td>James Lomax</td>
<td>722 Orleans St</td>
<td>944-5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald H. Lewis</td>
<td>Donald H. Lewis</td>
<td>1028 N. Elys St. Cowan</td>
<td>5404 N. Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Black</td>
<td>K. Black</td>
<td>1427 Periti Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K Lee
February 17, 1997

**WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL**

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUDREY M. WALKER</td>
<td>Audrey Walker</td>
<td>462 Flood</td>
<td>949-7031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEAN FRANKLIN</td>
<td>Jean Franklin</td>
<td>5000 N. Roman</td>
<td>945-7571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie O. Williams</td>
<td>Billie O. Williams</td>
<td>633 Andly St.</td>
<td>949-0285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACHEL PENN</td>
<td>Rachel Penn</td>
<td>421-23 Rhode St</td>
<td>222-9334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEILA FLOY</td>
<td>Sheila Floy</td>
<td>6036 St. Claude Ave</td>
<td>276-1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Smith</td>
<td>Linda Smith</td>
<td>6116 Rockfords Rd</td>
<td>271-7156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVELLL PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Lowell Phillips</td>
<td>6116 N. Rockfords Rd</td>
<td>271-7156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores M. Onnas</td>
<td>Delores M. Onnas</td>
<td>4218 Burgundy St</td>
<td>271-4036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookie Teng</td>
<td>Cookie Teng</td>
<td>2119 E. 23rd Ave, 2nd Fl., Apt. A315</td>
<td>366-6569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Moore</td>
<td>Regina Moore</td>
<td>1207-311</td>
<td>361-5477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKILA FLEMING</td>
<td>Akila Fleming</td>
<td>2330 Burgundy 1st 734-6374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Carr</td>
<td>Stacy Carr</td>
<td>2426 Painters St</td>
<td>949-4162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Henry</td>
<td>Walter Henry</td>
<td>1506 W. 14th St</td>
<td>945-4404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Green</td>
<td>Nicole Green</td>
<td>5100 Convent Ave</td>
<td>944-1405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Mautet</td>
<td>Vanessa Mautet</td>
<td>824 Tricou St.</td>
<td>279-8553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella B. Bogel</td>
<td></td>
<td>12344 Pecan Dr.</td>
<td>265-6305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varnise Lucas</td>
<td>Varnise Lucas</td>
<td>436 Florest St.</td>
<td>945-05-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Cade</td>
<td>Cynthia Cade</td>
<td>6036 Franklin Ave</td>
<td>283-5265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Green</td>
<td>Reginald Green</td>
<td>1236 Congress St.</td>
<td>947-7674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>1504 Audubon Ave</td>
<td>842-5440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Charles Crawford</td>
<td>Ray Charles Crawford</td>
<td>1037 Andry Street</td>
<td>948-3915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwendolyn M. Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1035 Audubon, New Orleans</td>
<td>918-3915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory H. Lee Sr.</td>
<td>Gregory H. Lee Sr.</td>
<td>7552 Briar Heath Dr.</td>
<td>242-1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome A. Green Sr.</td>
<td>Jerome A. Green Sr.</td>
<td>2136 Congress St.</td>
<td>947-2675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Moore</td>
<td>Thelma Moore</td>
<td>7951 Willow Ct.</td>
<td>241-1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Cade</td>
<td>Angel Cade</td>
<td>1038 Franklin Avenue</td>
<td>283-5265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Norfleet</td>
<td>Adrienne Norfleet</td>
<td>5609 Burgundy St.</td>
<td>947-0884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Nellon</td>
<td>Brenda Nellon</td>
<td>4300 Sullivan Pl.</td>
<td>391 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td>5609 Burgundy St.</td>
<td>947-0884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

**WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL.**

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bechet</td>
<td>Sarah Bechet</td>
<td>931 Jarden Dr.</td>
<td>271-2485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Reed Velti</td>
<td>Carolyn Reed Velti</td>
<td>1939 Lamar Dr.</td>
<td>917-8663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Harbor</td>
<td>Rosemary Harbor</td>
<td>1432 Gurnon Dr.</td>
<td>944-4756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene B. Simmons</td>
<td>Irene B. Simmons</td>
<td>6233 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>277-6443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl R. Hawkins</td>
<td>Cheryl R. Hawkins</td>
<td>8366 Leander St.</td>
<td>486-6473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonda J. Simmons</td>
<td>Vonda J. Simmons</td>
<td>6233 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>277-6443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie R. Malblue</td>
<td>Vickie R. Malblue</td>
<td>5420 Royal St.</td>
<td>944-0940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Sanders</td>
<td>Murphy Sanders</td>
<td>2731 Ann St.</td>
<td>943-5817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Markey</td>
<td>Carl Markey</td>
<td>5531 Bentley Dr.</td>
<td>943-2641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Malcom</td>
<td>Sandra Malcom</td>
<td>4239 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>944-9952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLY GUYTON</td>
<td>CAROLY GUYTON</td>
<td>3815 PIEDMONT DR.</td>
<td>945-3812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameil Alberts</td>
<td>Jameil Alberts</td>
<td>2535 Tricou St.</td>
<td>279-2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Alberts</td>
<td>Janet Alberts</td>
<td>2535 Tricou St.</td>
<td>279-2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Brown Harris</td>
<td>Katie Brown Harris</td>
<td>2608 St. Maurice</td>
<td>379-6113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores H. Johnson</td>
<td>Delores H. Johnson</td>
<td>4107 N. Rampart St.</td>
<td>944-7003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Token Frost Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2205 Egania St. 943-3113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvarnette Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>1818 N. Rocheblave St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Bradley Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5000 N. Roman St. 946-7571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Whipple</td>
<td></td>
<td>5410 Dauphine St. 943-2240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temese Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2108 Centauri Dr. 682-2100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Dumas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984 Bolden St. 949-2105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1632 Forsyth 949-4656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1019 Tamarac St. 947-74048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy D. Braden Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1012 Independence St. 941-5630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon McCrawley</td>
<td></td>
<td>4011 Coffin 948-4584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Britton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2515 - Calcasieu 685-4355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Smothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>9511 Flood St 943-3420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>2511 1/2 flood St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochelle Smothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>9511 Flood St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

**WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL**

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warren Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014 October</td>
<td>276-1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>1943 Lamarque</td>
<td>941-1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Lea</td>
<td></td>
<td>634 Flood St</td>
<td>945-8621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>733 Park St</td>
<td>943-9984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Simms</td>
<td></td>
<td>1415 Kelly St</td>
<td>943-8841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>5624 Washington Blvd</td>
<td>949-9984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td>3004 Caffin Ave</td>
<td>944-6884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td>712 5th St</td>
<td>944-9073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Smothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1724 Carolina</td>
<td>199-7952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Althea Smothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1924 Orleans</td>
<td>944-2724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Smothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>7515 Flood St</td>
<td>943-5524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>4565 28th Ave</td>
<td>948-2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrae Dossen</td>
<td></td>
<td>4565 28th Ave</td>
<td>948-2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardell Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>682-8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemania Early</td>
<td></td>
<td>1632 E. 7th</td>
<td>948-3997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrie Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>1436 Strand Ct</td>
<td>945-3941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terese Jones</td>
<td>Terese Jones</td>
<td>5424 N. Galvez</td>
<td>948-0423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores Herbert</td>
<td>Delores Herbert</td>
<td>2532 Delery</td>
<td>277-1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeri B. Jones</td>
<td>Effie Sims</td>
<td>3727 N. DeBakey</td>
<td>947-7469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores Houston Magee</td>
<td>Michael Houston Magee</td>
<td>216 Lindsay St</td>
<td>943-9538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette E. Green</td>
<td>Pamela Green</td>
<td>2332 Negroise St</td>
<td>947-2125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Chauvin</td>
<td>Athena Simmons</td>
<td>2416 Winstead Ave</td>
<td>949-3052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena Simmons</td>
<td>Athena Simmons</td>
<td>2416 Winstead Ave</td>
<td>949-3052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba Hart</td>
<td>Melba Hart</td>
<td>227 Fordall</td>
<td>945-3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle P. Burton</td>
<td>Michelle Burton</td>
<td>2108 Tennessee St</td>
<td>944-6225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl S. Armstrong</td>
<td>Cheryl Armstrong</td>
<td>1730 St. Marcoux Ave</td>
<td>979-6622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys P. Smith</td>
<td>Gladys P. Smith</td>
<td>2216 Delery St</td>
<td>979-2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella May</td>
<td>Stella May</td>
<td>1315 Audubon St</td>
<td>291-4684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Bates</td>
<td>Sheila Bates</td>
<td>1626 Charbonnet St</td>
<td>947-2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB Bates</td>
<td>Kelvin Bates</td>
<td>1620 Charbonnet</td>
<td>947-2999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Francis</td>
<td>Robin Francis</td>
<td>1717 Delery</td>
<td>219-5111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Richardson</td>
<td>Cheryl Richardson</td>
<td>1917 Lamarche</td>
<td>947-6584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Gabriel</td>
<td>Dianne Gabriel</td>
<td>1915 Lupela</td>
<td>276-0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheo Chaiborne</td>
<td>Cheo Chaiborne</td>
<td>81145 Effleurst</td>
<td>947-7186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stewart</td>
<td>Charles Stewart</td>
<td>1809 Deense</td>
<td>948-9484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin L. Thompson</td>
<td>Robin L. Thompson</td>
<td>5619 W. Johnson</td>
<td>277-8194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Thompson</td>
<td>Gregory Thompson</td>
<td>5619 W. Johnson</td>
<td>277-8194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Anderson</td>
<td>Shirley Anderson</td>
<td>2222 Cauffman Ave.</td>
<td>944-1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Rhodes</td>
<td>Wayne Rhodes</td>
<td>1642 Andry St</td>
<td>948-9487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Nott</td>
<td>Lynn Nott</td>
<td>2003 Cauffman Ave.</td>
<td>947-9023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Gardner</td>
<td>Sharon Gardner</td>
<td>1836 Hernandez Ave.</td>
<td>277-1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Parker</td>
<td>Carolyn Parker</td>
<td>1001 Garman Ave.</td>
<td>945-6409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Train</td>
<td>Marie Train</td>
<td>3341 Lupela St.</td>
<td>944-4633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve Renney</td>
<td>Genevieve Renney</td>
<td>2340 Forstall</td>
<td>948-8664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Fair</td>
<td>Donald Fair</td>
<td>28 Jackson Barracks</td>
<td>279-5649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Smith</td>
<td>Danielle Smith</td>
<td>4519 St. Claude Ave. 945-7165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmoila Deliet</td>
<td>Elmoila Deliet</td>
<td>1942 W Rochelle Ave. 943-6132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Douglas</td>
<td>Elaine Douglas</td>
<td>2247 Park Ave. 944-0392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Deliet</td>
<td>Dominique Deliet</td>
<td>1948 W Rochelle Ave. 943-6132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Smith</td>
<td>Linda Smith</td>
<td>4519 St. Claude Ave. 945-7165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Benjamin</td>
<td>2415 Caftin Ave. N.O.C.A 70117</td>
<td>949-3844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Curmer</td>
<td>1809 N. Merey</td>
<td>N.O.C.A 70119 949-1805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmelle Traire</td>
<td>3225 Alphcy St. N.O. 70112</td>
<td>489-1640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amie Graham</td>
<td>2815 N. Dorgue’s St. N.O. 70117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. J. Johnson</td>
<td>2714 71st St. 70117 70113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Coady</td>
<td>Dorothy Coady</td>
<td>941 Le. 70126 245-1057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Pamela</td>
<td>Pamela Miller</td>
<td>N.O.L.A 70119 449-7908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavoro Grayson</td>
<td>Leivo Grayson</td>
<td>N.O.L.A 70119 947-6805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Williams</td>
<td>Denise Williams</td>
<td>2028 Le. 7029 944-2837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Dudley</td>
<td>Wanda Dudley</td>
<td>8079 Le. 944-0931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIA NRECEN</td>
<td>K.Boleda</td>
<td>3010 Lawrence</td>
<td>368-2682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Davis</td>
<td>K. Findlay</td>
<td>1801 Flood</td>
<td>947-8285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIRE McQueen</td>
<td>C. McQueen</td>
<td>1501 Benton</td>
<td>942-2964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.I. HOLLINS</td>
<td>J.I. Holman</td>
<td>720 Devery</td>
<td>271-6849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINDY BUCKNER</td>
<td>C. B. Backer</td>
<td>5340 Harris</td>
<td>949-9847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Riddick</td>
<td></td>
<td>5100 Dauphine</td>
<td>943-0840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>雄2E McNight</td>
<td></td>
<td>1301 Joanville</td>
<td>947-9245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie Bernard</td>
<td></td>
<td>732 hoop</td>
<td>944-0545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARA Hille</td>
<td></td>
<td>1029 Desloede</td>
<td>944-8283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie K. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>5501 St. Claude</td>
<td>945-4457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Burchard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1300 Congress St.</td>
<td>947-2179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Matthews</td>
<td></td>
<td>9215 Sw. 65th Ave.</td>
<td>947-3211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Simons</td>
<td></td>
<td>927 Xaveli</td>
<td>343-465-3641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denise Coleman</td>
<td>Denise Coleman</td>
<td>1080 Canon</td>
<td>942-7711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Williams</td>
<td>Michael Miller</td>
<td>1372 St. Romain</td>
<td>271-4653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Carr</td>
<td>Sheila Jean</td>
<td>581 St. Claude</td>
<td>945-6015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Lawson</td>
<td>Juan Ramirez</td>
<td>2129 Ann St.</td>
<td>948-6106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Robertson</td>
<td>Patrick Robertson</td>
<td>1342 Clinton</td>
<td>949-2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alives Weasley</td>
<td>Albert L. Weasley</td>
<td>2367 N. Union</td>
<td>943-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sarah Mercadel</td>
<td>2763412</td>
<td>6127 N. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda French</td>
<td>Brenda French</td>
<td>2105 Clive Dr.</td>
<td>945-7753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Jones</td>
<td>Elizabeth Jones</td>
<td>5744 Marguierton</td>
<td>945-6056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Richardson</td>
<td>Emily Richardson</td>
<td>7321 White Ave</td>
<td>847-0757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lemon</td>
<td>S. Lemon</td>
<td>4646 N. Lombard</td>
<td>444-6703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deane Beatty</td>
<td>Deane Beatty</td>
<td>2439 West 19th St</td>
<td>44707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaynae Phillips</td>
<td>Jaynae Phillips</td>
<td>21024 Chebonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that cannot be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremmelle Collins</td>
<td>Bremmelle Collins</td>
<td>1415 Tupelo</td>
<td>551-9877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Youngblood</td>
<td>Donna Youngblood</td>
<td>1425 Reynolds St</td>
<td>949-3521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donalyn Youngblood</td>
<td>Donalyn Youngblood</td>
<td>1425 Reynolds St</td>
<td>949-3521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Youngblood</td>
<td>Joshua Youngblood</td>
<td>1425 Reynolds St</td>
<td>949-3521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaeVa Coz</td>
<td>DaeVa Coz</td>
<td>1209 St. Claude Ave</td>
<td>944-0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Heyward</td>
<td>Betty Heyward</td>
<td>1209 St. Cloud Ave</td>
<td>944-0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Bell</td>
<td>Ann Bell</td>
<td>1212 Mandeville</td>
<td>948-8421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Jones</td>
<td>Thelma Jones</td>
<td>720 Bartholomew</td>
<td>948-3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarra Chancy</td>
<td>Tarra Chancy</td>
<td>488 Acorn St.</td>
<td>272-7231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey Chantel</td>
<td>Possey Chantel</td>
<td>1137 Acorn St.</td>
<td>272-7231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacia Washington</td>
<td>Stacia Washington</td>
<td>1237 Habo St.</td>
<td>947-4729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Andrews</td>
<td>Catherine Andrews</td>
<td>1015 Tennessee</td>
<td>944-7579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Adams</td>
<td>Aaron Adams</td>
<td>6101 Plant Ave</td>
<td>943-9419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Adams</td>
<td>Maurice Adams</td>
<td>6101 Plant Ave</td>
<td>943-9419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Adams</td>
<td>James Adams</td>
<td>6101 Plant Ave</td>
<td>943-9419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prithia Noah</td>
<td></td>
<td>2616 Felicia St</td>
<td>947-0507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jannie M. Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>313 31st Maurice Ave</td>
<td>277-3297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAULETTE L. LUCAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2505 Park Place</td>
<td>373-7805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAULETTE L. LUCAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5742 Lewis Prime Dr. N</td>
<td>244-3348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Lucas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2019 Forest St.</td>
<td>947-2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Martin-Ahern</td>
<td></td>
<td>9181 Wood Ave</td>
<td>241-7864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debeg Dohme</td>
<td></td>
<td>3710 N Clairborne</td>
<td>949-4091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1231 Montreal</td>
<td>949-4085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td>2466 Pelican</td>
<td>949-4462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Desbris</td>
<td></td>
<td>11111 St Claude</td>
<td>947-3101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrien Gayt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/17 5220 Ct</td>
<td>721-9281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>922 Longy St</td>
<td>271-2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td>322 3221 Rampart</td>
<td>955 1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endice Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>1751 Orleans St apt 866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Marrero</td>
<td></td>
<td>924 Andrey St</td>
<td>949-3970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janine Watkins</td>
<td>James Watkins</td>
<td>12920 Chemin Et 345-1619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda-Jean-Marie</td>
<td></td>
<td>1030 dobela dr 867-496-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanyelle Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>2466 New Orleans H 949-5968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura B Shields</td>
<td></td>
<td>1340 egonia st 960-5968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia L Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td>6014 dauphine st 960-7011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold L. Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>5123 N Balder st 960-7017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra A Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1323 Tricou N 960-7017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrin H. Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>507 Tupelo N 960-7017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra C Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td>910 esponde N 960-825-1418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colette Bowers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2810 Desota      948-9941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1384 caffin 948-9721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Sullor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2512 short st 948-5968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1325 Alabama 948-4721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL.

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Lucas</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>2118 Forstall St</td>
<td>944-2570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Brown</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>1706 DeJary St</td>
<td>821-0977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangeline Dupuy</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>1639 Charbonnet St</td>
<td>271-5361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rena Gillee</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>2234 Ford Street</td>
<td>944-3178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gillee</td>
<td></td>
<td>2232 Ford Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undell Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>2029 CAFÉN AVE 840-9469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Sanders</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>534 W. Balzer</td>
<td>943-2836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>7104 Tennessee St</td>
<td>944-1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicite Joseph</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>5968 Dudley St</td>
<td>945-3843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Dupuy</td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>1622Chartes St</td>
<td>944-5256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Robertson</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>1607 Chartes St</td>
<td>277-8755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Rockett</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>2124 Forstall St</td>
<td>949-9674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Slack</td>
<td>P.</td>
<td>1440 Bayou</td>
<td>943-5717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin West</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>5425 Douglas</td>
<td>949-7601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td>230(Andres)</td>
<td>947-9815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Print)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junius McPherson</td>
<td>John McPherson</td>
<td>1800 Audubon Ave</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Kenneth Williams</td>
<td>Rev. Ken Williams</td>
<td>1819 Plaist</td>
<td>949-9627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Murray</td>
<td>Raymond Murray</td>
<td>1819 Alabama St</td>
<td>949-9627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Murray</td>
<td>Kenneth F. Murray</td>
<td>1819 Alabama St</td>
<td>949-9627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell J. Pope</td>
<td>Mitchell T. Pope</td>
<td>2302 German St</td>
<td>887-2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debi Lewis</td>
<td>Debi Lewis</td>
<td>3009 Pear St</td>
<td>879-8582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Young</td>
<td>Patricia Young</td>
<td>7440 Sandpine Dr</td>
<td>283-2587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton E. Bingham</td>
<td>Alton E. Bingham</td>
<td>618 Andrew St</td>
<td>945-5786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benita Maderia</td>
<td>Benita Maderia</td>
<td>2031 Southaven Ave</td>
<td>943-1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Powell</td>
<td>Kelly Powell</td>
<td>1317 Locust Blvd</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George C. Arndt</td>
<td>George C. Arndt</td>
<td>1317 Locust Blvd</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda A. Harris</td>
<td>Glenda A. Harris</td>
<td>2340 Delary St</td>
<td>4914-5123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence C. Fletcher</td>
<td>Lawrence C. Fletcher</td>
<td>7935 Lehigh St</td>
<td>244-6689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Chaney</td>
<td>Samuel Chaney</td>
<td>1800 Conti St</td>
<td>949-0801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha McCary</td>
<td>Natasha McCary</td>
<td>1809 Flood St</td>
<td>949-0801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Print)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice McCary</td>
<td>Alice McCary</td>
<td>1900 Floood St. 944-0801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subrina McCary</td>
<td>Subrina McCary</td>
<td>1900 Floood St. 944-0801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin McCary</td>
<td>Alvin McCary</td>
<td>1900 Floood 944-0801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Lewis</td>
<td>Marvin Lewis</td>
<td>1462 Ward 944-3905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shantelle White</td>
<td>Shantelle White</td>
<td>944 Duval St. 944-2237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schameka Walker</td>
<td>Schameka Walker</td>
<td>5712 St. Claude 544-0351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Henry</td>
<td>Stafford Henry</td>
<td>9404 Audubon 947-3637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita Thomas</td>
<td>Juanita Thomas</td>
<td>9420 Audubon 947-3637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Cantron</td>
<td>Lois Cantron</td>
<td>1014 Dauphine St. 276-1729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Allridge</td>
<td>Ernez Allridge</td>
<td>2118 Cardon St. 944-0811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Delacroy</td>
<td>Marie Delacroy</td>
<td>696 Rayner 944-6233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucile Dupont</td>
<td>Lucile Dupont</td>
<td>14291 St. Benice 949-7921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Jackson</td>
<td>Albert Jackson</td>
<td>3040 Audubon 949-7741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonye Roper</td>
<td>Sonye Roper</td>
<td>3271 Berkle 945-1455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Print)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Bates</td>
<td>Sharon Bates</td>
<td>1819 Deslauries 275-4870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Moss</td>
<td></td>
<td>2029 Dumas St. 565-6866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia B. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>4963 N. Rampart 948-4317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Simmons</td>
<td></td>
<td>4822 N. Galvez 349-1168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>4750 Violet 87-244-6628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelita Leon</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-10 Gordon 945-7322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Whittington</td>
<td></td>
<td>2240 Gordon 945-8322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td>5918 N. Robateau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>4242 Wright 241-3835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>1601 Tennessee 945-6304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael E. Anderson Sr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6316 Bregnollet 275-8742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian M. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>5629 Dauphine 948-9385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>5819 Dauphine 948-8540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anwood M. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 11, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betty Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>2111 T. Robertson</td>
<td>505-680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>279-565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>2111 T. Robertson</td>
<td>505-680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. Hines</td>
<td></td>
<td>110 N. Robertson</td>
<td>279-505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Hines</td>
<td></td>
<td>110 N. Robertson</td>
<td>279-505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1104 Wood Robertson</td>
<td>279-505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Neapolio</td>
<td></td>
<td>3057 H. Kelley</td>
<td>945-785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>2210 Apache</td>
<td>279-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Lewis III</td>
<td></td>
<td>8214 Apache</td>
<td>279-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Lewis IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>8214 Apache</td>
<td>279-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Hines</td>
<td></td>
<td>1209 Wood Robertson</td>
<td>279-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Cockrton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1805 Apache</td>
<td>514-755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1421 Jackson</td>
<td>265-88316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel R. Munford</td>
<td></td>
<td>4639 Burgundy</td>
<td>945-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Munford</td>
<td></td>
<td>4639 Burgundy</td>
<td>945-225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project.
We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marian Smith</td>
<td>Marian Smith</td>
<td>6016 St. Latourie</td>
<td>943-5245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette DeBlaine</td>
<td>Yvette DeBlaine</td>
<td>7615 Desire St.</td>
<td>243-5245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Thomas</td>
<td>Vanessa Johnson</td>
<td>6005 Underhill</td>
<td>847-2854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Johnson</td>
<td>Barbara Johnson</td>
<td>3213 St. Claude</td>
<td>899-1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Apple</td>
<td>Tamara Apple</td>
<td>229 Hood</td>
<td>334-0160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapheal Davis</td>
<td>Rapheal Davis</td>
<td>434 Dolory St.</td>
<td>275-3744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Williams</td>
<td>Aaron Williams</td>
<td>1222 Delacy</td>
<td>863-7438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deshawn Mumford</td>
<td>Deshawn Mumford</td>
<td>5311 Chamber kt.</td>
<td>918-4338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elouise Mumford</td>
<td>Elouise Mumford</td>
<td>6311 Chamber kt.</td>
<td>918-4338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Mumford</td>
<td>Henderson Mumford</td>
<td>5311 Chamber kt.</td>
<td>918-4338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael St. Mumford</td>
<td>Michael St. Mumford</td>
<td>5311 Chamber kt.</td>
<td>918-4338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole H. Johnson</td>
<td>Nicole H. Johnson</td>
<td>6311 Valentine St.</td>
<td>314-3654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Douma</td>
<td>Michael Douma</td>
<td>6311 N. Robertson Rd.</td>
<td>443-8255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Jones</td>
<td>Dorothy Jones</td>
<td>3501 Guardian Ave.</td>
<td>945-2477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denzel Thomas</td>
<td>Denzel Thomas</td>
<td>3501 Guardian Ave.</td>
<td>945-2477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Harrell-Huntley</td>
<td>B. Harrell-Huntley</td>
<td>4209 St. Claude Ave</td>
<td>944-0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Martin</td>
<td>T. Martin</td>
<td>1229 Flood St</td>
<td>825-6073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliska Davis</td>
<td>Eliska Davis</td>
<td>5123 Lizardi St</td>
<td>949-1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Goodman</td>
<td>Geneva Goodman</td>
<td>5121 Lizardi St</td>
<td>949-7851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin Powell</td>
<td>Melvin Powell</td>
<td>5119 Lizardi St</td>
<td>949-1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl DeFillio</td>
<td>Cheryl DeFillio</td>
<td>5118 N. Johnson Ave</td>
<td>944-7025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellee Davis</td>
<td>Shellee Davis</td>
<td>1800 Marion Rd</td>
<td>241-1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lon Harrell</td>
<td>Lon Harrell</td>
<td>523 Coffin Ave</td>
<td>944-8158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Harrell</td>
<td>Tony Harrell</td>
<td>523 Coffin Ave</td>
<td>944-7158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Harrell</td>
<td>B. Harrell</td>
<td>523 Coffin Ave</td>
<td>944-7158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Brown</td>
<td>T. Brown</td>
<td>517 Coffin Ave</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Morris</td>
<td>G. Morris</td>
<td>525 Coffin Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Carter</td>
<td>Tiffany Carter</td>
<td>324 Mars Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demira Johnson</td>
<td>Demira Johnson</td>
<td>324 Mars Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Johnson</td>
<td>W. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Danis G. Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1730 Caffin Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Irene M. Robertson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1745 Dilray St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alva M. Ellis</td>
<td>ALVA M ELLIS</td>
<td>519 St Marisela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navonne Powe</td>
<td>NAVONNE POWE</td>
<td>519 St Marisela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Harris</td>
<td>ALEX HARRIS</td>
<td>6101 St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Dillon</td>
<td>LAWRENCE DILLON</td>
<td>335 Trocon St</td>
<td>279 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takiva Dillon</td>
<td>Takiva Dillon</td>
<td>335 Trocon St</td>
<td>279 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauden Alexander</td>
<td>CLAU DEN ALEXANDER</td>
<td>339 Trocon St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Young</td>
<td>TAMARA YOUNG</td>
<td>401 Trocon St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Dillon</td>
<td>HELEN DILLON</td>
<td>2700 N Villien St</td>
<td>933882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Thomas</td>
<td>IVORY THOMAS</td>
<td>328 Delrey St</td>
<td>279 2812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neshia Thomas</td>
<td>NESHIA THOMAS</td>
<td>328 Delrey St</td>
<td>279 2812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Hall</td>
<td>ALEXANDER HALL</td>
<td>330 Delrey St</td>
<td>457 8530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrice Duplessis</td>
<td>BRONICE DUPLESSIS</td>
<td>730 Delrey St</td>
<td>279 2812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Duplessis</td>
<td>JOSEPH DUPLESSIS</td>
<td>730 Delrey St</td>
<td>11 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elvis Brumfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>500 St. Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td>6101 Douglas St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Viera</td>
<td></td>
<td>519 Nicoll St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Palermo</td>
<td></td>
<td>629 Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remond Monroe</td>
<td></td>
<td>429 Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>420 Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristie L. Marullo</td>
<td></td>
<td>6315 Douglas St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler J. McGill</td>
<td></td>
<td>519 St. Maurice Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>620 Dickey St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jaguar</td>
<td></td>
<td>924 Kentucky St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel Young</td>
<td></td>
<td>418 Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Billik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>519 St. Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Buxley</td>
<td></td>
<td>407 Tulicou St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereof declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residence property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. DAVIS</td>
<td>Robert J. Davis</td>
<td>435 Tugolo, ST N.O.</td>
<td>279-6267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARVEY R. JOHNSON</td>
<td>Harvey R. Johnson</td>
<td>430 ST Maurice St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARENCE MATTHEWS</td>
<td>CLARENCE MATTHEWS</td>
<td>621 Bimvenue St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA GARRISON</td>
<td>LISA GARRISON</td>
<td>433 ST Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda - Thomas A. Thomas</td>
<td>Linda - Thomas A. Thomas</td>
<td>325 Decatur St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>421 ST Maurice St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serri Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>6105 Bimvenue St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette M. Reed</td>
<td>Phone 485-504-01</td>
<td>405 ST Maurice, New Orleans LA 70111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Allen</td>
<td>6023 N Rampart St.</td>
<td>N.O. 17, 70117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Lee</td>
<td>415 ST Maurice St.</td>
<td>N.C. La. 27140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Henry</td>
<td>411 ST Maurice Ave</td>
<td>70117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMIE ALLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>409 ST Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Davis</td>
<td>Kevin Davis</td>
<td>5912 Burgundy ST. N.O.</td>
<td>70117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avis Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that cannot be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louis Gallaud</td>
<td>LIsa Call</td>
<td>423 St Maurice</td>
<td>277-4228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td>728 Tricou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Monroh</td>
<td></td>
<td>721 Tricou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Desruelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>633 Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td>6321 Dauphine St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Rehfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td>6101 Douglas St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augie Crews</td>
<td></td>
<td>6101 Dauphine St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>560 St Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki Dunson</td>
<td></td>
<td>6101 Douglas St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>420 St Maurice Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>524 Delray St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos de Leon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2120 N. G. Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1413 Lignelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Rainey</td>
<td></td>
<td>4823 vs. N. Romar St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Wallace</td>
<td></td>
<td>2527 Floyd St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlene B. Sietzen</td>
<td>Charles B. Sietzen</td>
<td>3016 Tara Dr.; Violet, LA 70092</td>
<td>682-2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Beck</td>
<td>Mildred Beck</td>
<td>209 Delery</td>
<td>227-0523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki J. Judice</td>
<td>Vicki J. Judice</td>
<td>415 Tupelo</td>
<td>70117 379-4685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dawol</td>
<td>Richard Dawol</td>
<td>414 Delery</td>
<td>70117 279-5038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Herkert</td>
<td>Greta Herkert</td>
<td>316 Delery</td>
<td>70117 276-1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Binney</td>
<td>Henry Binney</td>
<td>428 Tricou</td>
<td>277-3690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Davis</td>
<td>Nelson Davis</td>
<td>426 Tricou</td>
<td>277-3690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn A. Beckert</td>
<td>Carolyn A. Beckert</td>
<td>420 Tricou</td>
<td>248-7284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Porter</td>
<td>Jason Porter</td>
<td>415 Tricou</td>
<td>276-9011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence B. Gibson</td>
<td>Lawrence B. Gibson</td>
<td>1234 Alber</td>
<td>945-6136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgitt Lewis</td>
<td>Bridgitt Lewis</td>
<td>729 Tricou</td>
<td>945-9747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lewis</td>
<td>Steve Lewis</td>
<td>729 Tricou</td>
<td>945-9747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip A. Zanca</td>
<td>Phyllis Zanca</td>
<td>411 Tricou</td>
<td>270-0901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Wyman</td>
<td>Henry Wyman</td>
<td>4234 Degenhe</td>
<td>276-0901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda Thomas</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1738 Calv St.</td>
<td>940-0787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredaes Leonard</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1738 Calv St.</td>
<td>940-0787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlynn Narine</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>2335 hornc st.</td>
<td>945-6748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. God's Frances Ray</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>2523 Lambinedst.</td>
<td>945-4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K дела Ray</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>2523 Lambinedst.</td>
<td>945-4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaDiona Stewart</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1401 Lessers sy</td>
<td>948-4099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Gordon</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1901 Dejondest</td>
<td>947-2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacola Smith</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1930 Ferehsst</td>
<td>944-1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Hayman</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1930 Ferehsst</td>
<td>944-1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oranthelle Arron</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1930 Ferehsst</td>
<td>944-1724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirely Davis</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>933 Gordon St.</td>
<td>217-4311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Smoot</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>1219 Gordon st.</td>
<td>945-9818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Payten</td>
<td>хода</td>
<td>217-4311</td>
<td>246-1423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. James</td>
<td></td>
<td>1108 Hatcher St. 70803</td>
<td>240-0301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest B. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>425 Passage Ave. 70116</td>
<td>387-0409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>1738 Colab St. 70140</td>
<td>940-0787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>2832 Kenner St. 70125</td>
<td>945-0743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2523 Longfellow 70125</td>
<td>945-4780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>2828 Olive St. 70125</td>
<td>945-4853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>1401 Kaslo St. 70126</td>
<td>948-4099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Rondan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1901 Deslondes 70125</td>
<td>942-2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013 Myrtle St 70125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>1930 Fourteenth 70125</td>
<td>944-7124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td>321 Tangle St. 70125</td>
<td>879-4057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Aime</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013 Broad St. 70125</td>
<td>943-3722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>933 Gordon St. 70125</td>
<td>241-4311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Payton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1219 Gordon St. 70125</td>
<td>985-8818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annette James</td>
<td></td>
<td>2700 Bienville St.</td>
<td>949-2791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl A. Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>1738 Alabao St.</td>
<td>940-0778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>2122 Kenner St.</td>
<td>945-0749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Goldie Rainmaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>2523 Leonce St.</td>
<td>945-4780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Rainmaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>4634 North St.</td>
<td>246-9787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latricia Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>1401 Leesops St</td>
<td>948-4099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice Ponder</td>
<td></td>
<td>1901 Deslondes St</td>
<td>947-2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2713 Myrtle St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>1930 First St.</td>
<td>949-1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Hayman</td>
<td></td>
<td>124 Tupelo St.</td>
<td>279-4057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char thyroid Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013 Good St.</td>
<td>948-5722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>933 Gordon St.</td>
<td>217-4311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Smoot</td>
<td></td>
<td>1219 Gordon St.</td>
<td>945-9818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Payton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246-1423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that cannot be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Harrison</td>
<td>1834 London</td>
<td>943-8073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourine Harmon</td>
<td>1845 Deodoro</td>
<td>944-9087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Clarke</td>
<td>1432 Wescott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shonda Mckeen</td>
<td>5005 B. Delugny</td>
<td>939-3506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Jackson</td>
<td>5114 N. Romana</td>
<td>945-6216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Jackson</td>
<td>1827 Forrestal</td>
<td>945-6216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jackson</td>
<td>1829 Forrestal</td>
<td>945-6216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venessa Celestine</td>
<td>2529 St. Mauria</td>
<td>276-4352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen D Jones</td>
<td>1617 Forrestal</td>
<td>947-1543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretie Jordan</td>
<td>2410 Delaware</td>
<td>799-1627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Coleski</td>
<td>1209 Deodero</td>
<td>943-0726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Johnson</td>
<td>1612 Greenville Ctr.</td>
<td>948-6168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Jordan</td>
<td>1601 Cuffin Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Smith</td>
<td>1930 Forrestal</td>
<td>944-1729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**February 17, 1997**

**WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL**

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norlita A. Parker</td>
<td>Norlita A. Parker</td>
<td>716 Utopia St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>274-8724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannine Jackson</td>
<td>Jeannine Jackson</td>
<td>712 Louisa St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>944-1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Dervise</td>
<td>Shannon Dervise</td>
<td>5853 Paujie Dr., NOLA 70127</td>
<td>282-9995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Copelin</td>
<td>Michelle Copelin</td>
<td>2416 Devery St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>279-1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles E. Carter</td>
<td>Charles E. Carter</td>
<td>1821 Airline St., NOLA 70118</td>
<td>866-7835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Coleman</td>
<td>Angela Coleman</td>
<td>280 Canal, NOLA 70119</td>
<td>483-4178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Chambers</td>
<td>Sandra Chambers</td>
<td>3530 Dejux Blvd., NOLA 70119</td>
<td>948-2318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton H. Lewis</td>
<td>Felton H. Lewis</td>
<td>4281 Utopia Ave., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>284-1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise J. Jones</td>
<td>Denise J. Jones</td>
<td>2621 Tongil St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>944-3185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Sinclair</td>
<td>Shirley Sinclair</td>
<td>6108 Royal St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>277-7858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latoya Mixon</td>
<td>Latoya Mixon</td>
<td>7118 Royal St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>277-9858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Althea Atkins</td>
<td>Althea Atkins</td>
<td>7108 Royal St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>271-9858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezel Atkins</td>
<td>Lezel Atkins</td>
<td>7108 Royal St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>277-9858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obioma Austin</td>
<td>Obioma Austin</td>
<td>7108 Royal St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>277-9858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onnia Austin</td>
<td>Onnia Austin</td>
<td>7108 Royal St., NOLA 70117</td>
<td>277-9858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to
the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this
project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical
continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation
that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used
is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Magee</td>
<td></td>
<td>1507 Deslond 947-8607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Butler</td>
<td>1814 N Robertson 949-7893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Banks</td>
<td>1101 Tennessee 944-8513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Platte</td>
<td>711 S Tennessee 947-9476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carret J.Joseph</td>
<td>4710 N Williams St 948-0456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elisa Darrell</td>
<td>4917 Irick st 947-9936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelda J. Runyon</td>
<td>1402 Deslond St 947-4040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Runyon</td>
<td>1402 Deslond St 947-4045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter J. Robinson Jr.</td>
<td>1406 Deslond St 947-4090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores Grade</td>
<td>1416 Deslond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Maggs</td>
<td>1300 Deslond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherell Calley</td>
<td>1310 Deslond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aydel Maggs</td>
<td>1302 Deslond 945-2885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Starks</td>
<td>1433 Jordan Ave 943-5947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Starks</td>
<td>840 Deslond St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Bernstein</td>
<td>1318 Jordan Ave 943-5338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Marson</td>
<td>1427 Deslond St 944-3031 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Douglas</td>
<td>Sheila Douglas</td>
<td>3624 Ben Reaugh St.</td>
<td>844-4725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Broomfield</td>
<td>A. Broomfield</td>
<td>2207 AR Park</td>
<td>747-2821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Fike</td>
<td>F. Fike</td>
<td>829 Sister St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Hurst</td>
<td>Angel Hurst</td>
<td>827 Sister St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Davis</td>
<td>Esther Davis</td>
<td>819 Sister St.</td>
<td>940-1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Walker-Thomas</td>
<td>Tammy Walker-Thomas</td>
<td>919 Sister St.</td>
<td>943-9282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenehead Edwards</td>
<td>Jenehead Edwards</td>
<td>4711 N Rampart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Stanley</td>
<td>Sheryl Stanley</td>
<td>4711 N Rampart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Hohn</td>
<td>Marc Hohn</td>
<td>938 Southern Ave.</td>
<td>944-6275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilli Talley</td>
<td>Lilli Talley</td>
<td>905 Sister St.</td>
<td>943-2656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Hitchcock</td>
<td>Ken Hitchcock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Bates</td>
<td>M. Bates</td>
<td>4700 N. Rampart</td>
<td>944-1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audley Baudoin</td>
<td>Audley Baudoin</td>
<td>AUDREY BAUDDON-4708 N. RAMPART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 11, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Adams</td>
<td>Charline Adams</td>
<td>1031 Sister St., 949-6791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Harris</td>
<td>James Harris</td>
<td>1031 Sister St., 945-8612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Harris</td>
<td>Edward Harris</td>
<td>4706 St. Claude, 944-1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Jamison</td>
<td>Janice Jamison</td>
<td>1031 St. Ann, 949-8818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwail Thurlow</td>
<td>Edward Thurlow</td>
<td>938 Iowarden, 949-627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Russell</td>
<td>Andy Russell</td>
<td>924 N. Jordan, 940-5736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldon Greer</td>
<td>Eldon Greer</td>
<td>405 N. Jordan</td>
<td>949-5916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Green</td>
<td>Larry Green</td>
<td>405 N. Jordan</td>
<td>949-5916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Green</td>
<td>Jerome Green</td>
<td>405 N. Jordan</td>
<td>949-5916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Green</td>
<td>Lawrence Green</td>
<td>405 N. Jordan</td>
<td>949-5916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward J. Ray</td>
<td>Edward J. Ray</td>
<td>840 N. Jordan Ave.</td>
<td>949-2634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Galloway</td>
<td>Greta Galloway</td>
<td>820 Jordan, 947-1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellie B. H.</td>
<td>Nellie B. H.</td>
<td>834 Jordan, 948-058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorey Cole</td>
<td>Dorey Cole</td>
<td>9739 N. 24th St., 948-0658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Robinson</td>
<td>Sandra Robinson</td>
<td>4737 N. Dauphine, 949-555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

NAME (Printed) | SIGNATURE | ADDRESS | PHONE NO.
--- | --- | --- | ---
Linda Snead | Linda Snead | 618 Deslande | 947-4972
Douglas Sine | Douglas Sine | 535 Deslande St. | 947-9862
Reginald Lewis | Reginald Lewis | 645 Deslande Ste | 945-5875
Nicole Hamon | Nicole Hamon | 605 Deslande St | 947-8371
Audrey Smith | Audrey Smith | 600 Deslondre | 945-5850
Reginald Smith | Reginald Smith | 620 Deslande | 945-5850
Terrence Wolfe | Terrence Wolfe | 606 Deslande | 945-3206
Samuel Freeman | Samuel Freeman | 611 Deslande St | 945-6762
Gerald Morris Jr | Gerald Morris Jr | 617 Deslande St | 945-8015
Aliza Rashie | Aliza Rashie | 603 Jutland Ave | 430-6840
Marchatta Timon | Marchatta Timon | 605 Deslande St | 947-8371
Cynthia Summer | Cynthia Summer | 537 Deslande St | 944-9558
Shelby Sine | Shelby Sine | 603 Deslande St | 948-7681
Shelley Wilson | Shelley Wilson | 4839 Charles | 948-7681
February 17, 1991

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Hanzo</td>
<td>Albert Hanzo</td>
<td>5317 Royal St.</td>
<td>943-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Hanzo</td>
<td>Geraldine Hanzo</td>
<td>5317 Royal St.</td>
<td>943-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Bonne Carrere</td>
<td>Frank Bonne Carrere</td>
<td>5347 Royal St.</td>
<td>944-6397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadine Bonne Carrere</td>
<td>Bernadine Bonne Carrere</td>
<td>5347 Royal St.</td>
<td>944-6397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph K. Mehrten</td>
<td>Joseph K. Mehrten</td>
<td>5326 Royal St.</td>
<td>949-6490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel A. Baltimore</td>
<td>Manuel A. Baltimore</td>
<td>5326 Royal St.</td>
<td>949-6490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. Burse</td>
<td>J. D. Burse</td>
<td>5326 Royal St.</td>
<td>949-6490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Moore Jr</td>
<td>Frank Moore Jr</td>
<td>633 Egana St.</td>
<td>948-2410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>匀. M. S.</td>
<td>匀. M. S.</td>
<td>5335 Charity</td>
<td>943-2274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma D. Giron</td>
<td>Thelma D. Giron</td>
<td>524 Pulley</td>
<td>943-1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson M. Ford</td>
<td>Henderson M. Ford</td>
<td>5349 Charity</td>
<td>948-5558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammie Hamilton</td>
<td>Tammie Hamilton</td>
<td>5319 Douglas</td>
<td>949-7942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Freeman</td>
<td>Dianne Freeman</td>
<td>5318 Douglas</td>
<td>943-0754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Delcuir</td>
<td>Joseph Delcuir</td>
<td>5332 Douglas</td>
<td>949-0012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. **We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.**

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura L. Hanzo</td>
<td>Hanzo</td>
<td>5326 Royal St, N.O. 4T 945-8385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel J. Daller</td>
<td>Noel Daller 5323 Dauphine No. 14 945-7618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calandra Washington</td>
<td>Washington 5316 Dauphine N.O. 949-6896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manson McDonald</td>
<td>Manson 703 Andry N.O.14 945-7626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorien Riggelton</td>
<td>Riggelton 618 Andry N.O. 945-5286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Coleman</td>
<td>Coleman 621 Andry N.O. 945-7574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand Daller Jr.</td>
<td>Daller   5323 Dauphine St, N.O. 945-7618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Señor</td>
<td>Señor 5320 Dauphine St, N.O. 944-7906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Bell</td>
<td>Bell 5320 Dauphine St, N.O. 944-7906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE F. DAY</td>
<td>Day 5324 Royal 945-6440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBIE THOMAS</td>
<td>Thomas 5327 Dauphine St 945-2841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile Lindemann</td>
<td>Lindemann 605 Andry St 945-395-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas J. Lindemann</td>
<td>Lindemann 605 Andry St 943-2932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur N. Morgan</td>
<td>Morgan 710 Esplanade 945-5211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert J. June</td>
<td>June 625 Andry 944-1224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that cannot be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delia Crimble</td>
<td>Delia Crimble</td>
<td>5318 N Rampart</td>
<td>504-445-789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lemons</td>
<td>Jennifer Lemons</td>
<td>5320 N Rampart</td>
<td>944-5263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickie Jefferson</td>
<td>Rickie Jefferson</td>
<td>804 Andry</td>
<td>945-2726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Rhodes</td>
<td>Virginia Rhodes</td>
<td>741 Irwin</td>
<td>948-0487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyed Lonzo</td>
<td>Loyed Lonzo</td>
<td>625 Columbia</td>
<td>945-2648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Lonzo</td>
<td>Lois Lonzo</td>
<td>625 Columbia</td>
<td>945-2548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elphamous Malbrue Jr</td>
<td>Elphamous Malbrue Jr</td>
<td>5420 Royal St</td>
<td>944-0846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola Blue</td>
<td>Viola Blue</td>
<td>5426 Royal St</td>
<td>947-9715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Dunn</td>
<td>Theodore Dunn</td>
<td>5439 Royal St</td>
<td>943-5102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloise Griffin</td>
<td>Eloise Griffin</td>
<td>5453 Royal St</td>
<td>944-2392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Griffin</td>
<td>Henry Griffin</td>
<td>5453 Royal St</td>
<td>944-2392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Peden</td>
<td>Theresa Peden</td>
<td>5442 Royal St</td>
<td>944-6410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mervis Peden</td>
<td>Mervis Peden</td>
<td>5442 Royal St</td>
<td>944-6410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurine Chapman</td>
<td>Lurine Chapman</td>
<td>5444 Royal St</td>
<td>943-3584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Claiborne</td>
<td>Rodney Claibone</td>
<td>5463 Royal St</td>
<td>945-2343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HELEN JUNO</td>
<td>Helen Juny</td>
<td>523 Andry St.</td>
<td>944-1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA GARDEN</td>
<td>Anna Gordon</td>
<td>806 Andry St.</td>
<td>944-5697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERARD DARNEL</td>
<td>Gerard Darnel</td>
<td>800 Andry</td>
<td>945-1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. E.B. Burke</td>
<td>Mrs. E.B. Burke</td>
<td>Dauphine St.</td>
<td>944-431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Roy Marone</td>
<td>Roy Marone</td>
<td>824 Andry</td>
<td>944-431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Macklin</td>
<td>Dorothy Macklin</td>
<td>5330 Burgundy</td>
<td>945-3688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Gibson</td>
<td>Patricia Gibson</td>
<td>5335 Burgundy</td>
<td>945-5184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gibson</td>
<td>John Gibson</td>
<td>5313 Burgundy</td>
<td>948-9283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Riley</td>
<td>Wanda Riley</td>
<td>5313 Burgundy</td>
<td>948-9283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Young</td>
<td>Shannon Young</td>
<td>5303 Burgundy</td>
<td>945-5810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherrell Johnson</td>
<td>Sherrell Johnson</td>
<td>926 Egan</td>
<td>945-3067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Lewis</td>
<td>Stacy Lewis</td>
<td>926 Egan St</td>
<td>832-4215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Dillion</td>
<td>Roy Dillion</td>
<td>5306 N Rampart</td>
<td>947-8481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara E. Sims</td>
<td>Clara E. Sims</td>
<td>5314 N Rampart</td>
<td>945-1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verline Holmes</td>
<td>Verline Holmes</td>
<td>5317 N. Rampart</td>
<td>944-2426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia A. Cream</td>
<td>Patricia Cream</td>
<td>715 Eganía St</td>
<td>945-2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERVIN BUTLER</td>
<td>ERVIN Butler</td>
<td>715 Eganía St</td>
<td>945-2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne M. Green</td>
<td>Dwayne M. Green</td>
<td>715 Eganía St</td>
<td>945-2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Hale</td>
<td>Julia Hale</td>
<td>2537 Polk St</td>
<td>947-6097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell White</td>
<td>Darrell White</td>
<td>2523 Polk St</td>
<td>947-6987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlinda Wintre</td>
<td>Arlinda Wintre</td>
<td>701 Andrews St</td>
<td>947-3080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUDENE G. CARRAS</td>
<td>Eudene G. Carras</td>
<td>5338 Loyd</td>
<td>944-1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCINDA G. CARRAS</td>
<td>Lucinda G. Carras</td>
<td>5338 Loyd</td>
<td>944-1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDDI CARTER</td>
<td>Teddi Carter</td>
<td>5916 S. 21st</td>
<td>523-2322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt Cooley</td>
<td>Burt Cooley</td>
<td>5300 21st</td>
<td>944-2374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHONICA T. TAYLOR</td>
<td>CHONICA T. Taylor</td>
<td>5300 21st</td>
<td>943-0378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Peters</td>
<td>Dianne Peters</td>
<td>5329 Douglass</td>
<td>948-4928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Peters</td>
<td>Billy Peters</td>
<td>5329 Douglass</td>
<td>948-4928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES TAYLOR</td>
<td>James Taylor</td>
<td>2527 Alg 2</td>
<td>276-7521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Hayes</td>
<td>Antoinette</td>
<td>5240 Chartres St</td>
<td>948-2338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that cannot be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARIE C. PARKER</td>
<td>Marie C. Parker</td>
<td>504-279-7073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Copeland Parker</td>
<td>Elsie Copeland Parker</td>
<td>6127 Royal St. (504) 377-0675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norlisha Alicia Parker</td>
<td>Norlisha Alicia Parker</td>
<td>6127 Royal St. (504) 297-0675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Lewis</td>
<td>Pamela Lewis</td>
<td>8618 Hammond St (504) 244-1252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY FLEMING</td>
<td>Mary Fleming</td>
<td>1317 Lake St. 601-3620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHALL WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Marshall Williams</td>
<td>2231 Leslie St. 54-2844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Simpson</td>
<td>Dorothy Simpson</td>
<td>1645 Tulip St. 246-1318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Cheatham</td>
<td>Danielle Cheatham</td>
<td>1511 Harrison Ave. 288-3015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Logan</td>
<td>Jean Logan</td>
<td>1917 Pauline St. 282-572/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel Araspe</td>
<td>Muriel Araspe</td>
<td>208 N. De La. 392-2877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURICE GEORGE</td>
<td>Maurice George</td>
<td>4818 Knight Dr. 242-4509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE WILSON</td>
<td>George Wilson</td>
<td>3730 Republic St. 283-1273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERGENT BARRY</td>
<td>Sergent Barry</td>
<td>810 Bienville St. Apt.201 569-7959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANICE JACKSON</td>
<td>Janice Jackson</td>
<td>2402 Lafayette St. 823-5658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Gaines</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800 Mercari #219</td>
<td>887-5288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrie S. Burns</td>
<td></td>
<td>1533 St. Andrew</td>
<td>524-6805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Calinico</td>
<td></td>
<td>1458 Constance</td>
<td>523-5505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recinda Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>7409 Maida</td>
<td>286-5357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana T. Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td>3584 Virge Blvd NOLA</td>
<td>286-5939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J. Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>117 Hillary NOLA</td>
<td>861-2836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td>9842 Hopper Rd NOLA</td>
<td>286-1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Collier</td>
<td></td>
<td>491 Grenada Dr NOLA</td>
<td>287-2173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary B. Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>1930 Lombard St</td>
<td>288-2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td>201 Metropolitan</td>
<td>945-1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney J. Thorp</td>
<td></td>
<td>1946 Hope St.</td>
<td>945-9690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond E. McMillan</td>
<td></td>
<td>#5 St. Claude St. 947-9715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael A. Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>2263 Bush Pk. St.</td>
<td>556-4576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1820 Delray St.</td>
<td>848-4705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest J. Breaux</td>
<td></td>
<td>1343 Independence</td>
<td>949-8858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara McCot</td>
<td></td>
<td>3404 Feliciana</td>
<td>949-9305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>948-2726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie M. Wiegand</td>
<td></td>
<td>2745 Claiborne</td>
<td>943-2678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Coleman</td>
<td></td>
<td>944-2215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td>944-2935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Everhart</td>
<td></td>
<td>727 Phillips, 7030</td>
<td>944-9325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. Brey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1516 Cricket, Ct.</td>
<td>942-9398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael Caro</td>
<td></td>
<td>1866 Carroll St.</td>
<td>940-5696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry J. Hargrove</td>
<td></td>
<td>2912 Haverue St.</td>
<td>944-1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen C. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>2617 Lobel Dr.</td>
<td>944-3281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edric L. Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>136-3 Metairie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen J. Yang</td>
<td></td>
<td>1844 Penrose</td>
<td>944-8825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosella Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 Tennessee</td>
<td>944-8825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 S. Ralston</td>
<td>241-6974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>5472 N. Robertson</td>
<td>947-9152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

NAME                    SIGNATURE                     ADDRESS                      PHONE NO.
Antoinette D. Norri’s    Antoinette Dunn                619 Leslie St. 949-4100
Laverne Youngblood       Laverne Youngblood             49350 ed Dr 949-073
Broderica Payne          Bridgette Payne                6038 N. Rampart 772-825
Audrey Jenkins           Audrey Jenkins                 2803 N Claiborne
Carter Thompson          Carter Thompson                5431 N Rampart AT 274-3106
Thoung Mai Nguyen        Thoung Mai Nguyen              820 OR 949-2504
Hoit Yiao                 Y. Yiao                       9417 Geisler 772-3251
Edward Johnson            Edward Johnson                1163 Cauba 949-3167
Genevieve Bienvenu        Genevieve Bienvenu             1616 Caffin Ave 949-2257
Audrey Womble             Audrey Womble                116 Caffin Ave 949-415
Krae D. Smith            Krae D. Smith                 119 Egan Ave Apt 2 949-1444
James Nyguen             James Nyguen                 1616 Caffin Ave 949-7257
Frederick Sinner          Frederick Sinner              5314 N Rampart St 949-2257
Victor Reid               Victor Reid                   1616 Caffin Ave 949-2257
Terrence Sage             Terrence Sage                 1616 Caffin Ave 949-2257
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hammote</td>
<td>Mary Hammote</td>
<td>628 Lamarque</td>
<td>944-2315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Williams Gilmore</td>
<td>John W. Phinney</td>
<td>927 Floyd</td>
<td>944-9986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandra Calhoun</td>
<td>Chandra Calhoun</td>
<td>5507 Carondelet St</td>
<td>943-5880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Durner</td>
<td>Sandra Durner</td>
<td>5505 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>945-4307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Flagg</td>
<td>Cheryl Flagg</td>
<td>500 Floyd St</td>
<td>915-7013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Allen</td>
<td>Greg Allen</td>
<td>5437 Bayou St</td>
<td>944-3012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Kaylor</td>
<td>Kim Kaylor</td>
<td>3123 Argue St</td>
<td>943-5880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Garner</td>
<td>Marie Garner</td>
<td>8130 Royal St</td>
<td>944-5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Fouts</td>
<td>Darlene Fouts</td>
<td>827 Floyd St</td>
<td>940-5869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delilah Knox</td>
<td>Delilah Knox</td>
<td>5501 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>948-4683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polita René</td>
<td>Polita René</td>
<td>1027 Floyd St</td>
<td>943-1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine McCormick</td>
<td>Augustine McCormick</td>
<td>1036 Crofton St</td>
<td>947-2164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorelaine Bithoit</td>
<td>Lorelaine Bithoit</td>
<td>3140 E. Rampart St</td>
<td>947-3888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloris Calhoun</td>
<td>Deloris Calhoun</td>
<td>2125 Delcy St</td>
<td>947-79-1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarice Calhoun</td>
<td>Clarice Calhoun</td>
<td>2229 Delcy St</td>
<td>271-1847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victor Cruzado Jr</td>
<td>Victor Cruzado Jr</td>
<td>519 Flood St</td>
<td>947-9228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Davis</td>
<td>Wayne Davis</td>
<td>500 Andy St</td>
<td>940-5786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie Hammett</td>
<td>Willie Hammett</td>
<td>5337 Charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octavia Woods</td>
<td>Octavia Woods</td>
<td>1714 Trico St</td>
<td>279-7186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Black</td>
<td>James Black</td>
<td>Delery St 70</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Field Butler</td>
<td>Cherry Field Butler</td>
<td>2801 Delery St</td>
<td>279-7319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Flores</td>
<td>Tracy Flores</td>
<td>2716 Rodnets St</td>
<td>276-789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Watkins</td>
<td>Johnny Watkins</td>
<td>2316 Delery St</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Jenkins</td>
<td>Sylvia Jenkins</td>
<td>600 O'rin St</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Lee</td>
<td>Raymond Lee</td>
<td>1036 Callin Ave</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Coker</td>
<td>Robert Coker</td>
<td>6137 Flood St</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Brown</td>
<td>Rebecca Brown</td>
<td>2422 Dubuis St</td>
<td>272-9515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Haynes</td>
<td>Barbara Haynes</td>
<td>702 Caffin Ave</td>
<td>947-6410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Ann Harris</td>
<td>Penny Ann Harris</td>
<td>2422 Dubuis St</td>
<td>272-9515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Raci</td>
<td>Tony Raci</td>
<td>3914 Line Ave</td>
<td>541-0462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Orks</td>
<td>Michael Orks</td>
<td>808 Joe Yenni</td>
<td>467-0764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Coward</td>
<td>Patrick Coward</td>
<td>4725 Dauphine</td>
<td>524-4747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Flower</td>
<td>Mary Flower</td>
<td>4820 Royal</td>
<td>947-3387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beulah Parker</td>
<td>Beulah Parker</td>
<td>4820 Royal St.</td>
<td>947-2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Williams</td>
<td>Wesley Williams</td>
<td>4820 Royal St.</td>
<td>947-2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie Mitchell</td>
<td>Donnie Mitchell</td>
<td>622 Deslondes St.</td>
<td>279-8137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Boudrains</td>
<td>Bonnie Boudrains</td>
<td>431 Tricou St.</td>
<td>279-8137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Boudrains</td>
<td>Charles Boudrains</td>
<td>431 Tricou St.</td>
<td>279-8137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Collins</td>
<td>Arnold Collins</td>
<td>414 Tupelo St.</td>
<td>279-8137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrone Johnson</td>
<td>Tyrone Johnson</td>
<td>2300 N. Claiborne Ave.</td>
<td>945-7498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Collins</td>
<td>Barbara Collins</td>
<td>414 Tupelo St.</td>
<td>279-8137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Stovall</td>
<td>McKinley Stovall</td>
<td>5820 N. Claiborne Ave.</td>
<td>943-2354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marven Collins</td>
<td>Marven Collins</td>
<td>575 Caffin</td>
<td>943-2354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter McHugh</td>
<td>Peter McHugh</td>
<td>601 Bernard St.</td>
<td>895-7818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

NAME SIGNATURE ADDRESS PHONE NO.

Wendy Scott 2078 Bond St 940-578

Charnay Hill 1940 Flood St 940-5716

Jamy Haynes 1904 Flood 9413-2065

Eva M Joseph 2403 Ogania 943-2620

Michael Fagone 2011 Rockefeller 944-3717

Elsie A Kin 2354 Alma 947-3919

Larry Spicer Jr 600 Charter 619-5190

Lucia Riza 778 S. Main 9965

Kestus Holmes 1605 Flood St 945-883

Monica Welch Leonard 1827 Colvin 948-3105

Henry Myers 2314 Michael None

Yvette McTear Davis 5128 W. Valencia 943-9115

Orville Mowry Arvella Roman 4690 Lancelot Dr 29303014

Louis J Busse 1238 Lower 943-8575

Palmer Delk 3415 Chalm
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada Woods</td>
<td>Delia Woods</td>
<td>535 Tricou St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Woods</td>
<td>Reginald Asian</td>
<td>535 Tricou St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy McFadden</td>
<td>Cathy McFadden</td>
<td>59th and Douglas St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin McFadden</td>
<td>Alvin McFadden</td>
<td>2020 Lamarque St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina D. Bell</td>
<td>Tina D. Bell</td>
<td>601 Tricou St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory DeRusoe</td>
<td>Gregory DeRusoe</td>
<td>601 Tricou St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Green</td>
<td>Marilyn Green</td>
<td>617 Tricou St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley A. Allen</td>
<td>Stanley A. Allen</td>
<td>6119 Marais St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Morris</td>
<td>Chester Morris</td>
<td>6101 Douglas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol A. Liu</td>
<td>Carol A. Liu</td>
<td>5935 St Maurice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Niel</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>603 Tricou St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Bastian</td>
<td>Dwight Bastian</td>
<td>330 Delmar St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudine Alexander</td>
<td>Claudine Alexander</td>
<td>329 Tricou St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Ivory</td>
<td>Eli Ivory</td>
<td>6122 Douglas</td>
<td>272-8452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1991

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Brown</td>
<td>Evelyn Brown</td>
<td>1726 Delany</td>
<td>271-0277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Washington</td>
<td>Angel Washington</td>
<td>1904 Lamana</td>
<td>949-9286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelma Dupre</td>
<td>Samuel Dupre</td>
<td>6217 N. Pirourst</td>
<td>276-8846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Maye</td>
<td>Marie Maye</td>
<td>1247 N. 11</td>
<td>943-3910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Maye</td>
<td>Thelma Maye</td>
<td>1247 N. 11</td>
<td>943-3910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Proctor</td>
<td>Albert Proctor</td>
<td>3020 McAlveez</td>
<td>945-7537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeline Jacobs</td>
<td>Adeline Jacobs</td>
<td>5016 Chartres</td>
<td>949-0170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita Thomas</td>
<td>Juanita Thomas</td>
<td>9473-6317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Grissin</td>
<td>Vivian Grissin</td>
<td>5448 Galves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

NAME (Printed) SIGNATURE ADDRESS PHONE NO.

Corey Washington Corey Washington 708 Living 543-5242
Ernest Smith Ernest Smith 5020 Dauphine 945-9747
Shawn Pichon Shawn Pichon 4824 Dauphine 944-7170
Sennel Cooper Danielle Burge 5214 Dauphine 945-4086
Serenity Smith Mckylynn Smith 624 Forstall 947-1732
Charles Heilman Charles Heilman 5128 Charters 949-7295
Bob Hays Edward Moody, 607 Forstall

Toula Morgan Terry Morgan 400 Esplanade 947-8792
Merrice Andrew Spencer & Howard 1401 St. Nicasie 275-5971
Natacha Thomas Natacha Thomas 5231 Bayou st 949-4504
Cornelia Stone Cornelia Stone 5018 Royal 35-945-1539

Joseph Arsen Smith Joseph Arsen Smith 625 Flood St 943-5352
Lloyd Escaig Lloyd Escaig 627 Flood St 943-3524
Sarah Luter Sarah Luter 703 Flood St 949-3291
Judge Luter Judge Luter 703 Flood St 949-3291
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margie Mervin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1314 Zamaco St</td>
<td>947-2163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>2139 Forstall St</td>
<td>943-1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Dyal</td>
<td></td>
<td>8614 N Rampart St</td>
<td>947-1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredreene</td>
<td></td>
<td>1027 N Rampart St</td>
<td>271-8934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Keasley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1911 DeLesse St</td>
<td>947-6270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanda Keasley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1911 DeLesse St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxane Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>1609 DeLesse St</td>
<td>949-5444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettle J. Talley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1660 Caffin Ave</td>
<td>945-0439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Talley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1660 Caffin Ave</td>
<td>945-0439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. Amedee</td>
<td></td>
<td>8230 Aberdeen Knt</td>
<td>289-5098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Roy Clemons</td>
<td></td>
<td>6400 Press Drive</td>
<td>286-5235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Roy Clemons</td>
<td></td>
<td>6400 Press Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron M. Chapin</td>
<td></td>
<td>700 ST. Mauzie AVE</td>
<td>279-3392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lann S. Chapin</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 St. Mauzie Ave</td>
<td>947-3244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse F. Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006 VA Lamanet Ht</td>
<td>947-5353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006 VA Lamanet Ht</td>
<td>947-5353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>1616 Caffin Ave</td>
<td>947-2167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Daon III</td>
<td></td>
<td>5003 Lake</td>
<td>948-7278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1710 Alabo St.</td>
<td>947-5888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Reed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1616 Caffin Ave</td>
<td>941-3021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Coelho</td>
<td></td>
<td>5238 Chartres St</td>
<td>948-2338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne McGraw</td>
<td></td>
<td>718 Andry St.</td>
<td>948-2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals Mosley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1904 Boursey St.</td>
<td>941-2736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neisha Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1408 Alado St.</td>
<td>947-0456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold R. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2217 Hi Lane Dr.</td>
<td>682-1257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

NAME (Printed)    SIGNATURE    ADDRESS    PHONE NO.

Sue Dadeau        [Signature]  38520 E. 9 3 5 - 4 4 3 5

Dwayne Johnson    [Signature]  5215 Royal    364-1700

Pamela Bushell    [Signature]  1536 Audubon 946 - 1366

Jeanell Holmes    [Signature]  5329 N. Rampart St 944-8151

Alvin J. Powell   [Signature]  5325 Burgundy 943-1894

Ruby C. Synder    [Signature]  4123 Martin St 948-6491

Raymond R. Bracy  [Signature]  7023 Willow St 894-2589

John B. Park      [Signature]  5016 Pontiac 895-6312

CLEMENTINE D. BROWN [Signature]  4714 Burgundy St

Grace Allen

Marion Payne, Mari Payne 4719 Burgundy St 9410-0335

Hand Ace Walk 4719 1/2 Burgundy St

Bundy Cory 4717 1/2 Burgundy

Walter Payne, Walter Payne 9912 Dauphine 995-2974
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that cannot be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric L. Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>3736 Kauter St.</td>
<td>984-2833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>6711 N. Federal Blvd.</td>
<td>242-7985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>4810 Brittany Ct</td>
<td>254-2349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jasper</td>
<td></td>
<td>1421 Tricon St.</td>
<td>271-3215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloris Bouguereau</td>
<td></td>
<td>3641 DeSine Dr.</td>
<td>949-5691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne H. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 Dekay St.</td>
<td>279-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melva E. Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>3421 Lakeview</td>
<td>362-9827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Haynes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2223 DeSine Dr.</td>
<td>NOLA 70117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Courrier</td>
<td></td>
<td>7115 Evergreen</td>
<td>945-3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Hobson</td>
<td></td>
<td>707 Brett Pk.</td>
<td>6063-2353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene James</td>
<td></td>
<td>812 Touchee Ave.</td>
<td>941-0613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>6025 Urquhart St.</td>
<td>941-2854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseanne A. Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>6025 Urquhart St.</td>
<td>947-2854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Haynes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2539 Amanda St.</td>
<td>944-2832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Grant</td>
<td>Marilyn Grant</td>
<td>718 Lamothe</td>
<td>945-6390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. Delord</td>
<td>John P. Delord</td>
<td>614 CAFFNAVE</td>
<td>945-8174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Colindres</td>
<td>Harold Colindres</td>
<td>6022 Chartres</td>
<td>277-9970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson</td>
<td>Muba Johnson</td>
<td>6024 Chartres</td>
<td>370-2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Dillard</td>
<td>Donald Dingley</td>
<td>1815 Hollywood</td>
<td>850-8534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George A. DeJean</td>
<td>George A. DeJean</td>
<td>430 Franks</td>
<td>279-3365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Terrando</td>
<td>MARY LANDRY</td>
<td>923 Tchou 271-365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Ponche</td>
<td>Alfred McPonche</td>
<td>6412 Marque St.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Brickley</td>
<td>Karen Braden</td>
<td>319 Irwin St.</td>
<td>277-4810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Brickley</td>
<td>Iris Braden</td>
<td>319 Irwin St.</td>
<td>277-4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Lewis</td>
<td>Harry Amor</td>
<td>1609 N. Loven</td>
<td>47-0091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Centre</td>
<td>Dorothy Centre</td>
<td>705 Lamothe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charley Hill</td>
<td>Charley Dissor</td>
<td>63 24 Pantages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Williams</td>
<td>Jeanette Williams</td>
<td>63 24 Pantages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry A. Mills</td>
<td>Harry A. Mills</td>
<td>527 St. Marceaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Barnes</td>
<td>Deborah Barnes</td>
<td>4819 Royal St.</td>
<td>948-4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl A. Barnes, Sr.</td>
<td>Carl A. Barnes, Sr.</td>
<td>4819 Royal St</td>
<td>948-4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl A. Barnes Jr.</td>
<td>Carl A. Barnes</td>
<td>4819 Royal St.</td>
<td>948-4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudette Boles</td>
<td>Claudette Boles</td>
<td>3815 N. Roman</td>
<td>948-9381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRINETTE A. PARKER</td>
<td>GRINETTE PARKER</td>
<td>4820 ROYAL</td>
<td>947-2504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEY WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Wesley Williams</td>
<td>4820 Royal</td>
<td>947-2504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Barnes</td>
<td>Rachael Barnes</td>
<td>4819 Royal St.</td>
<td>948-4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Blaise</td>
<td>Elizabeth Blaise</td>
<td>5837 Bonnot</td>
<td>947-4471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEROY BILLER</td>
<td>Mary BILLER</td>
<td>1914 Egging</td>
<td>944-7398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Duplessis</td>
<td>Joe Duplessis</td>
<td>1814 Delclos</td>
<td>944-7398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Howard</td>
<td>Warren Howard</td>
<td>519 ST MAURICE</td>
<td>944-7398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James B. Benjamin</td>
<td>James B. BENJAMIN</td>
<td>6101 DOWNS</td>
<td>944-7398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY VAN BUREN</td>
<td>1944 CHARBONNET</td>
<td>1944 CHARBONNET</td>
<td>944-7398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Hubbard</td>
<td>Arthur Hubbard</td>
<td>1944 CHARBONNET</td>
<td>944-7398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine Wimbly</td>
<td>Geraldine WimBLY</td>
<td>2017 CHARBONNET</td>
<td>9490124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Williams</td>
<td>Auendolph Williams</td>
<td>4901 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>943 3156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodolfo Mejia</td>
<td></td>
<td>4911 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>943 3156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Bannister</td>
<td></td>
<td>335 Dauphine St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Bannister</td>
<td></td>
<td>335 Dauphine St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Cheever</td>
<td></td>
<td>528 Tapero Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Cummings</td>
<td></td>
<td>4901 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>943 3156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Ellis</td>
<td></td>
<td>48440 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>943 7945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda James</td>
<td></td>
<td>4901 Dauphine St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Close Hogan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1916 Dauphine St.</td>
<td>943 6665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresa Cheek</td>
<td></td>
<td>1915 Lamonache St.</td>
<td>943 2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trina Irving</td>
<td></td>
<td>1920 Lamonache St.</td>
<td>947 8276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Simas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1933 Lamonache St.</td>
<td>947 8276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Joan Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td>2430 Rayner St.</td>
<td>945 6318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean E. Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>3523 St. Ferdinand</td>
<td>288 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelia Cummins</td>
<td></td>
<td>1943 Lamonache St.</td>
<td>70117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June Carr</td>
<td>June Carr</td>
<td>618 Forstall St</td>
<td>944-7177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurita Douc</td>
<td>Douc</td>
<td>515 Dauphine St</td>
<td>947-8165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lindbeck</td>
<td>Lindbeck</td>
<td>1301 St Claude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Leonard</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>5101 St Claude</td>
<td>943-4787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bell</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>1001 St Claude</td>
<td>949-2115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Edwarde Williams</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>2317 Burgundy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Mitchell</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>5018 Burgundy</td>
<td>949-2715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Sylvester</td>
<td>Sylvester</td>
<td>1211 Eaganic</td>
<td>944-8119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Smith</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>5020 Dauphine</td>
<td>945-8253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Celestine</td>
<td>Celestine</td>
<td>4837 Burgundy</td>
<td>943-1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Williams</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>1415 N. Claiborne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO Ann Green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1214 Choctaw</td>
<td>745-5008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal Kennedy</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>2114 Carise</td>
<td>944-3058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benaw Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2114 Carisse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike West</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>4701 N. Rampart</td>
<td>945-6488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Tubbes</td>
<td>Tubbes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

NAME (Printed)  SIGNATURE  ADDRESS  PHONE NO.

Urban Goerken  [Signature]  436 Tupelo St  941-6559

Roger Belanger  [Signature]  436 Tupelo St  No phone

Sierra Fernando  [Signature]  530 Tupelo St  226-4568

James Ballas  [Signature]  417 Tupelo St  277-0477

Aldo M. Urias  [Signature]  436 Tupelo St  276-4568

Lawrence J. Broussard  [Signature]  419 Tupelo St  279-1725

JoAnn J. Hightower  [Signature]  4732 St Claude  949-4928

Elaine J. Jackson  [Signature]  4732 St Claude  949-4928

Kevin O'Neil  [Signature]  2817 CAMBIO E  895-7218

Damon O'Neal  [Signature]  2832 Bell St E  ?

Ron Black  [Signature]  2231 Royal St  561-1127

Ze' d Aquin  [Signature]  2623 Royal St  940-5475

Helena Shaw  [Signature]  4727 Dauphine  948-0141

Phil Daily  [Signature]  5011 Chalmette  944-3704

E Gray  [Signature]  601 Rayne  944-3704
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERNELL EDWARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>626 DeLesseps St</td>
<td>945-2302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANESSA TROTTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>4818 Dauphine St</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATHAN ASHBY</td>
<td></td>
<td>433 DeLesseps 7543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAWN SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>620 Deslonde St</td>
<td>945-2554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREDRY FEATHERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>830 DeLesseps St</td>
<td>945-0701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTELLE M. CALLUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>4829 Burgundy St</td>
<td>945-2212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTELLE BEAVERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4824 Burgundy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELANIE WILLIAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4827 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>945-8418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREDRY M. DUMAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4821+ 4921 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>945-8458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELANIE WILLIAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4827 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>945-8418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL BALTHAZAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>4827 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>947-8441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNATHAN SADL</td>
<td></td>
<td>4827 N. Rampart St</td>
<td>945-7414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNIFER SADL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY MALONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estelle F. Carter</td>
<td>Estelle F. Carter</td>
<td>2513 Deslond St</td>
<td>914-2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma C. Foreward</td>
<td>Irma C. Foreward</td>
<td>5016 N. Rocheblave</td>
<td>947-0529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda E. Carter</td>
<td>Brenda E. Carter</td>
<td>2213 Bertram St</td>
<td>944-0311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Austin</td>
<td>Mildred Austin</td>
<td>915 Lamar St</td>
<td>945-0681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian A. Stokes</td>
<td>Lillian A. Stokes</td>
<td>1443 Flood St</td>
<td>914-0644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae Ellis</td>
<td>Mae Ellis</td>
<td>5020 Charles St</td>
<td>915-7957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lita L. Howard</td>
<td>Lita L. Howard</td>
<td>1316 Bisceo</td>
<td>947-1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Kemmer</td>
<td>Barbara Kemmer</td>
<td>2214 Callaway St</td>
<td>914-3058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy S. Kirk</td>
<td>Mandy S. Kirk</td>
<td>2215 Callaway St</td>
<td>944-0523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Shy</td>
<td>Evelyn Shy</td>
<td>2201 Deslond St</td>
<td>944-3807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Schuyer</td>
<td>Mary Schuyer</td>
<td>1019 Callaway St</td>
<td>944-0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Franklin</td>
<td>Doris Franklin</td>
<td>948-4048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Thomas</td>
<td>Ann Thomas</td>
<td>241-6877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann M. Washinton</td>
<td>Ann M. Washinton</td>
<td>927 Forsyth St</td>
<td>944-5066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business liability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

NAME (Printed) SIGNATURE ADDRESS PHONE NO.

MICHAEL P. MERCER, Mickey G. Mercer 419 FORSTALL 945-4700
Roosevelt C. Washington 479 FORSTALL 945-1321
Nathan H. Washington 919 FORSTALL 945-1322

Dr. William

Virgie Nelson 930 FORSTALL 944-7003
Marshall L. Johnson

Herace Gaines

Rachel A. Clay 1015 RESIDES 942-7007

Ella Mae LeFlore 1019 N. Rampart 942-7017

Wanda Shaw 496 N. Rampart n.o. 7017

Penny Green 496 N. Rampart n.o. 7017

Johnny Baxi

Johnny Baxi 928 Jordan 107-7017

Beverly Thompson 938 Jordan N.2 927-7017

Maine Meadowe 938 Jordan Ave 7017
WE THE RESIDENTS OF THE LOWER NINTH WARD AND OTHERS HEREBY DECLARE OUR OPPOSITION TO THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL EXPANSION PROJECT OF THE U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS. WE BELIEVE THIS PROJECT IS A DIRECT THREAT TO SAFETY, ENVIRONMENT, RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY VALUES, HISTORICAL CONTINUITY, BUSINESS VIABILITY, FAMILY AND SOCIAL FABRIC, AS WELL AS, TRANSPORTATION THAT CAN NOT BE COMPENSATED.

WE WILL NOT ACCEPT THIS PROJECT. WE BELIEVE THE PROCESS THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS USED IS UNFAIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dave Turner</td>
<td>Robert D. Johnson</td>
<td>4839 N Rampart</td>
<td>947-7617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reina D. Laverne</td>
<td>Reina D. Laverne</td>
<td>1020 Forstall</td>
<td>945-6255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwin L. Links</td>
<td>1020 Forstall St</td>
<td>945-6255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Lancer</td>
<td>1020 Forstall St</td>
<td>945-6255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Warren</td>
<td>5030 St. Claude</td>
<td>945-6255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Santia</td>
<td>St. Claude</td>
<td>945-6255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrone Luckett</td>
<td>Jerrold Beckett</td>
<td>St. Claude</td>
<td>945-6255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant Pierce</td>
<td>Bryant Pierce</td>
<td>5030 St. Claude</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Knight</td>
<td>Disconnect</td>
<td>5029 St. Claude</td>
<td>949-6255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne Pantino</td>
<td>Dwayne Pantino</td>
<td>1113 N. Rampart</td>
<td>947-7641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Burks</td>
<td>607 Fall Ave</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Howard</td>
<td>Carmel Howard</td>
<td>1015 Forstall St</td>
<td>944-2630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry White</td>
<td>Henry White</td>
<td>5108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Gregory</td>
<td>931 1st Street</td>
<td>945-1355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Washington</td>
<td>919 Forstall St</td>
<td>945-1355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thresa Miller</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>7823 Fuy St</td>
<td>586-8646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Charleson</td>
<td>Charleson</td>
<td>935 Dante St</td>
<td>486-4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianna Padget</td>
<td>Padget</td>
<td>935 Dante St</td>
<td>865-7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Derby</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>1332 Napoleon</td>
<td>899-3960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Coone</td>
<td>Coone</td>
<td>2400 Pna St 4th</td>
<td>899-4146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Gourine</td>
<td>Gourine</td>
<td>7823 7th St</td>
<td>810-8145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Edmonds</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>1007 Jackson</td>
<td>588-9297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Bowman</td>
<td>Bowman</td>
<td>4880 Magazine St</td>
<td>891-2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Young</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>2917 Magazine St</td>
<td>899-2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kelly</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>2015 Urgent</td>
<td>944-6854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Fournier</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>622 Bl. Main St New Orleans (318) 888-4453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neli Vaandrager</td>
<td>Vaandrager</td>
<td>2527 3rd St</td>
<td>895-8678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Edelstein</td>
<td>Edelstein</td>
<td>1025 Upperline NOA 2015</td>
<td>871-1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Patch</td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td>9201 N Rampart NOA 2017</td>
<td>944-1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kraus</td>
<td>Kraus</td>
<td>679/81 Jourdan Ave</td>
<td>944-1666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1999

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We, the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlene James</td>
<td>Mrs. Charlene James</td>
<td>813 Jordan Ave</td>
<td>947-0713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tibbet</td>
<td>John Tibbet</td>
<td>4801 Dauphine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Jones</td>
<td>Kim Jones</td>
<td>1331 Park Ave</td>
<td>947-4132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrell Porter</td>
<td>Audrell Porter</td>
<td>703 Jordan Ave</td>
<td>949-3746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan de McCormick</td>
<td>Alan de McCormick</td>
<td>115 Jordan Ave</td>
<td>948-7781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENECARLA Bon</td>
<td>Gene Carla Bon</td>
<td>701 Purpelle</td>
<td>949-1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario de Steiger</td>
<td>Mario de Steiger</td>
<td>4816 Dauphine</td>
<td>943-7438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Gladys</td>
<td>Danielle Gladys</td>
<td>701 Deslone St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Dupond</td>
<td>Monique Dupond</td>
<td>703 Deslone St</td>
<td>947-8764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollieh Gaines</td>
<td>Ollieh Gaines</td>
<td>702 Deslone St</td>
<td>943-6100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Hager</td>
<td>Patricia Hager</td>
<td>712 Deslone St</td>
<td>943-5935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renée Bistrem</td>
<td>Renée Bistrem</td>
<td>4819 Dauphine</td>
<td>943-3769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neigea Darrell</td>
<td>Neigea Darrell</td>
<td>4819 Dauphine</td>
<td>943-3769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Cook</td>
<td>Marjorie Cook</td>
<td>4819 Deslone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devick Jones</td>
<td>Devick Jones</td>
<td>819 Deslone</td>
<td>947-168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that cannot be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Dowdette</td>
<td>sald Dowdette</td>
<td>915 Jourdan</td>
<td>945-4431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anil Nacouette</td>
<td>alin Nacouette</td>
<td>915 Jourdan</td>
<td>945-4434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren M Roberts</td>
<td>lauren M Roberts</td>
<td>913 Jourdan</td>
<td>944-1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleophus Marshall</td>
<td>cleophus Marshall</td>
<td>911 Jourdan</td>
<td>940-0898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keerla A Roberts</td>
<td>keerla A Roberts</td>
<td>913 Jourdan</td>
<td>944-1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna M. Kinebrew</td>
<td>edna M. Kinebrew</td>
<td>916 Jourdan</td>
<td>949-8470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis K. Alexis</td>
<td>francis K. Alexis</td>
<td>918 Jourdan</td>
<td>943-1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malda Green</td>
<td>malda Green</td>
<td>908 Jourdan</td>
<td>949-9076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Green</td>
<td>jerome Green</td>
<td>908 Jourdan</td>
<td>949-9076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Green</td>
<td>larry Green</td>
<td>908 Jourdan</td>
<td>949-9076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Green</td>
<td>lawrence Green</td>
<td>908 Jourdan</td>
<td>949-9076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus Gillan</td>
<td>janus Gillan</td>
<td>901 Jourdan</td>
<td>949-8209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal Peters</td>
<td>jamal Peters</td>
<td>908 Jourdan</td>
<td>947-6409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Hunebei</td>
<td>alfred Hunebei</td>
<td>833 Jourdan Ave</td>
<td>947-6409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam 117 11 Sq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827 Jourdan Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance Edwards</td>
<td>Constance Edwards</td>
<td>2540 Audubon 827092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Myers</td>
<td>Margaret Myers</td>
<td>2116 Decarie 2771 4144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Gardner</td>
<td>Larry Gardner</td>
<td>6110 Royal 7 st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Magner</td>
<td>Dorothy Magner</td>
<td>6118 Royal st 279625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Patterson</td>
<td>Donald Patterson</td>
<td>1661 N. Robinson 940-080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Evans</td>
<td>Tricia Evans</td>
<td>636 Angello st 276-418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia Evans</td>
<td>Delia Evans</td>
<td>636 Angello st 276-418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Wilson</td>
<td>Monica Wilson</td>
<td>818 Almeda St 276-4062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Brady</td>
<td>Sandra Brady</td>
<td>307 Royal St 276-8577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Brady</td>
<td>Barry Brady</td>
<td>6117 Royal 8 st 276-8875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Williams</td>
<td>Jake Williams</td>
<td>816 Audubon 276-5989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Darby</td>
<td>Joseph Darby</td>
<td>760 Angello 271-7761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Bolton</td>
<td>Anthony Bolton</td>
<td>5127 Boudingy 945-585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvada Anderson</td>
<td>Arvada Anderson</td>
<td>1701 Forsyth 943-1767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineer. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Clipi</td>
<td>Michael Clipi</td>
<td>5121 Harvard St, LA, 70801</td>
<td>341-7519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Herbert</td>
<td>Erin Herbert</td>
<td>2329 Vieux Coffre</td>
<td>504-5230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM: Alice M. Harte Elem. School
PHONE NO.: 504 398-7103

Mar. 03 1997 03:44PM P1

ALICE M. HARTE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

5300 BERKLEY DRIVE NEW ORLEANS, LA 70131
Dr. Stacy P. Rockwood
Principal

FAX TRANSMITTAL MEMO

DATE:

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING PAGES:

NAME: Les Waguespack
FIRM: Waguespack, King, Holy Cross CDC
CITY/STATE:
FAX NUMBER: 862-2572

SENDER'S NAME: Dr. Stacy Rockwood
FAX NUMBER: (504) 398-7103

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES, INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PLEASE CONTACT
ALICE M. HARTE SCHOOL AT (504) 398-7101

REMARKS:

"EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION"

(504) 398-7101
(504) 398-7102
February 17, 1997

WIDENING OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL

We the residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and others hereby declare our opposition to the Industrial Canal expansion project of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. We believe this project is a direct threat to safety, environment, residential property values, historical continuity, business viability, family and social fabric, as well as, transportation that can not be compensated.

We will not accept this project. We believe the process the Corps of Engineers used is unfair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Printed)</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Rollins</td>
<td>Linda Rollins</td>
<td>3721 Ridglea Ave, NOLA 394-0758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Rockwood</td>
<td>Stacy Rockwood</td>
<td>506 Flood St, NOLA 947-1402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Thornton</td>
<td>June Thornton</td>
<td>5024 Abbey Dr, NOLA 392-6537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Clark</td>
<td>Mary Jane Clark</td>
<td>7711 Mullet St, NOLA 242-3802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Ballou</td>
<td>Katherine Ballou</td>
<td>908 Napoleon Ave, NOLA 399-2895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherie Clay</td>
<td>Cherie Clay</td>
<td>6146 Bradfield Pl, NOLA 394-6125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Durmeray</td>
<td>Leslie Durmeray</td>
<td>5120 Congaree Dr, NOLA 382-9389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yves Auri</td>
<td>Yves Auri</td>
<td>733 Countrywood Village 331-1744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giselle Brunt</td>
<td>Giselle Brunt</td>
<td>1543 Terry St, NOLA 360-2911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Frederickson</td>
<td>Deborah Frederickson</td>
<td>3671 Plymouth Pl, NOLA 394-4534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lef Caldwell</td>
<td>Lef Caldwell</td>
<td>5829 Brights Ave, NOLA 392-0053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon W. Muhleisen</td>
<td>Sharon W. Muhleisen</td>
<td>1817 Newbury Ct, NOLA 362-7403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Giordano</td>
<td>Jan Giordano</td>
<td>1776 Atlantic Dr, NOLA 792-9236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie Marvin</td>
<td>Vickie Marvin</td>
<td>3600 Espanola, NOLA 394-0123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin Breau</td>
<td>Alvin Breau</td>
<td>2500 Houma Blvd, NOLA 458-1458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Lanza</td>
<td>Vicki Lanza</td>
<td>14 Grant Cypress, NOLA 392-0243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On February 19, 1937, a town meeting was conducted in St. Bernarr Parish to receive public comment on the Industrial Canal Lock Replacement Project proposed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

We, the undersigned, would like to express our support for a lock project and only if the Corps of Engineers will include the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet as a primary element of the proposed project and a high rise bridge be erected at Florida Avenue over the Industrial Canal.

Lynn Non  St. Bernarr  Oct 11
D.Y. Bueschel 11 J.E. "Pete" Sawyer
2. Lyle Bartlett 12. Lloy Degany
3. Am. Godin 13 Lynn Non  St. Bernarr
5. H. Cline 15. Don 10. Taffe
8. William Kintner 18. David Kintner