

ANNEX 3: Scoping Report



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**
New Orleans District

National Environmental Policy Act
SCOPING REPORT

**Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project
General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

February 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	STUDY BACKGROUND AND AUTHORITY.....	3
3.0	STUDY PURPOSE AND NEED.....	5
4.0	STUDY AREA.....	5
5.0	PROJECT GOALS/OBJECTIVES.....	5
6.0	SCOPING MEETING.....	6
7.0	SCOPING COMMENTS.....	7
8.0	SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS.....	34
9.0	CONCLUSIONS.....	34

APPENDIX A – SCOPING MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEETS

APPENDIX B – SCOPING COMMENT LETTERS, EMAILS, POSTCARDS

APPENDIX C – PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING TRANSCRIPT

National Environmental Policy Act

SCOPING REPORT

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

February 2015

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (Public Law 91-190; 42 U.S.C 4321 *et seq*) and the Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA (40 CFR §§ 1500-1508) require the federal government to use all practicable means to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony. The NEPA procedures insure that environmental information is available to the public before decisions are made and before actions are taken. Additionally, NEPA requires an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. This process is referred to as scoping.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mississippi Valley Division, New Orleans District (CEMVN) published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, New Industrial Canal Lock and Connecting Channels Project, New Orleans, LA (otherwise referred to as the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock Replacement Project) in the *Federal Register* (volume 80, number 19, pp 4911-12) on Thursday, January 29, 2015. This will be the second supplemental EIS prepared for this project.

A public scoping meeting was held on Wednesday, February 4, 2015 at the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Charter School for Science and Technology in New Orleans, Louisiana. NEPA scoping meeting announcements were advertised in the Times Picayune and New Orleans Advocate several days prior to the meeting. A mailing list was compiled utilizing an internal CEMVN mailing database and individual letters were mailed to Federal, State and local agencies, Parish and City Council members and other interested parties and stakeholders. A total of 62 individuals signed the attendance records positioned at the main entrance of the meeting hall. These included, but were not limited to, private citizens, industry stakeholders and non-governmental organization representatives.

2.0 STUDY BACKGROUND AND AUTHORITY

The existing Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock, located in Orleans Parish, Louisiana, connects the Mississippi River to Lake Pontchartrain, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), and the remaining authorized six miles of the Mississippi River – Gulf Outlet (MR-GO) between the Industrial Canal and the Michoud Slip. The IHNC lock, located between the St. Claude and Claiborne Avenue (Judge Seeber) Bridges in New Orleans, was commissioned and constructed by non-federal interests in 1923 to allow vessel traffic from the Mississippi River to Lake

Pontchartrain and to permit industrial development away from the river. The federal government purchased the existing lock at a later date.

The project was authorized by an act of Congress entitled “AN ACT to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet [sic]”, approved on March 29, 1956, as Chapter 112 of Public Law 455, of the 84th Congress as an amendment to the existing Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico to provide for the construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet substantially in accordance with the report and recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 245 of the 82nd Congress. The 1956 authorization was later amended by Section 844 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-662, and Section 326 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Pub. L. 104-303.

The original EIS and project evaluation report was finalized in March 1998. A Record of Decision was signed on December 18, 1998, selecting a construction method and location for a replacement lock north of the Claiborne Avenue Bridge, replacement of the St. Claude Avenue Bridge, modification of the Claiborne Avenue Bridge, extension of the Mississippi River flood protection levees and floodwalls, a community impact mitigation plan, and a fish and wildlife mitigation plan.

In 2003, the Corps’ decision to construct a new lock was challenged in United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana (Case No. 2:03-cv-00370). In October 2006, the Court enjoined the Corps from continuing with the Project until additional compliance with the NEPA was completed.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 7013 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, Pub. L. 110-114, that portion of the MR-GO from Mile 60 on the southern bank of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to the Gulf of Mexico was deauthorized effective upon the June 5, 2008 submittal by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to Congress of the Report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 29, 2008 recommending partial deauthorization of the MR-GO. In July 2009, in accordance with the 2008 MR-GO Chief’s Report, the Corps completed construction of a rock closure structure on the MR-GO at Bayou LaLoutre.

In 2007, the Corps initiated preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to address changes in the existing conditions after Hurricane Katrina, further analyze anticipated impacts associated with construction of the new lock and determine if any significant changes to the previously-recommended plan were necessary. The final SEIS considered three deep-draft lock alternatives and the no-action alternative (i.e., continued operation and maintenance of the existing lock), two dredging alternatives for the excavation that would be necessary for the construction of a new deep-draft lock, and three disposal alternatives for the dredged sediment. On May 20, 2009, a Record of Decision was signed, recommending the float-in-place plan for construction of the lock, the hydraulic dredging method for excavation of sediment from the canal, and a dredged material disposal plan that included three locations for disposal of excavated sediments.

In 2010, the Corps’ decision to construct a new lock was again challenged in United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana in a case that was subsequently consolidated with

the 2003 case. On September 9, 2011, the Court found that the 2009 SEIS failed to sufficiently consider the impact of the closure of the MR-GO to deep-draft traffic and the effect of that closure on the depth of the new lock and potentially how that depth may affect dredging and disposal alternatives for the Project.

3.0 STUDY PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of this study is to address the feasibility of improving navigation efficiencies for traffic travelling on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Mississippi River via the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal lock. A general reevaluation study of the lock replacement is required due to changes in the scope of the project which require reanalysis of the recommended plan. The scope changes include changes in existing conditions, including navigation traffic; methodology; commodity movements; and transportation costs.

4.0 STUDY AREA

The study area is located in Orleans, St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes in southeastern Louisiana. The area is generally bounded by Lake Pontchartrain on the north, the Mississippi River on the south and west, and Lake Borgne, Breton Sound and the Gulf of Mexico on the east and south. The area includes parts of the cities and communities of New Orleans, Chalmette, and Pointe a la Hache, Louisiana. Areas potentially affected by changes in vessel traffic include the navigation channels and related land areas in the study area, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Mississippi River.

5.0 PROJECT GOALS/OBJECTIVES

The project goal is to identify a recommended plan to replace the existing Inner Harbor Navigation Canal lock with a new lock. The results of this general reevaluation study may affirm the previous 1997 and 2009 plan(s); reformulate and modify it, as appropriate; or find that no plan is currently justified.

The following objectives are those that were established in the 1997 Evaluation Report that are relevant to this study. They were developed in response to the problems, needs, and opportunities identified by public and private interests. The 1997 objective that related to serving deep draft traffic is no longer relevant due to closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MR-GO) in 2009 with the MR-GO Closure Structure.

- To select a plan that reduces delays to navigation between the Mississippi River and waterways to the east of the Mississippi River.
- To select a plan to avoid and minimize relocations and other impacts on local residents and businesses to the maximum extent practicable.
- To select a plan to avoid and minimize environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable; and
- To design and recommend appropriate mitigation features for unavoidable impacts on local residents, cultural resources, and environmental resources.

6.0 SCOPING MEETING

On January 22, 2015, a scoping meeting public notice fact sheet was mailed to approximately 145 individual mailing addresses compiled from an internal CEMVN mailing database. These individual addresses were comprised of various Federal, State and local agencies and officials, Parish and city government representatives, non-governmental organizations, and individual stakeholders and members of the public. The fact sheet provided an overview of the meeting purpose, date, address and time as well as sufficient project background, study alternatives, the purpose and need and issues/resources to be addressed. Two questions were also provided as a means of focusing the public's concerns:

- *Question #1: What are the most important issues, resources, and impacts that should be considered in the SEIS?*
- *Question #2: Are there any other alternatives or modifications to the tentative alternatives that should be considered in the SEIS?*

In addition to the individual letters, four separate scoping meeting publications were run in two local newspapers on the following dates:

- *Wednesday, January 28, 2015 – Times Picayune*
- *Wednesday, January 28, 2015 – New Orleans Advocate*
- *Sunday, February 1, 2015 – Times Picayune*
- *Sunday, February 1, 2015 – New Orleans Advocate*

The January 29, 2015 Notice of Intent (volume 80, number 19, pp 4911-12), identified the NEPA public scoping meeting date, location, time and meeting format. The scoping meeting was held on Wednesday, February 4, 2015 at the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Charter School for Science and Technology, 1617 Caffin Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana, 70117. The scoping meeting began at 6:00 p.m. with an Open House wherein the public was invited to visit a series of poster stations staffed by the project delivery team members and subject matter experts. The posters on display covered the following topics:

- *Project Study Area Map* – map depicting the southeast region of Louisiana showing various proposed alternative lock sites.
- *Site Specific Map* – map showing the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, existing lock, and surrounding communities.
- *Cargo Volume Transportation Comparison* – comparison of three modes of cargo transportation and their respective capacities.
- *Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Map* – map depicting the inland navigation route for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.
- *Alternate Inland Navigation Waterway Transportation Map* – map showing a 14-day alternative inland navigation waterway route along the Mississippi River and Tennessee Tombigbee waterway.

Following the open house, a brief presentation was made to the attendees by the Environmental manager. This presentation provided an overview of the NEPA process, discussed the historical

background of the existing IHNC Lock, highlighted the prior 1997 and 2009 environmental studies, and provided the context for the current study and project scoping meeting. Meeting attendees were informed that all comments and questions received during the meeting and those postmarked before February 18, 2015 would be included in the project scoping report.

After the presentation, the facilitator initiated the public comment period of the meeting. Individuals were invited to present their verbal and/or written scoping comments to be recorded without interruption. This part of the meeting continued until no further scoping comments were offered. In total, 62 individuals signed the attendance records positioned at the main entrance of the meeting hall. As the meeting concluded, all attendees were reminded to pick up postage-paid comment cards if they wished to submit additional comments at a later date.

7.0 SCOPING COMMENTS

This NEPA Scoping Report presents and summarizes the scoping comments expressed at the public scoping meetings, as well as all other scoping comments received during the scoping comment period beginning January 29, 2015, and ending February 18, 2015. This information will be considered both during the study process and in preparation of the draft Supplemental EIS. Each scoping comment was reviewed for content and categorized by where in the draft Supplemental EIS individual comments would likely be addressed. A transcript of comments made at the scoping meeting was prepared by a certified court reporter and is presented in Appendix A.

A combined total of 149 comments were recorded from scoping meeting participants and comments submitted during the scoping comment period (Table 1). Table 1 identifies the source of the comment and the section of the draft Supplemental EIS where comments are likely to be addressed. A scoping comment may be addressed in more than one section of the draft Supplemental EIS if such consideration is required to appropriately address the ramifications of the comment. Draft Supplemental EIS subject matter headings include: purpose and need for action (PN); alternatives, including the proposed action (Alt); affected environment (AE); environmental consequences (EC); and consultation and coordination (CC) with the Federal, state and other agencies. Compliance with regulations (Federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations) is included in the latter category. Compliance with major environmental laws and regulations such as the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act will be addressed in specific sections of the draft Supplemental EIS (especially in the Environmental Consequences section).

Table 1. Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project – Summary of Scoping Comments

Table 1. This table categorizes scoping comments by EIS subject matter, which is where an individual comment would likely be addressed in the draft Supplemental EIS. EIS categories include: PN = Purpose and Need; ALT = Alternatives; AE = Affected Environment; EC = Environmental Consequences; CC = Consultation, Coordination, and Compliance with Regulations (Federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations). An individual scoping comment may be categorized under more than one EIS subject matter heading. A transcript of oral scoping comments from the NEPA public scoping meeting is provided in Appendix A. Copies of all written comments are provided in Appendix B. NOTE: Court reports of scoping meeting oral comments were not modified and public comments may have grammatical or spelling errors.						
Draft Supplemental EIS section where comment addressed						NEPA SCOPING COMMENTS
#	PN	ALT	AE	EC	CC	
The American Waterway Operators, Letter dated February 18, 2015.						
1	X	X		X		Comment 1: The Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock is a critical component of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and our nation’s inland waterways system. Its continued safe and reliable operation is needed to allow commerce to flow through the GIWW. The nation’s economy depends on the replacement of this antiquated lock with a modern shallow draft structure.
	X			X		Comment 2: The IHNC Lock provides the most efficient means to move from the Western Rivers and the western section of the GIWW. The only other marine option requires an additional 17 days transit, adding significant costs to moving goods.
				X		Comment 3: Closing the IHNC Lock would also cause severe environmental impacts. One tank barge carries the same amount of cargo as 144 trucks. Given the number of refineries and the extensive petrochemical infrastructure along the GIWW, inhibiting navigation on the GIWW would exponentially increase highway traffic and emissions in Louisiana and along the Gulf Coast.
		X		X		Comment 4: Replacing the current IHNC lock with a new shallow draft structure would benefit all stakeholders. A properly-sized lock would enable fewer trips through the structure, reducing maintenance costs to the nation. In addition, fewer trips would reduce traffic from bridge openings and the number of barges waiting in queue near the lock.
Citizens Against Widening the Industrial Canal (CAWIC), Electronic Mail Attachment dated February 6, 2015.						
2			X	X		Comment 1: The Corps has not considered real risks and adverse impacts but has offered "mitigation" payments instead (token side payments) because real compensation would greatly add to cost to the project

						<i>and make it infeasible. Environmental justice issues for the project in a largely minority community have been just as largely ignored.</i>
	X					<i>Comment 2: There is little economic justification for the project (Stearns, 2008). It will not pay for itself.</i>
	X		X			<i>Comment 3: The Corps now (2015) asks to proceed by merely updating the highly controversial 9-volume EIS of 1997 by a "Supplemental EIS." However, since ecosystem conditions have changed profoundly since 1997, and because of the deficiencies of that report, a much more extensive, basic evaluation would be much more appropriate and should be required for the lock project. Not just a supplement. It would be very difficult for the public to cover all that ground again. A brand new look would seem much more efficient.</i>
<i>Citizens Against Widening the Industrial Canal (CAWIC), Electronic Mail Attachment dated February 6, 2015.</i>						
		X	X	X	X	<i>Comment 4: A new analysis should include realistic risk and impact assessment, cost and benefit analyses, consideration of alternative solutions, coastal restoration needs, climate change, protection of environmental and historic resources, and fairness to minority communities.</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 5: Safety of larger barge tows on the river and along the Intracoastal (GIWW) is a growing concern, especially for areas of high population.</i>
			X	X	X	<i>Comment 6: Residents of Lower 9 have little interest in a new lock. or expanded redesigned channel, especially considering previous losses and the hazards. They would rather the canal be filled in than bring more hardship and difficulties. Among such are toxic sediments, barge dangers, years of elevated noise, dust, and houses shaking, and compromised infrastructure.</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 7: They don't want the bigger tows, longer bridge waits, construction traffic, compromised roadways, levees messed with and pushed out of shape and flood-walled instead, oak trees gone, high generic new bridge, years of depressed property values, Mississippi River levels all the way in past N Claiborne.</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 8: They don't want the insult, the taking for granted, the arrogance, the lies, the bad science and rigged plans, the lack of genuine community engagement and partnership. The lock project from Lower Nine is a very bad proposition, with no upside and no respect. Residents of Lower Nine and New Orleans would like to have confidence in the Corps and work with the Corps on so much, as fellow Americans, but not a new lock here.</i>
<i>John Koeferl, Citizens Against Widening the Industrial Canal (CAWIC), Electronic Mail dated February 18, 2015.</i>						
3			X	X		<i>Comment 1: This is to inform you that we do not consider it prudent or appropriate to do a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock project. The original EIS was</i>

						<i>done too long ago. Many factors have changed significantly for this channel and its human and natural environment since, markedly from Katrina and the closure of MR-GO.</i>
	X	X	X	X	X	<i>Comment 2: The Port of New Orleans was the local sponsor for the IHNC lock that was repeatedly defined as a function of MR-GO, and as deep draft. The Port was the major influence in the siting of the new lock in the IHNC for its own proprietary and somewhat arbitrary purposes. The other major site, favored by the Corps at Violet, was rejected by the Port, as well as by citizens there who did not want the deep lock because of the encroaching MR-GO salt water intrusion damages to the wetlands. Who could blame them? To fulfill requirements for a formal process the site "selection" was staged to eliminate all but IHNC. This was not an objective or equitable process. At that time environmental justice did not include urban and minority considerations, but NEPA does now and we want this protection.</i>
John Koeferl, Citizens Against Widening the Industrial Canal (CAWIC), Electronic Mail dated February 18, 2015.						
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 3: There were also the issues of cost benefit related to volumes and projections for barge traffic, and omission of the substantial offsetting costs and damages to historic and minority neighborhoods due to the loss of the existing lock and other impacts and risks far beyond mitigation assumptions.</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 4: We recognize that there is a strong impetus in the Corps itself, especially among operations personnel, and barge operators, to drill on through to a new lock in the IHNC. This is understandable. They have waited a long time. Yet there are other considerations with the IHNC site that affect the lives and livelihoods and health of many, many people who live in the neighborhoods surrounding the canal. These considerations do not come up for other sites, and they are real.</i>
			X	X	X	<i>Comment 5: A new SEIS based on the EIS of 1997 will not do justice or be objective. A sound basis for lock selection would have to venture back to decisions of the 1970's. Some Records of Decision have engineered into truth some things that should not have been and we have all paid a price for this. The Corps has broad powers but broad responsibility. For this reason it seems prudent to involve in this decision about a lock the broadest coalition of experts in every field and well as the public. This is a complex undertaking that seems to demand more than ordinary collaboration.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 6: We do not, and cannot, support a new lock in the IHNC. For us the only option is "No Project." We do, of course, support refurbishing of the existing lock. consistent with its original design.</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 7: It is extremely important for our downriver New Orleans neighborhoods that the existing lock and bridge be retained. We know they are of national maritime and engineering significance and recommended not to be disturbed if a new lock is needed. The study said to keep it for posterity. We certainly do not want it dynamited, and our houses shaken apart as an alternative. There are many problems associated with life here because of the existing lock and bridge but we have learned to tolerate these hardships, to live</i>

						<i>with the lock. We would see the channel closed before a new lock here with more hardship and disruption. The potent issues of toxicity in the channel are never far from our minds, that tell us these are better undisturbed.</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 8: After refurbishing the IHNC lock, the building of a second lock on the east side of the River to serve the GIWW would offer economic choices and marginal advantages for operators and for tows of larger size and different agendas. It would cut the wait time. It would spread things out for barge and river safety and efficiency. It would allow bigger and more hazardous cargoes hold suitable distances from each other and from populated areas, increase overall capacity, and ease risk in maneuvers to and from congested parts of the River. A second lock would seem an invaluable resource that could double the pathways and triple the options.</i>
John Koeferl, Citizens Against Widening the Industrial Canal (CAWIC), Electronic Mail dated February 18, 2015.						
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 9: The siting of an alternative shallow draft lock would have environmental and community concerns as well as potential advantages wherever considered. One option---given community assent--- would be a river diversion incorporated into a new shallow draft lock design for the Violet Canal, not far from other channels and close to wetlands needing fresh water. Bridges could be built first with little disruption. This could get Inland Waterway User funding, MR-GO Ecosystem Restoration Tier 3 funds, and maybe even state funding.</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 10: It would help to recognize that much of the solution has been greatly aggravated over the last forty years by the deep draft push, and wetland collapse with widespread flooding and loss. There is climate change now too. But in the search for a new shallow draft lock (no more deep ones please) we feel the Corps must look for broader options and alternatives than this present SEIS scoping limits suggest.</i>
Dorothy Duval (Dottie Nelson), Electronic Mail dated February 18, 2015.						
4		X				<i>Comment 1: Because of the closure of the MR-GO after Hurricane Katrina, vessels requiring a depth of 36 feet were denied access to the wharves east of the present lock. I am writing to urge the deepening of the lock in order to allow deep draft vessels to operate in the IHNC and GIWW.</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 2: To not exploit our existing, unique, and ever-more-protected wharf facilities and to not enable their fuller usage by deep draft vessels seems a poorly timed and short-sighted decision. It would be a detriment to our city's and port's abilities to exercise competitive advantage in shipping at a time when the Panama Canal Expansion, for example, will offer more opportunities to the northern Gulf Coast.</i>
	X					<i>Comment 3: I understand that the project has a local cost-share requirement. It is my understanding that by a 1914 act of the Louisiana Legislature, the Port of New Orleans and the Orleans Levee Board were authorized to issue bonds to build the canal and the lock. The people of this state and region have thus not only already invested private equity in the development and operation of this system, it is they who provided the</i>

						infrastructure of the IHNC via the bonds. Surely the history of investment of this community in this structure should be cited to support the argument that the local cost-share requirement has been met.
		X				Comment 4: I urge you to reconsider the appropriate lock dimensions during this Supplemental EIS phase.
Mark Stoppel & Mark Czarnecki, AEP River Operations, Electronic Mail dated February 9, 2015.						
Jim Stark, Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Letter dated February 9, 2015.						
5		X				Comment 1: A shallow draft replacement IHNC lock structure is extremely important to GICA members. The present lock is a critical component of the GIWW and of our nation's inland waterways system. Its continued safe and reliable operation is needed to allow commerce to flow east and west along the GIWW.
		X				Comment 2: A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. Replacing the present structure with a larger and modern lock design will improve the economics and safety of barge transport through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping. And, of course, modern machinery will make it more reliable.
			X	X		Comment 3: Impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance). Consider that recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute up Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.
			X	X		Comment 4: A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation Study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.
			X	X		Comment 5: Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.
			X	X		Comment 6: Routine, daily delays due to waiting on turn in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping.

						<i>An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.</i>
Mark Stoppel & Mark Czarnecki, AEP River Operations, Electronic Mail dated February 9, 2015.						
Jim Stark, Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Letter dated February 9, 2015.						
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 7: A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110 feet wide and 1200 feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 8: Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).</i>
		X				<i>Comment 9: It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC Lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MR-GO. Those should be eliminated from further time, and resource, consuming review.</i>
Jim Stark, Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Electronic Mail dated February 18, 2015.						
6		X	X			<i>Comment 1: One area which I did not address is the flood control aspects of a new lock. I assume a replacement lock structure (including monoliths, gates and associated levees) will have to meet post-Katrina standards for surge and overtopping. If so, it would seem to us that this is an additional benefit, accruing to the surrounding neighborhoods and the SELFPA-E area of responsibility, that should be considered in any B/C ratio calculations.</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Question 1: It would also appear that the lock and levees would be part of the HSDRRS system. Would the state then be responsible for cost sharing as non-federal sponsor for the flood control features of the lock?</i>
Karl C. Gonaes, Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association, Inc., Letter dated February 11, 2015.						
7		X	X	X		<i>Comment 1: Of notable importance, since the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MR-GO) canal, shallow draft mariners have only one dependable inland route {the GIWW} that links industries from the Lower Mississippi River and its tributaries to those located east of the IHNC Lock structure. A modern replacement lock is imperative to ensure a safe and reliable structure to facilitate the normal flow of</i>

						commerce throughout America. Of note, with the passage of HR 3080 and WRDA of 2014, further indicates that Congress recognizes the immediate need for improvement in our nation's infrastructure.
Karl C. Gonaes, Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association, Inc., Letter dated February 11, 2015.						
		X				Comment 2: By replacing the outdated structure with a larger and modern lock design will improve the economics and SAFETY of marine traffic thru this particular area, and at the same time, modern machinery will make it more reliable.
		X				Comment 3: A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area, and ultimately, for neighborhood residents.
		X				Comment 4: Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. A shallower draft structure will be much cheaper to construct and maintain.
			X	X		Comment 5: On a daily basis, delays due to waiting on turn in locking queues are very expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are passed on to consumers. A larger lock structure will eliminate much of the wait as a typical tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping.
			X	X		Comment 6: Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long term closures should be considered.
			X	X		Comment 7: A recent study by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of a long term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC Lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.
			X	X		Comment 8: Delays due to unanticipated lock closures (for extended repairs and/or maintenance). Consider that a recent unscheduled closure of the Algiers Locks (New Orleans) for 112 days resulted in costs to the maritime industry and their customers approximately \$146 million. Similar closures will cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute via the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterways to reach facilities in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. A detour of this nature will add 15-18 days to complete a normal voyage.
Matt Rota, Gulf Restoration Network, Letter dated February 18, 2015.						
8			X	X		Comment 1: The GRN is deeply concerned about the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction of a replacement lock in the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC).

<i>Matt Rota, Gulf Restoration Network, Letter dated February 18, 2015.</i>						
	X					Comment 2: The original Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and project evaluation report were completed in March 1998. The first SEIS was completed in May of 2009. The Corps now proposes to complete a second SEIS. However, the lapse of time and significant changes to the surrounding neighborhoods and economy of the City caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and the “recovery” from those storms have so changed the underpinnings of the original EIS as to require initiation of a new EIS, rather than supplementation of the existing EIS. Supplementing for a second time a 16 year old EIS is not appropriate.
	X	X				Comment 3: Further, it is our understanding that the local sponsor for deep draft navigation has pulled out of this project. Now that it will only be feasibly examined for shallow draft, a new EIS process would certainly be appropriate
	X	X	X	X	X	Comment 4: The Need For and Justified Scope of the Project: A) A full analysis of alternatives including, but not limited to, opportunities for lock improvement, rather than replacement, replacement without expansion of the lock, and a shallow draft lock. B) An updated cost-benefit analysis for the project, that including but not limited to: current vessel traffic through the lock; costs associated with additional testing of dredge sites needed to accurately determine levels of contaminants at those sites; current delays, if any, experienced by barges traveling through the lock predicted future use of the lock, particularly in light of de-authorization and closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet as a navigation channel; costs associated with disposal of acutely toxic sediments dredged from the canal in a Type 1 disposal facility; and costs to the community, see below.
			X	X		Comment 5: Community Impacts: A) The effect of construction of the replacement lock, expected to last several years, on ongoing redevelopment of the Upper and Lower Ninth Ward adjacent to the canal; B) The effect of construction activities on the structural integrity of building in the historic Holy Cross Neighborhood, particularly in light of the impacts of Hurricane Katrina and Rita on those structures; C) The effect of construction on storm evacuation of the residents of Lower Ninth Ward and Chalmette, including but not limited to closure of a central evacuation route during construction; D) The effect of construction on the ability to timely move vessels in advance of a hurricane needed to allow closure of the new storm surge barrier.

Matt Rota, Gulf Restoration Network, Letter dated February 18, 2015.						
			X	X	X	<p>Comment 6: Environmental Impacts: A) Increased noise associated with construction, as well as operation, on the adjacent community; B) The impact of the proposed dredging and construction on water quality in Lake Pontchartrain, the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet and other water bodies in the vicinity of the IHNC; C) Potential increases in air pollution (i.e. dust and particulate matter) from construction and operation; D) Impact on wetlands, including impacts associated with both the construction of the canal and construction of an appropriate confined sediment disposal facility. E) The impact of projected wetlands loss on storm surge attenuation in adjacent areas; F) The impacts of projected wetlands loss associated with construction of the lock on wetlands restoration projects contemplated by Coastal Wetland Planning and Restoration Authority, MR-GO Ecosystem Restoration Projects or Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast; and G) The indirect, cumulative and secondary impacts of replacement of the IHNC, including but not limited to increased industrial development in the vicinity of the canal.</p>
		X				<p>Comment 7: Additional Alternatives: A) While alternatives were not presented in any detail at the preliminary meeting, the following alternatives should be looked at. GRN does not necessarily endorse any of these alternatives, but suggests further research in these areas: a. Feasibility of building a new Claiborne Ave. bridge, and converting the existing bridge into a pedestrian/bike bridge; b. Retrofitting existing lock instead of a new lock; and c. Keeping the existing lock, in addition to building a new shallow draft lock to increase redundancy in case one lock needs repairs.</p>
Michael J. Toohey, Waterways Council, Inc., Letter dated February 17, 2015.						
9		X				<p>Comment 1: A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. Replacing the present lock structure with a larger, modern lock will improve the economics and safety of barge transportation through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping.</p>
			X	X		<p>Comment 2: The economic impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance) are harsh. Consider that the recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million that are ultimately passed onto consumers who pay higher costs for goods they depend on. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute to the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.</p>
Michael J. Toohey, Waterways Council, Inc., Letter dated February 17, 2015.						
			X	X		<p>Comment 3: A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long-term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes.</p>

						<i>In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 4: Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long-term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 5: Routine, daily delays due to waiting in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 6: A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110-feet wide and 1200-feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 7: Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).</i>
		X				<i>Comment 8: It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MR-GO. Those should be eliminated from further review.</i>
Walter Gallas, Public Scoping Meeting, Comment Card dated February 5, 2015.						
10		X				<i>Comment/Question 1: USACE really needs to look at the cost of repairing/replacing elements of the lock – the 90 day closure we were told about – what the life of that maintenance is – compared to the much more expensive cost of the proposed lock replacement. Why not keep what you have and maintain it? We don't see the benefits of this project compared to the vast needs elsewhere.</i>
Vanessa Gueringer, Public Scoping Meeting, Comment Card.						

11		X	X	X		<i>Comment/Question 1: Will the residents of St. Bernard Parish be displaced if lock replacement is done there? They have recovered, lower nine hasn't.</i>
			X	X		<i>Question 2: What sort of negative impact would this project have on this community?</i>
Darrell P. Wagner, Public Scoping Meeting, Comment Card.						
12			X	X	X	<i>Comment/Question 1: Back in 1985 USACE started this project while digging they found bad contamination in the ground then stopped. Katrina caused the same. Where did it all go, did all the toxic left?</i>
Mary "Patsy" Story, Public Scoping Meeting, Comment Card.						
13			X	X	X	<i>Comment 1: Dredging will dredge up toxins that will travel to Lake Pontchartrain which has been healed. Some of the toxins previously found in small amounts are detrimental to plant and animal life.</i>
	X					<i>Comment 2: No! No! No! Purpose and Need – I live 2 houses from the canal since 1978. Rarely have I seen backed up water traffic except for things like blessing of fleet ships. No Need!</i>
		X				<i>Comment 3: No Deep Draft – to dangerous if [unreadable text].</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 4: Mitigation plan was a joke. Too much [unreadable text] parking lots for work vehicles, etc. Better streets and lighting (that should come from city not mitigation funds).</i>
	X		X	X		<i>Comment 5: This community does not deserve to be displaced again by anything, esp. an unneeded project.</i>
M. Doyle Johnston, Public Scoping Meeting, Comment Card.						
14		X	X	X		<i>Question 1: Are you still going to have mitigation?</i>
					X	<i>Question 2: Who will we contact if we have problems with our properties?</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Question 3: Is the community base mitigation still be in place?</i>
Charles W. Nelson, Waldemar S. Nelson and Company, Inc., Letter dated February 18, 2015.						
15		X				<i>Comment 1: I urge your team to closely evaluate the design dimensions of the IHNC replacement lock. I urge you to place greater emphasis on the selection of dimensions suitable for deep draft vessels which are now blocked from existing and future wharf facilities in the IHNC and GIWW.</i>

			X			<i>Comment 2: Upon closure of the MR-GO post-Katrina, public and private wharves east of the present lock were negatively impacted: by that closure, vessels capable of navigating the MR-GO previously were prevented from accessing the available 36 foot depths in the eastern waterways.</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 3: Landowners and taxpayers have provided hundreds of millions of dollars in waterfront infrastructure over the 92 years the IHNC has been in operation. To limit their future use of existing facilities and of those to be built in the next 100 years would be a serious injury to their interests.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 4: I understand the Port of New Orleans has removed itself as local sponsor due to the cost of cost-sharing for the incremental depth of the sill. But if the argument can be made that the original construction has already been paid for by local interests, then perhaps the Port, as local sponsor, can be seen to already have met its obligation to satisfy the cost-share requirement for the deeper lock.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 5: The physical dimensions affected by the lock depth are roughly four miles of the IHNC and seven miles of the GIWW. According to boaters using those sections of the waterways, both waterways have existing mid-channel depths of 36 feet. Facilities line both banks of the IHNC, and facilities could in the future line both banks of the GIWW. Several large industrial facilities have been built on the GIWW, and more have been proposed. Those future projects would make good use of their ability to get larger blue water ships into the protected harbor behind the new hurricane protection system.</i>
Charles W. Nelson, Waldemar S. Nelson and Company, Inc., Letter dated February 18, 2015.						
		X	X	X		<i>Comment 6: The availability of roughly 22 miles of deep water (both banks of 11 miles of waterway) is more than the 2015 deep water real estate controlled by the Port of New Orleans in the main channel of the Mississippi River. This asset is unique in port infrastructure in the entire United States, in that it is protected by the IHNC Surge Barrier, the Chalmette levees, the Seabrook Floodgate, and the enhanced post-Katrina levee system. To not make the best use of this asset for the future would be illogical, and poor public policy at best.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 7: In the interest of fairness to the previous investors (taxpayers who retired the bonds and private investors in the 92 years of progress in New Orleans East since completion of the IHNC lock in 1923), the appropriate lock dimensions should be intimately investigated during this Supplemental EIS phase of a much-needed project.</i>
Philip K. Bell, Steel Manufacturers Association, Letter dated February 17, 2015.						
16			X			<i>Comment 1: SMA is extremely concerned with the deteriorating condition of our nation's inland waterway system. Existing inefficiencies at the lock interrupt the flow of commerce; further deterioration could have a</i>

						<i>negative impact on the competitive position of domestic steelmakers. As such, we urge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to please proceed with this project in a safe, timely manner.</i>
Bernard Pelletier, SSAB Enterprises, LLC, Letter dated February 17, 2015.						
17		X				<i>Comment 1: A modern replacement lock for the IHNC is needed. In its crucial location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time. For SSAB, our customers, as well as many other domestic manufacturers, such a closure would cause substantial damage and affect our nation's economic competitiveness. We ask that you consider the severe impact that delays or closures of the IHNC could have on U.S. manufacturers as you scope the Supplemental EIS for this project.</i>
Sarah Louise Wood Ham, Wood Resources, LLC, Letter dated February 10, 2015.						
18		X				<i>Comment 1: A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. Replacing the present lock structure with a larger, modern lock will improve the economics and safety of barge transportation through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping.</i>
Sarah Louise Wood Ham, Wood Resources, LLC, Letter dated February 10, 2015.						
			X	X		<i>Comment 2: impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance) are harsh. Consider that the recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute to the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 3: A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long-term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.</i>
			X	X		<i>Comment 4: Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long-term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.</i>

			X	X		<i>Comment 5: Routine, daily delays due to waiting in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 6: A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110-feet wide and 1200-feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.</i>
		X				<i>Comment 7: Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).</i>
Sarah Louise Wood Ham, Wood Resources, LLC, Letter dated February 10, 2015.						
		X				<i>Comment 8: It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MR-GO. Those should be eliminated from further review.</i>
Mr. Chris Pitts, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
19			X			<i>Mr. Chris Pitts: I own a company at 8000 Jourdan Road. My question tonight is: How is this lock closure going to affect our shipping industry on the industrial canal? I'm sure if you've been doing this since the Fifties, and this is the third or fourth one these are done, I'm sure you should have some answers to that.</i>
			X			<i>Mr. Chris Pitts: There was another question I had to a gentlemen earlier here today, and he said he was going to try and find out. Maybe you can answer this question. Is there a proposed lock closure for that lock later on this summer?</i>
			X			<i>Mr. Chris Pitts: How long is that going to last?</i>
			X			<i>Mr. Chris Pitts: Right. I understand. But I think the question I got is: What is my business at the same time going to -- I receive 100,000 tons of material a month, and I ship 100,000 tons of material a month. And that lock is the only way that my business stays alive. We're talking about a \$10 million a month business being shut down for three months.</i>

			X			Mr. Chris Pitts: I understand. But how come this thing wasn't addressed four years ago when y'all closed the MR-GO, which would have been the only other route other than a 1,020 mile route north in order to get that material out to Corpus. You should have known then that that lock was going to have to be closed at some point and time and that that was the only other route to go.
			X			Mr. Chris Pitts: I completely understand. Who's going to fund me for the next 90 days?
Mr. Ben Gordom, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
20			X	X	X	Mr. Ben Gordom: There's a lot of toxins, including heavy metals, that are going to be dredged up. But when the sediment is dredged up, where is it going to be put, the wet sediment itself. And of course it's going to be released into the water and allow these toxic metals to go into Lake Pontchartrain, which we're just to the point now of bringing it back somewhat better environmental quality.
Mr. John Koefler, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
21	X	X				Mr. John Koefler: I know the fact that the Port of New Orleans has been the sponsor for so long of the deep draft lock in the Industrial Canal. Having them gone may be a blessing because it seems to me that we need a second lock. We don't need to depend on one lock. We need another lock somewhere so that we don't have these problems.
Mr. Calvin Alexander, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
22		X				Mr. Calvin Alexander: I'm curious about the second map over there from the door. There are a number of red dots on there that seem to indicate an alternate route. But based on what I'm seeing and hearing tonight, there's no intent for an alternate route. It seems to me we're here talking about replacing that lock, period, end of statement.
Mr. Teddy Carlisle, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
23		X				Mr. Teddy Carlisle: I'm Teddy Carlisle, towboat captain on a canal barge. I ran the Industrial Canal with New Orleans through and out the canal. Feasible, there's no other spot to run another lock. If you go to Bonnet Carre, that means the towboat is going to cross 24 miles of open water over two bridges with high winds. You're taking the risk with two bridges (inaudible). You go down to Baptiste Collette. You can go all the way across Gulfport Ship Channel. But when the weather gets bad, no traffic is going to move. And Industrial Canal lock is the most feasible place to put the lock whereas commerce can keep on moving.
Mr. Matt Rota, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						

24	X		X			<p><i>Mr. Matt Rota: The first thing is: As we're saying we're looking at the first EIS that happened in 1998 and then the 2nd Supplemental EIS in 2009. Now, we're looking at another supplemental in 20, whatever, 2017, 2018, when you get around and get to it. Why are you not doing a full Environmental Impact Statement? At this point, supplementals, I don't think, are going to cut it. I think we ought to be doing it starting from scratch, and you're starting from scratch, because if the public has to be going back and looking at something from 1998, what's amended from 2008, then amended again, it's confusing. And I think enough changes have happened between MR-GO closure, between Hurricane Katrina, and a a bunch of other things that enough has changed in 20 years that we should be doing a full Environmental Impact Statement.</i></p>
Mr. Matt Rota, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
			X	X	X	<p><i>Mr. Matt Rota: Another thing that we're really concerned about is the disposal of dredged materials. That's one of the big things throughout this whole process is the contaminated sediments in the water. And before there would be proposed to be discharged in wha the Corps planned to be upwind cipher is actually in the middle of the wetlands. And what are some alternatives that you're looking at, and that particularly toxic chemicals needs to be disposed of in a Type 1 landfill facility. So I ask that that is looked at and wouldn't mind any responses on that.</i></p>
	X		X			<p><i>Mr. Matt Rota: And then another one that particularly comes up is during hurricanes, now that we have the large closure structure, how is that going to be factored in because we will probably be having a lot more barges, and I'm not a barge captain so I don't know about this, but coming in for safe harbor and things like that and trying to avoid the closure of the surge barrier. So is that going to be looked at in this scope of this new, what we hope to be the new EIS, not just a supplemental EIS?</i></p>
Mr. Josh Lewis, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
25			X	X	X	<p><i>Mr. Josh Lewis: One thing that comes to mind with the previous EIS has been an issue for a lot of people in the environmental community was the disposal of sediments, which Matt was referencing.</i></p>
		X				<p><i>Mr. Josh Lewis: And it seems to me if what we're talking about -- we made comments about -- we heard comments that the Port will not sponsor the deep draft portion of the lock. So that means the deep draft portion of the lock is not going to be built. It would be crazy. It wouldn't happen. That's my opinion.</i></p>
		X				<p><i>Mr. Josh Lewis: So in that case, we're looking at a 14- foot channel. The existing Industrial Canal channel is 30- foot. So if you're going to be, if this project actually goes forward, which we just heard they are rehabbing the lock and replacing the gates and probably spending a lot of money on that so it seems the better option being you wouldn't allow the destruction. But if you're already going to be generating all those sediments and you know there's toxins in them and you also know that within the Industrial Canal you have a 30-foot channel, I would say that why wouldn't we just dispose of those, you would just move those sediments</i></p>

						around within the channel bed because you only need a 14-foot channel within the Industrial Canal. You don't need a 30-foot channel in the Industrial Canal anymore.
Mr. Mark Wright, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
26	X					Mr. Mark Wright: I just had a question. I heard that the Port of New Orleans is deep draft sponsors. Who is the shall draft sponsor? Is there one?
Ms. Patsy Story, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
27			X	X	X	Ms. Patsy Story: I'm wondering that when you have all the impacts done is it going to be in the house by the Corps or will, I guess, would it be allowed to have independent companies do the study also like a watchdog or a check or whatever?
Ms. Margaret Doyle Johnston, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
28		X	X	X		Ms. Margaret Doyle Johnston: Are you still going to have mitigation? Who will we contact if we have a problem with our properties while you're doing this? And is the CBMC still in, will still be in place?
Mr. Frank Laplaca, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
29		X	X	X		Mr. Frank Laplaca: One thing I want to get out the way is that the flood wall in the Industrial Canal on the New Orleans side, which would be the westside, it's approximately 12 feet. On the Lower Ninth Ward side, it's 16 feet. Now, when the Corps of Engineers did all the repair and put in the new flood wall, they didn't increase the height of the flood wall on the New Orleans side. I just want to get that out the way. That needs to be addressed and looked at for the safety of the people getting flooded out.
		X	X	X		Mr. Frank Laplaca: The other thing is the locks, all four new locks, the old locks by the St. Claude bridge are delapidated, old. It all needs to come up. And the new locks, I would say, need to be put in the Industrial Canal somewhere between the bridges where people go from one side of the canal to the other. When the locks are opened and closed, they won't interfere with traffic as the old locks do by the St. Claude bridge. When something passes through there, it takes forever. They open up the lock. The vehicles and boats have to go through. It takes quite a while. And this is all opened up everybody's transportation, ambulances, emergency service, people going to their jobs. It holds up everything. So I think those locks at St. Claude need to come out completely. I wouldn't even rebuild.

Mr. Frank Laplaca, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
		X	X	X		Mr. Frank Laplaca: Now, they could put a flood gate there and that would stop the water one way going one way or the other. The new locks, like I say, in the Industrial Canal, I'm all for it. Another place they possibly could put the new locks is where the Intracoastal Canal, well, the Ship Channel where it comes into the Industrial Canal. Because you want to stop that water from getting into the canal, even when they had the MR-GO that's a long ways that the wind could make a rolling tide. These waves build up, and you have a roll of water coming all the way through the ship channel to the Industrial Canal. And then when it gets there, it's like a wall of water that comes right through it. That's why New Orleans, one of the reasons New Orleans got flooded was because of all that water coming in. So if you can put flood gates where the ship channel connects into the Industrial Canal, that would stop the flow of water coming through. However, either one. If you can't put it there or flood gates there where the ship channel connects to the Industrial Canal, then do put the new locks in the Industrial Canal.
		X	X	X		Mr. Frank Laplaca: Now, just to touch back on the old locks by the St. Claude bridge, if they do take those out, regardless, take them out or rebuild them. The old St. Claude bridge needs to come out. That place has been there for years. The thing vibrates. These 18-wheelers go over it, I mean, it is deplorable. It's terrible. What they ought to do when they take that bridge out, don't put one like the announcer was saying opens like this (indicating), put a new bridge like the Claiborne bridge. It's higher. Most boats that go through it, they won't even have to open the bridge, and it won't affect the traffic. And I'm going to wrap up. And the other things the ramp that goes to the old St. Claude bridge, those things are delapidated. My house is right against the bridge and the traffic comes over there, the 18-wheelers. That old bridge is bad. The Corps of Engineers has come out there and repair it, repair it, repair it, put on the black top, patch it up, whatever. The whole thing needs to come out and put a new roadway system.
Ms. Vanessa Gueringer, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
30			X			Ms. Vanessa Gueringer: First of all, most of the maritime industry are building to protect us now. So to expand that lock to support supertankers coming through here, again, we don't have that kind of traffic. Enough see we have traffic, barge traffic, or volumes of traffic here, we don't see that kind of traffic.
		X	X	X		Ms. Vanessa Gueringer: Now, you talk about St. Bernard Parish being an alternative. Well, would their residents be displaced if the lock replacement is down there, as residents will be displaced here?
Mr. Shannon French, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
31					X	Mr. Shannon French: I really am a proponent of community development happening on multiple scales. I think we need the government. We need industry. We need community meetings. We need grass roots

						<i>organizations all coming to the table. And I think if it's done well, and it's marketed well, any kind of development project like this can satisfy all the stakeholders needs.</i>
		X				<i>Mr. Shannon French: And I think there's a few marketing opportunities here with the Corps. You know, some people think that there are supertankers about to go through the Industrial Canal, and I'm sure that's not the case. And I think you need to put that out there for public consumption that we're talking about very shallow locks here and barge traffic, and we're not talking about dredging the stuff out of this waterway anymore.</i>
		X	X	X		<i>Mr. Shannon French: Another big opportunity that has been missed, the bridges are not pedestrian friendly. They are not bike friendly. I think part of the reason why the lower Ninth Ward is cut off socioeconomically as it is, it feels cut off, is that the residents, many of whom don't even have cars or bikes --they don't allow for an adequate amount of bicycle or pedestrian transportation connecting the Lower Ninth Ward to the rest of the city. And the opportunity here, I think, is for new bridges or improvements to existing bridges to make those passageways more pedestrian friendly and more bicycle friendly. I am an avid cyclist. I think it's a huge problem. The St. Claude bridge is terrible. Cyclist have been killed in recent years. So anyway, there's a lot of traffic. It's very anti-urban status quo. There's an opportunity here to address the community's socioeconomic needs.</i>
		X			X	<i>Mr. Shannon French: I strongly recommend that the Corps of Engineers engage in the community and bring urban planners and architects to the table when designing these bridge improvements.</i>
<i>Ms. Sarah Debacher, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.</i>						
32			X	X		<i>Ms. Sarah Debacher: To me, the most important issue is and the most important question for me as a resident is what is the benefit of this to the community.</i>
		X				<i>Ms. Vanessa Gueringer: What alternatives should be considered in the supplemental EIS, all of them.</i>
<i>Ms. Alisha Jacob, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.</i>						
33			X	X		<i>Mr. Alisha Jacob: So I'm concerned about my property and what's going to happen with that. I can't move around and hop around like I'm young so I'm concerned about that.</i>
<i>Mr. Jason Banks, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.</i>						
34			X			<i>Mr. Jason Banks: For a number of years I actually sat on the board, the mitigation board for the Corps of Engineers. And on that board for a number of years we wrote down all kinds of stuff, all kind of recommendations about how we are going to use that mitigation money to impact the quality of life for people here in the Lower Ninth Ward such as myself. And it seems like all the information that we put together for</i>

						<i>many years we're starting from scratch all over again. So my question is: Why don't we use the information that's already been compiled?</i>
Mr. Loye Ruckman, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
35		X				<i>Mr. Loye Ruckman: In what other locations are you holding lock meetings like this if it's not a foregone conclusion that the lock is going to be right here?</i>
Ms. Veronica Duplessis, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
36			X			<i>Ms. Veronica Duplessis: Right now, my concern is the project has not started. But I know residents from this area will tell you they have a lot of pounding that is going on right now and it devaluated the property for whenever the pounding it shakes the entire building. So when you have that construction and that is going to be going on at the same time. So definitely the residents need to take into account what's going to happen to their property.</i>
Ms. Mary Amaret, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
37					X	<i>Ms. Mary Amaret: I just specifically want to know more about the relationship with the EPA at this point. I want to know what your relationship to the mitigation committees and if you have any information and why is that not presented at this meeting?</i>
Mr. Mark Wright, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
38			X	X		<i>Mr. Mark Wright: I thought I heard Mr. Richard Boe making some question about you wanted to hear comments that addressed the economic benefits of shallow draft locks? There was something stated about the comments focusing on that. Did you say that?</i>
Ms. Janelle Holmes, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
39		X	X	X		<i>Ms. Janelle Holmes: With the replacement of both bridges, has it definitely been decided no movement to the land area of displacing people with dividing of that area of the bridges, can you tell me that the same --</i>
Ms. Naomi Dourner, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
40		X				<i>Ms. Naomi Dourner: My comment is really that former EIS, I wasn't here for that process. I mean, a lot of people have already stated that there has been the impacts sort of analyzed were very significant. And in terms of, you know, the deep draft no longer, I mean, so the Port is no longer on the table, the clarification I'd like</i>

						<i>before I continue my question or comment is: Does that mean there is no speaking of the deep draft going forward?</i>
		X				<i>Ms. Naomi Dourner: So in that case, I think that another lock is definitely what in a different location would be the way to go because if that's off the table, I think it was real misrepresented in the way it was presented. Because they said, oh, we don't have a sponsor, sure all alternatives are being considered. I think the fact a very concerning comment. And as a result, I think another lock location should definitely be considered.</i>
		X				<i>Ms. Naomi Dourner: And beyond that, you know, to the gentlemen who was talking about pedestrian (inaudible), that's always been an issue. It's something that's ongoing. That is very, very costly, very, very significantly impactful. It's absolutely not the way to, like, retrofit a bridge. If there's retrofitting, that's an option. Keep that alternative out as well.</i>
Mr. John Koeferl, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
41		X	X			<i>Mr. John Koeferl: The very important parts of this for us is the big picture about the City of New Orleans and the historic assets that bind people together. The Corps of Engineers in 1986 did a great study about the national register eligibility of the lock. And it concluded that this was a structure of national maritime and engineering significance that should never be displaced. If the lock should be there, if a new lock needed to be built, it should be built somewhere else.</i>
Mr. John Koeferl, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
		X				<i>Mr. John Koeferl: And I think we need to go back and look at that study again and consider it in contents of a city that's about to be 300 years old and has a great Corps of Engineers historic structure here, and it really needs to be restored and is very, very important to people living in the City fo New Orleans.</i>
Ms. Patsy Story, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
42		X	X			<i>Ms. Patsy Story: And as far as the mitigation funds go, there was a lot of money put aside. I wasn't with it towards the end so I don't know what they decided to use the money on, but there was a lot of money that was supposed to be spent on parking lots for the workers and were going to fix our streets and our lighting and everything, which we should be getting that from the city anyway. That funding should not come out of mitigation funds.</i>

Unknown Audience Member, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
43		X				Unknown Audience Member: I'm curious about the "alternative sites." I know you people in a 36-month length of time do not operate day to day and week to week. I cannot believe that. So my question is this: Are there any plans or scheduled meetings regarding any of the other alternative sites for a lock replacement?
		X	X			Unknown Audience Member: We talked about options are on the table as far as construction itself, which is in regards to deep or shallow draft in the depth of the construction. Where does the deep draft factor go now and with the MR-GO being closed, why would we need a deep draft canal at this time?
Mr. Jeff Treffinger, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
44			X			Mr. Jeff Treffinger: I am a property owner on the other side of canal on St. Claude Avenue and actually one of the authors of the report referred to. I was working for a firm in 1986. I assessed the lock. I did the national register on it. And it is indeed one of the most significant structures in a three- mile radius of this point, one of the greatest public works projects in the history of the City of New Orleans, designed by the Googels (phonetic) Engineering Firm, which also did the Golden Gate Bridge. The gate mechanisms are identical to those in the Panama Canal designed by the Schimberg Company. The only lock in the entire world with reversehead gates designed so that they could be high water.
Ms. Larraine Hoffman, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
45			X	X		Ms. Larraine Hoffman: Little things that seem so far down on your list need to come up a lot higher when people talk about the historic nature of the community and how they are now having to maintain homes in the face of ongoing construction around them. A lady over here talked about houses shaking. Right now, there are sidewalk and sewer repairs going on of a relatively modest nature. But when a concrete saw drills on a sidewalk, it shakes some of these houses in the neighborhood. So of course people are understandably concerned about what would happen working around enormous construction project going on virtually all round.
		X				Ms. Larraine Hoffman: So the question I have is: It's not going to be why did you have preliminary meetings with the people in the maritime industry who rely directly on this canal to see what they want and what they need, but will you now have those meetings with them to see what would be best for them? And most people in this room are pretty sure it would be at another location.
Mr. Scott Coll, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
46		X				Mr. Scott Coll: As we kind of understand today globally, the Panama Canal is getting ready to open. New orleans is in the middle of this. We need every piece of real estate we can get to create jobs. We need some of this new business. Up the Mississippi River, go look at all the new jobs. What about the east? Look at all that

						<i>real estate. We need new business. I'm looking at bringing deep water draft business to that neighborhood because with the Panama Canal you've got a lot of those smaller ships looking for business. It's protected water. It's a great place for investors to bring money to create jobs for the community.</i>
Ms. Sarah Debacher, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
47					X	<i>Ms. Sarah Debacher: I would like to request more notice about any future meetings. The piece of mail I received was late last night, and I had very little time over the weekend between the time that I got the piece of mail in just two business days or three business days to notify neighbors. I realize that some of them may not have signed up for mail. So really I would like a another scoping meeting in this community and one in which neighbors are given more advanced notice.</i>
Ms. Vanessa Gueringer, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
48			X	X	X	<i>Ms. Vanessa Gueringer: The other issue is, again, y'all talked in 2007 about the sediment issue. At that time, there was discussion about storing that sediment on the canal, and there was a real negative comment of residents who were concerned about poisoning our water supply in this area.</i>
		X	X			<i>Ms. Vanessa Gueringer: The bottom line is the amount of money that is being spent to rehab the existing lock some of it also needs to go towards the maintenance and the painting of the St. Claude Bridge. We the residents here advocated for the Judge Seeber Bridge to be painted.</i>
			X			<i>Ms. Vanessa Gueringer: And as far as bike traffic, residents have been walking across these bridges, biking across these bridge, and riding across these bridges in vehicles forever. But if some of this stuff can be retrofitted to accommodate some of our newer residents who are bikers out of this neighborhood, but that's where that money needs to be spent, not on a lock expansion.</i>
Mr. Frank Laplaca, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
49		X				<i>Mr. Frank Laplaca: Again, I want to say that the Industrial Canal is the right place to put a new lock system in it. It would serve two purposes. You'd have an extra lock in case the old locks go out. It would be a backup system. And another thing, it would act as a flood wall for flood gates if water came through the canal.</i>
		X				<i>Mr. Frank Laplaca: And the last thing I want to say, well, almost the last thing is the flood wall on the New Orleans side needs to be raised. And then if they do do something with the St. Claude Bridge, put a new bridge like the Claiborne bridge over there and replace the ramps without having to make the residents move and lose their home or property.</i>
Mr. John Koeferl, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						

50		X	X	X		<p><i>Ms. John Koefel: But I wanted to say that there was a study that was done by some engineers in Paradis some years back, and you remember Ed Noony, who just passed away. He and this group determined that the bridges would not go up as often with the new plan, but they would stay up 40 percent longer. So in effect when you have this long line of barges coming to fill this big lock, they would be coming all the way in past the area of the St. Claude and under that, all the way back for that mile lining up and they would stay up a long time too. The changes to the Claiborne bridge would raise it 20 feet would cause it to -- it would mean it would take like six minutes to get up and then five minutes to get down after all the traffic went down. So the upshot was that the people who were using these bridges would wait a longer time, and the bridges would be up together at the same time.</i></p>
Mr. John Koefel, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
		X	X			<p><i>Mr. John Koefel: I know that one of the issues for us is there's a lot of they needed to put a seawall on some of the Holy Cross levee. That was the deal, and we were promised a seawall that would go into the ground for 10 months a year. And there were a lot of other issues about, like, the oak trees would be gone, the bypass channel would have to be dug along the canal on this side of the existing bridge, and the seawall there or the wall doesn't go down through the Corps channel completely. You know what I mean? What do they call them? The sheet pile. So we still have these wells on this side. So the banks of the canal aren't as solid as they need to be yet.</i></p>
Mr. Robert Tannen, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
51			X		X	<p><i>Mr. Robert Tannen: There have been large-scale planning efforts, and I've been involved in several over the years. Has there been any consideration of pulling together a national scientific experts group to look at this situation and not take the Corps responsibilities to undertake the environmental impact studies? It would do well to either have the National Science Foundation or several experts, not just on the matter of navigation, or the matter of transportation, but looking globally at the city and the future prospects of the city taking into account perhaps global warming and climate change, an impact that might have on a project such as this. But to bring together some national experts that could bring a different view to this matter. Has there been any consideration as such?</i></p>
Ms. Kim Ford, Public Scoping Meeting Oral Comments, February 4, 2015.						
52					X	<p><i>Ms. Kim Ford: The science foundation did express some interest. There were some organizations that expressed interest in participating with an open investigation, so to speak, and the feasibility of what you're proposing to do.</i></p>

8.0 SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS

The concerns expressed at the public scoping meeting are summarized below. The primary concerns expressed by scoping participants regard the affected environment, followed closely by the project alternatives and environmental consequences, with consultation and coordination and purpose and need only slightly regarded as important.

Many local residents provided comments and questions regarding the effect on the local community with construction of the new replacement lock within the IHNC. A common concern was raised about noise or vibration impacts from construction activities within the IHNC. Residents were also concerned about pedestrian and bicycle traffic on the bridges and whether or not those options would be considered as part of the project. An additional concern was raised about the potential loss of a historic lock and bridge replacement alternatives and the impact on the people in the area. Many local residents requested additional information regarding the results and potential implementation of the community based mitigation plan.

There were multiple comments from industry and maritime representatives stressing the need for a replacement lock at the existing IHNC site. An equally represented concern voiced by the local public and non-governmental organization representatives was the selection of an alternative site for a replacement lock while maintaining the existing lock. Related comments dealt with the concern over current alternatives to replacing the lock. The project alternatives concerns centered on the potential deep draft versus shallow draft lock alternatives and the economic benefits of each in light of the MR-GO closure. Some concerns were raised about the economic viability of the proposed IHNC replacement lock. Questions were raised about a new cost benefit analysis due in light of the MR-GO closure.

The last major category of comments dealt with dredging and the environmental impacts of the project. Some of the major concerns were the dredging and disposal of contaminated materials, including the method of disposal. Water quality issues for the surrounding communities and nearby wetlands impacts were also mentioned.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

The scoping comments described herein will be addressed in the significant issues, range of alternatives, and consultation and coordination sections of the draft Supplemental EIS. Some comments are outside the scope of this project and CEMVN will consider them in consultation and coordination, where appropriate. The draft Supplemental EIS will be distributed for public comment and interagency review for a minimum of 45 days, which is anticipated to begin in January 2017.

ANNEX 3.1: Scoping Meeting Attendance Sheets



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New Orleans District

ATTENDANCE RECORD

H

Date: 04 February 2015

IHNC Lock Replacement Scoping Meeting

Location: MLK Charter
School- New Orleans

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	News
1	Johnston, M.		N.O.	LA	70117			✓
2	Frank LaPlaca		N.O.	LA	70117			
3	Teddy Carlisle		N.O.	LA	70032			
4	BEN GORDON		NOLA		70172			
5								
6	Chris Pitts		Rd		70126			
7	SHANNON FRENCH				70117			
8	Conrad Bui		N.O.		70117			✓
9	Kenneth McGruder				70117			
10	Catherine Dunn		Place		70130			✓
11	EDWARD DUNN		550	MT	70005			
12	Naomi Durrer		New Orleans	LA	70117			
13	Calvin Alexander		NOLA		70177			
14	SARAH DEBAETEE		NOLA		70117			
15	WALTER GALLAS		NOLA		70119			
16	Matt Rota		NOLA		70130			
17	Billy Apps		Kenner		70062			
18	Quinn Gray		251 N.O.	LA	70117			
19	Amanda Moore		Suite 325		70117			



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New Orleans District

ATTENDANCE RECORD

H

Date: 04 February 2015

IHNC Lock Replacement Scoping Meeting

Location: MLK Charter
School- New Orleans

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Newsp

	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone
1	Amy L. Irwin		N.O.	LA	70117		
2	Darrell Wagner		N.O.	LA	70412		
3	Donald Urban		Arabi	LA	70032		
4	Theresa Henkel		STE 339 NO	LA	70122		
5	Banks, Jason		N.O.	LA	70117		
6	Alton Coleman		N.O.	LA	70117		
7	RODNEY P. DEJOIE		N.O.	LA	70117		
8	Jeffrey R. Chambers		N.O.	LA	70117		
9	MARC B. KEMNER		NO	LA	70117		
10	MARY FONTENOT-SMITH		NO	LA	70122		
11	Don Shaw		NO	LA	70118		
12	Jason Emery		NO	LA	70117 70118		
13	Dorothy Nelson				70115		
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New Orleans District

ATTENDANCE RECORD

H

Date: 04 February 2015

IHNC Lock Replacement Scoping Meeting

Location: MLK Charter
School- New Orleans

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	Newsp
1	Elizabeth Sachs		New Orleans	LA	70117			
2	Ashley Ditts		New Orleans	LA	70117			
3	LOYE RUCKMAN		NEW ORLEANS	LA	70117			
4	Andrew Baker Jr.		NO.	LA	70117			
5	Ronald Robin ⁹¹² 204		N.O.	LA	70117			
6	Andrew Stephens		New Orleans	LA	70117			
7	Lorraine Hoffmann		NOLA		70117			
8	Scott Coll		New Orleans		70117			
9	Scott Mary		Rampart		70117			38
10	Josh Lewis		A	20119				
11	JOHN KOEFERL		NOLA	70122	70122			
12	Mark Wright		Cov. LA		70433			
13	Lacy Allen		NOLA	70117				
14	VERONICA DUPLESSIS		N.O.	LA	70117			
15	VANESSA GUERINGER		N.O.	LA	70117			
16								
17								
18								
19								



US Army Corps
of Engineers
New Orleans District

ATTENDANCE RECORD

H

Date: 04 February 2015

IHNC Lock Replacement Scoping Meeting

Location: MLK Charter
School- New Orleans

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

	First Last Name	Address	City	State	Zip	Email	Phone	News
1	Robert McFarland		NOLA					
2	Kim Ford		NOLA					
3	K. Kintz		NOLA					
4	Franklin Dumas		Monroe, LA	2012				✓
5	Will McCartney		Dr. Chalmette	LA	70043			✓
6	MARIN Tockman		NOLA		70117			
7	Tom Wells		NOLA		70130			✓
8	BOB TAN/NEW		N		70117			
9	CHARLES NELSON		NOLA		70130			✓
10	Lee Wagner		New Orleans		70117			
11	Doreen Lior		NO		70117			
12	William P. Watters		NO		70117			
13	Molly Ireland		NO		70117			
14	JEFF TREFFNIZ		Joint NO		70119			
15	Smitty		NOLA		70117			
16								
17								
18								
19								

ANNEX 3.2: Scoping Meeting Comment Letters, Emails, Postcards



The American Waterways Operators

www.americanwaterways.com

Southern Region

522 North New Hampshire Street
Suite 8
Covington, LA 70433

Mark A. Wright
Vice President – Southern Region

PHONE: (985) 674-3600
CELL: [REDACTED]
FAX: (866) 457-9354
EMAIL: mwright@vesselalliance.com

February 18, 2015

Mr. Mark Lahare
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District
Regional Planning and Environment Division,
South Coastal Environmental Compliance Section
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
PO Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Re: Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock
Replacement Project, New Orleans, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Lahare:

The American Waterways Operators is the national trade association for the U.S. tugboat, towboat, and barge industry. Our industry is the largest segment of the nation's 40,000-vessel Jones Act fleet and moves more than 800 million tons of cargo each year safely and efficiently. AWO members lead the transportation and maritime industry in safety, security, and environmental stewardship. We are committed to working with government partners to advance our shared objectives.

The Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock is a critical component of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and our nation's inland waterways system. Its continued safe and reliable operation is needed to allow commerce to flow through the GIWW. The nation's economy depends on the replacement of this antiquated lock with a modern shallow draft structure.

A National Waterways Foundation peer-reviewed study conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee concluded that the long-term closure of the GIWW would have a greater impact on the economy than similar closures on the Western Rivers or the Columbia-Snake rivers. The IHNC Lock provides the most efficient means to move from the Western Rivers and the western section of the GIWW. The only other marine option requires an additional 17 days transit, adding significant costs to moving goods.

Since the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO), no alternative exists that would not significantly increase the environmental and economic costs to the nation. The

IHNC Lock has been operating at the current location since 1923 and remains the best location to transit between the Mississippi River system and the GIWW.

Closing the IHNC Lock would also cause severe environmental impacts. One tank barge carries the same amount of cargo as 144 trucks. Given the number of refineries and the extensive petrochemical infrastructure along the GIWW, inhibiting navigation on the GIWW would exponentially increase highway traffic and emissions in Louisiana and along the Gulf Coast.

Replacing the current IHNC lock with a new shallow draft structure would benefit all stakeholders. A properly-sized lock would enable fewer trips through the structure, reducing maintenance costs to the nation. In addition, fewer trips would reduce traffic from bridge openings and the number of barges waiting in queue near the lock.

AWO strongly urges the Corps to consider all of these elements while conducting the SEIS. AWO stands ready to work with the Corps and other stakeholders to ensure that building a new IHNC Lock is done in a way that achieves a positive result for the nation's economy and environment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Mark A. Wright". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Mark A. Wright

Scoping the Lock Project Feb 4, 2015

Historical Background

About 1905 an aggressive "dock board" known now the Port of New Orleans "rolled back" the riverbank. The Port took blocks closest to the river including the Mother House of the Ursulines (1823). The Sisters moved uptown but their land became the "Industrial Canal" (1916-1923), AKA Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC), cutting off Lower Nine and St Bernard Parish from the city.

The lock had been in place for many years, and the neighborhoods had largely come to terms with the hardships and accepted it and the St Claude Bridge as part of the fabric of historic New Orleans. In 1986 a Corps study found the lock a maritime and engineering work of major national significance, not to be displaced even if a new lock was needed.

Yet the Port, its shippers and the barge industry have been restless, and pushed to extend the MRGO into the City with a new, deep MRGO lock for the IHNC. Congress authorized it. The Holy Cross Neighborhood Association (HCNA) and Citizens Against Widening the industrial Canal (CAWIC) with help of the Tulane Environmental Law Clinic, Gulf Restoration Network (GRN) and Louisiana Environmental Action Network (LEAN) sued over the issue of toxic sediments to be dredged and stored in the flood plain of Lower Nine Ward.

Despite objections the Corps kept on doing things to prepare the new lock. They tore down the Galvez St Wharf and exposed a weakened floodwall that came close to flooding the City in Hurricane Gustav. Before this, the premature start on a bypass channel without strengthening the floodwall enabled its collapse in Katrina, flooding Lower Nine and St Bernard

Corps Reasoning and Push-Back from Neighborhood

The Corps has not considered real risks and adverse impacts but has offered "mitigation" payments instead (token side payments) because real compensation would greatly add to cost to the project and make it infeasible. Environmental justice issues for the project in a largely minority community have been just as largely ignored.

There is little economic justification for the project. (Stearns, 2008). It will not pay for itself.

In 2011 the court determined the Corps had not done sufficient analysis of environmental impacts and halted the project.

After Katrina the deep draft MRGO channel was closed. MRGO was basis for the project. The Corps responded to this profound change of purpose by giving it an alias "lock replacement project"(2000, Supplemental Report #1)

The Corps now (2015) asks to proceed by merely updating the highly controversial 9-volume EIS of 1997 by a "Supplemental EIS." However, since ecosystem conditions have changed profoundly since 1997, and because of the deficiencies of that report, a much more extensive, basic evaluation would be much more appropriate and should be required for the lock project. Not just a supplement.

It would be very difficult for the public to cover all that ground again. A brand new look would seem much more efficient.

A new analysis should include realistic risk and impact assessment, cost and benefit analyses, consideration of alternative solutions, coastal restoration needs, climate change, protection of environmental and historic resources, and fairness to minority communities.

Safety of larger barge tows on the river and along the Intracoastal (GIWW) is a growing concern, especially for areas of high population.

Why Neighborhood Opposes Proposed Project

Residents of Lower 9 have little interest in a new lock, or expanded redesigned channel, especially considering previous losses and the hazards. They would rather the canal be filled in than bring more hardship and difficulties. Among such are toxic sediments, barge dangers, years of elevated noise, dust, and houses shaking, and compromised infrastructure. It is hard enough living in L9. Without the historic lock and bridge, the canal that brought death enough already could be filled in because citizens don't want it here. They don't want the bigger tows, longer bridge waits, construction traffic, compromised roadways, levees messed with and pushed out of shape and flood-walled instead, oak trees gone, high generic new bridge, years of depressed property values, Mississippi River levels all the way in past N Claiborne. They don't want the insult, the taking for granted, the arrogance, the lies, the bad science and rigged plans, the lack of genuine community engagement and partnership. The lock project from Lower Nine is a very bad proposition, with no upside and no respect.

Residents of Lower Nine and New Orleans would like to have confidence in the Corps and work with the Corps on so much, as fellow Americans, but not a new lock here.

Citizens Against Widening the Industrial Canal (CAWIC)

From: [John Koeferl](#)
To: [Lahare, Mark H MVN](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on IHNC Lock Scoping (CAWIC)
Date: Wednesday, February 18, 2015 9:58:43 PM

<file:///localhost/Users/koeferl/Library/Caches/TemporaryItems/msoclip/0/clip_image002.png>

(original by US Mail)

February 18, 2015 Ash Wednesday

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers(PDC-CE)

C/O Mark Lahare

P.O.Box 60267

New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Mark.h.lahare@usaace.army.mil

RE: Scoping for New Lock

Dear Mr. Lahare,

This is to inform you that we do not consider it prudent or appropriate to do a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock project. The original EIS was done too long ago. Many factors have changed significantly for this channel and its human and natural environment since, markedly from Katrina and the closure of MRGO.

While we know that the 1997 EIS is an assumptive document that certainly deserves revisiting, it is not an "undisturbed ground" basis for planning now. The EIS was controversial and disputed then, even more so now after Katrina.

The Port of New Orleans was the local sponsor for the IHNC lock that was repeatedly defined as a function of MRGO, and as deep draft. The Port was the major influence in the siting of the new lock in the IHNC for its own proprietary and somewhat arbitrary purposes. The other major site, favored by the Corps at Violet, was rejected by the Port, as well as by citizens there who did not want the deep lock because of the encroaching MRGO salt water intrusion damages to the wetlands. Who could blame them? To fulfill requirements for a formal process the site "selection" was staged to eliminate all but IHNC. This was not an objective or equitable process. At that time environmental justice did not include urban and minority considerations, but NEPA does now and we want this protection.

There were also the issues of cost benefit related to volumes and projections for barge traffic, and

omission of the substantial offsetting costs and damages to historic and minority neighborhoods due to the loss of the existing lock and other impacts and risks far beyond mitigation assumptions.

We recognize that there is a strong impetus in the Corps itself, especially among operations personnel, and barge operators, to drill on through to a new lock in the IHNC. This is understandable. They have waited a long time. Yet there are other considerations with the IHNC site that affect the lives and livelihoods and health of many, many people who live in the neighborhoods surrounding the canal. These considerations do not come up for other sites, and they are real.

The MRGO deep channel and its failure for the wetlands and in Katrina flooding have affected us here greatly with loss of life, property, and plenty misery. The Corps failed to protect Lower Nine from damaging impacts and took unacceptable risks pursuing the lock project. Corps personnel put pursuit of this project ahead of people's lives and safety and this is not forgotten.

We do not say this to vent, but to speak to the matter. A new SEIS based on the EIS of 1997 will not do justice or be objective. A sound basis for lock selection would have to venture back to decisions of the 1970's. Some Records of Decision have engineered into truth some things that should not have been and we have all paid a price for this. The Corps has broad powers but broad responsibility. For this reason it seems prudent to involve in this decision about a lock the broadest coalition of experts in every field and well as the public. This is a complex undertaking that seems to demand more than ordinary collaboration.

This all said, we were encouraged to hear some Corps voices say the scoping process would in effect be more of a "general evaluation" or "reevaluation" about the need for a new lock and a suitable site. This seems to have more promise. We would not like to see it tied to the assumptions of the past but potential for the future. It is very hard to discern a clear scoping objective for alternatives from the recent information notices that assume IHNC is the default for whatever goes. The effort

so far seems dubious and focused on magically pulling a shallow draft new lock from the IHNC hat.

We do not, and cannot, support a new lock in the IHNC. For us the only option is "No Project." We do, of course, support refurbishing of the existing lock. consistent with its original design.

We hold this not in opposition to anyone but to protect our own values, property, community resources, and defend our neighborhoods and City, and be as fair as we can in doing so.

It is extremely important for our downriver New Orleans neighborhoods that the existing lock and bridge be retained. We know they are of national maritime and engineering significance and recommended not to be disturbed if a new lock is needed. The study said to keep it for posterity. We certainly do not want it dynamited, and our houses shaken apart as an alternative. There are many problems associated with life here because of the existing lock and bridge but we have learned to tolerate these hardships, to live with the lock. We would see the channel closed before a new lock here with more hardship and disruption. The potent issues of toxicity in the channel are never far from our minds, that tell us these are better undisturbed.

After refurbishing the IHNC lock, the building of a second lock on the east side of the River to serve the GIWW would offer economic choices and marginal advantages for operators and for tows of larger size and different agendas. It would cut the wait time. It would spread things out for barge and river safety and efficiency. It would allow bigger and more hazardous cargoes hold suitable distances from each other and from populated areas, increase overall capacity, and ease risk in maneuvers to and from congested parts of the River. A second lock would seem an invaluable resource that could double the pathways and triple the options. It would not be perfection for those fixated on the IHNC but it could be a much better for most everyone than long struggle and bitterness. We feel certain you have considered this as some solution.

The siting of an alternative shallow draft lock would have environmental and community concerns as well as potential advantages wherever considered. One option---given community assent--- would be a river diversion incorporated into a new shallow draft lock design for the Violet Canal, not far from other channels and close to wetlands needing fresh water. Bridges could be built first with little disruption. This could get Inland Waterway User funding, MRGO Ecosystem Restoration Tier 3 funds, and maybe even state funding. But of course you already know this.

We cannot stress enough how much as Americans and as taxpayers and simply as people we want there to be answers to genuine problems. It would help to recognize that much of the solution has been greatly aggravated over the last forty years by the deep draft push, and wetland collapse with widespread flooding and loss. There is climate change now too. But in the search for a new shallow draft lock (no more deep ones please) we feel the Corps must look for broader options and alternatives than this present SEIS scoping limits suggest.

We wish you success at finding just and workable solutions.

Respectfully,

John Koefel

President, CAWIC

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Dottie Nelson](#)
To: [Lahare, Mark H MVN](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] IHNC lock
Date: Wednesday, February 18, 2015 5:11:08 PM

February 18, 2015

I attended one of your community presentations having to do with the IHNC lock.

Because of the closure of the MRGO after Hurricane Katrina, vessels requiring a depth of 36 feet were denied access to the wharves east of the present lock. I am writing to urge the deepening of the lock in order to allow deep draft vessels to operate in the IHNC and GIWW.

To not exploit our existing, unique, and ever-more-protected wharf facilities and to not enable their fuller usage by deep draft vessels seems a poorly timed and short-sighted decision. It would be a detriment to our city's and port's abilities to exercise competitive advantage in shipping at a time when the Panama Canal Expansion, for example, will offer more opportunities to the northern Gulf Coast.

I understand that the project has a local cost-share requirement. It is my understanding that by a 1914 act of the Louisiana Legislature, the Port of New Orleans and the Orleans Levee Board were authorized to issue bonds to build the canal and the lock. The people of this state and region have thus not only already invested private equity in the development and operation of this system, it is they who provided the infrastructure of the IHNC via the bonds. Surely the history of investment of this community in this structure should be cited to support the argument that the local cost-share requirement has been met.

Please do not cut off this area of realized and future potential from commerce!

I urge you to reconsider the appropriate lock dimensions during this Supplemental EIS phase.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Duval

From: [Mark Stoppel](#)
To: [Lahare, Mark H MVN](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, Louisiana
Date: Monday, February 09, 2015 10:39:21 AM

Dear Mr. Lahare

The Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association (GICA) is a 109-year-old trade association representing 200 industry members involved in towboat and barge operations, shipping, shipyards and associated waterways industries which use the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) between Brownsville, Texas and St. Marks, Florida. GICA is committed to ensuring the GIWW is maintained, operated and improved to provide safe, efficient, economical and environmentally-sound water transportation, serving a wide variety of GIWW users and beneficiaries.

I am writing to offer the Association's comment on issues that should be considered in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock Replacement Project. A shallow draft replacement IHNC lock structure is extremely important to GICA members. The present lock is a critical component of the GIWW and of our nation's inland waterways system. Its continued safe and reliable operation is needed to allow commerce to flow east and west along the GIWW.

Since the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) canal, shallow draft mariners have only one dependable inland route (the GIWW) that links industries in western Gulf state (Texas and Louisiana) with those in the east (Mississippi, Alabama and Florida). As the IHNC sits astride this route, its safe and reliable operation is crucial. A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. Clearly, the 1923 era machinery, lock walls and design are not apace with technologic advances in waterborne transportation - barges and tows are bigger and towboats more powerful. Replacing the present structure with a larger and modern lock design will improve the economics and safety of barge transport through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping. And, of course, modern machinery will make it more reliable.

GICA recommends the following be considered and carefully analyzed in scoping the SEIS:

- * Impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance). Consider that recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute up Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.

- * A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation Study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.

- * Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.

- * Routine, daily delays due to waiting on turn in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.

- * A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately,

for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110 feet wide and 1200 feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.

* Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).

* It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC Lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MRGO. Those should be eliminated from further time, and resource, consuming review.

GICA and its 200 member companies certainly understand the concerns and reservations of the local neighborhood population in the vicinity of the IHNC Lock. Some 75 GICA member companies, (consisting of barge owners, shippers, towboat operators, ship yards, suppliers, fleet operators and more) call Louisiana home; and at least 25 of those are located in the greater New Orleans area. Our companies' employees and their families live in affected neighborhoods, pay city, parish and state taxes, and share in the economies of New Orleans and Louisiana.

GICA and its members stand ready to assist as the Corps embarks on this SEIS effort. The reasons for replacing this aged infrastructure are as valid today as they were in 1956, when replacement was initially authorized by Congress.

Sincerely,

Mark Stoppel, Managing Director Sales & Logistics

AEP River Operations

16150 Main Circle Drive, #400

Chesterfield, MO 63017-4660

636.530.2121 office • [REDACTED] • 636.530.4121 fax

mastoppel@aepriverops.com

www.aepriverops.com <<http://www.aepriverops.com/>>

This email is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and its content may be regarded as privileged and/or confidential. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you or your employer have received this email by mistake, please immediately delete the message.

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: [Mark Czarnecki](#)
To: [Lahare, Mark H MVN](#)
Cc: [Mark Czarnecki](#); [Mark Stoppel](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] IHNC - GIWW
Date: Monday, February 09, 2015 10:30:03 AM

Mr. Mark Lahare

CEMVN-PDC-CEC

PO Box 60267

New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Mark,

Since the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) canal, shallow draft mariners have only one dependable inland route (the GIWW) that links industries in western Gulf state (Texas and Louisiana) with those in the east (Mississippi, Alabama and Florida). As the IHNC sits astride this route, its safe and reliable operation is crucial. A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. Clearly, the 1923 era machinery, lock walls and design are not apace with technologic advances in waterborne transportation - barges and tows are bigger and towboats more powerful. Replacing the present structure with a larger and modern lock design will improve the economics and safety of barge transport through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping. And, of course, modern machinery will make it more reliable.

I, Mark Czarnecki, a sales rep with AEP River Operations, recommend the following be considered and carefully analyzed in scoping the SEIS:

- Impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance). Consider that recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute up Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.
- A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation Study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.
- Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.
- Routine, daily delays due to waiting on turn in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge

openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.

- A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110 feet wide and 1200 feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.
- Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).
- It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC Lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MRGO. Those should be eliminated from further time, and resource, consuming review.

Thanks – Please call or email me with any questions/concerns.

Mark

Mark V. Czarnecki, Sales Representative

AEP River Operations

6582 HWY 44

P.O. Box 287

Convent, LA 70723

225-562-5069 office • [REDACTED] mobile • 636.530.4129 fax

mvczarnecki@aepriverops.com <<mailto:mvczarnecki@aepriverops.com>>

www.aepriverops.com <<http://www.aepriverops.com/>>

This email is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and its content may be regarded as privileged and/or confidential. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you or your employer have received this email by mistake, please immediately delete the message.

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail



Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association

PO Box 6846

New Orleans, LA 70174

██████████ 901-490-3312

February 9, 2015

Mr. Mark Lahare
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
PO Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Re: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Supplemental 2) for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Lahare

The Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association (GICA) is a 109-year-old trade association representing 200 industry members involved in towboat and barge operations, shipping, shipyards and associated waterways industries which use the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) between Brownsville, Texas and St. Marks, Florida. GICA is committed to ensuring the GIWW is maintained, operated and improved to provide safe, efficient, economical and environmentally-sound water transportation, serving a wide variety of GIWW users and beneficiaries.

I am writing to offer the Association's comment on issues that should be considered in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock Replacement Project. A shallow draft replacement IHNC lock structure is extremely important to GICA members. The present lock is a critical component of the GIWW and of our nation's inland waterways system. Its continued safe and reliable operation is needed to allow commerce to flow east and west along the GIWW.

Since the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) canal, shallow draft mariners have only one dependable inland route (the GIWW) that links industries in western Gulf state (Texas and Louisiana) with those in the east (Mississippi, Alabama and Florida). As the IHNC sits astride this route, its safe and reliable operation is crucial. A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. Clearly, the 1923 era machinery, lock walls and design are not apace with technologic advances in waterborne transportation - barges and tows are bigger and towboats more powerful. Replacing the present structure with a larger and modern lock design will improve the economics and safety of barge transport through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping. And, of course, modern machinery will make it more reliable.

GICA recommends the following be considered and carefully analyzed in scoping the SEIS:

- Impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance). Consider that recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute up Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to

reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This *detour* can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.

- A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation Study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.
- Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes **144** tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as **one** typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.
- Routine, daily delays due to waiting on turn in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a *positive* change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.
- A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110 feet wide and 1200 feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.
- Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).
- It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC Lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MRGO. Those should be eliminated from further time, and resource, consuming review.

GICA and its 200 member companies certainly understand the concerns and reservations of the local neighborhood population in the vicinity of the IHNC Lock. Some 75 GICA member companies, (consisting of barge owners, shippers, towboat operators, ship yards, suppliers, fleet operators and more) call Louisiana home; and at least 25 of those are located in the greater New Orleans area. Our companies' employees and their families live in affected neighborhoods, pay city, parish and state taxes, and share in the economies of New Orleans and Louisiana.

GICA and its members stand ready to assist as the Corps embarks on this SEIS effort. The reasons for replacing this aged infrastructure are as valid today as they were in 1956, when replacement was initially authorized by Congress.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jim Stark", is written over a horizontal line.

Jim Stark,
Executive Director

From: [Jim Stark](#)
To: [Boe, Richard E MVN](#)
Cc: [Lahare, Mark H MVN](#)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association (GICA) - Comments for SEIS Scoping - IHNC Replacement Project (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date: Wednesday, February 18, 2015 9:58:30 AM

Richard and Mark,

One area which I did not address is the flood control aspects of a new lock. I assume a replacement lock structure (including monoliths, gates and associated levees) will have to meet post-Katrina standards for surge and overtopping. If so, it would seem to us that this is an additional benefit, accruing to the surrounding neighborhoods and the SELFPA-E area of responsibility, that should be considered in any B/C ratio calculations.

It would also appear that the lock and levees would be part of the HSDRRS system. Would the state then be responsible for cost sharing as non-federal sponsor for the flood control features of the lock?

Please add this concern/question to our inputs as you consider scoping this important project. Thanks.

Jim Stark
Executive Director, GICA
P.O. Box 6846
New Orleans, LA 70174
901-490-3312
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Boe, Richard E MVN [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2015 11:39 AM
To: Jim Stark
Cc: Lahare, Mark H MVN
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association (GICA) - Comments for SEIS Scoping - IHNC Replacement Project (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Jim, I think I failed to acknowledge receipt of your comments. We received your email and appreciate your comments.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Stark [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2015 9:48 AM
To: Lahare, Mark H MVN; Boe, Richard E MVN
Cc: Landry, Victor A MVN; McKinzie, Richard R MVN
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association (GICA) - Comments for SEIS Scoping - IHNC Replacement Project

Mark, Richard,

See GICA comments in attached letter. I have also mailed hard copy to your office.

Please add me/GICA to your Interested Parties mailing list for this project.
Thanks.

Jim Stark

Executive Director, GICA

P.O. Box 6846

New Orleans, LA 70174

901-490-3312

[REDACTED]

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association, Inc.

**P.O. Box 355
Destrehan, LA 70047**
www.gnobfa.org

February 11th, 2015

Mr. Mark Lahare
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267

RE: Draft Supplemental Environmental
Impact Statement (Supplemental 2)
Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock
Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA

Dear Mr. Lahare:

The Greater New Orleans Barge Fleeting Association, Inc. (GNOBFA) is a 39 year old trade association representing over 75 maritime industry member companies that are involved in barge fleeting, barge operations, terminals, and towboat operators which use the Mississippi River and its' tributaries, including the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), and in particular, the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Locks (IHNC).

I am writing this letter to offer the Association's comment(s) on various issues that we ask be considered in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock Replacement Project. In particular, a shallow draft replacement IHNC Lock structure is a critical component of the Lower Mississippi River, the GIWW, and our nation's inland waterways system. The importance of its continued safe and reliable operation is imperative in order to allow commerce to transit east and west along the GIWW.

Of notable importance, since the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) canal, shallow draft mariners have only one dependable inland route (the GIWW) that links industries from the Lower Mississippi River and its tributaries to those located east of the IHNC Lock structure. A modern replacement lock is imperative to ensure a safe and reliable structure to facilitate the normal flow of commerce throughout America. Of note, with the passage of HR 3080 and WRDA of 2014, further indicates that Congress recognizes the immediate need for improvement in our nation's infrastructure.

As you are aware, the IHNC is a 1923 era facility, which is not in pace with today's technologic advances in waterborne transportation provided by barge and towboats. By replacing the outdated structure with a larger and modern lock design will improve the economics and SAFETY of marine traffic thru this particular area, and at the same time, modern machinery will make it more reliable.

GNOBFA would recommend the following be considered and carefully analyzed in preparation of the SEIS:

Mr. Mark Lahare
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267
February 11th, 2015
Page 2

1. A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area, and ultimately, for neighborhood residents.
2. Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. A shallower draft structure will be much cheaper to construct and maintain.
3. On a daily basis, delays due to waiting on turn in locking queues are very expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are passed on to consumers. A larger lock structure will eliminate much of the wait as a typical tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping.
4. Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long term closures should be considered.
5. A recent study by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of a long term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC Lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.
6. Delays due to unanticipated lock closures (for extended repairs and/or maintenance). Consider that a recent unscheduled closure of the Algiers Locks (New Orleans) for 112 days resulted in costs to the maritime industry and their customers approximately \$146 million. Similar closures will cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute via the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterways to reach facilities in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. A detour of this nature will add 15-18 days to complete a normal voyage.

We certainly understand the concerns and some reservations that the neighborhood population located in the vicinity of the present IHNC may have. Many of our member companies call Louisiana home; and maintain offices that are domiciled in the Greater New Orleans area. These companies' employees and their family along with their extended family members live in the affected neighborhoods, of which they too pay local and state tax(s), all contributing to the economics of the City of New Orleans and the State of Louisiana.

GNOBFA and our members stand ready to assist as the USACE embarks on this SEIS effort. For the reasons stated hereinabove, replacing the AGED infrastructure are as valid today as they were when discussed in 1956, when replacement of the IHNC Lock was initially authorized by Congress.

Mr. Mark Lahare
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
Post Office Box 60267
New Orleans, Louisiana 70160-0267
February 11th, 2015
Page 3

Thanking you in advance for your consideration regarding this matter, we remain,

Sincerely,

GREATER NEW ORLEANS BARGE FLEETING
ASSOCIATION, INC.


By: 

KARL C. GONALES

President

Post Office Box 355

Destrehan, Louisiana 70047

Office Phone: (504) 737-6993


KCG:kg



UNITED FOR A HEALTHY GULF

541 Julia Street, Suite 300, New Orleans, LA 70130
Phone: 504.525.1528 Fax: 504.525.0833

February 18, 2015

Mr. Mark Lahare
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267
Mark.h.lahare@usace.army.mil

Re: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Notice of Scoping for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA

The Gulf Restoration Network (GRN) is a diverse coalition of local, regional and national groups committed to uniting and empowering people to protect and restore the resources of the Gulf Region, forever protecting it for future generations. The GRN is deeply concerned about the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction of a replacement lock in the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC).

The original Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and project evaluation report were completed in March 1998. The first SEIS was completed in May of 2009. The Corps now proposes to complete a second SEIS. However, the lapse of time and significant changes to the surrounding neighborhoods and economy of the City caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and the “recovery” from those storms have so changed the underpinnings of the original EIS as to require initiation of a new EIS, rather than supplementation of the existing EIS. Supplementing for a second time a 16 year old EIS is not appropriate. Further, it is our understanding that the local sponsor for deep draft navigation has pulled out of this project. Now that it will only be feasibly examined for shallow draft, a new EIS process would certainly be appropriate

In terms of the scope of the NEPA process, the GRN believes that the following issues must be addressed:

The Need For and Justified Scope of the Project

- A. A full analysis of alternatives including, but not limited to, opportunities for lock improvement, rather than replacement, replacement without expansion of the lock, and a shallow draft lock.
- B. An updated cost-benefit analysis for the project, that including but not limited to:

- a. current vessel traffic through the lock;
- b. costs associated with additional testing of dredge sites needed to accurately determine levels of contaminants at those sites;
- c. current delays, if any, experienced by barges traveling through the lock
- d. predicted future use of the lock, particularly in light of de-authorization and closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet as a navigation channel;
- e. costs associated with disposal of acutely toxic sediments dredged from the canal in a Type 1 disposal facility; and
- f. costs to the community, see below.

Community Impacts

- A. The effect of construction of the replacement lock, expected to last several years, on ongoing redevelopment of the Upper and Lower Ninth Ward adjacent to the canal;
- B. The effect of construction activities on the structural integrity of building in the historic Holy Cross Neighborhood, particularly in light of the impacts of Hurricane Katrina and Rita on those structures;
- C. The effect of construction on storm evacuation of the residents of Lower Ninth Ward and Chalmette, including but not limited to closure of a central evacuation route during construction;
- D. The effect of construction on the ability to timely move vessels in advance of a hurricane needed to allow closure of the new storm surge barrier.

Environmental Impacts

- A. Increased noise associated with construction, as well as operation, on the adjacent community;
- B. The impact of the proposed dredging and construction on water quality in Lake Pontchartrain, the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet and other water bodies in the vicinity of the IHNC;
- C. Potential increases in air pollution (i.e. dust and particulate matter) from construction and operation;
- D. Impact on wetlands, including impacts associated with both the construction of the canal and construction of an appropriate confined sediment disposal facility.
- E. The impact of projected wetlands loss on storm surge attenuation in adjacent areas;
- F. The impacts of projected wetlands loss associated with construction of the lock on wetlands restoration projects contemplated by Coastal Wetland Planning and Restoration Authority, MRGO Ecosystem Restoration Projects or Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast; and
- G. The indirect, cumulative and secondary impacts of replacement of the IHNC, including but not limited to increased industrial development in the vicinity of the canal.

Additional Alternatives

- A. While alternatives were not presented in any detail at the preliminary meeting, the following alternatives should be looked at. GRN does not necessarily endorse any of these alternatives,

but suggests further research in these areas:

- a. Feasibility of building a new Claiborne Ave. bridge, and converting the existing bridge into a pedestrian/bike bridge;
- b. Retrofitting existing lock instead of a new lock; and
- c. Keeping the existing lock, in addition to building a new shallow draft lock to increase redundancy in case one lock needs repairs.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this proposed project. We look forward to additional opportunities to contribute our opinions and expertise.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Matt R.", with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Senior Policy Director

From: [Deb Colbert](#)
To: [Lahare, Mark H MVN](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] IHNC Letter, SEIS from Waterways Council, Inc.
Date: Tuesday, February 17, 2015 1:54:07 PM
Attachments: [IHNC letter 2015.docx](#)

Signed hard copy attached. Thank you.

WC-logo-web

February 17, 2015

Mr. Mark Lahare

CEMVN-PDC-CEC

PO Box 60267

New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Mark.h.lahare@usace.army.mil <<mailto:Mark.h.lahare@usace.army.mil>>

Dear Mr. Lahare:

The closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) canal has restricted to just one dependable inland route – The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway for shallow draft mariners. The GIWW links industries in the western Gulf states of Texas and Louisiana with those in the east (Mississippi, Alabama and Florida). As the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock sits astride this route, its safe and reliable operation is crucial.

A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. The 1923-era machinery, lock walls and design do not keep pace with the advances in waterborne transportation, with larger barges, tows and more powerful towboats. Replacing the present lock structure with a larger, modern lock will improve the economics and safety of barge transportation through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping.

Waterways Council, Inc. recommends the following points be considered in scoping the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS):

- The economic impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance) are harsh. Consider that the recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million that are ultimately passed onto consumers who pay higher costs for goods they depend on. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute to the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach

terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.

- A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long-term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.

- Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long-term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.

- Routine, daily delays due to waiting in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.

- A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110-feet wide and 1200-feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.

- Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).

- It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MRGO. Those should be eliminated from further review.

Thank you for considering our input. Please don't hesitate to call me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Toohey

President/CEO

499 S. Capitol Street, SW Suite 401 Washington, DC 20003

www.waterwayscouncil.org



February 17, 2015

Mr. Mark Lahare
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
PO Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267
Mark.h.lahare@usace.army.mil

Dear Mr. Lahare:

The closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) canal has restricted to just one dependable inland route – The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway for shallow draft mariners. The GIWW links industries in the western Gulf states of Texas and Louisiana with those in the east (Mississippi, Alabama and Florida). As the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock sits astride this route, its safe and reliable operation is crucial.

A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. The 1923-era machinery, lock walls and design do not keep pace with the advances in waterborne transportation, with larger barges, tows and more powerful towboats. Replacing the present lock structure with a larger, modern lock will improve the economics and safety of barge transportation through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping.

Waterways Council, Inc. recommends the following points be considered in scoping the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS):

- The economic impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance) are harsh. Consider that the recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million that are ultimately passed onto consumers who pay higher costs for goods they depend on. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute to the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.
- A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long-term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.

- Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long-term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.
- Routine, daily delays due to waiting in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.
- A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110-feet wide and 1200-feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.
- Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).
- It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MRGO. Those should be eliminated from further review.

Thank you for considering our input. Please don't hesitate to call me with any questions.

Sincerely,



Michael J. Toohey
President/CEO

Waldemar S. Nelson, P.E. (1916 - 2005)
Charles W. Nelson, P.E. *
Kenneth H. Nelson, P.E. *
James B. Lane, P.E. * †
Wayne J. Hingle, P.E. *
David R. Stewart, P.E. * †
Virginia N. Dodge, Corp. Sec.
Barton W. Harris, P.E. * †
Stephen M. Purnilia, P.E. * †
Arthur J. Smith, III, P.E. * †
Thomas W. Wells, P.E. * †
R. Kent Davis, P.E. * †
Leanne M. Gehegan, P.E. *
Michael D. Harbison, P.E. * †
Anthony D. Hoffman, P.E. *
Stephen O. Johns, P.E. *
Lyle F. Kuhlmann, P.E. *
Joseph R. Lawton, III, P.E. * PMP



WALDEMAR S. NELSON AND COMPANY
INCORPORATED
ENGINEERS AND ARCHITECTS

www.wsnelson.com

2 NORTHPOINT DRIVE
SUITE 300
HOUSTON, TX 77060
Phone (281) 999-1989
Facsimile (281) 999-6757

1200 ST. CHARLES AVENUE
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130
Phone (504) 523-5281
Facsimile (504) 523-4587

10375 RICHMOND AVENUE
SUITE 600
HOUSTON, TX 77042
Phone (281) 999-1989
Facsimile (281) 999-6757

Jack H. Neelis, II, P.E. * †
A. Pierre Olivier, P.E. *, P.L.S. *
Robert C. Olivier, R.A. * †
William E. Rushing, Jr., P.E. *
Clifton A. Snow, Jr., P.E. * †
Wayne D. Talley, P.E. * †
William F. Berg, P.E. * †
Stephen W. Carlson, P.E. †
Robert W. Griffin, P.E. * †
O. L. Haas, III, P.E. *
Richie A. Melancon, P.E. * †
R. Jason Ortis, P.E. *
Stephen E. Prados, P.E. *
Glenn J. Richoux, P.E. * †

* Licensed in Louisiana
† Licensed in Texas

Please Respond to the New Orleans Address

February 18, 2015

IHNC Lock Replacement Project
ATTN: Mark Lahare, CEMVN-PDC-CED
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Re: IHNC Lock Replacement Project

Gentlemen:

As a Professional Engineer with 40 years' experience in the design of marine facilities both local and international, I urge your team to closely evaluate the design dimensions of the IHNC replacement lock. I urge you to place greater emphasis on the selection of dimensions suitable for deep draft vessels which are now blocked from existing and future wharf facilities in the IHNC and GIWW.

Upon closure of the MRGO post-Katrina, public and private wharves east of the present lock were negatively impacted: by that closure, vessels capable of navigating the MRGO previously were prevented from accessing the available 36 foot depths in the eastern waterways.

The history of the IHNC dates to 1914, when an act of the Louisiana Legislature allowed the Port of New Orleans and the Orleans Levee Board to issue bonds to build the canal and the lock. At some later point, I understand the lock was transferred to the U. S. government for ownership, operation and maintenance. Landowners and taxpayers have provided hundreds of millions of dollars in waterfront infrastructure over the 92 years the IHNC has been in operation. To limit their future use of existing facilities and of those to be built in the next 100 years would be a serious injury to their interests.

I understand the Port of New Orleans has removed itself as local sponsor due to the cost of cost-sharing for the incremental depth of the sill. But if the argument can be made that the original construction has already been paid for by local interests, then perhaps the Port, as local sponsor, can be seen to already have met its obligation to satisfy the cost-share requirement for the deeper lock.

The physical dimensions affected by the lock depth are roughly four miles of the IHNC and seven miles of the GIWW. According to boaters using those sections of the waterways, both waterways have existing mid-channel depths of 36 feet. Facilities line both banks of the IHNC, and facilities could in the future line both banks of the

Providing Professional Services Since 1945

GIWW. Several large industrial facilities have been built on the GIWW, and more have been proposed. Those future projects would make good use of their ability to get larger blue water ships into the protected harbor behind the new hurricane protection system.

The availability of roughly 22 miles of deep water (both banks of 11 miles of waterway) is more than the 2015 deep water real estate controlled by the Port of New Orleans in the main channel of the Mississippi River. This asset is unique in port infrastructure in *the entire United States*, in that it is protected by the IHNC Surge Barrier, the Chalmette levees, the Seabrook Floodgate, and the enhanced post-Katrina levee system. To not make the best use of this asset for the future would be illogical, and poor public policy at best.

In the interest of fairness to the previous investors (taxpayers who retired the bonds and private investors in the 92 years of progress in New Orleans East since completion of the IHNC lock in 1923), the appropriate lock dimensions should be intimately investigated during this Supplemental EIS phase of a much-needed project.

Sincerely,
WALDEMAR S. NELSON AND COMPANY
Incorporated
Engineers and Architects

Charles W. Nelson, P.E.

Charles W. Nelson, P.E.
Chairman

CWN/khm



21st Century Steelmakers

Philip K. Bell
President
1150 Connecticut Ave. NW
Ste. 715
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 296-1515

Tuesday, February 17, 2015

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Regional Planning and Environment Division, South
Coastal Environmental Compliance Section
c/o Mark Lahare
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Mr. Lahare,

On behalf of the member companies of the Steel Manufacturers Association (SMA), I write to convey the SMA's strong support for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock Replacement project. SMA is the primary trade association for North America's electric arc furnace steel producers. SMA's 31 member companies account for over seventy-five percent of total domestic steel production. We are the largest steel industry trade association in North America. We count among our members Nucor Steel, ArcelorMittal, and SSAB.

The IHNC provides a critical link between the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Mississippi River. Many of SMA's members rely upon this waterway for the movement of steelmaking raw materials and finished steel products.

SMA is extremely concerned with the deteriorating condition of our nation's inland waterway system. Existing inefficiencies at the lock interrupt the flow of commerce; further deterioration could have a negative impact on the competitive position of domestic steelmakers. As such, we urge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to please proceed with this project in a safe, timely manner.

We appreciate your attention and would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Philip K. Bell".

Philip K. Bell



February 17, 2015

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Regional Planning and Environment Division, South
Coastal Environmental Compliance Section
c/o Mark Lahare
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Re: Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project

Dear Mr. Lahare:

SSAB is a global leader in value added, high strength steel. SSAB offers products developed in close cooperation with its customers to attain a stronger, lighter and more sustainable world. We are proud to manufacture steel in the United States where we employ more than 1,250 skilled and dedicated people, with annual steelmaking capacity of approximately 3 million tons.

SSAB Americas is well known in the industry as a leading recycler of scrap steel. SSAB products manufactured in the United States contain about 97% recycled steel. Our operations are strategically located on waterways and we depend on a safe, reliable and efficient waterborne transportation to receive the scrap we use to manufacture steel plate and steel coil.

The Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock (IHNC) is critically important to SSAB's operations in Mobile, Alabama. During 2014, SSAB Alabama received 667,842 net tons of ferrous scrap by barge --approximately 90% of those barge loads passed through the IHNC lock. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) is currently the only dependable inland route linking industries in the western Gulf States with those in the east. A modern replacement lock for the IHNC is needed. In its crucial location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time. For SSAB, our customers, as well as many other domestic manufacturers, such a closure would cause substantial damage and affect our nation's economic competitiveness.

We ask that you consider the severe impact that delays or closures of the IHNC could have on U.S. manufacturers as you scope the Supplemental EIS for this project.

SSAB Enterprises, LLC

801 Warrenville Road, Suite 800
Lisle, IL 60532

T +1 630 810 4800
F +1 630 810 4600

Toll-free +1 877 594 7726
www.ssab.com

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed project and thank you for your work to support America's infrastructure. If you have any questions, please contact Katie Larson by telephone at (202) 737-8996, or by email at katie.larson@ssab.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Bernard Pelletier". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "B" and a distinct "P".

Bernard Pelletier
Vice President Operation Services
SSAB Americas



Wood Resources, L.L.C.

February 10, 2015

Army Corp of Engineers
Attn: Mr. Mark Lahare
CEMVN-PDC-CEC
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

Dear Mr. Lahare,

Since the closure of the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) canal, shallow draft mariners have only one dependable inland route (the GIWW) that links industries in western Gulf state (Texas and Louisiana) with those in the east (Mississippi, Alabama and Florida). As the IHNC sits astride this route, its safe and reliable operation is crucial. A modern replacement lock structure is needed to ensure that reliability. Clearly, the 1923 era machinery, lock walls and design are not apace with technologic advances in waterborne transportation - barges and tows are bigger and towboats more powerful. Replacing the present structure with a larger and modern lock design will improve the economics and safety of barge transport through the industrial canal by reducing delays and tripping. And, of course, modern machinery will make it more reliable.

I, Sarah Louise Wood Ham, with Wood Resources, recommend the following be considered and carefully analyzed in scoping the SEIS:

- Impacts of delays due to unanticipated lock closures (and for extended repairs or maintenance). Consider that recent closure of the Algiers Lock for 112 days resulted in costs to industry of \$146 million. Similar closures cause significant delays as eastbound mariners must reroute up Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and down the Tennessee and Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway to reach terminals in Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. This detour can add 14-17 days to a typical voyage.
- A recent peer-reviewed National Waterways Foundation Study, conducted by the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee, concluded that the national impacts of long term closure of the GIWW are actually greater than similar closures of the Mississippi River, Ohio and Pacific Northwest routes. In its critical location, failure of the outdated, undersized IHNC lock could easily close a major portion of the GIWW for extended periods of time.
- Secondary efficiency, environmental and safety impacts of long term closures should be considered. Truck traffic could be expected to increase on roads in New Orleans and the I-10 corridor as shippers look for alternative means to get their products to users. Consider that it takes 144 tanker trucks to carry the same amount of oil as one typical barrel tank barge that operates routinely on this route. In a single year, thousands of tank barges transit the IHNC Lock and GIWW. More trucks on the road equal more pollution and an increase in potential accidental spills of products.



Wood Resources, L.L.C.

Page 2/...

- Routine, daily delays due to waiting on turn in locking queues are expensive. These costs to shippers, tow operators, and their customers are simply passed on to consumers. A larger lock will eliminate much of the wait as a typical six-pack tow could lock through without time consuming and expensive tripping. An additional benefit of fewer trippings will be a measurable reduction of bridge openings, noise, and disruptions associated with tows waiting to lock. This should result in a positive change for the immediate IHNC neighborhood.
- A larger, modern lock will be safer for the mariners who routinely transit this area and, ultimately, for neighborhood residents. The margin for error when pushing tons of cargo in 200 or 300 foot long barges is greatly increased when the width and length of the lock chamber is expanded to the recommended 110 feet wide and 1200 feet long. Additionally, costs to the USACE and mariners for repairing damaged pilings, fenderworks and gates would decrease.
- Specific sizing of the shallow draft replacement lock must be carefully considered. Presently, GIWW shallow draft lock depths range from 12-15 feet. Logically, capital construction costs, operations and maintenance costs and environmental and social impacts would be expected to be less for a 12-15 foot deep lock than those of a deeper draft lock of 22 to 36 feet (as contemplated in the 2008 SEIS).
- It appears that several of the alternative locations for relocating the IHNC Lock are no longer feasible due to the closure of the MRGO. Those should be eliminated from further time, and resource, consuming review.

Sincerely,

Sarah Louise Wood Ham

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: ON ~~DISPOSAL~~ DISPOSAL OF ~~EXCESS~~ DREDGED
SEDIMENT

Name REN GORDON Affiliation PAK CHRISTI / GREEN PARTY
Street [REDACTED] Phone [REDACTED]
City, St Zip N.O. LA. 70117 Fax [REDACTED]
E-mail [REDACTED]

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: _____

Name	<u>Matt Rota</u>	Affiliation	<u>Gulf Restoration Network</u>
Street	<u>[REDACTED]</u>	Phone	<u>[REDACTED]</u>
City, St Zip	<u>NOLA 70130</u>	Fax	<u> </u>
E-mail	<u>[REDACTED]</u>		

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: _____

Name JOHN KOFFERL Affiliation CAWIC
Street _____ Phone _____
City, St Zip _____ Fax _____
E-mail _____

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: ① WILL THE RESIDENTS OF ST. BERNARD PARISH BE DISPLACED IF LOCAL REPLACEMENT IS DONE THERE?.. THEY HAVE RECOVERED FROM HURRICANE KATRINA, LOWER NINE HASN'T.

② ON ANY GIVEN WEEK HOW MUCH BARGE/SHIP TRAFAC TRAVELS THROUGH THE... WE IN LOWER NINE DON'T SEE THE VOLUME OF TRAFAC THE CORP SEES.

③ WHAT SORT OF ~~NEGATIVE~~ IMPACT WOULD THIS PROJECT HAVE ON THIS COMMUNITY?

Name VANESSA GUETRINGER Affiliation A COMMUNITY VOICE
Street [REDACTED] Phone [REDACTED]
City, St Zip NOLA 70117 Fax [REDACTED]
E-mail [REDACTED]

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: Back in 1985 USACE started this project while digging they found bad contamination in the ground then stopped. Katrina caused the same where did it all go. did all the toxic left?

Name Darrell D. Wagner Affiliation
Street
City, St Zip N.O. La. 70112
E-mail
Phone
Fax

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Yes ☐No ☒**Comments:**

No! No! No!

① Purpose & Need - I live & house 2 from the canal since 1928 - rarely have I seen knotted up water traffic except for things like "Blowing in Trees" etc. - NO NEED! NO DEEP DRAFT → too dangerous "if" Rindoon Crvge.

Mitigation Plan was a Joke - Too much of focus on parking lots for work vehicles etc. Better streets & lighting (that should come from city not mitigation funds)

This community does not deserve to be displaced again by the expansion of the airport.

Name J. Paul Taylor Vtorek

Affiliation

NO. 13, CHURCH, Argent.

Street**Phone**

City, St Zip

Fax

E-mail

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: Here are my questions

1. Are you still going to have Mitigation?
2. Who will we contact if we have problems with our properties?
3. Is the Community Base Mitigation still in place?

Name M. Doyle Johnston Affiliation Upper 9th Ward Florida Comm. Base
Street [REDACTED] Phone [REDACTED]
City, St Zip N.O. LA. 70117 Fax [REDACTED]
E-mail [REDACTED]

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments: YES ON NEW LOCKS AT NEW SPOT
IN INDUSTRIAL CANAL

ALSO COMMENTS ON OLD LOCKS AT
ST CLAUDE AND OLD ST. CLAUDE DRAW
BRIDGE AND RAMPS

Name FRANK LAPLACA Affiliation _____
Street _____ Phone _____
City, St Zip N.O., LA, 70111 Fax Same phone and fax
E-mail _____

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Official Business

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY IF
MAILED IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS MAIL

PERMIT NO. 172

NEW ORLEANS, LA

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

US Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District
c/o Public Affairs
CEMVN-PAO
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

NEW ORLEANS
LA 70000
05 FEB 15
PM 4 L

The intent of public scoping meeting tonight is to solicit stakeholder input on the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement Project, New Orleans, LA, General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Speaker Request/Comment Card

2-5-15

Would you like to speak tonight? Yes ☐ No ☐

Comments: USACE REALLY NEEDS TO LOOK AT THE COST OF
REPAIRING/REPLACING ELEMENTS OF THE LOCK - THE 90 DAY
CLOSURE WE WERE TOLD ABOUT - WHAT THE LIFE OF
THAT MAINTENANCE IS - COMPARED TO THE MUCH MORE
EXTENSIVE COST OF THE PROPOSED LOCK REPLACEMENT.
WHY NOT KEEP WHAT YOU HAVE + MAINTAIN IT?
WE DON'T SEE THE BENEFITS OF THIS PROJECT COMPARED
TO THE VAST NEEDS ELSEWHERE.

Name WALTER GALLAS Affiliation LOUISIANA LANDMARKS SOCIETY
Street [REDACTED] Phone [REDACTED]
City, St Zip NOVA 70119 Fax [REDACTED]
E-mail [REDACTED]

ANNEX 3.3: Scoping Meeting Transcript

INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK REPLACEMENT

Public Scoping Meeting

New Orleans, Louisiana

The above-entitled cause came in for a meeting at the Martin Luther King Charter School, 1617 Caffin Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana, on Wednesday, February 4, 2015, commencing at 6:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

TIFFENY SUIRE GALLARDO
Certified Court Reporter
In and For the State of
Louisiana

A P P E A R A N C E S

RENE POCHE, USACE, MODERATOR

RICHARD BOE, USACE

* * * * *

I N D E X

	PAGE
APPEARANCES	2
PROCEEDINGS	4
Presentation by Richard Boe	6
Questions and Comments	18
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	76

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. RENEE POCHE:

Welcome to tonight's meeting. Thank you so much for taking the time to come out and see what you have to say. And more important, we want to hear what you say about the reevaluation of this project. So I'm going to run through some notes here, and then we'll get into the presentation.

A couple of administrative things. The exits, they have the one you came in, if you need to get out for whatever reason, there's one over there. The restrooms are through the double doors back over there, also, if you need to use those.

Again, welcome to this meeting for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement, the Second Supplemental. The purpose of this evening's meeting, again, is to just get your input for this draft SEIS and hear your comments and concerns. That input that we'll get tonight will be used to help scope this SEIS and establish goals and objectives and issues being considered in project alternatives.

1 We've had a discussion period. It
2 looks like it was pretty good judging from the
3 conversations that I heard. We'll have this
4 presentation. It should be about 15 to 20
5 minutes. And then we're going to open it up to
6 hear your comments. There's a variety of ways
7 also that you can provide input.

8 Everything that is submitted here,
9 either oral or written, is treated equally.
10 There's no weight assigned if someone sits down
11 and writes the district name and sends that in.
12 That doesn't get any more weight than you
13 standing up here tonight and making your desires
14 known.

15 We have a court reporter over here. So
16 when we get into the comment period, please
17 speak clearly so she can get the information as
18 accurate as possible. So let's go ahead and get
19 started. Again, there's the agenda. I didn't
20 introduce myself. I'm sorry. I'm Renee Poche.
21 I'm with the public affairs office. I get a
22 little excited at the meetings sometimes and I
23 forget so just bear with me on that.

24 I'll run through a couple of slides,
25 and then Richard Boe will talk about the lock

1 replacement. And then we're going to open it up
2 to your comments. And then we'll close the
3 meeting out no later than 9:00 o'clock tonight
4 if we go that long. Again, we want to hear your
5 input on these things.

6 Next slide. Just a little history. It
7 goes back to 1956 when the project was
8 authorized, and then the authorization was
9 amended again in 1986 and 1996, as well, so just
10 a real quick history. I'm going to turn it over
11 to Richard Boe. He's going to get into the real
12 stuff that you want to hear tonight, and that's
13 the reason why we're here.

14 I would ask that you hold all your
15 comments to the comment period. You may have
16 questions. But there was a lot of time and
17 effort put into putting this presentation
18 together tonight. You may find your question
19 gets answered somewhere in the presentation. We
20 just ask you to hold all those questions and
21 comments until after the presentation.

22 MR. RICHARD BOE:

23 Thank you, Renee. My name is Richard
24 Boe. I've been with the Corps since 1989. When
25 I started with the Corps in 1989, I was assigned

1 to work on this project and been working on it
2 on and off since then. So I have a long history
3 with the project.

4 And let's start off by talking about
5 National Environmental Policy Act. We call it
6 NEPA, four-letter acronym. We call it NEPA.
7 The National Environmental Policy Act requires
8 federal agencies to assess the impacts and
9 consider the impacts of their projects. And the
10 way we do that, it's in preparation of the
11 Environmental Impact Statements. NEPA
12 regulations apply to all federal agencies, and
13 those regulations requires a scoping process to
14 be part of the NEPA process. That's why we're
15 here tonight. As you can see, agencies are
16 required to make diligent efforts to involve the
17 public in preparing and implementing their NEPA
18 procedures, including their Environmental Impact
19 Statements. And of course public meetings are a
20 great way to accomplish that. Next slide.

21 Continuing on the NEPA scoping, scoping
22 involves stakeholders and other interested
23 parties. And the results of the scoping tonight
24 will help us in our environmental review of the
25 project.

1 We ask that you consider the following
2 when you make your comments. Scoping is really
3 what are the issues and resources of impacts
4 that you believe will happen, and that we should
5 consider when we prepare our EIS, and what are
6 the alternatives that we should consider in the
7 EIS. So those are the two major topics that we
8 would like to hear about. Of course, we want to
9 hear anything and everything you say. But those
10 are the two major things we want to hear about
11 tonight.

12 Let's talk just a minute about the
13 regional value of the canal. You might have
14 seen the display in the back about the Gulf
15 Intracoastal Waterway. As you can see, the
16 Inner Harbor Canal. We call it the Inner
17 Harbor. You may call it the Industrial Canal.
18 It lies right in the middle, basically right in
19 the middle of the Intracoastal Waterway. For
20 traffic, it moves all the way from the Mexican
21 boarder in Brownsville all the way to Florida
22 and then it causes traffic to continue across
23 Florida and up the Atlantic coast. The barge
24 traffic that moves on the GIWW is the main
25 traffic that flows through the Inner Harbor

1 Canal and Lock.

2 The next slide shows the locks on the
3 Intracoastal Waterway in Louisiana. It also
4 shows, the red line shows the Intracoastal
5 Waterway. We call the red line the main stem.
6 That's the main GIWW that goes from Mexico to
7 Florida. The yellow vertical line in the center
8 of the slide shows what we call the alternate
9 route of the GIWW that goes from Morgan City to
10 Port Allen Lock.

11 And the importance of this slide is
12 that some people have questioned why do we need
13 to, why do we think we may need to replace the
14 lock that's on the canal. Well, as you can see,
15 there is the Port Allen Lock, Harvey Lock, and
16 Algiers Lock. They are all on the west side of
17 the Mississippi River. And all those locks
18 allow barges to travel from the river to points
19 to the west. Whereas on the east side of the
20 river, all we have is the IHNC Lock. There are
21 no alternate routes.

22 Some of you are familiar with the area
23 they say, well, there's locks down in
24 Plaquemines Parish. There is. It's operated by
25 the State of Louisiana. It's not a Corps of

1 Engineers lock. But there is no connecting
2 channel that allows vessels to move throughout
3 the lock out into the open waters of Breton
4 Sound and to the east and then connect up into
5 the GIWW eastbound. So the small size of the
6 Kenner Harbor Lock and the fact that it's only
7 one lock contributes to the delays that vessels
8 have when they try to move through the waterway.

9 Focusing on the existing lock, it was
10 constructed in 1923. It was completed in 1923
11 by the Port of New Orleans. The U.S. Government
12 during World War II began leasing the lock from
13 the Port. Prior to them, the Port actually
14 charged a fee to go through the lock. And once
15 the government began leasing it, it became part
16 of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, and moving
17 through the lock was free of charge for all
18 vessels.

19 From World War II to about 1942, when
20 we began leasing it, until 1986 the Corps
21 operated and maintained the lock and paid their
22 annual fee to the Port. We actually purchased,
23 the government purchased the lock in 1986. And
24 around the Year 2000, the government actually
25 began, as part of this lock replacement project,

1 we actually acquired additional parcels of land
2 around the lock and actually bought some of the
3 canal itself in order to begin construction of
4 the lock.

5 The 1976 authorization is important
6 because it demonstrates that Congress realized
7 almost 60 years ago the lock may need to be
8 replaced. Since 1956, many studies and many,
9 many meetings have occurred. I'm sure some of
10 you here tonight have been in those previous
11 meetings. The first meeting was actually held
12 in 1960.

13 Throughout the Sixties, Seventies, and
14 Eighties, there were many, many studies and a
15 lot of those studies sound around where the new
16 lock should be located or replacement lock, I
17 should say. And of course many of you know that
18 there was a lot of opposition to replacing the
19 lock anywhere near the Inner Harbor Canal or in
20 St. Bernard Parish. Those were the two main
21 areas that were investigated for replacing the
22 lock.

23 So in 1997, the Corps produced its
24 first public document concerning replacement of
25 the lock, and we released the Draft EIS in 1997.

1 In 1998, we prepared, we released a final
2 Environmental Impact Statement. And
3 accompanying the Environmental Impact Statement
4 was what we call a Project Evaluation Report.
5 And you can see a record of decision was signed
6 in 1998.

7 And the information I want to tell you
8 about on this slide -- the recommended plan at
9 the time was a lock located, a new replacement
10 lock located basically within the confines of
11 the existing canal north of Claiborne Avenue.
12 The lock would have been, the lock that was
13 recommended at the time was 110 feet wide, 1,200
14 feet long, and 36 feet deep. It was 36 feet
15 deep. We call that a deep draft lock. It would
16 have accommodated large ships. At the time, the
17 Mississippi River Gulf Outlet was still open.
18 So it would have allowed vessels to move back
19 and forth from the Mississippi River to the
20 Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, MRGO.

21 The construction method means a lot to
22 the Corps because the construction method is
23 important. We looked at two different types of
24 construction: cast replacement construction,
25 which is basically very conventional. We de-

1 water the lock site. You build a lock as if it
2 was on dry land. And we evaluated a float-in
3 method, which would involve driving pilings
4 underwater and bringing in lock modules
5 prefabricated at an offsite location and
6 ballasting them down onto the pilings and then
7 filling in around it. That was called float-in.

8 We recommended at the time the float-in
9 lock construction to try to minimize the impacts
10 on the local area. A lot of the construction
11 would have been able to occur at an offsite
12 location. All of the lock construction would
13 have occurred on the flood side of the existing
14 flood walls and levees. No residential or
15 commercial businesses would have been, had to
16 have been relocated.

17 As part of the project, the St. Claude
18 Avenue bridge would have been replaced with a
19 new low-level, what we call, double bass fuel
20 basically, two bridge openings like this
21 (indicating) and a perdition for a temporary
22 bridge during construction of that St. Claude
23 Avenue bridge.

24 It would have also allowed, one of the
25 reasons for the low-level bridge there was to

1 minimize impacts on local neighborhoods and also
2 would have allowed for pedestrian traffic to
3 continue to use that crossing.

4 The project would have also included
5 modification of the Claiborne Avenue bridge by
6 replacing the westbound and the tower so that
7 the bridge, the deck where the cars drive across
8 could actually rise higher because with the new
9 lock at Claiborne, you would have river level
10 stages underneath the Claiborne Avenue bridge.
11 And when the river was high, you would have less
12 clearance. So in order to accommodate vessels,
13 we would have raised, not the stand while it was
14 open for vehicles, but as it was raised it would
15 be raised higher, and it would have been a
16 duration of about two weeks to do that work.

17 Also part of that plan was the
18 extension of Mississippi River level protection
19 to the north to tie into the new the lock,
20 demolition and removal of the existing lock.
21 And we've also included a community impact
22 mitigation plan, which would have provided
23 mitigation to the local community in the form of
24 things like increased playgrounds, increased
25 level of police and fire protection, that sort

1 of thing, also a fish and wildlife mitigation
2 plan to come to mitigate for some of the adverse
3 impacts of the project on the fish and wildlife
4 resources.

5 After we prepared that, the first
6 evaluation report and EIS, around the Year 2000
7 or so is when we acquired land from the Port to
8 begin construction. We demolished the Galvez
9 Street bar and performed extensive remediation
10 on the eastbank of the canal where there were
11 some old businesses the Port used to lease to
12 that left some contamination there -- would
13 someone give me a glass of water, please? Sorry
14 -- and we began implementing the impact
15 mitigation plan.

16 But in 2003, we were challenged in
17 court, plants alleged a variety of things. And
18 while we were in litigation, Hurricane Katrina
19 struck and caused damage to the area,
20 substantial damage. And then after Hurricane
21 Katrina, the Port joined the Corps continuing
22 the project until we complied with the NEPA,
23 National Environmental Policy Act.

24 Basically, the court ruled that the
25 Corps could not continue with the project until

1 we reevaluated the project in light of the
2 changed conditions as a result of Hurricane
3 Katrina.

4 So in 2007, we began preparation of a
5 Supplemental EIS to address those current
6 conditions at the time. And notable during that
7 time in the same time period, the Corps
8 completed the closure, completed a rock
9 structure on the MRGO at Bayou LaLoutre, which
10 effectively closed off the MRGO to navigation
11 traffic.

12 And the Supplemental EIS recommended,
13 in most respects, the recommended plan was the
14 same. We did refine the construction method.
15 And the method of dredging material, excavation
16 of the canal banks sediments, and canal soils,
17 and sediments were a point of concern by the
18 plaintiffs that some of them are contaminated.
19 So we refined that disposal plan to accommodate
20 all of the dredged material and designated three
21 locations to disposal.

22 So in 2009, well, in 2010, the project
23 was again found in court. Plaintiffs made a
24 variety of claims, not the least of which was
25 that the Supplemental EIS failed to consider the

1 impact of the MRGO closure on the depth of the
2 new lock. Remember, the MRGO was 36-feet deep.
3 We were recommending a 36-feet deep lock. And
4 the court ruled that we should have considered a
5 shallower lock in light of the fact the MRGO had
6 been closed.

7 So now we're starting what we call a
8 general reevaluation study. That's a term the
9 Corps uses when it's obvious that a lock that a
10 project that's already been under construction
11 should be reevaluated. And of course the
12 purpose is to determine if there is an economic
13 justification for a more efficient navigation
14 lock to replace the existing lock and that is
15 environmentally acceptable. And we've already
16 talked about the need because the vessels moving
17 through navigation traffic delays. All Corps
18 navigation project must be economically
19 justified. And that's going to be a big part of
20 our analysis is the benefits to navigation by
21 reducing navigation delays and the cost of
22 construction.

23 One important point is that for the
24 original EIS and for the supplemental, the Port
25 of New Orleans was our sponsor for the deep

1 draft lock of the project. Since that time,
2 since we've prepared the supplemental EIS, the
3 Port of New Orleans has informed us, the Corps,
4 that they no longer wish to be a sponsor for the
5 deep draft lock. That leaves us without a
6 sponsor for the deep draft lock. So we will be
7 evaluating shallow draft lock alternatives in
8 the reevaluation and then what we're going to be
9 calling the Second Supplemental EIS.

10 And then finally, just some of the
11 items that we know are important to local
12 community, and we're going to be evaluating all
13 of these resources. And we ask you tonight to
14 help us determine what other things and may add
15 some detail into some of these things that we've
16 already identified that we will be addressing in
17 the EIS.

18 And that's all I have. Thank you so
19 much for your attention.

20 MR. RENEE POCHE:

21 Thank you, Richard. There's some
22 contact information. I just want to remind you,
23 too, the table where you signed in, we do have
24 some postage-paid envelopes. If you want to
25 grab one on your way out, if you have some

1 thoughts, comments, after tonight's meeting, put
2 it in this, drop it in the mail. These are all
3 ways, as well, that you can get your information
4 to us. Can you go back to Slide 14, please?

5 So what we want to do now is hear from
6 you. But a couple of things I want you to keep
7 in mind. We are in Week 2 of a 36-month
8 project. So you may have questions that we're
9 going to tell you we don't know the answer to
10 because we are so early in the process. But
11 it's so important to hear from you early in the
12 process. That's why we're having this meeting
13 now.

14 So what we'd like to do is open it up,
15 but we're kind of limited with the mics. So
16 we're going to work from this side of the
17 audience over this way. And then we'll kind of
18 come back around. We want to give everybody the
19 chance to comment. So we're going to ask you to
20 limit your comments to about three minutes or
21 so. When you get close, I'll let you know.
22 Then we want to run through the whole audience
23 and give everybody a chance to make a comment.
24 And then if you have follow-ups, we'll come back
25 to you. Does that sound fair to everybody?

1 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

2 Just a point of order, what were the
3 cards for?

4 MR. RENEE POCHE:

5 Same thing. We ran out of cards. I'm
6 sorry. I didn't clarify that. Those cards that
7 some of you may have received when you came in,
8 we ran out. So now we have an envelope. No
9 different. Everything, like I told you before,
10 everything is treated exactly the same, whether
11 you write it, stand up here tonight and make a
12 comment. It all goes into the record.

13 To be part of this process that we're
14 doing tonight, February 18th is the deadline.
15 But we'll continue to accept comments -- back on
16 Slide 16 there. We'll continue to accept those
17 comments this way and if you wish this way as
18 well. Yes, sir.

19 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

20 Do you mind extending the limit thing
21 and let people talk for a while and see how it
22 goes?

23 MR. RENEE POCHE:

24 No. It's so important that we get as
25 many people to have their input. We'll have

1 time. It's not even 7:00 yet, and we have two
2 hours. So what I'd like to do is go through and
3 let everyone have a chance to make a comment,
4 and then we'll come back around. And I'm sure
5 you're going to have follow-ups.

6 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

7 Maybe if we can have a show of hands
8 and see how people feel.

9 MR. RENEE POCHE:

10 No. This is our meeting, and I want to
11 keep it flowing this way so everyone has their
12 change to comment. It wouldn't be fair if we
13 got bogged down in a 15- or 20-minute discussion
14 over here, and a lady and gentlemen over here
15 wanted to make a comment, and they didn't have
16 that opportunity. That's just not fair.

17 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

18 Can we defer our time to another
19 person?

20 MR. RENEE POCHE:

21 No, you may not yield your time. You
22 read my mind. That was my next point. You may
23 not yield your time.

24 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

25 Could you turn to the slide where you

1 direct us in terms of what it is you're wanting
2 to hear tonight.

3 MR. RENEE POCHE:

4 Yes. I want to go back to Slide 14 and
5 then I think it's Slide 15 is what you're
6 talking about. Slide 14, real quick. This is
7 why we are here. This is the whole point of why
8 we're here tonight.

9 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

10 It was a really early slide that said
11 there were two things.

12 MR. RENEE POCHE:

13 The two questions. Yeah. Let' see
14 what slide number it was.

15 THE COURT REPORTER:

16 I need people to state their names if
17 they're going to speak.

18 MR. RENEE POCHE:

19 Yes, if you would when it's your turn
20 to make a comment, we ask that you state your
21 name clearly. It's Slide 6.

22 MS. JANELLE HOLMES:

23 Janelle Holmes. My question is --

24 MR. RENEE POCHE:

25 Wait, wait. I just want to finish the

1 administrative part.

2 MS. JANELLE HOLMES:

3 I'm not making a comment. I have a
4 question. Will there be a website that you are
5 promoting this meeting because I didn't see it?

6 MR. RENEE POCHE:

7 The presentation?

8 MS. JANNELLE HOLMES:

9 Yes.

10 MR. RENEE POCHE:

11 Yeah. We're going to load it to the
12 Corps of Engineers New Orleans District website.
13 We were just talking about that. We're going to
14 pdf this document, and it will be out there
15 available to you some time tomorrow.

16 MS. JANELLE HOLMES:

17 Can you announce it for those who are
18 not familiar?

19 MR. RENEE POCHE:

20 The website address, yes, is
21 www.mvn.usace.army.mil.

22 MR. MARK LAHARE:

23 I just wanted to say real quick is that
24 my contact information is at the end of this
25 presentation. You can also contact me, and I

1 can email you if for some reason it doesn't
2 download. I'm sorry.

3 My name is Mark Lahare. I'm the
4 environmental manager of this project. I will
5 be writing the Environmental Impact Statement.
6 My contact information is at the very last
7 slide.

8 MR. RENEE POCHE:

9 We'll put it up again with all this.
10 Folks, we're not trying to hide anything from
11 anyone. We're open and transparent in this
12 whole process. We're going to give you as much
13 information as we can.

14 So let's go ahead and get started.
15 We're going to start on this side, and then
16 we'll work our way across the room. So anybody
17 on this end over there. She's going to come
18 around with the mic. Please state your name
19 first for the record and then your question.

20 MR. CHRIS PITTS:

21 My name is Chris Pitts. I own a
22 company at 8000 Jourdan Road. My question
23 tonight is: How is this lock closure going to
24 affect our shipping industry on the Industrial
25 Canal? I'm sure if you've been doing this since

1 the Fifties, and this is the third or fourth one
2 these are done, I'm sure you should have some
3 answers to that.

4 MR. VIC LANDRY:

5 Yes, sir. My name is Vic Landry. I'm
6 the operations manager for the Gulf Intracoastal
7 Waterway. So I'm at the existing lock, the
8 operations side of it. I'm not on planning end
9 but more the operations end.

10 Essentially, the waterway will never be
11 impacted with any type of closure to navigation.
12 The existing lock will remain in operation 24/7,
13 365, just like it is today. The new lock would
14 be built mostly likely in a proposed northern
15 location between the Florida and Claiborne
16 bridge. And while it's being constructed, there
17 will be a bypass channel to the side of it. But
18 the channel wouldn't be widened. It wouldn't be
19 made more narrow. It would always be passing
20 traffic on the GIWW.

21 MR. CHRIS PITTS:

22 There was another question I asked the
23 gentlemen earlier here today, and he said he was
24 going to try and find out. Maybe you can answer
25 this question. Is there a proposed lock closure

1 for that lock later on this summer?

2 MR. VIC LANDRY:

3 Currently, we're planning to de-water
4 the lock for maintenance.

5 MR. CHRIS PITTS:

6 How long is that going to last?

7 MR. VIC LANDRY:

8 It's scheduled for 75 to 90 days. Now,
9 this is maintenance on the lock to install new
10 gates to replace the old 92-year-old gates that
11 are in horrible condition.

12 MR. CHRIS PITTS:

13 Right. I understand. But I think the
14 question I got is: What is my business at the
15 same time going to -- I receive 100,000 tons of
16 material a month, and I ship 100,000 tons of
17 material a month. And that lock is the only way
18 that my business stays alive. We're talking
19 about a \$10 million a month business being shut
20 down for three months.

21 MR. VIC LANDRY:

22 That is correct. Is your traffic all
23 rely on IHNC? Does any of it come from the east
24 possible?

25 MR. CHRIS PITTS:

1 It can come from the east, yes, because
2 it all comes form Missouri. But the problem is
3 it's going to Corpus Christi. There is no other
4 route.

5 MR. VIC LANDRY:

6 Yes, sir. I agree. That's why this
7 lock is so critical to this nation's
8 infrastructure and our economy because when this
9 lock is closed, as Richard Boe indicated, it's
10 the only eastern access from this side of the
11 river up to the GIWW, but you have three forms
12 of access on the west.

13 MR. CHRIS PITTS:

14 I understand. But how come this thing
15 wasn't addressed four years ago when y'all
16 closed the MRGO, which would have been the only
17 other route other than a 1,020 mile route north
18 in order to get that material out to Corpus.
19 You should have known then that that lock was
20 going to have to be closed at some point and
21 time and that that was the only other route to
22 go.

23 MR. VIC LANDRY:

24 In 2008, we did a maintenance de-
25 watering as well. And it was a 60-day period

1 when we shut down. And that was when Hurricanes
2 Gustav and Ike actually re-watered the chamber,
3 and we did a maintenance cycle on it. And we
4 were basically saying we're not sure when we'll
5 have the opportunity to ever close the lock
6 again with the MRGO, which was our alternate
7 route. Before you could go down river to
8 Baptiste Collette, over to the MRGO, and tie
9 back in. With the MRGO now gone, deauthorized,
10 closed to all traffic, we've lost that access.
11 You're right, sir. I agree with you 100
12 percent.

13 We have since received funding from the
14 federal government to have new gates fabricated
15 to install in the lock.

16 MR. CHRIS PITTS:

17 I completely understand. Who's going
18 to fund me for the next 90 days?

19 MR. RENEE POCHE:

20 I think this might be something that
21 could be better handled --

22 MR. VIC LANDRY:

23 You and I can talk on the side.

24 MR. RENEE POCHE:

25 We got to stick to the purpose of why

1 we're here tonight. Anybody else over in this
2 area?

3 MR. BEN GORDOM:

4 My name is Ben Gordom. I live at 3921
5 St. Claude. I'm a fairly new person in this
6 area, resident in this area. I had to move for
7 a number of reasons. But I've been following
8 many issues, the environmental issues. And
9 there's a lot of issues that are being brought
10 tonight, but I'm mainly concerned, but not only
11 concerned, with some of the environmental
12 issues.

13 And many of you remember the shell
14 dredging struggle in Lake Pontchartrain in the
15 Eighties. With the sediment, a lot of it has
16 toxic. I've been reading some articles.
17 There's a lot of toxins, including heavy metals,
18 that are going to be dredged up. But when the
19 sediment is dredged up, where is it going to be
20 put, the wet sediment itself. And of course
21 it's going to be released into the water and
22 allow these toxic metals to go into Lake
23 Pontchartrain, which we're just to the point now
24 of bringing it back somewhat better
25 environmental quality.

1 MR. RENEE POCHE:

2 Who can best address that question?

3 MS. JASMINE SMITH:

4 Hi, I'm Jasmine Smith. I'm the project
5 manager for the lock replacement. At this time,
6 like Renee said earlier, we're early on in the
7 study stage. We don't know at this time. Later
8 on further in the study, we will determine that.
9 So at this time we don't know, but we appreciate
10 your comment. You can leave your comment on the
11 comment card or email Mark for any other
12 concerns you may have.

13 MR. JOHN KOEFERL:

14 Hello. I'm John Koeferl. I'm the
15 President of the Citizens against widening the
16 Industrial Canal. I've been listening, and I
17 think we could all be on the same page here if
18 we worked at it. I know the fact that the Port
19 of New Orleans has been the sponsor for so long
20 of the deep draft lock in the Industrial Canal.
21 Having them gone may be a blessing because it
22 seems to me that we need a second lock. We
23 don't need to depend on one lock. We need
24 another lock somewhere so that we don't have
25 these problems.

1 MR. CALVIN ALEXANDER:

2 My name is Calvin Alexander. I'm a
3 resident here in the Lower Ninth Ward. And
4 actually my question ties right in what John
5 just said. I'm curious about the second map
6 over there from the door. There are a number of
7 red dots on there that seem to indicate an
8 alternate route. But based on what I'm seeing
9 and hearing tonight, there's no intent for an
10 alternate route. It seems to me we're here
11 talking about replacing that lock, period, end
12 of statement.

13 MR. RENEE POCHE:

14 Thank you, sir.

15 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

16 Can you respond to that?

17 MR. RENEE POCHE:

18 I'll respond this way. We're two weeks
19 into a 36-month study. There have been no
20 decisions made. that a map shows a project
21 area. You saw some history here tonight. And
22 then on Slide 14, it shows the real purpose of
23 why we're here. So no decision has been made.
24 No decision has been made.

25 MS. JANELLE HOLMES:

1 Are you saying you're in the course --

2 MR. RENEE POCHE:

3 We're data gathering right now. We
4 want to hear your comments and concerns. Trying
5 to engage in a dialogue right now when we're
6 two weeks into a 3 -year study is real
7 difficult.

8 MS. JANELLE HOLMES:

9 I'm trying to find out (inaudible)
10 during the course of the study, will their
11 questions be directly answered within the study
12 as opposed to just being before the deadline,
13 the 18th? Or is it during the 36 course?

14 MR. RENEE POCHE:

15 Yes, they will be. They will be at
16 some point. We're bouncing around here. We're
17 trying to get there.

18 MR. TEDDY CARLISLE:

19 Teddy Carlisle. I'm Teddy Carlisle,
20 towboat captain on a canal barge. I ran the
21 Industrial Canal with New Orleans through and
22 out the canal. Feasible, there's no other spot
23 to run another lock. If you go to Bonnet Carre,
24 that means the towboat is going to cross 24
25 miles of open water over two bridges with high

1 winds. You're taking the risk with two bridges
2 (inaudible). You go down to Baptiste Collette.
3 You can go across all the way to Gulfport Ship
4 Channel. But when the weather gets bad, no
5 traffic is going to move. And Industrial Canal
6 lock is the most feasible place to put the lock
7 whereas commerce can keep on moving.

8 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

9 But if you have a second lock.

10 MR. RENEE POCHE:

11 We're not going to debate here. We're
12 taking comments. We're not going to debate the
13 issue. If you want to do that, you can go
14 outside and discuss it. We're here to gather
15 comments tonight.

16 MR. MATT ROTA:

17 Hi, I'm Matt Rota with the Gulf
18 Restoration Network and a few questions that I
19 have and comments. Number one --

20 MR. RENEE POCHE:

21 Just keep in mind, your questions
22 may not get answers. We're two weeks into a
23 three-year study. You're going to hear that
24 over and over again.

25 MR. MATT ROTA:

1 The first thing is: As we're saying,
2 we're looking at the first EIS that happened in
3 1998 and then the 2nd Supplemental EIS in 2009.
4 Now, we're looking at another supplemental in
5 20, whatever, 2017, 2018, when you get around
6 and get to it.

7 Why are you not doing a full
8 Environmental Impact Statement? At this point,
9 supplementals, I don't think, are going to cut
10 it. I think we ought to be doing it starting
11 from scratch, and you're starting from scratch,
12 because if the public has to be going back and
13 looking at something from 1998, what's amended
14 from 2008, then amended again, it's confusing.
15 And I think that enough changes have happened
16 between MRGO closure, between Hurricane Katrina,
17 and a a bunch of other things that enough has
18 changed in 20 years that we should be doing a
19 full Environmental Impact Statement.

20 MR. RENEE POCHE:

21 Any other comments?

22 MR. MATT ROTA:

23 Oh, yeah. And we will be submitting
24 more in-depth comments before the comment period
25 ends. Another thing that we're really concerned

1 about is the disposal of dredged materials.
2 That's one of the big things throughout this
3 whole process is the contaminated sediments in
4 the lock. And before there would be proposed to
5 be discharged in what the Corps planned to be
6 upwind cipher is actually in the middle of the
7 wetlands.

8 And what are some alternatives that
9 you're looking at, you'll be looking at
10 alternatives and that particularly toxic
11 chemicals needs to be disposed of in a Type 1
12 landfill facility. So I ask that that is looked
13 at and wouldn't mind any responses on that.

14 And then another one that particularly
15 comes up is: During hurricanes, now that we have
16 the large closure structure, how is that going
17 to be factored in because we will probably be
18 having a lot more barges, and I'm not a barge
19 captain so I don't know about this, but coming
20 in for safe harbor and things like that and
21 trying to avoid the closure of the surge
22 barrier.

23 So is that going to be looked at in
24 this scope of this new, what we hope to be the
25 new EIS, not just a supplemental EIS?

1 MR. RENEE POCHE:

2 Richard, did you want to address
3 supplemental versus new.

4 MR. RICHARD BOE:

5 Actually, we've heard that comment
6 previously about supplemental versus a new EIS.
7 And what we didn't get into was: NEPA, the
8 National Environmental Policy Act, is a very
9 short law. It's only about three pages long.
10 The president's council on environmental quality
11 wrote regulations for agencies that implement
12 NEPA. And there's no revision of regulations
13 that I can understand that allows an agency to
14 basically throw away an EIS that was prepared
15 originally for a project and start over again.
16 I've been through it, and I've talked to a lot
17 of people about it. I don't know that agencies
18 ever do that. I know the Corps never does it.

19 But the fact that we're calling it the
20 2nd Supplemental in no way limits us to just --
21 it does not limit us in any way. We could write
22 and will write a fully -- we're going to address
23 every known issue in that EIS. So just because
24 we're calling it a supplement, doesn't mean it's
25 going to be a little short document that doesn't

1 fully address all of the concerns. Don't get
2 hung up with that word.

3 MR. RENEE POCHE:

4 Who's next over here?

5 MR. JOSH LEWIS:

6 Hi, Josh Lewis, Tulane University. One
7 thing that comes to mind with the previous EIS
8 has been an issue for a lot of people in the
9 environmental community was the disposal of
10 sediments, which Matt was referencing. And it
11 seems to me if what we're talking about -- we
12 made comments about -- we heard comments that
13 the Port is not sponsoring the deep draft
14 portion of the lock. So that means the deep
15 draft portion of the lock is not going to be
16 built. It would be crazy. It wouldn't happen.
17 That's my opinion.

18 So in that case, we're looking at a 14-
19 foot channel. The existing Industrial Canal
20 channel is 30 feet. So if you're going to be,
21 if this project actually goes forward, which we
22 just heard they are rehabbing the lock and
23 replacing the gates and probably spending a lot
24 of money on that so it seems the better option
25 being you wouldn't allow the destruction. But

1 if you're already going to be generating all
2 those sediments, and you know there's toxins in
3 them, and you also know that within the
4 Industrial Canal you have a 30-foot channel, I
5 would say that why wouldn't we just dispose of
6 those, you would just move those sediments
7 around within the channel bed because you only
8 need a 14-foot channel within the Industrial
9 Canal. You don't need a 30-foot channel in the
10 Industrial Canal anymore.

11 Once that lock gets built to shallow
12 draft standards, you can't get large ships in
13 the Industrial Canal at all. So that
14 fundamentally changes the way that the
15 Industrial Canal project works, the channel
16 dimensions, what control concerns, all of those
17 things change.

18 So I just hope there's a communication
19 process goes well, and that we see there's not
20 going to be, that those sorts of things are
21 addressed, that the whole system is being
22 transformed right now, and there could be some
23 creative ways to handle some of these issue.
24 But again, I think we just heard the lock is
25 being rehabbed and a lot of things done on it

1 anyway. So hopefully this is just a no action
2 as a result of this. Thanks.

3 MR. RENEE POCHE:

4 Yes, sir. Right over here.

5 MR. MARK WRIGHT:

6 Mark Wright, 522 North New Hampshire,
7 Covington, 70433. I just had a question. I
8 heard that the Port of New Orleans is deep draft
9 sponsors. Who is the shall draft sponsor? Is
10 there one?

11 MR. RICHARD BOE:

12 That's a good question. The first
13 slide that Renee showed you talked about
14 authorization. One of those authorizations was
15 the 1986 Water Resource Development Act. That
16 act, that law, changed the whole game of how the
17 Corps financed projects. It required cost
18 sharing.

19 And the short answer to your question
20 is: The shallow draft portion of the lock would
21 be cost shared 50 percent by the federal
22 treasury and 50 percent by what's called the
23 Inland Waterway Trust Fund, which is an inland
24 waterway users board who sets priorities for
25 inland navigation projects. At one time the

1 lock was one of its top priorities. I'm not
2 sure where it's in there just now, the lock
3 replacement of the IHNC.

4 But that's the answer to your question.
5 50 percent. That trust fund, money from that
6 trust fund comes from fuel taxes collected from
7 inland waterway users, basically the barge
8 industry.

9 MS. PATSY STORY:

10 I'm sorry y'all. It's hard for me to
11 get up.

12 MR. RENEE POCHE:

13 You don't need to stand up. Just state
14 your name and your comment.

15 MS. PATSY STORY:

16 I'm Patsy Story. And I'm a resident of
17 Holy Cross since 1978. Can you hear me? So
18 I've seen all this stuff come and go and come
19 back again. I'm wondering that when you have
20 all the impacts done, is it going to be in the
21 house by the Corps or will, I guess, would it be
22 allowed to have independent companies do the
23 study also like a watchdog or a check or
24 whatever? You know what I mean?

25 MR. RICHARD BOE:

1 It's the federal agency's
2 responsibility to prepare the Environmental
3 Impact Statements. Sometimes we'll hire
4 consultants or architect engineering firms or
5 professional services contractors, but generally
6 it's the federal agency's responsibility.

7 In recent years, the Corps, Congress
8 has required the Corps to go through more
9 rigorous reviews. Our reevaluation report and
10 EIS will be subjected to what we call
11 independent external peer review, IEPR, if you
12 like acronyms. But as far as having someone
13 else prepare the EIS, generally, the only way
14 that that can happen is if someone who is on
15 contract to the Corps, or if we have a local
16 sponsor, sometimes we can allow them to help us
17 with the EIS.

18 But generally, it would not be prepared
19 by -- certainly, you'll have the ability to
20 comment and hire anyone you want to do
21 scrutinize it. We don't -- we wouldn't allow
22 our EIS to be -- it' actually we can't allow, by
23 law, we can't allow anyone else to prepare it
24 for us.

25 MR. RENEE POCHE:

1 Anybody else on this side? We'll move
2 on to this side. I do want to remind you
3 there's some questions about the two questions
4 up there. Take one of these on the way out.
5 You should have received one when you came in.
6 If you didn't get one of these. It has the
7 questions. It has the background. It has
8 Mark's contact info on there so we're not
9 bouncing back and forth on the slide. So make
10 sure you get one of these. If you walk out with
11 nothing else tonight, walk out with this.

12 So we're going to move to this side
13 of the room now.

14 MS. MARGARET DOYLE JOHNSTON:

15 My name is Margaret Doyle Johnston.
16 And my questions are: Are you still going to
17 have mitigation? Who will we contact if we have
18 a problem with our properties while you're doing
19 this? And is the CBMC still in, will still be
20 in place?

21 MR. RENEE POCHE:

22 I can tell you two weeks into three
23 years worth of work, a lot of those things will
24 be addressed. I can't give you any kind of
25 definite answer now. But we have your questions

1 on the record so we will go back in and look at
2 those things.

3 MR. FRANK LAPLACA:

4 My name is Frank Laplaca. I live 4511
5 St. Claude. I've been there since 1959. One
6 thing I want to just get out the way is that the
7 flood wall in the Industrial Canal on the New
8 Orleans side, which would be the west side, it's
9 approximately 12 feet. On the Lower Ninth Ward
10 side, it's 16 feet. Now, when the Corps of
11 Engineers did all the repair and put in the new
12 flood wall, they didn't increase the height of
13 the flood wall on the New Orleans side. I just
14 want to get that out the way. That needs to be
15 addressed and looked at for the safety of the
16 people getting flooded out.

17 The other thing is the locks, all four
18 new locks, the old locks by the St. Claude
19 bridge are delapidated, old. It all needs to
20 come up. And the new locks, I would say, need
21 to be put in the Industrial Canal somewhere
22 between the bridges where people go from one
23 side of the canal to the other.

24 When the locks are opened and closed,
25 they won't interfere with traffic as the old

1 locks do by the St. Claude bridge. When
2 something passes through there, it takes
3 forever. They open up the lock. The vehicles
4 and boats have to go through. It takes quite a
5 while. And this is all holding up everybody's
6 transportation, ambulances, emergency service,
7 people going to their jobs. It holds up
8 everything. So I think those locks at St.
9 Claude need to come out completely. I wouldn't
10 even rebuild. Now, they could put a flood gate
11 there and that would stop the water one way
12 going one way or the other.

13 The new locks, like I say, in the
14 Industrial Canal, I'm all for it. Another place
15 they possibly could put the new locks is where
16 the Intracoastal Canal, well, the Ship Channel
17 where it comes into the Industrial Canal.
18 Because you want to stop that water from getting
19 into the canal, even when they had the MRGO,
20 that's a long ways that the wind could make a
21 rolling tide. These waves build up, and you
22 have a roll of water coming all the way through
23 the ship channel to the Industrial Canal. And
24 then when it gets there, it's like a wall of
25 water that comes right through it. That's why

1 New Orleans, one of the reasons New Orleans got
2 flooded was because of all that water coming in.

3 So if you can put flood gates where the
4 ship channel connects into the Industrial Canal,
5 that would stop the flow of water coming
6 through. However, either one. If you can't put
7 it there or flood gates there where the ship
8 channel connects to the Industrial Canal, then
9 do put the new locks in the Industrial Canal.

10 Now, just to touch back on the old
11 locks by the St. Claude bridge, if they do take
12 those out, regardless, take them out or rebuild
13 them. The old St. Claude bridge needs to come
14 out. That place has been there for years. The
15 thing vibrates. These 18-wheelers go over it, I
16 mean, it is deplorable. It's terrible.

17 What they ought to do when they take
18 that bridge out, don't put one like the
19 announcer was saying opens like this
20 (indicating), put a new bridge like the
21 Claiborne bridge. It's higher. Most boats that
22 go through it, they won't even have to open the
23 bridge, and it won't affect the traffic.

24 And I'm going to wrap up. And the
25 other things the ramp that goes to the old St.

1 Claude bridge, those things are delapidated. My
2 house is right against the bridge and the
3 traffic comes over there, the 18-wheelers. That
4 old bridge is bad. The Corps of Engineers has
5 come out there and repair it, repair it, repair
6 it, put on the black top, patch it up, whatever.
7 The whole thing needs to come out and put a new
8 roadway system.

9 MS. VANESSA GUERINGER:

10 My name is Vanessa Gueringer. I'm a
11 lifelong resident of the Lower Ninth Ward. I
12 want to talk about these two questions you have
13 here. The issues. First of all, most of the
14 maritime industry are building to protect us
15 now. So to expand that lock to support
16 supertankers coming through here, again, we
17 don't have that kind of traffic. Enough so we
18 have traffic, barge traffic, or volumes of
19 traffic here, we don't see that kind of traffic.
20 So that's the question that we have.

21 Resources. The maritime industry, this
22 gentleman just talked about his company making
23 \$10 million a month. The maritime industry, the
24 Port of New Orleans, the Corps of Engineers,
25 they never put a dime, any money, into this

1 community, ever, playgrounds, community centers,
2 nothing.

3 In 2007, y'all came here. I came here
4 and I listened to y'all talk about the impact
5 that it would have on this community,
6 devaluation of our property, traffic jams like
7 crazy, dump trucks running up and down our
8 community 24/7, okay, all sorts of negativity.
9 Have y'all looked around this community? We are
10 still recovering from Hurricane Katrina.

11 Now, you talk about St. Bernard Parish
12 being an alternative. Well, would their
13 residents be displaced if the lock replacement
14 is down there, as residents will be displaced
15 here? You know, again, you come to this
16 community and ask us, who are still recovering
17 from a horrible storm, to deal with this issue
18 again. When are you people going to get that
19 our lives daily on fighting to come back. And
20 yet, you are coming here to push this project.
21 This is absolutely appalling and outrageous.

22 MR. SHANNON FRENCH:

23 Hello, my name is Shannon French. I
24 live in Holy Cross. I'm a resident of the Lower
25 Ninth Ward. I'm an architect and former Peace

1 Corps volunteer.

2 I really am a proponent of community
3 development happening on multiple scales. I
4 think we need the government. We need industry.
5 We need community meetings. We need grass roots
6 organizations all coming to the table. And I
7 think if it's done well, and it's marketed well,
8 any kind of development project like this can
9 satisfy all the stakeholders needs.

10 And I think there's a few marketing
11 opportunities here with the Corps. You know,
12 some people think that there are supertankers
13 about to go through the Industrial Canal, and
14 I'm sure that's not the case. And I think you
15 need to put that out there for public
16 consumption that we're talking about very
17 shallow locks here and barge traffic, and we're
18 not talking about dredging the stuff out of this
19 waterway anymore.

20 Another big opportunity that has been
21 missed, the bridges are not pedestrian friendly.
22 They are not bike friendly. I think part of the
23 reason why the lower Ninth Ward is cut off
24 socioeconomically as it is, it feels cut off, is
25 that the residents, many of whom don't even have

1 cars or bikes --

2 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

3 Do you have a problem with that?

4 MR. RENEE POCHE:

5 Hold on. We're not getting engaged in
6 this kind of debate. Excuse me. He's making
7 his comment. Let him make his comment, please.

8 MR. SHANNON FRENCH:

9 The problem with the bridges is that
10 they don't allow for an adequate amount of
11 bicycle or pedestrian transportation connecting
12 the Lower Ninth Ward to the rest of the city.
13 And the opportunity here, I think, is for new
14 bridges or improvements to existing bridges to
15 make those passageways more pedestrian friendly
16 and more bicycle friendly. I am an avid
17 cyclist. I think it's a huge problem. The St.
18 Claude bridge is terrible. Cyclists have been
19 killed in recent years. So anyway, there's a
20 lot of traffic. It's very anti-urban status
21 quo. There's an opportunity here to address the
22 community's socioeconomic needs.

23 I strongly recommend that the Corps of
24 Engineers engage in the community and bring
25 urban planners and architects to the table when

1 designing these bridge improvements. Thank you.

2 MS. SARAH DEBACHER:

3 I'm Sarah Debacher. I'm not a lifelong
4 resident but I have been involved in this
5 particular project for some years now. In fact,
6 today I reviewed the Corps' response to the
7 community's input on the last supplemental EIS.
8 And I think what Ms. Holmes was asking earlier
9 about how we respond to the questions is a
10 legitimate concern. And what Mr. French was
11 saying about this opportunity for community
12 engagement, that's also true.

13 I think the real issue we ask is what
14 is the most important issue. To me, the most
15 important issue is and the most important
16 question for me as a resident is what is the
17 benefit of this to the community. That's never
18 been adequately addressed. It's always been
19 addressed in a speculative way. There would
20 likely be, eventually, after decades an increase
21 to your property value. But there would be
22 significant adverse impacts. And those are the
23 words before in the meantime, significant
24 adverse effects.

25 What Ms. Gueringer is talking about is

1 super important because not only does the
2 neighborhood recovery, but the neighborhood is
3 recovering from harm done by the federal
4 government with no help from the federal
5 government. So to me, the community impact
6 needs to be really like equal to the economic
7 impact, the maritime industry, or the
8 speculative impact it would be on maritime
9 industry. That's huge to me.

10 What alternatives should be considered
11 in the supplemental EIS, all of them. I mean,
12 this would be potentially devastating,
13 potentially devastating for up to, and if not
14 more than a decade. And the thing I'm concerned
15 about in reviewing the Corps' comments on our
16 questions, you know, like I asked a question and
17 the comment from the Corps was, "The Corps does
18 not have evidence of this at this time."

19 And they weren't looking for evidence
20 to answer my question. It was just we don't
21 have evidence of this at this time. So I would
22 like for our questions to be taken seriously. I
23 would like for alternatives to be explored.

24 At the beginning of the meeting, Mr.
25 Boe said, I'm sorry, I'm quoting him. Maybe he

1 doesn't want me to. But "Why do we need, excuse
2 me, why do we think we may need a lock
3 replacement." And that slip told me a lot.

4 I also agree that this feels like a
5 foregone conclusion and that the impacts on the
6 community are going to be huge. They should be
7 chief among the important issues. And
8 resources, we are a resource. So please take us
9 seriously. Please answer our questions. And
10 please don't attempt to divide us with the
11 mitigation committee that -- I think you know
12 what I mean.

13 MR. RENEE POCHE:

14 Thank you. Yes, sir. Right over here.
15 Sir, raise your hand again, please, so she can
16 get the mic to you.

17 MR. ANDY BAKER:

18 My name is Andy Baker. I live at 1228
19 Tennessee Street. You said you are two weeks
20 into a 36-week study, but it seems like you're
21 putting a band-aid on a bleeding artery. It's
22 like y'all trying (inaudible) going this way.

23 MR. RENEE POCHE:

24 Thank you. We'll go to you, ma'am.
25 We're coming to you, sir, in the back next.

1 MS. ALISHA JACOB:

2 My name is Alisha Jacob. And I live at
3 1223 Tennessee Street. I'm a long resident of
4 17 years. So I'm concerned about my property
5 and what's going to happen with that. I can't
6 move around and hop around like I'm young so I'm
7 concerned about that.

8 MR. RENEE POCHE:

9 Thank you. We'll go to the back row.

10 MR. JASON BANKS:

11 My name is Jason Banks. I'm a resident
12 of Lower Ninth Ward. I live at 2311 Trichou.
13 I've been there all my life. For a number of
14 years I actually sat on the board, the
15 mitigation board for the Corps of Engineers.
16 And on that board for a number of years we wrote
17 down all kinds of stuff, made all kind of
18 recommendations about how we are going to use
19 that mitigation money to impact the quality of
20 life for people here in the Lower Ninth Ward
21 such as myself.

22 And it seems like all the information
23 that we put together for many years we're
24 starting from scratch all over again. So my
25 question is: Why don't we use the information

1 that's already been compiled? I'm sure the
2 person over that program still has all that
3 stuff. It's only been about a year ago. And we
4 can use that as a springboard to find out what
5 has already been decided by the Corps to be done
6 in this area because y'all had made some
7 decisions for what you're going to do and why
8 not use those same decisions that we tore over
9 for many hours, many years to come up with that.
10 Can someone answer that question for me?

11 CORPS REPRESENTATIVE:

12 We are certainly going to use all the
13 information that we collected in the past. I
14 don't know what formal decisions were made in
15 the past because it means we documented and
16 worked out with you all.

17 But certainly there is a lot of good
18 work and you mentioned some of it and that
19 certainly will be considered over the next 36
20 months. We're not going to give that
21 information away. We've done a lot of data
22 collection on the channel, determine soil
23 contaminants, et cetera. We've had all that.
24 That's going to be used.

25 MR. JASON BANKS:

1 You already understand the impacts on
2 the residents down here already.

3 MR. RENEE POCHE:

4 We can't hear you.

5 MR. JASON BANKS:

6 I'm saying we already know from
7 previous studies what's the impacts this area is
8 going to be and how everybody is going to be
9 affected. So I'm saying we need to springboard
10 this stuff. We don't need to be dragging along
11 and then at the end of another two or three
12 years it's declined and went back. It's been
13 going on for too long. I'm tired of it myself.

14 MR. RENEE POCHE:

15 And that's making an assumption we're
16 nowhere near. You're already assuming that the
17 decision has been made. There is no decision.
18 I understand your points. But to make that jump
19 that far would mean there was a decision already
20 made. That's just not the case. Any other
21 questions on this side. Yes, sir. We'll come
22 back to you next, ma'am.

23 MR. LOYE RUCKMAN:

24 Loye Ruckman. In what other locations
25 are you holding lock meetings like this if it's

1 not a foregone conclusion that the lock is going
2 to be right here?

3 MR. RENEE POCHE:

4 It'S the only one right now scheduled.

5 MR. LOYE RUCKMAN:

6 There we go.

7 MR. RENEE POCHE:

8 If you want to make that jump, that's
9 certainly your prerogative. I'll tell you
10 that's not the case. You can believe what you
11 wish. Yes, ma'am. Right here.

12 MS. VERONICA DUPLESSIS:

13 My name is Veronica Duplessis of Lower
14 Ninth Ward. Right now, my concern is the
15 project has not started. But I know residents
16 from this area will tell you they have a lot of
17 pounding that is going on right now and it
18 devaluated the property for whenever the
19 pounding it shakes the entire building.

20 So when you have that construction and
21 that is going to be going on at the same time.
22 So definitely the residents need to take into
23 account what's going to happen to their
24 property.

25 MR. RENEE POCHE:

1 Thank you. Anybody else on this side
2 of the room that would like to make a comment
3 that hasn't made a comment yet?

4 MS. MARY AMARET:

5 My name is Mary Amaret. I just
6 specifically want to know more about the
7 relationship with the EPA at this point. I also
8 want to know what your relationship to the
9 mitigation committees. And if you have any
10 information and why is that not presented at
11 this meeting?

12 MR. RENEE POCHE:

13 I'm the non technical guy here. I
14 can't respond directly to that. Can somebody
15 from the Corps address those?

16 CORPS REPRESENTATIVE:

17 Our relationship with the EPA is like
18 with any other federal or state agency. In
19 terms of why we're not presenting information
20 here tonight, the purpose of this meeting really
21 is we're a few weeks into a 36-month schedule.
22 We're really here to listen to you all and hear
23 your concerns. We're going to bring that back.
24 We're going to host other meetings as needed to
25 continue this discussion. I hope that you will

1 all get bored of seeing our team over the next
2 36 months. I really do hope that.

3 So the Corps is not going to come here
4 tonight with a decision and a bunch of
5 information. It would be predecisional. I
6 don't have any decisions. We did not make any
7 decisions. The relationship with EPA is like
8 what we have with any other project. That's
9 another federal agency. We will work with EPA
10 on this project just like we will with US Fish,
11 DEQ, and any other state and federal agency.
12 That's our due process. But more importantly,
13 we need to hear with you all and work with you
14 all as well.

15 MR. RENEE POCHE:

16 We're going to move back to this side
17 of the room. We'll start with another round of
18 questions or comments, actually. I keep saying
19 questions. It's really comments. We're not in
20 a position to answer a whole lot of questions.
21 Yes, sir. Could you state your name.

22 MR. MARK WRIGHT:

23 Mark Wright, 522 North New Hampshire,
24 Covington, 70433. I thought I heard Mr. Richard
25 Boe making some question about you wanted to

1 hear comments that addressed the economic
2 benefits of shallow draft lock? There was
3 something stated about the comments focusing on
4 that. Did you say that?

5 MR. RICHARD BOE:

6 I don't remember saying that.

7 MR. MARK WRIGHT:

8 I guess I misunderstood.

9 MS. JANELLE HOLMES:

10 My name is Janelle Holmes and my
11 question is: With the replacement of both
12 bridges, has it definitely been decided no
13 movement to the land area of displacing people
14 with dividing of that area of the bridges, can
15 you tell me that the same --

16 MR. RENEE POCHE:

17 There's no decision being made on
18 anything. We've been gathering information
19 right now. We're not at the point where we can
20 intelligently address that.

21 MS. NAOMI DOURNER:

22 I'm Naomi Dourner. I'm a resident here
23 in the Lower Ninth Ward. My comment is really
24 that former EIS, I wasn't here for that process.
25 I mean, a lot of people have already stated that

1 there have been the impacts that were sort of
2 analyzed were very significant. And in terms
3 of, you know, the deep draft no longer, I mean,
4 so the Port is no longer on the table, the
5 clarification I'd like before I continue my
6 question or comment is: Does that mean that
7 there is no seeking of the deep draft going
8 forward? You can't probably answer that
9 question.

10 CORPS REPRESENTATIVE:

11 Backing up here. No, what we've said
12 here tonight is all alternatives are on the
13 table. So that's the shallow draft and that's
14 deep draft.

15 MS. NAOMI DOURNER:

16 That's the clarification that I was
17 looking for. So in that case, I think that
18 another lock is definitely what in a different
19 location would be the way to go because if
20 that's off the table, I think it was real
21 misrepresented in the way it was presented.
22 Because they said, oh, we don't have a sponsor,
23 sure all alternatives are being considered.

24 I think the fact a very concerning
25 comment. And as a result, I think another lock

1 location should definitely be considered. And
2 beyond that, you know, to the gentlemen who was
3 talking about pedestrian (inaudible), that's
4 always been an issue. It's something that's
5 ongoing. That is very, very costly, very, very
6 significantly impactful. It's absolutely not
7 the way to, like, retrofit a bridge. If there's
8 retrofitting, that's an option. Keep that
9 alternative out as well. That's my comment.

10 JOHN KOEFERL:

11 John Koeferl, again. The very
12 important parts of this for us is the big
13 picture about the City of New Orleans and the
14 historic assets that bind people together. The
15 Corps of Engineers in 1986 did a great study
16 about the national register eligibility of the
17 lock. And it concluded that this was a
18 structure of national maritime and engineering
19 significance that should never be displaced. If
20 the lock should be there, if a new lock needed
21 to be built, it should be built somewhere else.

22 I'll first say in that particular
23 setting, 350 pages, very thorough. It was done
24 by really expert people engineers changed the
25 executive summary to say, well, the Corps needs

1 to do what the Corps needs to do, and we'll save
2 some pieces of the bridge, I mean, and the lock.
3 And I think we need to go back and look at that
4 study again and consider it in contents of a
5 city that's about to be 300 years old and has a
6 great Corps of Engineers historic structure
7 here, and it really needs to be restored and is
8 very, very important to people living in the
9 City fo New Orleans.

10 PATSY STORY:

11 It's Patsy Story again. I just wanted
12 to make a comment on the mitigation committee.
13 Many years ago, I was one of the two people on
14 the mitigation committee representing the Holy
15 Cross Neighborhood Association. We were
16 actually dismissed because we refused to sign a
17 partnering agreement with the New Orleans Corps,
18 which was very lopsided in the favor of the
19 corps.

20 And as far as the mitigation funds go,
21 there was a lot of money put aside. I wasn't
22 with it towards the end so I don't know what
23 they decided to use the money on, but there was
24 a lot of money that was supposed to be spent on
25 parking lots for the workers and were going to

1 fix our streets and our lighting and everything,
2 which we should be getting that from the city
3 anyway. That funding should not come out of
4 mitigation funds. But there was a lot of things
5 that were faulty with that mitigation.

6 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

7 I'm curious about the "alternative
8 sites." I know you people in a "36-month length
9 of time" do not operate day to day and week to
10 week. I cannot believe that. So my question is
11 this: Are there any plans or scheduled meetings
12 regarding any of the other alternative sites for
13 a lock replacement?

14 MR. RENEE POCHE:

15 No, to my knowledge, there's no meeting
16 scheduled.

17 UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:

18 Okay. We talked about options are on
19 the table as far as construction itself, which
20 is in regards to deep or shallow draft in the
21 depth of the construction. Where does the deep
22 draft factor go now and with the MRGO being
23 closed, why would we need a deep draft canal at
24 this time? I'm just missing something
25 obviously. Thank you.

1 MR. JEFF TREFFINGER:

2 Hi, my name is Jeff Treffinger. I am a
3 property owner on the other side of canal on St.
4 Claude Avenue and actually one of the authors of
5 the report referred to. I was working for a
6 firm in 1986. I assessed the lock. I did the
7 national register on it. And it is indeed one
8 of the most significant structures in a three-
9 mile radius of this point, one of the greatest
10 public works projects in the history of the City
11 of New Orleans, designed by the Googels
12 (phonetic) Engineering Firm, which also did the
13 Golden Gate Bridge. The gate mechanisms are
14 identical to those in the Panama Canal designed
15 by the Schimberg Company. The only lock in the
16 entire world with reversehead gates designed so
17 that they could be high water.

18 That being said, I also was involved in
19 surveing the St. Claude neighborhood for the
20 same Corps of Engineers in determining what
21 damage would be done to the context to the
22 neighborhoods by the bridge should the lock be
23 replaced. We also at Tulane University studied
24 what would happen to the other side of the St.
25 Claude Avenue. This neighborhood has been

1 studied. The bywater neighborhood has been
2 studied. The effects of the midrise bridge have
3 been studied. You got neighbors here who have
4 vocally expressed what would happen to their
5 property values.

6 I have one simple question is: What
7 more information do you need? I mean, I was a
8 young man when this started, 1986, I was a young
9 guy. I'm like almost 60, and you still haven't
10 put a shovel on this project. Where do you get
11 this kind of job? I really don't understand,
12 and I'm paying for it.

13 MS. LARRAINE HOFFMAN:

14 My name is Larraine Hoffman. I live at
15 605 Deslande. If the Army Corps of Engineers
16 historically has done a tremendous job trying to
17 handle navigational issues around transportation
18 pertaining to great rise and glory dealing with
19 issues around Mississippi River. It just seems
20 so strange that if transportation is the primary
21 focus here that the gentlemen in maritime
22 industry knew absolutely nothing about these
23 plans.

24 So there seems to be a real big
25 disonnect here. And the disconnect means that

1 the Corps is not having ongoing discussions or
2 didn't have preliminary discussions with people
3 who are economically impacted in a business
4 sense. It was embarrassing to hear the
5 gentlemen talk about what this would mean to
6 him. What that does is sets up a scenario that
7 pits the people with business interest against
8 people who live here. You realize that of
9 course. And it's really, it's putting everybody
10 in the community in a very unfair position.

11 Little things that seem so far down on
12 your list need to come up a lot higher when
13 people talk about the historic nature of the
14 community and how they are now having to
15 maintain homes in the face of ongoing
16 construction around them. A lady over here
17 talked about houses shaking. Right now, there
18 are sidewalk and sewer repairs going on of a
19 relatively modest nature. But when a concrete
20 saw drills on a sidewalk, it shakes some of
21 these houses in the neighborhood. So of course
22 people are understandably concerned about what
23 would happen working around enormous
24 construction project going on virtually all
25 round.

1 So the question I have is: It's not
2 going to be why did you have preliminary
3 meetings with the people in the maritime
4 industry who rely directly on this canal to see
5 what they want and what they need, but will you
6 now have those meetings with them to see what
7 would be best for them? And most people in this
8 room are pretty sure it would be at another
9 location.

10 MR. SCOTT COLL:

11 My name is Scott Coll. I have a
12 business at 4040 Read Road. And I also have
13 numerous properties around the Michoud Slip.
14 And I do have a deep water 32-foot draft
15 contract that we do have in and out of Michoud
16 and extended of that.

17 As we kind of understand today
18 globally, the Panama Canal is getting ready to
19 open. New Orleans is in the middle of this. We
20 need every piece of real estate we can get to
21 create jobs. We need some of this new business.
22 Up the Mississippi River, go look at all the new
23 jobs. What about the east? Look at all that
24 real estate. We need new business.

25 I'm looking at bringing deep water

1 draft business to that neighborhood because with
2 the Panama Canal you've got a lot of those
3 smaller ships looking for business. It's
4 protected water. It's a great place for
5 investors to bring money to create jobs for the
6 community. Thank you.

7 MR. RENEE POCHE:

8 Back over this way. Is there anybody
9 else over here? I'll come back to you next,
10 ma'am.

11 SARAH DEBACHER:

12 I would like to request more notice
13 about any future meetings. The piece of mail I
14 received was late last night, and I had very
15 little time over the weekend between the time
16 that I got the piece of mail in just two
17 business days or three business days to notify
18 neighbors. I realize that some of them may not
19 have signed up for mail.

20 So really I would like a another
21 scoping meeting in this community and one in
22 which neighbors are given more advanced notice.
23 My name is Sarah Debacher, 701 Deslonde Street.

24 MS. VANESSA GUERINGER:

25 Vanessa Gueringer, 827 Tupelo Street.

1 I do have issues of notification. I talked to
2 those elected officials that represent our area
3 and they could be lying like that do often, but
4 they did say they did not receive notification
5 that this meeting was actually happening
6 tonight. And as you can see, there's not a lot
7 of residents that I see from the north side of
8 my community here.

9 The other issue is, again, y'all talked
10 in 2007 about the sediment issue. At that time,
11 there was discussion about storing that sediment
12 on the canal, and there was a real negative
13 comment of residents who were concerned about
14 poisoning our water supply in this area. So
15 again, I can't sympathize with business and
16 maritime people. I can't sympathize with the
17 Corps who has never invested in this community
18 at all. And for you all to just say when
19 someone asks you the question, were there any
20 other meetings being held at alternative
21 locations about a lock replacement being done
22 somewhere else, and you said no, well, that is a
23 form of conclusion to us that this is where you
24 want to do this lock replacement.

25 The bottom line is the amount of money

1 that is being spent to rehab the existing lock
2 some of it also needs to go towards the
3 maintenance and the painting of the St. Claude
4 Bridge. We the residents here advocated for the
5 Judge Seeber Bridge to be painted.

6 And as far as bike traffic, residents
7 have been walking across these bridges, biking
8 across these bridge, and riding across these
9 bridges in vehicles forever. But if some of
10 this stuff can be retrofitted to accommodate
11 some of our newer residents who are bikers out
12 of this neighborhood, but that's where that
13 money needs to be spent, not on a lock
14 expansion.

15 If we're talking about only barge
16 traffic, and when you think about the Port has
17 pulled out as far as funding, you have to wonder
18 why. The Port has made millions for decades of
19 time. So again, we have been used as a
20 scapegoat for everything for decades. And we're
21 tired of it. It's enough is enough.

22 MR. FRANK LAPLACA:

23 Again, I want to say that the
24 Industrial Canal is the right place to put a new
25 lock system in it. It would serve two purposes.

1 You'd have an extra lock in case the old locks
2 go out. It would be a backup system. And
3 another thing, it would act as a flood wall for
4 flood gates if water came through the canal.

5 And the last thing I want to say, well,
6 almost the last thing is the flood wall on the
7 New Orleans side needs to be raised. And then
8 if they do do something with the St. Claude
9 Bridge, put a new bridge like the Claiborne
10 bridge over there and replace the ramps without
11 having to make the residents move and lose their
12 home or property.

13 MR. RENEE POCHE:

14 Any more comments or questions from
15 anybody on this side of the room? Over here.
16 Last call.

17 JOHN KOEFERL:

18 I could have said this in four and
19 a half minutes, but I didn't want to pressure
20 you. But I wanted to say that there was a study
21 that was done by some engineers in Paradis some
22 years back, and you remember Ed Noony, who just
23 passed away. He and this group determined that
24 the bridges would not go up as often with the
25 new plan, but they would stay up 40 percent

1 longer.

2 So in effect when you have this long
3 line of barges coming to fill this big lock,
4 they would be coming all the way in past the
5 area of the St. Claude and under that, all the
6 way back for that mile lining up and they would
7 stay up a long time too. The changes to the
8 Claiborne bridge would raise it 20 feet would
9 cause it to -- it would mean it would take like
10 six minutes to get up and then five minutes to
11 get down after all the traffic went down.

12 So the upshot was that the people who
13 were using these bridges would wait a longer
14 time, and the bridges would be up together at
15 the same time. That's what they said, okay.

16 I think tonight there are a lot of
17 other things that probably need to be said. I
18 know that one of the issues for us is there's a
19 lot of they needed to put a seawall on some of
20 the Holy Cross levee. That was the deal, and we
21 were promised a seawall that would go into the
22 ground for 10 months a year. And there were a
23 lot of other issues about, like, the oak trees
24 would be gone, the bypass channel would have to
25 be dug along the canal on this side of the

1 existing bridge, and the seawall there or the
2 wall doesn't go down through the Corps channel
3 completely. You know what I mean? What do they
4 call them? The sheet pile. So we still have
5 these wells on this side. So the banks of the
6 canal aren't as solid as they need to be yet.

7 Well, I can see I'm reaching three
8 minutes. I have more comments I'd like to talk
9 to you about.

10 MR. RENEE POCHE:

11 Yes, sir, in the back.

12 MR. ROBERT TANNEN:

13 My name is Robert Tannen. I have
14 property at 4725 Dauphine Street, between
15 (inaudible). There have been large-scale
16 planning efforts, and I've been involved in
17 several over the years. Has there been any
18 consideration of pulling together a national
19 scientific experts group to look at this
20 situation and not take the Corps
21 responsibilities to undertake the environmental
22 impact studies? It would do well to either have
23 the National Science Foundation or several
24 experts, not just on the matter of navigation,
25 or the matter of transportation, but looking

1 globally at the city and the future prospects of
2 the city taking into account perhaps global
3 warming and climate change, an impact that might
4 have on a project such as this. But to bring
5 together some national experts that could bring
6 a different view to this matter.

7 Has there been any consideration as
8 such?

9 MR. RENEE POCHE:

10 I don't know that answer. But it is
11 part of the record now.

12 MS. KIM FORD:

13 Just trying to piggyback on what he's
14 saying.

15 MR. RENEE POCHE:

16 I want to make sure we get this into
17 the record.

18 MS. KIM FORD:

19 My name is Kim Ford. And I'm a
20 resident of the Lower Ninth Ward. The science
21 foundation did express some interest. There
22 were some organizations that expressed interest
23 in participating with an open investigation, so
24 to speak, and the feasibility of what you're
25 proposing to do.

1 MR. RENEE POCHE:

2 Thank you. Any other comments anyone
3 would like to make? Okay. Then we're going to
4 wrap it up here. I remind you again before you
5 leave, if you didn't get a handout, get one. It
6 has all the contact information, everything you
7 need there. If you need to give a comment card,
8 you need some way to submit your written
9 comments, we do have postage-paid return
10 envelopes on the table back there. Please get
11 one of those if you need it before you leave.

12 Thank you so much for coming out this
13 evening and providing us with your comments.
14 Please drive safely.

15 (THE PROCEEDINGS ENDED AT 7:17 P.M.)

