

Meeting Summary
Neighborhood Working Group Meeting - July 29, 1993

Members present:

Mr. Marc Cooper - Bywater
Mrs. George-Ethel Warren - Lower Ninth
Ms. Vivienne Blair - Holy Cross
Mr. John Koefel - HCCDC
Mr. Rudy Muse - HDCDC
Mr. Richard Allen - CPC
Mr. Walter Brooks - RPC
Mr. Joe Dicharry - Corps
Mr. Les Waguespack - Corps
Mr. Patrick Gallwey - PNO
Mr. Robert Hughes - PNO
Mr. Cedric Grant - PNO
Mr. George Carbo - PNO

Others present:

Ms. Chandler - Chandler Enterprises

Meeting Summary:

Mr. Gallwey opened the meeting by welcoming those present and having everyone introduce themselves. He explained that the past working group meetings led to changes in the lock location resulting in a site north of Claiborne with no residential relocations. He noted that the concerns of the neighborhood groups have been heard and will continue to be addressed.

Mr. Dicharry explained the engineering technology involved in locating the lock north of Claiborne. He presented a slide show of an artist's rendition of how the construction project may look. During the slide presentation, he commented on some of the benefits and negative impacts of the construction project. Questions were asked concerning where the Coast Guard would be moving and what would happen to the ships that use the Galvez Street Wharf. The replacement of the green space lost from along side of the current lock with new green space along side of the new lock was discussed. A comment was made that the people of the area want the issue settled of if the lock is going to be built.

Mr. Grant presented a proposed process for creating a community developed mitigation plan. Group discussion centered on the need for a project such as this to bring positive benefits to the communities it impacts. These positive benefits should benefit the community economically and socially. Discussion also focussed on the need to extend the process. It was determined that the proposed two month time-frame was not enough time to accomplish all that is needed, and the process would most probably need to be between three and six months. It was also suggested that the Port meet with the individual neighborhood groups to discuss the process on a one-on-one basis.

The next meeting was set for tuesday, August 17, 1993.

Meeting Summary
Neighborhood Working Group Meeting - August 17, 1993

Members present:

Mr. John Andrews - Bywater
Mr. Marc Cooper - Bywater
Mr. Lloyd Brown - Lower Ninth
Mrs. George-Ethel Warren - Lower Ninth
Ms. Vivienne Blair - Holy Cross
Mr. Rudy Muse - HDCDC
Mrs. Laurentine Ernst - HDLC
Ms. Kristina Ford - CPC
Ms. Elrhei Thibodeaux - CPC
Mr. Joe Dicharry - Corps
Mr. Les Waguespack - Corps
Mr. Kevin Lovetro - Corps
Mr. Cedric Grant - PNO
Mr. George Carbo - PNO

Others present:

Ms. M. R. Chandler - Chandler Enterprises

Meeting Summary:

The meeting was opened with those present identifying themselves and the organization they represented. Mr. Grant distributed a summary of the previous working group meeting. It was agreed that a more detailed summary of future meetings would be provided. The summaries will be prepared from tape recordings of the meetings. Mrs. Warren handed out a copy of a letter from her to Mr. Brinson requesting assistance in acquiring community resources she feels are needed in the community. Mrs. Warren requested a formal response to the request.

Mr. Muse commented that the issue of whether or not there will be a lock built at the IHNC site has not been resolved, and the project is still in the proposal stage. Mr. Dicharry stated that the North of Claiborne option is the only proposal being considered by the Corps.

For the benefit of those new to the working group, some of the highlights of the working group's previous series of meetings were explained.

The schedule for future meetings was reviewed and it was noted that the process could possibly take six months or longer with meetings held every two weeks. The group discussed the method in which they would proceed and decided that the one common base that everyone could use is the Rigamer report. It was determined that the group would use the Rigamer report as the base document for a

Meeting Summary - August 17, 1993

Page 2

comparative analysis of mitigation proposed for the options considered in the plan and the mitigation that would be needed with the North of Claiborne option.

The issue of who was to be involved in the process was discussed. The members of the working group determined that they did not wish to have closed meetings. An agenda would be prepared for each meeting and adhered to, with the focus being on one topic at a time.

The next meeting was set for Tuesday, August 31, 1993.

as a reference.

Discussion turned to the issues of how mitigation should be determined. Rev. Gunn expressed that the greatest amount of mitigation possible should be given to those most impacted. Mr. Cooper stated that the maritime industry must prove that damage to the communities caused by the project can be offset. He commented that any damage to the community must be minimized and compensated for. He expressed that if new bridges will bring increased traffic, it would be preferable to have the people out of cars and into an extended streetcar line. It was suggested that the group should discuss the impacts that would occur and then how to address them. It was commented that this project will be a golden opportunity to get public works projects focused in the area of the canal.

The need to disseminate information about the project (what is currently happening and what the impacts of construction will be) to the general community was stressed. A list was created on a flip-chart to display issues to be discussed in the future. The list included the following:

- 1) Field office
- 1a) Business information clearinghouse
- 2) Information dissemination grant
- 3) Streets improvements
- 4) Study cost (to community)
- 5) Economic impacts
- 6) Housing/land use
- 7) Public facilities
- 8) Transportation
- 9) Noise
- 10) Social

The next meeting was scheduled for 7 PM Monday, September 13, 1993 at the Alvar Library. A set day and time for future meetings will be discussed at the next meeting.

-

MEETING SUMMARY
NEIGHBORHOOD WORKING GROUP MEETING- AUGUST 31, 1993

Members Present:

Mr. Lloyd Brown - Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council
Mrs. George-Ethyl Warren - Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council
Mr. Marc Cooper - Bywater Neighborhood Association
Rev. Lorenzo Gunn - Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
Ms. Vivienne Blair - Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
Mr. John Koefel - Holy Cross CDC
Ms. Laurentine Ernst - HDLC
Ms. Beverly Andry - HDLC
Mr. Walter Brooks - RPC
Mr. Joe Dicharry - Corps of Engineers
Mr. Keven Lovetro - Corps of Engineers
Mr. Les Waguespack - Corps of Engineers
Mr. George Carbo - Port of New Orleans
Mr. Cedric Grant - Port of New Orleans
Mr. Patrick Gallwey - Port of New Orleans

Others Present:

Ms. M. R. Chandler - Chandler Enterprises

Meeting Summary:

The first topic of discussion was the day of the week to hold future meetings. There exists a conflict with holding the meetings at Jackson Barracks on some future Tuesdays, and members of the working group expressed conflicts with their own organizational meetings on several Tuesdays of the month. It appeared that there would be fewer conflicts with holding the meetings on Monday nights.

Mr. Grant explained to the group that at all working group meetings there would be afforded the opportunity to ask questions on the technical aspects of lock construction. He showed two maps of the canal area that demonstrated the physical impact of the proposals for lock replacement. Members of the group did not have questions at this time.

The definition of mitigation was discussed. Mr. Grant explained the process proposed by the group at its last meeting of examining the impacts of the proposed lock as listed in the Rigamer report and developing relevant impacts and mitigation for the north of Claiborne alternative. Mr. Dicharry explained the titles of the impact categories. Mrs. Warren noted that the Rigamer report made several mistakes because it had little local input. Others agreed with this observation, and it was recognized that the neighborhood working group was intended to correct that limitation. Ms. Chandler stated that she had a personal grievance against the Rigamer report and the entire process because she felt that it benefited only a select few and excluded the lower ninth ward. Some members of the working group had a problem with using the Rigamer report as a starting point because of its limitations and preferred to cite it as needed

DOCUMENT REQUEST
ATTENTION: MR. CEDRIC GRANT

1. LOUISIANA HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AND ALL AMENDMENTS SINCE INCEPTION. (WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION GIVEN TO 1985-PRESENT)
2. COPIES OF ALL LEASES CITED ON PAGE 40 OF THE GREGORY RIGAMER REPORT (PLEASE NOTE THIS IS THE THIRD REQUEST).
3. DOCKET #'S OF ALL FUNDING REQUESTS TO PUBLIC AGENCIES BY THE PORT OF NEW ORLEANS SINCE 1990.
(ADDITIONAL REQUESTS WILL BE MADE AFTER ATTEMPT TO RESEARCH NEIGHBORHOODS ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS ARE ASCERTAINED)
4. *HAZARDOUS, TOXIC AND RADIOLOGICAL WASTE INVESTIGATION
5. **WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM TO SUPPORT HISTORICAL LANDMARKS IN ACHIEVING THEIR GOALS?
6. INDEX OF ALL STUDIES COMPLETED, THEIR COSTS & WHERE ARCHIVED.

*REFERRED TO "SIGNIFICANT FACTS" HANDOUT BY MR. CEDRIC GRANT REGARDING THE AUGUST 31, 1993 WORKING GROUP MEETING
**SEE ADDITIONAL HANDOUT-HISTORICAL DISTRICT REQUEST FOR INFORMATION BY MRS. GEORGE-ETHYL WARREN

VICE-PRESIDENT LOWER NINTH WARD
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
RESIDENT LOWER NINTH WARD

THIS IS TO BE AN ONGOING STUDY ON BEHALF OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE AREA-ONE THAT I AM NOT BEING COMPENSATED FOR-IN CONTRAST TO THE GREGORY RIGAMER REPORT OF 1991 FOR WHICH HE HAS BEEN COMPENSATED AT THE RATE OF \$200,000.00 PLUS DOLLARS AS NO FIGURE HAS BEEN REVEALED AS TO WHAT THE REPORT ACTUALLY COST THE TAXPAYER'S. I, GEORGE-ETHYL WARREN AM NOT ASKING TO BE PAID, BUT I AM ASKING THAT YOU PROVIDE THE PUBLIC DOCUMENTATION AS REQUESTED THAT I AM ENTITLED TO AS A RESIDENT ACCORDING TO THE LAW. MY REASON FOR REQUESTING THIS IS THAT I HAVE HAD COUNSEL WITH AN ATTORNEY FRIEND THAT HAS ADVISED ME TO DO A THOROUGH RESEARCH OF EVERYTHING THAT I COULD THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE PORT OF NEW ORLEANS/CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND LOUISIANA PUBLIC HIGHWAY TRUST. MY COUNSEL ESPECIALLY MENTIONED THE HIGHWAY TRUST THAT GETS SOME FUNDING FROM THE GASOLINE TAX.

AND BY THE WAY MR. GRANT WOULD PROVIDE YOU THE DOCUMENTATION AS TO THE COST OF THE RIGAMER REPORT AND SUBMIT TO THE WORKING GROUP.

SINCERELY,
MRS. GEORGE-ETHYL WARREN
VICE PRESIDENT LOWER NINTH WARD, NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
RESIDENT/LOWER NINTH WARD
AUG 14, 1993

SIGNIFICANT FACTS HANDOUT/FROM THE DESK OF MR. CEDRIC GRANT

IN EARLY SEPTEMBER WE HAD AN INFORMAL DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT LLOYD BROWN OF THE LOWER NINTH WARD NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL, VICE-PRESIDENT GEORGE-ETHYL WARREN AND RESIDENT M. R. CHANDLER OF THE LOWER NINTH WARD & THE HOLY CROSS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

IN ATTENDANCE.

THIS MEETING WAS CALLED BY MRS. GEORGE-ETHYL WARREN, A MEMBER OF THE WORKING GROUP OF THE IHNC, TO POINT UP SOME DISTURBING STATEMENTS IN HANDOUT.

POINT 1. (S.F.1)

REQUEST THAT MR. GRANT PROVIDE A COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING(S) WHICH LED ANY PUBLIC BODY TO CONCLUDE, BASED ON PREVIOUS NEIGHBORHOOD WORKING GROUP MEETINGS, THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN RE-STUDIED AND RE-ENGINEERED TO ADDRESS THE NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS.

- WHAT CONCERNS DID YOU HAVE REFERENCE TO?
- WHAT CONSTITUTES THE NEW STUDY?
- PLEASE PROVIDE COPY!

POINT 2. (S.F.2)

THAT NORTH OF CLAIBORNE AVENUE SITE IS THE ONLY SITE BEING STUDIED BASED ON INPUT FROM PREVIOUS NEIGHBORHOOD WORKING GROUP

- WHAT LED TO THIS CONCLUSION?
- WHAT MECHANISM WAS USED TO DETERMINE THIS?
- WHAT MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS WORKING GROUP MEETING VOTED FOR THAT ALTERNATIVE (N. CLAIBORNE-FLORIDA) AND WHEN WILL THAT COME TO A VOTE BY THE RESIDENTS IN THE COMMUNITY
- NO AUTHORITY HAS BEEN GIVEN TO ANY INDIVIDUAL AND/OR ORGANIZATION TO ARBITRARILY ACT ON BEHALF OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE COMMUNITY THAT I AM AWARE OF.
- HAVE THE RESIDENTS OF THE COMMUNITY HAD A CHANCE TO DETERMINE THAT THIS IS WHAT THEY WANT?
- WHEN DO YOU PLAN TO PRESENT THESE SIGNIFICANT FACTS TO THE RESIDENTS OF THE AFFECTED AREAS?

POINT 3. (S.F.#10)

IT IS REQUESTED THAT PRESIDENT BROWN REQUEST A COPY OF THE HAZARDOUS, TOXIC AND RADIOLOGIC WASTE INVESTIGATION WHICH HAS SHOWN THAT THERE ARE NO SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS IN THE AREA. (BECAUSE WE WOULD NOT LIKE TO SEE THE LOWER NINTH WARD BECOME ANOTHER CANCER ALLEY)

MRS. GEORGE-ETHYL WARREN REQUESTED THAT HE AS PRESIDENT PRESENT THESE CONCERNS TO THE WORKING GROUP: SO THAT THEY COULD KNOW OUR THINKING. HE HAS NOT DONE IT AND INSURE THAT IT IS PRESENTED. I'M PRESENTING IT NOW AS VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE LOWER NINTH WARD NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL, MEMBER OF THE WORKING GROUP AND RESIDENT OF THE LOWER NINTH WARD.

WHAT IS THE TIMETABLE OF THE PORT OF N.O./LOCAL SPONSOR OF THE IHNC & THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN GIVING TO THE COMMUNITY TO MAKE THEIR DECISIONS AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY WANT THE EXPANSION OF THE INDUSTRIAL CANAL.

I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE ARE GIVEN THE SAME OPPORTUNITY, AS THE PEOPLE OF THE VIOLET-AREA HAD TO COME UP WITH THE ANSWER THAT THEY DID NOT WANT THE LOCK IN THEIR COMMUNITY-(NIMBY)

THAT IS MY REASON FOR REQUESTING THE MINUTES OF THE VIOLET MEETINGS

MR. GRANT, HAVE YOU MADE ANY PROGRESS IN SECURING THOSE MINUTES-PLEASE SUBMIT LETTERS OF REQUEST, ETC.

THE MINUTES OF THE VIOLET MEETINGS WILL HELP ME AND OTHERS DETERMINE HOW THE PEOPLE IN THE VIOLET COMMUNITY WERE ABLE TO DETERMINE WHETHER THEY WANTED THE LOCK EXPANSION THERE OR NOT.

THE FIRST MEETING WAS HELD AT THE ALVAR STREET LIBRARY

- MRS. M. R. CHANDLER CITED A CORRECTION OF THE TIMETABLE IN THE MINUTES FROM THE FIRST MEETING WITH MR. GRANT AT JACKSON BARRACKS

-THERE WAS NO CONCENSUS THAT ONLY 3-6 MONTHS WAS NECESSARY FOR THE REVIEW AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROJECT.

- THAT IS THE FAST TRACK CALENDER ISSUED AT THE FIRST ALVAR STREET LIBRARY MEETING BY MR. GRANT'S MINUTES.

- VIGOROUS DISCUSSION, OPPOSED EVEN 1-2 YEARS BASED ON THE LENGTH OF TIME ALLOCATED TO THE RESIDENTS OF THE VIOLET AREA.

- THAT CORRECTION HAS NOT SURFACED YET!

**NEIGHBORHOOD WORKING GROUP
MEETING SUMMARY FOR SEPTEMBER 13, 1993**

Members Present:

Mr. Lloyd Brown - Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council
Mrs. George-Ethyl Warren - Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council
Mr. Marc Cooper - Bywater Neighborhood Association
Mr. John Andrews - Bywater Neighborhood Association
Ms. Vivienne Blair - Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
Rev. Lorenzo Gunn - Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
Mr. John Koefel - Holy Cross CDC
Ms. Laurentine Ernst - HDLC
Mr. Joe Dicharry - Corps of Engineers
Mr. Keven Lovetro - Corps of Engineers
Mr. Les Waguespack - Corps of Engineers -
Mr. George Carbo - Port of New Orleans
Mr. Cedric Grant - Port of New Orleans
Mr. Patrick Gallwey - Port of New Orleans

Others Present:

Ms. M. R. Chandler - Chandler Enterprises
Ms. Magee - Ninth Ward Coalition

Summary:

Mr. Gallwey recapped the progress of the group. At the last meeting the group talked about the process of documenting what the members of the group, as community leaders, think the important issues are to the community in terms of mitigation or compensation. He reviewed the list of issues created at the previous working group meeting and brought forward the idea of combining some of those issues into the same category, while recognizing them as important parts of the issue. "Neighborhood street improvements" would be a sub-topic of "Transportation." "Business information clearing house" would be included under "Economic development issues," which is planned to be discussed tonight. The items to be discussed at future meetings are: economic impacts, housing and land use, public and community facilities, transportation (public transit, streets), noise, and social impacts. Mr. Gallwey commented that this list is not intended to be exhaustive, and things will be added onto the list by the group. He explained that the group would take the topics from the Rigamer report as issues to discuss, since everyone generally agreed that the report did not completely reflect the wishes and feelings of the neighborhoods. He clarified the point that it is not being said that the report had to be fully accepted, but using the topics was a way to stimulate conversation and ideas.

Mr. Gallwey discussed the issue of the field office. The issue of the field office was on the list as a goal to achieve, and once there is a construction project a field office will be established. The lock project has been in the planning stage for thirty-five years and an active project is needed before it can be established.

The topic of information dissemination was explored. Discussed last time was the concept of

creating a library or location for the studies and other information about the lock. Mr. Grant has discussed with Mr. Brown establishing a library for this information in the Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council offices. The idea of setting one up in the Alvar library, so that the information is on both sides of the canal, is also being explored. The group has to tell the Port and the Corps what information on the lock project is needed for these locations. The Port's and Corps' staffs have already begun to gather some of the information needed. Mr. Grant commented that staff will be made available to answer question to the public at these location during certain hours. Mr. Dicharry noted that there is also the possibility of a display to visually show where the construction will actually occur. He asked for suggestions on how to go about this. Mr. Brown agreed that a display would be beneficial as long as it is established prior to any public forums.

Mr. Gallwey stated that the Port and Corps would like to be invited to the meetings of the various associations to make a presentation. This would help answer any questions others may have.

Mr. Gallwey restated the combining of certain issues on the list for the benefit of a couple of people who had entered the meeting late. Mrs. Warren questioned the use of the Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council's office if rent is not paid to keep it open. She also stated that residents want to have the opportunity to know what is planned for the lock replacement. She commented that she will not stop commenting on the project until she sees where the people are going to benefit from the project.

Mrs. Warren raised the issue of contamination at a school in the Desire area (not related to the lock project). She expressed a desire to see the environmental reports done on the lock site. Mr. Dicharry stated that he plans on putting those types of reports in the library along with minutes from public meetings that have been held in the past. He noted that previously there were not working group type meetings with an ongoing exchange of information. He reiterated that whatever information is needed will be provided if available. Mr. Gallwey encouraged everyone to continue to suggest in the future what information is needed. Mr. Dicharry asked if a display board of the slides showing that the lock would all be within the channel would be helpful as a visual display. Mrs. Warren agreed that it would be helpful, but commented that other things are needed also. She stated she would like to know how funding comes from the highway trust fund for the bridges and how that would effect the neighborhood. She commented that she has personally collected a variety of information on how government operates. She raised the issue of Port leases in the area and wondered if there where any leases that members of the community could get to set up a business. She expressed that she was trying to find out all the information that she can, to bring it to the table. Mr. Gallwey stated that as much information as could be found would be made available.

Ms. Magee asked Mr. Gallwey to clarify if the Sanchez Center would be kept open on certain nights for the public to look at the documents. He replied that it would be worked out with the Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council as to the hours it would be open. Mr. Brown noted that the center is not open normally on nights or the weekend. Mrs. Warren expressed that the City should keep the building open because it is paid for by the public. Ms. Chandler commented that keeping the center open one night a week is a joke. She expressed the desire

to have the building open four hours every night of the week with a staff member there one night a week for the next six months. She also stated her opinion that the meeting minutes have never been accurate and do not reflect what has happened in the meetings. She noted that a three to six month time frame was never agreed to by the working group. She stated that as a tax payer she intended to be notified of meetings. She challenged the minutes of the meetings.

Ms. Chandler commented that there is no budget for the working group. She stated that she had requested a copy of the highway trust fund and had not received it yet, and wants to know how the community fits into the different public funding and appropriations. She asserted that her community has not participated in the economic development of the Port of New Orleans. Ms. Chandler expressed confusion about the technical aspects of lock construction, and stated that the community is more concerned about employment.

Ms. Chandler stated that she is not privy to the information that led to the conclusion in the significant facts handout that, based on the meetings of the working group, the only site being considered is the north of Claiborne site. Mr. Dicharry explained to her that the previous series of meetings of the neighborhood working group, of which she was not involved, led to the Corps going back and looking at the north of Claiborne site. It was recognized that the working group did not say they favored that site, but that they encouraged that the north of Claiborne site be explored. Mr. Dicharry explained that the north of Claiborne site was not an alternative during that time. He commented that the group was intended to discuss the issues. Ms. Chandler questioned why Congress had not budgeted mitigation funds. Mr. Dicharry explained that Congress said to develop a community development program with the neighborhoods and then report back to them. He explained that there is a difference between study costs and authorized construction costs.

Ms. Chandler asked Mr. Dicharry about the mention of the north of Claiborne site in the Rigamer Report. Mr. Dicharry commented that it did not address the impacts of the north of Claiborne site because the details of the site had not been developed. Ms. Chandler claimed that the report ignored an entire segment of the community by not mentioning the Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council. She asserted that the community was painted as being unstable. Mrs. Warren stated that the lower ninth ward is being left out of the City's improvements, and the residents want the opportunity to make a living.

Ms. Chandler again stated that she had corrections for the minutes. She restated that the group required a longer time than the originally proposed three to six months and asked that this be noted.

Ms. Chandler then expressed concern over the historic designation of the Holy Cross neighborhood and its impact on property development. It was explained to Ms. Chandler that there is a difference between the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association, the Historic District Landmark Commission, the Holy Cross Community Development Corporation and the area of the Holy Cross historic district. Mr. Koefler brought forward that concerns over being able to meet the building requirements of a historic district should be brought to the HDLC to educate the commission. The issue of a lack of funding for renovations was also discussed. Mr. Cooper offered to share his insights as a former member of the HDLC if people had specific questions.

He noted that a neighborhood can have itself removed from the historic designation if it feels that the designation is hurting them more than it is helping them. Mrs. Ernst commented that the Corps had hired Earth Search for an archeological study and they had shown the neighborhood to be historic. It was requested that this study be included in the library being established. This and other studies will be included.

The group encouraged that Community Development Block Grants be channeled to the lower ninth ward area, as there are currently none directed to the neighborhood.

Ms. Blair raised the issue of the need for emergency evacuation facilities, and a fully manned and equipped police station. Mrs. Warren suggested that if a shelter is built, it be permanent. It was noted that there are no medical facilities on the east side of the canal in Orleans Parish.

The creation of a housing trust was encouraged, with the recommendations made in the Rigamer report being used as minimum requirements. It was suggested that the community had the resources to manage a trust fund, and that local participation in the management of the trust was needed. Mr. Gallwey asked the group to clarify what was desired in a trust fund so that their wishes were correctly expressed. It is desired that a housing trust fund should be revolving for the neighborhood with local involvement in its management.

Ms. Chandler stated her desire to see port development in the lower ninth ward. She raised the concept of a business incubator. The group expressed that they would like to identify all possible funding sources for business development in the area. Ms. Chandler suggested that part of the license plate fees from the area be dedicated to the housing trust. Mrs. Warren suggested getting corporate sponsorships for projects in the area as a source of funding for projects. Mr. Cooper pointed out that if legislation was needed to dedicate public funding, it would involve talking with the legislator from the district.

Mr. Koefler raised the issue that businesses (banks and supermarkets) are needed in the community to provide services. The issues of stabilizing businesses and establishing new businesses were discussed. The issue of the tax structure's impact on businesses was examined.

The effect of the project on Holy Cross School was looked at with the school being viewed as a business. It was remarked that when looking at transportation issues, the access to the school for commuting children will be important to keeping the school operating.

Mr. Gallwey told the group of the Port's current project of adding additional safety rails on the St. Claude Bridge.

The next meeting was set for Monday, September 27, 1993 at the Alvar Library at 7:00 p.m.

**NEIGHBORHOOD WORKING GROUP
MEETING SUMMARY FOR SEPTEMBER 27, 1993**

Members Present:

**Mrs. George-Ethyl Warren - Lower Ninth Ward Neighborhood Council
Mr. Marc Cooper - Bywater Neighborhood Association
Ms. Vivienne Blair - Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
Rev. Lorenzo Gunn - Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
Mr. John Koefed - Holy Cross CDC
Ms. Elaine Jackson - Holy Cross CDC
Ms. Laurentine Ernst - HDLC
Mr. Larry Hesdorffer - HDLC
Mr. Joe Dicharry - Corps of Engineers
Mr. Keven Lovetro - Corps of Engineers
Mr. Les Waguespack - Corps of Engineers
Mr. George Carbo - Port of New Orleans
Mr. Cedric Grant - Port of New Orleans
Mr. Patrick Gallwey - Port of New Orleans**

Others Present:

**Ms. M. R. Chandler - Chandler Enterprises
Mr. Michael Fletcher - resident
Ms. Irma Magee - Ninth Ward Coalition
Mr. Rudy Muse - resident**

Summary:

The meeting's primary topic for discussion was Housing. Mr. Grant and Mr. Dicharry presented Mrs. Warren with information she had requested. Because some of the discussion at the previous meeting had focussed on historic districts and their impact on the community, Mr. Hesdorffer of the HDLC was present to answer questions that had already been posed to him and any new questions that the group may have. Mr. Hesdorffer explained the different types of historic district designations (local and national), the complexity of defining what a historic district designation means, and how the historic designation can impact a community. He noted that historic district designations help exercise control over architectural changes within a district, akin to the way in which zoning and building codes regulate all land uses and buildings throughout the City.

Mrs. Warren commented that she wanted to see the whole community of the lower Ninth Ward benefit and not be splintered. She added that she desired to gather as much information as possible about possible funding sources for different projects for the community. Mrs. Warren stated that she is not interested in learning how the new lock will be built, but wishes to know what the community will get if a lock is built.

Mr. Muse commented on his view that the working group was charged with making the decision on whether or not the project will be done in the Industrial Canal. He stated that that decision

has not been made, and the working group process was to get to that question.

Mr. Hesdorffer continued with his answering of questions that had been posed to him. He discussed the issue of whether there is a prohibitive cost imposed on new construction or exterior rehabilitation of deteriorated housing stock because of a historic designation. He commented that nationwide, property values for historic districts increase over time because, as people maintain their properties, an area becomes more desirable. He replied to a question on what happens to those that do not maintain their property, that no one is required to restore their property, but noted that there are laws for the entire city requiring property owners to maintain their property to minimum code standards. He commented that the legal process to force a property owner to maintain their property is time consuming and difficult. Mr. Gallwey asked Mr. Hesdorffer to explain the HDLC's role in regulating the use of properties. Mr. Hesdorffer responded that the HDLC does not regulate the use of a property, which is regulated through the zoning ordinances. The processes of regulating conditional land use or changing the zoning of a property fall under the purview of the City Planning Commission, the Board of Zoning Adjustments and the City Council. The HDLC's job is to regulate architectural changes to those areas of buildings within a Historic District which are visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. Hesdorffer noted that the guidelines which the HDLC follows are published.

Mr. Muse remarked on the way the working group process was unfolding, and that resolution is needed to the question of if there will be a project in the Industrial Canal corridor. Mrs. Warren commented that there are many people in the lower Ninth Ward that do not know about the project, and that decisions cannot be made without knowing what is going to happen. Mr. Gallwey explained that the group had decided to set aside the issue of whether or not there will be a lock, and go through the process of discussing mitigation items. Mr. Muse responded that without a project there will be no mitigation. Mr. Gallwey, after asking the group to correct him if he was wrong, clarified that it was hoped to achieve a discussion of what the community wants in terms of programs, projects, public works and policies, so that it would be known what will have to be asked for from the state legislature and the federal government. Mr. Gallwey stated that after the previous series of neighborhood working group meetings it was clear that the residential displacement was unacceptable to the community, and now the group is at the point where it needs to begin discussing what else about the project is troubling the community and what can be done to offset those problems. He further stated that the group had decided to use the outline of the Rigamer report, come up with a plan, and hold a community forum to see if it is generally acceptable.

Mr. Hesdorffer summarized how a historic district designation impacts this project. The local district designation does not solve the problems, but the nature of a national historic district affects the project. He explained that his office does not provide funding for rehabilitation work, but is a regulatory body. He recognized that there are some programs through the Office of Housing and Urban Affairs (OHUA) that provide rehabilitation funds, but his office does not handle the programs and he does not know their regulations. He explained the composition of the HDLC. Mrs. Warren commented that she was concerned with only the historic landmarks in her community and how it affects her community. Mr. Hesdorffer discussed national historic district allowances for investment tax credits, facade easements, and tax abatement programs as means of benefitting a property owner. He explain the project review that takes place for

federal projects that impact a national historic districts.

Mrs. Warren stated that she would like to see the federal elected representatives invited to at least two of the working group meetings to see how they stand on supporting the project.

Mr. Gallwey asked Mr. Hesdorffer if he knew of any programs that could be used to improve the housing in the entire area. Mr. Hesdorffer responded that the City had a housing summit about a year before, but he does not know what projects came out of it. He commented that there are federal requirements for a minimum number of subsidized units, which could translate into rehabilitating existing buildings as a solution.

Mr. Cooper suggested that since transportation has proved historically to be an important factor in determining real estate value, improving the transportation to the lower Ninth Ward would have a positive impact on property values. He noted that the Federal Transit Administration has a program in place to expand existing rail lines, and the lock project may be able to provide a portion of the local matching funds needed. He suggested that extending the riverfront streetcar line across the canal from Bywater into the lower Ninth Ward would benefit everyone. Mrs. Warren supported Mr. Coopers efforts to benefit the whole community. She also suggested that establishing training programs for both young men and women would cut down on crime and promote development. She commented that the City has ignored the lower Ninth Ward in funding for the past three years.

Reverend Gunn reported that the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association had developed a list of needs for the community. They include:

1. Overcoming crime and drugs
2. A medical unit
3. Ditches removed (more green space)
4. Underground wiring
5. Historical markers
6. Improved street lighting
7. Ranger station on the levee
8. Federal guidelines preventing "real estate fraud"
9. Improved streets
10. Neighborhood pride
11. Grants specifically for this area
12. Playground.

Ms. Chandler asked Mr. Hesdorffer if his office received federal funds. He replied that they did not receive federal funding. Ms. Chandler questioned Mr. Hesdorffer on the operation of a business in the Holy Cross neighborhood and if it received federal, state or city dollars. Mr. Hesdorffer explained that his office is not involved in the operation of that building. Ms. Chandler requested Mr. Hesdorffer to explain what a local historic district means and commented that there was disagreement recorded in the National Register as to the value of Holy Cross as a historic district. Ms. Chandler asked from where the HDLC received its budget, and Mr. Hesdorffer replied that it is a part of the general fund of the City of New Orleans. She also

questioned what contracts the HDLC gives out.

Ms. Chandler commented on the Rigamer report's assessment of the neighborhoods, and expressed her belief that the project was a done deal and that the information being given to the community was deceptive. Ms. Chandler accused some members of the working group of being the great white hopes of transportation and community development who are serving only a portion of the community. Ms. Chandler informed Mr. Grant that in Mrs. Warren's request for information she wanted the document that created the entity for the Transportation Trust Fund and not the Revised Statute. Ms. Chandler stated that this is the time for the community to bring to the table what their needs are. She stated that the needs include dissemination of information, residency requirements for project related jobs, and mitigation dollars for a housing trust fund.

Mr. Cooper stated to Ms. Chandler: "I can't sit here without taking offense to your characterization ..."

Ms. Chandler: "I don't care if your offended."

Mr. Cooper: "Do you care if I finish my statement?"

Ms. Chandler: "Help yourself. And then I'll respond."

Mr. Cooper: "I can't sit here without taking offense to your portraying of racial overtones to what I'm trying to do. I personally am, as a representative of the neighborhood I live in, I take offense to your creating a racial overtone when you say I am, and I quote you, you play back any of these recorders it will have it on there, to say I am the 'Great White Hope of transportation' for this neighborhood. There was no need for you to put a color on what I'm doing for this neighborhood. I just want you to know that I resent that."

Ms. Chandler: "Good. Look, we are not here to discuss what hurts your feelings. What hurts my feelings is to see 15,000 people..."

Mr. Cooper: "Why would we discuss your feelings if were not going to discuss mine?"

Ms. Chandler: "...You know something...Let me say this to you sir. You represent Bywater. A black lady tried to put a television station in your area, and what support did you offer her?. To her?..."

Mr. Cooper: "You want to discuss that issue. We'll discuss it after this meeting"

Ms. Chandler: "...What support did your organization offer her to sustain her having that business there?"

Mr. Cooper: "You wouldn't begin to know. I sat in meetings with Ms. Barbara Lamont."

Ms. Chandler: "Well, pull your minutes. Pull your minutes and let us see them, if you really want to defend that. But, you know what, I didn't make it a black white issue."

Mr. Cooper: "If you're calling me a racist, say it in front of everybody."

Ms. Chandler: "I did not say you're a racist sir. No sir."

Mr. Cooper: "You made a racial issue."

Ms. Chandler: "It is a racial issue. Look at this report."

Mr. Cooper: "I had nothing to do with that report."

Ms. Chandler: "Look. Well. Everybody here. If this is the only dialog we have established here."

Mr. Cooper: "You called me the 'Great White Hope'..."

Ms. Chandler: "Yea, of transportation. ..."

Mr. Cooper: "You are making racial..."

Ms. Chandler: "Yes, because it's racial. Like it or no, it is racial. I didn't make it racial. Rigamer made it racial. Prove to me that black people are ..."

Mr. Cooper: "Marc Cooper is not making a racial issue."

Ms. Chandler: "...participating in the economic development of any of these projects. Marc Cooper is making certain that the transportation conduit is, the entity to receive monies and dollars for the transportation, when the transportation monies come in place...."

Mr. Cooper: "I cannot receive monies. The Bywater Neighborhood Association cannot receive money."

Ms. Chandler: "Look. Look. Bywater Neighborhood Association is positioned to participate. That's all I'm saying. You are clearly positioned to participate. And you go on record at every meeting, you bring up transportation issues. At every meeting..."

Mr. Cooper: "At every meeting you make a racial issue out of..."

Ms. Chandler: "Well it is sir. I don't make it so. The facts bespeak it."

Mr. Cooper: "Do you think that the streetcar line that I propose will be for white people only?"

Ms. Chandler: "Oh, no. You don't care if we ride your streetcar. You don't care if we ride it. You just don't want to sit and administer the dollars that are going to come into that entity."

Mr. Cooper: "I have nothing to do with who administers the money. ..."

Ms. Chandler: "Well, we'll see. We will see. ..."

Mr. Cooper: "...The Regional Transit Authority does."

Ms. Chandler: "We will see. We will see. We will see."

Mr. Gallwey asked Mr. Dicharry to tell the group about the information dissemination program. Mr. Dicharry showed the group some of the reports planned to be placed in the Sanchez Center. Mr. Muse asked about an audio visual presentation which demonstrated the impacts on the community (that had been discussed during the previous series of working group meetings). Mr. Dicharry explained that this is an initial attempt to disseminate information and allow the public to understand what is happening so they can contribute their input. Mr. Muse expressed his belief that the process would end up in court because the government agencies have no interest in telling the public what is going on with this project.

Rev. Gunn asked that the group not forget that the meetings were about mitigation. He said they were designed by the Port and Corps to hear and listen to what the people feel about the lock replacement. He commented that this is a positive process trying to bring out the needs of the people who are greatly effected by the project. Mr. Gallwey supported Rev. Gunn's comments and stated that as leaders of their organizations the group can express issues of concern in the community. He explained that towards the end of this process a public meeting will be held. Mr. Gallwey restated that the Port and Corps will attend neighborhood organization meetings if asked. He asked if there were any other comments on the topic of housing.

Mrs. Warren stated that she will work with the people in the community to get their views.

Mr. Koefel told the group about the Holy Cross Community Development Corporation, an organization with a board composed of representatives from the neighborhood. He explained that his organization is not using public money, but that the Local Initiative Support Corporation

is helping them in getting bank financing to fix up abandoned and vacant property for low and moderate income families. The organization is non-profit. Mrs. Warren asked if the HCCDC was just for Holy Cross. Mr. Koefler noted that his group was only for the Holy Cross area and another organization was being formed for the residents located north of St. Claude.

Mr. Koefler commented that property values have declined tremendously over the past 35 years. He remarked that the neglect of industrial properties in the Holy Cross area, especially those of the Port, also hurts property values. He expressed a desire to see some of the neglected and vacant commercial properties converted to a better use. Mr. Koefler stated that it was not desired to see heavy industrial expansion with its associated impacts in the Holy Cross neighborhood. He raised the topic of drainage for the area with the impacts of development on the residential areas. The question of hazardous chemicals crossing the wharves was raised. Mr. Gallwey explained that chemicals are shipped under federal regulations with documentation provided to the regulatory agencies and that the Port did not have the authority to deny access to companies transporting them.

Mrs. Ernst brought forward an idea that had been discussed outside of the working group of converting the old cotton press on Douglass into something else. Ms. Chandler pointed out that this was not a new idea and that it had been brought forward by Mrs. Warren and Ms. Chandler for their community. Mrs. Ernst stated that it was an excellent idea. It was noted that the building is operating as a public warehouse under private ownership but is currently for sale. Ms. Chandler stated that it had been discussed at past working group meetings of possibly using that building as a business incubator. There was discussion among the group on the issue of working together in supporting ideas of each other.

Mr. Fletcher questioned the low turnout of residents from the area. Mr. Cooper explained to him that the working group was for the leaders of the different neighborhood groups to get acquainted with the project, and not advertized to the public. Mr. Fletcher expressed his belief that there was a problem with the general community learning what was happening with the project. Mr. Fletcher suggested that the project should look at the community in a comprehensive manner for carrying out programs. He commented that problems were not limited by boundaries of the census tracts, and the solutions must cross the tracts also. Mr. Gallwey supported Mr. Fletcher's comments and stated that the working group was trying to document programs, improvements and suggestions that will benefit the whole community. Mr. Fletcher emphasized that the sociological and economic impacts of the communities cannot be separated by census tracts and that the neighborhood organizations had to work together in a comprehensive manner. He commented that there must be controls set into place to ensure that the programs will continue after the lock project is constructed. Mrs. Blair stated that the lower Ninth Ward/Holy Cross area has been neglected by the city. Mr. Koefler expressed a desire for the neighborhoods to have the assistance of people who do comprehensive planning and are not connected to the Port or Corps. Mr. Fletcher stated that if the neighborhoods were to create a comprehensive plan, that the resources to implement it were needed or it would be a waste of time. Mr. Gallwey tried to summarize the comments for future discussion as the need for long-term implementation and comprehensive planning.

Mr. Gallwey requested that if anyone had corrections for the last meeting summary they be put

in writing. Ms. Blair requested that the list created on the flip charts be written down and included with the meeting summary.

(list created during Neighborhood Working Group meetings)

ISSUES TO DISCUSS

1. Field Office
2. Information Dissemination Grant (\$100,000)
3. Neighborhood Street Improvements
4. Study Cost
5. Economic Impacts
6. Housing/Land Use
7. Public/Community Facilities
 - Police
 - Medical
8. Transportation
9. Noise
10. Social
11. Historic Districts
12. Emergency Facilities

(list created during Neighborhood Working Group meetings)

HISTORIC DISTRICTS / NEIGHBORHOODS

- Landmarks Designation
- Property designated
- Policy of Exclusion
- Economic Hardship
- Economic assistance to renovate properties in Hist. Dist.
- Revolving Fund
- Earth Search Study
- Community development grants for housing
- Housing Trust / per Rigamer
 - No Homebuilders of America.
 - Administer in Community.
 - \$.50 from license plates for fund
- Census Tract
- Incubator Business (Mallory)
- Maritime Businesses - LPFA Funding
- Develop neighborhood businesses
 - Bank
 - Supermarket
 - Tax abatements during construction
 - Assistance to Private Schools
 - Traffic Plan
 - PR campaign
- Organized Labor
 - Training programs commitments
 - Equal opportunity
 - From the community
 - 200 jobs

(list created during Neighborhood Working Group meetings)

HOUSING

1. Improve transit - Riverfront Streetcar via St. Claude Bridge to east side of canal
2. Historic Districts Financing
 - Tax credits
 - Facade donations
3. Training
4. Trust Fund
 - Dollar amount
5. Improve Port area Alabo St. Wharf
 - Develop other uses in abandoned buildings
 - Cut grass
 - Drainage
6. Long Term Implementation
 - Comprehensive Planning
 - Funding