Date	Name	Comments, Questions or Suggestions	Responses
7/25/23	Eric Johnson	Amphibian populations are declining worldwide, and amphibians are experience high extinction rates due to habitat loss, chytrid fungus, pollutants, pesticides, and climate change (see references below). Amphibians are the most threatened class of vertebrates and merit special attention in the St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study. Amphibians, such as the southern dusky salamander, Fowler's toad and Gulf Coast toad, may be present in freshwater wetlands and forested habitats in the project area. We recommend conducting amphibian monitoring to locate occupied amphibian habitats in the project area. Implement avoidance measures to mitigate impacts to amphibian habitat. Consider establishing protected areas for amphibians.	Project impacts to amphibians utilizing the habitat within the direct project footprint would likely occur and potentially result in mortality. Project impacts to habitat utilized by amphibian populations would be mitigated with in-kind habitat. These identified mitigation areas are obtained in fee and protected from development by an easement.
8/3/23	Terrance Bright	Many local and state officials do not realize the Lakeshore CDD is the only current operational CDD in the state. Rooted in state law, a CDD is a local, special purpose government entity created as an alternative method of planning, acquiring, operating and maintaining community-wide improvements in planned communities. The Lakeshore CDD owns and maintains the existing pumping station and ~six mile levee surrounding Lakeshore Villages located off of I-10 as well as a large portion of Oak Harbor Blvd/Lakeshore Blvd East near the Harbor Center. It is our understanding that any modifications to this system would require at minimum our CDD Board's vote and approval. I and other Board Supervisors, will be attending the Aug. 15th meeting to represent our District interests. Our Board, District Manager (cced) and District Engineer look forward to working with you throughout this feasibility process. We want to be sure our resident and community concerns are addressed. We also want to fully communicate any considered modifications to our levee system or drainage impact to Lakeshore Village to our residents in a timely manner.	Real Estate interests, surveys and future levee modifications are an activity for Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
8/3/23	Terrance Bright	My name is Terrance Bright and I am the Chairman of the Lakeshore Villages Master Community Development District (CDD) Board of Supervisors here in Slidell, LA. I sent the below message for public comment ahead of the public Aug.15th meeting, but I would like an Army Corps of Engineers representative to please contact me before the meeting on the 15th. This is in regard to reported discussions and considerations the Army Corps has had related to our community's private levee and drainage system without coordinating with our Board. Per the latest Parish feasibility study maps, the Army Corps is considering "connecting" to the existing Lakeshore CDD levee system. Rooted in state law, a CDD is a local, special purpose government entity created as an alternative method of planning, acquiring, operating and maintaining community-wide improvements in planned communities. The Lakeshore CDD owns and maintains the existing pumping station and ~six mile levee surrounding Lakeshore Villages located off of I-10 as well as a large portion of Oak Harbor Blvd/Lakeshore Blvd East near the Harbor Center. It is our understanding that any modifications to this system would require at minimum our CDD Board's vote and approval. Many local and state officials do not realize the Lakeshore CDD is the only current operational CDD in the state. I and other Board Supervisors, will be attending the Aug. 15th meeting in Slidell to represent our District interests. Our Board, District Manager (cced) and District Engineer look forward to working with you throughout this feasibility process. We want to be sure our resident and community concerns are addressed. We also want to fully communicate any considered modifications to our levee system or drainage impact to Lakeshore Village to our residents in a timely manner.	Real Estate interests, surveys and future levee modifications are an activity for Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
8/9/23	Diane Beaudoin	Will u b cleaning out Gum Bayou and Pearl River to help with the flooding in our area?	At this time we are not proposing to clean out Gum Bayou or the Pearl River. For more details on the features that are proposed, please visit the following link and navigate to the Main Report, Chapter 4. New Orleans District > Missions > Environmental > NEPA Compliance Documents > Bipartisan Budget Act 2018 (BBA 18) > BBA 18 Projects > St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study (army.mil)
8/9/23	Rebecca Ruffino	I'm a lifelong resident of St Tammany and in my 50yrs we have never flooded UNTIL y'all remove EVERY tree to put up a building to sit empty. Our infrastructure simply can not handle what has already been done! The tree removal has not caused major flooding it's affected wildlife, some of which is protected. Please see my letter below that I've sent to our parish president and council members. Trees, because of the beneficial services they provide and the character they add to the community, shall be retained and preserved to the maximum extent feasible on all property within the town limits. Planting trees helps make cities clean and green, but protecting the trees we already have may be even more important: large mature trees provide many more benefits than smaller young trees. Research shows that mature trees capture more carbon, filter more particulate matter to reduce air pollution, capture more storm water, create shade and reduce energy use, and many other environmental and health benefits. Some benefits trees provide: Prevent flooding. Rain flows down the trunk into the earth; Prevents soil erosion; Shield children from ultra-violet rays; Increase property value; Provides oxygen; Cleans the air as they absorb pollutant gases; Most importantly PREVENT FLOODING. The unfortunate reality is that the vast majority of trees are not being preserved and cut down. In many cases, trees could have been preserved but were cut down. This causes a massive negative environmental impact. Also, deforestation also destroys much needed habitat for animals, plants and other species. Deforestation has been a tragic disaster for the earth and everyone living on it. Scores of office buildings sit empty across the parish. True leaders are those that do something different and better. They learn from others mistakes and improve upon it rather than repeating the same mistakes. It takes more years to re-grow trees than it does to build around the tree. In addition to hurting this generation by cutting trees down, you're hurting your children, grandchildren — those you love dearly. Use your power to make a difference and show other cities, states, countries how to do things better.	The environmental analysis includes methods to first avoid impacts to sensitive resources such as trees. Once it's clear that not all impacts can be avoided, measures are taken to minimize those impacts to the extent that is possible but still meet the purpose and need for the project. Impacts that are unavoidable are then mitigated to replace the lost functions and habitat value. A mitigation plan has been developed to offset the impacts to pine savanna trees. The mitigation plan for this study is located in Appendix I. Chapter 5 of the Main Report discusses potential impacts resulting from implementation of the project.
		I request regulations established in the zoning ordinance are intended to preserve and protect the historical architecturally worthy buildings, structure, sights, monuments, streetscapes, squares, and neighborhoods of our historic area. .	Impacts to historic and cultural resources are discussed in Chapter 5. Compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act is discussed in Chapter 8. In compliance with e NHPA Section 106, CEMVN has initiated Section 106 consultation for the Proposed Action. CEMVN is developing a programmatic agreement that would establish procedures to satisfy the CEMVN's Section 106 responsibilities pursuant to 36 CRF Part 800.14(b). The final PA would be contained in the final Report and Record of Decision.

		Please encourage property owners to renovate vacant buildings or sell them for other uses. I simply ask that you all review buildings on a case-by-case basis and discuss where zoning changes make sense and which new uses might work best in a given location.	This is outside the authority of the Corps of Engineers. Parish Government is responsible for zoning and enforcement of municipal code provisions. Economic incentives may be available at the local, state or federal level or in the private sector.
8/14/23	Viginia Fay, Assistant Regional Administrator, Habitat Conservation District	The Optimized TSP will impact 123 acres of EFH of tidal fresh/intermediate marsh from the construction of the levee footprint and three acres of estuarine water bottoms and water column impacts to EFH associated with dredging activities. Upon further evaluation, USACE determined there were no indirect impacts to EFH. In a letter to USACE dated July 22, 2021, the NMFS provided three EFH conservation recommendations under provisions of the Magnuson- Stevens Act in response to the first DEIS. Based on the information provided in the revised DEIS, revisions to the EFH assessment will be required to further refine and quantify EFH impacts to determine the mitigation required for the final EFH assessment and EIS. A complete final EFH assessment should be provided to the NMFS incorporating all activities associated with this project, including a description of measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or offset the adverse impacts of the proposed activities on EFH. Avoidance and minimization of direct wetland impacts should be pursed to the greatest extent practicable. The final EIS should include in the EFH Section 5.1.1.5, details delineating and quantifying impacts to EFH by habitat type, as well as differentiating between the flood side EFH and the protected side of all structures. The NMFS supports hurricane protection to reduce risk to life or property, however we are concerned direct wetland losses from construction of project features and water control structures would adversely impact EFH and associated marine fishery resources. Based upon the information provided in the revised DIFR and DEIS, the proposed construction and operation of the west and south Slidell levee and floodwall system would result in impacts to EFH, while the Mile Branch channel improvements is located within a non-tidal area. The NMFS recognizes the USACE's efforts to avoid and minimize proposed impacts to EFH by providing the requested operational plans for all proposed structures. However, the NMFS continues to be concerned the proposed levee alignment and all remaining gate structures may reduce tidal drainage/exchange in the Pontchartrain Basin. Impediments to drainage may increase inundation stress of wetlands and could increase wetland loss. The NMFS recommends the final EFH assessment and EIS should include final operation plans, which assess potential structures related to fisheries access impacts in the Pontchartrain Basin. Construction of the levee system could also potentially induce flooding internally and externally to the levee alignment due to heavy rainfall events and high tides. The NMFS recommends conducting additional hydrologic modeling on project features to mitigate for any potential to reduce water exchange and increased hydroperiod of the Pontchartrain Basin. The USACE should provide hydrological modeling results for all structures justifying: 1) how particular locations were selected for each structure, 2) why each structure is needed, and 3) how the size and type of each structure was determined. The final EFH assessment and EIS should include the results of the assessment and associated mitigative measures. The revised DEIS included an EFH mitigation and monitoring plan, which states mitigation measures will be considered in the following order: 1) potential USACE constructed marsh mitigation sites in approximately 221 acres of open water, and/or 2) purchase of mitigation bank credits to offset impacts to tidal fresh/intermediate marsh. If the purchase of wetland credits from an USACE approved mitigation bank within the appropriate watersheds is not available, then the USACE should work with NMFS develop an appropriate plan to fully compensate for all EFH impacts. The proposed mitigation and monitoring plan should be presented to NMFS for review prior to release of the final EFH assessment and EIS. To avoid additional mitigation for temporal impacts, NMFS recommends implementation of the mitigation plan concurrent with the construction of the development. The preliminary mitigation analysis, approximate total acres, and Average Annual Habitat Units of impacts to tidal fresh/intermediate marsh provided in the revised DEIS should be refined to verify: 1) the final assessment of acres of impacts to EFH, 2) the final WVA analysis, 3) the types of mitigation required, and 4) the final project design. Open water should also be included among the habitat types requiring mitigation. Estimates of all direct and indirect project related impacts to tidally influenced habitat should be refined for inclusion in the project's final EFH assessment and EIS.	The NOD has and will continue to coordinate and consult with NMFS regarding potential impacts to fisheries and EFH. A meeting was held between our agencies to gain an understanding of the project, potential impacts and areas of the assessment that should be improved. A draft operating plan was provided during the meeting with agreement that if the project is approved and funded, additional H&H modeling would be conducted and the operating plan would be refined to clearly lay out a plan for opening and closing the various flood gates upon an impending named storm in the Gulf of Mexico. The H&H modeling would be refined and additional modeling would be conducted during PED to gain further information regarding baseline conditions and future with project conditions to adequately inform on the operations of the pump stations and floodgates during storm events. The mitigation plan as presented in the DEIS was reviewed with NMFS and agreement was reached that the information they were seeking was included in the mitigation plan. During the PED, the NOD will work closely with NMFS in further development of the mitigation sites. If the project is funded for construction, mitigation would be implemented concurrently with construction impacts.
8/15/23	Adrianne Urbano	We attended the meeting in Slidell on August 15th. The lack of advertising or educating the public in regards to the meeting, gives me pause to think there is an ulterior motive. Was this done to let this move forward with minimal resistance? Forgive my lack of faith in the Army Corp of Engineers. When will you see you cannot control mother nature? For every action you take there will be further consequences and more damage. Sadder yet is that my taxes go to your wasted projects. To think you can wall off so much of coastal territory is laughable! Your plan will just create new problems for the area. There are houses currently being built in Turtle creek. So the city/parish has allowed permits knowing this is a possibility. The developer makes his money while the unaware buyer gets taken for a ride. I realize I am nothing in your plan. But, we moved from a house that flooded in Lake Village subdivision to home that has never flooded. It was a marvel that my daughter , son in law and first grandchild bought the house next door. As people would talk of leaving Slidell we were trying dig roots. But, this plan makes all of our properties worthless. Perhaps, I will sue the Corp, parish or state if my home floods after this wall is built. Because it has never flooded prior. Perhaps, there could be a class action lawsuit from all the new homes built that will be uninsurable. I have worked my entire life, paid my taxes and followed all the rules to be a good citizen only to be bullied by a government I have supported.	For all information regarding interaction with the public and announcements, please see the Public Involvement Annex (Appendix C, Annex I).
8/15/23	Peter O'Connell	I live in Oak Harbor and attended the public meeting in Slidell on August 15th. While I appreciate the effort to solve numerous problems with flooding around the Parish, the proposal for the flood wall at Oak Harbor Drive actually increases the potential for future flooding south of Oak Harbor due to storm surge. That increased risk plus the very limited detail available in the current plan for "Non Structural Implementation", make it extremely difficult to evaluate a future in Slidell. All of the homes in Oak Harbor and Eden Isles are defined by FEMA as 'slab on grade'. While most of the slabs are poured on top of 12ft driven pilings, almost none of these could reasonably be raised without driving new pilings down to the level of the original substrate on which these developments were built and then lifting the structure on top of it. The lack of information about 'non structural implementation' makes it difficult to believe that the process is well thought through or that the quality of what would result would meet the original. The people who live in this area are likely some of the highest tax payers in the eastern part of the parish not to mention the percentage of income they bring to the area. If they are like me they are very likely to think it is time to plan on a move to a more welcoming community that would appreciate those contributions.	Refer to Appendix H: Nonstructural Implementation Plan for details on how USACE plans to implement the proposed project. Further information will be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
8/15/23	Cathy Henderson	Please send me a hard copy of the STPS Feasibility Report. The south Slidell plan leaves out hospitals, schools, thousands of homes and businesses behind the levee (running behind Walmart to I10) We are going to get higher flooding.	Comment noted. A hard copy was provided

8/15/23	Frank Hyde	I found it difficult to express my view about planned COEngineer plans. After much of my life spent living in Slidell and much longer time married living on Indian Village Rd, I have found any plans have failed. We are a community of wetlands. Eden Isles, Oak Harbor were built by filling in wetlands. This has happened all around the lake. I am definitely against a levee as it will negatively affect many of us and some in MS. What needs to be addressed should protect all (rich & poor) as well as wetland environments. Also immediate road & bridge work (hey 90) is so awful here. I'm sure personal protection from hurricanes in evaluations is non-existent. I don't expect our political leaders to care. Why do we try to improve when older problems are not addressed and fixed.	Comment noted.
8/15/23	Edward Robinson	It would be helpful to leave with a copy of the map for each area or at least my area. I am on 4th St, intersection of 433 and Hwy 90. what ever rules have to raise, min, max, height, my home needs to be raise. Raise the homes before you build one levee. I am a senior citizen on a fix income.	USACE will make note of this request for future public engagements.
8/15/23	Lucy Tierney	I am very fearful of the Slidell plan See what happened to New Orleans: one breach can fill a city for more damage. I have no complain against home elevation (which many have already done at their expense). Would re-settling residents be more practical? I am against levees! .	Buyouts are not a part of the proposed plan at this time.
		Slidell wetlands should never have been "developed" in the first place. Compounding the error with additional bisected wetlands accrued for unscrupulous developers injures the immediate quality of life of wildlife and citizens. Do not enclose wetlands	The current levee alignment was developed to avoid and minimize the impacts to the areas of wetlands in the Slidell area. Please see Chapter three of the Main Feasibility Report for documentation of these efforts.
		Is this a boondoggle - it is horribly expensive/	Thank you for your comment.
		Most Slidell Citizens are unaware of your plan & need to be afforded an opportunity to give feedback at a microphone.	Thank you for your comment.
		Because I care about the future of Slidell am wary of politicians interest in $, love nature, am aware of the infrequency of direct-hit storm surge and see no reason for secrecy around these topics. I cannot give this plan my support	Thank you for your comment.
8/15/23	Commander Wayne A. Day (Retired)	I am a resident of Coin Du Lestna on an island on Bayou Fouca. I am thrilled at the plan. It is great! I and my family have live on the water here for 32 years. Many have left. I love where I live.	Comment noted.
8/16/23	Rick Franzo, President	Concerned Citizens Board and Advisors strongly support the USACE, St. Tammany Parish LA Feasibility Study Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan so that the citizens of St. Tammany can be provided proper flood protection in order to protect their quality of life by reducing the severity of impacts from storm surge and hurricane rainfall, which results in serious property damages with an even greater risk to the health and safety of the citizens that live and work in St. Tammany.	Comment noted.
8/16/23	Kenneth Poore	Very few details provided on economic impact of several area left out of flood protection. Homes in the neighborhoods left out (re. Eden Isles) have structures that cannot be raised. Will plastic blow up barriers be provided to those areas? Was gates to lock water from entering canals in these areas considered?	For a full list of considered measures, refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation
8/16/23	Michelle Laegel	I walked away with more questions than questions answered. Would like to know more about how "purple dots" are we less protected with Levee which why elevation plan is needed? How will this effect insurance hikes? Expert didn't know - with levee will this increase, decrease or stay same as far as flood protection Eden Isles area?	For the areas on the exterior of the levee, the Nonstructural plan was determined to be the National Economic Development plan for the area. This means that it reduces flood risk to the area, while keeping a benefit to cost ratio above one. Each structure identified as eligible for raising will be elevated out of the 100 year floodplain. USACE cannot comment on impacts to insurance rates.
8/16/23	Shawn McManus	As a lifelong Slidell resident, I am greatly excited and supportive of this project. My home had 41" of flood water from Hurricane Katrina. I have been very disappointed that the I-10 has still not been raised to match the local levees ad was beginning to think we had been forgotten. My flood Insurance is rising so fast that soon I will not be able to afford it. Please work hard to get this done.	Comment noted.
8/16/23	no name provided	The presentation did not explain much. What about the people outside the "levee" as far as their insurance coverage? Why not take all the Billions & Billions of dollars and raise house and business in danger of flooding. You are spending millions in Covington for 300 houses? Can't endorse any of this plan. We will just be a funnel! Not well thought out.	USACE cannot comment on impact to insurance rates.
8/16/23	Stephen Scanlon	This project seems to be a blatant Money Grab. To put a levee around properties that are 10-20 ft above sea level is ludicrous. Any reduction of flow or any waterway would have a serious detrimental effect	Comment noted.
8/16/23	Kevin Strede	Have you identified the economic impact to housing outside the flood wall as houses outside the wall would be a risk to insurance and lenders. Who will manage the water ways and tributaries after the wall is built. Who will pay for the maintenance of all the "system of systems" to include pumps levees, gates, walls and others.	If the project is authorized, funded and constructed, at completion it would be turned over to a local sponsor for operations and maintenance. These specifics of operations and maintenance of the system will be developed in Preconstruction, Engineering and Design. USACE cannot comment on impact to insurance rates.
8/16/23	James Stiede	How are you planning to manage the drainage to the lake after its built. Is St. Tammany at greater risk after the levees in Laplace are completed. Sheet pile and dirt or?	It is not anticipated that the drainage of the lake will be affected by the construction of the West/South Slidell Levee. Results of impacts of the structures proposed int he St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study can be seen in the Hydraulics &Hydrology Appendix. Impacts from the West Shore Lake Pontchartrain study are available in the West Shore Lake Pontchartrain Report. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/16/23	Helene Tate	I have reviewed the STP Feasibility study and have numerous questions and concerns regarding details of the proposed borrow sites, specifically STP-9 (Robert Rd Detention Point) as my home and property border this site. I am requesting to be contacted to discuss pg 11 of the Feasibility Study (Environmental Impact) which mentions "Robert Rd Detention Pond Expansion". I need more information to be able to fully give comments before the planned October 20.2023 updated draft report is submitted.	A detailed explanation was sent with attachments via Email and certified mail
8/16/23	Kim Tate	My property line abuts the Robert Road Detention Pond (STP-9). I have future plans to build an outdoor kitchen and a vehicle nd equipment shelter near this property line. I request that someone contact me and let me know if the enlargement of the Robert Road Detention Pond will interfere with my construction plans.	The Robert Road detention pond is a potential borrow source for construction of the levee. Details regarding the use of this site as a borrow source would be established in Preconstruction, Engineering and Design. Please see Appendix B: Plan Formulation for additional information on borrow sites.

8/16/23	Cathy & Bob Henderson	1. The St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility 355 page hard cover document is not reader friendly. The lines of the levees and	Comment noted.
		2. The general public was not informed enough. Homeowners should have received a notice by mail - given that millions were spent on a study alone.	Comment noted.
		3. More public meetings to inform the public should be held and more time to read absorb and understand the full impact of the study	Comment noted.
8/16/23	Jessica Callae	My house is in danger of flooding in heavy rain events in north of Slidell. This sound like a bad idea & will increase my chances of flooding by slowing down stream drainage during & after a storm.	Please see the Hydraulics &Hydrology Appendix for detailed information on the levee and water flow.
8/16/23	Daniel Kirk	I have lived in Slidell my entire life. The house I won now has flooded 3 times. In May 1995 it flooded twice and once in Kartina. It also almost flooded twice in 2021 once in a tropical storm and then again in Ida. All of these were mostly rain events (12" or more in 24 hrs) Slidell is gravity drained putting a levee in would insure my house will flood the next big rain event, the water has to go somewhere. Slidell proper does not flood from storm surge.	Reference the Hydraulics &Hydrology Appendix for detailed information on the levee and water flow. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. We will continue to work with our local and state governments for development of plans that are outside of the Federal interest.
8/16/23	Peter Callas III	This levee storm protections system does not sound like a great idea. All of Slidell and above drains to Lake Pontchartrain via the bayous and canals. To block this with levees and flood gates (even with pumps)* will restrict the quantity of water that can be rained per hour. With a slow moving storm & a training rain event the will be a recreation of New Orleans. All the water is behind the levees and can't be pumped out fast enough. *Will the pumps be manned" * will they haea power when the electric grid goes out?.	If the project is authorized, funded and constructed, at completion it would be turned over to a local sponsor for operations and maintenance. These specifics of operations and maintenance of the system will be developed in Preconstruction, Engineering and Design.
		Are the flood gates accessible when flooded? *Can the flood gates be opened wit out power and tremendous water pressure behind the gates?	If the project is authorized, funded and constructed, at completion it would be turned over to a local sponsor for operations and maintenance. These specifics of operations and maintenance of the system will be developed in Preconstruction, Engineering and Design.
8/16/23	Jessica Jones	I have looked over the plans for this and it seems it barricades all of east Slidell off. Have you ever thought that now our flood insurance will be sky high, not that it already isn't, because we won't be in a so called flood protected area? Also, we pay some of the highest property taxes and our property values are going to go down tremendously. I don't recall a lot of the areas off East Gause to flood during Katrina, I know the house we are in now didn't and we are in Sterling Oaks. some may have because they are lower and from street flooding. How about we do something about drainage, Gause floods when it rains hard just for a few hours, and not build walls to flood others?	Reference the Hydraulics &Hydrology Appendix for detailed information on the levee and water flow. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. We will continue to work with our local and state governments for development of plans that are outside of the Federal interest, such as local drainage.
8/16/23	Jeanne Stangle	I live upstream on Bayou Liberty where the bayou is narrow in width but deep, wild, and beautiful, providing vital drainage for a large basin. This property is located in East St Tammany Parish. We do not want "channel improvements". I OPPOSE this St Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study. In 1984, my husband Aynaud Foster Hebert, MD, and I bought our property, at the above address, located on the east bank of Bayou Liberty, and have seen the increasing water levels adversely affect our historic property during subsequent years. I am writing to object to "feasibility study" to build a levee which may hurt us if the wind blows from the wrong direction.	Comment noted.
		I suggest preserving wetlands without change, in their natural state, described for this project for the following reasons: (1.)Applicants Have Not Shown There Are No Practicable Alternatives to the Wetlands Site. Contrary to federal law, 40 C.F.R 230.10 (a), applicants have not met their burden of showing there is no practicable alternative to building Levee in the Bayou Liberty basin that is already overwhelmed by development. Applicants' project is not effective if hurricane blows from certain directions, and practicable alternatives are presumed to be available unless clearly demonstrated otherwise, 40 C.F. R. 230.10(a)(3). Many failed and empty commercial sites have already been paved over in nearby sites along US Hwy 190 Gause West and both sides of Northshore Blvd, including multiple strip malls and huge Northshore Square Mall with leveled movie theatre site adjacent to I-12. Why not remodel these commercial sites at these already filled and paved sites which include huge paved parking lots? There are clearly practicable alternative sites for the proposed levee and for this reason the application should be denied.	The environmental analysis includes methods to first avoid impacts to sensitive resources such as wetlands. Once it's clear that not all impacts can be avoided, measures are taken to minimize those impacts to the extent that is possible but still meet the purpose and need for the project. Impacts that are unavoidable are then mitigated to replace the lost functions and habitat value. A mitigation plan has been developed to offset the impacts to pine savanna trees. The mitigation plan for this study is located in Appendix I. Chapter 5 of the Main Report discusses potential impacts resulting from implementation of the project. CEMVN Regulatory office manages and issues permits for impacts to "waters of the United States" that is a separate mission from the Civil Works Mission.
		(2.)Environmental Impact Study is Required. The altering of wetlands for construction of levee will have a significant negative effect on drainage in the Bayou Liberty basin and will increase flooding of some structures if cut-off from the outflow into Bayou Liberty. Flooding must also be considered for long-standing adjacent residential properties both downstream and on the west bank of Bayou Liberty, the already flood-prone Victoria Park houses. Cumulative effect of destruction of wetlands must be considered for this proposal in view of previously permitted destruction of wetlands in the Bayou Liberty basin for building of Wal-Mart, Sam's Club, and Target Stirling shopping center for which the US Army Corps of Engineers issued permits for filling of wetlands along Bayou Liberty before Hurricane Katrina. Combined with the Corps' previous permitting for these stores, alteration of wetlands and Bayou Liberty channel for this proposed levee would be a "major federal action" significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and as such triggers the requirement of an environmental impact statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C).	The draft report is an integrated feasibility report and Environmental Impact Statement. Chapter 5 of the Draft report includes an analysis of potential impacts if the proposed action is implemented. H&H impacts are discussed in Section 5.1.1.9 and Appendix . Wetland impacts are discussed in Section 5.1.1.1 with supporting documentation in Appendix C. Cumulative impacts are discussed within each Resource impact analysis and in Section 5.2. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		(3) Applicants Have Not Submitted Hydrology Study-plan and Certification That Run-off Will Not Be Increased By the Proposed Levee. It is particularly important that applicants comply with local law requiring hydrological studies and measures to control runoff because Bayou Liberty's capacity is already exceeded in major storms. The experience of long-time residents along Bayou Liberty, including families living downstream of the site for which applicants seek a permit, is that water in the Bayou overflows its banks much more regularly in moderate storms and that homes that never flooded in the past are now subject to flooding in heavy storms. This is due to increased development in the Bayou Liberty basin.	Reference the Hydraulics and Hydrology Appendix for detailed information on the impacts of the levee construction to the water flow. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. We will continue to work with our local and state governments for local drainage concerns.

8/17/23	Ron Kaba	As President of the Chamale Property Owners Association, the Lead HOA in the Chamale subdivision, and on behalf of our residents I strongly support your initiatives for enhanced levee protection of south and west St. Tammany Parish. Chamale, as you are aware, is a community of approximately 200 dwellings, both single family dwellings and condominiums, with significantly more than 300 residents. We dramatically recognize the need for far better storm protection. Many po1tions of Chamale routinely flood from "riverine" events given the immediate proximity to Bayous Bonfouca and Vincent advanced by wind-driven flooding from Lake Pontchartrain. Additionally, flooding is significantly increased by catastrophic events such as hurricanes Katrina, Ida and others. The detailed information provided via your recent email certainly represents well- crafted planning and the potential for excellent execution if acted on with immediacy. Delays to such good planning will likely yield more costly devastation in our community and others in St. Tammany Parish. The residents of Chamale thank you for your dedication and diligence. As President of the Chamale Property Owners Association, the Lead HOA in the Chamale subdivision, and on behalf of our residents I strongly support your initiatives for enhanced levee protection of south and west St. Tammany Parish. Chamale, as you are aware, is a community of approximately 200 dwellings, both single family dwellings and condominiums, with significantly more than 300 residents. We dramatically recognize the need for far better storm protection. Many po1tions of Chamale routinely flood from "riverine" events given the immediate proximity to Bayous Bonfouca and Vincent advanced by wind-driven flooding from Lake Pontchartrain. Additionally, flooding is significantly increased by catastrophic events such as hurricanes Katrina, Ida and others. The detailed information provided via your recent email certainly represents well- crafted planning and the potential for excellent execution if acted on with immediacy. Delays to such good planning will likely yield more costly devastation in our community and others in St. Tammany Parish. The residents of Chamale thank you for your dedication and diligence.	Comment noted.
8/17/23	Debbie Hall	When I looked at this plan, I was dumbfounded as to how you would leave off the bulk of the tax base of this area. Speaking on this area Old River Road Subdivision, Turtle Creek, The Bluffs, Indian Village, Honey Island, Little Oak schools, Cross Gates etc. We have lived here for 20 years. My home is PAID for and is large two story, 4100 sq feet with two huge attached garages, with a mother-in-law apartment and a pool. Imagine the destruction to raise this home. Homeowners insurance is forcing me to insure for $820,000 and you're telling me we will be outside the levee protection?? I pay almost $5000 a year in property tax. We are being forced from our homes by the cost of flood and homeowners and now you'll leave us out of protection?? Seems to me, like most government today, you're in bed with the insurance companies. This study is crap and you need to recognize the tax base you're leaving off, the value of our properties and the age of these neighborhoods. We live in a rare area where we all have property and are not on top of each other, beautiful trees and wildlife. It's a way of life and people love it here. Many of us experienced the destruction of Katrina and with HAARP and weather manipulation, it's certain another storm will come this way. 3 feet of water in tour home is not pleasant. Please find a way to include these expensive and important areas in your plan.	Comment noted.
8/17/23	Brian Clavin	I live in Turtle Creek and saw this levee flood plan that has been proposed below. I am absolutely AGAINST this idea since you will flood everyone in Turtle Creek Subdivision. We have over 300 homes in our subdivision and the subdivision is still growing. Many of us in Turtle Creek survived Hurricane Katrina without flooding and now you want to intentionally flood us out? So your idea of flood protection is to flood all of our homes including the Cross Gates subdivision, French Branch subdivision, Quail Ridge subdivision and many businesses along Gause Blvd. You must come up with a better plan to protect our homes and include us in that new plan for protection, not exclude us!	Areas outside of the risk reduction provided by the levee are eligible for the Nonstructural Plan. Please see the Hydraulics &Hydrology Appendix for detailed information on the levee and water flow. We will continue to work with our local and state governments for development of plans that are outside of the Federal interest, such as local drainage. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/17/23	Melissa Gillespie	Last redrawing, 211 N Queens Dr, Slidell, LA 70458 was included in the flood zone which meant our insurance went through the roof even though we didn't even flood during Katrina. Citizens wanted $9000 a year for an area that has never flooded and all the mortgage companies are now using these thieves. We had to find our own after most of the insurance companies pulled out. How about removing us from the flood zone?	Homes that are eligible for the Nonstructural plan will be elevated outside of the 100 year floodplain.
		On a keyword search for "Schneider" in Appendix D and Appendix G, we could not find answer to our question in 6.29.21 email: What is elevation of Schneider Canal PS and levee now? Everard Baker, then environmental manager, St. Tammany Parish feasibility study in 7.2.21 email timed 9:31am: A response will be provided in the final report. We are accepting public comments on the feasibility study until 26 July 2021.	Elevation of the pump station is 14.5 ft NGVD and levee crown is 9.0 NGVD
		Appendix D under Floodwall Elevation and Location: For this alignment, elevation of floodwall segments would vary from 13.5 feet to 17 feet. It notes 300 feet of Old Spanish Trail Floodwall segment. Appendix D under Sluicegates, Vehicular Floodgates and Ramps: It notes a 30-foot vehicular floodgate at LA Highway 433 East (Old Spanish Trail). At several figures, for example, Appendix D figure D:1-14, comment box reads: Old Spanish Trail Gate (Hwy 433).	
		Appendix E at Section 7.1.3 Alternative 6 – South Slidell (6a & 6b) at 7.1.3.1 [page 54]: Schneider Canal Pump Complex: There is a pumping station at the intersection of Schneider Canal and the proposed levee alignment, which was constructed by the City of Slidell. The 1990 USACE Schneider Canal, Slidell, LA Hurricane Protection Reconnaissance Report identified a capacity of 100 cfs. It is important to note that the Schneider Canal pump station was constructed by the City of Slidell at a capacity of 850 cfs. It is unlikely that additional capacity is needed there. The existing pump station does not have fronting protection, but that need has been identified in the ongoing USACE Southeastern Louisiana Project (SELA) Schneider Canal hurricane protection study.	

8/18/23	Camille Philips	Nonstructural measures: Appendix G Section 13 Zoning Ordinances: The [NS] measures are voluntary in nature and would be available only to existing eligible structures as defined within the [OTSP]….The NFS will be required to coordinate these matters with the local planning commissions. Section R322.2.1; Elevation Requirements of the Louisiana [UCC] states that "Buildings and structures in [FHAs], including [FHAs] designated as Coastal A Zones, shall have the lowest floors elevated to or above [BFE] or the design flood elevation….For residential structures located in flood zone "A," the minimum [FFE] shall be at the [BFE] or 12 inches above the centerline of street or top of curb fronting the home, whatever is greater. For residential lots less than 90 feet wide in all flood zones, structures shall be raised if more than 24 inches of fill is required to satisfy this section. Elevations shall be tied to NAVD88 vertical datum. Appendix H Section 3.1 Preliminary Eligibility [page 8]: 2. The structure must be outside of the area of influence of the structural features recommended in the [OTSP] and not be receiving flood risk reduction benefits from the structural features (i.e., outside of the areas of influence of [OTSP] --the West Slidell and South Slidell Levee and Floodwall System…) Appendix F figure F:7-1 measures comprising the [OTSP] [page 44], appears to have at least two purple dots inside the OTSP. What would explain this? Appendix D: •Under Structural Assumptions for Alternative 6c > 2.) Floodwalls: On the east side of the railroad tracks, it reads b…. c…. d…. b…. e…. Are second b…. and e…. correctly included here? Should this string be amended? Appendix D: •online and printed hard copy, header reads St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study, no reference to Appendix D •online and printed hard copy, page numbers in footers are very hard to read, white numbers on gray background •online and printed hard copy, every other page has no number Appendix D Annex 10: •online has no page numbers •online has no headers Appendix D Annex 11: •Could this be available as Excel spreadsheet? Appendix G: •online page numbers in footers are very hard to read, white numbers on gray background	Reference the Nonstructural Plan and Appendix F, Figure F.6.1. Note two structures to the north of the levee that are part of the riverine flooding risk group called "Pearl-River Urban". In this grouping, homes are subject to riverine flood risk and structures in the 25 year floodplain are eligible for inclusion to the nonstructural plan. The levee addresses coastal storm surge south of that group. For Old Spanish Trail 433. Structural features like gates or pumpstations transition from levee to floodwall and back for the gate. Elevations for floodwall are generally a little bit higher in elevation than earthen levees to accommodate for the steep surface of the floodwall and wave run up. The Schneider canal pump station is 14.5 ft NGVD and the levee crown is 9.0 NGVD . At the Schneider Canal pump station the estimated design height of the floodwall is 17.5 ft NGVD. Ground surveys are conducted during Preconstruction Engineering and Design if the project is authorized and funded. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/18/23	Mona Prince	I have to voice my heartfelt disapproval of this project. Our home of 30 years in Turtle Creek will be outside of the proposed levee. We have never flooded but most certainly will if this project is approved. Our insurance rates would soar and property values plummet! You have to do better and include our neighborhood. We have just retired and will be forced to leave our home if this happens.	Comment noted.
8/20/23	Dr. Jean Cefalu	I am opposed to the current levy protection plan as it leaves out a large area (Old River Road Subdivision) that faces the brunt of any flooding. All of the other properties DRAIN towards us. The current W-14 widening has caused damage and flooding to 1070 Old River Road that never had flooding in the past. Please feel free to contact me.	Comment noted.
8/20/23	Christopher Coleman	I oppose the ridiculous flood plan being put forth here for St Tammany Parish. It does nothing for the most vulnerable residents, who pay the most taxes, in Eden Isles or Lakeshore Estates. A lot of the damage you cite on the home page after Katrina, over $1billion, is due to the loss in these neighborhoods. It is asinine to devise a plan which doesn't include the most vulnerable in the parish on the front lines. Why not get the other parishes around L Pontchartrain involved and fix the problem once and for all with a flood gate at the Rigolets and Chef Pass?	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
8/21/23	Crystal Simon	After review of the posted levee plan and discussions with my counselman, Mr. Mike Smith, I am sincerely concerned about my neighborhood and home located at 115 Blackbeard Dr., Slidell, LA 70461. Given the current levee plan appears to place my neighborhood outside the levee system, I'm sure you can understand I have many concerns about the future of my property and that of my neighbors. I completely understand that not everyone can be happy when implementing a project of this magnitude, but I am writing to you in an effort to formally place your offices on notice in regard to any future damages to my property and that of my neighbors' which could possibly be caused by the implementation of this levee plan. I further want to formally express my personal concerns for my own property and to express the concerns of my neighbors in regard to this matter. From the appearance of the proposed project maps, it appears our neighborhood will be placed outside of levee protection. This is also what was understood at the recent meetings on 08/15 & 08/16. If I am incorrect in this statement, please educate me. With that being said, I formally request an explanation from your offices as to why this project cannot extend out to the Pearl River area in an effort to include the neighborhoods of Doubloon Bayou Estates and Old River Road within levee protection. If this is not feasible, please let me know why another option (other than the one presented) is not possible. Please understand that I am not an engineer and this information is, quite frankly, a bit over my head, but if an extension of this levee plan to protect my neighborhood cannot be done, I formally request a response to my request for a thorough explanation of what consideration the Army Corps of Engineers took in regard to the protection of my neighborhood, how this levee project/plan will indeed benefit/affect the neighborhoods of Doubloon Bayou Estates and Old River Road, and what plans are currently in place to protect the families and properties residing in this area. I attach a map of the area of my concern for your quick reference. Please note the area circled in "red".	In response to your questions regarding the impacts on your area. The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Appendix E, section 14.1.7 discusses impacts of flooding for the Pearl River. Additional modeling will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/21/23	David Cougle c/o Gloria Van Zandt	My name is David Cougle and I am writing in opposition to the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) for St. Tammany parish. In addition to being a candidate for parish council, District 9, I am of course, a resident of District 9. Myself and my fellow residents are quite concerned about the possibility of flooding and other related issues, as you can imagine, so we have been following the USACE's work on this quite closely and are at a loss as to why our district is being excluded from protection by this proposal. There are many other ideas that would offer more protection, including that of raising HWY 90/190, to our district, but it seems those are not being considered in this particular proposal. Instead, we have something that excludes a large amount of homes, leaves a large amount of the parish unprotected, and would leave my entire district exposed and possibly make things even worse for us. I appreciate the plan's attention to the greater Slidell area, but I ask that you consider the fact that this plan simply does not work for us. We, as taxpayers and residents, deserve protection by any plan that is proposed and expect the same. The overwhelming majority of us have lived here during some of the worst storms in the last several decades, and we know how critical it is that our area be protected.	Thank you for the comment. District 9 in St. Tammany Parish is eligible for the Nonstructural plan. Residential structures that are within the 50 year floodplain are preliminarily eligible to be elevated outside of the 100 year floodplain. Please see Chapter 6 in the Main Report and the Economics Appendix for details on the Nonstructural Plan.

8/21/23	Margaret Diaz	I tried to understand the document that was presented at the open meeting last week at Slidell Auditorium. While I am thoroughly impressed with the document, it is inconceivable that anyone other than the persons that drafted it understand it: its intimidating, and full of jargon that no one can possibly understand. But your answer will be: 'we presented to the community, and they accepted it'. How fortunate for you and your organizations that you can implement such a drastic program, and the very people whom it affects, cannot even understand how it will affect them. How does it affect those homes that are outside of this protected area? I was wiped out in Katrina and moved to the northshore because of it. Now I will be faced with the possibility of being 'outside the protection' of this proposed levee system. Homes in my and surrounding neighborhoods are appraised at or above $300K. Your proposal just drops the value of all of our homes. It appears to me this proposal is a 'done deal'. You do not want input from the community, you just want to 'check the box' that it was presented to the community and to move onto the next phase. I own my home in the Quail Ridge Subdivision, east side of S. Military Road. What happens to my home, my neighborhood and all those homes and subdivisions the length of Military Road when this levee is built? How does this directly affect me, and my neighbors?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The current nonstructural plan, with levee in place can be seen in the attached graphic. The purple dots indicate structures that are currently eligible to be raised or floodproofed. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/23/23	Paul Marin	I live in a residence, 102 Lynn Dr. in Holiday Acres subdivision of Slidell, which falls outside of the proposed levee protection location. Examining Figure E:13-6 from Appendix E of the study, which shows the residual between the as-is conditions vs those created by the project, most of my neighborhood and the surrounding ones, such as French Branch, Frenchman's Estates, et al. would be made worse by the project (see the attached figure). I assume this is due to a funneling effect and the piling up of waters along the levee. If I am reading this figure correctly, the storm surge models used for modeling the hydrology show an increase of flood waters by as much as a foot in my immediate area. The graphic is not the best and is much too small of scale to be very useful. It should have only shown the area of impact instead of the broader GOM. Why are our neighborhoods not inside of the proposed levee system and given the increased risk of flooding to us, what is being done to mitigate our increased chances of flooding?	Thank you for your comment. Figure E: 13-6 shows the difference between these two results as a quality check to ensure that differences in the Water Surface Elevation values could be attributed to the presence of the structure (red values indicate an increase, blue values indicate a decrease). Single, known values are used for quality checks of data, but not for formulation. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of Water Surface Elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/23/23	Kimberly Hatcher	I oppose the flood wall not including all of the City Limits of Slidell and populated neighborhoods My home is not currently in a flood zone and I am in the City Limits. I see this structure only limiting the ability for the water to run off and consequently flooding areas that would not normally do so, even with a hurricane. Flood gates and Pumps do not always work, as seen in New Orleans many times over the years. The City and Parish do not and have not maintained the ditches for water to flow freely so why would it be any different with pumps and gates? It is evident that the Corp would like all water front properties to return to its original marsh land state with no protection offered, increased flood and home owners insurance, however that should and would not be the case for homes currently NOT in a flood zone at all. I would like you to reconsider and expand the areas of protection to include all of the City of Slidell. Issues that will likely occur are more flooded homes, increased flood insurance and the vacating of many residents to other areas with a better quality and affordable living thus reducing the tax revenues. I have also observed from your maps that many schools are not included in your plan, I do not comprehend the logic behind that. With another major hurricane and all the schools flood, there will be NO reason for many families to return from evacuation.	Thank you for your comment. Figure E: 13-6 shows the difference between these two results as a quality check to ensure that differences in the Water Surface Elevation values could be attributed to the presence of the structure (red values indicate an increase, blue values indicate a decrease). Single, known values are used for quality checks of data, but not for formulation. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of Water Surface Elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/23/23	Stephanie Neal	I'm writing to voice my concerns, regarding the St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study, specifically Alternative 6A Slidell Levee. I've reviewed this topic at length and I do not agree with alternative 6A Slidell East flood wall. This wall would put all of Gause East outside of the wall and would not protect multiple businesses, Ochsner hospital, multiple residential communities as well as our schools on the east side of Slidell. Also, this levee flood wall would cause everyone outside of it (Gause East area) to possibly incur higher insurance/flood premium and in some cases, policies may even be dropped all together. At this time, my recommendations for Slidell East (Gause East) not to have a wall and go with alternative 2 - Nonstructural.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. The structural measure 6c was compared to the nonstructural plan (2) for the area. The combination of alternatives. as laid out in the feasibility report is the National Economic Development plan, according to USACE guidance. Please see Appendix B: Plan Formulation for further details. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.

8/24/23	Michael Caswell	I am outraged by the Military Road area being excluded from the proposed flood protection system. We moved to this area after our first home in Slidell was flooded multiple times, to a home that was in Flood Zone C and had never flooded. Now, as a result of this proposed levee, not only will our neighborhood suffer the stigmatization (and economic ramifications) of being “outside the flood protection system”, but we will be MORE likely to flood than before, since that storm surge blocked by the levee has to go somewhere. These are thriving neighborhoods with thousands of homes and multiple schools, which are going to be directly harmed as a result of this proposed levee.	Figure E: 13-6 shows the difference between these two results as a quality check to ensure that differences in the Water Surface Elevation values could be attributed to the presence of the structure (red values indicate an increase, blue values indicate a decrease). Single, known values are used for quality checks of data, but not for formulation. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of Water Surface Elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8’, with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8’2” or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/24/23	Robin Jourdan	We have lived in this area since 1994 and have endured many hurricanes and flood situations, but we are still here. This proposed plan would devistate those outside the proposed area! We are on Red Mill Dr and our insurance would increase substantially and the risk of flooding will more than triple. Please include this out to Hwy 90!!!	Figure E: 13-6 shows the difference between these two results as a quality check to ensure that differences in the Water Surface Elevation values could be attributed to the presence of the structure (red values indicate an increase, blue values indicate a decrease). Single, known values are used for quality checks of data, but not for formulation. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of Water Surface Elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8’, with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8’2” or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/24/23	Thomas Thompson, Commissioner; Frank Jobert Jr	The residents of St. Tammany Parish support USACE’s effort to provide storm surge protection for St. Tammany Parish, but it must be equitable and comprehensive. Additional alternative alignments are needed to meet the plan’s stated objectives and requirements to reduce risk to public health and safety requirements by reducing flood impacts to structures, evacuation routes, and critical infrastructure. Also, the plan, as written, does not Increase resiliency (to sustain a community’s available resources before, during, and after coastal storm events). Issues: Coastal communities south and east of Slidell have the greatest storm surge risk while receiving the plan’s lowest level of coastal protection A non-structural elevation plan may be appropriate for low-density flood plain areas, but not for high-density, non-flood plain communities with vital infrastructure and evacuation routes at risk 50-year structural protection for Eden Isles is preferable to 50-year nonstructural protection; it provides greater protection with a high cost benefit ratio, and must be added as an approved alternative plan The decision not to study a 50-year structural plan for Eden Isles is a major flaw in the St. Tammany feasibility study Coastal Slidell community’s surge risk has increased significantly as a result of HSDRRS’ ongoing construction. USACE policy requires mitigation when their projects harm communities. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is the ideal venue to take corrective action to compensate coastal Slidell communities impacted by HSDRRS.	Refer to Section 4.3.1 of the main report and in Appendix B: Plan Formulation, section 2.4 for more information into the investigation into Eden Isle.

8/24/23	Robert Carroll	Is Eden Isles IN or OUT of the current Corp proposal? That's fine for the several hundred homes in Eden Isles, but what about the 5,000 homes in the Military Road area?!	Eden Isles is definitely in the $4.5B investment plan as identified in the draft St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. The area of Eden Isle is specifically identified as part of the non-structural plan whereby eligible residences will be elevated above the 100-yearfloodplain as established for Year 2082 (please see attached graphic). Please know that the Federal $4.5B investment plan as drafted includes an 18-mile levee system which extends from West Slidell to East Slidell near the I-10/1-12 interchange and north of Eden Isle (again see attachment). Further, please know that the State of LA is considering a local/state "levee plan" around Eden Isle that would complement the above Federal $4.5B investment plan. This is being led by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority. If you have additional questions, please feel free to ask and my Project Management Team led by Kaitlyn Richard and Amy Dixon will respond. An evaluation of alternative levee alignments was conducted in regards to the Military Road area and is documented in section 4.4.2 (page 143) of the main report. Additionally, the nonstructural plan was optimized across 20 flood sources in the study area to determine the plans that produce positive net benefits. A summary of this effort can be found in section 4.4.2.7 of the Main Report with additional information in figure F:6.1 of Appendix F. The military road area is mainly located within the Coastal Slidell aggregate (or group of structures) with a northern section of Military Road in the Pearl River Urban aggregate. Structure eligibility within the Coastal Slidell area was justified up to the 50 year floodplain. Structure eligibility within the Pearl River Urban area was justified up to the 25 year floodplain. The eligible residential structures will be elevated out of the estimated 100 year floodplain in the year 2082. The results of this economic analysis can be referenced in section 6.3 of Appendix F. Recently, the details of the draft report were also communicated in public meetings in Slidell and Covington, where USACE requested public comments. This presentation is available at the following link: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/26/23	Carol Barber	I am providing a "Conditional" Letter of Support for the St. Tammany Feasibility Study. There are flooding issues throughout the parish and hopefully this project will alleviate some of the storm surge and riverine issues benefiting specific areas of St. Tammany Parish. I do not want to impede these areas from receiving the help they need. The Feasibility Study benefits Eden Isles area residents with non-structural support recommendations, which is insufficient. Our area needs comprehensive protection since we reside in one of the most vulnerable parts of the parish in regards to storm surge. The cost benefit analysis for this area was flawed.	USACE will continue to work with our state and local partners to address remaining risk for the residents outside of the structural protection. The USACE team followed policy (ER 1150-2-100) for development and cost estimation of the National Economic Plan for St. Tammany Parish.
		Two large areas that are gaps in the USACE plan include the Eden Isles area and the Military Road area. I am grateful for the commitment made by our Congressional Delegation, St. Tammany Parish and the CPRA for a comprehensive flood protection plan for the Eden Isles area to include a breakwater, flood gates, pumping station, road elevations and barriers. I would expect the USACE to support the efforts of CPRA and St Tammany Parish as they progress toward structural flood protection for the Eden Isles area and not hinder any component of this comprehensive plan.	USACE will continue to work with our local and state partners on the coordination of projects for St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana flood risk reduction.
8/29/23	985 Phone number	The levee being proposed will negatively affect so many people. Don't waste our money if you can't protect every resident. Jodie griffin, resident of cross gates subd for 43 years	The USACE team followed policy (ER 1150-2-100) for development of the comprehensive, National Economic Plan for St. Tammany Parish
8/29/23	Jerry Solomon	I am writing to express my grave concerns with my understanding of the latest plans for the proposed hurricane protection levee that would be constructed on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain. I am a resident of the French Branch Estates subdivision located off of Military Road in Slidell, LA. My understanding of the latest plan would have the levee running essentially E/W between Lacombe and Slidell and then turning north and terminating in the general area of the Gause Blvd. and I-10 interchange. This positioning of the levee would leave thousands of homes, businesses, schools, and other buildings on the east side of I-10 unprotected. It could even increase the flooding potential for these excluded buildings by containing any rising seawater in a significantly smaller area. This seems to be an unwise choice. If the eastward run of the levee were continued a relatively short additional distance and then starting the northward turn at a point that would include most, if not all, of the Slidell-East housing and businesses, very few areas would be excluded. It would seem that taking this route, while it would marginally increase the project cost, it might be less expensive when the additional cost of some of the "other measures" are considered. There will also likely be a significant negative impact on other issues such as flood insurance cost and property resale values for excluded property. Please reconsider this plan and institute revisions that would protect most or all of the residential, municipal, and commercial property on the east side of Slidell. Thanks in advance for your thoughtful consideration of my inquiry.	Figure E: 13-6 shows the difference between these two results as a quality check to ensure that differences in the Water Surface Elevation values could be attributed to the presence of the structure (red values indicate an increase, blue values indicate a decrease). Single, known values are used for quality checks of data, but not for formulation. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of Water Surface Elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.

8/30/23	Jenny Brennan	I am a home owner off of Indian Village! I feel that I have no representation in this matter! I feel that we are being discriminated against because we are being left out of the levee plans ! We pay the most taxes in the state but yet are being left out of adequate protection of storm surge and in turn after the levee is built the burden of ALL the surge will be on us!!! I own my home and feel that the value will depreciate!! I do not have the finances to elevate my home! I have already looked into that possibility years ago! I do not understand why you are protecting one area and the detriment of another!	Thank you for your comment. Figure E: 13-6 shows the difference between these two results as a quality check to ensure that differences in the Water Surface Elevation values could be attributed to the presence of the structure (red values indicate an increase, blue values indicate a decrease). Single, known values are used for quality checks of data, but not for formulation. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of Water Surface Elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. We also computed the future conditions out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
8/30/23	Raymon Pierce	I have been reading through some of the material you have posted online at: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/NEPA-Compliance-Documents/Bipartisan-Budget-Act-2018-BBA-18/BBA-18-Projects/St-Tammany-Parish-Feasibility-Study/fbclid/IwAR1LaipXmCBBuenYOZo570-VKGlWNoloeq_hkv2nltNk43_5YJ3LIF2Ngp8/. My home is currently outside of the proposed protection area, and in flood zone AE or a 100 year flood plain. I know with this proposal there are options for raising these structures to potentially mitigate future effects from flooding, however I am concerned. My home was built over 40 years ago in accordance with building codes from that time. While there have been updates, and things like that, it is mostly cosmetic, and likely nothing to bring the house up to today's code. Per Appendix H – Nonstructural Implementation Plan: " The costs that exceed that which is necessary to safely elevate a structure are deemed ineligible costs and any such costs are the sole financial responsibility of the property owner. The following items are ineligible:" "Costs associated with bringing a non-conforming structure into compliance with current building codes, housing codes, and/or other applicable codes;" So does this mean my home is ineligible, or I need to get all of these corrected before hand? Does this mean if work starts and something is discovered, I will be Left with a torn up home until I have the funds to update everything? What about things like sewer drainage under a home? When this neighborhood was built, the sewer pipes under slab were buried, and not required to be hung or affixed to the slab, so raising the slab on any of these houses is going cause an issue where the sewer lines aren't attached per code, and per how the plan is written, the cost of addressing that isn't covered? Where can I find additional information on what this is going to mean for me and my family?	Coordination with the Nonfederal Sponsor, USACE and the homeowner will address each individual structure during Preconstruction, Engineering and Design and handled on a case by case basis.
8/30/23	Marcia Saluga	To whom it may concern: I have lived in Turtle Creek for 27 years and have never flooded. My husband is disabled and homebound. He is in a power chair and we have a lift system for transfers so it is nearly impossible for us to leave. I am deeply concerned that the proposed levy will force water into areas east of Military Road and flood my home. Please reconsider protecting ALL of Slidell, not just a select few areas.	In response to your questions regarding the impacts on your area. The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
8/30/23	Michelle Grout	My name is Michelle Grout, I live at 241 Rue Jonathan in Slidell and have lived in my home for 13 years. I have concerns about my home not being included in the currently proposed levee plan for St. Tammany. I don't understand why our government would build a levee and exclude many of the neighborhoods. I request that the plan be revisited to include all the neighborhoods including French Branch which I live in.	The recommended plan spans the entire parish and includes both the structural levee feature and nonstructural. Even if not in the levee plan structures were considered as part of the nonstructural plan development. The USACE team followed policy (ER 1150-2-100) for development of the comprehensive, National Economic Plan for St. Tammany Parish

8/31/23	El Lamulle, Colonel USA/Ret), President, French Branch Civic Association	I'm against the revised levee plan as published because my entire subdivision is against it. I'm president of the French Branch Subdivision HOA which consists of 303 homes. It would left totally outside the proposed levee as would several other subdivisions and schools etc along Military Road. This amounts to several thousand residents being negatively impacted if the proposed levee is built. Our concern is not only a loss of protection but a negative impact from additional water being channeled to our areas after a major storm. In effect, this would put us in a worst position than we're in right now with no levee. Either do the levee right and protect area subdivisions or don't do it at all!	Comment noted.
		As my local residents realize what is happening with the new Gulf Coast Master Plan of 2023, we feel the need to have our voice heard. Most of our community has concerns regarding the United States Army Corps of Engineering (USACE) St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study: Alignment for East Slidell Optimization plan. We have looked at the whole plan in its entirety, obviously focusing on the Ponchartrain/Breton section. The ridge restoration, marsh creation and barrier island maintenance are wonderful plans. However, your structural risk reduction plan cannot be supported. Rebuilding the wetlands is key. We believe history has shown the difficulty we have had with trying to control the natural flow of our rivers and tidal surge. You divert from one place and it cause unforeseen damage to another. Fanglin Sun and Richard T. Carson, did a research project in 2020 with University of California San Diego titled "Coastal Wetlands Reduce Property Damage during Tropical Cyclones". The study focused on towns in warmer areas, form 1996-2016, 88 hurricanes and 232 counties. As quoted in the study "With coastal areas under increasing threat from more powerful storms due to climate change, it's critical to prevent further destruction of existing wetlands as Wetlands play a critical role in helping to reduce property damage from storms," (Barry, "Lose the Levee and Keep the Wetlands"). Government should also actively seek to restore wetlands that have been lost. Nicholas Printer wrote, "The Problem with Levees" in Scientific American in 2019. This article mainly refers to the all the failed attempts to control the Mississippi River, but it is interesting to see history repeating itself. Our local government is very supportive of this levee. But, these are the same entities who have allowed people to build in areas that should have remained as wetlands, buffer regions, etc. So we cannot support the decisions they are making on our behalf. Let's break this down on a more personal note. My home has been here for 26 years and has never flooded. There are many people in my area that have not flooded either. Some of the people who have flooded were due to the Pearl River rising as the tidal surge pushed water into the river during Hurricane Katrina and have never flooded since that day. The levee will do nothing for this act of nature, but improving our natural buffers will decrease effects of these events.	The Gulf Coast Master Plan for 2023 is a plan from the State of Louisiana. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study followed the Smart Planning regulations for the Army Corps of Engineers for flood risk reduction.
		What the levee does in actuality is allow insurance companies to further discriminate who they will cover. And a wall will be the divide, thus making home values plummet due to lack of affordability of insurance astronomical rates. How is this fair? How do you make the decision to destroy over 5000-6500 people's homes and businesses? In an instant you take away what people have worked for with the stroke of a pen. The homes in these areas range from an average of $ 200,000- 700,000. If this were a majority of low income families would it be treated the same? The middle working class in this country is struggling and just because someone's home may be worth more monetarily than someone else's home doesn't mean they haven't worked or sacrificed to earn it. Although our home should not be our greatest investment according to Warren Buffett, it is for most people. And you will be stealing that from people if this is allowed.	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.

8/31/23	Jerry Reed	Now, let us look at this from “inside the wall” point of view. Will the wall protect me if we have another catastrophic rainfall as in 1995? Are my tax dollars really going to maintaining the levee/wall, pumps and sluice gates? Maybe if the money were placed more on the restoration plans I wouldn’t need to worry about the levee topping during a tidal surge and now I am sitting in a bowl of water. Sound familiar?	The pumps will levee and floodwall system will only be closed, with the pumps running, when there is a threat of a storm event posing a surge risk to the protected area. The purpose of the pumping stations is to drain the interior of the alignment when the line of protection is enclosed. It is anticipated that when the levee and floodwall system is open, water will flow as it does in the future without project condition. Please see section 6 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation for the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor’s (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 “Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors” dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		St Tammany parishioners pay the highest property taxes in the State of Louisiana. We don't think a large portion of your residents want to pay tax dollars to maintain a system that has devalued their homes and cost them an increase in insurance. And only protects the chosen. This statement doesn’t mean we want a levee, it just means that the people out of its protection will have to pay for this and that is injustice. (We also have a high sales tax, 10.25% in some places). One local politician emailed me to say the best option is to raise houses. This is a foolish idea due to cost and feasibility. Some council members thought we should pass this plan with amendments. Tell that Terrebonne Parish residents, where there seems to be a disagreement over levees built by the state, but not certified by the USACE nor approved by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (Boudreaux P2). This is leading to a lot of trouble for the residents. So, we would like to avoid all of their nonsense ideas. But, there is science to back up the downside of levees. Including the socioeconomic impact.	The level of risk reduction provided by the levee will be to the 100 year event and design will meet the criteria for certification.
		Now, let’s look at some of the legal issues. The Flood Control Act of 1928 states that the United States shall not have liability for damage from floods or flood waters. However, that has changed over time. They are not allowing blanket immunity. The Tucker Act directs the U.S. Court of Federal Claims to consider claim for damages that arise under the Constitution, federal law, or contracts with the government. This includes property-related claims brought under the Fifth Amendment. Obviously there is more to all of the legal issues, but there is some form of recourse if people feel they have been treated unjust and leading to property damage, etc. Cases to review would be 2012 Arkansas Game and Fish Commission vs United States, St Bernard Parish vs United States (2018 federal court hearing), and Milton vs United States. Although the verdicts in these cases were mixed results the bottom line is when flowage easement or other property rights exist, Congress cannot supersede right to just compensation in the event of a federal action that takes property rights. This is especially important for the people whose homes/property border the levee/wall (Kristen, Opening the Floodgates). As this letter identify the concerns of the community for building a levee and being left out of the governments Alignment for East Slidell Optimization plan it is our understanding the benefit to rebuild the wetlands that have been destroyed by United States Army Corps of Engineering, hurricanes, coastal erosion, and other human involvement. The rebuilding of the wetlands is the only plan backed up by sound scientific research that our community can bear. "Walls protect and limit. It is the nature of walls that they should fall." (Divergent)	Thank you for the comment

		Tribal and Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis. Pursuant to Section 3.2.2.3.2-Tribal Trust Resources in the EIS, there are six federally-recognized Tribes that have current and/or ancestral interest within the study area: The Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas (ACTT), the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma (CNO), the Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana (CT), the Jena Band of Choctaw Indians (JBCI), the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians (MBCI) and the Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana (TBTL). Each Tribe has a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) who assumes the responsibilities of the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for cultural resources within their Tribal lands and consults with Federal agencies on activities that may impact archaeological sites of interest on or off Tribal lands. The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma has asked to be included as a consulting agency. All entities' input has been sought throughout the planning process in developing alternatives and at Project Delivery Team meetings with USACE staff. The PDT used U.S Census Data to identify areas of EJ concern (minority and low-income communities) within the study area, St. Tammany Parish. For purposes of the EJ analysis, "environmental justice communities" were defined as communities that meet established thresholds for identifying low-income area residents who identify as a person of color, or minority. Recommendations - EPA recommends USACE staff maintain consultation and coordination with all identified federally recognized Tribes as warranted. EPA recommends USACE incorporate a discussion on the demographic area that would or could be adversely impact from induced flooding once Tammany Parish is secured. These areas may be outside of the study area. EPA recommends USACE and all responsible parties ensure minority/low-income populations (Block groups in Figure 3-7 and outside the study area) mitigation which will provided protection of homes and properties, such as raising impacted homes above anticipated flood level (piers) and/or providing a trust to rebuild or repair homes and properties that could be damaged or destroyed due to the proposed project.	CEMVN concurs and will continue to maintain consultation and coordination with all identified federally recognized Tribes as warranted; There are no flooding inducements to structures in areas of EJ concern that are caused by either the South and West Slidell levee or Mile Branch Channel improvement; The NS plan measure does include eligible residential structures in areas of EJ concern. URA benefits will be provided to those impacted by acquisitions and this is discussed in the NS plan and the EJ Section within the main document.
8/31/23	Michael Jansky	The Optimized TSP refers to a variety of construction activities many which are likely to be covered under CWA 404 permitting. However, operators of construction activities who cause earth disturbances outside the jurisdiction of 404 permitting who meet CWA 402 permitting criteria specific to discharging stormwater from construction activities in areas upland from a waterbody and not considered a jurisdictional wetland area, may be required to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit coverage via the Construction General Permit (CGP). The construction activities identified in the 2023 Updated Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and EIS that would require CGP permit coverage include, but are not limited to: - Raising the elevation of 5,583 residential structures and floodproofing of 827 structures, including connecting utility lines and direct impacts to lawns and landscaped areas. - Raising I-10 road surface and construction of road ramps. - Removing material from three borrow sites. Borrow site STP-5 would impact approximately 62 acres, STP-6 would impact less than one acre, and STP-9 would impact approximately 5 acres. - Detention ponds. For CWA 402 permitting, all operators of construction activities causing an earth disturbance of 1 acre or greater, or less than one acre if part of a larger common plan of development or sale, who discharge stormwater from their construction activities and on-site/off-site construction support activities are required to obtain NPDES permit coverage via the CGP or other NPDES permit from the NPDES permitting authority prior to beginning construction activities and construction support activities [40 CFR 122.26(b)(15)(i)]. Because the overall earth disturbance of this project is greater than 1 acre, the larger common plan of development or sale is triggered for any construction activities outside the jurisdiction of CWA 404 permitting. The NPDES permitting authority in Louisiana is the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ). NPDES CGP permit coverage for upland construction activities not covered by 404 permitting must be obtained through the LDEQ. Please provide in the Final EIS an organized table or list of all the required permits that USACE will need to acquire for the proposed project	A discussion was added to Section 8 Clean Water Act regarding Section 402 and our permit requirements under the NPDES program
		Also, we could not locate a table or list of all waterbodies within the project area. For any waters that are listed as "impaired" please highlight those and provide their impairment cause. You can reference Louisiana's 2022 Integrated Report for this information at https://deq.louisiana.gov/page/louisiana-water-quality-integrated-report. If there are any concerns related to water quality and contamination from this project please address them in the Final EIS.	A table of impaired waters impaired waters was added to Section 3, Water Quality
		Mentab, Inc. (Mentab), a corporate entity, along with its respective shareholders, hereby submits this public comment in opposition to the Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan (OTSP) for West Slidell proposed in the St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study – Revised Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (RDIFR-EIS "Report") prepared July 2023 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). We are opposed to the natural environment impacts and the economic and real estate impacts of the proposed levee placement to Mentab's land and other rural land lying between Slidell and Lacombe. Background: The land on which the West Slidell levee ties into high ground is property owned by Mentab. Mentab is a family corporation owning land passed down through family members for over 200 years. The proposed levee in West Slidell - west of Bayou Paquet and south of So. Tranquility Road - runs through the middle of our property. Mentab's property represents approximately 11% or 2 miles of the 18.5 miles of levee and floodwall. Likely, there are no other private landowners whose land is as materially impacted by this levee placement. The levee path, as drawn in both 2021 and 2023, cuts through our land in a line following So. Tranquility Road and CC Road rendering 700 +/- acres of our land on the unprotected side of the levee. In addition, the levee as re-routed in 2023 was placed on top of our existing historical homestead built in 1829. The alignment change which placed the levee on our homesite can be seen by referring to Figure 4-6 page 141 of the Main Report pointed to by the marker labeled "Reroute Alignment in Bayou Paquet Watershed". During the feasibility study process in 2020 and 2021, Mentab was not considered a stakeholder or informed of the numerous alternative paths being drawn through our property. In late July 2021 after the first public comment period, the USACE made a Request of Entry and Mentab became aware of the USACE plans for our private property. We were finally allowed a meeting with the USACE in July 2022. Nevertheless, the USACE has not addressed the ill-advised placement through this rural residential area or the issue of taking our land and the undesired consequences to the land west of the levee in the latest OTSP. The expropriation of our private land is unacceptable when alternative paths including Federal land are available and alternative nonstructural solutions are possible.	USACE CEMVN, and/or the CPRA shall consult with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Tribe(s), and other Consulting Parties, as appropriate, to establish the appropriate level of effort to accomplish an inventory/re-inventory. Efforts may be directed towards the resurvey of previously designated historic properties, per 36 CFR 800.16(l), which have undergone change or lack sufficient documentation, or the survey of new historic properties and/or districts that lack formal designation. The proposed TM will describe the boundaries of the survey area and the data collection method in keeping with SHPO's guidance for surveys which will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.

8/31/23	Leslie Sharkey	Adverse Economic Impact on Mentab Land Value: Our unimproved rural land that does not have major flood issues and which is good land available for future expansion of West Slidell is adversely affected by the proposed levee placement. Notwithstanding the undeniable negative impact of a structural levee on the natural land ecology, a levee in this location will have significant real estate and economic consequences. 80% of our landholdings will forever lie immediately outside the proposed levee system. Insurance on this land will be unobtainable, land resale value will decrease, and the future economic growth of this old established low density residential area with expansion potential in West Slidell will be damaged. The taking of 2 miles or 50 +/- acres of land to construct the levee puts the adjacent 700 acres of Mentab's land (80% of our acreage) out of commerce for St. Tammany Parish future development. It may be the USACE preference to construct the levee in the present alignment, but it does irreparable damage to all landowners' properties south of Highway 190 and west of the proposed levee, rendering that land a flood plain.	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee.
		Comments on Benefit-to-Cost (BCR) Analysis: The cost-benefit analysis (also referred to as the benefit to cost ratio (BCR)) used by the USACE has resulted in an adverse alignment for Mentab. For example, the land and homes west of the levee extending to Lacombe are being 'screened out' because of a low BCR. If this land is not screened out, the levee would not be running through our property. Likewise, throughout the selection process the USACE has avoided placement on Federal Wildlife Refuge Land due to the higher cost of acquiring federal land and mitigation requirements. Table 4-17 on page 142 quantifies the alignment cost impacts to the Refuge and Mitigation. If a levee system ran parallel to the Lake through Federal land, then the levee would not be running through our property. Using parameters such as the BCR may not result in the best placement or meet the intended objectives of the plan for protection. The current placement merely hugs existing homesites on the West Slidell leg as evidenced by the floodwalls placed on the sides of homes at 32365 Bayou Paquet Road, 32271 Dumas Road, 32147 West Doucette Road, and 32060 and 32068 CC Road. It is our opinion that a well thought out placement based on topography has not been achieved in this proposal.	As required by Engineering Regulation 1150-2-100, the USACE team selected the plan that reasonably maximizes net benefits. Should the project be authorized by Congress and funded for Preconstruction Engineering and Design, the full levee alignment will be surveyed and levee alignments may be shifted at that time based on the results of those surveys and additional engineering effort.
		Conclusion: The current West Slidell levee placement, the desire to avoid building on adjacent Federal land, and the USACE's deferral of placement adjustments until the Pre-Construction Engineering and Design (PED) stage, only serves to increase our concern that the USACE is inflexible and resistant to public engagement. Statements regarding public sentiment in West Slidell are misleading in saying that the structural levee is well received in West Slidell. There is an unpredictable reality of levee protection, and of hurricane and storm systems, and of the resulting damage to adjacent property. The impact of surge flooding in Slidell can be as much a result of levee protection across the Lake in New Orleans, or the absence of protection at the Rigolets, as it is of the surge event itself. For this reason, Mentab recommends and supports efforts such as the Lake Pontchartrain Barrier project which aims to protect the entire lake, its ecosystems, and all surrounding parishes. Mentab also recommends and supports increasing natural protections and expending resources for water management – bayou clearing and dredging, channel improvements, culverts, restoration of marshland, etc. - so that placement of a structural levee does not run through this West Slidell area. The cost benefit analysis of using Natural Resources for protection has not been fully considered. There is an opportunity to protect the function and increase the resiliency of the ecosystem in West Slidell to reduce flood damage. For this reason, we recommend that a levee for East and South Slidell be designed separate from the plans for West Slidell.In summary, we strongly oppose the proposed OTSP placement of the West Slidell Levee across our property without our input and without consideration of the environmental and economic impacts to Mentab's property. If a levee is inevitable, we suggest two alignments for consideration in the PED phase. 1. West Slidell to Lacombe along Bayou Paquet Road – starting at Bayou Liberty and Keller Road, run the levee south of Keller Road and then parallel with the Lake south of and in line with Bayou Paquet Road. This levee placement would address the flooding on Bayou Paquet Road and protect residents on Keller Road and Bayou Paquet Road, in addition to the Pine Ridge Subdivision, Mayfield School, and other residents lying west of the OTSP. This placement would also protect future development plans for the North Shore corridor and Lacombe. A levee through Federal Wildlife Refuge Land is possible in this area. 2. The Local Landowner Alternative suggested earlier this year to the USACE – this alternative is the West Slidell 2021 alignment modified for neighbor concerns. The alignment places the levee south of Keller Road on the Refuge border and travels to high ground across the southern border/acreage of Mentab's property turning north on the west side of our property to the west side of the Pine Ridge Subdivision and further as deemed necessary.	Should the project be authorized by Congress and funded for Preconstruction Engineering and Design, the full levee alignment will be surveyed and levee alignments may be shifted at that time based on the results of those surveys and additional engineering effort. Alternatives considered for the project, including the Rigolet's Barrier, and some dredging and marsh construction projects can be seen in Section 4 of the main report. Please see Section 5.1.1.13 of the main report in reference to all historic properties, such as Mentab's in the Bayou Pacquet area. "As such, all field survey, evaluation, and reporting required to make NRHP eligibility determinations for Section 106 compliance would largely be deferred to the PED/Construction phase. If direct adverse effects to cultural resources are identified and cannot be avoided or minimized, such impacts would be mitigated through the procedures outlined in the PA. The PA would then govern the CEMVN's subsequent NHPA compliance efforts and any additional conditions or requirements would be documented at that time."

8/31/23	Jeff Protzel	I am a resident of the Turtle Creek subdivision in East St. Tammany Parish. I want to submit this public comment against the proposed flood protection plan. We are being forced to decide on a plan spending billions of federal dollars to protect areas further north and west of my home. We will indirectly benefit by having the City of Slidell, and associated homes and businesses protected that are inside the levee. However, not only will we not directly benefit from this plan, but we will be harmed in several ways. 1) The plan expects those who live outside of the levee system to flood more frequently and at higher levels..	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are discussed in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		2) We would have to expect our property values to drop as a result of this	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		3) We would have to expect insurance rates to increase as a result of this.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.
		4) The cost benefit analysis that was done, and is the basis for the ACOE's decision to move forward, only included the cost of constructing the levee system and did not consider the cost of #2 and #3 above (since it is not coming out of their funding) and it did not consider the full cost to mitigate those residents and businesses left out of the levee protection system through buy-outs, home and business structure elevations, waterproofing structures, etc. (which at this point is understated in the ACOE plan (6,500 out of 28,000 structures), and we would have to find funding for it elsewhere for the structures that are left out.	USACE followed Engineering Regulation 1150-2-100 for development of the National Economic Development Plan. Structures within the 50 year floodplain are included in the Nonstructural Plan for the STPFS. f authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. Future with project modeling did not show inducements outside of the levee that would add any structures to the plan for mitigation purposes. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.

		5) We should expect St. Tammany taxes to go up in order to pay for the maintenance and repair of the new levee system, which will be turned over to the parish. I do not believe this is an equitable plan for all residents and we should not institute a plan in the interests of getting “something” done, while leaving out a large segment of the population of St. Tammany parish.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor’s (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 “Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors” dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
9/1/23	Joey Breaux	I have no objection or further comment at this time regarding the above referenced project.	Comment noted.
9/1/23	Jeff Orillion	My name is Jeff Orillion. I live at 1115 Zachary Drive in Slidell, LA 70461 in Breckenridge subdivision with my wife Jessica Orillion and our 4 children. We have lived in this house for 8 years. I am writing to share my concern with the Levee planned for Slidell, LA which appears to exclude my personal residence. I am concerned that the project will not protect my home and will in fact increase the risk for flooding. .	In response to your questions regarding the impacts on your area. The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8’, with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8’2” or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I am also concerned that the project will negatively impact the value of my home and increase my insurance costs which are already almost unaffordable.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.
		It seems that the project has not been widely publicized and that you are trying to sneak this past residents. I only heard about this alarming news when I was invited to join the Facebook group – Good Levee for All- Slidell/St Tammany Parish	Reference Appendix C Environmental Annex I Public Involvement for the details regarding public outreach for the STPFS.

		It appears that I would be responsible for upgrading and raising my home at my own expense. That is ridiculous and unreasonable. If the government decides to jeopardize my safety, my home value, and my insurance protection, then the government needs to pay residents that are negatively impacted.	Please see section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
9/1/23	Mark Suckow	It has come to my attention that the local politicians along with the army corp of engineers are proposing to put up a flood levee almost in my back yard in the Slidell area. I live in the French Branch subdivision and after looking at the current proposed flood wall this will put my house just on the outside of the wall. I was very disappointed to find out that apparently this has been a study/plan that has been in the making for the last three years but no one from the St Tammany Parish Council ever bothered to inform us citizens that would be affected. I know if the current plan gets approved and goes through that it would have a negative impact on my house, neighbors, and the rest of our close communities that fall outside of this proposed wall. My house will now be more likely to flood and not to mention that the value of it will most certainly decline. I am a veteran and still proudly serving in the US Air Force for over 30 years and have been fortunate to be able to be stationed close enough to live in this fine community. However, if this proposal goes through, I don't think my family and I would be able to continue to live here. I need a positive piece of mind that we have had for so long living here when I have to deploy or be gone on any exercises for a lengthy period of time. My family and I have lived here since 2002 and I would hate to have to leave this area because of bad bureaucratic decision making. Either figure out a way to include all of the surrounding communities east of I-10 all the way to the Pearl River or don't put this wall up at all. I refuse to send my tax dollars to a project that will only put my home and my community into a negative position. Your current plan will only end up costing people more money and harm for storm repairs if put into effect under the current proposal.	Reference Appendix C Environmental Annex I Public Involvement for the details regarding public outreach for the STPFS. Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3” for 100-year and up to 5” for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2” for 100-year and up to 4”). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets.

9/1/23	Michael Hopkins, Coastal & Community Program Director, Pontchartrain Conservancy	At Pontchartrain Conservancy (PC), our mission is to drive environmental sustainability and stewardship through scientific research, education, and advocacy. PC's policies and advocacy are grounded in science and it is for this reason, we respectfully urge you to consider the following recommendations for the revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study. With a stated goal of developing alternatives "to reduce flood damages caused by hurricane and rainfall events," modeling used to assess flood risk is the lens through which all the decisions made in the Revised St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) are viewed. After reviewing the updated DEIS, we have concluded that PC still cannot support the Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) at this time. The primary concern with the study remains and is focused on the disconnect between riverine and rainfall modeling and the coastal flooding models. This disconnect generates a significant mischaracterization of the extent of flooding on the landscape and cannot be ignored. The main concern that PC has with the feasibility study is that flood levels are underestimated for all return periods modeled. This feasibility study analyses riverine and surge models separately; however, it must be stressed that this disconnect could have serious consequences. USACE even acknowledges this point in Appendix E – Hydrologic & Hydraulics – Section 4.4.2.1 Coincidence of Rainfall and Surge Page 21. The primary issue here is a potential underestimation of flood levels for the individual return periods. This uncertainty needs to be addressed not only to ensure the accuracy of, and thusly confidence in, the study, but also because of the TSP's heavy reliance on non-structural work in the project area. It must be made clear that any and all structures raised will be assessed using a combination of both surge and riverine/rainfall contributions. If that is not the case, home and business owners must be made fully aware of their specific and individual risks before they agree to participate in the voluntary non-structural program. PC believes it is the responsibility of USACE to bring clarity to the communities across St. Tammany or risk potentially damaging those relationships in the future. PC initially recommended (in our letter dated July 23, 2021) that one way to combine the surge and riverine/rainfall models was to include surge as a boundary condition of the HEC-RAS models for the various return periods. This was not done. However, USACE did include elevated Lake Pontchartrain water level in the boundary conditions to account for future sea level rise. This is elaborated on in Appendix E Page 21-22. If sea level rise can be included as a boundary condition to examine future flooding risk, then so can water elevations from storm surge derived from ADCIRC models. We respectfully ask that USACE include the additional models or provide evidence and elaborate on the specific uncertainties related to underestimated flood levels in each watershed for every return period modeled.	Per section 4.4.2.1 - Coastal flooding damage was analyzed separately from the rainfall and river-based flood damage. Rainfall associated with tropical cyclones is not modeled within ADCIRC, which may result in underestimated flood levels and damages by some amount. The uncertainty associated with degree of coincidence between local rainfall, regional river flooding and coastal storm surges, is consistent across all the study alternative areas. For this analysis, it was assumed that local rainfall with regional river flooding is independent of, or non-coincident with coastal storm surges.
9/1/23	Kristy Neal	I am greatly concerned that the proposed levees will not protect all of the homes in the area. This will make flooding in my area more prevalent. My neighbors and I live in homes which flooded twice in 2021. We are already so vulnerable to flooding that anything that will make flooding worse in this area is a grave concern for us. I don't understand this plan. It doesn't seem to do anything to help protect the most vulnerable in the area. The Corp's job is to protect people, I thought, not increase the chances of our flooding. What will we do? Our homes will be worth absolutely nothing. We have worked hard all of our lives to be able to have a nice home, and this proposal really scares us. I thank you for your time in reading this,	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. Structures outside of the levee and floodwall system, that lie within the 50 year floodplain, will be eligible to be raised under the Nonstructural portion of the plan.
9/1/23	Craig Flucke	Another disastrous plan from USACE. Diversions and levees will be the birth of man made disasters and flood events in subdivisions where there has been NO FLOODING to date. One needs to look no further than Laplace, LA for the kind of results eastern Slidell can look forward to from this plan. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. This plan delivers more problems than solutions. Levees to keep water out of areas that don't currently flood will result in trapped water inside the levee system and CAUSE FLOODING. Now along with screwing the home owners outside of the levees, which are some of the most affluent subdivisions in Slidell, you are also screwing the people inside the levees where it currently DOES NOT FLOOD from rivers or lakes or the Gulf. Having been a resident of Slidell for 22 years now I can tell you that the Palm Lake and Bayou Liberty area floods from the lake, not the Military rd area. Leave us out of your plan.	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. Structures outside of the levee and floodwall system, that lie within the 50 year floodplain, will be eligible to be raised under the Nonstructural portion of the plan.
9/1/23	Diane Douglas	I reside in Turtle Creek subdivision, Slidell, LA in the Parish of St Tammany. The way I understand the current revised plan, I would not be protected by the project. I live too close to the West Pearl and I ask that you reconsider plans for East Slidell to include subdivisions along the Military Road in Slidell. I did flood for Hurricane Katrina, although it was only a few inches. I do not want to do that again!	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. Structures outside of the levee and floodwall system, that lie within the 50 year floodplain, will be eligible to be raised under the Nonstructural portion of the plan.

9/1/23	Johnny Rayner	I'm being told of this levee is approved I'll have to raise my home to be up to code. This cant be true?	Preliminary eligibility criteria are included in Appendix H, Nonstructural Implementation Plan. Participation would be voluntary.
9/1/23	Lisa Aldridge	I live in a subdivision off of Military Road and am not included in the proposed levee system. My address is 506 Winbourne Drive, Slidell, LA 70461. I am very concerned that the proposed corps project will negatively impact my home and my neighbors' homes as the location of the levee will cause water to be deferred from protected neighborhoods and flow into our neighborhood. Since the job of the corps is to protect all of the people and this proposal does not protect all of the people, I feel the decisions made concerning locations of the levee are unjust and unfair. The proposed levee and flood wall alignments will cause flooding in our area. I do not understand nor agree with the proposal concerning the levee system where a large portion of the city will be left out of the system. I am a tax payer of the parish yet I will not benefit from the taxes paid towards the enhancement of current levees and building of new levees. I have lived in Slidell all of my life and would hate to have to move because of the location of the levees and the increase risk for flooding in my neighborhood. I feel certain if this plan comes to fruition I will be forced to move. And I also feel strongly that my home value, along with all others in my neighborhood, will decrease significantly in value. I do not see how your decisions made about the levee will protect me and my ability to stay in my home and in my neighborhood. This is not an example of the corps protecting the people.	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. Structures outside of the levee and floodwall system, that lie within the 50 year floodplain, will be eligible to be raised under the Nonstructural portion of the plan.
		The St. Tammany Levee District's initial meeting on this subject roughly 3 years ago and again the one last Wednesday where they discussed the ACOE flood protection plan for the south Slidell area. This proposed plan did not change significantly in that time, Although, they did do several feasibility studies during that time. Unfortunately, the reality of living in the Military Road area of Slidell is that the current belief of the various parties studying the issue of flooding in our area is that any affordable plan for levee construction to protect those of us in a Military Road Subdivision, would also destroy the wetlands. So, we are forced to decide on a plan spending billions of federal dollars to protect areas further north and west of us. We will indirectly benefit by having the City of Slidell, businesses, friends and relatives that are inside the levee, protected. However, not only will we not directly benefit from this plan, but WE WILL BE HARMED in several ways. Our area is one of the few areas that pay the higher taxes in in East St. Tammany! But where is our protection. 1) The plan expects those who live outside of the levee system to flood more frequently and at higher levels.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		2) We would have to expect our property values to drop as a result of this. This is NOT something a new widowed person wants to see! WE ARE ONE OF THE AREAS IN EAST ST. TAMMANY PAYING HIGHER TAXES!	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.

9/1/23	Chenee Roheim	3. We would have to expect insurance rates to increase as a result of this. Again not something a new widowed person wants to see!	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.
		4) The cost benefit analysis that what was done, and is the basis for the ACOE's decision to move forward, only included the cost of constructing the levee system and did not consider the cost of #2 and #3 above (since it is not coming out of their funding) and it did not consider the full cost to mitigate those residents and businesses left out of the levee protection system through buy-outs, home and business structure elevations, waterproofing structures, etc. (which at this point is understated in the ACOE plan (6,500 out of 28,000 structures), and we would have to find funding for it elsewhere for the structures that are left out)	USACE followed Engineering Regulation 1150-2-100 for development of the National Economic Development Plan. Structures within the 50 year floodplain are included in the Nonstructural Plan for the STPFS. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. Future with project modeling did not show inducements outside of the levee that would add any structures to the plan for mitigation purposes. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		5) We should expect St. Tammany taxes to go up in order to pay for the maintenance and repair of the new levee system, which will be turned over to the parish. Will the parish place these funds where they need to be placed. Will we end up like Orleans Parish i.e. Lakeview? As a young widowed person with two children it is again something, I don't want to hear: TAX INCREASE I wish I could support this plan because I would like to see those people in the protected areas benefit, but the cost to those thousands of residents who are left out is just too much. I am against supporting this plan.	See section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation of the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
9/1/23	Richard Graham (Adele Graham)	THE PLAN LOOKS GOOD EXCEPT FOR THE EXTENDED TIME DUE TO BUDGET CONSTRAINTS, WE LIVE ON THE RIVER SIDE OF SOUTH MILITARY ROAD AND CLOSE TO US 190; SO WE ARE INTERESTED IN OURS FIRST, NATURALLY. THE PLAN RIGHTLY POINTS OUT THAT NO ONE IS COMPLY COVERED UNTIL IT IS FINISHED,	Thank you for the comment.

9/1/23	Jean-Paul & Tina Sandrock	We are concerned that the proposed Corps of Engineers project will not protect our house or our neighbor's houses. The job of the Corps is to protect people and this does not protect us. We have already experienced an increase in water on our property due to hurricanes since the completion of the Chalmette levee. This current proposal is not only going to create more flooding in our area but is also going to devalue our property.	USACE followed Engineering Regulation 1150-2-100 for development of the National Economic Development Plan. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. Future with project modeling did not show inducements outside of the levee that would add any structures to the plan for mitigation purposes. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
9/1/23	Don and ChrisAnn McKinney	We are writing to you after reviewing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's JULY 2023 Revised Draft St. Tammany Parish Integrated Feasibility Report & Environmental Impact Statement. We are residents of St. Tammany Parish and live in Slidell, LA in the Turtle Creek neighborhood off of Military Road. Our home address is referenced below. We are very concerned that this proposed flood protection project 1) will not protect our house and our neighbors' houses in the Turtle Creek neighborhood and 2) could increase the risk for flooding and the loss of property in our area. As of this date, there are currently 323 homes in the Turtle Creek neighborhood with 88 additional homes to be built in our subdivision in the next development phase. We have lived in our home for 23 years and have never flooded. However, there were homes in the Turtle Creek neighborhood that did flood during Hurricane Katrina so the neighborhood is very susceptible to flooding. If the flood wall is built as proposed, the Turtle Creek subdivision along with several other subdivisions, the two public elementary schools (Cypress Cove and Honey Island), and numerous businesses off of Military Road will be on the wrong side of the flood wall and outside the protected area. As a result, we fear if the proposed flood wall is built that during a hurricane/tropical storm there will be an increased risk for flooding as more water will flow towards us than before the flood wall was built.	USACE followed Engineering Regulation 1150-2-100 for development of the National Economic Development Plan. Structures within the 50 year floodplain are included in the Nonstructural Plan for the STPFS. f authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. Future with project modeling did not show inducements outside of the levee that would add any structures to the plan for mitigation purposes. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		We are also very concerned if this proposed project is implemented, we 3) will experience a significant decrease in our home's market value and an increase in our flood insurance premiums. In summary, we think this proposed project will cause more harm. Please reconsider.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/1/23	Marissa Jimenez	Letter of No Objection. •If your project results in a discharge to waters of the state, submittal of a Louisiana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (LPDES) application may be necessary. •If the project results in a discharge of wastewater to an existing wastewater treatment system, that wastewater treatment system may need to modify its LPDES permit before accepting the additional wastewater; •All precautions should be observed to control nonpoint source pollution from construction activities. LDEQ has stormwater general permits for construction areas equal to or greater than one acre. It is recommended that you contact the LDEQ Water Permits Division at (225) 219-3590 to determine if your proposed project requires a permit.;•If your project will include a sanitary wastewater treatment facility, a Sewage Sludge and Biosolids Use or Disposal Permit is required. An application form or Notice of Intent will need to be submitted if the sludge management practice includes preparing biosolids for land application or preparing sewage sludge to be hauled to a landfill. Additional information may be obtained on the LDEQ website at https://deq.louisiana.gov/page/sewage-biosolids or by contacting the LDEQ Water Permits Division at (225) 219- 3590.; •If any of the proposed work is located in wetlands or other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, you should contact the Corps directly regarding permitting issues. If a Corps permit is required, part of the application process may involve a water quality certification from LDEQ. ; •All precautions should be observed to protect the groundwater of the region. ; •Please be advised that water softeners generate wastewaters that may require special limitations depending on local water quality considerations. Therefore if your water system improvements include water softeners, you are advised to contact the LDEQ Water Permits to determine if special water quality-based limitations will be necessary.; •Any renovation or remodeling must comply with LAC 33:III.Chapter 28, Lead-Based Paint Activities; LAC 33:III.Chapter 27, Asbestos-Containing Materials in Schools and State Buildings (includes all training and accreditation); and LAC 33:III.5151, Emission Standard for Asbestos for any renovations or demolitions.; •If any solid or hazardous wastes, or soils and/or groundwater contaminated with hazardous constituents are encountered during the project, notification to LDEQ's Single-Point-of-Contact (SPOC) at (225) 219-3640 is required. Additionally, precautions should be taken to protect workers from these hazardous constituents.; •Water Planning and Assessment Division comments/recommendations; •We agree with the recommendations contained in Appendix C – Annex F - ESA Phase I Report Based on the environmental records review and site visits, there is a probability of encountering potential hazardous, toxic, or radioactive waste (HTRW) within the mile branch waterway. Right of Entry (ROE) will be needed of the entire St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study Right of Way (ROW) to fully determine the extent of HTRW. It is therefore necessary that further environmental assessment of the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study ROW once ROE is obtained.; •If the project will involve the disturbance of any soils in former UST areas which may exceed the Screening Option Standards established by the LDEQ Risk Evaluation/Corrective Action Program (RECAP) Regulation, these materials may be considered a waste and disposed of at a permitted facility, or might be managed as part of a Solid Waste Beneficial Use or Soil Reuse Plan in accordance with LAC 33:VII.Chapter 11. Alternately, a site-specific RECAP Evaluation might be conducted and submitted to the LDEQ.; •If any underground storage tanks are encountered during the project, they must be in compliance with the regulations found in LAC 33:XI of the Environmental Regulatory Code. If any contaminated soil or groundwater is encountered, the findings should be reported to LDEQ.	Noted. No response is required. Best management practices will be followed and applicable coordination with LDEQ will occur if it becomes necessary
9/2/23	Wayne Brown	I live at 121 Rue Holiday, in French Branch Subdivision of East Slidell, LA, of which a significant portion was flooded by Hurricane Katrina in 2005. If I am interpreting the proposed Slidell Levee System map correctly, it appears that French Branch Subdivision is excluded from the proposed levee protection system.	This area is outside of the structural measure, but included in the nonstructural plan.
9/2/23	Bob Goodwin	I want to thank you for everything you are doing. I have been attending these meetings for 2 years. The levee will have a positive effect on our subdivision, Coin du Lestin. It's amazing the negativity coming from the uninformed public. I for one am not one of them. Keep up the good work.	Comment noted.
9/2/23	Gayle Klein	Shared Note blocked by Security	Comment noted.
9/2/23	Emerson Loga	My name is Emerson P. Loga IV. I am a current resident of Turtle Creek subdivision. My address is 134 Ayshire Ct, Slidell, LA 70461. I am writing this email to express my concerns with the St. Tammany Levee Project. The large number of homes excluded from levee protection concerns me. I do not wish for the value of my property to decrease. Also, I am worried about the negative impact this will cause me financially due to the possible increase in cost of my flood insurance. I would like USACE to consider one of the alternative plans which include protections for the homes west of Military road.	Reference Section 4.2 of the main report for documentation regarding the investigation into structural protection in the area of Military Road. While the structural measures for the area were screened, the area is eligible for consideration in the Nonstructural Plan. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
9/2/23	John Champaign	I want to voice my opposition to the proposed levee protection for Slidell, it will place many homes and businesses outside the levee protection wall to increased chances of flooding from storms if constructed. Either expand the wall to include a more of the unprotected area or don't build it all.	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. Structures outside of the levee alignment that are within the 50 year floodplain are preliminarily eligible for the Nonstructural Plan.
9/2/23	Helene Tate	I attended the public meeting in Slidell, LA on 8/15/23. While there were multiple displays of maps showing potential placement of the proposed levee, there were no maps that showed the 5 potential borrow sites for the required 7,079,000 cubic yards of fill. Additionally, there was no verbal mention of borrow sites in the ACE presentation. I have reviewed the STP Feasibility Study and have attached copies of pages from that report concerning the borrow sites; specifically the expansion of borrow site STP-9, Robert Road Detention Pond, which borders my home and property. I respectfully request to be contacted and provided more sufficient information prior to the October 2023 finalized report.	At this time, this is all of the borrow site information we have available. Further information on borrow sites and the real estate actions that are required for borrow would be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design, if Congress gives us additional Authorization and Funding.

9/3/23	Nancy Jones	Please do not do this plan. It will hurt my house in turtle Creek! I did not flood in Katrina, but this new plan will make me flood. Please include my neighborhood in the flood protection plan! Nancy Jones 117 Ayshire Ct. Slidell, LA 70461	In response to your questions regarding the impacts on your area. The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		We are writing to you today in regard to the St Tammany Parish Levee Project. We live at 126 Rue Holiday in French Branch Estates. To date we and several others around us and in Holiday Acres have not flooded. We fear that due to these changes, our homes will take on flood water. If this occurs, it would be reasonable to think that it is due to the changes made by this project. We are retired tax paying citizens and not able to pay to bring our home up to code (built in 1985) and not able to assume an SBA loan to make us whole again. What compensation will be provided to us as a result of these changes? Speaking of tax paying citizens, we understand that a millage will be necessary to maintain this levee. We cannot imagine that we would be asked to approve a millage for something that would not only not protect us but more clearly would inundate us.	Reference Section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		In the last couple of days, we along with a few other concerned residents in French Branch have canvassed this neighborhood informing folks of this project. Very few people knew anything about it and all were horrified to learn of it. We found out about it on the afternoon of the meeting held at the auditorium on August 23, 2023. Our face book group Good Levee for All – Slidell/St Tammany Parish has been overwhelmed with concerned residents from other affected subdivisions.	Comment noted.
	John and	As we went door to door, it was evident that the homes that were raised in French Branch were difficult to access due to the number of steps involved to reach the doors. This made us realize the need for elevators for the elderly and especially the disabled to be able to come and go from their homes. Many residents in here are older now having enjoyed living here for a long time. For us, it has been 32 years. What compensation will be provided for this?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.

9/3/23	Debbie Foster	We understand a possible solution would be to explore the Railroad option. Raising the tracks, widening them and extending them from Slidell to Mobile might be a better option increasing commerce and not negatively impacting our friends in neighboring states. Hwy 190 to Bait Shop, then up Military Road to power line and power line to the river? Have these options been studied?	Using the railroad from Slidell to Mobile was not studied as a part of the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. A complete list of all considered measures is available in Section 2 of Appendix B: Plan Formulation.
		Regarding loss of property value and insurability – Please tell us what your study indicates our property value loss and insurance rate increases to be? How and where will this water be diverted? Will we even be able to get insurance? How will you compensate us for these matters? Will you confirm that your plan is in fact to go through Holiday Acres and French Branch neighborhoods with this levee as indicated on your map?	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		Regarding potential impact, please tell us how this project will negatively affect the Military Road area at 5 feet, 10 feet, 15 feet, 20 feet of surge and in what areas? How will our home be affected at 13 feet elevation?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		We respectfully request you go back to the table to devise a better plan that protects all in this area. Our understanding is that this plan not only leaves out residents but also schools, churches, hospital, doctors and many businesses. How can this be a feasible plan we wonder when it will negatively impact so many? Surely there must be other options? Thank you for your consideration in this very important and deeply concerning matter.	A complete list of all considered measures is available in Section 2 of Appendix B: Plan Formulation. The screening process is also documented in Appendix B. A combination of a structural feature and nonstructural for the rest of the parish was determined to be the National Economic Development Plan for the area, in accordance with Engineering Regulation 1150-2-100.
	Kim Tate	My name is Kim Tate and I own the home/property located at 932 9th Street in Slidell, La 70458. My property line abuts the Robert Road Detention Pond, also known as STP-9. I have plans to build an outdoor kitchen and equipment shelter near my property line. Please contact me and let me know if the enlargement of the Robert Road Detention Pond will interfere with my plans. I can be reached via email (kimmtate@hotmail.com) or mobile phone (5048133126).	In a phone call on 25 SEP 23 and by email on 05 Sep 23 : "At this time, this is all of the borrow site information we have available. Further information on borrow sites and the real estate actions that are required for borrow would be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design, if Congress gives us additional Authorization and Funding."
		We are writing to express our specific concerns, questions and suggestions for consideration regarding the St. Tammany Levee Project and the proposed protection wall. It is truly unfortunate that many of us in this community knew nothing of this plan before a couple of weeks ago. Although we are not totally aware of the specific details of all of the Corp plans, it has been enough to instill fear in our daily lives. Many of the families in our community have lived here since the subdivision inception. They built their dream homes over 40 years ago and looked forward to a long life in this beautiful area. Although we moved here after our home was flooded in St. Bernard Parish with 12 feet of water in Katrina, we thought that this area would be safe and serve our family well for the remainder of our lives. We ask that the Corp consider the following overwhelming impacts on our future. 1.Financial Impact: Most of us have invested substantial money in improvements to our homes over the years. These improvements will be worthless if the wall is built and we will not recoup our investment on resale. We may not be able to sell our home at all when this wall is completed. Once the plans are finalized, our property values will be dramatically affected. Our homes may not even sell for one-third of the present value. This diminished value, if we can sell, will not allow us to purchase similar homes elsewhere. We will also incur expensive moving costs not considered in our retirement funds.	Comment noted

9/3/23	Steven and Katherine Vicknair	2. Insurance Impact: We are quite certain that both homeowners and flood insurance premiums will dramatically increase, assuming we are able to obtain these policies at all. We read a news article this morning that most insurance companies are considering not insuring homes in flood prone, storm prone areas.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.
		3. Impact of Considering Home Elevation: We purposely purchased a one story home because we did not want to climb stairs in our retirement years. It is our understanding that the process is very expensive and could take years to finalize. One of our neighbors stated that he finally started work on his elevation after 7 years of frustration. The paperwork to qualify for the grants, as well as the extensive rules and regulations that must be followed, would be overwhelming. We would also have to incur the costs of relocating while the elevations are done and bear the costs of storing all of our furniture while the work is done.	If the project is authorized and funded by Congress, participation in the home-raising program would be voluntary. If eligibility and other criteria are met and a homeowner chooses to participate, the cost of raising the residence would be paid for by the project.
		4. Emotional Impact: As previously mentioned, many of us are above retirement age. The emotional strain, just within the last few weeks of learning of this, has initiated gut wrenching thoughts as to our future. The depression and thoughts about our future have impacted our feelings in ways that many cannot imagine. Starting over when you are 70 plus years of age is a lot to bear.	Comment noted.
		1. We have been advised that there is an excellent plan using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier. We have also heard that CSX railroad is in favor of the plan. We do not know how extensive this plan has been studied, but we are told that it would save most of the homes now in jeopardy. Can you please advise why this plan was not seriously considered?	CEMVN did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. Documentation of that effort can be found in section 2 of Appendix B: Plan Formulation. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community alone. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
		2. Ninety percent of our neighbors did not know anything about this proposed wall. It has been a shock to most. We feel we did not have adequate time to digest this and look for alternatives. We have been advised that preliminary work has already started. Is this true?	A public notice and media announcement were made on 21 July 2023 announcing the 45-day public comment period and public hearings. The public involvement report is included in Appendix C. If the project is authorized and funded by Congress additional design would be conducted prior to any construction beginning.
		3. Would you please give us an approximate time line as to when the actual wall will be started and when it is estimated it will be completed?	If the Chief of Engineers recommends the project to Congress and if Congress authorizes and funds the project, the earliest potential receipt of funding would be 2027. Construction is estimated to take 12 years
		Recommendations: 1. A total buyout by the federal government including relocation costs should be approved. We understand that the government has done this before. Buyouts should be approved using fair market value from 2021 home values as this is when the project was started. While we absolutely do not want to give up our home, a quick buyout would certainly lessen the emotional stress this has brought.	Buyouts are not part of the Recommended Plan.

		Recommendations: If elevations are our only option, FEMA rules should be eliminated. All costs should be paid by the federal government, including storing furniture and relocation expenses while the home is being raised. A time line, on contract, should be required in order to insure timely completion of the project.	USACE does not have authority to eliminate or alter FEMA's rules.
9/3/23	James Pear	The recommended alternative benefits twenty five percent of the parish structures and residents while seventy five percent will have no direct benefit. In fact, many of the seventy five percent will be negatively impacted by the combination of induced flooding risk outside the levees, disruptions during the construction phase, rising insurance rates or inability to obtain insurance in unprotected areas and the resulting drop in property values. The same seventy five percent will be asked to pay for the project through a combination of federal, state and local taxes while enduring a reduced quality of life during the construction phases. Levee construction including 3 levee lifts will be ongoing through most of the project timeline (2025-2076) with home raising projects over a best-case twelve-year period.	Comment noted.
		I am also concerned that weighting of project selection criteria to screen alternatives is not transparent. Benefit to cost ratios seems to be a major criterion to select final alternatives. The alternative of raising homes has by far the best Benefit to cost ratio, double that of the levee system. The nonstructural home raising plan ratio is the highest even with a cost per structure $300,000+, which is significantly higher than current costs advertised by local house raising companies. However alternative two of parish wide home raising was eliminated because it did not meet other project objectives which apparently had more weighting than the B/C ratio. Alternative one (Do nothing) was rejected for the entire parish yet seventy five percent of the parish will by default will fall under this, with the added negative benefits I previously mentioned.	Risk reduction for the Parish was determined according to USACE policy for feasibility studies and the requirements for Federal investment.
		Another area of concern is regarding future communication plans. Despite what is indicated in the report, I believe many of the residents of the Parish were not aware of the project. I am sure there are multiple reasons why and I have no interest in finger pointing. Many of us in the Parish will need to make future decisions on where to live due to climate change and coastal issues regardless. However, this project will add an additional layer of complexity and uncertainty to those decisions. I sincerely hope that key information including detailed project timelines and work plans showing where and when specific neighborhoods will be impacted will be communicated in a timely fashion so it can be incorporated into our personal decisions regarding our properties. The current project timelines included in Appendix D- Annex 11 are inadequate.	Thank you for the comment. If the Chief of Engineers recommends the project to Congress and if Congress authorizes and funds the project, the earliest potential receipt of funding would be 2027. Construction is estimated to take 12 years. Requested details would be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design prior to any construction.
		This project if approved will forever change the parish. It is a complex long-term project with many uncertainties. As most projects of this nature, there will be benefits but also unforeseen and unintended consequences. It will shape where people reside in the parish of if they stay in the parish at all. I am fortunate that I will have the means to relocate but many will not. I hope decision makers for the project fully understand the impact and implications for the entire parish and keep the greater good in mind.	Thank you for expressing your concerns
		My name is Pauline Gay. I live at 147 Rue Charlemagne in the French Branch Subdivision. I have lived in my home for over 40 years. I want to make sure I am on public record with the federal government with regard to my opposition to the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project. I just recently became aware of the nature of this project when I attended the 8/23/23 meeting where the proposed project was discussed and the plan was approved by the Levee Board. I, like a majority of the attendees, expressed deep concern that the French Branch and Military Road areas were being excluded from the protection leaving us more vulnerable than ever before. My home flooded in both May 1995 and during Katrina. Some of my major concerns are as follows: a. Loss of property value: Many of the residents of the French Branch neighborhood are long-time residents and are retired or are nearing retirement. Their home is one of their major assets. This increased vulnerability to flooding is sure to cause emotional and financial distress to them.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		b. Increase in insurance costs: Our insurance is already very costly and is sure to increase exponentially since we will be outside the protected area. Even worse yet, we may not even be able to purchase coverage.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		c. Impact on the excluded population: It has been estimated that 25,000 people and 500 businesses will be impacted. We also know that our hospital and many of our schools, churches, and doctors' offices will be affected.	Thank you for expressing your concerns. Impacts to residents and businesses are discussed in Section 5.

9/3/23	Pauline Gray	d. Increased taxes to cover maintenance of the levees: Will I be expected to pay for this when I am outside the protected area????	Reference section 6 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		Additional questions: a. What consideration has been given to adequately compensate individuals affected by the exclusion? (Full upfront coverage of home elevation costs and total buyout @2021 market value)	Please see section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement.
		Have any alternative considerations been given to help protect our citizens in the excluded area? (Acceleration and improvement of the Fritchie Marsh Restoration, collaboration with DOTD and CPRA to explore surge mitigation, and consideration of alternative levee sites)	Please reference Section 4.4 of the Main Report for the efforts made at alternative levee alignments for the West/South Slidell levee. The Fritchie Marsh Restoration is in progress under a different Authority. We will continue to coordinate with our Nonfederal Sponsor (CPRAB) and the local governments on projects not selected in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study.
9/3/23	Betty Guillot	My name is Betty Guillot. My husband, Don Guillot, and I are Homeowner in French Branch Subdivision, Slidell, La. My address is 271 Rue Piper. Can you tell me if my property is protected from future hurricanes, in your proposed study? Or will we be negatively affected by the proposed levee direction you will be sending the floods. My neighbors are also concerned and talking about the Project leaving out Military Road area. Any information you can send to us would be appreciated. Let me know.	Thank you for the comment. The address provided is outside of the current levee alignment. Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets.
	Sue Gibbs	The Bayou Liberty Association (BLA) Board cautiously supports the Updated USACE Saint Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. The Board fully understands that this is a multifaceted two-phase project that significantly impacts the environment and water flow in the Bayou Liberty Watershed. The Board also appreciates that not all members of the Association may be in agreement with this position. The current areas of concern are listed below. These matters have been repeatedly communicated to principals within the USACE and the St. Tammany Levee, Drainage, and Conservation District (STLDCD) 1) Current levee alignments submitted, which intersect the Bayou Liberty watershed remain unacceptable, each for a variety of reasons. The BLA Board recommends the levee alignment trek further West onto the Big Branch National Wildlife Reserve. This latter endorsed alignment reduces floodgate numbers, pump stations, future maintenance, and thereby costs. It results in more private property protection as well as less private property destruction. Finally, it is far more aesthetically pleasing to the area.	Chapter 4 of the main report outlines the plan formulation process, screening of measures and identification and selection of the recommended plan

9/3/23	Sue Gibbs; William Newton; Brenda Case; Donna McDonald; Lee and Catherine Domangue; Donald McDonald; Charlotte Collins	2) The height limitation for the proposed Bayou Liberty floodgate is problematic. Two large, well-established marinas (Bonfouca, Foggy Waters) are located upstream. Both marinas house vessels supporting superstructures that exceed the height limit of 22.8'. All sailing vessels would be precluded from accessing and mooring at these facilities. Sailboat masts frequently exceed 45'. On behalf of these marinas and residents possessing such vessels who reside upstream, BLA insists on floodgate designs with no height ¬¬ limitation. Acceptable opening design options include a dual or single slide, and/or a swing open gate(s). The Board suggests that similar concerns may exist on other waterways affected by this project. Lastly, de-snagging, clearing trees, and removing dangerous structures that impede navigation often require barges, tugboats, and equipment that exceed the specified height limitation.	Page 108 of the Appendix D: Hydrologic and Hydraulics discusses the gate sizing. The engineers started with the data set they had available for current channel dimensions. Then they completed modeling efforts to appropriately size the gates to maintain existing water flows. Table E: 14-1 in that appendix details the minimum gate width. The lift gate was selected for this location with engineering and environmental considerations in mind. Other considerations down the line that could affect the gate designs would be surveys of the channels, additional hydraulic modeling, environmental considerations, and coordination with the Coast Guard. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		3) The BLA Board realizes many of our concerns about the proposed engineering and design elements cannot be addressed at this stage of development. We continue to make those concerns known and respectfully request to be fully involved in all public input aspects, including meetings and public comment periods, assuming the project advances into the Preconstruction, Engineering, and Design (PED) stage.	Comment noted.
		4) The BLA strongly urges the USACE and STLDCD to pursue initiatives outside this limited feasibility study. These include, but are not limited to, marsh restoration and preservation; along with assessing long-term plans such as constructing flood barrier control measures at both Passes of Lake Pontchartrain.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community alone. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
9/3/23	Ehren Malone	I am writing regarding the proposed levee in St Tammany Parish—specifically Slidell. I live near Military Road. My husband and I just built a beautiful wheelchair accessible home in The Landings (he is a wheelchair user). I am very concerned about my area of town being excluded from the levee plan. This is will increase the chance that our neighborhood would flood (the water has to go somewhere if it is deterred by a wall). Here are the potential impacts to our family: 1.If our home were to flood, it would be VERY difficult for us to relocate during repairs —we searched for a wheelchair accessible rental when we built this house and were not able to find any. 2.Elevating our home is not feasible. Of course, there are options for a ramp or elevator, but both options make my husband less independent and would cause a financial burden for upkeep. 3.I'm concerned about the financial impacts to us with the shift in our property value and flood insurance. 4.My daughter's school will also be in an area outside of the flood protection. This is quite concerning to me that if we had a flood event we would be displaced and so would the school operations.	Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4"). The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. Accessibility is addressed in section 3.4 of the Implementation Plan. If a property owner and/or the property owner's family member or other person or tenant, who is a current occupant of the structure at the time of scheduling elevation of the structure, is physically disabled or has mobility impairments, such as in the case of elderly homeowners, special access improvements (e.g., elevators, lifts, ramps, etc.) may be an eligible cost.
		My name is Walt Cleighton and I have lived in Slidell, LA for 43 years, and at my current home for 33 years. In all of those years, I've only flooded once, and that was a direct result of Hurricane Katrina. In fact, on May 7th and 8th, 1995 this area received more than twenty-five inches of rain which fell in a twenty four hour period. My house did not flood. Specifically, this latest plan does NOT provide any structural flood risk reduction system protections for the vast majority of the area east and south of I-10 (Military Road). This area represents approximately 25,000 residents, over 500 businesses, two schools, a fire station, and an electrical sub-station. This excluded demographic is roughly equal in size to the City of Slidell which is included in the current protection proposal. This current plan will cause major harm to the residents and business of the Military Road area. Since the residents living in the Military Road exclusion area are also tax payers, don't they deserve the same level of protection as all other residents of the Parish. What are the reasons this area is excluded?	Refer to Section 4.4.2 of the Main Report for the discussion on Military Rd.
		Please note that I DO NOT support the currently proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiative to provide structural flood risk for Southeaster Louisiana (St. Tammany Parish).	Comment noted.
		However, I, am in support of USACE Alternative plans D or E (Floodwall) Phase IV, which covers the vast majority of the Military Road area.	Chapter 4 of the main report outlines the plan formulation process, screening of measures and identification and selection of the recommended plan
		Since Hurricane Katrina was a once in a lifetime event why is the USACE proposing flood protection to this degree? Flooding in many areas can also be attributed to the Pearl River. What efforts are under way to prevent flooding from the Pearl River, and NOT focus strictly on the water from Lake Pontchartrain? What other initiatives/alternatives are proposed for the homeowners, business, etc. in the excluded areas? Does the current USACE proposal call for or provide funding for non-structural home elevation, flood proofing, or other initiatives for the areas outside of the levee protection? What about a home buyout initiative for the residents of the exclusion area, as an incentive to relocate to areas that are less flood prone? What are the projected costs associated with home buyouts, home elevations, flood proofing, frequent flood damage remediation, verses providing levee protection for this area?	The flood risk reduction afforded by the levee is the 100 year coastal storm event. Both coastal storm surge and rainfall events were considered and modeling for the project. Please reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for these results. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Areas outside of the levee and within the 50 year floodplain may be eligible to be raised in the Nonstructural Plan. Buyouts are not included in the recommended plan. Please reference the main report for the details on comparison of the various alternatives considered in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study.
		I have the following concerns: This will most assuredly have major impacts on our home values and what are the Corps' estimates of our losses?	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.

9/4/23	Walt Cleighton	This will most assuredly have major impacts on our home values and what are the Corps' estimates of our losses?	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		Flood insurance costs will increase significantly and what is that projected cost?	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		What are the projected costs for remediating flood damage, and more than likely repetitive flooding?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		Currently FEMA estimates 80% of homeowners in Louisiana do not have flood insurance. If this is correct, then 20,000 of the 25,000 homes in the excluded are do not have flood insurance.	Comment noted.
		Generally, anytime levee protection is provided in one area, there are unintended consequences to another area, so what are the Corps' plans to deal with this issue?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I have the following requests of the federal government: Is the Corps' considering any other initiatives for the Military Road area?	Please reference section 6.1 of the Main Report for a discussion of the Nonstructural Plan in the Military Rd area. The Implementation Plan discusses how the Nonstructural Plan will be implemented for the project.
		If the USACE proposal is accepted is there any effort in the near term to partner with the State of Louisiana, and St Tammany Parish to provide other alternatives to the residents, and business of this excluded area of the Parish?	The measures selected in the Recommended Plan are the selected measure that are inside of the requirements for the Federal government. USACE will continue to work with the state and local governments to support their efforts in further flood risk reduction efforts.

9/4/23	Adrianne Urbano signed by 50 people	As my local residents realize what is happening with the new Gulf Coast Master Plan of 2023, we feel the need to have our voice heard. Most of our community has concerns regarding the United States Army Corps of Engineering (USACE) St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study: Alignment for East Slidell Optimization plan. We have looked at the whole plan in its entirety, obviously focusing on the Pontchartrain/Breton section. The ridge restoration, marsh creation and barrier island maintenance are wonderful plans. However, your structural risk reduction on plan cannot be supported. Rebuilding the wetlands is key. We believe history has shown the difficulty we have had with trying to control the natural flow of our rivers and dal surge. You divert from one place and it causes unforeseen damage to another. Fanglin Sun and Richard T. Carson, did a research project in 2020 with University of California San Diego tled "Coastal Wetlands Reduce Property Damage during Tropical Cyclones". The study focused on towns in warmer areas, from 1996-2016, 88 hurricanes and 232 counties. As quoted in the study "With coastal areas under increasing threat from more powerful storms due to climate change, it's cri cal to prevent further destruct on of exis ng wetlands as Wetlands play a cri cal role in helping to reduce property damage from storms," (Barry, "Lose the Levee and Keep the Wetlands"). Government should also actively seek to restore wetlands that have been lost. Nicholas Printer wrote, "The Problem with Levees" in Scien fic American in 2019. This ar cle mainly refers to all the failed a□empts to control the Mississippi River, but it is interes ng to see history repea ng itself. Our local government is very supportive of this levee. But, these are the same enties who have allowed people to build in areas that should have remained as wetlands, buffer regions, etc. So we cannot support the decisions they are making on our behalf. Let's break this down on a more personal note. My home has been here for 26 years and has never flooded. There are many people in my area that have not flooded either. Some of the people who flooded were due to the Pearl River rising as the tidal surge pushed water into the river during Hurricane Katrina and have never flooded since that day. The levee will do nothing for this act of nature, but improving our natural buffers will decrease the effects of these events. What the levee does in actuality is allow insurance companies to further discriminate who they will cover. And a wall will be the divide, thus making home values plummet due to lack of affordability of insurance astronomical rates. How is this fair? How do you make the decision to destroy over 5000-6500 people's homes and businesses? In an instant you take away what people have worked for with the stroke of a pen. The homes in these areas range from an average of $ 200,000- 700,000. If this were a majority of low income families would it be treated the same? The middle working class in this country is struggling and just because someone's home may be worth more monetarily than someone else's home doesn't mean they haven't worked or sacrificed to earn it. Although our home should not be our greatest investment according to Warren Buffett, it is for most people. And you will be stealing that from people if this is allowed. Now, let us look at this from "inside the wall" point of view. Will the wall protect me if we have another catastrophic rainfall as in 1995? Are my tax dollars really going to maintaining the levee/wall, pumps and sluice gates? Maybe if the money were placed more on the restoration plans I wouldn't need to worry about the levee topping during a tidal surge and now I am sitting in a bowl of water. Sound familiar? St Tammany parishioners pay the highest property taxes in the State of Louisiana. We don't think a large portion of your residents want to pay tax dollars to maintain a system that has devalued their homes and cost them an increase in insurance. And only protects the chosen. This statement doesn't mean we want a levee, it just means that the people out of its protection will have to pay for this and that is injustice. (We also have a high sales tax, 10.25% in some places). One local politician emailed me to say the best option is to raise houses. This is a foolish idea due to cost and feasibility. Some council members thought we should pass this plan with amendments. Tell that to Terrebonne Parish residents, where there seems to be a disagreement over levees built by the state, but not certified by the USACE nor approved by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (Boudreaux P2). This is leading to a lot of trouble for the residents. So, we would like to avoid all of their nonsense ideas. But, there is science to back up the downside of levees. Including the socioeconomic impact. Now, let's look at some of the legal issues. The Flood Control Act of 1928 states that the United	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE. Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level. Legal precedents are outside the scope of the report. USACE complies with the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and public laws in its acquisition of real property interests required for its projects. For authorization documentation refer to Appendix A.
9/4/23	Louis Cauley	My name is Peggy Cauley. I reside at 205 Avery Dr. Slidell, La. 70461. I have lived at this address for 40 years. I strongly oppose the levee! The levee with no only cause hardships to those outside the levee protection, it will place people's lives in danger. --Prove me wrong.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

9/4/23	Pam Flucke	I appreciate your time in considering my thoughts in this letter. I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. I have been a resident of Slidell for over 30 years. We raised our children here and most of them are now also tax paying, involved citizens in our community. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community. I bought my house because of the flood plain it was in, the businesses nearby, doctors offices, large hospital etc. We bought into a community. Now, without me knowing, this plan has been put into place to hurt those of us outside of the levee. This decision was supposed to make sure it would not hurt the environment or the people outside of this proposed levee. But instead, I have not seen anything yet that can assure us on the outside of the planned levee that we will not be hurt by this levee instead. I have many questions and concerns that cannot possibly be addressed based on the studies done as the true impact of these studies will not be realized for many years. Whole neighborhood houses will have to be raised at our expense first to bring anything to code before being raised and after to actually get it raised. This will in turn call for lots of changes in pipes and sewer, electrical wiring, gas lines etc etc. Our neighborhood would completely change as far as esthetics. I bought my house in my neighborhood because I liked the neighborhood feel. I didn't want a raised house area.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		Who is going to pay for my raised flood insurance or the fact that I might eventually not even be able to get any at all? Who is going to pay to compensate me for my now much lowered property value as my whole neighborhood is being forced into a situation for which we didn't ask for? My home value is dropping now with the knowledge of this levee. It is too late for us to sell at full value.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.
		What studies have been done on water flow around this proposed levee on damages now caused to the "outside " areas?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		What changes will be caused to the environment, marshes, bayous, waterways, and the birds and animals who live there?	Section 5.1 of the Main Report addresses environmental impacts of the project. After coordination with our environmental partners,

		How will it affect how the wild animals move from one area to another?	The animals will leave the area during construction and find less noisy areas to forage. They would be expected to return to the areas once construction is complete . Less mobile wildlife such as frogs and reptiles may be permanently impacted by construction as they are not able to quickly move out of the way of construction activities.
		Will they be shut off from food and water?	wildlife will be able to find food and water during construction by relocating to other areas.
		Will the levee system affect fishing, crabbing or shrimping in the area?	There should be no impacts from the levee to fishing, crabbing and shrimping
		What studies have been done to consider the schools and churches outside the levee?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		What is the impact on the community as they close or struggle to find the means to rebuild within the levee system?	Impacts are disclosed in Section 5 Environmental Consequences
		What will be the compensation to those religious organizations that are typically the ones who have cared for the communities in times of devastation if they too are under water?	There is no compensation to religious organizations
		Why are new subdivisions and houses being allowed to continue to build outside of this proposed levee system? Streets are being paved as we speak 3 blocks from my home which is far outside of this levee. A moratorium on building should be implemented now to protect existing residents from the losses we are about sure incur.	Recommendations for the local managers of flood plains and development can be found in section 4 of Appendix B: Plan Formulation.
9/4/23	Jennifer Sculley; Keenan Sculley; Ktristian Leggett; Jenny Reed; Karen Carroll; Dorothy Greene; Tracy Domingues;	I hope you are doing well, and appreciate your efforts to hear my concerns regarding the July 2023 Corps' St. Tammany Parish, LA., Feasibility Study Revised Draft. My name is Jennifer Scully and I have lived in Slidell, LA for 43 years, and at my current home for 5 years. In all of those years, I've only flooded once, and that was a direct result of Hurricane Katrina. In fact, on May 7th and 8th, 1995 this area received more than twenty-five inches of rain which fell in a twenty four hour period. My house did not flood. Specifically, this latest plan does NOT provide any structural or non-structural flood risk reduction system protections for the vast majority of the area east and south of I-10 (Military Road). This excluded demographic is roughly equal in size to the City of Slidell which is included in the current protection proposal. This current plan will cause major harm to the residents and business of the Military Road area. Please note that I DO NOT support the currently proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiative to provide structural flood risk for Southeaster Louisiana (St. Tammany Parish). However, I, am in support of USACE Alternative D or E (Floodwall) Phase IV, which covers the vast majority of the Military Road area, which is currently excluded. Since the residents living in the Military Road exclusion area are also tax payers, they deserve the same level of protection as all other residents of the Parish.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

9/4/23	Ronda & Carlos Castillo	We oppose the current levee plan for Slidell. It does not provide levee protection for our subdivision, Willow Wood or other Military Road residents. This levee plan will increase water levels in our area and will harm us, flooding our homes. If a levee is built, we must be included.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
9/4/23	Michael Havert	I'm not completely understanding the thought process of the core. Please consider the following before you decide to wreck people's biggest asset (Their home). 1. Devalue their home, I'm being told around 20% minimum. 2. Making home and flood insurance rates climb by being on the wrong side of the wall. 3. Mortgages will be outrages and eventually mortgages will be unaffordable for some. 4. Schools and the hospital are on the outside of the wall, why not protect these. Please reconsider as thousands will be negatively affected.	Real estate values are not considered for development of the plan. A depreciation value of 20% was applied in the economics assessment for damages. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
9/4/23	Erin Everitt	I have lived in my home for 14 years. I want to make sure that I am on public record with the federal government with regard to this project. I have the following questions that I do not believe have been addressed... I have the following concerns: This will severely increase our risk of flooding! We flooded twice recently - (TS Claudette and Hurricane Ida). We applied for the elevation grant and have not been approved. I have the following requests of the federal government: Please reconsider the plan! This will put ours, as well as all of our surrounding neighbors' properties, in jeopardy.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
9/4/23	Candy Piehet	Comment page could not be opened	Comment noted

9/4/23	Melissa Boffenmyer	I am writing this email to voice my concerns about the proposed Slidell levee. My family lives in French Branch. It will negatively impact my family having the wall outside our home and pushing water towards us. (Water that doesn't normally flow towards us.) I'm upset you chose to put Walmart and Lowes inside the levee but not the schools. (Little Oak Middle School, Boyet Jr. High, Honey Island Elementary, Cypress Cove Elementary and private school Pope John Paul High School) This levee will put thousands of children's education at risk. I guess corporate America is more important. If the goal is to do no harm, this proposed plan does the exact opposite.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		You do not know me, but I was given your name by another concerned citizen you have spoken to on the above subject. I am writing to express my deep concerns, displeasure, and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community.	Thank you for expressing your concerns. Chapter 4 of the main report outlines the plan formulation process and all the measures identified and considered that were screened down to the recommended plan
		1. Accelerate and Improve Fritchie Marsh Restoration: I strongly recommend accelerating and enhancing the ongoing Fritchie Marsh restoration project. as it holds significant potential to reduce storm surge. Proper restoration of the marsh could result in a substantial dropin surge levels, providing some degree of storm surge protection. You can find detailed information about this project in attachment (A) Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing (P0-173) source.	No attachment received, however we are aware of the Fritchie Marsh Project. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is a separate authorization from the Fritchie Marsh Creation.
		2. Collaboration with DOTD and CPRA for Surge Mitigation: I urge you to collaborate with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) to explore surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East. A similar study for surge mitigation using Hwy 11 and Lakeshore Drive (Rat's Nest Road) is already underway. The Hwy 190 restoration and bridge replacement project should be activated soon, presenting an opportunity to maximize further reductions in	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		3. Change Funding Allocation for Residential Protection Strategies: I propose a change in funding allocation language within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) budget. Currently, the focus is primarily on home slab elevation, which may not be the most cost-effective or efficient strategy. I suggest amending the language to allow for a range of residential protection strategies, similar to the options available for businesses. Such a change would align with the USACE study's recommendations and could lead to more effective and affordable solutions for homeowners, especially homeowners who are on fixed- and/or retirement	USACE is required to follow policy and guidance for feasibility studies. Should policy be changed, the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study would adapt to those changes.
		4. Consider Alternative Levee Sites: I request a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites, including alignments that extend along Hwy 190 and/or Military Road. All proposed alignments currently leave sonie residents outside of protection, which raises concerns about the fairness and equity of the project.	USACE considered over 200 measures from the start of the study for potential risk reduction. Please see the Main Report and Plan Formulation appendix for documentation of all alternatives considered and screening criteria.
		5. Collaboration on a Surge Barrier Plan: I strongly recommend joining the Lake Coalition to explore the feasibility of using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier. This plan has the potential to close five openings, preventing surges of up to 10 feet. While it may require extensive coordination, including involvement at a Cabinet level;--it could offer a cost-effective and efficient solution to protect our community.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community alone. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
		6. Full Upfront Coverage of Horne Elevation Costs: All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these costs before qualifying for grants. In visiting my local community, the FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Costs associate with the Nonstructural Plan that are allowed by policy are covered under the funding for the proposed elevations. Please see sections 4.1.2 and 6.1 of the Main Report as well as the Economics appendix for further discussion of the costs associated with the Nonstructural Plan. USACE coordinates with FEMA, but does not have control over the policies in place for FEMA.
		7. Impact on Local Schools: An assessment of the impact on local schools, particularly those in areas excluded from the levee, must be conducted. The disregard for property, community, and the tax base could have long-term negative consequences for our education system which is directly related to jobs and thus a core responsibility of the army Corp of engineer to address as part of this and any other proposal	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a full analysis of the impacts on the human environment.
		8. Oversight Entity for Funding Allocation: The creation of an independent entity, separate from St. Tammany Parish and Louisiana, to ensure fair and transparent allocation of project funds, free from potential biases or political influence and diversion of funds to other	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization Documents.

9/4/23	Ted and Theresa Harmon	9. Options for Affected Residents: Total Buyout: Offer a total buyout of property by the federal government, including relocation costs. These buyouts should be fair market value as of 2021 when the project was started. Offers such as those made for Avery Estates have shown that many will be unable to find new housing, move themselves, elevate their property or secure insurance/funding for new homes if homeowners are not adequately compensated. Additionally addressing this early with homeowners living in their single-family homes would prevent unnecessary delays, lawsuits etc... by current residents who've had buy-in to a process that has not been transparent. The buy- out process should also be handled by a dedicated, non-affiliated entity as described above in paragraph 8, ensuring that the fair-	Refer to Section 4 of the Main Report and Appendix B Plan Formulation for detail on consideration of buyouts and why this was screened.
		10. Moratorium on Building: Implement a moratorium on all new building in the area and within 50 minutes of the levee to protect existing residents. This would ensure that all monies earmarked for elevation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes at the time of project inception and completion.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
		11. Local Job Training: Creation of a training program for Louisiana residents to participate in the levee's construction, providing long-term, family-wage job opportunities that are long term and local hires. Provide programs for residents who can no longer working their current employment due to the hardships brought upon by increased and excess travel, higher medical insurance, and taxes brought about by the levee systems.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		12. Tax Refunds: Provide tax refunds to homeowners in single-family dwellings outside the levee as compensation for project costs that they will not benefit from.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		13. Impact on local healthcare: Creation of a healthcare fund to protect healthcare access to the community that will be impacted by the levee location and changes in access to hospitals and clinics that may be close by, but with significant changes in roads and community will change.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		14. Relocation costs for religious institutions and their congregations: Churches, synagogue, temples must receive funding and help in maintaining traditions, services, and access to their community. Costs should not increase for churches that will be responsible for caring for a community that will be impacted monetarily by the loss of good paying jobs that pay taxes in an area that will be negatively impacted. Additionally, Churches and religious organization spend large sums of money during disaster relief and should be compensated for all money increases that are passed on to them (and their members) for care of their congregations in providing disaster relief, food, and	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		15. Compensation to homeowners and small businesses for additional costs of flood: insurance. In visiting with our neighbors there are multiple strings attached to FEMA and other money including but not limited to a requirement to hold certain levels of insurance. Many small businesses, startup businesses and home businesses are struggling in this community. With a potential exodus of residents who are well paid and technically advanced (thus able to leave Louisiana) small businesses will be impacted. Compensation must be considered for those businesses who may shutter without the needed customer base which will change with the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Future changes to insurance rates cannot be predicted and are not incorporated into the analysis.
		Additional Information and Questions for Clarification. To better understand the project and its implications, I kindly request the following information and answers to the following questions: 1. Which Flood Control Act authorizes this levee project, and what are the specific provisions of this act?	The St. Tammany Parish Louisiana Feasibility Study was authorized under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016. Please see Appendix A for authorization documentation.
		2. Has a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review been conducted for this project? If so, what were the findings regarding environmental impacts?	Please see the Main Report and Appendix C for details on NEPA compliance.
		3. What are the engineering standards being used for the levee's construction, and is there a projected timeline for the project's milestones?	Please see the Engineering Appendix for design standards and assumptions. The USACE team used the greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) design criteria for development of the features of the West/South Slidell levee.
		4. What is the projected economic impact of the levee on major local employers, such as military and space complexes?	Refer to Appendix F: Economics.
		5.Isthere a plan for long-term maintenance of the levee, and who will be responsible for it? It is well known that upkeep is expensive and necessary.	Please see Section 6.5.5 pf the Main Report for Operations and Maintenance information. Additional details will be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
		6. How can residents access updates or changes to the project plans to ensure transparency and public input?	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		7. How/When will St. Tammany residents vote on a levee tax? Who will pay for the levee?	The levee construction cost is born by the Federal government at a rate of 65% and the Nonfederal Sponsor at a rate of 35%. Maintenance of the levee will be at the expense of the local sponsor after completion of construction.
		8. Has a plan been established for movement or removal of sacred burial sites including family sites and religious or traditional rites? What costs have been set aside for this?	Please see Appendix C, Annex G and section 8.16 of the main report for the efforts on historic considerations.
		9. Has an evaluation been done on the new representation of taxpayers with this project?	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Tax considerations are not a part of the process.

		10. Will the communications between levee entities and communities be transparent henceforth? It is my firm opinion that the lack of information flow and invited citizen participation is negligent, appalling, and breeds mistrust between both sides; and only open communication from the powers will negate the mistrust and educate neighbors.	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		My biggest complaint is as a resident in my neighborhood for more than 5 years, I have received NO communications for these plans, nor invitations to meetings to voice my concerns. If not for the sharp diligence of several concerned citizens, these issues would have blind-sighted me and many of my neighbors. All which is causing my biggest complaint that the entire plan has the feel of deception by the powers-to-be, quite like having "the wool pulled over one's eyes." We choose our home after I worked for over 48 years and my husband nearly 60 years, to live in for our "golden years." This plan has us seriously reexamining our plan to see if other options are better for us-in another state. Since most of our children and grandchildren are also residents here, the thought breaks our hearts. But if the Parish, State, and Levee boards proceed with the plan as written, we will not have any other viable option. I believe that addressing these concerns and questions will lead to a more equitable and effective levee project that prioritizes the safety and well-being of all residents. I look forward to your response and hope for a constructive dialogue on this matter.	Thank you for expressing your concerns. Their was an announcement of the USACE intent to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register in early 2022. The release of the DEIS was announced in the Federal Register in 2021. The revised DEIS was announced in the Federal Register in 2023. Upon the release of both documents, announcements were made via USACE website, public affairs and local media outlets
9/4/23	Anthony Evett	My name is Anthony Evett, I live at 105 Devereaux Drive Slidell, LA 70461. Our home is located in a flood-prone area along the French Branch. Our home has recently been designated as a severe repetitive loss property. The parish recently undertook two multimillion-dollar flood mitigation projects along the French Branch to reduce flood impacts in our area. I have concerns that the proposed Slidell Levee project will adversely impact our area rendering the recent French Branch Drainage project improvements useless. The Slidell Levee Project will increase our overall flood risk during hurricane events. Please ensure that the Slidell Levee Project cannot begin or receive federal funding until all impacted properties have been adequately mitigated.	We are working in coordination with the State and Parish and are aware of their efforts.
9/4/23	Lisa Aldridge	My name is Peggy Cauley. I have lived at 205 Avery Dr. Slidell, La. 70461 for 40+ years. Learning about the levee has left me broken. My husband and I are elderly. He is disable. At a time where we should be enjoying the fruits of our labor, we now wonder, "Where are we going to go? What are we going to do?" How sad it is to know that only some of the people of St. Tammany Parish matter. Currently we get about 21/2 foot of water during a storm. What is the projected height of the flood water going to be after the levee is built? I live in a modest home. Currently my homeowners/flood insurance is around $6,600. How much will it increase? What adds insults to injury in not knowing about the levee until after the fact. Why wasn't we informed? How ironic it is to know that the residents of Avery Estates aren't allowed to get fill dirt due to concern of flooding our neighbors, but the parish is constantly approving projects that results in flooding our neighborhood.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
9/4/23	Lisa Eaton	I live in Slidell Louisiana of military Road and none of us are protected from y'all so-called levee protection plan. We are a flood zone and my neighbors insurance just went up $1000 on her mortgage every month. This is not OK with y'all are trying to do and excluding most of district 13	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/4/23	Amanda McNeil	I'd like to voice concerns over the proposed levee that will run through Slidell LA/St Tammany Parish. Under the current proposal, my newly purchased home in Turtle Creek along with my childhood home where my mother resides in Quail Ridge will not be protected. In fact, we will be at risk for greater losses during future weather events. I implore you to reconsider this decision and reconfigure this levee to protect the good taxpaying citizens along Military Road. Schools, businesses and beautiful homes are at risk under the current plan. If it must be built, a better contingency for the thousands of citizens needs to be in place to raise the impacted homes, supplement home equity losses and lower the insurance premiums that are bound to increase above the already astronomical levels already in place. Thank you for reconsidering this detrimental plan. I look forward to hearing a better, more inclusive plan in the near future.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
9/4/23	Frank Jobert	Thank you for your Feasibility study for St. Tammany Parish Referenced above and for you attendance at the recent Public Information Meeting on Tuesday, August 15, 2023 in Slidell, LA. I enjoyed the presentation and appreciate your time and effort devoted to the study on behalf of the residents of St. Tammany Parish. Although Oak Harbor/Eden Isles does not appear to be in line for any substantive levee work on Lakeview, Drive, Highway 11, or Interstate 10, and basically leaves Eden Isles/Oak Harbor in its present posture, I still support the Feasibility Study of the Corps as presented. However, while I would not wish to deprive others in the St. Tammany Parish of any upgrades in their respective areas, I am also in full agreement with the attached comments from Commissioner Thomas Thompson with the St. Tammany Levee, Drainage, and Conservation District. The apparent long-range solution(s) need to incorporate Eden Isles (Oak Harbor), Military Road, Lakeshore Estates, and other portions of South and East St. Tammany Parish in the final/final plan of action (even if it is only based on a 50-year and not a 100-year flood protection model) to improve the Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR). Please note that The Inlets HOA Board of Directors has not yet weighed in on your plans nor those comments (attached) of Commissioner Thompson, as they will not meet until after your comment period ends on September 6, 2023.	Comment noted.
9/4/23	Mary Ellen Jovanovic	My husband and I live in the Sterling Oaks community, off Pearl Acres, and within the city limits of Slidell We built here in 2003 and have been through Katrina, where we flooded by inches. Even today, our street flooded with 5-7 inches of rain. We pay ridiculous home insurance ($5000) and flood insurance close to $1000. What will the lack of being within the proposed levee area do to our homes? If there will be more flooding , will the federal government flip the bill for raising our homes? Please reconsider for the livelihood of the many taxpayers, businesses, churches, and good schools(Cypress Cove, Honey Island, Boyet, Northshore, Pope John Paul II) that will also be adversely affected by this current plan. Please reconsider and include the neighborhoods off East Gause Blvd and Military Rd to be within the levee protection.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/4/23	Tim Cleighton	I wanted to send an email indicating my dissatisfaction/opposition to the feasibility plan. My house will be outside the protected area and I have only flooded as a result of Katrina. I support the alternative plans.	Comment noted.
9/4/23	Jena Castaing	I am writing this letter along with many other concerned citizens in regards to the Corps proposed Levee project in St Tammany Parish. We had a meeting with the Levee board this past week in our neighborhood to learn about the plans and were left with several concerns and not many answers. Since then there has been a page created (Good levee for all) to better explain and address issues, gaining many new members daily. As a home owner in this area, we have valid concerns about what this could do to the value of our homes, insurance rates and general safety. Our home at 124 Rue Holiday 70461 could be adversely affected in the French Branch Subdivision along with many other homes and subdivisions that would be left out of the Military Rd area. if this happens. We would like to know what other alternative plans are on the table and what studies have been done to back them up? Will there be compensation to all homeowners who are left out of this project that will negatively impact our property values, force us to raise homes, and be in grave danger of flooding? A perfect example to draw from would be the catastrophic flooding in Laplace caused by the New Orleans flood gate diversion of water. We would like to know how much money is ear marked for this project, and what would be the proposed millages? I'm sure I can speak for every homeowner being left out and unprotected, that will strongly oppose any taxes related to this project. We hope you will seriously consider our concerns along with thousands of other families affected in the Slidell East St Tammany.	Reference Section 4 of the Main Report for the alternatives considered The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. The project has not been Authorized or funded for Construction by Congress. Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
9/4/23	Ray Adams	I am writing to state my concerns with regards to the proposed Levee project that excludes much of unincorporated Slidell. I am deeply disturbed by the lack of transparency surrounding this project. This affects not only my personal home on Old River Road at my dad built for me, but also my family home, which we have owned and lived in since 1974. My family purchased the first home built in the French Branch in 1973, and we have resided here sine . I believe this levee would cause lasting and far reachi g repercussions way beyond the currently estimated 20 percent loss of assessed value of our horn s, which is already a matter of substantial harm for tens of thousands of us who would find ourselves outside the levee.	Real estate values are not considered for development of the plan. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		There are too many factors that I don't see being take into consideration, such as reasonable studies on the effects of a very limited levee breaking up an int grated drainage system which could potentially lead to a bowl effect in incorporated areas and increase flooding in areas outside the levee. There is the matter of massively accelerating flood and insurance costs that are already at all time highs for most of us. There is the concern of fairness in excluding a va t portion of this area's residents - and primarily those most in need of flood mitigation and protection-re ulting in serious and lasting future harm for generations to come, while boosting the values and asse s of those within the proposed limited wall, which largely seems to benefit the town of Slidell and a select amount of residents included within that circle.	Thank you for expressing your concerns. Chapter 2 list the studies and prior reports considered in the formulation of measures and plans to address the problems of the area.
		I would like to see the time taken to thoroughly consi er and study alternatives, including levees that would extend protection to all of Military road and the s ounding subdivisions. I personally feel the use of the existing rail way bed/modifying roadways/ b dges/highway 90 provides maximum potential for at least some valuable protection for all, while also oviding increased property safety, value to assets, and fair treatment of everyone.	Thank you for expressing your concerns. Chapter 4 of the main report outlines the plan formulation process and all the measures identified and considered that were screened down to the recommended plan
		This levee as currently proposed, would cause lasting d permanent damage to this community in the form of personal loss for many thousands of residen , affected job market and growth, education quality and opportunities, decreased values of long time ssets, and the health and well being of some of Slidell's longest term residents, that I believe would e tend far beyond what has currently been mentioned or discussed.	Thank you for expressing your concerns

9/4/23	Jenn Adams	I'm writing with grave concerns about the proposed plans from the United States Army Corp of Engineers. This is people's lives. I moved here in 2 12 to help care for my husband's ailing mother. I fell in love and the rest is history. My husband's whole family lived here and lives here. We don't leave for hurricanes. This is our wa of living. This makes me sick to see that our lives, property will be devalued. Our homes and w y of life cannot be replaced. These homes are where families were born, grew up and built c mmunity. What has been done to research the impacts on commerce and industry when peo le that are committed to this way of life can no longer have community? This isn't a transient_p pulation. Many of these people have been here for generations.	Thank you for the comment. Please reference the Economics appendix for factors that were considered under the Federal guidelines for risk reduction projects such as the proposed actions in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study.
		There is said to be a 20% hit on property value ho ever, loss of the natural barriers has caused this problem. French Branch did not cause this pro lem. The continued building has caused these problems. The development has taken away ot only the protections of the area but also much of the beauty and now will take away our cul ure, traditions and livelihoods.	Real estate values are not considered for development of the plan. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. Recommendations for the local managers of flood plains and development can be found in section 4 of Appendix B: Plan Formulation.
		There has been limited communication from our H A. Supposedly the Army Corp, St Tammany and MRA have been in contact with organizations. s a resident here I would say between COVID and the shutdowns there was more of a nee for better communications. We didn't hear about this in 2020, 2021, 2022. We heard abo ta meeting happening at a local home and as soon as we heard we started educating ourselves and our neighbors. We would therefore ask that the education and open comment period e reopened, and meetings be held with ample and plentiful notification that are led by Army Corp of Engineers. This is not only reasonable but also the responsible way to act.	Thank you for expressing your concerns. Their was an announcement of the USACE intent to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register in early 2022. The release of the DEIS was announced in the Federal Register in 2021. The revised DEIS was announced in the Federal Register in 2023. Upon the release of both documents, announcements were made via USACE website, public affairs and local media outlets
		We would ask that you implement a moratorium o all new building in the area. The continued building that has happened since the beginning oft e studies change the numbers, impact and topography of the neighborhoods impacted and "n n-impacted". Subdivisions have been built, homes have sold, businesses have gone in. The nu bers that the Army Corp is using are not valid anymore. We need to make sure that commu ity members and taxpayers who are here and have been here are taken care of first. I am not against building but the building that is being done knowing that this levee was being plann d is irresponsible and unreasonable.	Recommendations for the local managers of flood plains and development can be found in section 4 of Appendix B: Plan Formulation.
		Historical and traditional communities and familie need to know that we can continue our livelihoods. How does the Army Corp of Engineers plan accomplish this? Is there any reference or consideration for generations of families and tr ditions etc. Is there money earmarked to help protect families and traditions? Churches? C mmunities? Schools? What types of programs will be enacted?	Please reference Appendix C: Environmental for details regarding impacts to the human environment.
		Priority elevation funding for homes currently in e istence. Not grant funding, not reimbursement. We cannot afford the money nor an many of our neighbors afford to elevate their homes and update to code. Retirede , disabled persons will be disapporitaely impacted. We implore upon you to have money se aside for people who currently own homes. This would insure that all monies earmarked for el vation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes a the time of project inception nd completion.	Please see section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement.
		There will be loss of life according to your own rep rt. According to the life safety risk assessment 8.0 (Your proposal) the current alterna ive would be medium/high for life loss, LLR- Life Loss Risk. What kind of money will be set asid for life insurance, extended care and families who are relocated due to this plan? What horrific way to have to be impacted at the end of your life. To have to leave your home, your amily, your church and your community. Some folks have lived in this neighborhood 40 or ore vears.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		Creation of an unbiased oversight and monitoring committee over the distribution of any money that comes to St Tammany/Louisiana. This ay seem pessimistic but what I have seen since moving here is it is about 'who you know' no 'what you know'. People need to be treated fairly. This money needs to be specifically for this p rpose and MAY NOT be diverted or changed.	Comment noted.

9/4/23	James Jones	I have reviewed your July 2023 St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study Main Report. I appreciate the balancing of cost vs benefit of the Slidell levee ALT6 proposal. The proposal will protect Sidelle but increases the risk to areas East of the proposed Slidell levee. The current proposal leaves 7,000 parcels at extreme safety and financial risks with ineffective mitigation options. The proposal is unacceptable and puts an unfair burden of East St Tammany citizens in unprotected areas.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		The plan unfairly burdens East St Tammany unprotected structures. Eminent Domain policies are offering 50-65% less than property appraisals in Avery Estates . Nonstructure elevation modifications pay for only a portion of the total expenses necessary to restore a property to a functional and aesthetic level equal to that prior to being raised. East St Tammany has very developed structures with brick veneer, landscaping and large structures that make a complete structure elevation project very costly.	Generally, the non-federal sponsor's policy is to not appropriate or expropriate property rights for the implementation of USACE flood/coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration projects. Appropriation or expropriation is only used by the non-federal sponsor for USACE projects that mandate that the non-federal sponsor use appropriation and/or expropriation to acquire the lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and/or material disposal/placement areas ("property") required for the project. For USACE projects that include the construction of levees and related structures, appropriation and/or expropriation may be used by the non-federal sponsor if necessary, and as a last resort, and only in the following limited situations: (a) the property has numerous undeterminable and/or absent owners; (b) the non-federal sponsor is unable to negotiate reasonable conditions or payment for conventional acquisition of the property; (c) under "friendly" quick take circumstances (e.g., the non-federal sponsor is unable to negotiate a reasonable price for the property, but the landowner(s) willing to give up property voluntarily); and/or (d) there is limited time available for the non-federal sponsor to acquire the required property (i.e. emergency situations or other time constraints imposed by outside factors). Therefore, if necessary, appropriation and/or expropriation may be used by the non-federal sponsor for the implementation of the structural components of the RP. On the other hand, appropriation and expropriation will not be used by the non-federal sponsor in the implementation of the non-structural component of the RP since property buy-outs are not included in the plan and participation is 100% voluntary.
		Recurrence of even minor flooding will result in immense financial burdens to cover gaps between disaster relief funding and actual restoration costs. Hardships to both the structures and owner's financial liability will result in incomplete restoration of the community. Unprotected areas will become another Lower Nine story if this plan is allowed to proceed.	Thank you for expressing your concerns.
		The levee proposal will all but isolate East St Tammany to financial devastation. This plan must provide homeowners a complete nonstructure elevation modification that will restore the property to its original condition prior to elevation.	Please reference Appendix H: Implementation Plan for details on how USACE will implement the Nonstructural Plan.
		The plan must compensate for increased flood insurance and property taxes that results from the proposed levee location.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		Lastly, a documented Eminent Domain policy must be included in the levee plan to protect property values at level prior to levee approval. Your plan Objective: 4 "Increase community resiliency ….. before, during and after significant rainfall and or coastal event…." has not been achieved for East St Tammany citizens in the current levee proposal. I object to the levee proposal and am extremely offended about the lack of consideration to protecting safety and structures of East St Tammany citizens.	Generally, the non-federal sponsor's policy is to not appropriate or expropriate property rights for the implementation of USACE flood/coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration projects. Appropriation or expropriation is only used by the non-federal sponsor for USACE projects that mandate that the non-federal sponsor use appropriation and/or expropriation to acquire the lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and/or material disposal/placement areas ("property") required for the project. For USACE projects that include the construction of levees and related structures, appropriation and/or expropriation may be used by the non-federal sponsor if necessary, and as a last resort, and only in the following limited situations: (a) the property has numerous undeterminable and/or absent owners; (b) the non-federal sponsor is unable to negotiate reasonable conditions or payment for conventional acquisition of the property; (c) under "friendly" quick take circumstances (e.g., the non-federal sponsor is unable to negotiate a reasonable price for the property, but the landowner(s) willing to give up property voluntarily); and/or (d) there is limited time available for the non-federal sponsor to acquire the required property (i.e. emergency situations or other time constraints imposed by outside factors). Therefore, if necessary, appropriation and/or expropriation may be used by the non-federal sponsor for the implementation of the structural components of the RP. On the other hand, appropriation and expropriation will not be used by the non-federal sponsor in the implementation of the non-structural component of the RP since property buy-outs are not included in the plan and participation is 100% voluntary.

9/4/23	Bryan Beyer	I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed St Tammany Parish Levee Project, and specifically the exclusion of my property from the tentatively selected plan (TSP) for South Slidell. I am homeowner residing in the Turtle Creek subdivision in eastern St Tammany Parish. Upon reviewing the Feasibility report and the modeling used to determine your TSP, the data shows my property at increased risk for surge flooding following the construction of the proposed floodwall and levees. Your non-structural mitigations in Appendix H make a number of assumptions that are not reasonable and are not justified in the document, to include the availability of contractors, the number of simultaneous projects each contractor can handle, and the separation of costs to be borne by the homeowner or non-federal partner. It also provides a time period of 12 years for the non-structural mitigations to be enacted, a time frame that is based very loosely on the assumptions previously mentioned, and, even if the optimistic time period is achieved, still occurs after the structural changes are constructed. Even in the best-case scenario, impacted properties will be at increased risk before non-structural mitigations can be completed.	Thank you for the comment. Corrections will be made to Appendix D Annex 11 Construction Schedule for readability.
		The report as provided does not clearly provide justification for the location of the TSP, nor why only an array of 13 alternatives were considered, given the varied nature of the flood risk in the study area.	Thank you for expressing your concerns. Chapter 4 of the main report outlines the plan formulation process and all the measures identified and considered that were screened down to the recommended plan
		Furthermore, the effort of public outreach on this venture, considering the significant impact to thousands of homes, in addition to the NEPA requirements, was minimal.	Please reference Appendix C: Environmental for full NEPA compliance documentation.
		Given these concerns, I respectfully request the following: ● An understanding of the method and rigor used in developing the non-structural approach, to include market research conducted, cost estimating, and schedule estimation tools, and a determination that all eligible non-structural mitigations can be completed prior to the construction of levees and the subsequent increase in flood risk.	Please reference the Economics Appendix and Cost Engineering Annex for the requested details.
		A consideration for how the non-eligible excluded local government or public service structures (schools, fire stations, water utilities) will be resourced and restored following a flood event	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		An explanation on why the area bounded by both the TSP and the non-selected Alternative 7 in southeast St Tammany Parish was not included in any structural alternative analysis.	Please reference section 4.1.6 for the feasibility analysis of Alternative 7.
		Information on how the TSP will impact flood insurance premiums for excluded properties.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		A tentative construction schedule with more granularity using an accepted method (Critical-Path Method, Gantt, MS Project, etc).	Thank you for the comment. Corrections will be made to Appendix D Annex 11 Construction Schedule for readability.

		A clear statement on the increased flood risk for excluded properties as a result of the enactment of the TSP.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		What is your public outreach plan as this effort continues to move forward?	Please Reference Appendix C: Environmental Annex I: Public Involvement for details on public outreach completed in the feasibility phase of the project.
		I am writing to you with concerns regarding the United States Army Corps of Engineering (USACE) St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study: Alignment for East Slidell Opmizaon Plan. I have looked at the whole plan in its entity. It appears that our local government is very supportive of this levee. Over the past several years, these local governments have allowed people/contractors to build in areas that should have remained as wetlands, buffer regions, etc. Why don't we STOP allowing more homes to be built in newly developed subdivisions in St. Tammany Parish causing drainage issues!!!!! As a concerned citizen, I cannot and will not support the decisions the governments are making on my behalf.	thank you for expressing your concerns.
		Will the "inside the wall" protect me if we have another catastrophic rainfall as in 1995? Look at the amount of flooding that today's rains have caused in French Branch and other subdivisions outside of the proposed wall! I can only imagine the flooding if we received this amount of rain with a "wall"!!! Our houses will be floating off of their slabs!	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I would think that the homeowners in French Branch and surrounding area, pay several thousand dollars of yearly taxes. I know my 2023 Property Taxes are over $3,000.00. Will my tax dollars go to maintaining the levee/wall, pumps and flood gates? Will a mileage have to be placed on the ballet for approval by the Citizens of St. Tammany Parish? As of now, St. Tammany Parishioners pay the highest property taxes in the State of Louisiana. I can assure you, the majority of the residents here do not want this proposed levee. It will result in tax dollars to maintain a system that could diminish their homes, personal properties, cars, etc. which ultimately will increase both our homeowners' insurance, as well as flood!	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.

		The concerns of the community for building a levee and being left out of the governments Alignment for East Slidell Opmizaon Plan be DENIED!!! It is my understanding that the benefit to rebuild the wetlands have been destroyed by United States Army Corps of Engineering, hurricanes, coastal erosion, and other human involvement. The rebuilding of the wetlands is the only plan backed up by sound scientific research that our community can bear.	thank you for expressing your concerns
		My home has been here for 26 plus years. The only time that my house at 244 Rue Jonathan has flooded was due to the Pearl River rising as the tidal surge pushed water into the river during Hurricane Katrina resulting in approximately 8 inches of water which came in and out within a few hours. The levee will do nothing for this act of nature, but improving our natural buffers will decrease the effects of these events. What the proposed levee does is allow insurance companies to further discriminate who they will cover thus making home values plummet due to lack of affordability of insurance companies astronomical Rates. If I knew that our local governments were going to propose a wall being built right outside of French Branch, I would have never moved here.	Thank you for your expressing your concerns.
		How will this levee wall effect our schools? There are several schools that will be outside of the protective wall. Where will these thousands of kids go to school if a major hurricane comes through causing massive flooding destroying their schools? Make the children priority!!!!!!	Nonresidential structures outside of the levee, but inside of the 50 year floodplain are preliminarily eligible for the floodproofing effort in the Nonstructural Plan.
		Is the government trying to push us out of our homes?	No
		Is the government getting a kick back in their pockets as a result of this plan?	No
		Is anyone in our local government's houses in this proposed levee wall?	The USACE team does not have knowledge of which individuals or the names of specific property owners in regard to their location in reference to the levee alignment.
9/4/23	Lisa Molero	Where will the children attended school should we receive massive flooding outside of the protective wall?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		If this proposal goes through, will my house value go from $550,000 to $200,000?	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		If this proposal goes through, will my Property Taxes go down?	USACE does not have a role in property tax rates.
		If this proposal goes through, will the government pay for the increase of our homeowner's and flood insurance?	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		If this proposal goes through, who will absorb the cost of raising our houses, as well as raising our driveways to protect our vehicles?	Please reference Appendix H: Nonstructural Implementation Plan for feasibility level details on construction of the Nonstructural Plan.

		If this proposal goes through, will my tax dollars go to maintaining the levee/wall, pumps and flood gates at the current mileage?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		If this proposal goes through, will a mileage have to be placed on the ballet for approval by the Citizens of St. Tammany Parish?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
9/4/23	Celeste Silbernagel	I live in Holiday Acres. As I understand, a proposed levee is going to go through our neighborhood. So part of the neighborhood will be protected and part will not. I fail to understand how this will work so I am totally against this levee unless the proposition isn't as I understand. Please enlighten me.	Thank you for your concern. Chapter 4 of the main report explains the formulation of plans and how the alignment was chosen
9/4/23	Sherry Roberts	I have just heard that the subdivision I live in is going to be outside the new proposed levee. This is very upsetting! I have lived in Slidell all my life and 30 years ago built my forever home and now find out that it will almost very likely flood with this new levee. My home has never flooded before and I'm certainly not happy to find out that it probably will if this levee is built. This is unacceptable! Our flood insurance is increasing yearly, I can only imagine what it will be if I ever have to file a claim! You choose who to protect, whose homes you will pay to raise and leave the rest of us just to deal with it! I hope and pray that you will reconsider this plan of action and if you move forward, you will protect ALL of us.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/4/23	Mike Ortega	I just got wind of your proposed levee project for Slidell, Louisiana. As I can tell from maps obtained on line it appears that you are planning construction of a flood wall through the east side of Slidell that would essentially place the bulk of the east side of Slidell outside of that proposed wall. WHY IN THE WORLD WOULD YOU DO SUCH A THING? This area encompasses several subdivisions, doctors and dentists offices, two schools, numerous businesses and churches. You would essentially place us in a highly floodable area that would increase our flood insurance and home owners' premiums making them prohibitive for most of us.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.
		My career in Federal Law Enforcement required me and my family to relocate away from Slidell. After I retired my wife and I were able to move back to Slidell in 2015. We chose to live on the east side because of its amenities and its proximity to some of the worlds best fishing. Being on a government pension my income is limited. I, for one, cannot afford raising my home at the cost of thousands of dollars, and I can't afford to relocate again. If I chose that option I doubt seriously I would ever get a fair market value for my home with your proposals hanging over us. I respectfully ask that you reconsider placing your flood wall closer to the Pearl River so that ALL of Slidell is protected from storm surges. I believe that the cost of such a wall would ,in reality, be less expensive than reimbursing everyone through grants to rebuild, relocate or improve their properties.	Please see section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement.
		I am writing this letter to express my concern regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project. I am concerned that the proposed levee will not protect my home or my neighborhood, as I will be outside of levee protection, even though we are Slidell residents. The Corps job is supposed to protect residents, but I am a resident and this does not protect me or my family. I am very worried about being excluded. I don't understand how a levee can be built that leaves entire sections of Slidell's population out, including schools, churches, hospitals, businesses, and neighborhoods. How is this fair or equitable?	Thank you for your concern. Chapter 4 of the main report explains the formulation of plans and how the alignment was chosen
		If my neighborhood will be impacted adversely, will raising my home be paid for in full by the government, because I sure can't afford to pay for it. If a levee is built I want whoever is building it to raise my house for me, ALL accompanying costs included. How much will this lower the value of my home? How will I be compensated for this? How will this affect my flood and homeowners insurance costs/coverage, which I can barely afford as it is now? Who will cover the increase in costs? What will happen if they will no longer cover my home at all? I would like to know what the Corps will do for me if I have no insurance? What will they do for me if I can no longer live in my house and I can't sell it either? How much will this cost us as taxpayers? Do I not only have to watch the value of everything I hold dear drop, but pay for it out of my own pocket as well?!?!	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/4/23	Ashlea May	What studies have been done to show where the water will go now? How much water will now divert to the unprotected areas, like my neighborhood? How much water can I expect in my neighborhood, at my children's schools, at the hospital I use, and the church I go to (all outside the levee)? How will the levee change the environment around it? What effect will it have on wildlife/vegetation, etc?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		What about putting a greater emphasis on things like marsh improvements, such as the Fritchie Marsh restoration project? What about alternate levee sites that include ALL of the residents, businesses, schools, etc? What about mailing out information to every household, business, church and school that will be left unprotected that includes what we can expect to happen, when it will happen, how much it will take from us, how much it will cost us, etc?	Thank you for your concern. Chapter 4 of the main report explains the formulation of plans and how the alignment was chosen
9/4/23	Kathy Arseneaux	Why would you want to flood your votes out???	Comment noted.
9/4/23	Paula Nuber	My husband and I have lived in St. Tammany Parish in River Oaks Estates down Indian Village Road since 1987. We flooded with Katrina like many and have grave concerns for the Corps proposed levee project for St. Tammany Parish. This levee will not protect our subdivision and we are adamantly opposed to this project. However, we would fully support a revised plan that provided protection equally for all neighborhoods. Thank you for considering our voice to protect our home and our neighbors.	Thank you for your concern. Chapter 4 of the main report explains the formulation of plans and how the alignment was chosen
9/4/23	Kathy Zweifel	I am requesting a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites along Hwy 190 and Military Rd. According to proposed levee sites, many residents are left outside of the levee protection. This appears to be a dangerous situation in view of possible flooding during heavy rainstorms and hurricanes. These homes should be protected as much as the others. Please consider reevaluating the proposed levee sites. Thank you for your consideration.	Please reference section 4.4 of the Main Report that discusses the alternatives and considerations for the levee alignment.
9/4/23	Pamela Miller	Hello, my name is Pamela, Badinger Miller. I reside at 101 LYNN Ave., Holiday acres subdivision, Slidell, Louisiana, 70461. It has been brought to my attention that a levee is coming to our area. We as citizens should have known about this sooner. This is totally wrong. I wish to express that I do not want the levee anywhere near the Holiday acres subdivision. With new homes already being built near North Shore high school we have more flooding in this area than we ever had. I am a single mom surviving breast cancer. My home is all I have at the present time, it's very difficult to even afford flood insurance and homeowners insurance. I have been living in holiday acres since 1994. There have been no areas of flooding in or around my area Since this time and I do not want for flooding, depreciation of my property, higher cost of flood insurance, which I don't need at the present time AND higher home owners insurance. I wish to express, and make it perfectly clear, that I do not want the levee in my area. I have worked hard my whole life to keep what I have. My home is all I have. Do not put a levy here!!!!! Another location needs to be provided for all of the citizens of Saint Tammany Parish, and the people within the holiday acres subdivision, the french branch area and all of the subdivisions around. We DO NOT want this levy and we will fight to stop it from coming here. Please take this to heart. It will affect all of us in a negative way. Again, I do not want the Levee here. The way the St. Tammany parish and Slidell elected officials, who have not communicated AT ALL to the citizens is a DISGRACE. Trying to hide and keep this from us as homeowners is wrong, unacceptable and uncalled for!	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

9/4/23	Roger Wibright	We are very concerned and worried over the present plan to build a wall to allow thousands of homes, businesses, schools, hospitals, and people to be devastated. We ask you to reevaluate this plan for other options. Thank you, Roger and Alta Wibright	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
9/4/23	Mirza Marin	It's my understanding that you are the person that I should send my concerns regarding the St. Tammany Levee Project. I live on the east side of Slidell, specifically in Holiday Acres Subdivision at 102 Lynn Drive. My home is located near Northshore High School and French Branch Subdivision. Based on the proposed map that I have seen, it appears my home is outside the protection area like many homes in and near my subdivision. I don't quite understand why it's being proposed that the flood wall/levee should basically cut through my neighborhood. It makes more sense to me that this wall/levee should actually be further east and closer to Hwy 190 East.	Thank you for your concern. Chapter 4 of the main report explains the formulation of plans and how the alignment was chosen
		My home has never flooded before, it was built in the seventy's and I have lived here since 2003. Even during Katrina, we saw no flooding. But I greatly fear that my home will flood if the flood wall/levee is built as it is being proposed. All of the homes affected in my subdivision and nearby subdivisions probably have a fair market value of $300,000 and above. We all pay a great deal of property tax which is used to support our local schools and community resources. If my home suffers any flooding because of this project, I know I will have no choice but to leave our parish. And I imagine that will also be what others will do as well. This would have a devastating economic impact on our community.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		In addition, there are several schools outside the protection of the proposed plan. All the schools in our parish are already over capacity and if any of these schools flood because of the lack of protection, families may be forced to leave this parish in order for their children to be able to attend school. Is that the ultimate goal? To purposedly flood a large percentage of people who impact the tax base of the east side of the parish? I hope not.	We appreciate your comment and concern. The ultimate goal is to provide an economically justified flood risk reduction plan as outlined in the report and appendices.

		If this project goes through as planned, will the residents that are impacted by it be provided the funds and resources to raise our homes to better protect them from flooding? Will buyouts of property be offered to those residents whose homes will be directly impacted by increased flooding and damage caused by the construction of the levee/flood wall at the proposed location? Will residents be compensated for increased costs in flood insurance? I ask that if this project goes throught that an alternative levee site be considered that extend further east perhaps along or east of Hwy 190 and/or Military Road.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		I am writing to request the USA COE reconsider their. Optimized TSP for St Tammany and specifically Eastern Slidell. The Revised Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement dated July 2023 states as a Final Array of Alternatives for Eastern Slidell was not included in the Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan {TSP). The modeling methodology used to select alternatives does not adequately reflect the current nor future conditions in Eastern Slidell. It also fails to incorporate actual flooding events that Slidell has faced since the 1980s.	Comment noted.
		Appendix F contains the Economics modeling. The region my house is located at is within #20 of the Study Area Reaches (see Figure F:3-1). The TSP uses Expected Annual Damages (EAD) as the primary basis for alternative selection. The underlying assumptions for damages may not be relevant to the area and Eastern Slidell in particular. Section 1.5 states that "(the) Optimized TSP would not induce development, but would rather reduce the risk of the population being displaced after a major flood event." It is my contention and others in Eastern Slidell that this plan INCREASES the risk of flooding and displacement. Section 2 contains the Asset Inventory discussion. In Section 2.2 Structure Value Uncertainty, it states: "The most-likely depreciated value was based on the average construction class and a 20 percent depreciation rate (consistent with an observed age of a 20-year old structure in average condition)" There is no supporting citation for this assertion. Home values in Eastern Slidell have continue to rise year after year since I have lived here since approximately 1990. Eastern Slidell has a mixture of large subdivisions as well as smaller more semi-custom homes. A better approach would have been to aggregate the average home values with each of the Study Area Reaches that form Eastern Slidell (i.e. 20, 21 and 22). Additionally, the home values are not depreciating over time, but either appreciating or remaining stable. Since displacement is a large factor in the study, Vehicle Value Uncertainty is included to model and capture potential damages: "The most likely value was $8,269, which is the average value of a used vehicle, $27,564, adjusted for the 70 percent evacuation rate. The maximum value used was $14,484, which is the average value of a new vehicle, $48,281, adjusted for the evacuation rate. The minimum value used was $1,448, which is the average IO-year depreciation value of a vehicle, $4,828, adjusted for the evacuation rate." There is no supporting citation for this assertion. The Eastern Slidell region is a fairly affluent portion of the parish. In order for a model to be an accurate representation of the phenomenon under study, the data must reflect the region under consideration and not a "typical" number. These values may have come from the cited report: "Depth-Damage Relationships for Structures, Contents, and Vehicles and Content- To-Structure Value Ratios (CSVRS) In Support Of the Jefferson and Orleans Flood Control Feasibility Studies, June 1996 Final Report." This report appears to be unavailable. It was conducted almost 30 years ago using cities across Lake Ponchartrain. Its applicability to St. Tammany Parish in 2023 is highly suspect.	In section 2.2 of the Economics Appendix, "The uncertainty surrounding the residential structure values was based on the depreciation percentage applied to the average replacement cost per square foot calculated from the four exterior wall types." refers to replacement costs, not market real estate values. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
9/4/23	Neil VandeVoorde	Section 4.2 discusses the methodology used (emphasis added): "The model also used the number of years that stages were recorded at a given gage to determine the hydrologic uncertainty surrounding the stage-probability relationships. The possible occurrences of each variable were derived using Monte Carlo simulation, which used randomly selected numbers to simulate the values of the selected variables from within the established ranges and distributions .... The resulting mean value and probability distributions formed a comprehensive picture of all possible outcomes." This seems to imply that the Monte Carlo simulation assumed that the variables used were independent and thus could be selected individually. This is not the case, the variables within an environmental model are Bayesian in that there is joint-probability for many of the variables. Not properly modeling the probability relationships within the model's variables does not result in a "comprehensive picture of all possible outcomes."	Acknowledged. Model updates are underway for the USACE HEC-FDA model which will adjust for future project use

		Finally in terms of the economic modeling, once Eastern Slidell is excluded from the TSP there appears to be no further modeling done. Specifically as flood waters are blocked or diverted, the water will flow elsewhere. Appendix G discusses the Real Estate Plan and provides a detailed discussion of the routing used for the flood wall in Section 2.3. Using the elevation maps from the LSU AgCenter (http://maps.lsuagcenter.com/floodmaps/?FIPS=22103) the area to the east of the proposed floodwall south of Gause Blvd is Breckenridge Subdivision at an elevation of 13 ft. To the east is Military Rd and further is the Pearl River. Due north is Pearl River, LA. The entire area from Breckenridge to the Pearl River and north to Pearl River, LA is essentially all shown to be at the same elevation of 13 ft. The elevation to the south of Breckenridge increase to 16 to 18 ft. The proposed levee and floodwall system could reasonably be expected to increase either the storm surge moving up the Pearl River or add water to the Pearl River. In either case increase water will enter the Pearl River area in the eastern portion of Slidell - the lower elevation will result in increased flooding for Eastern Slidell. This NEGATIVE impact and INCREASED risk is not accounted for in the economics modeling and MUST be. Section 2.3 of Appendix G - Real Estate Plan, Section 8 Induced Flooding brushes this problem aside with a statement that ADCIRC showed an increase of 1 to 3 inches for a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability and that induced flooding would be further investigated during the planning, engineering, and design (PED) phase. This is AFTER the project is authorized. Modeling of induced flooding should be occurring now during the initial design phase of the project before seeking Congressional Authorization.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 104 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions were also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. A worst-case scenario was also evaluated. The worst-case scenario involved the peak stage on the Pearl River coinciding with inflows from the Bogue Chitto at the 1% AEP along with 1% AEP rainfall. This scenario was the one used to assess inducements from the levee system. Even with these coincident events the inducements from the Pearl River weren't significant. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.4 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are discussed in Section 14.1.4 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
		We have discussed some concerns during the most recent public meetings. In one meeting I asked about two significant flooding/rain events - the 1983 Pearl River Flood and the May 1995 Extreme Rain Event. In April 1983, the Pearl River, at Pearl River LA river gauge measured 21.05 above flood stage, (https://water.weather.gov/ahps2/probability information.php?wfo=lix&gage=perll&graph id=2) and since then there have been 3 events exceeding 19 ft above flood state (i.e. (20.35 ft on 03/14/2016, 19.6 ft on 01/30/1990 andl9.18 ft on 04/01/2009). The National Weather Service (NWS) shows the 19 ft flood state is a 3% probability. Additionally A 48-hour plus extreme rain event occurred in the Slidell area between 09 and 10 May 1995. Eight to 10 inches of rain was experienced during each 24-hour period. The 100-yr Average Recurrence Interval is between 10 to 15 inches per 24 hour period (https://www.wpc.ncep.noaa.gov/qpf/ari/qpf vs ari.php). You reached out to the modelers who informed you that these two events were not used. There were issues with the consistency of the data across selected gauges used in the modeling domain. While I understand the need to calibrate a model before using it with accurate and consistent data (as discussed above) these two events should be modeled to	Calibration was based on the March 2016 and December 2009 events due to several factors. The two events are representative of current conditions, availability of gage information, and spatial extent of flooding represented by these two events. The 1983 and 1995 events were significant events, but given the factors mentioned, the 2016 and 2009 events were used for calibration. As it pertains to ADCIRC modeling, ADCIRC results represent coastal tropical storm surge conditions and not local rainfall-runoff as represented by the calibration events referenced above.
		Appendix C Annex M provided information on the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) assumptions. The section labeled "Land Loss/ Sea Level Rise Effects" discusses Relative Sea Level Rise (RSLR) for the overall modeling. Modeling was done using only one tide gauge on the far western side of the parish (Lake Ponchartrain at Mandeville, number 85575). A more appropriate one to have used is Gauge 85700 (Rigolets near Lake Ponchartrain). Examination of the time series for Gauge 85700 shows a gap at 1985. After 1985, the trend of the gauge changes to what appears to be< I mm/yr ground subsidence. This is in large contrast to the Mandeville gauge's (#85575) value of 4.99 mm/yr. This change could result in large changes to the Economic benefits calculated for the eastern side of St. Tammany parish.	Although the Rigolets gauge is closer to Slidell, IUSFWS felt the Mandeville gauge was closer to the project marsh sites (nearer to Lacombe in Big Branch Marsh NWR) and a better representation of those inland solid marshes than the Rigolets gauge would be. After a quick review, USFWS id note the Rigolets gauge is slightly closer to the project marsh (~14miles to the Mandeville gauge vs ~12 miles to the Rigolets gauge). There were not a great of a significant difference in the gauge used in this case since its 3mm/yr. and not less than 1mm/yr. There would be a difference however that would possibly reduce the marsh mitigation needed. If the proposed project is approved and funded, during pre-engineering and design further investigations would be conducted and if necessary any changes warranted would be made.
9/4/23	Luis and Darla Socarras	I am a current home owner in Slidell and would more information as to why my home would not be included in the proposed levee. I live at 1114 Joy drive in Breckinridge. I have lived here for 12 years. We are an AE flood zone. My rates for FEMA have increased significantly…about 1200 dollars a year for flood insurance alone. We need to be protected as well and cannot afford to be outside of the levee. Please send your information on my area and why I would not be included.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/4/23	Brian Caruso	I am writing to express our deep concerns pertaining to the subject project, especially the exclusion of our residence from it's protection and the adverse impacts the project will have on our security. My wife and I are retired seniors who have resided in our home for 23 years in the Turtle Creek subdivision on Military Road. While we have maintained flood insurance on our property since it was built, fortunately we have never had to file a flood claim. However, in its current iteration, the plan would create a significantly enhanced chance of flooding in our subdivision that has never existed before due to waters being channeled from protected areas into unprotected areas such as ours outside the protective levee. Additionally, the value of our home would decrease drastically, and the costs of homeowners and flood insurance would skyrocket. As retired seniors on a fixed income, we cannot afford any of these adverse consequences of the plan. To impose these potential adverse consequences on us and others outside of the protection, while the security of those within is increased, is simply an exceptionally unfair tradeoff which we cannot accept.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
9/4/23	Alan Houlihan	The purpose of my communication is to advise you of my opposition to the St Tammany Parish, Louisiana Levee Feasibility Study as it is currently proposed. The goal of the study was to reduce the severity of flood damages and risk to public health and safety, caused by heavy rainfall, riverine flooding, tropical storms and hurricanes. I feel that this proposal has fallen short of its goals for the following two reasons, which I understand to be qualifiers to proceed. - The USACE plan causes harm to both residents and the natural ecosystem with the introduction of this levee system. - The Cost / Benefit Analysis of the proposal shows at 2.4. I would like a better understanding of the factors utilized in this equation. This appears to be the economic impact reduction for a disaster scenario. I would like to know what your findings were for the economic downturn of property value for the area outside of the protection system and the overall economic impact would be for cost of insurance and lack of protected infrastructure. I would like to see what the economic impact outside of the levee would be as it correlates to the life of the levee. My opinion is that the economic downturn would be incurred by the residents outside of the levee, not the USACE, which in turn does financial harm to the residents.	Please reference Appendix F: Economics for a full explanation of the calculation of benefit to cost ratio.
		I have additional questions for the proposal to spend approximately half of the funds to raise houses. 1) What is the plan for houses that are not up to code to be raised, or are unable to be raised? 2) What is the timeline for completion of raising the houses outside of the levee protection? I estimated 6500 homes with 7 qualified contractors to complete this task with each contractor completing 3 homes a year to take a total of 309.5 years to raise all of the homes. I am hopeful that I am wrong here - please advise.	Please reference Appendix H: Implementation Plan for additional details on how the homes will be raised. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate.
		What is the process used when the levee will go over personal property? Will the landowner be compensated, or will they just lose the prop	The Non Federal Sponsor (NFS) will coordinate with USACE on negotiations regarding fair market value for required real property. Coordination of the effort between the NFS and USACE will be ongoing. Please see Sections 11 and 12 of Appendix G: Real Estate Plan for details on real estate actions, including estimated costs and coordinations efforts. The financial costs for the acquisition of the lands required for the construction, operation, and maintenance, for all three of the Recommended Plan measures, including lands required for mitigation sites and borrow sites, although specific borrow sites have yet to be determined, have been estimated (shown in the 01 – Lands and Damages account). The Facility/Utility Relocations costs have also been estimated. These estimates are preliminary and may be refined during PED. The financial costs estimates are distinct from the economic costs for National Economic Development Costs, referenced in ER 1105-2-100.
		What is the impact for the people inside of the levee in the event of a heavy rain event? For example, the Baton Rouge flood in Aug, 2016 which produced 20+ inches of rain over 4 days and left 75% of homes in total loss. It seems as if the levee designed to protect from storm surge would have opposite effect in a rain event.	Please reference Appendix E for the rainfall modeling results for the measures in the recommended plan.

		Can you please detail the cost to maintain the levee over time and where will those funds originate?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		What is the environmental impact of the proposed levee on the Pearl River Ecosystem? The West Pearl River continues to silt over from lack of flow and is currently incurring a $2.2 million dollar dredging project in St Tammany Parish on a very small segment of it. On top of its natural beauty, it is necessary for drainage for the area outside of the proposed levee and it continues to decline.	Please reference Appendix C for the full environmental impacts of the measures in the Recommended Plan.
		Opposed to putting together patchwork of levee systems and being hopeful to add on the them in broken segments at a future date, has surge mitigation been evaluated? It appears that if the CSX railroad were raised on the coastline, that it would act in the same way as a levee, except that it would protect us all and satisfy your requirement to do no harm.	This measure was considered and screened. Please see section 4 of the Main Report for more information on measures considered.
9/4/23	David Pooler	My husband David Pooler and I are home owners at 122 Ayshire Ct, Slidell, LA 70461. We have lived at this address in the Turtle Creek Subdivision (off of Military Road) for close to 30 years. In that time we have only flooded once, which was during Hurricane Katrina. The experience was a nightmare and one I do not wish to repeat. Our flood waters were attributed to the high water levels of the Pearl River, which is very close to our property. Just last week, we were informed on Facebook that the Army Corps will soon submit a plan for a levee on our side of town to Congress. After studying the proposal and reviewing the likelihood that this levee will hurt rather than help thousands of Slidell residents, my husband and I would like to voice our opposition to the plan drafted by the Army Corps. It is apparent that if the levee is built according to this plan, our subdivision and many others will be outside of the new levee. This will likely increase our risk of flooding in future storms. Historically, in areas where levees have been built, such as in Fenton, Missouri, other towns such as Arnold Missouri, have suffered the consequences of heavy damage due to flooding. Personally, I view the situation as dire.	Comment noted.
		Our property values are surely going to drop. I might add that many of the most valuable properties in Slidell, are located beyond the boundaries of the proposed levee. The Army Corps estimates that values may decrease by 20%. We never anticipated a loss of that magnitude on our primary investment.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		Our flood insurance costs will most certainly go up substantially, due to the increased risk of flooding. As Senior citizens on a fixed income, that is unacceptable.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		The environmental impacts to our side of town have not been addressed.	Please reference Appendix C: Environmental for the full environmental impact analysis.
		Many schools and businesses outside of the proposed levee would be likely to flood.	Comment noted.
		The models studied by the Army Corps did not address flooding from the Pearl River or rain events, as has happened in the past.	Rain events were modeled with the levee in place and results can be referenced in Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		It has been mentioned that 6,500 homes outside of the levee will have to be raised. There will be substantial cost to home owners to first bring their home up to current codes. In addition, the character and aesthetic of these homes will be negatively impacted. I have yet to learn if my home is included in the proposal, but I would be inclined to put my home on the market, if it were the case. In summary, I'd like to respectfully point out that this proposal does nothing to protect my neighbors and ourselves, rather, it will only harm us. Thus the Army Corps is not abiding by one of their own rules.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the
9/4/23	Holli Oatis	I live in Slidell and am completely against the levee protection program! It will destroy my neighborhood	Comment noted.

9/4/23	Michael Harpster	I am writing to express concerns regarding the proposed levee project and to include my name and address as one that opposes the current project. Many of my neighbors have expressed substantial details and evidence regarding this project and how it would be detrimental to my property and the surrounding area. The project leaves my property unprotected and could also result in further flooding in the areas along Military Road.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
9/4/23	Wayne and Cheryl Backes	The purpose of this letter is to express our opposition to the proposed St. Tammany Levee Project, and we would like our objections on the public record. We have lived in St. Tammany parish for 27 years at our current address in French Branch Estates on Rue Juneau. Our home has never flooded, however many of our neighbors have experienced significant property damage due to flood waters from rain and hurricanes. We are concerned that the current TSP will lead to flooding for us and worse flooding for our neighbors who are at lower elevations	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		There are a number of reasons for our concern. Increased risk of flooding from the Pearl River o With a levee wall in place next to our property, we would be located in an area that would retain greater amounts of water should such a flood occur as it has in the recent past. o Your modeling does not appear to have taken into account potential flooding from the Pearl Riiver and its impact the proposed protection plan on those of us outside (Appendix E, Page 80 appears to only acknowledge potential impact inside the levee)-	Please reference Appendix E, section 12. The previously reference section is regarding climate change.
		There are a number of reasons for our concern. climate related increases in flooding potential o Sea levels are rising, and Louisiana land levels are dropping. Additionally, there is a loss of wetlands, which have previously served as protection from flood events. These alone increase the threat of flooding to many residences in Louisiana; however, this threat is exacerbated by the construction of a levee that will restrict the flow of water, and confine it to a smaller area.	Comment noted.
		Section 5 of the St. Tammany Levee Project states that there would not be significant changes to storm surge levels in the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity system in the Greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System nor would there be an impact to the West Shore Lake Pontchartrain system. o The stated regions do not address Northshore areas east or west, and outside of the proposed levee and the potential impact to them during storm surge. o Additionally, section 5 states that there are possible increases of 1-3 feet in the 1 °/o AEP water level on the flood side of the levee/wall. Although the claim is for a 1 °/o increase, this is for the entire area. This risk is not equal, but will be much greater for large areas,	Comment noted.
		Effects on economy and the community have not been considered. o Schools, hospitals and other medical services, local businesses outside of the proposed levee which would be forced to decide if remaining here is viable	Please reference Appendix F: Economics for all factors considered in the feasibility process.
		Loss of home value increase in flood insurance outside of the levee in the TSP	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		Whe.re is the protection for those in our area, many of whom have already previously flooded? As designed, the TSP does not meet the needs of large portions of the St. Tammany Parish community. Our concerns related to increased potential flooding adjacent to and outside of the proposed levee have not been addressed. It seems that there is strong probability that residents located outside of the levee will be significantly harmed by the plan. We will request that the federal government not approve funding for this proposal without significant modifications to protect all of St. Tammany Parish.	Comment noted.

9/5/23		I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to a levee in Slidell, Louisiana. I am a lifelong resident of Slidell, Louisiana. Thru my adult years I have prided myself in protecting and cherishing our unique and prized ecosystem, culture and community. In addition to being an Administrative Coordinator at our local hospital, I am a charter and recreational fisherman. It is without question, obvious that a levee would have countless detrimental effects on our delicate ecosystem and economy. Restricting natural waterways will impact the seafood industry, our swamp and marsh lands. This is what we are known for.	The pumps will only be running when the gate structures are closed when there is a threat of a storm event posing a surge risk to the protected area. The purpose of the pumping stations is to drain the interior of the alignment when the line of protection is enclosed. The pumping stations will not introduce additional discharge that would not already be flowing to the floodside of the alignment during normal operating conditions (gravity flow). Please reference Appendix C: Environmental for the full environmental impact analysis.
		I am one of over 25,000 homes that will be excluded from the levees protection. A levee of such will lead to sky rocketing insurance rates due to an increased risk of flooding. Keep into mind, my insurance has increased from $3200 a year to $11,800 over the past couple of years as it is. I could only imagine how my homes value will dramatically decrease should this levee proposal become active. Home owners such as myself are already struggling to pay an inflated and unfair increased insurance rates.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		Businesses, schools, churches and religious sites will also be at an increased risk of flooding when a levee is erected. How can anyone thin	Comment noted.
		It is my understanding that my tax dollars will be spent to erect and maintain this levee. How will I be compensated and will I be compensate	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		The St. Tammany levee board discreetly held 2 public meeting that were not publicized effectively. Residents were not given the opportunity to fairly object to this levee. It is only thru word of mouth and social media that this proposal came to light which prompted people to reach out. I attended one of the two meeting and at the meeting no one mentioned that we could express opposition. I found out by searching on your website that I could express concerns via email.	Please reference Appendix C: Annex I for public involvement efforts in the study. The St. Tammany Levee, Drainage and Conservation District is a local entity, recognized as a such in the feasibility report. Their meetings are separate from those held by USACE.
		YOUR "project goals" to "reduce the severity of flood damages and risk to public health and safety" contradict just what a levee would do to District 13 residents and all those outside of the levee parameter. A levee will increase the severity of flood damages and risk to public health and safety. Hurricane Katrina was a	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

		Our homes, culture, ecosystem and way of life are worth CONSERVING. We knew the risk of flooding when we moved into a flood zone, what we did not anticipate was an astronomical inflated insurance rate and a compounded risk of flooding with the construction of a levee. It is absurd to implement what some see as detrimental 18 years AFTER the fact…Katrina.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
	Lana Houlihan	For the sake of all those to be impacted, I kindly ask you to reallocate the funds to coastal protection.	Comment noted.
9/5/23		My name is Jessica M. French. I live at 515 Cross Gates Blvd, Slidell, LA. I have lived in my home for one year. I want to make sure that I am on public record with the federal government with regard to this project. I have the following questions that I do not believe have been addressed. 1.□live in an area that drains fairly well at the current time. I am no engineer, but it seems to be that putting up a levee to the west of my home would increase the likely hood of flooding. How is creating a problem for a large number of residents fixing the currently non-existent problem?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		2.□The time frame of gathering public comment is absolutely atrocious. How can you guarantee that affected voices have been heard when no one knows about the possibility of this levee? I am a college-educated individual and I STILL had a very difficult time understanding the scope of this project and exactly how this will affect my home, subdivision, etc.	The 45 day public comment period is required by the National Environmental Policy Act. Please see Appendix C: Annex I for public involvement efforts.
		I have the following concerns 1.□This project seems to be creating more problems than it is solving. The levee as proposed will leave out a HUGE portion of East Slidell. This huge portion is a very large tax base. Without the tax base, this project will most certainly destroy the community. It is my understanding that destroying communities is not the goal, but I don't see how the proposed alignment of the levee can do anything but destroy the entire Gause/Military Road area. It is a large, bustling area with numerous schools, subdivisions, retail establishments, medical offices, restaurants, gyms, etc.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

	Jessica M. French	I have the following requests of the federal government. 1.TRANSPARENCY. It seems that this was rammed through on a very short time frame with little public awareness. Thank goodness there are citizens on the ground attempting to inform people of this project.	Refer to Appendix C: Annex I Public Involvement for information regarding the public outreach efforts for the feasibility study.
		2.Iwould like better educational materials regarding this project. Like stated above, I am a college-educated individual, but the report is heavily written in jargon, engineering speak. How can the people properly advocate for themselves if no one understands the problem at hand? Thank you for your time. This is just the tip of the iceberg of my concerns, but there wasn't exactly a great time frame to work with	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Sharon Jacobs	I am highly in favor of the recommendations in the most recent revised study area. As a 20 year resident of Slidell and a Hurricane Katrina survivor, St Tammany parish needs this flood protection project funded and started ASAP.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Johnny Rayner	So the program will fund the home being raised?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		My name is Elizabeth Stoltz, my husband is Darryl Stoltz, We live at 106 Dublin Ct. in Crossgates subdivision off of East Gauze. I have lived in my home since June 2004 when we moved back home from Houston, Texas. I want to make sure that I am on public record with the federal government with regard to this project.I have the following questions that I do not believe have been addressed or if addressed Awww seems to have been concluded with old or incomplete information. I have the following concerns and many more which my husband and I would like answered. We would like another meeting face to face with all involved in the decision to build this levee and exclude us. Also we would like clear updated answers and proof that this levee will not hurt or change our environment in any way.	Comment noted.
		I have the following comments and requests of the federal government. Very scary. I bought my house because of the flood plain it was in, the businesses nearby, doctors offices, large hospital etc. I was careful to consider all things before we bought our home. Now unbeknownst to us, this plan has been put into place to hurt those of us outside of the levee. This decision was supposed to make sure it would not hurt the environment or the people outside of this proposed levee. But instead, I have not seen anything yet that can assure us on the outside of the planned levee that we will not be hurt by this levee instead.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

9/5/23	Liz Stolz	Whole neighborhood houses will have to be raised at our expense first to bring anything to code before being raised and after to actually get it raised. This will in turn call for lots of changes in pipes and sewer, electrical wiring, gas lines etc etc. One change causes another change and it doesn't seem like much thought was given to this. Plus the fact that our neighborhood would COMPLETELY change as far as esthetics and usable land for growing our own food etc. I bought my house in my neighborhood because I liked the neighborhood feel. I didn't want a raised house area. Not to mention the fact that some if us weren't even approved to be raised.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		So shall we sit and wait for the water to come around that levee to us?	Comment noted.
		Who is going to pay for my raised flood insurance or the fact that I might eventually not even be able to get any at all? I didn't ask for this problem either and yet it becomes my problem? Who is going to pay to compensate me for my now much lowered property value as my whole neighborhood is being forced into a situation for which we didn't ask for.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		What studies have been done on water flow around this proposed levee as far as damages now caused to the "outside " areas? What changes will be caused to the environment, marshes, bayous, waterways, and the birds and animals who live there? Will there be damage to native trees, plants etc as a result of this levee? How will it affect how the wild animals move from one area to another? Will they be shut off from food and water? Will the levee system affect fishing, crabbing or shrimping in the area?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ Full environmental assessment in in Appendix C: Environmental.
		If the engineers are wrong and the "outside" areas /homes are flooded as a direct result of the levee, will the people who live there be bought out at prices before the levee was proposed as I am hearing talk that property value has already been affected/lowered in outside areas. Because if people are looking for a home they certainly are not going to buy a home in a possible flood area caused by a levee. We have all seen other places where levees have caused significant flooding in the outside areas.	Comment noted.
		Who will compensate businesses? How will churches/faith formations be compensated? Where will people go to the doctor or hospital, get their meds, shop for groceries, or send their kids to school if they are flooded on the outside!! I am proposing these questions and much more!!!! We would like to speak to all involved in decision/law/plan making. Please give us all a chance to do that before the decision is made. We have these questions and many more.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Susan Marsh	I am opposed to the levee/retaining wall that is being proposed in the eastern section of St. Tammany Parish in Slidell.	Comment noted.

9/5/23	Allyson Cleighton	I hope you are doing well, and appreciate your efforts to hear my concerns regarding the July 2023 Corps' St. Tammany Parish, LA., Feasibility Study Revised Draft. My name is Allyson Cleighton, and please note that I DO NOT support the currently proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiative to provide structural flood risk for Southeaster Louisiana (St. Tammany Parish). Specifically, this latest plan does NOT provide any structural or non-structural flood risk reduction system protections for the vast majority of the area east and south of I-10 (Military Road). This excluded demographic is roughly equal in size to the City of Slidell which is included in the current protection proposal. This current plan will cause major harm to the residents and business of the Military Road area.	Thank you for your comment. The areas outside of the structural protection have been identified as a part of the Nonstructural elevations and floodproofing.
		However, I, am in support of USACE Alternative D or E (Floodwall) Phase IV, which covers the vast majority of the Military Road area, which is currently excluded.	Comment noted.
		Since the residents living in the Military Road exclusion area are also tax payers, they deserve the same level of protection as all other residents of the Parish.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Carmine Costantini	I am a life long resident of St Tammany/Slidell. We currently reside in French Branch Estates (28 years). We are currently in flood zone x, which previously was c, flood insurance not required. At no time did our property flood. The proposed levee is within the Cleco right of way 25ft from our property line. The proposed study would in fact place our home on the Non Protected side of levee. The exposure to this proposal also places additional subdivisions on the wrong side, Meadowlake, New Cross Gates, Cross Gates, Quail Ridge, Turtle Creek and Honey Island school. Your proposed drawing shows tie in at Kingspoint levee and crossing over US Hwy 190 connecting into Cleco right of way. This may be the path of least cost but it as I mentioned causes problems to other communities. I believe what you are trying to achieve is in good faith but the results will cause greater flooding.	Comment noted.
		If you extended the Kingspoint levee down about 1 mile further east and build the levee near Indian Village be a better deterrent to prevent flooding without having a negative impact on the previous communities mentioned. I await your response.	Reference Section 4 Alternative Formulation for a detailed explanation of measures considered, screened and measures carried forward for further analysis
9/5/23	Sarah Guth	I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the levee protection—or lack thereof—for the homes on the east side of Slidell, Louisiana. It has come to my attention that due to the lower population density in this area, the costs of levee protection per house become higher, making it challenging to justify these projects from an economic standpoint. As stated by Roderick Scott, chairman of the Flood Mitigation Industry Association, the nature of the population distribution leads to higher per-house costs. However, I would like to bring to your attention that the value of a community, and its residents, shouldn't be solely quantified by economic metrics. The safety, well-being, and peace of mind that levee protection provides to homeowners are invaluable. Every resident, irrespective of where they live, deserves to feel safe and protected in their homes. The homes on the east side of Slidell, though fewer in number, are an integral part of our community. Many of these homes represent significant investments by families, and it's crucial to ensure their protection against the devastating impacts of floods.	Refer to Appendix F: Economics for all factors included in determining economic impacts and benefits.
		I understand the complexities involved in decision-making, especially when it comes to allocating resources. However, I would urge you to consider alternative solutions or partnerships that might allow for the protection of these homes. Perhaps exploring collaborations with private entities, grants, or community fundraising efforts could help bridge the financial gap	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		Many of the residents in East St. Tammany are extremely involved in the community. A large amount are business owners who contribute to local jobs. Continuing with the proposed flood wall that excludes these residents will drive a large number of residents to consider moving, which will have a tremendous negative affect on the community.	Comment noted.
		Lastly, I'd appreciate any information on how concerned residents like myself can get involved or assist in this matter. Collaborative efforts between local authorities and the community can often yield creative solutions to seemingly insurmountable challenges. Thank you for taking the time to consider this important issue. I hope we can work together to find a viable solution that ensures the safety and security of all Slidell residents. Warm regards,	Reference the study webpage where future opportunities for public involvement and study developments will be announced. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

9/5/23	Gayle Klein	My name is Gayle Klein and I live at 502 Corss Gates Blvd., Slidell and have resided intheis house for 30 years. I have studied the proposed levee plan and have many concerns about it. As proposed it seems that it will only benefit some of Slidell/St. Tammany areas byt will cause flooding to areas in east Slidell.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ Full environmental assessment in in Appendix C: Environmental.
		A good portion of some areas in east Slidell consists of a large number of young coupes with small children a nd also of senior citizens. This proposed plan is unfair since it doesn't protect all residents.	Areas outside of the structural risk reduction measure may be eligible for the Nonstructural Plan for risk reduction.
		Most of our properties on the east side of Slidell are in a free flood szone and this proposal will chane this which in turn will raise our flood insurance and homeowner's policies.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		We need other options that will benefit all fo the parish not just some. A large number of Slidell residents can't afford $100,000 to raise their homes. We need to vote on any and all proposals for a levee if needed. We need to be united in this matter. Thank you for considering my concerns.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.

9/5/23	David Cougle, Councilman	My name is David Cougle and I am writing in opposition to the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) for St. Tammany parish. In addition to being a candidate for parish council, District 9, I am of course, a resident of District 9. Myself and my fellow residents are quite concerned about the possibility of flooding and other related issues, as you can imagine, so we have been following the USACE's work on this quite closely and are at a loss as to why our district is being excluded from protection by this proposal.	Areas outside of the structural measures are under consideration for the Nonstructural Plan.
		There are many other ideas that would offer more protection, including that of raising HWY 90/190, to our district, but it seems those are not being sufficiently considered in this particular proposal. Instead, we have something that excludes a large amount of homes, leaves a large amount of the parish unprotected, and would leave my entire district exposed and possibly make things even worse for us.	Areas outside of the structural measures are under consideration for the Nonstructural Plan. Coordination of efforts that are outside of the Federal proposal are ongoing with CPRA.
		I appreciate the plan's attention to the greater Slidell area, but I ask that you consider the fact that this plan simply does not work for us. We, as taxpayers and residents, deserve protection by any plan that is proposed and expect the same. The overwhelming majority of us have lived here during some of the worst storms in the last several decades, and we know how critical it is that our area be protected. Thank you for your time and prompt attention to this matter.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Carol Cleighton	I hope you are doing well, and appreciate your efforts to hear my concerns regarding the July 2023 Corps' St. Tammany Parish, LA., Feasibility Study Revised Draft. My name is Carol Cleighton and I have lived in Slidell, LA for 43 years, and at my current home for 33 years. In all of those years, we've flooded once, and that was a direct result of Hurricane Katrina. In fact, on May 7th and 8th, 1995 this area received more than twenty-five inches of rain which fell in a twenty-four hour period. My house did not flood. Specifically, this latest plan does NOT provide any structural flood risk reduction system protections for the vast majority of the area east and south of I-10 (Military Road). This area represents approximately 25,000 residents, over 500 businesses, two schools, a fire station, and an electrical substation. This excluded demographic is roughly equal in size to the City of Slidell which is included in the current protection proposal.	Comment noted.
		This current plan will cause major harm to the residents and businesses of the Military Road area.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		Why is the USACE proposing a 14" levee so far inland?	Other alternatives were considered for the area as seen in the Main Feasibility Report, section 4.1.
		Is this levee to prevent flooding at the Katrina levels?	The system is designed to the HSDDRS standards for levee design at the 100 year storm level.
		Hurricane Katrina was a once-in-a-lifetime event?	Comment noted
		Acceleration of the Fritchie Marsh project (currently underway) will provide some protection from future flooding by dropping flood waters.	Comment noted.
		Why not pursue flood protection at the old CSX railroad tracks as a surge barrier, by closing 5 openings? This plan requires cooperation between Louisiana, Mississippi, two USACE districts, and many other State and local AGENCIES.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
		Please note that I DO NOT support the currently proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiative to provide structural flood risk for Southeaster Louisiana (St. Tammany Parish). However, I, am in support of USACE Alternative D or E (Floodwall) Phase IV, which covers the vast majority of the Military Road area, which is currently excluded.	Comment noted.

		Since the residents living in the Military Road exclusion area are also taxpayers, they deserve the same level of protection as all other residents of the Parish. What are the reasons this area is excluded? Sincerely, Carol	The areas outside of the structural protection of the levee are under Nonstructural Plan. Eligible structures would be raised outside of the 100 year flood plain. Please see the Main Feasibility Report, section 4.1 for the screen process for alternatives.
9/5/23	Rick Saluga	My name is Rick Saluga and I live at 2160 Hampshire Drive, Slidell, LA 70461. I have lived at this address for 28 years and never flooded. I am writing to voice my opposition to the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) for St. Tammany Parish. I am permanently disabled and confined to a power chair. My home is designed with a lift system for transfers, has a whole house generator and is handicapped accessible. I am homebound. I am very concerned that the proposed plan will cause my home to flood. I have no idea why you would not protect such a large area of Slidell that has a big tax base and schools. As a taxpaper and resident I am asking that you please reconsider this plan and seek to protect all residents of the Slidell area. This plan does not work for me. Thank you for your time and prompt attention to this request.	Thank you for your comment. The structures (homes and businesses) outside of the structural risk reduction of the levee may be eligible under the Nonstructural plan.
9/5/23	Maria Ricca	Thank you for your efforts to help protect the land flooding in our area. Your proposed plan for protection appears to be feasible for preventing flooding and I support it.	Comment noted.
		It is evident that the bayous and tributaries are filled with sediment and marsh due to the push from recent storms and will need to be dredged in order to regain water retention area.	At this time, there are no plans to dredge any of the bayous or tributaries
		Also, an added weir at the Rigolets would be a possibility to protect all perimeters of Lake Pontchartrain without walling off the entire lake.'Hopefully, this project will be a priority due to the losses already incurred in this region and the imminent potential for another storm. Your concern is greatly appreciated.	A structure at the Rigolet's was considered and screened. Please see section 4.1 for the discussion of initial alternatives.
		After writing & rereading this letter, I came back to add … please forgive my feelings showing through in this letter – if you put yourself in my shoes, I think you can understand why I am upset. My name is Joanne Astredo and I own the property at 125 Rue Holiday in French Branch. This has been my home since August 2003 when my children were 13, 12 & 6. Less than 18 months after we moved here, my daughter was diagnosed with Leukemia and went through 2 ½ years of chemotherapy, then fought (and is still living with) avascular necrosis due to side effects from the chemo. Shortly after all of this, I divorced. My daughter did not want to leave the home where she went through so much and the wonderful people that have supported us throughout her treatment. She knew I could not afford the house on my own and she offered to help financially. With her help and the fact that we had never flooded, not even for Katrina (which was during my daughter's chemo treatment) I managed a way to buy out my ex so we could stay in the home and area we love.	Comment noted.
		Now I hear about a levee wall. I do realize that hearing things through the grapevine that it is not always accurate, but from what I have heard, the wall will basically go through neighborhoods and my neighborhood will not be protected. I find it hard to believe because I have never heard or seen anywhere a levee wall in a neighborhood, and I can't believe anyone would consider putting a wall in a neighborhood or anywhere near peoples' homes. I am all about protecting peoples' homes and definitely feel for the people that have flooded in the past.	The levee and floodwall is anticipated to go though some of the Slidell community. Please see section 6.2 of the Main Feasibility Report for a map and description of the levee alignment. This alignment is a preliminary alignment for the feasibility level analysis completed by the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study.
		I have also heard that we will be taxed to help pay for this levee wall – so basically I will be paying to have my home flood, not to mention we probably will not be able to afford flood insurance if anyone will even insure us.	The proposed project, if authorized and funded by Congress, would be funded by the Federal Government and Non Federal Sponsor.

9/5/23	Joanne Astredo	I've also heard there may be assistance to raise our homes. I did not buy a raised or multi-level home because I planned to live out my life here and I did not want to deal with stairs. Plus, I've heard we will need to bring our homes to current code in order to get this assistance and this is not something I can afford to do. My partner and I own 2 businesses and were beginning to get to where we weren't robbing Peter to pay Paul until Covid hit. With the debt we are in, including 2 SBA loans, we probably can't even get SBA loans. We are bringing money into Slidell and St Tammany between 2 occupancy licenses we are paying due to having a home office for 2 businesses (one business was primarily in NO but Ida flooded that office and insurance has yet to pay for damage), as will sales tax we bring in for 5 fireworks locations (and we are continuously looking for new locations in the area). There are several other businesses and some of the best schools around that will be left out of this current plan I am just recently hearing about.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		I'm sure there must be other options. I heard something about the railroad line – wouldn't this also improve the railroad? If so, wouldn't the railroad assist financially? Has this even been considered?	The closure at the Rigolet's was considered and screened. Please see section 4 of the Main Report for this information.
		I'm already high anxiety and this surely is not helping. I have also heard this has been in the plans for several years. Why haven't we been notified? Why are we just now hearing about it?	USACE followed policy for advertisements and coordination with the public. Please see Appendix C, Annex I for the details regarding public outreach for this effort.
		ome are saying it is a done deal. How can it be a done deal when so many people that are being negatively impacted still do not know exactly what is going on?	The study is in the feasibility level of design. While this stage of the process is complete, the recommended plan has not been authorized and funded by Congress. If it is authorized and funded by Congress, we expect at least three to five additional years of Preconstruction Engineering and Design before the first increment of construction could begin.
		Last thoughts – please put yourself in our shoes and consider other options such as the railroad. On my knees!!	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Elizabeth Sleeper	I am writing out of serious concern for the levee plans in Slidell. The current plan has our home just outside the levee. It will leave our home at greater risk of flood damage and make acquiring and affording home owners insurance nearly impossible. My husband and I purchased our home two years ago. We were first time homebuyers and relocated from San Diego to raise our family in our dream home. We have four children at home. Two of which are special needs. We are also foster parents. The current levee plans could seriously effect our ability to keep our home. It wouldn't just be a matter of moving for us. It would massively effect our childrens lives. Occupational therapy, speech therapy, behavioral health, Autism, psychologists, schools. Please consider other options.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) continues to recommend that construction features of the proposed project not be located within Big Branch Marsh National Wildlife Refuge. If the USACE determines that this option is not feasible, close coordination with the Service will be necessary, throughout the planning, construction, and mitigation design and monitoring phases of the project to minimize impacts to that refuge to the maximum extent practicable. As discussed in PDT meetings, levee alignments should avoid and/or minimize impacts to surface hydrological features (including existing drainage ditches/canals) to the extent practicable to avoid inducing excessive inundation of forested wetlands. As such, it may be necessary to construct an interior borrow canal to maintain current hydrology in areas that would otherwise be impacted. The Service recommends that the USACE assess the feasibility and function of such a canal and provide that information in the subject document. In addition, any planned floodgates should be designed to efficiently handle the drainage needs and avoid increased flooding duration and depths for the large, protected area north of any levee alignments.	If project is authorized and funded, the USACE will continue to work closely with the service to minimize impacts to the refuge and significant habitats to the extent possible and still meet the project purpose and need. Additional surveys and data would be collected during PED to inform the project design and analysis. Additional H&H modeling is also planned for PED to refine hydrologic conditions and operations of proposed floodgates/pump stations etc. If after conducting additional modeling it is determine that an interior borrow canal would benefit and maintain the current hydrology, the impacts from the action would be assessed and disclosed in supplemental NEPA documents.

9/5/23	Becky Collins, USFWS	Page 13, Mile Branch Channel Improvements: In order to minimize impacts to Mile Branch, the Service recommends that the USACE assess whether the existing culverts are sufficiently sized to allow for adequate drainage. If larger culverts would be installed, we recommend the USACE assess whether these larger structures would preclude the need to widen and deepen the channel. In addition, the Service recommends that the USACE assess whether debris build-up at bridges and/or culverts is blocking/limiting conveyance of floodwaters. If obstructions in the waterway are present and removal would allow for adequate flow during flood events, the Service recommends that the less damaging action of snagging and clearing be conducted in place of widening and deepening the canal. The Service further recommends the USACE include a statement in the Final EIS confirming that this assessment will be completed; and, should larger culverts and/or debris removal adequately improve conveyance of floodwaters then mechanical dredging of Mile Branch	Mile Branch improvements are not part of the Recommended Plan.
		Page 17, Table ES-2. Environmental Impacts: Net gain in Average Annual Habitat Units (AAHUs) indicates that the project is beneficial to the habitat being evaluated; a net loss of AAHUs indicates that the project is damaging to that habitat type. Because the proposed project would result in adverse impacts to habitats present in the project area, AAHU values should be a negative value. The Service recommends revising accordingly.	The change has been made in the FEIS
		Page 40, 3.2.1.1.4 Longleaf Pine Flatwood Savanna, Paragraph 2, Sentence 1: This sentence should read “Pine savannas are scattered within the study area and are a managed habitat type within Big Branch Marsh National Wildlife Refuge.”	Correction will be made in the FEIS
		Page 41, Section 3.2.1.3 Soils: This section does not describe soil types present within the study area; instead, it describes the percentage of land/water in the area. The Service recommends revising this Section to adequately discuss the soil types that are located within the project area.	Figure 3-4 highlights the prime and unique soils in study area and Table 3-7 on pg 42 lists the soils within the study area and the percentage. The heading for the table will be changed from "Farmland Classification for St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana" to read "Soils Classification and farmland rating for St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana
		Page 47, Section 3.2.1.8 Wildlife: Add intermediate marsh as a habitat type that occurs within the project area.	Correction will be made in the FEIS
		Page 48, Table 3-9 Threatened and Endangered Species in St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana that may be Present in the Project Area: In Louisiana, the gopher tortoise occurs in Washington, Tangipahoa, and St Tammany Parishes. This species is associated with areas that have well drained, sandy soils appropriate for burrow establishment, ample sunlight for nesting, and understory vegetation suitable for foraging (i.e., grasses and forbs). Suitable soil types for gopher tortoises include Latonia and Bassfield (highly suitable), Cahaba, Ruston, and Smithdale (less suitable), and Abita, Malbis, Angie, and Prentiss (marginal). The proposed project area contains areas of suitable habitat; therefore, the Service recommends indicating that this species may be present in the project area.	Table 3-9 has been corrected to correctly indicate that the Gopher Tortoise may be found in the project area
		Page 49, Section 3.2.1.9.3 Red-cockaded Woodpecker (RCW), Last Sentence: This sentence reads “The proposed project would be located in a parish known to be inhabited by RCWs; however, it is anticipated that this species is more of a concern toward the northern border of the parish, where uplands are more common and there is less development.” RCWs are known to occur on Big Branch Marsh National Wildlife Refuge, located in the southern portion of the parish, and this population has been identified as a significant support population in the RCW Recovery Plan. Significant support populations are populations that have a population goal of 10 or more active clusters. Support populations are an important source of immigrants for other populations to increase retention of genetic variation and could potentially provide a buffer against stochastic loss of core populations. Accordingly, the Service recommends revising or removing this sentence.	This section has been corrected to reflect the RCW are known to occur in the project area
		Page 182, Section 5.1.1.1 Wetlands Resources, Sentence 2: Add that the Bottomland Hardwood wetland value assessment was used to determine impacts to riparian habitat along Mile Branch.	This section has been corrected to indicate that the BLH WVA was used to assess impacts to riparian habitat along mile branch
		Page 203, Section 5.1.1.7 Threatened, Endangered and Protected Species, Sentence 3: Add the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries as an agency participating in the gopher tortoise surveys.	This clarification will be made in the FEIS
		Page 203, Section 5.1.1.7 Threatened, Endangered and Protected Species, Sentence 5: Replace the term “cluster analysis” with “foraging habitat analysis.”	This change will be made in the FEIS
		Page 318, Section 7 Mitigation Assessment: Bullet 2 should be revised to read “Compensate for the loss of 55 average annual habitat units (0 red-cockaded woodpecker AAHU; 55 pine warbler AAHU) of Pine Savanna habitat on private lands in the Lake Pontchartrain Watershed.”	This change will be made in the FEIS
		Page 318, Section 7 Mitigation Assessment: Bullet 4 should be revised to read “Compensate for the loss of 21 average annual habitat units (17 red-cockaded woodpecker AAHU; 5 pine warbler AAHU) of Pine Savanna habitat on refuge land within BBMNWR.	This change will be made in the FEIS
		This communication is in response to the proposed levee location in East St. Tammany Parish. We learned of this proposal through local concerned citizens. I have reviewed the drawings and imagery showing the proposed levee locations and it is very disturbing. The proposed location of the level will leave out some of the most vulnerable areas along the Pearl River Basin (approximately 25,000 residents, schools, and businesses). The lower lying areas along Military Rd are already suffering compounding problems due to over-development and a lack of dredging of the gravity fed drainage canals and feeder bayous to the Pearl River.	Comment noted.

9/5/23	Martin Doody	Building a levee in the location as proposed would further increase the flooding potential of the exposed areas. The requirement to raise the homes not protected would cause an artificial undue financial burden on those homeowners, with many unable to pay the costs. In addition, this would have a long term negative effect on values of properties excluded from the levee.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		Leaving this many residents in the most impacted areas of the east side of the parish unprotected is gross negligence. As a resident of East St. Tammany, I implore your office to reconsider the location of the proposed levee, and relocate it east of the neighborhoods along the Pearl River.	Comment noted.
		I attended the St. Tammany Levee District's initial meeting on this subject about 3 years ago and again the one last Wednesday where they discussed the ACOE flood protection plan for the south Slidell area. Their proposed plan did not change significantly in that time, Although, they did do several feasibility studies during that time. Unfortunately, the reality of living in the Military Road area of Slidell is that the current belief of the various parties studying the issue of flooding in our area is that any affordable plan for levee construction to protect those of us in a Military Road Subdivision, would also destroy the wetlands. So, we are forced to decide on a plan spending billions of federal dollars to protect areas further north and west of us. We will indirectly benefit by having the City of Slidell, businesses, friends and relatives that are inside the levee, protected. However, not only will we not directly benefit from this plan, but we will be harmed in several ways.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		1) The plan expects those who live outside of the levee system to flood more frequently and at higher levels.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		2) We would have to expect our property values to drop as a result of this.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.

9/5/23	Frank maggio	3) We would have to expect insurance rates to increase as a result of this.	USACE followed Engineering Regulation 1150-2-100 for development of the National Economic Development Plan. Structures within the 50 year floodplain are included in the Nonstructural Plan for the STPFS. f authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. Future with project modeling did not show inducements outside of the levee that would add any structures to the plan for mitigation purposes. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		4) The cost benefit analysis that what done, and is the basis for the ACOE's decision to move forward, only included the cost of constructing the levee system and did not consider the cost of #2 and #3 above (since it is not coming out of their funding) and it did not consider the full cost to mitigate those residents and businesses left out of the levee protection system through buy-outs, home and business structure elevations, waterproofing structures, etc. (which at this point is understated in the ACOE plan (6,500 out of 28,000 structures), and we would have to find funding for it elsewhere for the structures that are left out)	Please see section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		5) We should expect St. Tammany taxes to go up in order to pay for the maintenance and repair of the new levee system, which will be turned over to the parish.	Thank you for the comment.
		I wish I could support this plan because I would like to see those people in the protected areas benefit, but the cost to those thousands of residents who are left out is just too much. I am against supporting this plan.	Thank you for the comment.
9/5/23	Adam Bowers	I find it very disturbing that a levee will be built to protect all but some of highest value neighborhoods in eastern st Tammany parish. we pay property taxes just like anyone inside your proposed levee system. why leave out our neighborhoods and homes? please redraw this levee to include all homes on eastern Slidell as it was meant to be.	Thank you for the comment. An analysis was done to include the areas outside of the current levee alignment. Please see section 4.4 of the main report for the analysis completed on the levee during the optimization process.
9/5/23	Paula Mills	Just finding out about this leaves me little time to compose a proper letter, but please take into account what I say. We live in Magnolia Forest off of Military Rd. We will be outside of this proposed levee. Homes in our neighborhood have flooded in the past. My home has never flooded before. Our fear is that this levee could make our area more prone to flood in the future. If a levee is being considered it needs to protect us all!	It is not anticipated that the structures outside of the levee system will see a significant increase in water surface elevations. Please see Appendix E Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for more information on potential flooding outside of the levee alignment. Modeling efforts indicate less than 2 inches of additional water surface elevation outside of the levee in the 100 year event, present year event. Structures that are not included in the Nonstructural Plan are not justified above the 50 year level event. Please see the Economics Appendix for the cost benefit analysis completed for the Nonstructural Plan. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		First, I commend the Corps for beginning this study. Anything that can be done to avoid or control the flooding in these areas is very important. As a member of the Bayou Liberty Association, I appreciate your efforts to share information and listen to the concerns of those who will be closely affected by this project.	Comment noted.

9/5/23	Suzanne Broadwell	I am concerned about the height limitation at the floodgate on Bayou Liberty. This height restriction will make it impossible for sailboats/ tall vessels to maneuver in the areas upstream where we live. Also, we now have 2 marinas that service this area, and again, these boats would be unable to use the upstream waters. We have a beautiful public campground, Camp Salmon, which is open to all, and would not be usable by families owning these taller boats.	The engineering team started with the data set they had available for current channel dimensions. Then they completed modeling efforts to appropriately size the gates to maintain existing water flows. Table E: 14-1 in that appendix details the minimum gate width. The lift gate was selected for this location with engineering and environmental considerations in mind. Other considerations down the line that could affect the gate designs would be surveys of the channels, additional hydraulic modeling, environmental considerations such as recreation, and coordination with the Coast Guard.
		I would like to see the levee alignment moved further west onto the Big Branch National Wildlife Reserve. This would allow more private property protection, less visibility to floodgates pumps, etc., and less destruction of private property.	Comment noted.
		Again, I thank you for listening to my concerns and hope that you will continue to inform us as a group as the project grows and changes.	Comment noted.
		I attended a meeting a few years ago regarding the flooding on this side of the parish and remember an exchange I had with a parish employee that told me we did not have a flooding issue in our area, River Oaks at Holly Ridge, because there were no flood claims after the 2016 flood event nor Hurricane Issac. The fact that there are no flood claims is not indicative of there not being a flooding problem. During Hurricane Isaac, the 2016 Flood event and Hurricane Ida we were water locked into our homes and neighborhood. All of the streets in and out were flooded and our homes were like little islands in the area. These homes were built based on the Elevation rules in place in 2004 and now that has been changed by the Army Corp of Engineers yet I cannot see that any of that information has been considered in this plan. Why are we left out of the plan along with the Military Road area including Cypress Cove and Honey Island? I have so many questions.	Structures that are outside of the levee alignment and within the 50 year floodplain are preliminarily eligible for inclusion in the nonstructural plan. Refer to Appendix H: Implementation Plan for details on the nonstructural plan.
		We moved here from East Moline, IL an area known as the Quad Cities, which is located beside the Mississippi River, (there is a Corp of Engineers office in Rock Island, IL, part of the Quad Cities). The Mississippi River has a long history of flooding and many cities along the way have built levees and then areas nearby that had not had a flooding issue suddenly have a problem during the next flood event. (Steven is a career Fire Fighter/Emergency Disaster Director and Emergency Preparedness Director, we have seen some flooding living along the Mississippi in Illinois.) Developers come in and are allowed to fill in low lying and wetland areas as long as they replace it with a similar area nearby, this does not historically work because the natural flow of water is being altered and now it flows to an area not previously having water issues based on water always seeking the lowest and easiest point. The computer generated models do not seem to take into consideration on what will happen to all the water flow with the levees in place. Where will it have a tendency to go based on the elevation levels and the directions the canals flow or do not flow in the case of a surge from Lake Ponchartrain?	Please see Appendix E Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for more information on movement of the water with the levee in place. Modeling efforts indicate less than 2 inches of additional water surface elevation outside of the levee in the 100 year event, present year event. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		When the Pearl floods what will happen?	Please see Appendix E Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 14 for more information on modeling of the Pearl River. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		What about the project in Jackson MS, if that proceeds there will be many more problems in this area.	The One Lake project is conducting its own analysis of impacts as it proceeds. The St. Tammany Parish Louisiana Feasibility Study considered current projects on the ground and the proposed alternatives in its analysis.

9/5/23	Deborah & Steven Carlson	I have heard it discussed that those left out of the plan would have their homes raised, what if they cannot be raised? How can you compensate us for loss of value on our homes when the insurance rates will change based on the levee location. Who will make sure that proper compensation happens based on values now before the levee? What if what you say is proper compensation and the actual sale price of the property after the levee are vastly different? Are you going to enter into a legal and binding contract with all of us to raise our homes or pay for loss of value? Will the government fund this project to pay for our homes to be raised or is there the potential to not fund that part? How are we to trust this when this study has left out so many areas in the process and decision?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		The Parish had the ability to alert all of the home owners this process was happening yet they chose not to, the information could have been provided to you as well, we receive mail from the Parish thru the post office when they want to communicate something to us. This makes me wonder why no communication? The locals have information on their specific area that might not be known by those behind a desk on the opposite side of the parish. We know where the water is pushing in from and where it goes when it leaves based on Pearl River flooding or surge pushing in, insurance claims do not tell the whole story!	Details on the study process and public outreach and involvement can be found in Appendix C, Annex I. Public input was taken at public meetings in 2021, during an official public comment period in 2021 and throughout the course of the study. While insurance claims are a starting point for identifying areas of flood concern, additional input was taken from the public and USACE conducted modeling efforts to establish the movement of water without a project and with a project in place. Alternative analysis can be found in the main report. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		Levees are always a hot topic and engineers want to solve problems. Some problem solving creates even more problems and leaving out information to make the model fit what one entity wants to happen is not good problem solving. I do not wish to see this plan to proceed as written at this point, there needs to be more information provided with concrete proof of the governments commitment to follow thru with promises. The parish has allowed the development in these areas to occur, collect the taxes and now are pulling the rug out from under us or land so to speak.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Cathy Jones	I am responding to your proposed flood wall that will have a major impact to two homes that I own in French Branch and Quail Ridge sub divisions. I have endured two floods in French Branch in 2021flood insurance does not pay for the misery that it creates in your life needless to say a disaster such as Katrina with all your personal possessions such as countless children and wedding pictures with relatives whom a deceased. Please use the railroad proposed levy protection wall that has been studied by Loyola which will stimulate growth and prosperity in our region and will not have an impact on our infer structure	Structures that are not included in the Nonstructural Plan are not justified above the 50 year level event. Please see the Economics Appendix for the cost benefit analysis completed for the Nonstructural Plan.
9/5/23	Dorothy Fulton	I have just found out about this project today ... I would like to know my personal impact as it looks like I will fall outside the Levee borders. I have tried to understand the material. Please advise me what steps this would cause me to take. Would I have to raise my home? I live in a neighborhood named The Landings. The address of my home is 532 Dockside Dr. Slidell. I do not want this project to move forward as I purchased it at this location for the Flood Zone C area. There has NOT been enough communication about this project.	The address reference is outside of the structural risk reduction feature. If the structure is determined to be in the 50 year floodplain, it is preliminarily eligible to be raised in the nonstructural plan. Participation in the nonstructural plan is voluntary.

9/5/23	Mary Beyer	Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the St Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. I am a homeowner in eastern Slidell and am currently excluded from the Tentatively Selected Plan. My concerns include the following: -- The report indicates that my property will experience a net negative impact during storm surge events due to the proposed TSP, and that some of the structural alternatives, not included, would have lessened or mitigated this impact. Why was east Slidell excluded from a structural solution?	In the areas outside of the structural features of the recommended plan, the Nonstructural plan for home elevations and business floodproofing is a part of the recommended plan. For details on this portion of the plan, please see section 6.1 of the main Feasibility Report.
		The loss costs identified seem undervalued and definitely do not include The inflationary pressures experienced over The past three years. Such an undervaluation not only depresses The value of The loss experienced by The excluded property owners but hurts The cost-benefit ratio of proposed alternatives. Additionally, public buildings and services (water utilities, wastewater treatment, fire and emergency response, schools) lay outside The structural protection and I couldn t identify where The costs for relocating or restoring those services were clearly laid out when analyzing alternatives. were The above concerns considered in your cost data, and if so, where? Was The impact of flooded wastewater treatment facilities considered in your environmental factors?	Refer to Appendix F: Economics for a detailed explanation of factors that contribute to development of the benefit to cost ratio.
		Multiple assumptions were made in the analysis of the non-structural alternatives (dry floodproofing, elevating) that were not justified in the report. For instance, you quote five contractors able to raise 100 homes simultaneously each month to justify your timeline. I could not find any market research to justify that remarkably rapid pace of progress. Your non-structural alternatives also place a heavy burden, in cost, effort, and time, in non-federal partners for permitting and utilities, and in the individual homeowners to schedule the work and to pay for non-reimbursable elements of the work. I could not find evidence that these steps were included in your schedule. Please provide evidence of market research conducted and details of your scheduling process to verify that the local area industry partners can meet the pace of work, that the government agencies can meet the permitting timelines, and that all excluded properties can achieve the non-structural alternative prior to the construction of the flood protection structures that will increase hazards to the excluded properties.	Our Non Federal Sponsor has committed to the assumptions made in the report. Their written commitment will be a part of the final Chief's Report.
		Thank you for your assistance, and our community looks forward to more dialogue with the project team to produce an equitable and beneficial project proposal. We can be reached at 985-290-0423 or 985-290-5957.	Comment noted.
		I am writing to express my deep concerns and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. I reside in the “New” Cross Gates neighborhood, on the west side of Military Road. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community.	Comment noted
		1. Accelerate and Improve Fritchie Marsh Restoration: I strongly recommend accelerating and enhancing the ongoing Fritchie Marsh restoration project. as it holds significant potential to reduce storm surge. Proper restoration of the marsh could result in a substantial dropin surge levels, providing some degree of storm surge protection. You can find detailed information about this project in attachment (A) Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing (P0-173) source.	No attachment received, however we are aware of the Fritchie Marsh Project. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is a separate authorization from the Fritchie Marsh Creation.
		2. Collaboration with DOTD and CPRA for Surge Mitigation: I urge you to collaborate with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) to explore surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East. A similar study for surge mitigation using Hwy 11 and Lakeshore Drive (Rat's Nest Road) is already underway. The Hwy 190 restoration and bridge replacement project should be activated soon, presenting an opportunity to maximize further reductions in storm surge through structural changes to highway and bridge design.	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		3. Change Funding Allocation for Residential Protection Strategies: I propose a change in funding allocation language within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) budget. Currently, the focus is primarily on home slab elevation, which may not be the most cost-effective or efficient strategy. I suggest amending the language to allow for a range of residential protection strategies, similar to the options available for businesses. Such a change would align with the USACE study's recommendations and could lead to more effective and affordable solutions for homeowners, especially homeowners who are on fixed- and/or retirement incomes.	USACE is required to follow policy and guidance for feasibility studies. Should policy be changed, the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study would adapt to those changes.
		4. Consider Alternative Levee Sites: I request a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites, including alignments that extend along Hwy 190 and/or Military Road. All proposed alignments currently leave sonie residents outside of protection, which raises concerns about the fairness and equity of the project.	USACE considered over 200 measures from the start of the study for potential risk reduction. Please see the Main Report and Plan Formulation appendix for documentation of all alternatives considered and screening criteria.
		5. Collaboration on a Surge Barrier Plan: I strongly recommend joining the Lake Coalition to explore the feasibility of using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier. This plan has the potential to close five openings, preventing surges of up to 10 feet. While it may require extensive coordination, including involvement at a Cabinet level;--it could offer a cost-effective and efficient solution to protect our community.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.

		6. Full Upfront Coverage of Horne Elevation Costs: All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these costs before qualifying for grants. In visiting my local community, the FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Costs associate with the Nonstructural Plan that are allowed by policy are covered under the funding for the proposed elevations. Please see sections 4.1.2 and 6.1 of the Main Report as well as the Economics appendix for further discussion of the costs associated with the Nonstructural Plan. USACE coordinates with FEMA, but does not have control over the policies in place for FEMA.
		7. Impact on Local Schools: An assessment of the impact on local schools, particularly those in areas excluded from the levee, must be conducted. The disregard for property, community, and the tax base could have long-term negative consequences for our education system which is directly related to jobs and thus a core responsibility of the army Corp of engineer to address as part of this and any other proposal.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for impacts analysis for the project.
		8. Oversight Entity for Funding Allocation: The creation of an independent entity, separate from St. Tammany Parish and Louisiana, to ensure fair and transparent allocation of project funds, free from potential biases or political influence and diversion of funds to other programs, interests etc.... Funds would be managed for Education, Vocation, Elevation, Relocation, Mitigation, levee maintenance, etc....	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization Documents.
		9. Options for Affected Residents: Total Buyout: Offer a total buyout of property by the federal government, including relocation costs. These buyouts should be fair market value as of 2021 when the project was started. Offers such as those made for Avery Estates have shown that many will be unable to find new housing, move themselves, elevate their property or secure insurance/funding for new homes if homeowners are not adequately compensated. Additionally addressing this early with homeowners living in their single-family homes would prevent unnecessary delays, lawsuits etc... by current residents who've had buy-in to a process that has not been transparent. The buy- out process should also be handled by a dedicated, non-affiliated entity as described above in paragraph 8, ensuring that the fair-market price is fair to both sides, not just the federal government. The reality is that the homeowner is always unduly compensated in buy-out programs, leaving them in a much poorer state than they anticipated.	Refer to Section 4 of the Main Report and Appendix B Plan Formulation for detail on consideration of buyouts and why this was screened.
9/5/23	Angie Eberly	10. Moratorium on Building: Implement a moratorium on all new building in the area and within 50 minutes of the levee to protect existing residents. This would ensure that all monies earmarked for elevation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes at the time of project inception and completion.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
		11. Local Job Training: Creation of a training program for Louisiana residents to participate in the levee's construction, providing long-term, family-wage job opportunities that are long term and local hires. Provide programs for residents who can no longer working their current employment due to the hardships brought upon by increased and excess travel, higher medical insurance, and taxes brought about by the levee systems.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		12. Tax Refunds: Provide tax refunds to homeowners in single-family dwellings outside the levee as compensation for project costs that they will not benefit from.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		13. Impact on local healthcare: Creation of a healthcare fund to protect healthcare access to the community that will be impacted by the levee location and changes in access to hospitals and clinics that may be close by, but with significant changes in roads and community will change.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		14. Relocation costs for religious institutions and their congregations: Churches, synagogue, temples must receive funding and help in maintaining traditions, services, and access to their community. Costs should not increase for churches that will be responsible for caring for a community that will be impacted monetarily by the loss of good paying jobs that pay taxes in an area that will be negatively impacted. Additionally, Churches and religious organization spend large sums of money during disaster relief and should be compensated for all money increases that are passed on to them (and their members) for care of their congregations in providing disaster relief, food, and labor due to placement of the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		15. Compensation to homeowners and small businesses for additional costs of flood: insurance. In visiting with our neighbors there are multiple strings attached to FEMA and other money including but not limited to a requirement to hold certain levels of insurance. Many small businesses, startup businesses and home businesses are struggling in this community. With a potential exodus of residents who are well paid and technically advanced (thus able to leave Louisiana) small businesses will be impacted. Compensation must be considered for those businesses who may shutter without the needed customer base which will change with the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Future changes to insurance rates cannot be predicted and are not incorporated into the analysis.
		Additional Information and Questions for Clarification. To better understand the project and its implications, I kindly request the following information and answers to the following questions: 1. Which Flood Control Act authorizes this levee project, and what are the specific provisions of this act?	The St. Tammany Parish Louisiana Feasibility Study was authorized under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016. Please see Appendix A for authorization documentation.
		2. Has a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review been conducted for this project? If so, what were the findings regarding environmental impacts?	Please see the Main Report and Appendix C for details on NEPA compliance.
		3. What are the engineering standards being used for the levee's construction, and is there a projected timeline for the project's milestones?	Please see the Engineering Appendix for design standards and assumptions. The USACE team used the greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) design criteria for development of the features of the West/South Slidell levee.

		4. What is the projected economic impact of the levee on major local employers, such as military and space complexes?	Refer to Appendix F: Economics.
		5.Isthere a plan for long-term maintenance of the levee, and who will be responsible for it? It is well known that upkeep is expensive and necessary.	Please see Section 6.5.5 pf the Main Report for Operations and Maintenance information. Additional details will be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
		6. How can residents access updates or changes to the project plans to ensure transparency and public input?	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		7. How/When will St. Tammany residents vote on a levee tax? Who will pay for the levee?	The levee construction cost is born by the Federal government at a rate of 65% and the Nonfederal Sponsor at a rate of 35%. Maintenance of the levee will be at the expense of the local sponsor after completion of construction.
		8. Has a plan been established for movement or removal of sacred burial sites including family sites and religious or traditional rites? What costs have been set aside for this?	Please see Appendix C, Annex G and section 8.16 of the main report for the efforts on historic considerations.
		9. Has an evaluation been done on the new representation of taxpayers with this project?	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Tax considerations are not a part of the process.
		10. Will the communications between levee entities and communities be transparent henceforth? It is my firm opinion that the lack of information flow and invited citizen participation is negligent, appalling, and breeds mistrust between both sides; and only open communication from the powers will negate the mistrust and educate neighbors.	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I believe that addressing these concerns and questions will lead to a more equitable and effective levee project that prioritizes the safety and well-being of all residents. I look forward to your response and hope for a constructive dialogue on this matter.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Karmen Karraker	I am writing to voice my concerns over the proposed St. Tammany/Slidell levee. As a resident of Quail Ridge (district 13) my home, along with countless others would be left outside of the levee protection system. I am worried as to how this will affect flooding in my area. One of the major selling points when I bought my home 2 years ago was that it had never flooded and was zoned X. Please consider an alternative plan that would benefit all residents.	Please see Appendix E Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for more information on movement of the water with the levee in place. Modeling efforts indicate less than 2 inches of additional water surface elevation outside of the levee in the 100 year event, present year event. In the areas outside of the structural features of the recommended plan, the Nonstructural plan for home elevations and business floodproofing is a part of the recommended plan. For details on this portion of the plan, please see section 6.1 of the main Feasibility Report. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		We are writing to express deep concerns with the proposed levee project. Our property is excluded from the protection of the levee system as proposed. it is vital that issues regarding safety, lives, and property be addressed to ensure fairness to all and especially ensure well-being of our residents. Upon educating ourselves on the proposed project, we also have several thoughts and recommendations:	Comment noted
		1.Full upfront coverage of all home elevation costs. It is not reasonable, feasible, or fair to expect residents to pay out of pocket for these costs while they apply for grants that they may or may not qualify for. The FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Costs associate with the Nonstructural Plan that are allowed by policy are covered under the funding for the proposed elevations. Please see sections 4.1.2 and 6.1 of the Main Report as well as the Economics appendix for further discussion of the costs associated with the Nonstructural Plan. USACE coordinates with FEMA, but does not have control over the policies in place for FEMA.
		2.Nearby district schools will also go unprotected with this plan. An assessment on the impact on these large, in demand, public schools must be done. We are shocked this has not been done already. The disregard for the impact on the families, children, education, property, and community is shocking.	Comment noted.
		3.Options for fair market buyouts for affected residents should be made a priority. Offers made to neighbors in Avery Estates show with such unfair offers make it impossible for them to relocate, elevate, or secure insurance or buy new homes.	Buyouts are not a part of the Federal plan. The nonstructural plan is voluntary. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/5/23	Anne Galiano	4.Compensation for additional costs of flood insurance to homeowners and business owners.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		5.Moratorium on building to protect existing residents.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
		6.Collaborating with DOTD and CPRA for surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East, to reduce storm surge with structural changes and bridge design.	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		7.Collaboration with the Lake Coalition to explore a surge barrier plan using the railroad as a surge barrier.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
		8.Consider alternative levee sites; first by doing a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites, especially considering persons left outside of levee protection as proposed, as this project has shown to not be fair and equitable to all residents.	USACE considered over 200 measures from the start of the study for potential risk reduction. Please see the Main Report and Plan Formulation appendix for documentation of all alternatives considered and screening criteria.
		9.Provide tax refunds to residents outside of any project from which they will not benefit.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		We are certain you are receiving more detailed letters and requests, so we will keep this short. We area absolutely not in favor of this proposed levee project as it endangers lives and property to those outside of its protection as it is drafted currently. Please prioritize lives, safety and well-being of the residents, and surely a more equitable and effective levee project could be developed. We await your response and hope that this matter is addressed immediately for the safety of all.	Comment noted.
		I am writing to express my deep concerns and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. I reside in the Pearl Acres subdivision, on Amber St., right on the French Branch. I already flood from rain and storm surge. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community.	Comment noted.
		1. Accelerate and Improve Fritchie Marsh Restoration: I strongly recommend accelerating and enhancing the ongoing Fritchie Marsh restoration project. as it holds significant potential to reduce storm surge. Proper restoration of the marsh could result in a substantial dropin surge levels, providing some degree of storm surge protection. You can find detailed information about this project in attachment (A) Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing (P0-173) source.	No attachment received, however we are aware of the Fritchie Marsh Project. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is a separate authorization from the Fritchie Marsh Creation.
		2. Collaboration with DOTD and CPRA for Surge Mitigation: I urge you to collaborate with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) to explore surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East. A similar study for surge mitigation using Hwy 11 and Lakeshore Drive (Rat's Nest Road) is already underway. The Hwy 190 restoration and bridge replacement project should be activated soon, presenting an opportunity to maximize further reductions in storm surge through structural changes to highway and bridge design.	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		3. Change Funding Allocation for Residential Protection Strategies: I propose a change in funding allocation language within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) budget. Currently, the focus is primarily on home slab elevation, which may not be the most cost-effective or efficient strategy. I suggest amending the language to allow for a range of residential protection strategies, similar to the options available for businesses. Such a change would align with the USACE study's recommendations and could lead to more effective and affordable solutions for homeowners, especially homeowners who are on fixed- and/or retirement incomes.	USACE is required to follow policy and guidance for feasibility studies. Should policy be changed, the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study would adapt to those changes.
		4. Consider Alternative Levee Sites: I request a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites, including alignments that extend along Hwy 190 and/or Military Road. All proposed alignments currently leave sonie residents outside of protection, which raises concerns about the fairness and equity of the project.	USACE considered over 200 measures from the start of the study for potential risk reduction. Please see the Main Report and Plan Formulation appendix for documentation of all alternatives considered and screening criteria.

9/5/23	Claudette Eberly	5. Collaboration on a Surge Barrier Plan: I strongly recommend joining the Lake Coalition to explore the feasibility of using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier. This plan has the potential to close five openings, preventing surges of up to 10 feet. While it may require extensive coordination, including involvement at a Cabinet level;--it could offer a cost-effective and efficient solution to protect our community.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
		6. Full Upfront Coverage of Horne Elevation Costs: All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these costs before qualifying for grants. In visiting my local community, the FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Costs associate with the Nonstructural Plan that are allowed by policy are covered under the funding for the proposed elevations. Please see sections 4.1.2 and 6.1 of the Main Report as well as the Economics appendix for further discussion of the costs associated with the Nonstructural Plan. USACE coordinates with FEMA, but does not have control over the policies in place for FEMA.
		7. Impact on Local Schools: An assessment of the impact on local schools, particularly those in areas excluded from the levee, must be conducted. The disregard for property, community, and the tax base could have long-term negative consequences for our education system which is directly related to jobs and thus a core responsibility of the army Corp of engineer to address as part of this and any other proposal.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a full analysis of the impacts on the human environment.
		8. Oversight Entity for Funding Allocation: The creation of an independent entity, separate from St. Tammany Parish and Louisiana, to ensure fair and transparent allocation of project funds, free from potential biases or political influence and diversion of funds to other programs, interests etc.... Funds would be managed for Education, Vocation, Elevation, Relocation, Mitigation, levee maintenance, etc....	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization Documents.
		9. Options for Affected Residents: Total Buyout: Offer a total buyout of property by the federal government, including relocation costs. These buyouts should be fair market value as of 2021 when the project was started. Offers such as those made for Avery Estates have shown that many will be unable to find new housing, move themselves, elevate their property or secure insurance/funding for new homes if homeowners are not adequately compensated. Additionally addressing this early with homeowners living in their single-family homes would prevent unnecessary delays, lawsuits etc... by current residents who've had buy-in to a process that has not been transparent. The buy- out process should also be handled by a dedicated, non-affiliated entity as described above in paragraph 8, ensuring that the fair-market price is fair to both sides, not just the federal government. The reality is that the homeowner is always unduly compensated in buy-out programs, leaving them in a much poorer state than they anticipated.	Refer to Section 4 of the Main Report and Appendix B Plan Formulation for detail on consideration of buyouts and why this was screened.
		10. Moratorium on Building: Implement a moratorium on all new building in the area and within 50 minutes of the levee to protect existing residents. This would ensure that all monies earmarked for elevation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes at the time of project inception and completion.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
		11. Local Job Training: Creation of a training program for Louisiana residents to participate in the levee's construction, providing long-term, family-wage job opportunities that are long term and local hires. Provide programs for residents who can no longer working their current employment due to the hardships brought upon by increased and excess travel, higher medical insurance, and taxes brought about by the levee systems.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		12. Tax Refunds: Provide tax refunds to homeowners in single-family dwellings outside the levee as compensation for project costs that they will not benefit from.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		13. Impact on local healthcare: Creation of a healthcare fund to protect healthcare access to the community that will be impacted by the levee location and changes in access to hospitals and clinics that may be close by, but with significant changes in roads and community will change.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		14. Relocation costs for religious institutions and their congregations: Churches, synagogue, temples must receive funding and help in maintaining traditions, services, and access to their community. Costs should not increase for churches that will be responsible for caring for a community that will be impacted monetarily by the loss of good paying jobs that pay taxes in an area that will be negatively impacted. Additionally, Churches and religious organization spend large sums of money during disaster relief and should be compensated for all money increases that are passed on to them (and their members) for care of their congregations in providing disaster relief, food, and labor due to placement of the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		15. Compensation to homeowners and small businesses for additional costs of flood: insurance. In visiting with our neighbors there are multiple strings attached to FEMA and other money including but not limited to a requirement to hold certain levels of insurance. Many small businesses, startup businesses and home businesses are struggling in this community. With a potential exodus of residents who are well paid and technically advanced (thus able to leave Louisiana) small businesses will be impacted. Compensation must be considered for those businesses who may shutter without the needed customer base which will change with the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Future changes to insurance rates cannot be predicted and are not incorporated into the analysis.

		Additional Information and Questions for Clarification. To better understand the project and its implications, I kindly request the following information and answers to the following questions: 1. Which Flood Control Act authorizes this levee project, and what are the specific provisions of this act?	The St. Tammany Parish Louisiana Feasibility Study was authorized under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016. Please see Appendix A for authorization documentation.
		2. Has a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review been conducted for this project? If so, what were the findings regarding environmental impacts?	Please see the Main Report and Appendix C for details on NEPA compliance.
		3. What are the engineering standards being used for the levee's construction, and is there a projected timeline for the project's milestones?	Please see the Engineering Appendix for design standards and assumptions. The USACE team used the greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) design criteria for development of the features of the West/South Slidell levee.
		4. What is the projected economic impact of the levee on major local employers, such as military and space complexes?	Refer to Appendix F: Economics
		5.Isthere a plan for long-term maintenance of the levee, and who will be responsible for it? It is well known that upkeep is expensive and necessary.	Please see Section 6.5.5 pf the Main Report for Operations and Maintenance information. Additional details will be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
		6. How can residents access updates or changes to the project plans to ensure transparency and public input?	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		7. How/When will St. Tammany residents vote on a levee tax? Who will pay for the levee?	The levee construction cost is born by the Federal government at a rate of 65% and the Nonfederal Sponsor at a rate of 35%. Maintenance of the levee will be at the expense of the local sponsor after completion of construction.
		8. Has a plan been established for movement or removal of sacred burial sites including family sites and religious or traditional rites? What costs have been set aside for this?	Please see Appendix C, Annex G and section 8.16 of the main report for the efforts on historic considerations.
		9. Has an evaluation been done on the new representation of taxpayers with this project?	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Tax considerations are not a part of the process.
		10. Will the communications between levee entities and communities be transparent henceforth? It is my firm opinion that the lack of information flow and invited citizen participation is negligent, appalling, and breeds mistrust between both sides; and only open communication from the powers will negate the mistrust and educate neighbors.	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I believe that addressing these concerns and questions will lead to a more equitable and effective levee project that prioritizes the safety and well-being of all residents. I look forward to your response and hope for a constructive dialogue on this matter.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Dana Kollat	Good afternoon I'm writing a letter for the levee. I live on the corner of your pond, and I would like to know what actually will happen to my house since it's like right here. I'm not happy with the situation of a big wall coming up between my house. I am opposed	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Elizabeth Brennan	I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed levee system affecting Eastern St. Tammany Parish/Slidell. It seems this levee will benefit some and hurt others. The determination as to what properties will remain outside the levee system seems unfair as all will be paying for the levee via taxes. As a homeowner outside the levee whose property is literally located six houses away from the proposed wall, I have no doubt my property value will be severely deflated while my flood insurance will increase significantly.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		Reconsideration should be given to include more residential and commercial areas, especially on the eastern end of Gause Boulevard, eastern end of Fremaux and areas around Military Road. If these areas remain excluded, the property values will decline and the tax basis for the parish will decrease thus hurting everyone within the parish. Again, I beg you to please consider EVERYONE when making your final decision.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		I am writing to express my deep concerns and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. I reside on Ranch Road off of Military Road in Slidell. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community.	Comment noted.

9/5/23	Amanda Mattos	1. Accelerate and Improve Fritchie Marsh Restoration: I strongly recommend accelerating and enhancing the ongoing Fritchie Marsh restoration project. as it holds significant potential to reduce storm surge. Proper restoration of the marsh could result in a substantial dropin surge levels, providing some degree of storm surge protection. You can find detailed information about this project in attachment (A) Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing (P0-173) source.	No attachment received, however we are aware of the Fritchie Marsh Project. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is a separate authorization from the Fritchie Marsh Creation.
		2. Collaboration with DOTD and CPRA for Surge Mitigation: I urge you to collaborate with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) to explore surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East. A similar study for surge mitigation using Hwy 11 and Lakeshore Drive (Rat's Nest Road) is already underway. The Hwy 190 restoration and bridge replacement project should be activated soon, presenting an opportunity to maximize further reductions in storm surge through structural changes to highway and bridge design.	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		3. Change Funding Allocation for Residential Protection Strategies: I propose a change in funding allocation language within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) budget. Currently, the focus is primarily on home slab elevation, which may not be the most cost-effective or efficient strategy. I suggest amending the language to allow for a range of residential protection strategies, similar to the options available for businesses. Such a change would align with the USACE study's recommendations and could lead to more effective and affordable solutions for homeowners, especially homeowners who are on fixed- and/or retirement incomes.	USACE is required to follow policy and guidance for feasibility studies. Should policy be changed, the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study would adapt to those changes.
		4. Consider Alternative Levee Sites: I request a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites, including alignments that extend along Hwy 190 and/or Military Road. All proposed alignments currently leave sonie residents outside of protection, which raises concerns about the fairness and equity of the project.	USACE considered over 200 measures from the start of the study for potential risk reduction. Please see the Main Report and Plan Formulation appendix for documentation of all measures considered and screening criteria.
		5. Collaboration on a Surge Barrier Plan: I strongly recommend joining the Lake Coalition to explore the feasibility of using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier. This plan has the potential to close five openings, preventing surges of up to 10 feet. While it may require extensive coordination, including involvement at a Cabinet level;--it could offer a cost-effective and efficient solution to protect our community.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
		6. Full Upfront Coverage of Horne Elevation Costs: All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these costs before qualifying for grants. In visiting my local community, the FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Costs associated with the Nonstructural Plan that are allowed by policy are covered under the funding for the proposed elevations. Please see sections 4.1.2 and 6.1 of the Main Report as well as the Economics appendix for further discussion of the costs associated with the Nonstructural Plan. USACE coordinates with FEMA, but does not have control over the policies in place for FEMA.
		7. Impact on Local Schools: An assessment of the impact on local schools, particularly those in areas excluded from the levee, must be conducted. The disregard for property, community, and the tax base could have long-term negative consequences for our education system which is directly related to jobs and thus a core responsibility of the army Corp of engineer to address as part of this and any other proposal.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for the full analysis of the human environment.
		8. Oversight Entity for Funding Allocation: The creation of an independent entity, separate from St. Tammany Parish and Louisiana, to ensure fair and transparent allocation of project funds, free from potential biases or political influence and diversion of funds to other programs, interests etc.... Funds would be managed for Education, Vocation, Elevation, Relocation, Mitigation, levee maintenance, etc....	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization.
		9. Options for Affected Residents: Total Buyout: Offer a total buyout of property by the federal government, including relocation costs. These buyouts should be fair market value as of 2021 when the project was started. Offers such as those made for Avery Estates have shown that many will be unable to find new housing, move themselves, elevate their property or secure insurance/funding for new homes if homeowners are not adequately compensated. Additionally addressing this early with homeowners living in their single-family homes would prevent unnecessary delays, lawsuits etc... by current residents who've had buy-in to a process that has not been transparent. The buy- out process should also be handled by a dedicated, non-affiliated entity as described above in paragraph 8, ensuring that the fair-market price is fair to both sides, not just the federal government. The reality is that the homeowner is always unduly compensated in buy-out programs, leaving them in a much poorer state than they anticipated.	Refer to Section 4 of the Main Report and Appendix B Plan Formulation for detail on consideration of buyouts and why this was screened.
		10. Moratorium on Building: Implement a moratorium on all new building in the area and within 50 minutes of the levee to protect existing residents. This would ensure that all monies earmarked for elevation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes at the time of project inception and completion.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
		11. Local Job Training: Creation of a training program for Louisiana residents to participate in the levee's construction, providing long-term, family-wage job opportunities that are long term and local hires. Provide programs for residents who can no longer working their current employment due to the hardships brought upon by increased and excess travel, higher medical insurance, and taxes brought about by the levee systems.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.

		12. Tax Refunds: Provide tax refunds to homeowners in single-family dwellings outside the levee as compensation for project costs that they will not benefit from.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		13. Impact on local healthcare: Creation of a healthcare fund to protect healthcare access to the community that will be impacted by the levee location and changes in access to hospitals and clinics that may be close by, but with significant changes in roads and community will change.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		14. Relocation costs for religious institutions and their congregations: Churches, synagogue, temples must receive funding and help in maintaining traditions, services, and access to their community. Costs should not increase for churches that will be responsible for caring for a community that will be impacted monetarily by the loss of good paying jobs that pay taxes in an area that will be negatively impacted. Additionally, Churches and religious organization spend large sums of money during disaster relief and should be compensated for all money increases that are passed on to them (and their members) for care of their congregations in providing disaster relief, food, and labor due to placement of the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		15. Compensation to homeowners and small businesses for additional costs of flood: insurance. In visiting with our neighbors there are multiple strings attached to FEMA and other money including but not limited to a requirement to hold certain levels of insurance. Many small businesses, startup businesses and home businesses are struggling in this community. With a potential exodus of residents who are well paid and technically advanced (thus able to leave Louisiana) small businesses will be impacted. Compensation must be considered for those businesses who may shutter without the needed customer base which will change with the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Future changes to insurance rates cannot be predicted and are not incorporated into the analysis.
		Additional Information and Questions for Clarification. To better understand the project and its implications, I kindly request the following information and answers to the following questions: 1. Which Flood Control Act authorizes this levee project, and what are the specific provisions of this act?	The St. Tammany Parish Louisiana Feasibility Study was authorized under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016. Please see Appendix A for authorization documentation.
		2. Has a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review been conducted for this project? If so, what were the findings regarding environmental impacts?	Please see the Main Report and Appendix C for details on NEPA compliance.
		3. What are the engineering standards being used for the levee's construction, and is there a projected timeline for the project's milestones?	Please see the Engineering Appendix for design standards and assumptions. The USACE team used the greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) design criteria for development of the features of the West/South Slidell levee.
		4. What is the projected economic impact of the levee on major local employers, such as military and space complexes?	Refer to Appendix F: Economics.
		5.Isthere a plan for long-term maintenance of the levee, and who will be responsible for it? It is well known that upkeep is expensive and necessary.	Please see Section 6.5.5 pf the Main Report for Operations and Maintenance information. Additional details will be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
		6. How can residents access updates or changes to the project plans to ensure transparency and public input?	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		7. How/When will St. Tammany residents vote on a levee tax? Who will pay for the levee?	The levee construction cost is born by the Federal government at a rate of 65% and the Nonfederal Sponsor at a rate of 35%. Maintenance of the levee will be at the expense of the local sponsor after completion of construction.
		8. Has a plan been established for movement or removal of sacred burial sites including family sites and religious or traditional rites? What costs have been set aside for this?	Please see Appendix C, Annex G and section 8.16 of the main report for the efforts on historic considerations.
		9. Has an evaluation been done on the new representation of taxpayers with this project?	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Tax considerations are not a part of the process.
		10. Will the communications between levee entities and communities be transparent henceforth? It is my firm opinion that the lack of information flow and invited citizen participation is negligent, appalling, and breeds mistrust between both sides; and only open communication from the powers will negate the mistrust and educate neighbors.	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I believe that addressing these concerns and questions will lead to a more equitable and effective levee project that prioritizes the safety and well-being of all residents. I look forward to your response and hope for a constructive dialogue on this matter.	Comment noted
9/5/23	Kathleen Wilkin	Please accept my objection to the proposed Slidell levee. It will push flood waters into the Military Road subdivisions flooding thousands of homes. It will devastate our schools, commerce and properties. Please re-evaluate the proposed plan.	Comment noted
		Please register my emphatic disapproval of any form of artificial levee that would be constructed along Military Road ostensibly for the purpose of protecting coastal properties. While I agree that protection is needed, a levee system that may be outwardly simple and therefore relatively inexpensive to construct would, in my opinion based on study and observation, cause utterly intolerable disruption on every possible level.	Comment noted

9/5/23	Candy Piehet	Paralyze transport due to the construction equipment in the area while at the same time trying to upgrade (long overdue). Destroy thriving communities, local businesses and tourism industries, and their rising tax bases. Permanently altering the ecosystem for the worse, after first being mired in expenses. Sacrifice properties "for the greater good" to the first major surge with no ability to be recovered due to being uninsurable. Commit to years of negotiations and legal expenses to resolve imminent domain suits with property owners in the path of the dike, as surely as with the expansion project. These are just the first requirements that come to mind with the implementation of this type of proposal.	Comment noted
		While this proposal offers some protection to many properties, it leaves a very large proportion completely unprotected and essentially under greater risk than currently assumed. Hidden costs lurk at every turn. Exposure of municipalities can become crippling liabilities.	Comment noted
		I urge extreme caution in your planning of our future. The impact of your decisions will be historic and will outlive all of us living today.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	L & M Lambert	We respectfully request that the ACE reconsider and reject the proposed Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement specifically for Eastern Slidell.	Comment noted.
		We chose to live in the French Branch neighborhood because of its natural environment, community values, and excellent schools. It was a place where children could have many adventures fishing in ponds, talking nature walks and planning scavenger hunts.	Comment noted
		We fear the prospect of the degradation of the once nationally recognized schools in our district. Families invested in the school district not only with our tax dollars and volunteerism, but also through time and fundraising efforts to improve the district schools by adding playgrounds and lights for night baseball games. All of these are examples of the ways the people invested into the community to make it a vibrant and aspirational living area. We feel, if the feasibility study was implemented, the results would drastically change our community and make it unrecognizable in a few years.	Comment noted
		Additionally, we fear that if the plan is implemented by the ACE, it would change the attitude of the community. As consequences of the plan, our natural environment would be less protected, our homes and schools would lose value and unfortunately, our property taxes and insurance would increase dramatically. Most of the homeowners living in French Branch would not be able to afford the higher property and tax rates. As a result, this plan would leave an inferior community in its wake.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a discussion on impacts to the human environment. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community.	Comment noted.

9/5/23	Kristie Guidry	When I purchased my property in November 2020 it was classified as a Flood Zone C. We specifically searched for homes that were classified as such. After we purchased our home, the FEMA flood maps changed and our flood zone was downgraded. Fast forward another year, and here we are facing a proposed levee project that leaves my largest investment unprotected. This project is going to flood families out of their homes, which have otherwise never flooded. According to the previous owners of this house, we were high and dry for Hurricane Katrina, which was the largest flooding event in this area.	Comment noted
		Will FEMA, or some other federal agency, provide full grants to raise our homes above the flood risk level in advance of the completion of th	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		Has anyone thought about the impact to the schools and hospital that will now fall outside of this levee? Where will thousands of children attend school during the years it will take to rebuild these schools from a major flood? My uneducated estimate is that 2 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 junior high and 1 high school will be directly impacted by this decision.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental.
		I truly hope that this plan will be revisited, and a new plan drawn up that protects all citizens of our community.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Saundra Katz	I hope you are doing well, and appreciate your efforts to hear my concerns regarding the July 2023 Corps’ St. Tammany Parish, LA., Feasibility Study Revised Draft. My name is Saundra Katz, and please note that I DO NOT support the currently proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiative to provide structural flood risk for Southeastern Louisiana (St. Tammany Parish).	Comment noted.
		Specifically, this latest plan does NOT provide any structural or non-structural flood risk reduction system protections for the vast majority of the area east and south of I-10 (Military Road). This excluded demographic is roughly equal in size to the City of Slidell which is included in the current protection proposal. This current plan will cause major harm to the residents and business of the Military Road area.	Refer to Appendix F: Economics for information regarding the structures included in the nonstructural plan for the areas outside of the structural measure.
		However, I, am in support of USACE Alternative D or E (Floodwall) Phase IV, which covers the vast majority of the Military Road area, which is currently excluded.	Comment noted.
		Since the residents living in the Military Road exclusion area are also tax payers, they deserve the same level of protection as all other residents of the Parish.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	Geoffrey Katz,	I hope you are doing well, and appreciate your efforts to hear my concerns regarding the July 2023 Corps’ St. Tammany Parish, LA., Feasibility Study Revised Draft. My name is Geoffrey Katz, and please note that I DO NOT support the currently proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiative to provide structural flood risk for Southeastern Louisiana (St. Tammany Parish).	Comment noted.
		Specifically, this latest plan does NOT provide any structural or non-structural flood risk reduction system protections for the vast majority of the area east and south of I-10 (Military Road). This excluded demographic is roughly equal in size to the City of Slidell which is included in the current protection proposal. This current plan will cause major harm to the residents and business of the Military Road area.	Refer to Appendix F: Economics for information regarding the structures included in the nonstructural plan for the areas outside of the structural measure.
		However, I, am in support of USACE Alternative D or E (Floodwall) Phase IV, which covers the vast majority of the Military Road area, which is currently excluded.	Comment noted.
		Since the residents living in the Military Road exclusion area are also tax payers, they deserve the same level of protection as all other residents of the Parish.	Comment noted.

9/5/23	Bonnie Clements	• The proposed Slidell Levee, an industrial project, would create visual blight within our bayous with pump station complexes, flood gates and flood walls. This requires the downgrade of the bayous' natural and scenic designations and water quality protections. It would have an irreversible, destructive impact on the ecology, on the marshlands that have provided centuries of flood protection, and on our cultural heritage.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a feasibility level analysis of impacts to the environment.
		The areas outside of the proposed Slidell Levee (e.g., Lacombe, Eden Isles, Military Road) will experience increased flooding, property value diminution and property loss.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		The proposed Slidell Levee will not protect against rain or riverine flooding. To that end, the 2016 no-name storm is said to have dumped 3 times as much rain on Louisiana as Hurricane Katrina.	Refer to the Main Report, section 6, which refers to the Nonstructural Plan which addresses risk reduction for riverine events.
		The Slidell Levee is proposed to be 14-ft. high thus would be unable to protect against a hurricane like Katrina. The NOAA reported Katrina storm surge of 10-20 ft. above normal tide levels. In parts of the Slidell area it's believed that the Katrina storm surge topped 21-ft. Residents living on the "protected" side of the Levee are at risk of having a false sense of security, not evacuating as needed.	Refer to Main Report, Section 6. The West/Slidell levee was designed for the 100 year coastal storm event.
		St. Tammany Parish would be tasked with maintaining and operating the Slidell Levee, requiring an increase in parish taxes for this proposed $2.6 billion project just for Slidell.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
		The numbers on the proposed Slidell Levee just don't add up. A simple google search shows the population of the greater Slidell area is just under 28,000. Drop out areas placed outside of the Slidell Levee, such as Eden Isles and Military Road area households, those on the "protected" side are much fewer. The cost cannot be substantiated.	For information on the cost development process and estimated annual damages reduced by the risk reduction measures in the recommended plan, refer to the Economics Appendix and Engineering Appendix Annexes for Cost Engineering.
		The proposed Slidell Levee represents a disjointed, discrete project that would not be in the best interests of the whole area and	Comment noted.
		Alternatives: •Re-initiation of the Corps' Barrier Plan to control flood waters at the Rigolets and Chef Menteur Pass areas for the benefit of all parishes under threat of storm surge flooding.	Refer to Main Report, Section 4 for all measures considered and the screening rationale.

		Marsh restoration and creation through dredging, increasing volume capacity for improved water retention and using bed sediment for lasting sustainability. As an example, the $28M post-Katrina Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation project (posed to be diminished by the Slidell Levee as located outside of it) restored historic marsh ponds, and created 604 acres of marshland plus nourished another 310 acres of marshland with sediment pumped from Lake Pontchartrain.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for a full list of alternatives and the screening process.
		Elimination of unbridled development destroying wetlands and increasing harmful flooding. The Corps can prevent any development in wetlands.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a full analysis of the impacts of the recommended plan.
		Elevating homes for those who opt to.	Refer to the Main Report, section 6.1 for the voluntary Nonstructural Plan
		Ditch clearing, maintenance and widening as needed, to minimize water back up onto private property and roads.	Refer to the main report discussion on constraints. Proposed projects must meet minimum flow (800 cubic feet per second for a 10 percent chance flood) and drainage area (1.5 square miles) requirements (USACE Engineer Regulation (ER) 1165-2-21);
		Concerns about the Process: Many members of the affected public remain ill-informed or uninformed. Absent in the public feedback to the Corps will be comments from those who remain unaware their properties would be placed at greater risk of flooding or potential ruin from the proposed Slidell Levee by being outside of it or in the middle of its alignment.	Refer to Appendix C: Annex I Public Involvement for the efforts made to reach the public during the course of the feasibility study.
		It is a concern that the public only has 45 days to comment on this 5,000+ page Study. So voluminous no one is able to fully read it within this very limited 45-day time period, which compromises the effectiveness and importance of public input.	Comment noted
		The focus on Slidell is disproportionate. The Slidell Levee is almost 60% of the Corps' estimated $4.5 billion cost of its proposed flood control measures in the Study. Slidell is already bordered by marshland protection, which the Levee ironically would diminish as a vast amount of the marshland would be located outside of it. So why is Slidell even being singled out?	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for a full list of Parish wide alternatives and the screening process.
		Finally, the Corps' eleventh hour drop of 2,000 homes previously eligible to be elevated, resulted in the last minute adjustment of the obscure cost/benefit ratio to a number needed to allow Congress to consider a feasibility study. This action suggests the Corps is pushing or being pushed to substantiate the Slidell Levee, which is hard to substantiate as not beneficial and harmful to the environment.	Refer to the Main Report, section 6.1 for the optimization process for the Nonstructural Plan.
9/5/23	Paula Mills	Just finding out about this leaves me little time to compose a proper letter, but please take into account what I say. We live in Magnolia Forest off of Military Rd. We will be outside of this proposed levee. Homes in our neighborhood have flooded in the past. My home has never flooded before. Our fear is that this levee could make our area more prone to flood in the future. If a levee is being considered it needs to protect us all!	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/

9/5/23	Hal and Judy Jenkins	I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed levee wall. I live in French Branch Estates, an area just outside the levee wall and have only recently been made aware of a proposed levee which will impact my home as well as hundreds of other homes, schools, and businesses. It is my understanding that the levee, if built as it is presented, will result in lost home values and higher insurance rates. The levee will not protect my home; instead, it could cause more flooding in our neighborhoods. Please reevaluate the proposed levee plans to include protection for hundreds of homes, churches, schools, and businesses in dozens of neighborhoods in Slidell.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
9/5/23	Deborah Roberts	I am writing to talk about the levees that they are talking about adding to St Tammany and how the neighborhood I live in will suffer. We already have the biggest water issue in Slidell and now you want to add a levee that would not project us. Do you realize how many already suffering people would suffer in more. Most are loving on a fixed income and can not afford to do up grades. With property taxes going up and homeowners prices going up how can we keep afford to live. We need someone to stand up for what is right. Please lives and homes will be in danger.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on "substantial improvements" to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		Thank you for your service, and thank you for taking my email. I would like to put my objection to a St. Tammany Levee project on public record.	Comment noted

I have lived and worked in St. Tammany Parish for 34 years. Formerly on Bayou Bonfouca , my 17 foot raised house flooded on the ground level with Katrina, proposed to be outside of the levee; now I have lived for 18 years in French Branch estates. Neighbors have flooded at least 5 times in the past 28 years, from RAIN and RIVER flooding, and then the once with a hurricane surge with Katrina, which truly seemed to come from the Pearl back up. The Corp proposal does not appear to consider the impact of a levee on the river side, which is our whole neighborhood. I suspect the water displacement from a 13-17 foot levee will impact the flood waters in my and other neighbors back yards. Will this be addressed please?	Refer to Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for the results of the rainfall modeling with the levee in place. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
Impacts of economics proport that people will move out – however that was not the case as most rebuilt after floods and Katrina, and St. Tammany council has egregiously continued to rapidly build houses in dense areas (particularly along Hoover and Military roads, outside of the protection zone, with no objection by the Corp or projection for the future. Surely the council KNEW of this study and proposal? Was it ignored? Did the Corp intervene or update the study with so much building going on?	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation, section 4 for recommendations for local and state authorities for flood plain management.
The Corp project involving Valley Park, MO has been a night mare for citizens outside of the flood wall, with growth during the time of the study, but not taken in account as the project steamrolled forward. 'Scientific American', 'propubica.org-Flood Thy Neighbor: Who Stays Dry and Who Decides?'	Comment noted
Homes in our area have continued to have increased value, and not depreciate. A 30 year old study is soooo inaccurate.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
Flood waters from Katrina in our area were from back up of the Pearl, which now would appear to be trapped behind the flood wall, because the gates would not be opening in case of surge from the lake, or not able to flow naturally in case of , a river flood only.	Refer to Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for additional information on water flow from riverine and coastal storm simulations. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
The Appendix G, Real Estate Plan Section 8 INDUCED FLOODING should have been addressed BEFORE the proposal went public, not after or NOT done). I think this is where so many of us are alarmed that this proposal wasn't adequately disclosed to us, in the past years as it was being formulated, as most modern people, including myself, do not get public notices in newspapers, and do not have local news to catch a glimpse of sometime important topics. I really am ashamed that I knew nothing until this recent, BRIEF public comment period. I am also ashamed of our local leaders who did not have the gumption or where with all to keep us up to date.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
The environmental impact along a scenic waterway, Bayou Bonfouca, with probably red dirt, with a large hill on the banks to funnel in and	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for the full analysis of the impacts of the recommended plan on the environment.

9/5/23		The homes in Coin du Lestin should be raised, but doubtful that the owners there will be able to renovate them up to Code, before a government or private elevation, at a cost of $200,00 per house.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		Lastly, Ms. Dixon, I do not wish to have a 13 foot levee in my backyard and have never once been approached about buying my land. What is the proposed value of my land, and how much will be displaced by a levee there?	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		What is the induced water displacement in my yard from flooding, rivers, rain, and back wash when the surge goes around the levee ends?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8’, with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8’2” or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
	Phyllis Dale Waring MD	Teenagers enjoy easy walking access from our neighborhood into Northshore High School grounds. Guess now they may have to jump off the levee onto their campus.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for impacts to the human environment.
		My name is Dr. Kurt Varner, I live at 568 Winbourne Dr., Slidell, LA. I have been a resident of the Turtle Creek area since 2006 and a resident of Eastern Slidell since 1995. I have recently become aware of the Corp’s revised feasibility study and I am both dismayed and appalled that large sections of eastern St. Tammany Parish, including the portion where I reside was not included in the plan.	Comment noted

		As a taxpayer, I cannot fathom why my tax dollars should be used to create a project that will negatively impact the safety and value of my and my neighbors' properties.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
9/5/23	Kurt Varner	. In the event of a major storm surges, the proposed placement of levies and flood walls in the east-central part of the parish will force a greater volume of water towards the Pearl River Basin in the east, increasing the likely hood of flooding in the eastern neighborhoods. My house did not flood during Katrina, but the increased water levels outside the proposed structures, would increase the probability of significant flooding should a similar event occur.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		As a result, it is likely that implementation of this plan will lead to higher flood insurance rates and significantly decrease the value of my home.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.

		Prior to Katrina I lived in the French Branch neighborhood, at lower elevation and with poorly designed drainage. That home flooded during the 1995 rain event and tropical storm Allison. I am well aware of the negative impact flooding had on the value of my house and my ability to subsequently sell it. It is sad to think that the proposed plan would increase the risk of flooding in a previously unflooded area and potentially cause significant, additional financial hardship.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I am also dismayed that the proposed plan also fails to protect and may actually increase the risk of flooding local hospitals, clinics and businesses in the eastern parish. During a natural disaster one would think that medical facilities and business that would be necessary for the recovery of the area.	Refer to Appendix F: Economics for the economic impact to the area.
		I hope that the Corps will reevaluate the proposed plan to provide greater protection to eastern St. Tammany Parish without producing finan	Comment noted
		My name is Anthony Finch, I'm a small business owner. I live outside of the proposed levee at 601 Swallow Ct. Slidell, La. I'm a lifelong resident of Slidell and have lived in my home since 2014. I want to make sure that I am on public record with the federal government with absolute objection to this project. Here are my concerns:	Comment noted.
		How will this affect property values?	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
9/5/23	Tony Finch	How high are insurance rates expected to be?	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		Will there even be insurance available?	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. National Flood Insurance Policy (NFIP) rates are not set up USACE.
		What effect on our wetlands and wildlife will this cause?	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a full environmental impact analysis.
		Does Mississippi know about this?	The Vicksburg District for USACE is aware of the ongoing feasibility study.
		If this project in eastern Slidell moves forward it will harm so many people, including myself and family who will not be within the levee/flood system as it has been drawn up currently. The area that is scheduled to not be included is a huge part of the Slidell/eastern St Tammany community. Many including myself and family will lose the homes and property we have worked hard for everyday. Losing this huge sector of homes, businesses, schools, hospitals, and community agencies will halt financial and community support for the entire Slidell area. This will be felt across our community.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for full environmental impact analysis, including impacts to the human environment.

9/5/23	Bonnie Suckow	If this project is allowed to proceed, this piece of heaven of a place to live, work and raise a family will no longer exist. I moved into my current home with my family 9 years ago for one huge reason of it had never flooded even during Katrina, and it never has since, there is no doubt in my mind if this project proceeds that my safe haven from floods will be no longer. My husband and I once our kids all graduate within two more years will leave our home we love and move elsewhere and most likely not within Slidell area if his project moves forward.	Comment noted.
		I urge you to reconsider this project and what it will do to not only the areas outside the wall but the area within the wall that get much financial gain and community support from those that have been left behind in this current plan	Comment noted.
		I urge you to put as much energy into more natural protection barriers then putting my family and my neighbors in an area outside the protection plan that will no doubt have huge consequences in the numbers it will hurt and the way those hurt will no longer be here to financially support the community within the walls.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for the full like of measures considered and the screening process.
		Please consider the other options that will not be exclusive and will be in greater interest of the community as a whole.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for the full like of measures considered and the screening process.
9/5/23		Excuse my ignorance. Not knowing the proper person to address our concerns. Only information being posted on social media is by my neighbors and many residents of St. Tammany parish. These residents have names and they use them..	Comment noted.
		The glaring fact is this doesn't. To me a glaring show of disrespect to every taxpayers and homeowners in the mapped area set for this levee plan. There isn't concise information nor has the trust been established that is imperative before a project of this size is underway. .. The plans with its demand of certain stipulations and added expectations & requirements to raise homes at homeowners expense is incredulous.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		These actions will cause severe financial hardship to 1000's of homeowners. Many of these homes currently aren't in a flood zone nor an	Comment noted.
		The current information as it' written will impose extra taxes plus extar homeowners cost to raise their home with the staggering high cost	alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the
		. Our state's leadership has failed to fight for homeowners fair insurance cost.	alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the
		Our parish government has allowed poorly designed development without proper drainage that causes more street flooding.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation, section 4 for recommendations for local and state authorities for flood plain management.
	Lola Huelster	The levee plan seems like a blind. With another plan not disclosed to taxpayers vote. We want more solid information. And the funds to raise our homes have to be accounted into the levee budget. Facts please. .	Comment noted.
		We strongly OBJECT to the Updated USACE St Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. We fully understand that, while this is a proposal for a two-phase project, the impacts of the first phase of the project would have too many negative consequences to the environment and hydrology of the Northshore of Lake Pontchartrain to entertain thoughtful consideration. The “projected” costs are astronomical for taxpayers in Louisiana and around the country.	Refer to Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for impacts of the recommended plan to the hydrology of the area. Appendix C: Environmental has a full analysis of the impacts to the environment. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		We are property owners along Bayou Liberty in St. Tammany Parish and our property will surely suffer significant impacts from this project, specifically the construction of the USACE-proposed West Slidell Levee system. We are not alone; most of the property owners who live along these natural waterways will undoubtedly be negatively impacted by the proposed levee.	Comment noted.

9/5/23	Peg Riley	We are members of the Bayou Liberty Association and we concur with the Association's concerns about the Bayou Liberty area, but we also recognize that negative impacts will extend well beyond the Bayou Liberty area, from the Big Branch Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (BBMNWR) across Bayou Paquet, Bayou Liberty and Bayou Bonfouca. This is an extensive levee and flood gate system and would have to be maintained by St. Tammany Parish in perpetuity???	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs.
		We suspect that, with the currently dynamic situation of climate change, rising sea levels and land loss, there will also be unpredictable factors that will make this levee system inadequate within a short span of time.	Refer to Section 3 of Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for the sea level rise analysis. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		We agree with the Bayou Liberty Association's focus on impacts to property owners but feel our focus must also be on the impacts to the highly-critical natural ecosystems on the northshore of Lake Pontchartrain. In the Feasibility Study you state that 98 acres of important Northshore habitat within the BBMNWR will be directly impacted for which mitigation would need to be made somewhere beyond the Refuge (in addition to the 32 acres that could be mitigated within the Refuge). Not only will this have a huge impact on BBMNWR - 130 acres of important wetlands that had been set aside for protection - it also suggests that the wetlands along Bayou Liberty and the other bayous would similarly be impacted and require mitigation as well. This is simply unacceptable.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for full feasibility level impacts to the environment.
		In summary, we strongly object to the project as currently proposed in the St Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. While we support funds to elevate existing homes in the project area, we are strongly against any project that encourages further developments below Interstate 12. Thank you for your consideration of our concerns and suggestions.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for the full like of measures considered and the screening process.
		I am writing to express my deep concerns and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community.	Comment noted
		1. Accelerate and Improve Fritchie Marsh Restoration: I strongly recommend accelerating and enhancing the ongoing Fritchie Marsh restoration project. as it holds significant potential to reduce storm surge. Proper restoration of the marsh could result in a substantial dropin surge levels, providing some degree of storm surge protection. You can find detailed information about this project in attachment (A) Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing (P0-173) source.	No attachment received, however we are aware of the Fritchie Marsh Project. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is a separate authorization from the Fritchie Marsh Creation.
		2. Collaboration with DOTD and CPRA for Surge Mitigation: I urge you to collaborate with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) to explore surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East. A similar study for surge mitigation using Hwy 11 and Lakeshore Drive (Rat's Nest Road) is already underway. The Hwy 190 restoration and bridge replacement project should be activated soon, presenting an opportunity to maximize further reductions in storm surge through structural changes to highway and bridge design.	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		3. Change Funding Allocation for Residential Protection Strategies: I propose a change in funding allocation language within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) budget. Currently, the focus is primarily on home slab elevation, which may not be the most cost-effective or efficient strategy. I suggest amending the language to allow for a range of residential protection strategies, similar to the options available for businesses. Such a change would align with the USACE study's recommendations and could lead to more effective and affordable solutions for homeowners, especially homeowners who are on fixed- and/or retirement incomes.	USACE is required to follow policy and guidance for feasibility studies. Should policy be changed, the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study would adapt to those changes.
		4. Consider Alternative Levee Sites: I request a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites, including alignments that extend along Hwy 190 and/or Military Road. All proposed alignments currently leave sonie residents outside of protection, which raises concerns about the fairness and equity of the project.	USACE considered over 200 measures from the start of the study for potential risk reduction. Please see the Main Report and Plan Formulation appendix for documentation of all alternatives considered and screening criteria.
		5. Collaboration on a Surge Barrier Plan: I strongly recommend joining the Lake Coalition to explore the feasibility of using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier. This plan has the potential to close five openings, preventing surges of up to 10 feet. While it may require extensive coordination, including involvement at a Cabinet level;--it could offer a cost-effective and efficient solution to protect our community.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.

9/5/23	Karen Bartholomay	6. Full Upfront Coverage of Horne Elevation Costs: All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these costs before qualifying for grants. In visiting my local community, the FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		7. Impact on Local Schools: An assessment of the impact on local schools, particularly those in areas excluded from the levee, must be conducted. The disregard for property, community, and the tax base could have long-term negative consequences for our education system which is directly related to jobs and thus a core responsibility of the army Corp of engineer to address as part of this and any other proposal.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for full feasibility level impacts to the human environment.
		8. Oversight Entity for Funding Allocation: The creation of an independent entity, separate from St. Tammany Parish and Louisiana, to ensure fair and transparent allocation of project funds, free from potential biases or political influence and diversion of funds to other programs, interests etc.... Funds would be managed for Education, Vocation, Elevation, Relocation, Mitigation, levee maintenance, etc....	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization Documents.
		9. Options for Affected Residents: Total Buyout: Offer a total buyout of property by the federal government, including relocation costs. These buyouts should be fair market value as of 2021 when the project was started. Offers such as those made for Avery Estates have shown that many will be unable to find new housing, move themselves, elevate their property or secure insurance/funding for new homes if homeowners are not adequately compensated. Additionally addressing this early with homeowners living in their single-family homes would prevent unnecessary delays, lawsuits etc... by current residents who've had buy-in to a process that has not been transparent. The buy- out process should also be handled by a dedicated, non-affiliated entity as described above in paragraph 8, ensuring that the fair-market price is fair to both sides, not just the federal government. The reality is that the homeowner is always unduly compensated in buy-out programs, leaving them in a much poorer state than they anticipated.	Refer to Section 4 of the Main Report and Appendix B Plan Formulation for detail on consideration of buyouts and why this was screened.
		10. Moratorium on Building: Implement a moratorium on all new building in the area and within 50 minutes of the levee to protect existing residents. This would ensure that all monies earmarked for elevation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes at the time of project inception and completion.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
		11. Local Job Training: Creation of a training program for Louisiana residents to participate in the levee's construction, providing long-term, family-wage job opportunities that are long term and local hires. Provide programs for residents who can no longer working their current employment due to the hardships brought upon by increased and excess travel, higher medical insurance, and taxes brought about by the levee systems.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		12. Tax Refunds: Provide tax refunds to homeowners in single-family dwellings outside the levee as compensation for project costs that they will not benefit from.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		13. Impact on local healthcare: Creation of a healthcare fund to protect healthcare access to the community that will be impacted by the levee location and changes in access to hospitals and clinics that may be close by, but with significant changes in roads and community will change.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		14. Relocation costs for religious institutions and their congregations: Churches, synagogue, temples must receive funding and help in maintaining traditions, services, and access to their community. Costs should not increase for churches that will be responsible for caring for a community that will be impacted monetarily by the loss of good paying jobs that pay taxes in an area that will be negatively impacted. Additionally, Churches and religious organization spend large sums of money during disaster relief and should be compensated for all money increases that are passed on to them (and their members) for care of their congregations in providing disaster relief, food, and labor due to placement of the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.

		15. Compensation to homeowners and small businesses for additional costs of flood: insurance. In visiting with our neighbors there are multiple strings attached to FEMA and other money including but not limited to a requirement to hold certain levels of insurance. Many small businesses, startup businesses and home businesses are struggling in this community. With a potential exodus of residents who are well paid and technically advanced (thus able to leave Louisiana) small businesses will be impacted. Compensation must be considered for those businesses who may shutter without the needed customer base which will change with the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Future changes to insurance rates cannot be predicted and are not incorporated into the analysis.
		Additional Information and Questions for Clarification. To better understand the project and its implications, I kindly request the following information and answers to the following questions: 1. Which Flood Control Act authorizes this levee project, and what are the specific provisions of this act?	The St. Tammany Parish Louisiana Feasibility Study was authorized under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016. Please see Appendix A for authorization documentation.
		2. Has a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review been conducted for this project? If so, what were the findings regarding environmental impacts?	Refer to the Main Report and Appendix C for details on NEPA compliance.
		3. What are the engineering standards being used for the levee's construction, and is there a projected timeline for the project's milestones?	Refer to the Engineering Appendix for design standards and assumptions. The USACE team used the greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) design criteria for development of the features of the West/South Slidell levee.
		4. What is the projected economic impact of the levee on major local employers, such as military and space complexes?	Refer to Appendix F: Economics
		5.Isthere a plan for long-term maintenance of the levee, and who will be responsible for it? It is well known that upkeep is expensive and necessary.	Refer to Section 6.5.5 pf the Main Report for Operations and Maintenance information. Additional details will be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
		6. How can residents access updates or changes to the project plans to ensure transparency and public input?	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		7. How/When will St. Tammany residents vote on a levee tax? Who will pay for the levee?	The levee construction cost is born by the Federal government at a rate of 65% and the Nonfederal Sponsor at a rate of 35%. Maintenance of the levee will be at the expense of the local sponsor after completion of construction.
		8. Has a plan been established for movement or removal of sacred burial sites including family sites and religious or traditional rites? What costs have been set aside for this?	Refer to Appendix C, Annex G and section 8.16 of the main report for the efforts on historic considerations.
		9. Has an evaluation been done on the new representation of taxpayers with this project?	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Tax considerations are not a part of the process.
		I believe that addressing these concerns and questions will lead to a more equitable and effective levee project that prioritizes the safety and well-being of all residents. I look forward to your response and hope for a constructive dialogue on this matter.	Comment noted.
9/5/23	P.W.Reily and C.B. Kennedy	We strongly OBJECT to the Updated USACE St Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. We fully understand that, while this is a proposal for a two-phase project, the impacts of the first phase of the project would have too many negative consequences to the environment and hydrology of the Northshore of Lake Pontchartrain to entertain thoughtful consideration. The “projected” costs are astronomical for taxpayers in Louisiana and around the country.	Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level
		We are property owners along Bayou Liberty in St. Tammany Parish and our property will surely suffer significant impacts from this project, specifically the construction of the USACE-proposed West Slidell Levee system. We are not alone; most of the property owners who live along these natural waterways will undoubtedly be negatively impacted by the proposed levee. We are members of the Bayou Liberty Association and we concur with the Association’s concerns about the Bayou Liberty area, but we also recognize that negative impacts will extend well beyond the Bayou Liberty area, from the Big Branch Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (BBMNWR) across Bayou Paquet, Bayou Liberty and Bayou Bonfouca. This is an extensive levee and flood gate system and would have to be maintained by St. Tammany Parish in perpetuity??? We suspect that, with the currently dynamic situation of climate change, rising sea levels and land loss, there will also be unpredictable factors that will make this levee system inadequate within a short span of time.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor’s (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 “Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors” dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs.
		We agree with the Bayou Liberty Association’s focus on impacts to property owners but feel our focus must also be on the impacts to the highly-critical natural ecosystems on the northshore of Lake Pontchartrain. In the Feasibility Study you state that 98 acres of important Northshore habitat within the BBMNWR will be directly impacted for which mitigation would need to be made somewhere beyond the Refuge (in addition to the 32 acres that could be mitigated within the Refuge). Not only will this have a huge impact on BBMNWR - 130 acres of important wetlands that had been set aside for protection - it also suggests that the wetlands along Bayou Liberty and the other bayous would similarly be impacted and require mitigation as well. This is simply unacceptable	Refer to Section 3 of Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for the sea level rise analysis. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.

		In summary, we strongly object to the project as currently proposed in the St Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. While we support funds to elevate existing homes in the project area, we are strongly against any project that encourages further developments below Interstate 12	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for the full like of measures considered and the screening process.
9/6/23	Chris Davis, Program Manager, Scenic Rivers Program;)	LDWF is concerned with impacts to wetlands, streams, and other habitats, resulting from TSP implementation. Due to the limited information provided on TSP features and lack of associated detail, LDWF cannot fully understand impacts associated with the TSP at this time. Additional information including cross-sectional and plan view drawings and maps of all TSP features should be provided to resource agencies to convey a better understanding of all project features and aid in those agencies analyses of potential impacts. Information on the impacts to hydrology and operational plans for all water control structures should be developed and provided to resource agencies as well. It is our intent to ensure that hydrology is maintained to the greatest extent practicable and impacts to aquatic habitats are avoided and minimized to the greatest extent practicable. If constructed, the TSP will directly and permanently impact Bayou Liberty and Mile Branch, both Louisiana designated Scenic Rivers. The TSP may also adversely impact a third Scenic River, the Tchefuncte River. The USACE should coordinate with LDWF Scenic Rivers Program staff during the design phase to ensure that impacts to Scenic Rivers are minimized and avoided to the greatest extent practicable and that any unavoidable impacts are appropriately mitigated.	The TSP has been optimized and the report has been updated to include additional discussion on potential impacts. A scenic rivers section has been added. A WVA and HEP analysis was conducted to further inform the impact assessment.
		For all planned impacts to Scenic Rivers, including Bayou Liberty and Mile Branch, a complete Scenic River permit application shall be provided to LDWF. As stated in prior LDWF comments, the proposed channelization and clearing and snagging of Mile Branch currently outlined in Alternative 8 are prohibited by the Louisiana Scenic Rivers Act. LDWF certainly does not object to flood risk reduction measures to reduce risk to life and/or property. LDWF looks forward to continuing to work with USACE and Parish officials to develop solutions that provide flood risk reduction and maintain natural and free flowing streams	Mile Branch is not a part of the Recommend Plan
		The DIFR and DEIS should acknowledge and accurately analyze the full and permanent impacts to Mile Branch water quality and habitat resulting from the TSP. The TSP is expected to result in an oversized, deeply incised channel. Widely accepted channel evolution models show that the resulting channel will result in continuing erosion as the stream adjusts to bed lowering and increased contained flows. Remaining, natural floodplain will be disconnected, riparian habitat will be removed (and not replaced), aquatic habitats will be degraded. Higher water temperature and increased turbidity are expected to persist well into the future. Aesthetics will also be impacted. Although residential development is the dominant land use along the stream's riparian corridor, many reaches of the stream remain forested to various degrees and tracts of forested land and woodlots occur adjacent to the stream throughout much of its length.	The revised report has improved upon the habitat assessment and impacts to include impacts to the Mile Branch scenic river and water quality. Mile Branch has been dropped and is not a part of the RP
		Due to the Scenic River designation of Mile Branch and the expected impacts of the current TSP, the USACE should provide LDWF hydrological modeling demonstrating justification for the proposed dredging on Mile Branch. The USACE should also provide analysis of less damaging alternatives for addressing flooding along Mile Branch. Alternatives for Mile Branch should include the construction of off-channel detention ponds and channel improvements that incorporate Natural Channel Design and Engineering With Nature principles. When compared to the current plan, Priority 2 or 3 (Rosgen) restoration would result in improved natural functions and ecosystem services, reduced bank erosion, increased aquatic and riparian habitat, reduced water quality impacts, and reduced channel/project maintenance. The social benefit associated with dry detention and floodplain areas that can also serve as parks and public green space would be significant within the city of Covington and should be included in the CBA. The alternatives should also include a nonstructural alternative that analyses home elevations in lieu of the currently proposed channel improvements.	Additional hydrologic modeling has been conducted and is a part of the revised report. The H&H modeling report is located in Appendix E. Additional modeling and assessment is to occur during PED if the project is authorized and funded to proceed. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		The report's relevant resources should include Scenic River's relevance beyond aesthetics. Section 3.2.2.4 should be expanded to more accurately represent the protections afforded by the Louisiana Scenic Rivers Act (The Act). Additionally, The Act was enacted in 1970, not in 1988 as stated in the draft report. To better inform the readers, where appropriate, the report should specifically indicate that Mile Branch is a designated Scenic River. Not all readers may realize that Mile Branch is a tributary of the Tchefuncte and thereby a Scenic River.	Scenic Rivers has been added to the revised draft report
		Impacts associated with some of the alternatives may have been inaccurately assessed within the report. For example, under Section 5.3.1.6, Wildlife impacts, Alternative 8 is reported to directly result in the loss of a very small amount, under 1 acre, of forested habitat…due to construction activities. However, other descriptions entail over 2 miles of bank clearing and grubbing ahead of significant dredging of 20 acres of stream channel, lowering the stream bed elevation by five feet. The impacts associated with these types of activities are fairly well understood and should be included.	The draft report has been revised to include additional information on potential impacts of implementing the TSP. Impacts to important resources has been updated based on habitat modeling. Mile Branch improvements are not part of the Recommended Plan.
		The TSP's levee, pump station, and flood gate will permanently impact Bayou Liberty, a Scenic River and recreational destination for many on the Northshore. Levee impacts enumerated within the report should be amended to show the associated impact to recreation and mitigation should be provided for those impacts.	The revised report includes discussions regarding scenic streams and recreational impacts
		TSP benefits may be overstated in some sections. For example, under Wildlife Impacts, Alternative 8 is reported to likely stabilize terrestrial habitat that is being lost to erosion. LDWF is concerned with this assessment. As described above, it is expected that Alt 8 will likely directly impact this habitat. Allowing the area to revegetate naturally (as proposed) will also allow invasive species such as Chinese tallow and Chinese privet to dominate the riparian corridor.	Noted. The engineering plan includes measures to consider planted riprap and nature based measures to restore the natural function lost due to channelization. In addition, a backwater area is proposed to help offsite potential impacts to the water bottoms.
		We are pleased to see that the proposed borrow site analysis indicated that no wetlands would be impacted from borrow; however, the borrow site analysis should also account for potential stream impacts. For example, STP-5 borders or contains a small stream that may not have been accounted for.	The borrow plan to be developed during PED would include measures to protect streams from impacts from borrow to include best management practices such as silt screens, hay bales etc to prevent run off from borrow sites/construction adversely impacting streams. Buffer zones would also be established to limit any adverse impacts that might occur.

		Rivers and streams should be included in the habitat types requiring mitigation. Coordination with resource agencies should occur to better define and assess impacts to streams not covered under the current analyses. Subsequently, the final report (and CBAs) should be amended to include mitigation for these habitats. The resulting, complete mitigation plan should be provided to LDWF and other resource agencies for review.	Consideration was given to riverine habitats and the inclusion of mitigation for riparian habitat and the loss of stream habitat resulting from the channelization of Mile Branch. However, Mile Branch is not part of Recommended Plan
		Mitigation for impacts should occur prior to or concurrent with construction of the TSP.	Reference Appendix I for the mitigation plan
		The LDWF Wildlife Diversity Program database indicates that the West Indian Manatee (Trichechus manatus) may occur in the surrounding waterbodies of the project footprint. The manatee is a large mammal that inhabits both fresh and salt water. Although the manatee is a year round resident of Florida and Central America, the species has been known to migrate to areas along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts during the summer months. The West Indian Manatee is a threatened species protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and the Federal Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. In Louisiana, take or harassment of a manatee is a violation of state and federal laws. Critical habitat for the manatee includes beds of submerged aquatic vegetation (e.g., sea-grass beds). Areas with sea-grass beds should be avoided during project activities. Report all manatee sightings to the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries at 504-286-4052 or 1-800-442-2511.	Comment noted. Manatee avoidance measures would be implemented. ESA consultation is complete.
		Please accept the following public comments concerning the USACE St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study submitted by Northshore Riverwatch.1 We request these comments submitted in a timely fashion be added to the public record. Northshore Riverwatch retains the right to use any public comments submitted by other interested parties. While we do not oppose the Feasibility Study in itself, there are several issues surrounding the Slidell Levee and Miles Branch proposed actions which raise legitimate concerns. Each part will be addressed separately.	Comment noted.
		To Whom it May Concern, Please accept the following public comments concerning the USACE St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study submitted by Northshore Riverwatch.1 We request these comments submitted in a timely fashion be added to the public record. Northshore Riverwatch retains the right to use any public comments submitted by other interested parties. While we do not oppose the Feasibility Study in itself, there are several issues surrounding the Slidell Levee and Miles Branch proposed actions which raise legitimate concerns. Each part will be addressed separately. Slidell Levee: 1. There are several working marinas and a shipyard upstream on Bayous Liberty and Bonfouca which will be negatively impacted by the height restrictions associated with the floodgates. The proposed restrictions will not allow sailboats currently using the marinas passage into and out of the Bayous, negatively impacting these thriving businesses.	We understand the concern over the height of the lift gates. Additional gates may be investigated in Preconstruction, Engineering and Design, when channel surveys, soil borings, and Coast Guard coordination can occur.
		Slidell Levee: The proposed footprint of the levee impacts several historical structures. The levee must be realigned to protect these properties.	Refer to section 5.1.1.13 to cover any potential historic properties, like Bayou Pacquet area. "As such, all field survey, evaluation, and reporting required to make NRHP eligibility determinations for Section 106 compliance would largely be deferred to the PED/Construction phase. If direct adverse effects to cultural resources are identified and cannot be avoided or minimized, such impacts would be mitigated through the procedures outlined in the PA. The PA would then govern the CEMVN's subsequent NHPA compliance efforts and any additional conditions or requirements would be documented at that time."
		Slidell Levee: Northshore Riverwatch has concerns that limiting the outflow from the protected side to floodgates will redirect historical sheet flow and groundwater flow directly into the marshes toward narrowed floodgate openings during normal intense rainfall resulting in a rise of Base Flood Elevation for the 1% storm. Raising the elevation of floodwaters will have negative impacts that could outweigh the benefits of the project. We request that during the engineering phase, the effects on BFE must be studied and the provisions of the National Flood Insurance Policy be followed to ensure no negative impacts due to inland rainfall.	Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		Slidell Levee: Northshore Riverwatch has concerns of increased flooding during storm events when the gates are closed. The F.S. indicates the 1% storm was studied, but we have had many storms in the gulf which surpass the 1% storm. A slow-moving tropical system can drop tens of inches of rain which would be trapped behind the levees. The proposed pump stations will have limited capacity which, when exceeded, could flood more of the area than the storm without the levee. This also needs to be addressed in the engineering phase.	Refer to Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, specifically section 14.1.6 for a discussion on the methodology for pump station sizing. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
9/6/22	Mathew Allen (Northshore	Slidell Levee: Levees are designed to a specific intensity of storm. When the storm exceeds the design specification, there is a real possibility of levee overtopping, failure, and flooding. How long will it take to drain the dry-side of the system once the storm passes considering the overland flow is cut off. Will it be weeks before residents could return home? The proposed levee would not protect from a Katrina type storm. The design must be for a 500-year or 1000-year storm to ensure protection of the residents.	Refer to Appendix D: Engineering for design assumptions.

9/6/23	(Northshore Riverwatch)	Slidell Levee: Levees give a false sense of safety. Levees will be overtopped by strong storms that exceed the design specifications. The Gulf Coast is seeing more intense storms than in the past. Our concern is the proposed levee system will encourage inappropriate development in normally flood-prone areas on the dry side, placing more property and citizens at risk. Intense development and urbanization should not occur is areas that will be affected by levee failure.	Refer to Appendix F: Economics, Section 10 for the life safety analysis for the feasibility stage of the project.
		Slidell Levee: Many of the residences that are most prone to tidal surge flooding in the area west of Slidell (Bayous Liberty, Pasquet and Bonfouca) have already been elevated to sufficient height to be protected form the designed surge elevations. Any home that has flooded with more than 50% damage should have been rebuilt to safe elevations. The fact that so many homes that flooded in storms have not been raised is a commentary on the ineffectual application of NFIP requirements by St. Tammany Parish and other governing bodies. The cost of raising the remaining homes subject to the design tidal surge may be more protective and cost effective than building an ecologically destructive levee.	Participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP. Refer to section 4 of the Main Report for a full comparison of measures considered for the area.
		Mile Branch: Miles Branch, as a tributary to the Little Tchefuncte River (local name for the section of the Tchefuncte River from its headwaters to its confluence with the Bogue Falaya River) is a Louisiana Scenic Stream and considered an Outstanding Natural Resource Water in and of itself. The CWA requires no degradation of its waters. The proposed Miles Branch clearing and dredging will lead to many adverse impacts, not just to the Branch itself, but also the main stem of the Tchefuncte. Miles Branch is incised into the Pine-Savannah terrace with encompasses much of Southern St. Tammany and much of the Gulf Coast. The sandy-clay soils are extremely erodible. The mucking and dredging of Miles Branch will introduce massive amounts of fine sediment into the system, impairing its designated use as an ONRW. The fine clay fraction of the soils remains suspended for miles downstream impacting both benthic and nektonic organisms.	Refer to section 3.2.1.11 for a discussion on scenic rivers.
		Mile Branch Northshore Riverwatch has concerns that the transportation of the eroded soils could deposit in the mainstem of the Tchefuncte River just downstream of the confluence resulting in the need to dredge the excess sediment, further destroying an ONRW. Any impact that will require more action must be included in the cost/benefit analysis.	Refer to Appendix E-5 for particle tracing.
		Mile Branch: Dredging an extra 5 feet in highly erodible soils will affect the stability of the river system by surpassing the critical angle of repose for the soils. Deepening the channel will require armoring the sides which has its own very negative impacts.	Refer to Section 10.22 of Appendix D: Engineering.
		Mile Branch While armoring Miles Branch with concrete will solve erosion issues and speed the discharge, it will result in the loss of the natural and beneficial filtering functions of the current system. The results of armoring will be more pollutants entering the already impaired Tchefuncte River. This is a step to completely urbanize the natural drainage system	Comment noted.
		Mile Branch: The Draft Feasibility Study indicates the work on Miles Branch will cost approximately $77,000,000 to protect 250 homes. Many of these homes are older. A buy-out of the 250 homes would be more cost effective than the damaging actions proposed for Miles Branch. We request that a cost comparison to raising and/or buyouts be completed prior to engineering.	Buyouts are not a part of recommended plan at this time.
		Mile Branch: There are other, more environmentally sensitive alternatives. One such alternative would be to widen the stream valley and floodplain to accommodate more water in a natural setting. Restoring Miles Branch to a natural stream state would be more beneficial to the residents of Covington and be used as an open space park for community access to the stream. Restoring the stream to a natural condition will improve environmental outcomes in the immediate vicinity and in the Tchefuncte River.	Comment noted.
		Mile Branch: Northshore Riverwatch is concerned that increasing the rate of discharge from Miles Branch will have a negative affect on the BFE of the Tchefuncte River downstream from the confluence. A hydrological model must be produced showing the increased	Refer to Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for completed H&H modeling. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community.	Comment noted
		Accelerate and Improve Fritchie Marsh Restoration. I strongly recommend accelerating and enhancing the ongoing Fritchie Marsh restoration Project, as it holds significant potential to reduce storm surge. Proper restoration of the marsh Could result in a substantial drop in surge levels, providing some degree of storm surge Protection. You can find detailed information about this project in the source.	The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is a separate authorization from the Fritchie Marsh Creation.

		Full Upfront Coverage of Home Elevation Costs. All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in Water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these Costs before qualifying for grants. In visiting with my local community the FEMA rules on Elevation should be removed.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		Compensation to homeowners and small businesses for additional costs of flood insurance.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
9/6/2023	Nadia Atamany	In visiting with our neighbors there are multiple strings attached to FEMA and other money Including but not limited to a requirement to hold certain levels of insurance. Many small Businesses, start up businesses and home businesses are struggling in this community. With a Potential exodus of residents who are well paid and technically advanced (thus able to leave Louisiana) small businesses will be impacted. Compensation must be considered for those Businesses who may shutter without the needed customer base which will change with the levee.	This request is outside of this feasibility study's authority.
9/6/2023	Timur Bolukbas	My life is spent on the Doubloon Bayou and Pearl River. Everyday after I come home, I fish, and kayak. I love taking my boat out there as well, it is amazing to have this ability. I am concerned that this levee project will take that ability away from me, and my future generations. My parents spent years on their very large garden, if we are excluded, and we flood, that will all be taken away. The dynamics of a bayou are very complex, I feel creating this levee can cause concern with it either drying up, or heavily flooding. In one of the project photos, specifically alternative E in phase IV, it cuts right through my road, and excludes my home from the flood wall. Wrapping this around the homes at the end of Yorktown would be a good option, splitting the road and excluding 2 beautiful homes and many properties doesn't sound like a great idea.	Refer to Appendix C: Annex J: Recreation for information regarding impacts to the recreation of the Slidell area.
		I Kenneth Broadwell, cau Ÿously supports the Updated USACE Saint Tammany Parish Feasibility Study. I fully understands that this is a mul Ÿfaceted two-phase project that significantly impacts the environment and water flow in the Bayou Liberty Watershed.	Comment noted.
		I agree with the Bayou Liberty Board and their current areas of concern are listed below. These maters have been repeatedly communicated to principals within the USACE and the St. Tammany Levee, Drainage, and Conserva Ÿon District (STLDCD)	Comment noted.
		1) Current levee alignments submitted, which intersect the Bayou Liberty watershed remain unacceptable, each for a variety of reasons. The BLA Board recommends the levee alignment trek further West onto the Big Branch Na Ÿonal Wildlife Reserve. This later endorsed alignment reduces floodgate numbers, pump sta Ÿons, future maintenance, and thereby costs. It results in more private property protec Ÿon as well as less private property destruc Ÿon. Finally, it is far more aesthe Ÿically pleasing to the area.	Comment noted.

		2) The height limita□Ÿon for the proposed Bayou Liberty floodgate is problema□Ÿc. Two large, well-established marinas (Bonfouca, Foggy Waters) are located upstream. Both marinas house vessels suppor□Ÿng superstructures that exceed the height limit of 22.8'. All sailing vessels would be precluded from accessing and mooring at these facili□Ÿes. Sailboat masts frequently exceed 45'. On behalf of these marinas and residents possessing such vessels who reside upstream, BLA insists on floodgate designs with no height limita□Ÿon. Acceptable opening design op□Ÿons include a dual or single slide, and/or a swing open gate(s). The Board suggests that similar concerns may exist on other waterways affected by this project. Lastly, de-snagging, clearing trees, and removing dangerous structures that impede naviga□Ÿon o□Łen require barges, tugboats, and equipment that exceed the specified height limita□Ÿon.	Page 108 of the Appendix D: Hydrologic and Hydraulics discusses the gate sizing. The engineers started with the data set they had available for current channel dimensions. Then they completed modeling efforts to appropriately size the gates to maintain existing water flows. Table E: 14-1 in that appendix details the minimum gate width. The lift gate was selected for this location with engineering and environmental considerations in mind. Other considerations down the line that could affect the gate designs would be surveys of the channels, additional hydraulic modeling, environmental considerations, and coordination with the Coast Guard.
		3) The BLA Board realizes many of our concerns about the proposed engineering and design elements cannot be addressed at this stage of development. We con□Ÿnue to make those concerns known and respec□žully request to be fully involved in all public input aspects, including mee□Ÿngs and public comment periods, assuming the project advances into the Preconstruc□Ÿon, Engineering, and Design (PED) stage.	The request for inclusion in meetings in the future is understood and the BLA will be invited to all public events in the future.
9/6/2023	Kenneth Broadv	4) The BLA strongly urges the USACE and STLDCD to pursue ini□Ÿa□Ÿves outside this limited feasibility study. These include, but are not limited to, marsh restora□Ÿon and preserva□Ÿon; along with assessing long-term plans such as construc□Ÿng flood barrier control measures at both Passes of Lake Pontchartrain.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
	Diane Calico	I feel not being included in the flood protection plan can cause harm to us and the two nearby schools. The adjacent subdivision, La Chenier has only elderly residents which can cause them great harm.	Comment noted.
		hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property from its protection. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues related to this project to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness for all members of our community. 1. Accelerate and Improve Fritchie Marsh Restoration I strongly recommend accelerating and enhancing the ongoing Fritchie Marsh restoration project, as it holds significant potential to reduce storm surge. Proper restoration of the marsh could result in a substantial drop in surge levels, providing some degree of storm surge protection. You can find detailed information about this project in the source.	No attachment received, however we are aware of the Fritchie Marsh Project. The St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study is a separate authorization from the Fritchie Marsh Creation.
		2. Collaboration with DOTD and CPRA for Surge Mitigation I urge you to collaborate with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) to explore surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East. A similar study for surge mitigation using Hwy 11 and Lakeshore Drive (Rat's Nest Road) is already underway. The Hwy 190 restoration and bridge replacement project should be activated soon, presenting an opportunity to maximize further reductions in storm surge through structural changes to highway and bridge design.	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		3. Change Funding Allocation for Residential Protection Strategies. I propose a change in funding allocation language within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) budget. Currently, the focus is primarily on home slab elevation, which may not be the most cost-effective or efficient strategy. I suggest amending the language to allow for a range of residential protection strategies, similar to the options available for businesses. Such a change would align with the USACE study's recommendations and could lead to more effective and affordable solutions for homeowners.	USACE is required to follow policy and guidance for feasibility studies. Should policy be changed, the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study would adapt to those changes.
		4. Consider Alternative Levee Sites. I request a thorough evaluation of alternative levee sites, including alignments that extend along Hwy 190 and/or Military Road. All proposed alignments currently leave some residents outside of protection, which raises concerns about the fairness and equity of the project.	USACE considered over 200 measures from the start of the study for potential risk reduction. Please see the Main Report and Plan Formulation appendix for documentation of all alternatives considered and screening criteria.
		5. Collaboration on a Surge Barrier Plan. I strongly recommend joining the Lake Coalition to explore the feasibility of using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier. This plan has the potential to close five openings, preventing surges of up to 10 feet. While it may require extensive coordination, including involvement at a Cabinet level, it could offer a cost-effective and efficient solution to protect our community.	We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.

9/6/23	Sue Brown; Karen Bartholomay	6. Full Upfront Coverage of Home Elevation Costs, All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these costs before qualifying for grants. In visiting with my local community the FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		7. Impact on Local Schools. An assessment of the impact on local schools, particularly those in areas excluded from the levee, must be conducted. The disregard for property, community, and the tax base could have long-term negative consequences for our education system which is directly related to jobs and thus a core responsibility of the army Corp of engineer to address as part of this and any other proposal.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a full analysis of the impacts on the human environment.
		8. Oversight Entity for Funding Allocation: The creation of an independent entity, separate from St. Tammany Parish and Louisiana, to ensure fair and transparent allocation of project funds, free from potential biases or political influence and diversion of funds to other programs, interests etc.… Funds would be managed for Education, Vocation, Elevation, Relocation, Mitigation, levee maintance etc…	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization Documents.
		9. Options for Affected Residents: Total Buyout: Offer a total buyout of property by the federal government, including relocation costs. These buyouts should be fair market value as of 2021 when the project was started. Offers such as those made for Avery Estates have shown that many will be unable to find new housing, move themselves, elevate their property or secure insurance/funding for new homes if homeowners are not adequately compensated. Additionally addressing this early with homeowners living in their single family homes would prevent unnecessary delays, lawsuits etc… by current residents who’ve had buy-in to a process that has not been transparent.	Refer to Section 4 of the Main Report and Appendix B Plan Formulation for detail on consideration of buyouts and why this was screened.
		10. Moratorium on Building: Implement a moratorium on all new building in the area and within 50 minutes of the levee to protect existing residents. This would insure that all monies earmarked for elevation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes a the time of project inception and completion.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
		11. Local Job Training: Creation of a training program for Louisiana residents to participate in the levee's construction, providing long-term, family-wage job opportunities that are long term and local hires.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		12. Tax Refunds: Provide tax refunds to homeowners in single-family dwellings outside the levee as compensation for project costs that they will not benefit from.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. This request is outside of the scope of the feasibility study.
		13. Impact on local healthcare: Creation of a healthcare fund to protect healthcare access to the community that will be impacted by the levee location and changes in access to hospitals and clinics that may be close but with significant changes in roads and community will change.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.
		14. Relocation costs for religious institutions and their congregations. Churches, synagogue, temples must receive funding and help in maintaining traditions, services, and access to their community. Costs should not increase for churches that will be responsible for caring for a community that will be impacted monetarily by the loss of good paying jobs that pay taxes in an area that will be negatively impacted. Additionally, Churches and religious organization spend large sums of money during disaster relief and should be compensated for all money increases that are passed on to them (and their members) for care of their congregations in providing disaster relief, food and labor due to placement of the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. These costs are outside of the USACE Policy for inclusion into the feasibility process.

15. Compensation to homeowners and small businesses for additional costs of flood insurance. In visiting with our neighbors there are multiple strings attached to FEMA and other money including but not limited to a requirement to hold certain levels of insurance. Many small businesses, start up businesses and home businesses are struggling in this community. With a potential exodus of residents who are well paid and technically advanced (thus able to leave Louisiana) small businesses will be impacted. Compensation must be considered for those businesses who may shutter without the needed customer base which will change with the levee.	The feasibility study process allows for a determination of the Federal interest in a project for reducing the risk and damages associated with flood events into the future. Future changes to insurance rates cannot be predicted and are not incorporated into the analysis.
Additional Information and Questions for Clarification. To better understand the project and its implications, I kindly request the following information and answers to the following questions: 1. Which Flood Control Act authorizes this levee project, and what are the specific provisions of this act?	The St. Tammany Parish Louisiana Feasibility Study was authorized under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016. Please see Appendix A for authorization documentation.
Has a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review been conducted for this project? If so, what were the findings regarding environmental impacts?	Please see the Main Report and Appendix C for details on NEPA compliance.
What are the engineering standards being used for the levee's construction, and is there a projected timeline for the project's milestones?	Please see the Engineering Appendix for design standards and assumptions. The USACE team used the greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) design criteria for development of the features of the West/South Slidell levee.
What is the projected economic impact of the levee on major local employers, such as military and space complexes?	Refer to Appendix F: Economics
Is there a plan for long-term maintenance of the levee, and who will be responsible for it? It is well known that upkeep is expensive and necessary.	Please see Section 6.5.5 pf the Main Report for Operations and Maintenance information. Additional details will be developed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
How can residents access updates or changes to the project plans to ensure transparency and public input?	Further communications on the project can be found on the study website. https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
How/When will St Tammany residents vote on a levee tax? Who will pay for the levee?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
Has a plan been established for movement or removal of sacred burial sites including family sites and religious or traditional rites? What costs have been set aside for this?	Refer to Appendix C, Annex G and section 8.16 of the main report for the efforts on historic considerations.

		Has an evaluation been done on the new representation of taxpayers with this project? I believe that addressing these concerns and questions will lead to a more equitable and effective levee project that prioritizes the safety and well-being of all residents. I look forward to your response and hope for a constructive dialogue on this matter.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on implementation fo the recommended plan. The Non Federal Sponsor's (NFS) obligation to Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) the project at no cost to the Government shall be set forth in an OMRR&R manual prepared and issued by USACE in accordance with ER 1110-2-401 "Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation Manual for Projects and Separable Elements Managed by Project Sponsors" dated 30 September 1994, the executed Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), and applicable USACE regulations. The NFS shall conduct its OMRR&R responsibilities in a manner compatible with the authorized purpose of the project and in accordance with applicable Federal laws and specific directions prescribed by the Government in the OMRR&R manual. The purpose of OMRR&R is to sustain the constructed project. The assumed OMRR&R included items such as routine maintenance, routine clearing and snagging, periodic inspection, machinery and gate replacements, and minor and major repairs. The estimated costs were annualized and included in the economic analysis to determine the BCR. The project specific OMRR&R activities and associated costs were estimated for the levee and channel improvements and will be done further refined in Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). Should the local NFS require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
9/6/23	Debra Lombard	My comments below are based on me being a Civil Engineer EI and being the 1st St. Tammany Parish Project Manager on the 31 mile long Tammany Trace Project. Are permeable paving parking lots required for all new commercial projects over 2000 SF? If not, that should be required in all areas in south 1/2 of st. Tammany parish including all towns too similar, but needs to be more stringent, than whats required in Orleans Parish. The biggest two problems in STP today in order is the flooding and congested roads.	Future construction is outside the scope of the Federal feasibility study, however, please see section 6.5.7 for recommendations to local authorities.
9/6/23	Karie and Michael Falgout	I hope you are doing well, and appreciate your efforts to hear my concerns regarding the July 2023 Corps' St. Tammany Parish, LA., Feasibility Study Revised Draft. My name is Karie Falgout, and please note that I DO NOT support the currently proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiative to provide structural flood risk for Southeastern Louisiana (St. Tammany Parish). Specifically, this latest plan does NOT provide any structural or non-structural flood risk reduction system protections for the vast majority of the area east and south ofl-10 (Military Road). This excluded demographic is roughly equal in size to the City of Slidell which is included in the current protection proposal. This current plan will cause major harm to the residents and business of the Military Road area.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		However, I, am in support of USACE Alternative D or E (Floodwall) Phase IV, which covers the vast majority of the Military Road area, which is currently excluded. Since the residents living in the Military Road exclusion area are also tax payers, they deserve the same level of protection as all other residents of the Parish.	Comment noted.
9/6/23	Suzanne Krieger	Attached you will find the Letters of Support and Resolutions of Support from various St. Tammany Parish individuals, community organizations, and cities. Please include these documents within the public comment portion of the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as necessary to provide community support for this project at the federal level.	Comment noted.
		I am writing to express my opposition to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District's (CEMVN) recently released Revised Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (RDIFR-EIS) for the St. Tammany Parish Louisiana, Feasibility Study. I am gravely concerned that the project scope and plan formulation was based on a vast number of assumptions and further manipulated through erroneous calculations utilizing outdated, incomplete, and inaccurate data. At best, the CEMVN failed to exercise methodological due diligence throughout the project. However, the omissions and errors are significant enough that they bring into question the CEMVN's true intent.	Comment noted.

		Appendix B - Plan Formulation identifies the project scope through identif1ed problems, opportunities, and related objectives. Table 8:1-1. St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study, Problems, Opportunities, and Objectives cites specific evidence for the defined objectives, including: "3500 residential structures are on the FEMA repetitive and severe repetitive loss list." Clearly, these structures should be prioritized in any plan set forth. However, there is no data presented to indicate the Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) will address this stated problem. Has the CEMVN analyzed which of these residences will be protected through the structural and/or non structural plans? Of those residences that will only be eligible for non structural measures, it appears doubtful many will meet all of the eligibility criteria (i.e. future damage risk, reduction in damage costs, cost to elevate related to value of home, physical inspection, floodplain elevation level) as set forth in the Optimized TSP. How will the proposed cost to benefit ratio be affected when homes do not meet criteria for elevation and are left unprotected? It is critical to understand this relationship before seeking funding, as a reduction in cost to benefit ratios will decrease the impact and efficacy of the Optimized TSP.	A discussion of the FEMA repetitive loss structures in the interior to the levee will be added to the final report. Structure by structure assessments will be completed in PED to determine which structures meet the eligibility criteria. This task will occur well after plan selection, so this does not factor into the estimation of the BCR. It is possible that the results of the surveys could affect future economic updates of the study. Refer to Appendix F: Economics for information on benefits calculated in the study process. Funding for construction is not being requested at this time, see new figure added to Section 10.
		Another identified problem in Table B:1-1 is stated: "Critical infrastructure throughout the region including the 1-10, 1-12, and 1-59 transportation system and evacuation routes, Government facilities, hospitals, and schools is expected to become more at risk of damage from potential floods." The Optimized TSP fails to address most of this stated problem. With the exception of the City of Slidell government offices and a small portion of 1-10 contained within the proposed levee, there is no firm evidence provided to indicate protection of key infrastructure and resources throughout the parish. I assert that the area of Eastern Slidell outside of the proposed levee will have more floodwater pushed into the area, thus CAUSING an INCREASED risk for flooding, INCREASED risk of damage to structures, INCREASED loss of life, and INCREASED disruption in services, including four schools my children attend, the closest and largest hospital and medical complex in Slidell, and several large churches that serve the greater community through welfare programs and disaster recovery (e.g. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, located just off Military Road). Further linking the levee design to 1-10 as proposed will CAUSE and INCREASE in transportation and evacuation interruptions if the levee is breached.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for a full list of measures considered in the study process.
		Yet another problem statement listed in Table B:1-1 is that there is an "increasing risk to people from catastrophic flooding events". Again, the Optimized TSP does not address this problem. Appendix D - Annex 4 - Preliminary Life Safety Risk Assessment, Section 8.1 includes a matrix summarizing the life safety risk analysis. The proposed levee included in the Optimized TSP is listed in the Section 8.1 matrix to INCREASE annual life loss and INCREASE incremental risk, even with the unfortunate stated omission of unavailable inundation map data.	The Recommended Plan has multiple features that collectively reduce flood risk to approximately 26,600 structures and approximately 70,000 residents in the study area. Refer to Appendix F: Economics Section 10 for the Life Safety analysis that was completed. This Federal Plan is not expected to solve all of the flooding concerns in the St Tammany Parish but is part of the overall system. Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation Section 3 for Local Flood Policies and Management.
		Appendix B - Plan Formulation also includes Figure 8:1-3 Types of Measures Evaluated Under the St. Tammany Feasibility Study. This figure uses a scoring methodology to determine which proposed actions met the project objectives and would be kept in the plan for further review. No data is cited as a basis for these scores, therefore the scoring methodology can't be assessed for appropriateness, nor can it be replicated. Since the generated scores determined if actions were kept as feasible solutions or removed from consideration, the entire validity of the plan formulation is highly suspect.	The management measures were evaluated based on category type, planning measures objectives, existing data, professional judgment, avoiding study constraints and addressing the opportunities and problems of the area. The management measures were also screened on effectiveness and efficiency, which are two of the four principles and guidelines (P&G) evaluation criteria as defined in P&G Section VI.1.6.2(c). This is standard in the initial stages of PF as far as ensuring measures meet these criteria.
		Appendix D - Annex 4 - Preliminary Life Safety Risk Assessment illustrates weaknesses and ethically irresponsible approaches in the methodology. Concerning statements (emphasis added) include: Section 1.0 - "The life safety assessment is qualitative and prepared prior to completion of the engineering appendix and without consequence modeling." (No sources or methodology for qualitative data collection are noted.) Section 2.5 - "The South Slidell is a combination of levees and pump stations, which are proposed to reduce risk of storm surge flooding." (Data is not cited for this assumption of reduced risk.) Section 3.0 - "Limited modeling has been done to inform the potential benefits and consequences of the flood reduction alternatives." (Data on benefits and consequences needs to be accurately and thoroughly modeled to inform appropriate decision-making. Section 4.3 - "Sea level rise and subsidence considerations must be investigated tor both design and the future condition risk assessment." (Sea level rise data should be considered cntical in appropriate flood mitigation plan formation.) Section 8.2 - "Significant uncertainties and unknowns are incorporated Into this assessment. The engineering unknowns, particularly the lack of geotechnical data resulting , major assumption tn the foundation design, result in uncertainty with the potential long-term performance of the levees and f/oodwalfs as currently presented. In addition, no life consequence data was available to the team for the assessment. Assumptions were made about the performance and the potential consequences." (It 1s grossly negligent to repeatedly justify the use of assumptions instead of data where data 1s obtainable.)	The efforts for life safety analysis are in accordance with USACE guidance. Please refer to Appendix F: Economics, section 10 for additional life safety analysis. Additional life safety will be completed if the project is Authorized and Funded by Congress.

9/6/23		I am concerned about the overall cost to benefit ratio of the Optimized TSP. Per the study overview, "Hurricane Katrina damaged over 48,000 residential structures causing 1.45 billion in damages.wIn today's dollars, this amounts to 2.3 billion in damages, approximately half of the proposed project cost Hurricane Katrina was an anomaly. Since a significant number of St. Tammany homes will not be protected by the levee and can not eligible to be raised without repairs or modifications to meet code (per stipulations outlined in Appendix H - Nonstructural Implementation Plan), it can be assumed that any storm impacting St. Tammany Parish will still result in substantial damages and repair costs for these omitted structures in addition to the excessive cost of the Optimized TSP. It is possible that the area would need to experience 3 storms causing similar damages to Hurricane Katrina before recouping the cost of the pro1ect. Without data regarding how many homes will qualify for elevation, it is impossible to accurately determine a cost to benefit ratio. While a reduction in homes eligible for elevation may improve projected costs, it will definitely reduce the beneficial impacts of the Optimized TSP. How these reductions will affect the stated cost to benefit ratio is unknown.	USACE policy does not formulate for one storm, but for the modeled results of a variety of storms and the associated damages over a given area (as outline in the H&H appendix). The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Please refer to Appendix F: Economics, section 5 for how USACE uses the information generated in the model to determine economic justification for the proposed project. And Section 6 of the same appendix for specific information regarding the nonstructural plan economics.
		Appendix D - Annex 5 - Cost Engineering cites that cost data was "supplemented with estimating information from... quotes, bid data, and Architect-Engineer estimates" and further states "historical Government and Commercial bid data" and "other available historical cost data sources" were utilized. This supplementation is problematic from a modeling perspective in that no details are given of the ratio of supplemented estimated data to the actual cost data used, ,1or is there any accounting for the relevance or validity of the collected quotes, bids, and estin1ates used in representing project costs for St. Tammany Parish. Therefore, the resulting cost modeling may be invalid.	The USACE PDT followed USACE guidance for cost estimation. Cost certification was obtained on December 20, 2023 from the USACE Cost Center of Expertise, as required by Planning Guidance.
		The discussion in Appendix D - Annex 5 also states: "The cost of each structure was then escalated to 4th Quarter 2020 pricing to develop new costs for all structures". Is there a reason the costs were not updated to reflect inflation before the Revised Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (RDIFR-EIS) dated July 2023 was released to the public? The Bureau of Labor Statistics CPI Inflation Calculator shows a 17% inflation rate from December 2020 to July 2023 (https://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/cpicalc.pl?cost1;;;;1.00&year1=202012&year2=202307). Excluding such significant inflation greatly skews any calculations.	The USACE PDT followed USACE guidance for cost estimation. Cost certification was obtained on December 20, 2023 from the USACE Cost Center of Expertise, as required by Planning Guidance.
		The Executive Summary, Non-structural Elevations and Flood Proofing states "the cost toraise homes cannot exceed the anticipated damages caused by flood water". The vast majority of homes in Eastern Slidell that will ba outside of the proposed levee are large homes that will be expensive to raise. This may lead to an excessive number of homes in Eastern Slidell being eliminated from elevation consideration, greatly reducing the projected positive impacts of the Nonstructural Plan. Other factors that will reduce participation and actual benefit denved from the Optimized TSP Nonstructural Plan include the incredible financial burden this plan places on individual homeowners, including bringing homes up to current codes (my neighbors have received estimates totaling over $200,000 to update their homes for elevating), projected loss of property use and displacement costs during raising (45 days or longer), unidentified/unforeseen issues uncovered during the elevation process (e.g. asbestos, termite damage, wood rot, mold, roof leaks, structural damage, etc), loss of aesthetic value and marketability, etc. (See Appendix H - Section 3.)	Per Planning Bulletin 2019-03, nonstructural analyses are to be conducted using a “logical aggregation method.” Rather than the individual structure, this selected aggregate is the unit of analysis, and each such aggregate is a separable element that must be incrementally justified. Aggregates were arranged based on several factors. Since the study area is subject to flooding from a variety of rivers, lakes, and bayous, as well as coastal flooding, aggregates were primarily grouped according to source of flooding. Furthermore, the inland aggregates that were grouped by riverine flood sources were further divided based on whether structures were located either in a rural or urban area where applicable. The coastal aggregates were further subdivided based on geographic boundaries. The net benefits of each aggregate were optimized based on incremental floodplain. Refer to Appendix F: Economics Section 6 for additional detail.
		Further challenging homeowner participation is the proposed timeline of initial eligibility and secondary eligibility. At this time, CEMVN has not collected individual data on residences that will be protected under the Optimized TSP Nonstructural Plan. This will be done after funding is received. I contend that this is too late, as part of eligibility requirements set forth are dependent on the cost to elevate not exceeding the determined value of the residence (Appendix H. Section 3). The actual market values of residences in Eastern Slidell will DECREASE as soon as the Optimized TSP is funded. This DECREASED market value will be used to assess a further depreciated value of homes. The proposed formula for valuation of residences is problematic in that it is, again, based upon an assumption that home values in St. Tammany Parish have depreciated over 20 years. This assertion is not based on fact, and data that supports appreciating home values is easily obtainable. Choosing to omit this fact is negligent at best and may prove critically harmful to homeowners as well as the success of this plan. By using already devalued property amounts in formulas that further reduce the home value, CEMVN is effectively reducing the number of homes that will qualify for elevation per the set criteria that costs to elevate can not exceed the determined value of the property. In addition, CEMVN has stated that no other alternatives will be offered to homeowners outside of the limited areas protected by the Structural Plan. What will happen to any unclaimed/ unused nonstructural funds? I and others contend that the majority of unprotected homes will fail to meet criteria for raising, due to stipulations and processes set forth by CEMVN. I highly recommend that a sampling of residences representative of the actual homes in each zone be assessed by the elevation eligibility criteria to model pass/fail ratios BEFORE this plan is funded.	Real estate values are not considered for development of the plan. A depreciation value of 20% was applied in the economics assessment for damages. Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. Funding will be received for PED to further design (refer to Section 6.5 in the main report).

		Homeowner participation in the nonstructural plan is voluntary and buy in will be challenging due to the financial burden this plan places on the homeowner. Additionally, the community lacks trust In CEMVN and government entities, both from experiences with previous project failures and known corruption (e.g. Hurricane Katrina levee failures and community responses, St. Tammany Utilities mismanagement). Improvements in transparency, accountability, and stakeholder involvement are greatly needed moving forward for the non structural plan to have meaningful impact. For example, I recently attended the Slidell Public Meeting regarding the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study on 8-15-2023 after a neighbor invited me to attend. This was the first information I received about the project in 3 years of living here. The meeting was not advertised directly to the community by CEMVN or the local and state governments. Is there a reason for this communication failure?	Refer to Appendix C: Annex J: Public Involvement for details on how CEMVN has communicated with the public for this study. Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		I also must request that the management and maintenance of any structural plan be given to an entity different from St. Tammany Parish. They have failed to properly maintain and manage pumps, retention pond levels, and drainage canals throughout the parish on multiple occasions within just the past 3 years. They also struggle to maintain the ditches in the parish. These failures have caused notable flooding events in Eastern Slidell and other areas. Should you wish to receive more information on these failures, I would be happy to provide details.	Comment noted.
		Lastly, in addition to CEMVN's extensive use of assumptions throughout the approach and development of the TSP, it appears CEMVN is taking liberties in their jurisdiction. Per the USACE International Boundary Map and Address Locator (https://usace.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=7344e62432694199af7790aa47a 32fdd}, my home and others in Eastern Slidell are not within the CEMVN district and instead reside within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Vicksburg, MS District. Through a phone conversation with the Vicksburg District Office, I was informed they are unaware of this proposal and had not been invited to participate at any level. Can you give reason for the exclusion of the USACE - Vicksburg District Office in development of a project directly impacting homes within their jurisdiction? Furthermore, will homes outside of the USACE - New Orleans District (CEMVN) be eligible to receive any funds as part of the Optimized TSP Nonstructural home elevations? I urge you to review the methodological weaknesses I have discussed and revisit the planning and decision-making process. A proposal for 4+ billion dollars should be developed from facts, utilizing thorough data reviews and robust modeling BEFORE funding is obtained.	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization documentation. Congress authorized USACE to investigate flood risk reduction for St. Tammany Parish. The next step is to complete, detailed plans and specifications during the PED phase. The PED phase occurs after Congress authorizes the recommended plan into law and appropriates funds for construction of the recommended plan. Refer to Section 6.5 of the main report.
		We oppose this project for the following reasons. 1. The proposed project unnecessarily destroys private property. The levee alignment described above, could easily be placed to the west of existing homes, including my family's, in property which is undeveloped and uninhabited. The current alignment can be expected to destroy homes on Bayou Pacquet Road, Keller Road and elsewhere. I have heard comments from the government that this would increase the cost due to mitigation required for the loss of wetlands. This concern rings hollow for a project which most believe would exceed $6 billion.	Comment noted.
		The proposed project would destroy marsh and wetlands. Post-Katrina, the Louisiana Coastal Protection Restoration Authority successfully saved and replenished the Bayou Bonfouca marsh, with dredging from Lake Pontchartrain. I understand that the project cost $28 million. That same marsh would now be outside of the Slidell levee circle, vulnerable to every storm, and eventually lost. The same would be true of other wetlands which presently serve as a buffer from storm surge. The effect on the environment, fish and wildlife would have to be detrimental.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a feasibility level analysis of impacts for the recommended plan.

9/6/23	Miles Clements	The proposed project would adversely impact the St. Tammy population west of Slidell. Levees do not eliminate flood waters, they just move it elsewhere. The St. Tammany population west of Slidell, from Lacombe to Lake Maurepas, would fall victim to the diversion of flood waters westward. There is no representation on the St. Tammany Levee Board of residents outside of Slidell. I have to question whether those residents to the west have any meaningful knowledge of this planned project, and I doubt they have been provided, much less read, the Feasibility Study. Parenthetically, after its release several months ago, I copied it in its entirety, and it is just shy of five thousand pages long. The remedy proposed by this plan is for the government to pay to elevate all occupied homes in the areas which, post-levee construction, would more than ever before, be exposed to flooding as a consequence of the levees they are outside of. Do they really want their homes raised? How disruptive would that be, how long would it take, how would it look, and who would do it? I have seen no answers to these questions in the five-thousand-page study.	Refer to Appendix H: Nonstructural Implementation Plan for the procedures and schedule for raising the residential structures identified in the report as eligible to be raised.
		The proposed project would still not provide complete protection for those inside the levee. The levee design purports to create 14 feet maximum flood protection. At its highest, Katrina was almost twice that height. A 14-foot levee may be formidable, but not eliminate the risk from the worst storms.	The system is designed to the HSDDRS standards for levee design at the 100 year storm level.
		The proposed project would exact too high a price to the quality of the environment and the beauty of the area. Many are drawn to St. Tammany Parish for its scenic waterways and natural beauty. My family has, for five generations, enjoyed the peace of bayous such as Pacquet, Liberty, and Bonfouca. The Feasibility Study shows massive pumping stations, flood walls and flood gates, in addition to levees running through marsh and wetlands. Collectively, they are a scar and blight on the environment.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for a feasibility level analysis of impacts for the recommended plan.
		The proposed project would consume billions of dollars to protect Slidell in lieu of pursuing the remedy which would serve all of the Parishes in the Lake Pontchartrain and Lake Maurepas basin. As far back as the aftermath of Hurricane Betsy in 1965, area engineers have opined that the best solution to protect the most people from flooding from natural disasters would be to erect barriers at the Rigolets and Chef Passes. Storm surge measures and structures to serve as barriers to waters which would otherwise enter Lake Pontchartrain might be expensive, one might guess even more than the $6 billion required for the Slidell levee circle, but the cost-benefit ratio would prove such a project to be more advantageous considering the vast number of residents in cities and towns around Lake Pontchartrain. Today, engineers continue to comment that the Barrier Plan which initially emerged with the USACE in the 1970s, should be resurrected. It is believed to have been defeated then due to perceived environmental damage. But environmental damage is, in any event, very much a factor in what is now proposed in Slidell.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
9/6/23	Michele Duvic	The Corp's purpose is to build and move dirt. The damages done with these "essential" projects does not materialize for years, then more billions of dollars are needed to correct the harm done. Examples which come to mind are - the levees of the Mississippi River which do not allow silt to be distributed to build wetlands, with the catastrophic loss of miles of Louisiana coast. Then billions get spent to dredge and divert in order to fix the damage. - the inadequate material used to build these levees leading to deadly gaps in the New Orleans levees which then must be repaired. - the permitting of oil crew work boat waterways slicing and dicing the wetlands, thus providing easy destruction of wetlands and Louisiana coast. The Corp does not have a good track record. I do not trust the "feasibility study" to provide an objective review of the potential damage to our wetlands and scenic byways. The review does not take in to account the horrific land misuse of the "2040" project approved by the St. Tammany Parish Council. The tremendous acreage that has been approved for "manufacturing/logistics" and high-density development with the subsequent clear-cutting and land fill will greatly impact the ability of the multiple watershed areas to drain. And now there will be a levee to adversely impact yearly drainage as opposed to a hundred year storm surge. Different options have not been explored thoroughly enough for you to have my support.	Comment noted.

9/6/23	David Leblanc	I would never support this plan unless it were amended to include all flood prone areas of St Tammany. We live in Lacombe off of Lake Rd. and if this plan were implemented, it would reduce the size of the floodplain and increase the flooding in our area. Protecting one area at the expense of the other taxpaying citizens while requiring them to financially support its maintenance is not a valid plan. Put floodgates at the Rigolets and solve the problem once and for all. Keep the surge out of Lake Pontchartrain and all these intermediate levees become unnecessary. Just my opinion.	Should the local Non Federal Sponsor require a tax increase or millage for operations and maintenance, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level. We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
9/6/23	Michael Caswell	First of all, the sheer absurdity of a floodwall slicing right through the middle of eastern Slidell, cutting neighborhoods in half, crossing numerous residential streets, and affecting businesses on Gause Blvd. as well, is difficult to fathom.	Comment noted.
		Secondly, I do not believe that the BCR calculations adequately valued the homes in this area, and must be recalculated to be more accurate and realistic. I understand the concept that it's difficult to justify extending a levee dozens of miles through some remote rural area just to protect a few more homes. But it defies logic that these neighborhoods, with thousands of well-kept middle-class homes, along with some large and very expensive custom homes, and (by my count) six schools, are not worthy of protecting.	Real estate or values are not a factor in determining estimated annual damages reduced by a flood risk reduction measure. Refer to Appendix F: Economics for how the estimated annual damages and benefit to cost ratios were calculated.
		In addition, the disparity of having protected neighborhoods and unprotected neighborhoods is going to have an immediate and drastic impact on the value of our homes, which must be factored in to any plan. I recognize that the plan includes "non-structural" projects for these neighborhoods, predominantly involving slab elevations. But the often hideous nature of these elevations would ruin the aesthetic of these neighborhoods, and that's assuming that these projects could even take place in a reasonable amount of time, as there are only a small number of companies qualified for this work, and I have my doubts as to whether the funding for these projects would be given the same level of priority as the structural elements. Furthermore, this would not protect vehicles from being destroyed in floods.	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project. It is anticipated that if the recommended plan is authorized and funded by Congress, the construction time frame is 12 years.
		Lastly, the TSP only glosses over the impacts that the project will have to neighborhoods outside of the protection. It indicates that the amount of induced flooding to these areas as a result of the levee and floodwall is something that would be studied in more detail later. This is something that needs to be determined now, BEFORE the project is approved and set into motion. While I am not a hydrologist, it is logical that blocking storm surge from one area will noticeably increase the amount of storm surge to adjacent areas. Same with heavy rainfall inside the protected areas which will be pumped out into the unprotected areas (with these areas also having to cope with their own rainfall). Imagine a hurricane or tropical storm scenario in which rivers and bayous are backed up from widespread heavy rainfall and are unable to drain due to storm surge in Lake Pontchartrain. With the rainfall occurring within the levee-protected areas being actively pumped out into these already full waterways, unprotected areas that rely solely on gravity drainage (which would already be very limited due to backed-up waterways) would surely see notably increased flooding. This negative impact on the Military Road neighborhoods MUST be accounted for.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ We did investigate the Rigolet's Barrier in the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study as an initial alternative. It was screened from our process due to cost benefit analysis for the St. Tammany coastal community. However, the Parishes around the lake and CPRA are working on revitalizing the study of the Rigolet's Barrier. If Congress authorizes USACE to start a feasibility study to investigate the Rigolet's Barrier, we will do so.
9/6/23	PJ Calico	It appears looking at the proposed flood protection levee system, that the area east of military road is not included in this levee protection. This causes considerable concern since would leave us open to flooding. Some of this area flooded with hurricane Katrina. I also assume this will result in an increase cost for flood insurance. I would like your attention to this issue.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/ To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.

9/6/23	Cameron Tipton	Please accept this email as a comment and request for information concerning the proposed “Optimized TSP (Tentatively Selected Plan) ” for St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana dated July 2023. While we appreciate that it appears that considerable research and study has occurred to determine the location of the proposed TSP, the proposed structures obviously do not include all areas of Slidell, LA. Was study made as to what affect the proposed system of structures including floodwalls and levees will have on the areas remaining outside of the proposed protected area; Will flooding potential be more likely in those areas with the addition of the proposed structures?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8’, with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8’2” or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		Also, was the location of public facilities such as schools reviewed when determining the location of the proposed TSP? Will schools outside of the system of structures receive any assistance with flood-proofing?	Refer to Appendix H: Nonstructural Implementation Plan. For the nonresidential structures in the area referenced and within the 50 year floodplain, floodproofing is identified in the plan.
9/6/23	Pat Fitzpatrick	The conclusions reached by the Army Corps with regards to rural St. Tammany Parish storm surge protection are disappointing and shows no inclination to consider the feedback of it's citizens. What is particular galling is that the Eden Isles region has actively participated in many meetings and provided a detailed protection plan for its community. The Corps conclusions show that such community interaction is not awarded or even considered. Specific concerns: 1) Raising hundreds of brick homes is not feasible. Using code words such as 'Nonstructural Plan" for this action highlights the insensitivity and opaqueness of this organization. The Eden Isles plan was never taken seriously. This plan includes a floodgate at the Eden Isles entrance and raising HWY 11 and Lakeview Drive. A pump system may be needed as well depending on the elevation protection installed. This plan is feasible, cheaper, and quicker. The Corps simply refuses to consider it.	Refer to section 4.3.1 of the Main Report for a detailed analysis of measures for the Eden Isle community. USACE will continue to work with the Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA to advance projects that are outside of the scope of this feasibility study.
		2) Since the Corps could no longer use cost effectiveness as an excuse once the correct economical value of Eden Isles was included, they now have twisted EIS requirements as the impetus for not protecting Eden Isles. They simply are determined to use the existing levee without concern for Eden Isles.	Comment noted.
		3) State and federal officials will be liable to a lawsuit when the proposed ring levee enhances flooding in Eden Isles during the next storm s	Comment noted.
9/6/23	Mathwe Allen	Please Accept the attached Comments for the St. Tammany Feasibility Study. **NO COMMENTS WERE ATTACHED TO THE EMAIL**	Comment noted.
		I am writing to formally submit comments on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Public Notice issued on July 14, 2023, regarding the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study: Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan {TSP). These comments are provided in accordance with Title 33 CFR Parts 336.l{b)(l) and 337.1. To begin, I would like to emphasize the significance of St. Tammany Parish and its unique characteristics. St. Tammany Parish is home to over 273,000 residents, comprising more than 114,000 housing units and approximately 100,000 individual households. Covering nearly 900 square miles, the Parish boasts an extensive network of almost 60 Scenic Rivers and approximately 60 miles of coastline. Over the past two decades, the Parish has faced a staggering 28 major federal disaster declarations, primarily related to tropical storms, hurricanes, and flooding. The recent sharp increases in flood insurance rates, averaging a 134% hike for single-family homes under FEMA's new Risk Rating 2.0, have placed a considerable financial burden on our residents, with average premiums set to increase by 18% annually over the next six years.	Comment noted.
		The TSP provides the Corps' final array of alternatives and net benefit for same. The TSP identifies the Corps' final selection of projects as follows: Nonstructural Elevations and Floodproofing; Bayou Patassat Channel Improvements - Clearing and Snagging; South Slidell and West Slidell Levee and Floodwall System; Mile Branch Channel Improvements. The TSP projects that, with all alternatives implemented, will benefit 15,800 structures at a cost of over $4 billion.	Comment noted.
		The study includes the construction of approximately 18.5 miles of a levee and floodwall system from West Slidell to South Slidell, to include 8 pump stations, 13 culverts/sluice gates/lift gates, 18 vehicular floodgates, 1 pedestrian floodgate, 1 railroad floodgate, 6 road ramps, and the 1-10 road surface would be raised to construction elevation 22.0 to ramp over the new levee section. The Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) also includes 2.15 miles of channel improvements in Covington and home elevations for roughly 6.6 thousand residences, and floodproofing for about 1,800 non-residential structures. It is anticipated that the TSP, if fully implemented, will result in an annual reduction of damages by nearly $400 million.	Comment noted.

9/6/23	Jake Airey, St. Tammany Parish Council	While we acknowledge the considerable progress made in the Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) there remain a few key concerns and considerations: 1. Community Engagement: We strongly urge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to continue engaging with the St. Tammany Parish community extensively throughout the implementation of the TSP. The input and concerns of our residents and their elected representatives, the Parish Council, should be taken into account at every stage of the project. Due to the susceptibility of the Parish to flooding via severe rain events and tropical systems, it is imperative that implementation begin immediately. We have heard across the Parish from residents that there is a lack of trust in this process and whether actual mitigation projects will be completed. The Parish has been left out of significant projects and has seen structural mitigation completed in the New Orleans area and begun on the West Bank. Our residents are eager for an implementable plan that makes sense and has funding attached.	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization documentation. Construction has not been authorized or funded by Congress for the recommended plan.
		2. Resilience and Adaptation: In light of the increasing frequency and severity of natural disasters, we encourage the incorporation of resilience and adaptation strategies in the TSP to safeguard our community against future challenges. While the TSP states that it incorporates resiliency as part of the evaluation of the alternatives array, the fact that a large number of non- structural mitigation measures have been cut from the final array in the TSP. In our opinion this is shortsighted, does not promote resilience and adaptation. The TSP should include all previously identified areas for non-structural mitigation. We also urge the Corps to prioritize non-structural I mitigation and provide funding to implement this alternative before any structural alternatives are addressed.	The nonstructural measures are a stand alone project, not a mitigation effort. Refer to section 4.1 of the Main Report for considerations given to all measures including Alternative 2: Nonstructural parish wide.
		3. Affordability: The substantial increase in flood insurance rates under FEMA's Risk Rating 2.0 is a pressing concern for our residents. We request that measures be explored within the TSP to mitigate the financial impact on homeowners. The TSP does not provide a clear statement of the effect of the recommended alternatives on the flood risk rating of structures for purpose of Risk Rating 2.0. The most beneficial projects are those that positively effect structures in the Special Flood Hazard Areas of the Parish in the most cost effective and timely manner. The TSP in minimizing the number of non-structural measures and recommending structural projects in environmentally delicate areas is not affordable and does not benefit the most residents in the most economically feasible manner.	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		In conclusion, we appreciate the efforts of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in addressing the critical flood mitigation needs of St. Tammany Parish through the Optimized Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP). However, we believe that the final array should be realigned with continued collaboration and consideration of the aforementioned concerns in order to ensure the long-term success and sustainability of this project. We request an opportunity to engage in further discussions and meetings with the Corps to address these concerns in greater detail and work together to develop a comprehensive plan that best serves the interests and well-being of St. Tammany Parish and its residents.	Comment noted.
9/6/23	Don and Christine Mottinger	If a levee is inevitable, we suggest two alignments for consideration in the PED phase. 1. West Slidell to Lacombe along Bayou Paquet Road - starting at Bayou Liberty and Keller Road, run the levee south of Keller Road and then parallel with the Lake south of and in line with Bayou Paquet Road. This levee placement would address the flooding on Bayou Paquet Road and protect residents on Keller Road and Bayou Paquet Road, in addition to the Pine Ridge Subdivision, Mayfield School, and other residents lying west of the OTSP. This placement would also protect future development plans for the North Shore corridor and Lacombe. A levee through Federal Wildlife Refuge Land is possible in this area. 2. The Local Landowner Alternative suggested earlier this year to the USACE - this alternative is the West Slidell 2021 alignment modified for neighbor concerns. The alignment places the levee south of Keller Road on the Refuge border and travels to high ground across the southern border/acreage of Mentab's property turning north on the west side of our property to the	Comment noted.
9/6/23	Sharon Hewitt, State Senator District 1	Thank you for the work you and your team have done to evaluate the feasibility The goal of the St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study is to reduce the severity of flood damages and risk to public health and safety, caused by heavy rainfall, riverine flooding, tropical storms and hurricanes. While many of my constituents nearer Lake Pontchartrain are supportive of the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) and believe it will help reduce flooding of their homes, other constituents in the Military Road Area are concerned about a potential increase risk of flooding because they are left out of the levee system. While I know that everyone would prefer to be inside the levee system rather than outside of the levee system, I do not believe that we can install a flood protection system that benefits some residents if it hurts other residents. On behalf of the residents in the Military Road area, I am requesting that you hold a public hearing to address two primary issues: 1. Does the TSP increase the risk of flooding for the Military Road residents when compared to a "do nothing" scenario? Let's look at it with and without home elevations. 2. How did the TSP Benefit/Cost Ratios change when you included the various scenarios that you considered in the Military Road alternatives and why did you rule all of them out at this time?	Section 4.4 of the Final Report describes the additional investigations conducted to further evaluate alignments on the eastern terminus which include Military Road. Through the evaluation the recommended plan was confirmed as the NED plan. The Military Road and other alignments considered to incorporate additional structures were determined to not be justified increments. Reference Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology, section 13.1.1 for detailed information and graphics on flooding inducements. Larger inducements occur for 2082 (up to 3" for 100-year and up to 5" for 500-year) than for 2032 (up to 2" for 100-year and up to 4" for 500-year). The inducments are within the range of error for the modeling conducted. The largest inducements are on the east side of the proposed alignments with the largest inducements being on the east side of Lakeshore Estates and Kingspoint levees. The larger inducements on the eastern side of the system are expected as these areas are closer to the Gulf of Mexico where storm surge would enter the Lake Pontchartrain basin via Rigolets. To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		The Sierra Club Delta Chapter / Louisiana is opposed to the proposed St. Tammany Parish Levee Project. We believe that there are preferred alternatives that would accomplish as much or more protection and do far less environmental damage to the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain.	Comment noted.
		In addition to the 18.5 miles of levee suggested to "protect" Slidell from future flooding, the project includes "8 pumping stations, 13 culverts/sluice gates/lift gates, 18 vehicular floodgates, 1 pedestrian floodgate, 1 railroad floodgate, 6 road ramps, and the I-10 road surface would be raised to construction elevation 22.0 to ramp over the new levee section." The vast amount of construction that will be necessary to complete this project is in and of itself a prime reason to avoid the project. Marshes and littoral habitats that are already under attack from development and sea level rise will not likely survive the onslaught of dredges, bulldozers, draglines and other heavy equipment that would be used.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental impacts for the feasibility level analysis of the proposed project.

9/6/23	Margie Vicknair-Pray, Sierra Club Delta Chapter	Additionally, those areas adjoining the proposed levee system, even if they survived the decimation of heavy industrial attack, would be permanently affected by the disruption of drainages across southern St. Tammany Parish. When I-12 was built it caused a similar damming effect across the Parish. Land to the south of I-12 was deprived of its natural water supply and natural drainages were cut off, quite possibly exacerbating the drying and dying off of the lakefront marshes. On the northern side of I-12, the pooling of water held back by the Interstate formed new bog areas and wetlands north of the Interstate. Such restriction of natural water flows disrupts the hydrology and habitats of the areas affected. A similar situation will quite likely be formed by this project.	Refer to Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for information on pump station and sluice gate sizing for pre and post construction water flow impacts. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.
		In the USACE "Review Plan - St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study" – released on April 26, 2020 the USACE maintains "The Future With-out Project Conditions include increased flood risk due to continued storms and rainfall events, changes in floodplain hydrology from development activities, and changes in riverine geomorphology caused by stream bank erosion and channel degradation. This will result in higher and more frequent storm damages and higher average annual damages. These impacts would be exacerbated due to heavy rainfall coupled with increases in relative sea level change." What is not mentioned is that the increased flooding and degradation is more often likely to be of combined riverine and monsoonal type rains that overwhelm the rivers and bayous, not tropical storm activity. Therefore, a levee that is built to keep lake and estuarine waters out of homes on the Northshore is highly likely to precipitate increased flooding from waters flowing south from the restricted natural flows (because of the levees).	Comment noted.
		The Sierra Club Delta Chapter / Louisiana strongly urges the USACE and St. Tammany Levee, Drainage and Conservation District to pursue initiatives outside this feasibility study. We support the buying out and demolition of structures that are located in areas that cannot be reasonably protected and strongly urge that more immediate and intense actions are done in the area of marsh restoration and preservation, including the denial of ALL development permits that allow the destruction of wetlands, marshes and floodplains in St. Tammany Parish. We have already lost too much ground – albeit low ground – in St. Tammany, especially in the past 30 years. To protect the areas where the majority of citizens live, the USACE and St. Tammany Parish need to be thinking long-term about not only protecting structures but also protecting the lake and its shoreline habitats. Without marshes, Lake Pontchartrain will not support the fisheries and other wildlife that depend on the marsh grasses to forage, mate and nest. We will lose an invaluable resource and a lifestyle. A levee is not the right answer; rebuilding shoreline marshes, stopping the current boom of development in low-lying areas, and possibly constructing a flood barrier control in the Rigolets and Chef Pass areas is less intrusive and destructive, although whether this is truly doable is questionable.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for recommendation to the local governments for floodplain management.
9/6/23	Kathryn Camp	My husband and I own our home located at 289 Rue Piper, Slidell, LA 70461. This lovely home of ours is a couple of blocks away and outside of the proposed flood wall to be built. Our home is over 6,000 square feet and has never flooded, but surely will once this wall redirects floodwaters back onto our property. Our neighborhood has had some flooding prior, but our home, being on a small ridge, has kept it dry. Our home is worth about $790,000 in the current market. Our real estate taxes and homeowner's insurance costs are hefty. Your floodwall will surely plummet the value of our property, while increasing our insurance costs, and the cost of trying to raise a 2.5 story, >6K sq ft home would be out of reach. How could this plan have gone forward, leaving out such a substantial area of neighborhoods, businesses, medical facilities, and schools? The east side of Slidell has most of the high-end neighborhoods in town, and property values have only gone up in the last 20 years. We have no idea why your plan assumes these huge custom homes would depreciate, when we have yet to see that happen in decades. I have a beautiful home and do not want it to flood, do not want my property value to plummet, do not want my insurance costs to soar further, and do NOT want my tax dollars to pay for a wall that will do HARM to us and our neighbors. Your wall will DESTROY my home!	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		Please reconsider this plan and include the eastern side of Slidell or revamp the plan altogether to perhaps take a different approach. We have had two major flood events in Slidell that were not included in your models, specifically the 1983 Pearl River Flood Event and the 1995 Extreme Rain Event. These events were devastating to our town and the proposed plan you have would not help, but could potentially hurt us during similar events. All I see are the areas in other parishes where floodwall protections have only caused areas that never flooded to now flood often. I don't understand why you would propose to build a wall right behind my neighborhood and knowingly cause all of our houses to flood. What compensation is the government offering to us for the destruction we will surely endure?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon.Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I hope you and your family are doing well. Unfortunately, we live in a hectic world. I know your work at the Corp of Engineers can be challenging. Therefore, I hope that this note can help you and your organization to make the best decision possible as you develop the levee project plans for our area. As I understand it, your levee project plans will impact all of the residents and property owners of east St. Tammany Parish and not just properties located in the city limits of Slidell. I am asking for your organization to re-evaluate your levee plans by considering the needs of all the residents living in east St Tammany Parish.	Comment noted.

9/6/23	Edward Hetherington	I am a resident in a Slidell subdivision located off military road. We have lived in this area since 1998 and love living here. My home is located in a beautiful subdivision next to two outstanding elementary schools and not far from two outstanding high schools. However, I have been made aware that a proposed levee project will not meet our needs and may even create harm to all of us living and working in this part of the parish. Many of us have not had any flooding in our neighborhoods in the past. We, including my family as my daughter also lives in my same neighborhood, want the Corp of Engineers to improve our hurricane protection defenses and not make them worst. We want a peace of mind. As I understand it, the properties along both sides of military road, homes, schools, businesses, etc. are located outside the current proposed levee protection plans. I hope that is not the case, but if it is, those plans need to be changed to include our properties.	Refer to section 4.4.1.2.4 for a discussion of options considered for the community referenced.
		The levee project, as it stands, could potentially create a greater risk of flooding and property damage from storms that occasionally hit our area than exists today. Is that fair to the people living here?	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		Is it fair to adversely impact our property values?	Real estate values are unpredictable, location dependent and highly speculative. As such, changes in value of residential structures are not factored into the analysis for cost of the proposed project.
		Is it fair to treat our taxpayers differently than those families whose properties are being protected?	Should the local Nonfederal Sponsor require a tax increase or millage, this would have be voted upon by citizens at the local level.
9/6/23	Frank, Judy Heinrich	We oppose the levee.	Comment noted.
9/6/23	Karen Lamastus	I would like to state my objection to the proposed levee plan that will put the homes along Military Road outside of protection. I ardently request that you reconsider this plan and include ALL of the homes within the levee system. We have beautiful homes and pay a great deal of taxes and would greatly appreciate some protection from the hurricanes.	The levee was modeled in place to view the effects of the levee to the movement of storm surge in the event of a storm. On page 102 of the H&H Appendix, you will find Figure E:13-7. This is a difference plot of water surface elevation between 2032 with- and without-project values for the 100-year computed Water Surface Elevation (in inches) for coastal surge events at various locations surrounding the footprint of the Draft TSP. Blue-colored dots represent reductions with the project in place, on the interior of the proposed system. Red dots represent increases. This shows an increased water surface elevation of less than 2 inches. If the storm surge was present without the levee in place was 8', with the levee in place it would be estimated to be 8'2" or less. The future conditions was also computed out to year 2082 (Figure E:13-8) and that showed an increase of less than 4 inches. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Section 14.1.7 of Appendix E discusses impacts of flooding surrounding the alignment from precipitation and the Pearl River flood sources. The impacts of Sea Level Rise and coincident rainfall with Pearl River flooding events on the alignment and regions surrounding it are disused in Section 14.1.8 of Appendix E. The margin of error for the modeling is approximately 6 inches for 2032 results; the margin of error increases with the time horizon. Additional modeling and refinement of the design will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design. You may access the documents here : https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns and provide recommendations regarding the St. Tammany Parish Levee Project, specifically concerning the exclusion of my property , and many other fellow citizens from its protection. As a concerned resident, I believe it is vital to address various issues that will impact those of us who are outside of the levee to ensure the safety, well-being, and fairness of all members of our community. 1. The existing drainage issues on Jacob Rd and along I-10 a. Please see the attached email thread between our previous parish councilman and the DOTD regarding this issue. From: Mary K. Bellisario: Eddie: At least a year ago there was a meeting on Jacob Road to correct a long term drainage problem. It was decided that Engineering was to write a letter to the LA DOTO that would allow us the construct a d itch to take the Jacob Road flow to the LA DOTO ROW and that they would approve this project. Has the letter been sent to the LA DOTO? The reason I'm asking is that there is another resident, Peter Macaluso is concerned about this issue. I need a response for this man and for Bill and Vickie Pruett who brought the complaint to the Parish. Please advise, E. L. "Gene" Bellisario Parish Council - District; From: "Donna S. O'Dell" <dsodell@stpgov.org> Date: June 9, 2016 at 12:15:43 PM CDT; To: "Gene Bellasario (External Email)" <bayouduo97@charter.net>: Gene, Extensive regrading of the ditch along the exit ramp and interstate is needed for stormwater to flow that way. DOTO will allow us to do a project through a permit, but we do not want to take on the liability of working along the interstate nor do we have funding for the work. Since this will not be a benefit to DOTO, they will not do the regrading for us: Donna O'Dell, P.E.;Tammany Parish Government	Refer to the main report discussion on constraints. Proposed projects must meet minimum flow (800 cubic feet per second for a 10 percent chance flood) and drainage area (1.5 square miles) requirements (USACE Engineer Regulation (ER) 1165-2-21);
		The USACE plan causes harm to both residents and the natural ecosystem with the introduction of this levee system.	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for an environmental impact analysis of the recommended plan.
		Change Funding Allocation for Residential Protection Strategies.	USACE is required to follow policy and guidance for feasibility studies. Should policy be changed, the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study would adapt to those changes.

	Lisa Pilet	Collaboration with DOTD and CPRA for Surge Mitigation I urge you to collaborate with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) and the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) to explore surge mitigation strategies using Hwy 90 and 190 East. A similar study for surge mitigation using Hwy 11 and Lakeshore Drive (Rat's Nest Road) is already underway. The Hwy 190 restoration and bridge replacement project should be activated soon, presenting an opportunity to maximize further reductions in storm surge through structural changes to highway and bridge design.	USACE will continue to collaborate with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA. The projects mentioned are outside of the Federal interest, as documented in Section 4 of the main report.
		CSX Railroad Surge Barrier Considered: I strongly recommend joining the Lake Coalition to explore the feasibility of using the CSX railroad as a surge barrier.	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for investigation into the Rigolet's Barrier.
		Full Upfront Coverage of Home Elevation Costs: All costs associated with the elevation of homes due to the levee placement and changes in water flow should be covered upfront, as it is unreasonable to expect residents to bear these costs before qualifying for grants. The FEMA rules on elevation should be removed.	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.
		Options for Affected Residents: Total Buyout: Offer a total buyout of property by the federal government, including relocation costs. These buyouts should be fair market value as of 2021 when the project was started. Many will be unable to find new housing, move themselves, elevate their property, or secure insurance/funding for new homes if homeowners are not adequately compensated.	Refer to Section 4 of the Main Report and Appendix B Plan Formulation for detail on consideration of buyouts and why this was screened.
		Oversight Entity for Funding Allocation: The creation of an independent entity, separate from St. Tammany Parish and Louisiana, to ensure fair and transparent allocation of project funds, free from potential biases or political influence and diversion of funds to other programs, interests, etc.… Funds would be managed for Education, Vocation, Elevation, Relocation, Mitigation, levee maintenance, etc	Refer to Appendix A: Authorization documentation.
		Moratorium on Building: Implement a moratorium on all new buildings in the area and within 50 minutes of the levee to protect existing residents. This would ensure that all monies earmarked for elevation and based on numbers from 2021 should be applied only to homes owned at the time of project completion by private homeowners who owned homes a the time of project inception and completion.	Recommendations for the local managers of flood plains and development can be found in section 4 of Appendix B: Plan Formulation.
		Tax Refunds: Provide tax refunds to homeowners in single-family dwellings outside the levee as compensation for project costs that they will not benefit from.	This request is outside of authorization for this feasibility study. Refer to Appendix A: Authorization Documents.
		Compensation to homeowners for additional costs of flood insurance	To the extent that flood insurance rates are affected by flood risk, the construction of the levee is not anticipated to increase flood risk outside of the levee alignment. Please see Appendix E: Hydraulics and Hydrology for detailed information on potential impacts outside of the levee. Residential property owners may be eligible for reduced insurance rates under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) if the first floor of the structure is at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) (or higher if specified by local regulations) after the elevation is completed and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. However, the participation in the Nonstructural Plan does not guarantee reduced rates under the NFIP.
		To better understand the project and its implications, I kindly request the following information and answers to the following questions: 1. 6,500 homes to be elevated: a. Is my home one of the 6,500 that are to be raised b. Is there a list or a map identifying the homes that qualify for elevation c. Is there a list or a map identifying the homes that DO NOT qualify for elevation d. What is the plan for houses that are not up to code to be raised, or are unable to be raised e. What is the timeline for homes being elevated outside of the levee protection	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Residential property owners will be required to grant a temporary right-of-entry to USACE and the NFS to enter in and upon the property to conduct such property and structural investigations deemed necessary for USACE to determine final eligibility of the structure for participation in the Project. These investigations may include, structural inspections, surveys, limited environmental testing and site assessments, inspections to verify current elevation and determine elevation requirements, and to conduct other activities deemed necessary by USACE. Refusal to grant temporary right-of-entry to USACE will constitute an election by the property owner not to participate. Cost details for individual structures are detailed in section 3.3 of Appendix H: Implementation Plan. State and local building and zoning codes must be taken into consideration in the implementation process. Some codes contain restrictions on “substantial improvements” to existing non-confirming structures that may require that the entire structure be brought up to current code requirements, which may increase the costs beyond that of the elevation costs alone. USACE will work in coordination with the local authorities to address the local codes. In addition, zoning codes may have height restrictions for buildings in residential areas that might affect the ability of certain structures to be raised without obtaining a variance or other form of relief from the zoning code. USACE will continue to work with our Nonfederal Sponsor, CPRA, and the local government agencies for these efforts.

		How can residents access updates or changes to the project plans to ensure transparency and public input?	Future updates for the St. Tammany Parish Feasibility Study webpage: https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/BBA-2018/studies/St-Tammany/
		How/When will St. Tammany residents vote on a levee tax? Who will pay for the levee?	Reference section 6.5 of the main feasibility report for information on cost share of the project. If authorized by Congress, it is anticipated the cost share for the design and construction of the project would be 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. However, Public Law 115-123 provides that a project that is studied using Supplemental Investigations funds is eligible for implementation using Construction funds provided in that Act if the Secretary determines that the project is technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable. Final, specific cost share requirements would be identified in the Project Partnership Agreement. Should the local Nonfederal Sponsor require a millage for operations and maintenance, once the levee is constructed, that item would be voted upon at the local level.
9/6/23	Barbara Casserleigh	As property owners of an historical home in one of the most beautiful and pristine settings that exists, lpplease consider our concerns about the St Tammany feasibility study as it currently exists. The current map location will place a pumping station and flood gate essentially in our front yard, at the junction of Bayous Liberty and Pacquet, and outside the proposed levee protection. At one of the many meetings we have attended over the past year, an alternate alignment was discussed that would place these structures at a greater distance (200-300 yds, perhaps?) down Bayou Liberty, offering our property not only the protection of being inside the levee , but also preserving the ecological importance and visual aesthetics of this lovely spot. At the least, this change in the proposal would be much more acceptable.	USACE CEMVN, and/or the CPRA shall consult with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Tribe(s), and other Consulting Parties, as appropriate, to establish the appropriate level of effort to accomplish an inventory/re-inventory. Efforts may be directed towards the resurvey of previously designated historic properties, per 36 CFR 800.16(l), which have undergone change or lack sufficient documentation, or the survey of new historic properties and/or districts that lack formal designation. The proposed TM will describe the boundaries of the survey area and the data collection method in keeping with SHPO's guidance for surveys which will be completed in Preconstruction Engineering and Design.
		Also, as currently proposed, it seems apparent that the recent successful restoration of the Bayou Bonfouca marsh would be greatly jeopardized. That project cost millions of dollars. I personally helped LDWF in replanting the marsh and strongly feel that it would be a travesty to flush that money down the drain!	Refer to Appendix C: Environmental for full environmental analysis of the recommended plan.
		Based on many comments made by representatives of the St Tammany Levee Board chairman, Suzanne Krieger, we are greatly concerned that this entire project has been desperately undertaken as a means to spend the available funds somehow, but without proper understanding of all the repercussions to the environmental issues, property values of all concerned, and wishes of the taxpayers…more of a "you don't use it, you lose it" ideology than a careful, sensible plan to provide flood protection to as many as possible.	Authorization and Funding for the construction of the recommended plan have not been given by Congress. For study authorization, refer to Appendix A: Authorization Documents.
		Additionally, we would strongly suggest that the study include reopening of the discussions of the feasibility of constructing flood prevention	Refer to Appendix B: Plan Formulation for investigation into the Rigolet's Barrier.
		Our family has had the rare pleasure of enjoying the beauty and serenity of the bayou for over 60 years. Our home was lovingly constructed in the mid 1960s by Henry G. Casserleigh, Sr., our grandfather. He enjoyed a long and successful career as a higher up with the ACOE, eventually heading up the flood protection effort as Director. He built our structure to withstand whatever Mother Nature sent our way, with attention to all structural elements available at that time. The home has stood firm and intact through all flooding events since then, and we have never made a flood claim, even in Katrina! Mr. Casserleigh was an avid environmental activist and advocate and he would be certainly be horrified to know of this proposal! We appreciate all the efforts put forth as attempts to protect the residents of Slidell from flooding. But there is much work left to do before any current plan is approved to move forward!	Comment noted.
9/6/23	Jacob and Charlotte Levy	Our families have lived in Slidell for generations. We currently reside at 102 Alberu St., Slidell, La. 70460 and own a business at 2024 Front St., Slidell, La which is in very close proximity to Bayou Bonfouca. Over the last 32 years at this residence, we have personally seen the effects of storm surge from large and small storms which continuously affect our neighborhood and the surrounding area. Our business has been in the same location for the last 63 years and the Southern Railroad tracks has been our only protection from the storm surges affecting Bayou Bonfouca. We do support the Feasibility Study and the 100-year protection that it will provide. However, we are concerned about the alignment of this study. This alignment would leave our property at Keller Rd and our neighbors on Keller Rd out of the levy protection system. We feel that the proposed changes from the local landowners would be more beneficial to all parties. We respectively request that your alignment be changed in the PED to reflect what the current landowners have suggested in the Bayou Liberty and Bayou Paquet area.	Should the project be authorized by Congress and funded for Preconstruction Engineering and Design, the full levee alignment will be surveyed and levee alignments may be shifted at that time based on the results of those surveys and additional engineering effort.