APPENDIX A: PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 10/404) AND PERMISSIONS REQUEST (SECTION 408)

A1: Section 10/404 Permit Application

A2: Section 408 Permissions Request

A3: Agency Invitation and Response Letters A1: Section 10/404 Permit Application

2022 Revised Joint Permit Application

Louisiana Depar Reso Office of Coast	tment of Natural urces al Management	Joir For Wo	nt Permit App ork Within the Coastal Zo	olicati e Lou ne	ion isiana	U.S. /	Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District
Application Numb	eer: 15540		Permit Number:	P2013	31098	Date Receive	d: 05/17/2016
Step 1 of 15 - Ap	blicant Information						
Applicant Name:	LOUISIANA COAST RESTORATION AU	AL PROTEC THORITY (CI	TION & PRA)		Applicant Type:	GOVERNME	NT AGENCY
Mailing Addr :	150 Terrace Avenue Baton Rouge, LA 70	802					
Contact Info:	Lawrence B. Haase						
Phone:	(225) 342-7308	Fax: -	E	mail:	Bren.I	laase@la.gov	
Step 2 of 15 - Age	ent Information						
Agent Name:	LOUISIANA COAST	AL PROTEC	TION & RESTORA		UTHORITY	′ (CPRA)	
Mailing Addr:	150 Terrace Ave Baton Rouge, LA 70	802					
	Elizabeth Davoli						
Contact Info: Phone:	(225) 342-4616	Fax: -	E	mail:	Elizab	eth.Davoli@la.	gov
Step 3 of 15 - Per	mit Type						
📓 Coastal Use P	ermit (CUP)	Solicita	ation of Views (SO	V)	🗖 Requ	est for Determ	ination (RFD)
Step 4 of 15 - Pre	- Application Activity						
a. Have you pa	rticipated in a Pre- Ap	oplication or	Geological Revie	ew Mee	eting for the	e proposed pr	oject?
	lo	Yes	Date meet	ting wa	s held: ()5/19/2016	
Attendees:	Elizabeth Davoli	(CPRA)	Step	ohanie 2	Zumo		Brad LaBorde
	(Individual or Compa	any Rep)	(OCM R	eprese	ntative)	(CC	E Representative)
b. Have you ol	otained an official wet	land determ	ination from the	COE fo	r the proje	ct site?	
	10	🗙 Yes	lf Yes, Please uj	oload a	copy with	your applicat	ion.
c le thie annli	nation a mitigation pla	an for anoth	JD Num er CUP2	ber:	MVN- 2012	2- 02806- SY	
				Permit N	lumber:		
			0001	J. mit I			





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Step 5 of 15 - Project Information

Office of Coastal Management

a. Describe the project.

The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion is a large-scale, complex civil works and ecosystem restoration project. When operated, up to 75.000 cubic feet per second (cfs) of sediment-laden water would be diverted from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin to deliver sediment, freshwater, and nutrients to reduce land loss and sustain wetlands.

b. Is this application a change to an existing permit?

c. Have you previously applied for a permit or emergency authoriation for all or any part of the proposed project?

	🗋 No 🔀	Yes		
Agency	Contact	Permit Number	Decision Status	Decision Date
ОСМ	Stephanie Zumo	P20131098	Pending	
COE	Brad LaBorde	MVN-2012-02806- EOO	Pending	
Other				

Step 6 of 15 - Project Location

a. Physical L	ocation								
Street:	Louisiana	State High	way 23 (LA 2	3)					
City:	Ironton (vi	cinity)		Parish: F	Plaquemi	nes		Zip:	70083
Water Body:	Mississipp	oi River (Mi	le 60.8) / Bar	ataria Basin					
b. Latitude a	Ind Longitu	ıde							
Latitude	e: 29	39	43.5	Longitude:	-89	57	47.8		
c. Section, T	ownship, a	and Range							
Section	#: 516	47 48 49	Tov	vnship #:16S		Range #:	25E		
Section	#: 321	41 19	Tov	vnship #:17S		Range #:	24E		

d. Lot, Tract, Parcel, or Subdivision Name





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Louisiana Department of Natural

Resources

Office of Coastal Management

Lot #:

Parcel #:

Tract #:

Subdivision Name:

e. Site Direction

START- From I-10 in New Orleans, take US-90Bus W across Mississippi River. Continue on US-90Bus W / Westbank Expy for 4 miles. Take exit #7 for LA 23 / Lafayette St. Continue south on LA 23 for 21 miles to the project area between the Phillips 66 Alliance Refinery and the community of Ironton, near Mississippi River Mile 60.8 -END

Step 7 of 15 - Adjacent Landowners - See attached list

Step 8 of 15 - Project Specifics

- a. Project Name and/or Title: Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153)
- b. Project Type: Non-Residential
- c. Source of Funding FEDERAL
- d. What will be done for the proposed project?

×	Bridge/Road		Home Site/Driveway	×	Pipeline/Flow Line		Rip Rap/Erosion Control
×	Bulkhead/Fill	×	Levee Construction		Plug/Abandon		Site Clearance
×	Drainage Improvements	×	Dredging		Production Barge/ Structure		Subdivision
×	Drill Barge/ Structure	×	Prop Washing		Vegetative Plantings		Wharf/Pier/Boathouse
×	Drill Site	×	Pilings	×	Remove Structures		
X	Fill		Marina		Major Industrial/Comm	ercial	
X	Other: excave	ation fo	r conveyance channel /	levee	tie-ins		

e. Why is the proposed project needed?

Consistent with the Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group's Strategic Restoration Plan (SRP) and Environmental Assessment #3 and the Louisiana Coastal Master Plan (CMP), the project purpose is to restore for injuries caused by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill by implementing a large-scale sediment diversion in the Barataria Basin that will reconnect and re-establish sustainable deltaic processes between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients to support the long-term viability of existing and planned coastal restoration efforts. The proposed project is needed to help restore habitat and ecosystem services injured in the northern Gulf of Mexico as a result of the DWH oil spill.

Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management	Join For Wo	t Permit Application rk Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District
Step 9 of 15 - Project Status			
a. Proposed start date:	01/02/2023	Proposed completion date:	01/02/2028
b. Is any of the project work in	progress?		

Step 10 of 15 - Structures, Materials, and Methods for the Proposed Project

Yes

Yes

a. Excavations

No

No

c. Is any of the project work completed?

6,652,000 Cubic Yards

b. Fill Areas

9,097,000 Cubic Yards 1,998 Acres

c. Fill Materials



1,248 Acres





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

d. What equipment will be used for the proposed project?

×	Airboat	×	Bulldozer/Grader	×	Marsh Buggy
×	Backhoe	×	Dragline/Excavator		Other Tracked or Wheeled Vehicles
⊠	Barge Mounted Bucket Dredge		Handjet		Self Propelled Pipe Laying Barge
	Barge Mounted Drilling Rig		Land Based Drilling Rig	×	Tugboat
	Other:				

Step 11 of 15 - Project Alternatives

a. Total acres of wetlands and/or waterbottoms filled and/or excavated.

1,376 acres

b. What alternative locations, methods, and access routes were considered to avoid impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

As part of the engineering and design phase, construction and staging areas considered the use of existing access roads and drives to minimize impacts to wetlands. See Chapter 2 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the alternatives (functional type, location, and capacity) that were screened and selected to carry forward for analysis.

c. What efforts were made to minimize impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion was developed using the minimum construction footprint to maximize the conveyance of sediment-laden water from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin. The gravity conveyance alignment was developed for efficient sediment conveyance between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin. Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been developed to minimize disturbance to wetlands and can be found in Supplemental Information Step 11c.

d. How are unavoidable impacts to vegetated wetlands to be mitigated

Direct wetland impacts within the construction footprint will be offset at the time of impact through disposal of excess excavated material into dredge material placement areas (DMPAs) in the Barataria Basin, adjacent to the diversion outfall, for the creation and nourishment of wetland habitat.

CPRA's Mitigation and Stewardship Plan, Appendix R1 of the Draft EIS, provides supporting information on the proposed creation and nourishment of basin-side intertidal wetlands in the DMPAs.

Step 12 of 15 - Permit Type and Owners

a. Are you applying for a Coastal Use Permit?

🗋 No 🚺 Yes

h Aro	you the sole	Jandownor /	ovetor	معدما	holder?
D. Ale	you the sole	anuowner /	Oyster	lease	noider

Louisiana De R Office of Co	epartment of Natural esources bastal Management		Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District
×	No	D Ye	95	
	The applicant is an	owner of	the property on which the proposed described a	ctivity is to occur.
⊠	The applicant has in the land on which the parish in whi	made reas he propos ch the pro	sonable effort to determine the identity and curre sed described activity is to occur, which included, oposed activity is to occur.	nt address of the owner(s) of , a search of the public records
×	The applicant here oyster lease holder	by attests s. See at	that a copy of the application has been distribute tached list.	ed to the following landowners /
c. Does the	project involve dri	lling, pro	duction, and/or storage of oil and gas?	
×	No	Yes	If yes, you must attach a list of all state and regulations	d federal laws and rules and

Step 13 of 15 - Maps and Drawing Instructions

Note: OCM Compiled Plats consist of a complete and current set of plats that have been pieced together by OCM using only the most current portions of the plat files provided by the applicant/agent. All out-of-date plats have been excluded.

MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_9of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:35:28 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_8of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:34:59 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_10of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:40:41 PM
P20131098_OCMProcessingRequest_20220816.pdf	08/16/2022 04:59:49 PM
20131098OCMFeeWaiverRequest20220413.pdf	04/13/2022 02:42:50 PM
MBSDBMPs_Water_Land_FW_CR_60percentDesignUpdate.pdf	04/13/2022 02:59:54 PM
MBSD_DEIS_Chapter_2_Alternatives.pdf	04/13/2022 03:03:42 PM
USACE_Figure_Jurisdictional_Wetlands_and_WOTUS.pdf	03/19/2018 08:20:03 AM
P20131098_5.23.2022RAIResponses.pdf	08/16/2022 04:22:10 PM
P20131098_6.8.2022RAIResponses.pdf	08/16/2022 04:24:47 PM
P20131098SupplementalInfo20220816_Final.pdf	08/16/2022 04:26:41 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_1of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:28:20 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_2of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:30:40 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_3of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:31:50 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_4of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:32:58 PM





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_5of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:33:27 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_6of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:34:00 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_7of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:34:30 PM
MBSDCupDrawings_2022-08-15_9Of10.pdf	08/16/2022 04:40:04 PM

Step 14 of 15 - Payment

The fee for this permit is: \$ 100.00

Step 15 of 15 - Payment Processed

Applicant Information

 Applicant Name:
 LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION & RESTORATION AUTHORITY (CPRA)

 Address:
 150 Terrace Avenue

 Baton Rouge, LA 70802

To the best of my knowledge the proposed activity described in this permit application complies with, and will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program. If applicable, I also certify that the declarations in Step 12c, oil spill response, are complete and accurate.

Landowners List

Landowner	
Alton S Fabre III c/o Norbert Fabre	
5127 Andrea Dr	
Barataria, LA 70036	
Landowner	
Canard Land LLC	
605 S America St	
Covington IA 70422	



Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone



Landowner	
DLT Investments LLC	
PO Box 283	
Belle Chasse, LA 70037	
Landowner	
Doris Magdalene E Rojas	
649 Wright Ave	
Gretna, LA 70056	
Landowner	
Entergy Louisiana Properties LLC	
PO Box 61000	
New Orleans, LA 70161-1000	
Landowner	
Entergy Louisiana, LLC	
639 Loyola Ave	
New Orleans, LA 70113	
Landowner	
Gervin L Coulon, Jr	
4820 Jean Lafitte Blvd	
C	
, LA 70067	
Landowner	
Gordon V Rojas	
5070 Jean Lafitte Blvd	
Lafitte, LA 70067	



Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone



 Landowner
Iris Mae E Rojas
5122 Rojas St
Lafitte, LA 70067
Landowner
JAT Oysters LLC
30300 Hwy 23
Buras, LA 70041
Landowner
Jackie A Tranchant ET AL
2921 Doreen Ln
Marrero, LA 70072
Landowner
Jacob D Giardina, Jr ET AL & Paul Paciera EST
PO Box 640356
Kenner, LA 70064
Landowner
John Rojas ET AL c/o Andrew Nolan
5105 Western St
New Orleans, LA 70122
Landowner
Lena L B R Curol ET AL c/o Gwen Rojas Eschete
819 Barbe St
Westwego, LA 70094





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Landowner
Loch Leven 7, LLC
850 Engineers Rd
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Landowner
Midway Cattle Ranch LLC
PO Box 854
Belle Chasse, LA 70037- 0854
Landowner
Mildred R Collins EST c/o Carl Navarre, Jr
5112 Rojas St
Lafitte, LA 70067
Landowner
Phillips 66 Co Attn: PTTRC
2200 Old Spanish Trail
Room 2303
WESTIAKE, LA 10009
Landowner
Plaquemines Parish Government
106 Avenue G
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Landowner
Plaquemines Port Harbor and Terminal District
PO Box 547
Belle Chasse, LA 70037





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Landowner
Ralph C. Neeb, Jr. ET AL
PO Box 6047
Mandeville, LA 70470-9047
Landowner
State Land Office, LA Dept of Administration c/o Cheston Hill
PO Box 44124
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
Landowner
The Louisiana Land and Exploration Company c/o Conoco Philli
PO Box 7097
Houma, LA 70361
Landowner
Wildlife Lands LLC
5100 Jourdan Rd
New Orleans, LA 70126
Landowner
William H Elliott, Jr EST c/o Cynthia E Faucheaux
4000 Westbank Expwy
68
Marrero, LA 70072
Landowner
Woodland Borrow Pits, LLC
1074A Hwy 1
Thibodaux, LA 70301-0000





Adjacent Landowner
BNB Partners LLC
PO Box 534
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
Blue Point Partners, LLC
413 Highland Crossing St
Baton Rouge, LA 70810
Adjacent Landowner
Captain Zach's Myrtle Grove Properties LLC
3223 8th St
Suite 300
Metairie, LA 70002
Adjacent Landowner
Dwight Adam, ET AL
20182 Lyndra Dr
Springfield, LA 70462
Adjacent Landowner
Edward G. Perrin
4634 Jean Lafitte Blvd
Lafitte, LA 70067
Adjacent Landowner
Eschete Land LLC
1755 Jean Lafitte Blvd
Lafitte, LA 70067





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Adjacent Landowner

Henry J & Margaret Muench Jumonville c/o Robert Jumonville

734 Pine St

New Orleans, LA 70118

Adjacent Landowner

James Webb, Jr ET AL c/o Marietta Green

4111 Franklin Ave

Gulfport, MS 39507

Adjacent Landowner

Jean P. Caulfield & Fredy & Patricia Belsom 5134 Texas St Lafitte, LA 70067

Adjacent Landowner

John Rojas ET AL c/o Andrew Nolan 5105 Western St New Orleans, LA 70122

Adjacent Landowner

Livaudais Co LLC

4626 E St Bernard Hwy

Meraux, LA 70075

Adjacent Landowner

MRJ Holdings LLC

605 S America St

Covington, LA 70433





Adjacent Landowner
Rio Vista Trust
108 Isle of Cuba Rd
A
Schriever, LA 70395-3433
Adjacent Landowner
River Rest, LLC
605 S America St
Covington, LA 70433
Adjacent Landowner
Thaddeus Rojas ET AL c <i>l</i> o Carissima Fisher
5024 Jean Lafitte Blvd
Lafitte, LA 70067
Adjacent Landowner
Tosco Corp c/o Phillips66
PO Box 421959
Houston, TX 77242
Adjacent Landowner
Whitney Coulon III ET AL c/o Melvin Coulon
96 Anchorage Dr
Marrero, LA 70072



FIGURE	SHEET	TITLE
1	1	COVER SHEET
2	1	PERMANENT WORKS DRAWING INDEX
2	2	TEMPORARY WORKS DRAWING INDEX
2	3	GENERAL NOTES AND LEGEND
3	1	DRAWING KEY MAP
3	2	DRAWING KEY MAP
3	3	DRAWING KEY MAP
4	1	PROJECT VICINITY MAP
5	1	LIMITS OF WORK
6	1	DIVERSION PROFILE
7	1	DEMOLITION KEY PLAN
7	2	EXISTING SITE & DEMOLITION PLAN
7	3	EXISTING SITE & DEMOLITION PLAN
7	4	EXISTING SITE & DEMOLITION PLAN
7	5	DEMOLITION TABLE
8	1	HEADWORKS PLAN
8	2	HEADWORKS U-FRAME SECTION A
8	3	HEADWORKS U-FRAME SECTION B
9	1	DIVERSION GATE SECTION
9	2	DIVERSION GATE SECTION
10	1	NORTH TRANSITION T-WALL PROFILE
10	2	SOUTH TRANSITION T-WALL PROFILE
10	3	HEADWORKS TRANSITION T-WALL SECTION
10	4	HEADWORKS TRANSITION T-WALL SECTION
10	5	HEADWORKS TRANSITION T-WALL SECTION
11	1	MRL T-WALL PROFILE
11	2	MRL T-WALL TYPICAL SECTION A
11	3	MRL T-WALL TYPICAL SECTION B
12	1	NOGC RR BRIDGE PLAN
12	2	NOGC RR BRIDGE PROFILE
12	3	NOGC RR BRIDGE SECTION A
12	4	TEMP NOGC RR SPUR PLAN
12	5	TEMP NOGC RR MAINLINE & SPUR SECTIONS
13	1	HEADWORKS RIVER PROTECTION STRUCTURES PLAN
13	2	HEADWORKS RIVER PROTECTION STRUCTURES SECTIONS
13	3	HEADWORKS RIVER PROTECTION STRUCTURES SECTIONS
14	1	CONVEYANCE CHANNEL PLAN
14	2	CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION
14	3	CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION
15	1	LA-23 BRIDGE PLAN & PROFILE
15	2	LA-23 PLAN
15	3	LA-23 BRIDGE SECTION
16	1	MBSD OVERALL SITE DRAINAGE PLAN
16	2	EXISTING SITE DRAINAGE PLAN
17	1	INVERTED DRAINAGE SIPHON SITE PLAN
17	2	INVERTED DRAINAGE SIPHON PROFILE
17	3	INVERTED DRAINAGE SIPHON INTAKE SECTION

17	4	INVERTED DRAINAGE SIPHON STRUCTURE SECTION
18	1	NOV-NF-W-05A.1 DRAINAGE STRUCTURE PLAN
18	2	NOV-NF-W-05A.1 DRAINAGE STRUCTURE PROFILE
19	1	OUTFALL TRANSITION FEATURE PLAN
19	2	OUTFALL TRANSITION FEATURE SECTION
19	3	OUTFALL TRANSITION FEATURE SECTION
19	4	OUTFALL TRANSITION FEATURE SECTION
20	1	RESERVATION AREA SITE PLAN
21	1	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BOAT LAUNCH PLAN
21	2	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BOAT LAUNCH PROFILE
22	1	BASIN BOAT LAUNCH PLAN
22	2	BASIN BOAT LAUNCH PROFILE
23	-	OMIT
24	1	DMPA NORTH PLAN
24	2	DMPA SOUTH PLAN
24	3	DMPA SECTION A
24	4	DMPA SECTION B & C
24	5	DMPA SECTION D
25	1	STOCKPILE AREA PLAN
25	2	STOCKPILE AREA SECTIONS E & F
25	3	BORROW PIT SECTIONS G & H
26	1	POWER TRANSMISSION RELOCATION PLAN
27	1	POWER DISTRIBUTION LINES RELOCATION PLAN
28	1	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	2	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	3	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	4	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	5	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	6	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	7	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	8	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	9	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.
28	10	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO 20 IN.

FOR PERMIT	A=COM	LAZA BLVD	LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION AUTHORITY ENGINEERING DIVISION 150 TERRACE AVENUE BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802		MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION	PERMANENT WORKS DRAWING INDEX	
PURPOSE ONLY	8555 UNITED PLAZA BLVD SUITE 300				CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-0153		
BRUCE LELONG CIVIL ENGINEER OF RECORD DISCIPLINE	BATON ROUGE, LA 70809 225-922-5700	LENOS CPRA			AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60649021	DATE: AUGUST 2	022
LA. 29393 AUGUST 2022 STATE LICENSE NO. DATE		OFINA	DRAWN BY: PD	DESIGNED BY: PO	APPROVED BY: BL	DRAWING FIGURE 2	SHEET 1 OF 3

FIGURE	CUEFT	TITLE
FIGURE	SHEEL	
101	1	
102	2	
102	2	
102	3	
102	1	DEWATERING PLAN
103	2	
103	3	
103	4	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
103	5	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
103	6	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
103	7	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
103	8	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
103	9	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
103	10	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
103	11	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL
104	1	SECTION SITE PLAN
104	2	SECTION A-A
104	3	SECTION B-B
104	4	SECTION C-C COFFERRDAM TIE INTO MRL
104	5	SECTION D-D COFFERRDAM TIE INTO MRL
104	6	SECTION STA 32+00
104	7	SECTION STA 36+00
105	1	SIPHON EXCAVATION PLAN
106	1	DRAINAGE STRUCTURE CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE PLAN
107	1	HIGHWAY 23 SITE PLAN
107	2	
108	1	
109	1	
P1	-	
P2	-	
P3	-	KIVER TRESTLE LUCATION PLAN
P4	-	COFFERDAIVI LOCATION PLAN
P5 DC	-	
P0 07	-	
P7	-	
ро	-	RIVER TRESTLE SECTIONS 2 OF 2
P10	-	LEVER RAMP LOCATION PLAN
P11		LEVEE RAMP SECTIONS
P12	-	TEMPORARY DRAINAGE PLAN
P13	-	TEMPORARY TIMBER CANAL BRIDGE PLAN AND DETAIL
P14	-	TEMPORARY TIMBER CANAL BRIDGE SECTION AND ELEVATION
P15	-	COFFERDAM PLAN AND ELEVATION
P16		3 PILE DOLPHIN PLAN, SECTIONS, AND DETAILS

P17	-	BARGE MOORING BUOY PLAN AND ELEVATION
P18	-	BARGE MOORING MONOPILE PLAN AND ELEVATION
P19	-	OVERALL EQUIPMENT APPROACH ROUTE
P20	-	DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SURVEY
P21	-	DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SURVEY
P22	-	DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SURVEY
P23	-	DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SURVEY
P24	-	DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SURVEY
P25	-	DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SURVEY
P26	-	EQUIPMENT ENTRANCE DETAIL
P27	-	SPOIL PLACEMENT PLAN - 1 OF 5
P28	-	SPOIL PLACEMENT PLAN - 2 OF 5
P29	-	SPOIL PLACEMENT PLAN - 3 OF 5
P30	-	SPOIL PLACEMENT PLAN - 4 OF 5
P31	-	SPOIL PLACEMENT PLAN - 5 OF 5
P32	-	SHELL 24" HORIZONTAL DIRECTIONAL DRILL

na\phillip.dempsey	PRELIMINARY FOR PERMIT	AECOM	LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION		MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION		NORKS	
om_ds16	PURPOSE ONLY	8555 UNITED PLAZA BLVD SUITE 300	N AUTI	ENGINEERING DIVISION 150 TERRACE AVENUE BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802		CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-0153	DIAMING	I DEX
rking\aec	BRUCE LELONG CIVIL ENGINEER OF RECORD DISCIPLINE	BATON ROUGE, LA 70809 225-922-5700	CPRA TO			AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60649021	DATE: AUGUST 2	022
C:\pwwoi	LA. 29393 AUGUST 2022 STATE LICENSE NO. DATE		OFINA	DRAWN BY: PD	DESIGNED BY: PO	APPROVED BY: BL	DRAWING FIGURE 2	SHEET 2 OF 3























_	DISPOSITION TABLE:							
L	ID NO.	DESCRIPTION	DISPOSITION	QUANTITY	UNIT			
*L	B1 - B12	42" CHS INC. FLEETING PILE	A	12	EA			
L	D1	24" STEEL PIPE	A	34±	LF			
L	D2	8" PVC PIPE	A	28±	LF			
L	D3	8" PVC PIPE	A	29±	LF			
L	D4	8" PVC PIPE	A	29±	LF			
	D5	8" PVC PIPE	А	29±	LF			
L	D6	8" PVC PIPE	A	29±	LF			
L	D7	30" RCP	Α	179±	LF			
L	D8	30" RCP	А	179±	LF			
	D9	30" RCP	I	30±	LF			
	D10	30" RCP	I	30±	LF			
	D11	18" CMP	А	30±	LF			
	D12	18" CMP	A	30±	LF			
	D13	18" CMP	А	30±	LF			
	D14	18" CMP	А	32±	LF			
	D15	18" CMP	A	30±	LF			
	D16	18" CMP	А	30±	LF			
	D17	36" STEEL PIPE	A	17±	LF			
	D18	12" CMP	A	34±	LF			
	D19	18" METAL PIPE	A	22±	LF			
	D20	10" CMP	A	20±	LF			
	D21	12" PVC	A	20±	LF			
	D22	21" PVC	A	59±	LF			
	D23	21" PVC	A	60±	LF			
	D24	21" PVC	A	59±	LF			
	D25	21" PVC	A	59±	LF			
	D26	21" PVC	А	58±	LF			
	D27	36" CMP	A	41±	LF			
Г	D28	21" PVC	A	59±	LF			
	D29	21" PVC	А	59±	LF			
Г	D30	21" PVC	A	58±	LF			
Г	D31	21" PVC	А	21±	LF			
	D32	18" PVC	A	21±	LF			
	D33	21" PVC	A	22±	LF			
	D34	21" CCP	A	21±	LF			
	D35	21" CCP	A	24±	LF			
	D36	18" PVC	A	23±	LF			
	D37	18" PVC	A	20±	LF			
	D38	18" PVC	A	21±	LF			
	D39	15" CPP	A	22±	LF			
	D40	18" RCP	1	21±	LF			
	D41	18" CMP	1	24±	LF			
	D42	21" PVC	A	60±	LF			

* EXISTING CHS INC. FLEETING PILES SHALL BE CUT AT THE MUDLINE

OR BOTTOM OF EXCAVATION.

DISPOSITION TABLE:

ID NO.	DESCRIPTION	DISPOSITION	QUANTITY	UNIT
F2 AND F3	FIRE HYDRANT	G	2	EA
F1, F4 AND F5	FIRE HYDRANT	I	3	EA
L1	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEE	A	1,615±	LF
P1	USACE MYRTLE GROVE REVETMENT	А	7.6±	AC
P2	MRL CONCRETE SLOPE PAVEMENT	A	4500±	SY
P3	MRL CRUSHED STONE ACCESS ROAD	A	1,800±	SY
PP1 THRU PP9	ENTERGY DISTRIBUTION POLE	-	9	EA
PP10 THRU PP24	ENTERGY DISTRIBUTION POLE	D	14	EA
R1	NOGC RAILROAD	А	3,840	LF
S1	SHELL PIPELINE	D	XXX	LF
T1	FORESTED AREA (BATTURE / DOCK)	A	4±	AC
T2	FORESTED AREA (MRL TO HWY 23 + RR)	A	130±	AC
TP1 THRU TP5	ENTERGY TRANSMISSION POLE	D	5	EA
TP6 THRU TP7	ENTERGY TRANSMISSION POLE	I	2	EA
T2	FORESTED AREA (MRL TO HWY 23)	A	130±	AC
Т3	TREES (HWY 23 TO BAY SIDE)	A	5±	AC
WV1 THRU WV3	WATER VALVE	G	2	EA
W1	16" WATER MAIN	G	1,474±	LF

ID LEGEND:

- B BUOY, DOLPHINS
- D DRAINAGE PIPE OR DRAINAGE STRUCTURE
- F FIRE HYDRANT
- L LEVEE
- P PAVEMENT (CONCRETE, STONE, ASPHALT)
- PP POWER POLE
- R RAILROAD
- S SHELL PIPELINE
- T TREES/FOREST
- TP TRANSMISSION POLE
- W WATER MAIN
- WV WATER VALVE

DISPOSITION LEGEND:

- A TO BE REMOVED BY THE CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION
- B TO BE REMOVED BY THE OWNER PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION
- C TO BE RELOCATED BY THE CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION
- D TO BE RELOCATED BY THE OWNER PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION
- E TO RE REMOVED BY THE CONTRACTOR CONCURRENT WITH CONSTRUCTION
- F TO BE REMOVED BY THE OWNER CONCURRENT WITH CONSTRUCTION
- G TO BE RELOCATED BY THE CONTRACTOR CONCURRENT WITH CONSTRUCTION
- H TO BE RELOCATED BY THE OWNER CONCURRENT WITH CONSTRUCTION
- I DO NOT DISTURB
- X TO BE CONFIRMED WHO WILL REMOVE OR RELOCATE

PRELIMINARY		AND RES	LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTE	CTION AND RESTORATION	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION		
FOR PERMIT	AECOM 8555 UNITED PLAZA BLVD SUITE 300 BATON ROUGE, LA 70809 225-922-5700	CDPPA COPPA	AUTHORITY ENGINEERING DIVISION 150 TERRACE AVENUE BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802		MID-BARATAKIA GEDIMENT DIVERGION	DEMOLITION TABLE	
PURPOSE ONLY					CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-0153		
BRUCE LELONG CIVIL ENGINEER OF RECORD DISCIPLINE					AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60649021	DATE: JULY 2022	
LA. 29393 JULY 2022 STATE LICENSE NO. DATE		OFRA	DRAWN BY: PD	DESIGNED BY: PO	APPROVED BY: BL	DRAWING FIGURE 7	SHEET 5 OF 5

eyiii@aecom.com\d054516730003C108-110A.dwg, Jul 27, 2022 - 11:26:38AM, philip.












NOTE:

ALL ELEVATIONS ARE IN FEET NAVD88







NOTE: ALL ELEVATIONS ARE IN FEET NAVD88 APPROXIMATE CONTRACTOR'S EXCAVATION GRADE APPROXIMATE CONTRACTOR'S INTERIM LEVEE TRANSITION T-WALL -**EXISTING GRADE** W/L CHANNEL SIDE LAND SIDE 30 30 20 20 1V:4H 1V:4H 10 10 0 0 1V:3H 1V.3H -10 -10 12" THICK 10-LB STONE -20 -20 (CHANNEL SECTION) -30 -30 9" THICK #57 STONE SHEET PILE -40 -40 SEPARATOR FABRIC -50 -50 -300 -275 -250 -225 -200 -175 -150 -125 -100 -75 -50 -25 0 25 50 75 100 125 150 175 200 225 PILE BATTER AND TIP ELEVATION VARIES (W-33 AND W-34 - SYMMETRICAL ABOUT CHANNEL BASELINE) (W-16 AND W-17) HEADWORKS TRANSITION T-WALL SECTION J SCALE: 1" = 40' 8,1 20' 20' 40' SCALE: 1" = 40' PRELIMINARY LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION AND REST MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION HEADWORKS TRANSITION FOR PERMIT AUTHORITY T-WALL SECTION ENGINEERING DIVISION PURPOSE ONLY CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-0153 8555 UNITED PLAZA BLVD SUITE 300 150 TERRACE AVENUE BATON ROUGE, LA 70809 225-922-5700 CIVIL DISCIPLINE BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802 JULY 2022 AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60649021 DATE: BRUCE LELONG ENGINEER OF RECORD **CPRA** JULY 2022 LA. 29393 STATE LICENSE NO DRAWN BY: PD DESIGNED BY: PO APPROVED BY: BL DRAWING FIGURE 10 SHEET 5 OF

DATE



DESIGNED BY: PO

APPROVED BY: BL

DRAWING FIGURE 11

SHEET 1 OF 3

DRAWN BY: PD

JULY 2022

DATE

LA. 29393 STATE LICENSE NO























NOTE:

ALL ELEVATIONS ARE IN FEET NAVD88





























NOTE:

ALL ELEVATIONS ARE IN FEET NAVD88














NOTE:

ALL ELEVATIONS ARE IN FEET NAVD88



1 Martine	- Ulkind			
PRELIMINARY FOR PERMIT			MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION	DMPA NORTH PLAN
PURPOSE ONLY BRUCE LELONG CIVIL 2555 UNITED PLAZA BLVD SUITE 300 BATON ROUGE, LA 70809 225:202-5700	150 TERRA BATON ROUGE,	CE AVENUE LOUISIANA 70802	CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-0153 AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60649021	DATE: AUGUST 2022
ENGINEER OF RECORD DISCIPLINE 220-522-01-00 9 LA. 29393 AUGUST 2022 STATE LICENSE NO. DATE	DRAWN BY: PD	DESIGNED BY: PO	APPROVED BY: BL	DRAWING FIGURE 24 SHEET 1 OF 5





































NOTES:

ALL STRUCTURES, FACILITIES, WELLS AND PIPELINES/FLOWLINES OCCURRING IN OPEN WATER AREAS, OR IN OILFIELD CANALS, OR SLIPS SHALL BE REMOVED WITHIN 120 DAYS OF ABANDONMENT OF THE FACILITIES FOR THE HEREIN PERMITTED USE, UNLESS PRIOR WRITTEN APPROVAL TO LEAVE SUCH STRUCTURES IN PLACE IS RECEIVED FROM THE COASTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION. THIS CONDITION DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE NECESSITY FOR REVISING THE CURRENT PERMIT OR OBTAINING A SEPARATE COASTAL USE PERMIT, SHOULD ONE BE REQUIRED FOR SUCH ACTIVITIES.

AS-BUILT DRAWINGS SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT TO THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, COASTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION AND OFFICE OF CONSERVATION, PIPELINE SAFETY DIVISION, POST OFFICE BOX 44487, BATON ROUGE, LA 70804-4487.

IN ORDER TO ENSURE THE SAFETY OF ALL PARTIES, THE PERMITEE SHALL CONTACT THE LOUISIANA ONE CALL SYSTEM (1-800-272-3020) A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY EXCAVATION (DIGGING, DREDGING, JETTING, ETC.) OR DEMOLITION ACTIVITY.

THE PERMITEE SHALL ALSO CONTACT OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES THAT MAY HAVE OPTED OUT OF THE ONE CALL PROGRAM . THESE GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES MAY HAVE OPERATIONS LOCATED IN THE AREA OF THIS PROJECT.

ALL STRUCTURES WILL BE MARKED AND LIGHTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH U.S. COAST GUARD REGULATIONS.

THE QUANTITIES AND ACREAGES OF IMPACT DESCRIBED HEREAFTER FOR THE RELOCATION OF THE PIPELINE WILL PRECEDE AND OVERLAP WITH THE AREAS WHERE THE OVERALL PROJECT CONSTRUCTION EXCAVATION AND FILL WILL OCCUR, SUCH AS BENEFICIAL USE RESTORATION AREAS AND THE OUTFALL CONSTRUCTION DREDGING AND ARMORING. FOR IMPACT ANALYSIS, THE TEMPORARY HDD IMPACTS TO WETLANDS AND WATER BOTTOMS ARE INCLUDED WITHIN THE RESPECTIVE LOCATIONS (OUTFALL NORTH, OTF, OUTFALL SOUTH 1 AND 2).

APPROXIMATELY 14.7 ACRES OF WATERBOTTOMS WILL BE IMPACTED FOR DRILL ENTRY / DRILL EXIT LOCATIONS.

APPROXIMATELY 37,435 CUBIC YARDS OF NATIVE MATERIAL WILL BE EXCAVATED FOR DRILL ENTRY / DRILL EXIT. THE NATIVE MATERIAL WILL BE USED AS BACKFILL UPON COMPLETION.

APPROXIMATELY 8.2 ACRES OF WATERBOTTOMS WILL BE IMPACTED FOR DRILL STRING LAY AREA AND FOR PULL BACK AREA.

APPROXIMATELY 4,625 CUBIC YARDS OF NATIVE MATERIAL WILL BE EXCAVATED FOR DRILL STRING LAY AREA. THE NATIVE MATERIAL WILL BE USED AS BACKFILL UPON COMPLETION.

APPROXIMATELY 7.6 ACRES OF WATERBOTTOMS WILL BE IMPACTED DURING REMOVAL OF EXISTING 20" PIPELINE.

APPROXIMATELY 3,573 CUBIC YARDS OF NATIVE MATERIAL WILL BE EXCAVATED FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING 20" PIPELINE. THE NATIVE MATERIAL WILL BE USED AS BACKFILL UPON COMPLETION.



ENGINEER: <u>SCOTT J. SCHEXNAYDER, P.E.</u> LICENSE NUMBER: 40347

THESE DRAWINGS ARE TO BE USED EXCLUSIVELY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF REGULATORY PERMITS.

ISSUED FOR PERMIT SHEET 10 OF 10

03	7/13/22	REVISED PER COMMENTS		MSL	SJS	DELTA CRUDE			
02	6/01/22	REVISED PER COMMENTS		MSL	SJS				
01	3/24/22	REVISED PER COMMENTS		LDE	SJS	PL SEG - NAIRN TO NORCO ZUIN.			
REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION OF REVISION	ES NO.	ΒY	APP	P 20" DELTA NAIRN TO NORCO PIPELINE			
	THIS DOCUMENT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND IT SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED OR				MID-E	BARATARIA SEDII	MENT DIVERSION DIRECTIONAL D	RILL	
REDIS	REDISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PRIOR PERMISSION. NEITHER THE OPERATOR NOR THE OWNER					PLAQUEM	INES PARISH, LOUISIANA		
INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS DRAWING, AND THE USER ASSUMES ALL RISK OF				DATE:	6/09/2021		REV.		
LOSS TO PERSONS AND PROPERTY AS A RESULT OF RELIANCE THEREON.				BY:	TBS-2020.1074	SPLC-GOM-DL-SA9	03		













Engineering Supportios DRAWINGSIO2 CADIO2 CIVILI-PermitCIO1 STE FLIVI Javg. Aug 10, 2022 - 11:03:11AM. JunSander					
PRELIMINARY FOR PERMIT PURPOSE ONLY	LOUISIANA COASTAL PRO- AUTH ENGINEERI	ECTION AND RESTORATION DRITY IG DIVISION	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION PLAQUEMINES PARISH, LOUISIANA CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153	DEWATERING W	ELL DETAIL
WILLIAM RUSHING ENGINEER OF RECORD SISCIPLINE AUGUST 2022 STATE LICENSE NO. DISCIPLINE DISCIPLINE BATON ROUGE, LA 70816 512-845-1366	DRAWN BY:	ACE AVENUE , LOUISIANA 70802 DESIGNED BY:	AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60591673 APPROVED BY:	DATE: AUGUST 2 DRAWING FIGURE 103	2022 SHEET 2 of 11



JimSa

AUGUST 2022 DRAWING FIGURE 103 SHEET 3 of 11

DEWATERING WELL DETAIL

MATCH LINE 6 OF 11

Aug 10, 2022 - 11:04:37AM

dwg.

NC101 SITE PLAN.

CIVIL



Aug 10, 2022 - 11:05:08AM

NC101 SITE PLAN.dwg,

CIVIL

8

MATCH LINE 7 OF 11



MATCH LINE 4 OF 11



MATCH LINE 5 OF 11

, Jim Sander

Aug 10, 2022 - 11:06:12AM,

nit/C101 SITE PLAN.dwg,

V02 CAD/02 CIVIL

Support/05 DRA

FOR PERMIT	ARCHER WESTERN ALBERICI JOINT VENTORE		LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTE	ECTION AND RESTORATION	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION Plaquemines parish, louisiana	DEWATERING WE	ELL DETAIL
PURPOSE ONLY			ENGINEERING DIVISION		CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153		
WILLIAM RUSHING CIVIL ENGINEER OF RECORD DISCIPLINE	9654 BROOKLINE AVE, SUITE 100	CDPA 1	BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802		AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60591673	AUGUST 2	022
LA. 21891 AUGUST 2022 N STATE LICENSE NO. DATE	BATON ROUGE, LA 70816 512-845-1366	OFIA	DRAWN BY:	DESIGNED BY:	APPROVED BY:	DRAWING FIGURE 103	SHEET 7 of 11
MATCH LINE 10 OF 11

0

PRELIMINARY FOR PERMIT	ARCHER WESTERN	SUCTON AND RESTORMENT	LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTE	CTION AND RESTORATION	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION Plaquemines parish, louisiana	DEWATERING WE	ELL DETAIL
PURPOSE ONLY		TUA NTI	ENGINEERIN	NG DIVISION	CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153		
WILLIAM RUSHING CIVIL ENGINEER OF RECORD DISCIPLINE	9654 BROOKLINE AVE, SUITE 100	CDPA IT	BATON ROUGE, L	OUISIANA 70802	AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60591673	AUGUST 20	022
LA. 21891 AUGUST 2022 STATE LICENSE NO. AUGUST 2022 DATE	BATON ROUGE, LA 70816 512-845-1366	OFINA	DRAWN BY:	DESIGNED BY:	APPROVED BY:	DRAWING FIGURE 103	SHEET 8 of 11

8

MATCH LINE 11 OF 11



MATCH LINE 8 OF 11



MATCH LINE 9 OF 11

ithC101 SITE PLAN.dwg,

V02 CAD/02 CIVIL

Support/05 DRA

Civil En

Z:\2019 Projects\19 014 00 - Alberici -

PRELIMINARY FOR PERMIT	ARCHER WESTERN	ERN AND RESTORTS		TION AND RESTORATION	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION Plaquemines parish, louisiana	DEWATERING WELL DETAIL	
PURPOSE ONLY		ALL PRO		IG DIVISION	CPRA PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153		
WILLIAM RUSHING CIVIL ENGINEER OF RECORD DISCIPLINE	9654 BROOKLINE AVE, SUITE 100	HORA TA	BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70802		AECOM PROJECT NUMBER: 60591673	AUGUST 2022	
LA. 21891 AUGUST 2022 STATE LICENSE NO. DATE	BATON ROUGE, LA 70816 512-845-1366	OFINA	DRAWN BY:	DESIGNED BY:	APPROVED BY:	DRAWING FIGURE 103	SHEET 11 of 11





































2/15/22 10:35 A.M











2/15/22 10:35 A.M





















2/15/22 10:35 A.M.


7-21-22

325400 312450 312450	DSED DREDGE ACCESS	REVISED P.I. NATING: 416823.84 ASTING: 370840.44 LAT: N29' 38' 22.25' LONG: W90' 00' 40.33' ROUTE	EVISED P.I. ORTHING: 417097.33 ASTING: 3702434.67 ONG: W90*00 22.23* OPOSED DREDC	REVISED P.I. INGTHING 418001 LATIN 29'38'3A. LATIN 29'38'3A. LONIC W90'00'0 CACCESS ROOM CACCESS ROOM CACCE	.60' 33' 39- 30-27' NORTHING 417387. EASTING: 3708202. LAI: 129' 20NG: W89'59'16.	LONG: WB9'59'17.80	LOUISIANA SOUTH ZOVE - MADES HIGK DATUM
10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -				*	▲ мас-80	ARCHER WES	TERN
BOOR DO HAD-49	MAG LEGEND	LEGEND	REVISED BY:	DATE:		ARCHER WES ALBERICI	VENTURE
BO+DO BO+DO AC-4 AC-49	MAG LEGEND	LEGEND MBSD DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE ALIGNMENT	REVISED BY:	DATE:		ARCHER WESTERN / ALBERICI	VENTURE VEY
BOP-DO BOD-DO BO	MAG LEGEND 1-50 GAMMAS 51-100 GAMMAS	LEGEND MBSD DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE ALIGNMENT SURVEY SECTION LINES	REVISED BY:	DATE:		ARCHER WESTERN / ALBERICI	VENTURE VEY PROJECT RVEY
AG44 KEITH J POBLICIS KEITH J POBLICIS KEITH J POBLICIS KEITH J POBLICIS	MAG LEGEND	LEGEND MBSD DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE ALIGNMENT SURVEY SECTION LINES LIMITS OF RIGHT-OF-WAY	REVISED BY: HORIZONTAI 1* = 1.0	DATE:		ARCHER WESTERN / ALBERICI JOINT PRE-CONSTRUCTION SUR MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SUK SURVEY PLAN VIEW	VENTURE VEY PROJECT RVEY
REITH J. POBLETIS REITH J. POBLETIS REITH J. POBLETIS REITH J. POBLETIS REITH J. POBLETIS REITH J. POBLETIS REITH J. POBLETIS	MAG LEGEND 1-50 GAMMAS 51-100 GAMMAS 101-500 GAMMAS 501-1000 GAMMAS	LEGEND MBSD DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE ALIGNMENT SURVEY SECTION LINES LIMITS OF RIGHT-OF-WAY	REVISED BY: HORIZONTAI 1* = 1,0 1,000' 0'	DATE:	HYDROTERRA	ARCHER WESTERN / ALBERICI JOINT PRE-CONSTRUCTION SUR MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SUR SURVEY PLAN VIEW JEFFERSON & PLAQUEMINES PARIS	VENTURE VEY PROJECT RVEY
REITH J POBARIS REITH J POBARIS	MAG LEGEND 1-50 GAMMAS	LEGEND MBSD DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE ALIGNMENT SURVEY SECTION LINES LIMITS OF RIGHT-OF-WAY	REVISED BY: HORIZONTAI 1* = 1,0 1,000' 0'	DATE: SCALE 00' 1,000'	HYDROTERRA	ARCHER WESTERN / ALBERICI JOINT PRE-CONSTRUCTION SUR MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SUR SURVEY PLAN VIEW JEFFERSON & PLAQUEMINES PARIS S, LLC 212 JACOBS RUN, SCOTT, LA 70583	VENTURE VEY PROJECT RVEY

7-21-22



ISSUED FOR PERMITTING

7-21-22

		MBSD I)redge Ac	cess Rout	e Alignn	ient				MBS	D Dredge A	ccess Rou	te Alignm	ient			MBSI) Dredge	Access Ro	oute Aligni	ment	
PI Station	Northing	Easting	Latitude	Longitude	Distance	Direction	PI St	ation	Northing	Eastir	ng Latitude	Longitud	e Distance	Direction	PI	Station	Northing	Easting	Latitude	Longitude	Distance	Directi
0+00.00	417,634.7417'	3,673,610.5022	29" 38' 33.29'	90" 05' 48.71									265.50	N87° 36' 21"E	3 10	0+42.54	415,747.3499'	3,682,134.7585	29° 38' 13.69	90" 04'12.35"		
					560.92'	N67° 44' 14"E	43+	33.00	417,947.8567'	3,677,280.	0492' 29* 38' 36.00	90° 05' 07.0	9"								883.33'	845° 07' 13
5+60.92	417,847.2484'	3,674,129.6075	29° 38' 35.34"	90" 05' 42.80								1	183.81'	N65° 14' 04"E	3 10	9+25.87	415,124.0526'	3,682,760.6766	29° 38' 07.45	90° 04' 05.33"		1
				1	471.74	N68° 01' 56"E	45+	16.81	418,024.8541'	3,677,446.	9509' 29" 38' 36.74	90" 05' 05.1	8"		1 -						495.87	\$49° 36' 28
10+32.66	418,023.7203	3,674,567.1011	29° 38' 37.04'	90" 05' 37.82'			i						465.85'	S78° 19' 39"E	11	4+21.74	414,802.7215	3,683,138.3447	29" 38' 04.23	90° 04'01.09"		
	1				145.51	\$66° 48' 54"E	49+	82.66	417,930.6041'	3,677,903.	1696' 29" 38' 35.76	90" 05' 00.0	3"								443.25'	\$49° 17' 38'
11+78.17	417,966.4336'	3,674,700.8573	29" 38' 36.46"	90" 05' 36.31'	,								423.07'	\$77° 29' 23"E	11	8+65.00	414,513.6400'	3,683,474.3600	29" 38' 01.33"	90" 03' 57.32"		1
	+ +			1	426.44'	\$41º 13' 44"E	54+	05.73	417,838.9611'	3,678,316.	1909' 29" 38' 34.81	90" 04' 55.3	6"		1 -						400.95'	\$54° 18' 41"
16+04.61	417,645.7145'	3,674,981.9123	29" 38' 33.25"	90" 05' 33.16'	,								236,33'	\$80° 10' 32"E	12	22+65.95	414,279.7310'	3,683,800.0142	29" 37' 58.98"	90" 03' 53.66"		
					453.07'	S74° 07' 06"E	56+	42.05	417,798.6372'	3,678,549.0	0518' 29" 38' 34.38	90° 04' 52.7	2"		1 -						444.91'	\$83° 27' 51"
20+57.69	417,521.7300'	3,675,417.6926	29° 38' 31.98'	90° 05' 28.24'									360.69'	S66° 09' 58"E	12	27+10.86	414,229.0884'	3,684,242.0342	' 29° 37' 58.43"	90" 03'48.66"		-
	<u> </u>			1	287.98'	\$75° 04' 41"E	60+	02.74	417,652.8884'	3,678,878.	9790' 29° 38' 32.90	90" 04' 49.0	0"		1 -				1		326.34'	N62° 19' 02"
23+45.67	417,447.5741'	3,675,695.9615	29° 38' 31.22'	90° 05' 25.10'	,								785.42	\$53° 39' 31"E	13	30+37.20	414,380.6968'	3,684,531.0170	29° 37' 59.90	90° 03' 45.37"		
	<u> </u>				131.28	S57° 32' 21"E	67+	88.15	417,187.4551'	3,679,511.	6317' 29" 38' 28.23	" 90° 04' 41.8	9"								373.55'	N79° 14' 21"
24+76.95	417,377.1123'	3,675,806.7318	29" 38' 30.51"	90" 05' 23.85'				-					460.48'	\$53° 07' 36"E	13	34+10.75	414,450.4425'	3,684,897.9969	' 29° 38' 00.55"	90" 03'41.20"		
					204.34	\$69° 54' 12"E	72+-	48.64	416,911.1433'	3,679,880.0	0014' 29" 38' 25.45	" 90° 04' 37.7	5"		1						361.70'	\$47° 47' 39"
26+81.29	417,306.9009'	3,675,998.6276	29* 38' 29.79'	90* 05' 21.69'									387.09	\$34° 37' 22"E	13	37+72.45	414,207.4569'	3,685,165.9190	29" 37' 58.11"	90" 03' 38.19"	-	
					116.28	\$84° 35' 12"E	76+	35.73	416,592.6016	3,680,099.	9362' 29" 38' 22.28	90" 04' 35.3	0"								331.15	\$43° 22' 02"
27+97.57	417,295.9311'	3,676,114.3887	29* 38' 29.67"	90* 05' 20.37'									191.52'	\$25° 14' 03"E	14	11+03.59	413,966,7226'	3,685,393.3099	29° 37' 55.70"	90° 03' 35.65"		
					82.95'	N81° 38' 36"E	78+	27.25	416,419,3573'	3.680.181.:	5847' 29* 38' 20.55	90" 04' 34.3	9"								314.67	\$59° 58' 01"
28+80.52	417,307,9870'	3.676,196.4617	29" 38' 29.78"	90" 05' 19.44'	02.55					.,,			297.02'	S32° 09' 51"E	14	4+18.26	413.809.2313'	3.685.665.7308	29" 37' 54.12"	90" 03' 32.58"		
					135.37'	N44° 26' 13"E	81+	24.27	416.167.9179'	3.680.339.	7044' 29* 38' 18.05	90" 04' 32.6	3"								678.54	\$83° 27' 46"
30+15.89	417.404.6466'	3.676.291.2400	29" 38' 30 73"	90" 05' 18 36'	,								185.97/	\$73° 32' 27"F		50+96.80	413.731.9795'	3.686.339.8572	29* 37' 53 28"	90" 03' 24 95"	070.04	000 27 10 1
50.15.05		-,,	25 50 50115	50 05 10:50	90.15	N17º 21' 47"E	83+	0.24	416.115.2267	3.680.518.	0537' 29" 38' 17 51	" 90" 04' 30 6	2"	010 02 21 2		0.90.00	,			50 05 21155	738 47'	\$89° 49' 32"
31+05.04	417 490 6872	3 676 318 1427	20" 38' 31 58'	90" 05' 18 04'	, ,	HI 2147 E		10.24	110,11012201	5,000,0100	0.007 25 50 17.51	. 50 04 50.0	122.70	\$70° 31' 05"E	15	8+35 27	413 729 7308	3 687 078 3219	' 29° 37' 53 17'	90" 03' 16 58"	733.47	505 47 52
51100.04	111,150.0012	5,610,510,11121	25 58 51.58	50 05 18.04	161.60'	N20º 16' 30"E	84+	13.04	416 074 2742	3 680 633 :	8155' 20" 38' 17.00	" 90° 04' 79 3	122.75	370 31 05 1		10133.27	115,12511500	2,007,070.215	25 37 33.17	50 03 10.50	565 77	N887 52' 50"
22-67-64	417 631 6492	3 676 397 1664	201 201 22 061	001 05117 12	101.00	N29 10 30 E	047.	55,04	410,074.2742	5,000,025.	0155 25 56 17,05	50 04 25.3	82.211	E 608 001 4211E			413 740 7841	1 687 641 0834	201 27 52 22	002 02 10 17	505.77	1488 32 30
32+07.04	417,031.0493	5,676,597,1004	29 38 32.96	90 05 17.13	128.87	NIRO 201 2015		1.10	416 022 1216	1 680 705	1007 201 201 201 20 0	000 041 20 5	82.51	560° 00' 42"E	10)4+01.04	415,740.7841	5,067,045,9654	29 37 53.22	90 03 10.17	612.001	N220 421 428
24:05 50	417 769 06921	2 676 417 7802	208 201 24 221	008 05116 001	158.80	N0 32 20 E		15.55	410,055.1510	3,080,705.	1037 25 38 10.07	50 04 28.5	171.20	C COD 011 4CW		0.14.11	414 328 00661	2 682 842 2204	205 271 50 121	008 00107 64	545.07	N25 42 42
34+06.50	417,708.9085	3,070,417.7893	29 38 34.32	90 05 16.88					115 204 01001	2 6 0 1 1 1 6			4/4.20	560° 01° 46° E		99+44.11	414.238.0000	5,087,802.5700	29 37 38.12	90 03 07.64		
26 11 20	417.004.4072	3 676 600 8714	201 201 20 01	005 05124 051	234.78	N04- 40- 10"E	89+	03.01	415,790.2122	2,001,112.	7001 29:38:14.28	90. 04. 23.8	211 (2)	N770 100 4/77		10100.00	414 602 1924	2 688 270 2211	208 281 02 523	008 03103 051	011.18	N41- 51- 43"
36+41.29	417,904.4022	5,070,009.5740	29 38 35.64	90 05 14.69	102.001	1000 1110000			415 043 601 10	1 681 202	(120) 201 201 (211.63	IN / / ~ 18' 46"E		(3+35.28	414,093.1820.	3,000,270.2311	29:38.02.58	an. na. ns. 95.36.	300.07	22222 (0)
20.3130	417.081.242**	3 676 775 7611	201 201 20 20 20		183.09	1402-11.04 _" E	92+	n.24 -	413,842.6911	5,061,522.	+129 Z9- 38- 14.72	90. 04.21.5	200.001	N922 071 227		10 1 5 4 1 5	415 020 4127	2 600 406 1660		001 07100 (77	398.87	N 32° 48' 40"
38+24.38	417,981.2421	3,070,775.7641	59.38,39'38	an. n2.15'80,	142.12	5.705.271.2277		0.70	415 806 2021	2.681.705	15051 201 201 45 21		389.55	N82- 05-33"E		/9+34.15	415,028.4137	2,000,480.3060	29:38:05.87	90" 03" 00.47"	142 (2)	N 140 470 11-
10.17.5	417.026.76501	2 (22 014 2020	201 201 25 25		243.12	879° 27' 33"E	95+	90.79	410,896.2831	5,081,708.	2090 291 381 15.21	90" 04 17.1	b	0.000 4.01 0.000		10 - 0 C 7C	415 142 86 50	2 689 670 1207	1 201 201 02	001 031 50 57	142.63	N 35° 57' 32"
40+67.51	417,936.7659	3,6/7,014./858	29" 38" 35.92"	an. 02.10'08.	1								451,75'	\$70° 45' 03"E	18	10+96.78	413,143.8665	3,088,370.1206	29~ 38. 07.01	90" 02:59.50"		
ARRENT													DATE		24			ARCH			BERICI	
EOFLOU	TS MA										REVISED BY:		DATE.	(m)	HYD	ROT	ERRA		PRF-CO	NSTRU	CTION	LSUR\
· 👹	1 the													19								
FITH LOOP	KE																		NARA I ARI	ACCEC	יינסם פ	TECUN
AREC N	786- ()E	-												107		0	Alberte		IKEDGE	ACCESS		IE SUR
RECHER	D F						DOLLER	100	TOTE	DAL				111		Q	AIDETIC	۳		LIGNMEN	I REPO	KIS R DADIO
PROPESSIO	₩L & E					A	KUHER	W	ESIE	ΗN								JE	FFERSON	oc PLAQ	UEMINE	5 PARIS
SURV	EXTERN					1	DEDIC	T	-	20				PREF	PARED BY: HYDR	ROTERRA	TECHNOLOG	ES, LLC 21	2 JACOBS RU	N, SCOTT, LA	70583	
TITTTT	444					A	LDCNIL	1 15	IST YES	18.86	DATE: 07/20/	2022	JOB# 22010)71 FILE:	AWA Pre-Construct	tion Survey.	_REV_07-20-22	.dwg				SHEET:

P23

ISSUED BY: Waldemar S. Nelson & Co. PRELIMINARY ISSUED FOR PERMITING

7-21-22

	MBS	D Dredge	Access Ro	oute Align	ment			MBS	D Dredge	Access Ro	oute Align	ment				MBS	D Dredge	Access Ro	ute Align	ment	
PI Station	Northing	Easting	Latitude	Longitude	Distance	Direction	PI Station	Northing	Easting	Latitude	Longitude	Distance	Direction	on PI:	Station	Northing	Easting	Latitude	Longitude	Distance	Direction
					126.78'	N56° 55' 19"E	238+23.42	412,650.7365'	3,692,669.6417	7' 29° 37' 41.87"	90° 02' 13.37	0								819.02'	N0° 46' 02"E
182+23.56	415,213.0593'	3,688,676.3508	29* 38' 07.68"	90° 02' 58.29'								349.80'	S13° 46' 38"E	"Е 30	6+01.42	410,721.8826	3,697,262.2475	29* 37' 22.26"	90* 01'21.58'		
					273.24'	878° 14' 22"E	241+73.21	412,311.0054'	3,692,752.9447	7' 29" 37' 38.50"	90° 02'12.47	0								394.01'	N2° 37' 42"E
184+96.80	415,157.3665	3,688,943.8577	" 29° 38' 07.10"	90" 02'55.27'								212.76	S34° 09' 12"E	"E 30	9+95.44	411,115.4815'	3,697,280.3150	29° 37' 26.15"	90° 01'21.33'		
					511.43'	\$63° 54' 05"E	243+85.97	412,134.9415'	3,692,872.3886	5' 29° 37' 36.74"	90° 02' 11.14									673.68'	N5° 52' 14"E
190+08.24	414,932.3782'	3,689,403.1442	29° 38' 04.82"	90° 02' 50.09'								278.63'	846° 39' 24"E	"E 31	6+69.11	411,785.6245'	3,697,349.2182	29° 37' 32.78"	90° 01'20.46'		
					489.35'	\$50° 37' 07"E	246+64.60	411,943.7017	3,693,075.0210)' 29" 37' 34.83"	90° 02'08.87									423.89'	N8º 49' 32"E
194+97.58	414,621.8982'	3,689,781.3801	29° 38' 01.70	90° 02' 45.84'								166.74'	N87° 40' 49"E	9"E 32	0+93.01	412,204.4998'	3,697,414.2550	29° 37' 36.92"	90° 01'19.67'		
					532.82	\$51° 32' 26"E	248+31.33	411,950.4503'	3,693,241.6209	29° 37' 34.87"	90° 02'06.98	n								185.05'	N17° 01' 54"I
200+30.40	414,290.5072'	3,690,198.5996	29° 37' 58.38"	90° 02'41.16'								310.39	N73° 13' 58"E	32. 32.	2+78.06	412,381.4373'	3,697,468.4573	29" 37' 38.66"	90° 01' 19.03'		
					339.22	S50° 56' 36"E	251+41.72	412,039.9920'	3,693,538.8123	3' 29" 37' 35.73"	90" 02'03.60									90.25'	N25° 06' 04"1
203+69.62	414,076.7701'	3,690,462.0109	29° 37' 56.23"	90° 02' 38.20'								238.36	\$83° 48' 10"E	"E 32	3+68.31	412,463.1627	3,697,506.7422	29° 37' 39.47"	90° 01'18.59'		
	111 212 225	1 (00 (05))			433.21	\$32° 43' 03"E	253+80.08	412,014.2606'	3,693,775.7808	29° 37' 35.45"	90° 02'00.92				<	113 //0 20/	2 607 622 02			232.46	N32° 00' 01"
208+02.82	413,712.2931	3,690,696.1589	29" 37' 52.60"	90° 02' 35.59'								335.97'	S22° 50' 24"E	"E 32	6+00.77	412,660.2960'	3,697,629.9260	29" 37' 41.41"	90* 01'17.17'		
	112 140 1207	2 (00 000 1700			287,04	\$23° 11' 10"E	257+16.05	411,704.6354	3,693,906.1897	29" 37' 32.37"	90° 01'59.48					112 055 00211				391.58	N38° 40' 49"
210+89.86	413,448.4387	5,690,609.1708	29 37 49.97	90 02 34.35	210.70	0205 221 6987	250190.67	411 470 6408'	3 604 049 0251	1 201 17: 20 02"	001 011 57 00	2/5.02	831° 13° 23° E	-E 32	9+92.35	412,905.9851	5,097,674.0550	29 37 44.40	90 01 14.35	502.60	N208 171 548
214±00.56	413 205 4531	3 691 002 7936	20127147 55	00 02 22 18	310.70	838-32-38-E	259+89.67	411,470,0498	3,694,048.0231	29.37.30.03	90. 01. 57.90	140.30	5200 55' 10"E		4+05.03	413 355 3617	3 608 102 5824		90* 01:10 70	502.69	N39-13-34-1
214+00.50	415,205.4551	5,691,002.7956	23 37 47.33	50 02 32.18	115 30'	\$510 21' 33"F	263+29.97	411 209 6643'	3 694 266 4123	2 20" 27' 77 42"	00' 01' 55 46	340.30	339 33 19 1	- E	4+93.03	410,000.0017	5,090,192.5624	23 37 40.22	50 01 10.70	220.23	N 22º 27' 02"E
215+15.85	413 133 4587'	3 691 092 8477	" 29° 37' 46 82"	90° 02' 31 17'	1(5.30	351 21 35 E	203+29.97	411,209.0045	5,094,200.412.	25 37 27.43	50 01 33.40	290.08'	\$65° 14' 25"F		7+15.76	413 539 1139'	3 698 313 9775	29° 37' 50 03"	90° 01' 09 30'	220.23	N33 27 02 1
215-15.85	415,155.4501	5,071,072.0471	25 57 40.82	50 02 51.17	166.67	\$88° 27' 10"E	266+20.05	411.088.1728'	3.694.529.8297	7 29 37 26 19	90° 01' 57 49	290.08	305 14 25 1		7115.20	415,555.1155	5,090,515.9715	25 37 30.03	50 01 05.50	219.01	N38º 34' 13"
216+82.52	413,128,9588'	3,691,259,4536	29" 37' 46.76"	90" 02'29.29'	100.07	000 27 10 5	200-20.00	11100011120	0,000,000,000,000,000	25 57 20.25	50 01 52.45	523.40'	N88° 25' 15"E	5"E 33	9+34.27	413,710.3427'	3,698,450.5227	29" 37' 51.71"	90" 01'07.73'	215.01	1150 54 15 1
	,				414.34'	N60° 23' 16"E	271+43.45	411,102.5965'	3,695,053.0267	7' 29" 37' 26.28"	90° 01'46.56	0				,				256.30'	N38º 36' 22"
220+96.86	413,333.6959'	3,691,619.6763	29° 37' 48.75"	90° 02' 25.18'				-				480.44'	\$86° 30' 35"E	"E 34	1+90.57	413,910.6326	3,698,610.4462	29° 37' 53.67"	90° 01'05.89'		
					402.98'	N65º 35' 51"E	276+23.89	411,073.3480'	3,695,532.5788	8' 29" 37' 25.93"	90" 01'41.13									225.74'	N37º 33' 39"1
224+99.84	413,500.1845'	3,691,986.6562	29* 37' 50.35"	90° 02' 21.00'						+		548.58'	S58° 36' 37"E	"E 34	4+16.32	414,089.5812'	3,698,748.0599	29* 37' 55.43"	90* 01'04.31'		
					243.43	N76° 44' 49"E	281+72.48	410,787.6139	3,696,000.8749	9' 29* 37' 23.05"	90° 01' 35.87									419.74'	N38° 05' 43"E
227+43.27	413,555.9921'	3,692,223.6047	" 29" 37' 50.88"	90° 02' 18.31'								425.62'	862° 53' 05"E	"Е 34	8+36.06	414,419.9086'	3,699,007.0266	29* 37' 58.67"	90° 01'01.33'		
					153.78'	\$72° 06' 27"E	285+98.10	410,593.6214'	3,696,379.7191	29" 37' 21.09"	90° 01' 31.60									211.11'	N41° 35' 31"E
228+97.05	413,508.7463	3,692,369.9450	29° 37' 50.40"	90° 02' 16.66'								504.14'	S49° 00' 08"E	"E 35	0+47.16	414,577.7931'	3,699,147.1638	29° 38' 00.21"	90" 00' 59.73'		
					240.41'	\$38° 10' 35"E	291+02.24	410,262.8928'	3,696,760.2075	5' 29° 37' 17.78"	90° 01'27.33									138.72'	N33° 41' 34"E
231+37.46	413,319.7578'	3,692,518.5377	" 29° 37′ 48.51"	90° 02' 15.00'								437.17	S34° 34' 25"E	"E 35	1+85.89	414,693.2143'	3,699,224.1190	29° 38' 01.35"	90° 00' 58.84'		
					310.21	S11° 43' 33"E	295+39.40	409,902.9320'	3,697,008.2832	2' 29° 37' 14.18"	90°01'24.57	U .								184.00'	N35° 56' 38"E
234+47.67	413,016.0239'	3,692,581.5810	29° 37' 45.50"	90° 02' 14.32'								243.00'	N90° 00' 00"E)°Е 35	3+69.89	414,842.1807	3,699,332.1262	29° 38' 02.81"	90° 00' 57.60'		
					375.75	813° 33' 14"E	297+82.40	409,902.9320'	3,697,251,2806	5' 29° 37' 14.15"	90° 01'21.81									6.97'	N50° 13' 09"E
	44.											B.1		0			100				
E OF LOL	TSUL									REVISED BY:		DATE:	-	- HVD	ROI	FPP/					
	A												19			L'ED DA	1.00	PRE-CC			N SURV
	Ch'E																MID-L	BAKATAR	A SEDIMI		ERSION
REG		-											1986	JAI.	2	ATLant	/	UREDGE	ACCES	SRUU	IE SUR
VECHER								TOT	1001				10		C	Albert	61		ALIGNMEN	I REPO	KIS R DADIC
PROFESSIO	NAL &					A	KCHER W	F211	- HN								J	LLLKZON	N & PLAU	ULMINE	5 PARIS
SUR	Emm					٨	REBICI				r		PRE	REPARED BY: HYD	ROTERRA	A TECHNOLO	GIES, LLC 2	12 JACOBS RU	IN, SCOTT, LA	70583	
TTTTTT	444.					A	LDLNIGI /	SINT YE	NTNAS D	DATE: 07/20/2	2022	JOB# 2201	071 FILE:	E: AWA Pre-Construc	ction Survey	_REV_07-20-:	22.dwg				SHEET:

P24

	MB	SD Dredge A	ccess Rou	te Alignm	ent	
PI Station	Northing	Easting	Latitude	Longitude	Distance	Direction
353+76.85	414,846.6384'	3,699,337.4802	29° 38' 02.85"	90° 00' 57.53"		
					96.50'	N38° 05' 56"E
354+73.36	414,922.5811'	3,699,397.0245'	29° 38' 03.60"	90° 00' 56.85"		
					110.52	N37° 48' 56"E
355+83.88	415,009.8939	3,699,464.7894'	29° 38' 04.46"	90° 00' 56.07"		
					98.23'	N32° 50' 54"E
356+82.11	415,092.4164'	3,699,518.0703	29° 38' 05.27"	90° 00' 55.46"		
					89.90'	N32° 48' 55"E
357+72.01	415,167.9737'	3,699,566.7922'	29° 38' 06.01"	90" 00'54.89"		
					243.57'	N36° 51' 02"E
360+15.58	415,362.8769'	3,699,712.8675'	29" 38' 07.92"	90° 00' 53.21"		
					495.84'	N 36° 01' 29"E
365+11.42	415,763.8922'	3.700,004.4881'	29" 38' 11.86"	90" 00'49.86"		
					463.95'	N38° 36' 31"E
369+75.37	416,126.4320'	3,700,293.9887	29" 38' 15.41"	90" 00'46.53"		
					361.65	N33° 52' 08"E
373+37.02	416,426.7190'	3,700,495.5371'	29° 38' 18.36"	90" 00'44.21"		
					525.83'	N40° 59' 21"E
378+62.85	416,823.6355'	3,700,840.4386	29" 38' 22.25"	90* 00'40.25"		
					1,617.45'	N80° 15' 29"E
394+80.31	417,097.3290'	3,702.434.5662'	29" 38' 24.78"	90° 00' 22.15"		
					2,168.17'	N62° 42' 17"E
416+48.48	418,091.6002'	3,704,361.3257	29° 38' 34.40"	90" 00'00.18"		
					1,932.39'	N25° 36' 21"E
435+80.87	419,834.2090'	3.705,196.4618'	29° 38' 51.55"	89° 59' 50.49"		
					3,263.89'	S50° 44' 02"E
468+44.76	417,768.4167	3,707,723.4179'	29° 38' 30.81"	89° 59'22.13"		
					507.55'	S49° 46' 13°E
473+52.32	417,440.6120'	3,708,110.9132	29° 38' 27.52"	89* 59'17.78"		
					105.56	859° 50' 55"E
474+57.87	417,387.5928'	3,708,202.1875	29° 38' 26.99"	89* 59'16.75"		
					124.28'	S73° 47' 36"E
475+82.15	417,352.9063	3,708,321.5265'	29" 38' 26.63"	89" 59' 15.40"		



	REVISED BY:	DATE:	HYDROTERRA	ARCHER WESTERN / ALBERICI JOINT VENTURE PRE-CONSTRUCTION SURVEY <i>MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION PROJECT</i>
ARCHER WESTERN				DREDGE ACCESS ROUTE SURVEY ALIGNMENT REPORTS JEFFERSON & PLAQUEMINES PARISH, LA
AI PEDICI			PREPARED BY: HYDROTERRA TECHNOLOGI	ES, LLC 212 JACOBS RUN, SCOTT, LA 70583
ALDENIOL INST VISTOR	DATE: 07/20/2022	JOB# 2201071	FILE: AWA Pre-Construction Survey_REV_07-20-22	dwg SHEET: 5 OF 9

P25

ISSUED BY: Waldemar S. Nelson & Co. PRELIMINARY ISSUED FOR PERMITTING

7-21-22





2/15/22 10:35 A.M.



3/26/21 10:35 A.M





8/1/22 10:35 A.M.





2018 Revised Joint Permit Application



Date Received: 03/19/2018

Step 1 of 15 - Applicant Information

Applicant/Company Name:	COASTAL PROTI AUTHORITY OF I	ECTION & RESTORATION LOUISIANA (CPRA)	Applicant Type:	GOVERNMENT AGENCY
Mailing Address:	150 Terrace Aven Baton Rouge, LA	ue 70802		
Contact Information:	Megan Terrell			
Daytime:	225 342 6952	Fax:	Contact Email:	

Step 2 of 15 - Agent Information

Company Name:	Coastal Protection & Restoration Authority (CPRA)						
Mailing Address:	i0 Terrace Avenue aton Rouge, LA 70802						
Contact Information:	Elizabeth Davoli						
Daytime:	225 342 4616 Fax: 225 342 4591 Contact Email: Elizabeth.Davoli@la.gov						

Step 3 of 15 - Permit Type

I Coastal Use Permit (CUP) □ Solicitation of Views (SOV) □ Request for Determination (RFD)

Step 4 of 15 - Pre-Application Activity

🗆 No	🗙 Yes	Date meeting was he	eld:05/19/2016
	Elizabeth Davoli (CPRA)	Stephanie Zumo	Brad LaBorde
Attendees:	(Individual or Company Rep)	(OCM Representative)	(COE Representative)
b. Have you ob	tained an official wetland dete	ermination from the COE for th	ne project site?
🗆 No	🛛 Yes	JD Number:	MVN-2012-02806-SY
c. Is this applic	ation a mitigation plan for and	other CUP?	
🛛 No	□ Yes	OCM Permit Numb	er:
r			

a. Have you participated in a Pre-Application or Geological Review Meeting for the proposed project?

Step 5 of 15 - Project Information

a. Describe the project:

The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion is a large-scale, complex civil works and ecosystem restoration project. When operated, up to 75.000 cubic feet per second (cfs) of sediment-laden water would be diverted from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin to deliver sediment, freshwater, and nutrients to reduce land loss and sustain wetlands.

- b. Is this application a change to an existing permit?
 - X No Ves OCM Permit Number:
- c. Have you previously applied for a permit or emergency authorization for all or any part of the proposed project?

No
⊠ Yes

Agency Name
Permit Number

Agency Name
Permit Number

OCM
Stephanie Zumo

Brad LaBorde
P20131098

Pending

COE
Brad LaBorde

Other

a. Physical Location

b.

с.

d.

Str	reet:	Loui	siana	a State	Highv	way 23 (LA 2	23)				
Cit	iy:	Iron	ton (v	/icinity)	Ра	rish:	PLA	QUE	MINES	Zip:	70083
Wa	ater Body:	Miss	sissip	pi Rive	r (Mile	e 60.7) / Bar	ataria E	Basin			
Latitud	le and Long	itude	•								
La	titude:	29	39	42.5	Lo	ongitude:	-89	57	48.6		
Section	, Township,	, and	Ran	ge							
Sec	tion #:	5 16	6 47	48 49	Tow	nship #:	16	S		Range #:	25E
Sec	tion #:	32	1 41	19	Tow	nship #:	17	'S		Range #:	24E
Lot, Tra	act, Parcel, o	or Su	bdiv	ision N	ame						

Lot #:	Parcel #:
Tract #:	Subdivision Name:

e. Site Direction:

START- From I-10 in New Orleans, take US-90Bus W across Mississippi River. Continue on US-90Bus W / Westbank Expy for 4 miles. Take exit #7 for LA 23 / Lafayette St. Continue south on LA 23 for 21 miles to the project area between the Phillips 66 Alliance Refinery and the community of Ironton, near Mississippi River Mile 60.7 -END

Step 7 of 15 - Adjacent Landowners

Adjacent Landowner :	Woodland Borrow Pits, LLC c/o Phyllis Adams
Mailing Address:	1074A Highway 1 Thibodaux, , LA 70301
Adjacent Landowner :	Canard Land, LLC c/o John W. Newman
Mailing Address:	605 South America Street Covington, , LA 70433
Adjacent Landowner :	River Rest, LLC c/o John W. Newman
Mailing Address:	605 South America Street Covington, , LA 70433
Adjacent Landowner :	Plaquemines Parish Government
Mailing Address:	106 Avenue G Belle Chasse, , LA 70037

Adjacent Landowner :	Michael A. Neeb
Mailing Address:	221 W. 9th St. Rushville, , IN 46173
Adjacent Landowner :	Ralph C. Neeb, Jr. et al.
Mailing Address:	1001 Amelia St. Gretna, , LA 70053
Adjacent Landowner :	Shawn E. Dugas and Ken Dugas
Mailing Address:	515 Moncla Ave. Belle Chasse, , LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner :	Lois F. Landry
Mailing Address:	1401 St. Andrew St. 208 New Orleans, , LA 70130
Adjacent Landowner :	Walter Landry
Mailing Address:	111 Landridge Dr. Belle Chasse, , LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner :	Entergy Louisiana c/o John A. Braymer
Mailing Address:	639 Loyola Avenue, 26th Floor New Orleans, , LA 70113
Adjacent Landowner :	CHS-SLE Land LLC c/o Francis J. Lobrano
Mailing Address:	147 Keating Belle Chasse, , LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner :	Loch Leven 7 LLC c/o Michael Jeansome
Mailing Address:	850 Engineers Road Belle Chasse, , LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner :	Benjamin X. & Gwendolyn Becnel, Jr.
Mailing Address:	16198 Highway 23 Belle Chasse, , LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner :	Ameripure Processing Company, Inc.
Mailing Address:	803 Willow St. Franklin, , LA 70538
Adjacent Landowner :	Eugene & Jacey Linder
Mailing Address:	119 E. St. A Belle Chasse, , LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner :	Midway Cattle Ranch LLC c/o Khai Q. Nguyen

Mailing Address:	1051-A W, Ravenna Rd. Belle Chasse, , LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner :	Stone Energy Corp.
Mailing Address:	625 Kaliste Saloom Road Lafayette, , LA 70508

Step 8 of 15 - Project Specifics

- a. Project Name and/or Title: Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153)
- b. Project Type: Non-Residential
- c. Source of Funding: Federal
- d. What will be done for the proposed project?

⊠ Bridge/Road	□ Home □ Site/Driveway	☑ Pipeline/Flow Line	Rip Rap/Erosion Control
Bulkhead/Backfill	Levee Construction	n⊟ Plug/Abandon	Site Clearance
Drainage Improvements	🛛 Dredging	□ Production Barge/Structure	□ Subdivision
Drill Barge/Structure	□ Prop Washing	Vegetative Plantings	□ Wharf/Pier/Boathouse
□ Drill Site	🛛 Pilings	Remove Structures	
🛛 Fill	🗆 Marina	□ Major Industrial/Commercial	

M Other: excavation for conveyance channel / levee tie-ins

e. Why is the proposed project needed?

Consistent with the Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group's Strategic Restoration Plan (SRP) and Environmental Assessment #3 and the Louisiana Coastal Master Plan (CMP), the purpose is to restore for injuries caused by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill by implementing a large-scale sediment diversion in the Barataria Basin that will reconnect and re-establish sustainable deltaic processes between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients to support the longterm viability of existing and planned coastal restoration efforts. The proposed project is needed to help restore habitat and ecosystem services injured in the northern Gulf of Mexico as a result of the DWH oil spill.

Step 9 of 15 - Project Status

- a. Proposed project start date: 01/01/2020 Proposed project completion date: 01/01/2025
- b. Is any of the project work in progress?

🛛 No 🛛 Yes

c. Is any of the project work complete?

🛛 No 🛛 🗆 Yes

Step 10 of 15 - Structures, Materials, and Methods for the Proposed Project

a. Excavations 3,850,000 yd³ 288 Acres b. Fill Areas 4,152,001,00 yd³ 554.30 Acres c. Fill Materials Concrete: 371,293 yd³ 65,676 yd³ X Rock: Crushed Stone or 102,290 **vd³** vd³ Sand: Gravel: Excavated and placed Hauled in topsoil/Dirt: 1,100,000 **vd³** Х 584,035 yd³ onsite: Excavated and hauled 2,300,000 yd³ х offsite: Other: Nourishment 2,300,000.00yd³ Х **Disposal Area** d. What equipment will be used for the proposed project? X Airboat Bulldozer/Grader Marsh Buggy **Other Tracked or Wheeled** Vehicles Backhoe Dragline/Excavator Barge Mounted Bucket Self Propelled Pipe Laying Barge Handjet Dredge □ Barge Mounted Drilling Rig □ Land Based Drilling Rig X Tugboat Other:

Step 11 of 15 - Project Alternatives

a. Total acres of wetlands and/or waterbottoms filled and/or excavated.

484.6 acres

b. What alternative locations, methods, and access routes were considered to avoid impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

As part of the engineering and design phase, construction and staging areas would consider the use of existing access roads and drives to minimize impacts to wetlands. See pp. 16-19 for additional information on alternatives (location, capacity, and structure type) analysis conducted since 1996 that resulted in the location of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion at River Mile 60.7 with a capacity of 75,000 cfs.

c. What efforts were made to minimize impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

The analysis of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion was developed using the minimum construction footprint to maximize the conveyance of sediment-laden water from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin. The gravity conveyance alignment was developed for efficient sediment conveyance between the river and the basin. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are being developed for access routes to minimize disturbance to wetlands between the MR&T and NOV levees.

d. How are unavoidable impacts to vegetated wetlands to be mitigated?

The project is self-mitigating. The purpose of the Project is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin as a long-term resilient, sustainable strategy to reduce land loss rates and sustain DWH injured wetlands through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients.

Step 12 of 15 - Permit Type and Owners

a. Are you applying for a Coastal Use Permit?

🗆 No 🛛 🗶 Yes

b. Are you the sole landowner/oyster lease holder?

🛛 No 🛛 🗆 Yes

□ The applicant is an owner of the property on which the proposed described activity is to occur.

The applicant has made reasonable effort to determine the identity and current address of the owner(s) of the land on which the proposed described activity is to occur, which included, a search of the public records of the parish in which the proposed activity is to occur.

The applicant hereby attests that a copy of the application has been distributed to the following landowners/oyster lease holders.

Landowner/Oyster Lease
Holder:Ram Terminals, LLCMailing Address:7733 Forsyth Blvd.City/State/Zip:St. LouisMO 63105-1836

Landowner/Oyster Lease Holder: Mailing Address: City/State/Zip: Houston TX 77252

c. Does the project involve drilling, production, and/or storage of oil and gas?

Step 13 of 15 - Maps and Drawing Instructions

USACE_Figure_Jurisdictional_Wetlands_and_WOTUS.pdf	03/19/2018 08:20:03 AM
Pages_from_JD_final_2012_02806_1_SY_Davoli.pdf	03/19/2018 08:20:59 AM
MBSDBA-153PermitSet.pdf	06/22/2016 03:29:40 PM
P20131098NeedsandAlternativesJustification.pdf	06/22/2016 03:29:40 PM
RevisedP20131098_MVN-2012-02806-ETTSupplementInfo.pdf	06/22/2016 03:29:41 PM
Supplementalfigures2.pdf	06/22/2016 03:29:41 PM
FEE_WAIVER_REQUEST_LETTER_07-24-13.pdf	07/24/2013 01:31:40 PM

Step 14 of 15 - Payment

The fee for this permit is: \$100.00

Step 15 of 15 - Payment Processed

Applicant Information

Applicant Name:	COASTAL PROTECTION & RESTORATION AUTHORITY OF LOUISIANA (CPRA)
Address:	150 Terrace Avenue
City/State/Zip:	Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Application Information

Permit Type: CUP

To the best of my knowledge the proposed activity described in this permit application complies with, and will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program. If applicable, I also certify that the declarations in Step 12c, oil spill response, are complete and accurate.

View Comments related to this project

(to be used for accounts where no letter is being sent)

Account #: 2012-02806-1 Account Name: Davoli, Elizabeth

DETERMINATION DATE: <u>8/11/16</u> SUBJECT: Jurisdictional Determination

MEMORANDUM FOR CEMVN-OD-SE, ATTN: Brad Laborde

MEMORANDUM FROM CEMVN-OD-SS, Surveillance & Enforcement Section

PARISH: <u>Plaquemines</u> SECTION <u>5,16,47,48,4</u> TWP <u>16S</u> RANGE <u>25E</u>

PROPERTY/PROJECT DESCRIPTION: <u>Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153)</u>

OWNER/COMPANY NAME: CPRA of LA

1. After careful review, the Surveillance & Enforcement Section has determined that this property/project is:

NONWETLAND		NO PERMIT REQUIRED	
MIXED	\boxtimes	AND/OR SECTION 10	\square
WETLAND		OTHER:	

 \boxtimes A map is enclosed that outlines the wetland or nonwetland area that has been delineated.

- 2. Additional comments: _____
- 3. P.O.C. for this determination: Brian Oberlies, x 2275





PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM

This preliminary JD finds that there "may be" waters of the United States on the subject project site, and identifies all aquatic features on the site that could be affected by the proposed activity, based on the following information:

District Office	New Orleans District File/ORM #	MVN-2012-0	2086-1-SY		PJD Date:	Aug 11, 2016
State LA (City/County Plaquemines Parish		Nome	Ms. Eliza	abeth Davoli	
Nearest Waterbody:	rest Waterbody: Mississippi River		Address of	Coastal I LA	Protection & Re	estoration Authority of
Location: TRS, LatLong or UTM: Sec. 5,16,47,48,49, T16S, R25E 29.661806 N -89.9635 W		Person Requestin PJD		P. O. Box 44027 Capitol Station Baton Rouge, LA 70804		
Identify (Estimate Non-Wetland Waters: linear ft) Amount of Waters in the Review Area: Stream Flow: width acres Perennial	Name of Any on the Site I Section 10	l Water Bodies dentified as 0 Waters: No	Tidal: [] m-Tidal: [Mississippi River	
Wetlands: ~38	acre(s) Cowardin Class: Estuarine	✓ Office ✓ Field D	(Desk) Determination:	ation Date	of Field Trip:	
 ✓ Maps, plan ✓ Data sheet ✓ C ✓ Data sheet ✓ Corps nav ✓ U.S. Geoke ✓ U.S. Geoke ✓ U.S. Geoke ✓ USDA Na ✓ National w ✓ State/Loca ✓ FEMA/FII ✓ 100-year H ✓ Photograp ✓ Previous d ✓ Other info 	ns, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf is prepared/submitted by or on behalf of th Office concurs with data sheets/delineation Office does not concur with data sheets/del is prepared by the Corps igable waters' study: ogical Survey Hydrologic Atlas: USGS NHD data. USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps. ogical Survey map(s). Cite quad name: itural Resources Conservation Service Soi vetlands inventory map(s). Cite name: d wetland inventory map(s). Cite name: d wetland inventory map(s). RM maps: Floodplain Elevation is: hs: \name Aerial (Name & Date): 98, 04, 05,06 \name Other (Name & Date): eletermination(s). File no. and date of respondent of the second s	of the applicant/contreport. Ineation report. 24k Phoenix I Survey. Citat 5, 08, 10,13 Sonse letter: 200	ion: NRCS we	b soil survey		
OBERLIES.BRIAI	he information: recorded on this form has not necessarily Dialay agosts of BERLIES BRIAN MC N.M. MRI 12077/79 011-045, out 5 Overment, out 00, 730 methy, aut50, condenues BRIAN MC	v been verified by th	e Corps and shoul	d not be relie	cant $6/30/10$	sdictional determinations.
Signature and Date of (REQUIRED)	Regulatory Project Manager		ature and Date of UIRED, unless of	Person Requi	esting Preliminary	/ JD (cticable)
EXPLANATION OF PRI 1. The Corps of Engineers hereby advised of his or he has declined to exercise the 2. In any circumstance wh- or requests verification for following: (1) the permit a the option to request an a compensatory mitigation b other general permit author requirements the Corps ha acceptance of the use of th undertaking any activity in that activity are jurisdictio appeal or in any Federal c proffered individual permit and a lingthetication	ELIMINARY AND APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL D believes that there may be jurisdictional waters of the Uni- er option to request and obtain an approved jurisdictional de e option to obtain an approved JD in this instance and at this ere a permit applicant obtains an individual permit, or a Na' a non-reporting NWP or other general permit, and the pe- pplicant has elected to seek a permit authorization based or pproved JD before accepting the terms and conditions of using required or different special conditions; (3) that the ap- rization; (4) that the applicant can accept a permit authori- is determined to be necessary; (5) that undertaking any acti- ne preliminary JD, but that either form of JD will be proce- reliance on any form of Corps permit authorization based o- nal waters of the United States, and precludes any challeng- court; and (7) whether the applicant elects to use either an t (and all terms and conditions contained therein), or indiv-	ETERMINATION ited States on the sub etermination (JD) for stime. tionwide General Per mit applicant has no a a preliminary JD, w the permit authorize pplicant has the righ zation and thereby a vity in reliance upon essed as soon as is p on a preliminary JD o ge to such jurisdictic approved JD or a p idual permit denial of doministrative asserts	S: bject site, and the p r that site. Neverthe rmit (NWP) or othe of requested an app which does not makk ation, and that basis t to request an indiv gree to comply will the subject permit racticable; (6) acce constitutes agreemen on in any administra reliminary ID, that an be administrativ	ermit applican less, the permit r general permit coved JD for t e an official de mg a permit a vidual permit a h all the terms authorization pting a permit that all well ative or judicia JD will be pr ely appealed j	t or other affected pa it applicant or other p it verification requiri the activity, the perm etermination of jurised uthorization on an ap rather than accepting a and conditions of th without requesting an t authorization (e.g., ands and other water al compliance or enfo pocessed as soon as is pursuant to 33 C.F.R.	arty who requested this preliminary JD is person who requested this preliminary JD ing "preconstruction notification" (PCN), it applicant is hereby made aware of the lictional waters; (2) that the applicant has pproved JD could possibly result in less the terms and conditions of the NWP or lat permit, including whatever mitigation n approved JD constitutes the applicant's signing a proffered individual permit) or bodies on the site affected in any way by orcement action, or in any administrative s practicable. Further, an approved JD, a . Part 331, and that in any administrative

site, or to provide an official delineation of jurisdictional waters on the site, the Corps will provide an approved JD to accomplish that result, as soon as is practicable.



SHEET NO. DESCRIPTION

- 1 TITLE SHEET
- 2 GENERAL NOTES, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS
- 3 PROJECT LAYOUT
- 4 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL LAYOUT
- 5 OVERALL ROADWAY AND RAIL PLAN
- 6 CHENIER TRAVERSE BAYOU PUMP STATION SITE
- 7 TYPICAL CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION (1 OF 2)
- 8 TYPICAL CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION (2 OF 2)

N

- 9 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTION (1 OF 2)
- 10 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTIONS (2 OF 2)
- 11 DISPOSAL AREA
- 12 POTENTIAL SEDIMENT DEPOSITION/LAND BUILDING AREA



STATE OF LOUISIANA



STATE OF LOUISIANA

INSET MAP

APPLICATION BY: CPRA P.O. BOX 44027 BATON ROUGE, LA 70804	COASTAL PROTECTION & RESTORATION AUTHORITY 450 LAUREL STREET BATON ROUGE LOUISIANA 70801		MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION PROJECT	TITLE SHEET
			STATE PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153	DATE: JUNE 2016
DRAWN BY: K. CANTU	DESIGNED BY: K. GUILLORY, P.E.	APPROVED BY R. SIMONEAUX, P.E.	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER:	SHEET 1 OF 12

GENERAL NOTES

ABBREVIATIONS

APPROX

B/L

CL

E

CES

DWG

EL, ELEV

HORIZ

HWY

MHW

MLW

MR&T

LA

N

NO

NOV

POB

POE RD

ROW

STA

TBD

VC.

W

VERT

1 THESE PLANS WERE DEVELOPED USING 2010 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY, NAD83, LOUISIANA STATE COORDINATE SYSTEM, SOUTH ZONE

2. ALL ELEVATIONS SHOWN ARE IN NAVD 88

3. AS-BUILT DRAWINGS WILL BE SUBMITTED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT TO THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, COASTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION, P.O. BOX 44487, BATON ROUGE, LA 70804-4487.

4. THE PERMIT APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE LOUISIANA ONE CALL SYSTEM (1-800-272-3020) A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY EXCAVATION (DIGGING, DREDGING, JETTING, ETC.) OR DEMOLITION ACTIVITY.

5. ALL NORTHING / EASTING AND LATITUDE / LONGITUDE VALUES ARE BASED ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN DATA AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE

6, ALL ELEVATIONS ARE BASED ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN DATA AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

CUBIC FEET PER SECOND

APPROXIMATE

BASELINE

DRAWING

EASTING

HIGHWAY

NORTHING

NUMBER

ROAD

TYPICAL

WESTING

ELEVATION

HORIZONTAL

MEAN HIGH WATER

MEAN LOW WATER

POINT OF BEGINNING POINT OF ENDING

RIGHT OF WAY

TO BE DETERMINED

VERTICAL CURVE

MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES LEVEE

NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE LEVEE

CENTERLINE

FEATURE LOCATION TABLE

DESCRIPTION	NORTHING / LATITUDE	EASTING / LONGITUDE
POB CHANNEL BASELINE	426308.37 / 29° 39' 54.20" N	3717488.25 / 89° 57' 30.31" W
POE CHANNEL BASELINE	417902.28 / 29° 38' 32.30" N	3706292.82 / 89* 59' 38,32" W
DIVERSION GATE STRUCTURE	424567.11/29" 39' 37 24" N	3715169.19 / 89* 57' 56.83" W
BACK STRUCTURE	418983.06 / 29° 38' 42.84" N	3707732.23 / 89° 59' 21.86" W
POB PUMP STATION BASELINE	424556,45 / 29" 39' 38,77" N	3701081.76 / 90" DD' 36.50" W
POE PUMP STATION BASELINE	424331 16 / 29" 39' 36 65" N	3700158.86 / 90* 00' 46 99" W



YR	YEAR				
APPLICATION BY CPRA P.O. BOX 44027 BATON ROUGE, LA 70804		COASTAL PH RESTORATIO 450 LA	ROTECTION AND ON AUTHORITY UREL STREET	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION PROJECT	GENERAL NOTES, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMB
		BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70801		STATE PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153	DATE. JUNE 2016
DRAWN BYCANTU		DESIGNED BY: K. GUILLORY, P.E.	APPROVED BY, R. SIMONEAUX, P.E.	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER:	SHEET 2 OF 12




















2016 Joint Permit Application

		Join For Wo	t Permit Ap rk Within tl Coastal Z	oplicatio he Louis ione	n iana		ii
Louisiana Depar Reso Office of Coast	rtment of Natural Jurces tal Management					U.S. Arm	y Corps of Engineers (COE) Orleans District
Application Numb	ber: 15540	I	Permit Numbe	r : P20131	098 D	ate Received:	05/17/2016
Step 1 of 15 - App	blicant Information						
Applicant Name:	Coastal Protection (CPRA)	& Restoration A	uthority of Loui	isiana A	pplicant (Type:	GOVERNMENT	AGENCY
Mailing Addr :	P.O. Box 44027 Ca Baton Rouge, LA 7	pitol Station 08044027					
Contact Info:	Elizabeth Davoli						
Phone:	(225) 342-4616	Fax: (225)	242-3550	Email:	elizabeth	n.davoli@la.gov	
Contact Info: Phone:	-	Fax: -		Email:			
Step 3 of 15 - Per	mit Type						
🔀 Coastal Use F	^v ermit (CUP)	Solicita					
			tion of views (t	SOV)		t for Determinat	tion (RFD)
Step 4 of 15 - Pre-	-Application Activity			SOV)		st for Determinat	tion (RFD)
Step 4 of 15 - Pre	-Application Activity articipated in a Pre-A	pplication or G	ieological Rev	SOV)	☐ Reques	oposed project	tion (RFD)
Step 4 of 15 - Prea	-Application Activity articipated in a Pre-A	pplication or G	Geological Rev	SOV) iew Meetin eeting was I	☐ Reques g for the pr neld: 05/	oposed project	tion (RFD)
Step 4 of 15 - Pre a. Have you pa	-Application Activity articipated in a Pre-A No Elizabeth Davo (Individual or Com	pplication or G Yes li (CPRA) pany Rep)	Geological Rev Date mo OCN	SOV) r iew Meetin eeting was h tephanie Zu I Represent	Reques	oposed project /19/2016 B (COE F	tion (RFD) t? rad LaBorde Representative)
Step 4 of 15 - Pre a. Have you pa D M Attendees: b. Have you of	-Application Activity articipated in a Pre-A No Elizabeth Davo (Individual or Com btained an official we	pplication or G Yes li (CPRA) pany Rep) stland determin	Geological Rev Date mo	Fiew Meetin Peeting was h tephanie Zu Represent S COE for t	■ Reques g for the pr neld: 05/ imo ative) he project s	oposed project (19/2016 B (COE F	tion (RFD) t? rad LaBorde Representative)
Step 4 of 15 - Pre a. Have you pa I Attendees: b. Have you ol	-Application Activity articipated in a Pre-A No Elizabeth Davo (Individual or Com btained an official we	pplication or G Yes li (CPRA) pany Rep) Hand determin Yes	Seological Rev Date mo Oate mo OCM Nation from the If Yes, Please JD Nu	sov) riew Meetin eeting was l tephanie Zu Represent coE for t upload a c umber:	Reques	oposed project /19/2016 B (COE F site? our application.	tion (RFD) t? rad LaBorde Representative)





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Step 5 of 15 - Project Information

a. Describe the project.

The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion is a large-scale, complex civil works and ecosystem restoration project. When operated, up to 75.000 cubic feet per second (cfs) of sediment-laden water would be diverted from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin to deliver sediment, freshwater, and nutrients to reduce land loss and sustain wetlands.

b. Is this application a change to an existing permit?

🖬 No 🔲 Yes	OCM Permit Number:
------------	--------------------

c. Have you previously applied for a permit or emergency authoriation for all or any part of the proposed project?

	No No	Y es		
Agency	Contact	Permit Number	Decision Status	Decision Date
ОСМ	Stephanie Zumo	P20131098	Pending	
COE	Brad LaBorde	MVN-2012-02806- ETT	Pending	
Other				

Step 6 of 15 - Project Location

a. Physical L	ocation									
Street:	Louisiana	ouisiana State Highway 23 (LA 23)								
City:	Ironton (vicinity)		Parish: F	Parish: Plaquemines				70083		
Water Body:	Mississippi River (Mile 60.7) / Barataria Basin									
b. Latitude a	nd Longit	ude								
Latitude	: 29	39	42.5	Longitude:	-89	57	48.6			
c. Section, To	ownship,	and Range	1							
Section	#: 516	47 48 49	Точ	vnship #:16S		Range #:	25E			
Section	#: 321	41 19	Tov	vnship #:17S		Range #:	24E			

d. Lot, Tract, Parcel, or Subdivision Name





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Lot #:

Parcel #:

Tract #:

Subdivision Name:

e. Site Direction

START- From I-10 in New Orleans, take US-90Bus W across Mississippi River. Continue on US-90Bus W / Westbank Expy for 4 miles. Take exit #7 for LA 23 / Lafayette St. Continue south on LA 23 for 21 miles to the project area between the Phillips 66 Alliance Refinery and the community of Ironton, near Mississippi River Mile 60.7 -END

Step 7 of 15 - Adjacent Landowners - See attached list

Step 8 of 15 - Project Specifics

- a. Project Name and/or Title: Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153)
- b. Project Type: Non-Residential
- c. Source of Funding: FEDERAL
- d. What will be done for the proposed project?

×	Bridge/Road		Home Site/Driveway	X	Pipeline/Flow Line		Rip Rap/Erosion Control
×	Bulkhead/Fill	×	Levee Construction		Plug/Abandon	⊠	Site Clearance
⊠	Drainage Improvements	⊠	Dredging		Production Barge/ Structure		Subdivision
×	Drill Barge/ Structure		Prop Washing		Vegetative Plantings		Wharf/Pier/Boathouse
	Drill Site	×	Pilings	×	Remove Structures		
×	Fill		Marina		Major Industrial/Comm	ercial	
X	Other: excav	ation fo	r conveyance channel /	levee	tie-ins		

e. Why is the proposed project needed?

The impacts of coastal land loss threaten Louisiana's economy, commerce, infrastructure, and culture. The Barataria Basin is suffering from significant land loss--approximately 75,000 acres between 1985 and 2010, with projected loss by 2060 ranging from 105,000 to 150,000 acres. Historically, Mississippi River overbank flooding deposited sediment, freshwater, and nutrients in the Barataria Basin during annual flooding cycles, building land and sustaining wetland habitats. Levees and Mississippi River channelization have altered natural fluvial interaction and sediment transport from the river into the basin, removing the source of sediment and freshwater that built and maintained wetlands relative to subsidence and sea level rise. In addition, recent hurricane events and the Deepwater Horizon (DHW) oil spill have exacerbated land loss impacts in the basin. The purpose of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin; the project is needed as a long-term resilient, sustainable strategy to reduce land loss rates and sustain DWH injured





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

wetlands through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients.

Step 9 of 15 - Project Sta	atus		
a. Proposed start dat	e: 01/01/2020	Proposed completion date:	01/01/2025
b. Is any of the projec	ct work in progress?		
📓 No	Yes		
c. Is any of the projec	ct work completed?		
🔀 No	☐ Yes		

Step 10 of 15 - Structures, Materials, and Methods for the Proposed Project

a. Excava	ations							
3,8	50,000 Cubic Yard	S	288 Ac	cres				
b. Fill Are	eas							
4,152,0	001,00 Cubic Yard	S	554.30 Ac	cres				
c. Fill Ma	terials							
	Concrete:	371,293	Cubic Yards	s	ē	Rock:	65,676	Cubic Yards
2	Crushed Stone or Gravel:	102,290	Cubic Yards	5		Sand:		Cubic Yards
	Excavated and Placed onsite :	1,100,000	Cubic Yards	3	×	Hauled in Topsoil/Dirt:	584,035	Cubic Yards
×	Excavated and hauled offsite:	2,300,000	Cubic Yards	6				



Step 11 of 15 - Project Alternatives

a. Total acres of wetlands and/or waterbottoms filled and/or excavated.

484.6 acres

b. What alternative locations, methods, and access routes were considered to avoid impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

As part of the engineering and design phase, construction and staging areas would consider the use of existing access roads and drives to minimize impacts to wetlands. See pp. 16-19 for additional information on alternatives (location, capacity, and structure type) analysis conducted since 1996 that resulted in the location of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion at River Mile 60.7 with a capacity of 75,000 cfs.

c. What efforts were made to minimize impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

The analysis of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion was developed using the minimum construction footprint to maximize the conveyance of sediment-laden water from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin. The gravity conveyance alignment was developed for efficient sediment conveyance between the river and the basin. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are being developed for access routes to minimize disturbance to wetlands between the MR&T and NOV levees.

d. How are unavoidable impacts to vegetated wetlands to be mitigated?

The project is self-mitigating. The purpose of the Project is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin as a long-term resilient, sustainable strategy to reduce land loss rates and sustain DWH injured wetlands through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients.

Step 12 of 15 - Permit Type and Owners

a. Are you applying for a Coastal Use Permit?

Louisiana D R Office of Co	epartment of Natural lesources loastal Management		Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District					
	No	×	Yes						
b. Are you	b. Are you the sole landowner / oyster lease holder?								
⊠	No		Yes						
	The applicant is an	ı owne	r of the property on which the proposed described	activity is to occur.					
×	The applicant has made reasonable effort to determine the identity and current address of the owner(s) of the land on which the proposed described activity is to occur, which included, a search of the public records of the parish in which the proposed activity is to occur.								
×	The applicant hereby attests that a copy of the application has been distributed to the following landowners / oyster lease holders. See attached list.								
c. Does the	project involve dri	lling, p	production, and/or storage of oil and gas?						
	No	Yes	If yes, you must attach a list of all state ar regulations	nd federal laws and rules and					

Step 13 of 15 - Maps and Drawing Instructions

Note: OCM Compiled Plats consist of a complete and current set of plats that have been pieced together by OCM using only the most current portions of the plat files provided by the applicant/agent. All out-of-date plats have been excluded.

 LANDOWNER_ATTACHMENTS_07-24-13.pdf
 07/24/2013 01:31:42 PM

 SUPP_APP_FORM_INFO_07-24-13.pdf
 07/24/2013 01:33:03 PM

 FEE_WAIVER_REQUEST_LETTER_07-24-13.pdf
 07/24/2013 01:31:40 PM

 APPLICATION_FORM_07-24-13.pdf
 07/24/2013 01:30:46 PM

 4686268 - APPLICATION PLATS REVISIONS - PLATS
 07/24/2013 01:51:34 PM

Step 14 of 15 - Payment

The fee for this permit is: \$ 100.00

Step 15 of 15 - Payment Processed

Applicant Information

 Applicant Name:
 Coastal Protection & Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA)

 Address:
 P.O. Box 44027 Capitol Station

 Baton Rouge, LA 70804--4027





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

To the best of my knowledge the proposed activity described in this permit application complies with, and will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program. If applicable, I also certify that the declarations in Step 12c, oil spill response, are complete and accurate.

Landowners List

Landowner
Phillips 66
P.O. Box 2197
Houston TX 77252
Landowner
Ram Terminals, LLC
7733 Forsyth Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63105-1836
Adjacent Landowner
Ameripure Processing Company, Inc.
803 Willow St.
Franklin, LA 70538
Adjacent Landowner
Benjamin X. & Gwendolyn Becnel, Jr.
16198 Highway 23
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
CHS-SLE Land LLC c/o Francis J. Lobrano
147 Keating
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
Canard Land, LLC c/o John W. Newman
605 South America Street
Covington, LA 70433



Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Adjacent Landowner
Entergy Louisiana c/o John A. Braymer
639 Loyola Avenue, 26th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70113
 Adjacent Landowner
Eugene & Jacey Linder
119 E. St.
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
Loch Leven 7 LLC c/o Michael Jeansome
850 Engineers Road
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
Lois F. Landry
1401 St. Andrew St.
208
New Orleans, LA 70130
Adjacent Landowner
Michael A. Neeb
221 W. 9th St.
Rushville, IN 46173
Adjacent Landowner
Midway Cattle Ranch LLC c/o Khai Q. Nguyen
1051-A W, Ravenna Rd.





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Adjacent Landowner
Plaquemines Parish Government
Rollo Chasas I.A. 70027
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
1001 Amelia St.
Gretna, LA 70053
Adjacent Landowner
River Rest, LLC c/o John W. Newman
605 South America Street
Covington, LA 70433
Adjacent Landowner
Shawn E. Dugas and Ken Dugas
515 Moncla Ave.
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
Stone Energy Corp.
625 Kaliste Saloom Road
Lafayette, LA 70508
Adjacent Landowner
Walter Landry
111 Landridge Dr.
Belle Chasse, LA 70037



Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Adjacent Landowner

Woodland Borrow Pits, LLC c/o Phyllis Adams

1074A Highway 1

Thibodaux, LA 70301

5a. Describe the Project

The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) is one of 33 conceptual projects identified by CPRA for the first implementation period (2012-2031) in Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (2012 Master Plan). The Project footprint is from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin, just west of the back levee, spanning a length of approximately two miles and width of approximately 1600 feet for the gravity conveyance structure and appurtenant structures.

The Project consists of the construction of an intake control structure on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at River Mile 60.7, through a section of the existing Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) levee. The structure would be operated to reestablish the connection between the Mississippi River and the mid-Barataria Basin by transporting sediment, freshwater, and nutrients through the gravity conveyance structure, leading across land and through the future federal New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to an outfall or receiving area in the mid-Barataria Basin. The outfall area is located south of the Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery Project (BA-39), the Mississippi River Long Distance Sediment Pipeline (BA-43EB), and the Bayou Dupont Marsh and Ridge Creation (BA-48). Additional Project features include relocation and replacement of segments of Louisiana Highway 23 and the New Orleans Gulf Coast Rail Road over the gravity conveyance structure.

The project also incorporates a pump station to be located in the northwestern portion of the Project area. Forced drainage is currently provided by Wilkinson Canal Pump Station located near Myrtle Grove to the south of the project area. The Project will require the modification of internal drainage collection swales and the construction of a new drainage pump station north of the conveyance channel in order to capture and convey area drainage north of the channel to the Barataria Basin. Right-of-way and road access will be required for the construction and maintenance of the pump station.

Relocations of water and electrical utility lines will be needed in order to accommodate the construction and operation of the diversion channel and the proposed LA 23 and New Orleans Gulf Coast Rail Road bridges. A 22 inch crude oil pipeline is located immediately west of the proposed channel outfall. All infrastructure and utility improvements and relocations will be based upon continued service during construction and will be designed and constructed using utility owner criteria and guidelines and addressing hurricane criteria during interim and final phases of construction.

An Operations and Maintenance Plan will be developed for the Project prior to construction.

An Adaptive Management Plan will be developed to maximize sediment transport from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin to reduce land loss rates and sustain wetlands through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients. The Adaptive Management Plan would monitor the diversion control structure and outfall area and allow for variable flow rates to respond to seasonal, sediment, and basin conditions, maximizing the benefits of sediment transport for restoration.

Step 8.c. Funding

CPRA anticipates construction the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion with Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) funds allocated to the State of Louisiana by the Deepwater Horizon BP Spill Consent Decree (dated April 2016).

Step 10a. Excavation					
Location	Habitat Type (existing)	<u>Feature</u>		Area (acres)	Excavation (CY)
Mississippi River	Riverine	Diversion Channel		14.0	350,000
Batture	Forested Wetlands	Diversion Channel		4.2	202,796
MR&T levee west to LA 23	Forested Wetlands	Diversion Channel		3.2	127,050
LA 23 west to back levee	Emergent Wetlands	Diversion Channel		30.9	1,247,510
	Open Water Canal I Drainage {WOTUS)	Diversion Channel		1.8	57,112
MR&T levee to back levee	Non-wetland {uplands)	Diversion Channel		230.0	1,765,532
Barataria Basin	Waterbottom	Outfall Transition Zone		4.0	100,000
Cumulative Subtotals	Riverine			14.0	350,000
	Wetlands			38.3	1,577,356
	Open Water Canall Drainage {WOTUS)			1.8	57,112
	Waterbottom I Emergent wetlands			4.0	100,000
	Non-wetland {uplands)			230.0	1,765,532
			Total	288.0	3,850,000

Step 10b & 10c. Fill					
Location	Habitat Type (existing)	Feature	Material	Area (acres)	Fill (CY)
			Soil,		
MR&T levee west to LA 23	Forested Wetlands	Construction access	gravel	2.4	11,568
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	2.4	25,931
			Soil,		
LA 23 west to back levee	Emergent Wetlands	Construction access	gravel	22.8	110,207
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	24.7	221,031
			Soil,		
LA 23 west to back levee	Open Water Canal I Drainage (WOTUS)	Construction access	gravel	2.1	10,261
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	2.4	23,293
			Soil,		
MR&T levee to back levee	Non-wetland {uplands)	Construction access	gravel	64.5	311,964
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	41.5	1,129,746
			Soil,		
Construction Routes	Non-wetland {uplands)	Access I Haul Roads	gravel	1.5	8,000
			Topsoil,		
Barataria Basin (Benefits)	Waterbottom I Emergent wetlands	Nourishment Disposal Area	soil	390*	2,300,000
Cumulative Subtotals	Wetlands			52.3	368.737
	Open Water Canall Drainage (WOTUS)			4.5	33,554
	Non-wetland {uplands)			107.5	1,449,710
	Waterbottom I Emergent wetlands	Land I marsh building		390	2,300,000
			Total	554.3	4,152,001

10b. and 10c. Supplemental Fill Information

Note: Due to preliminary design stage, the amount of fill material by type (e.g., soil, rock, concrete, etc.) is approximate.

* Excavated from channel and placed in Barataria Basin.

11a. Total acres of wetlands and/or waterbottoms filled and/or excavated:

- Wetlands excavated = 38.3 acres
- Wetlands filled = 52.3 acres
- Waterbottom excavated = 4.0 acres
- Waterbottom filled = 390 acres

P20131098 Needs and Alternatives Justification

Background

The proposed sediment diversion project was initially identified as part of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) funded Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient and Freshwater Redistribution Study (MRSNFR) in 2000. Subsequent studies ensued relevant to the sediment diversion alternatives analysis including location, diversion flow, and ancillary features such as various combinations of marsh creation and sediment introduction. In 2001, the CWPPRA task force approved study of the Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove (BA-33) with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as the federal sponsor; a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was published in the Federal Register in 2002 and the public scoping resulted in a range of diversion operation for further analysis. The project was evaluated as a near-term critical restoration feature in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Final Programmatic EIS dated 2005 and included in the LCA restoration plan. The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 authorized USACE to carry out the Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove in accordance with the LCA restoration plan. As a result, the CWPPRA project was de-authorized in 2008 and transferred to USACE for implementation. Also in 2007, the State of Louisiana included the CWPPRA Mississippi River Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging in the Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (Master Plan). The Master Plan was updated in 2012 and the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion was identified as a project in the First Implementation Period (2012-2031). In 2016, the Natural Resources Damage Assessment (NRDA) Trustees established Mississippi River Diversions as an approved restoration alternative to restore resources injured by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion (Siphon) (BA-24) (1996-1998)

The Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion was moved forward under CWPPRA for further study with NMFS as the federal sponsor. Conceptual design consisted of a multiple pipe system capable of delivering up to 2,100 cfs of water from the Mississippi River to the back marsh area west of Myrtle Grove.

Myrtle Grove Ecosystem Restoration Project—Coast 2050 (1997-1998)

The Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force (a federal-state multi-agency partnership), in partnership with the Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Authority, published *Coast 2050: Toward a Sustainable Coastal Louisiana* in December 1998. *Coast 2050 set* forth a new approach to 1) sustain a coastal ecosystem with the essential functions and values of the natural ecosystem; 2) restore the ecosystem to the highest practicable acreage of productive and diverse wetlands; and 3) accomplish restoration through an integrated program that has multiple use benefits for all coastal Louisiana communities and resources.

The 15,000 cfs delta-building diversion at Myrtle Grove was identified for near-term implementation (1-5 years) following completion of the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution (MRSNFR) Feasibility Study. The rationale was the Myrtle Grove diversion would provide information to assist in the planning of the next Mississippi River diversion.

Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution (MRSNFR) Study

(draft report & environmental resources document dated July 2000)

The CWPPRA Task Force funded the MRSNFR feasibility study with USACE as study lead. A Myrtle Grove Sediment Diversion with a capacity of 15,000 cfs through gated culverts at the Mississippi River was included as a major sediment diversion in the Initial Alternatives. Also included in the Initial Alternatives was a 5,000 cfs Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion through a siphon. The screening process resulted in both the Myrtle Grove Sediment Diversion and the Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion at Ironton being carried forward into the Intermediate Array of Alternatives.

The Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion would run at a capacity of 5,000 cfs and freshen or stabilize salinities in the Round Lake/Lake Laurier vicinity. Although not a sediment diversion, it was expected that this diversion would introduce sediment into the Barataria Basin, creating over 1,400 ac of marsh and sustaining approximately 6,500 ac of emergent wetlands over 50 years. The total cost was estimated to be \$29,679,827. Located at River Mile 59 AHP, the diversion structure would consist of four 10 ft x 10 ft gated concrete box culverts approximately 400 ft long under LA 23. The highway would be relocated closer to the railroad so the culverts could be placed under both facilities. In order to efficiently capture freshwater, the invert of the entrance channel would be placed at a depth of -10 NGVD with a radius of 130 ft; the conveyance channel would run 6,000 feet from the entrance channel to the outlet channel and would be 100 feet wide. Parallel guide levees would be constructed to maintain hurricane protection and a pump station would be constructed to provide local drainage.

The Myrtle Grove Sediment Diversion would run at a capacity of 15,000 cfs to freshen the lower Barataria Basin. Located at RM 59 AHP, the diversion structure would consist of five 16 ft x 16 ft gated concrete box culverts approximately 400 feet long under LA 23. The highway would be relocated closer to the railroad so the culverts could be placed under both facilities. In order to efficiently capture sediment, the invert of the entrance channel would be placed at a depth of -15 ft NGVD with a radius of 450 feet and proceed 800 feet to 1,000 feet into the box culverts for transport to the basin. A channel with a 230 ft bottom would be dredged to Wilkinson Canal; this channel would bend with a radius of 700 feet as it approached the canal in order to provide better flow conditions. Channel closures would be placed in channels intersecting Wilkinson Canal. Approximately 6,000 ac of marsh would be created; at the end of 50 years 12% of the 1990 marsh acreage would be lost but there would still be approximately 28,000 more acres of marsh than if the diversion had not been implemented.

A diversion at Myrtle Grove with locks was also evaluated. A 15 ft long pilot channel would be excavated from the Mississippi River to Barataria Bay. The bottom width of the pilot channel would be 200 feet and the invert would be -10 ft NGVD. Two 45 ft x 130 ft x 830 ft lock chambers would be constructed in the initial project year with additional chambers constructed in years 10 and 35. Approximately 5 years after construction, a closure would be constructed across the Mississippi River channel in order to divert river flow down the pilot channel. Without locks, approximately 70% of Mississippi River flow and sediment would be diverted into the Barataria Basin.

Myrtle Grove Ecosystem Restoration Project (CWPPRA)

Primary purpose of study, conducted under MRSNFR, was identification of the recommended plan to provide maximum benefit to the study area while taking into account sustainability and cost. The project objective was creation of a sustainable, functional ecosystem with a focus on sediment delivery through the restoration of fresh and intermediate marshes in the upper, highly deteriorated portions of the study area and to restore marsh and reduce land loss rates in the southern portions of the basin and reduce average annual salinities throughout the study area. Study focused on a diversion located on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River between RM 61.3 and 60.8.

The study integrated the alternatives identified in the MRSNFR. Studied flow rates included 2,500 cfs, 5,000 cfs, and 15,000 cfs in addition to dedicated dredging.

Myrtle Grove—LCA Recommended Restoration Plan (2000-2005)

The study team defined the primary area of wetland restoration to be bounded on the east by the Citrus Lands levee, on the north by the southern extent of "The Pen," on the west by the Barataria Bay Waterway and the Bayou Grande Cheniere ridge, and on the south by the southern extents of Round Lake and Lake Laurier. The team adopted the LCA proposed alternatives for diversion capacities of 5,000 cfs and 15,000 cfs and modified an LCA proposed alternative to an operation of 5,000 cfs 4 out of 5 years and 15,000 cfs in the 5th year. The team also proposed a diversion capacity of 2,500 cfs.

As part of the LCA feasibility study, a total of five operation scenarios were evaluated for Myrtle Grove. These scenarios were: 1) a 5,000 cfs diversion; 2) a 15,000 cfs diversion; 3) a 38,000 cfs diversion with sediment enrichment; 4) a 75,000 cfs diversion with sediment enrichment; and 5) a 150,000 cfs diversion with sediment enrichment. Plan formulation resulted in a medium diversion (5,000 cfs – 15,000 cfs) and a large diversion (greater than 15,000 cfs) carried forward. Following further evaluation, the medium diversion was selected as the alternative to carry forward.

As proposed in the LCA feasibility study, the Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging considered an operation range between 2,500 cfs and 15,000 cfs to create up to 19,700 new acres of wetlands. This diversion would be operated in conjunction with the Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion, which is authorized for control of salinities in the Barataria Basin; the operation of the Davis Pond project would be modified in order to achieve the goals of the Myrtle Grove project. A total of 19 to 23 sites would be selected for the placement of dredged material to create a total of 6,500 acres of marsh; approximately 2 million cubic yards of material would be dredged from the Mississippi River for the dedicated marsh creation.

CWPPRA Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove (BA-33) (2001-2008)

In 2001, the CWPPRA Task Force approved feasibility study for a project titled Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove with NMFS as the federal sponsor. As proposed, this project would combine a freshwater diversion of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove with dedicated dredging from borrow sites in the Mississippi River to create marsh in the vicinity of Bayou Dupont, the Bayou Barataria Waterway, and/or the Wilkinson Canal. A NOI to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register

and the public scoping resulted in a range of diversion operations from 2,500 cfs to 15,000 cfs for further analysis.

Per the project fact sheet, the project would install five 16 ft x 16 ft gated box culverts on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove. The intake structure would be set at -15 ft NGVD and convey a maximum of 15,000 cfs to the outfall at the basin. Sediment capture would be maximized through a reverse curve inflow channel. Other project features would include a conveyance channel with parallel mainline flood control levees, and outflow channel with guide levees, and, potentially, a pump station.

In 2006, the process began to de-authorize the project and transfer it from CWPPRA to USACE's LCA program. The rationale was the project was beyond traditional CWPPRA efforts in terms of scope and cost; also, a Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging project was identified as a critical near-term restoration project in the LCA Chief's Report.

Louisiana Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (2007)

A Technical Group of scientists evaluated conceptual scenarios for Mississippi River diversions in 2006 at the "Envisioning the Future of the Gulf Coast" symposium. A freshwater diversion at Myrtle Grove was recommended. The Mississippi River Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging was evaluated in the Master Plan; the evaluated diversion would operate at a flow between 2,500 cfs to 15,000 cfs to transport freshwater from the Mississippi River to the basin and dredged material from the river would be transported to the Barataria Basin via pipeline.

Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging (LCA, 2008-2014)

WRDA 2007 included an authorization for USACE to prepare a feasibility study and EIS for the Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging under the LCA program. This project was conditionally authorized in the 2005 LCA Chief's Report, pending the completion of a feasibility study. For the Myrtle Grove cost-shared study, the project was described as a freshwater diversion ranging from 2,500 cfs to 15,000 cfs coupled with dedicated dredging to create up to 19,700 ac of new wetlands.

The dog-legged alignment, referred to as Original USACE Alignment at RM 60.2, was designed to carry a flow of 15,000 cfs to the basin; the sediment/water ratio (SWR) was 0.26. A Modified Alignment of a straight channel from river to basin, located at RM 60.7, was modeled with capacities of 15,000 cfs, 45,000 cfs, and 75,000 cfs. The results were published in 2011 in a report titled, "Myrtle Grove Delta Building Diversion Modeling Effort in Support of the LCA Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging Project Data Collection, Preliminary Design and Modeling Initiative."

Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (2012)

Modeling conducted for the evaluation of projects against the Future Without Action scenario showed that sediment diversions are essential to sustaining coastal Louisiana. The 2012 Master Plan focused on sediment diversions, rather than freshwater diversions, as a land-building restoration tool. A 50,000 cfs sediment diversion at Myrtle Grove was included in the First Implementation Period (2012-2031).

BA-153, State Only E&D (2012-2014)

CPRA entered into a contract with HDR Engineering in 2012 to provide services for the design of the LCA recommended 75,000 cfs diversion structure at RM 60.7 to capture and transport sediment and freshwater from the Mississippi River and convey it to the mid-Barataria Basin through a constructed channel. The project utilized the SWR results and Modified Alignment from the State-NGO modeling.

Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (2016)

Under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA), the Trustees evaluated injuries to natural resources and natural resource services and then identified the actions to restore, replace, or acquire natural resources or services equivalent to those injured by the Deepwater Horizon BP Spill. When implemented, the goal for these actions is to return the natural resources and natural resource services to the condition they would have been in if the incident had not occurred. OPA defines natural resource services as "the functions performed by a natural resource for the benefit of another natural resource (ecological services) and/or the public." This evaluation was documented in a Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (PDARP).

A total of three (3) action alternatives were evaluated along with the No Action Alternative. Alternative A, Comprehensive Integrated Ecosystem Restoration, emphasizes the broad ecosystem benefits that can be realized through coastal habitat restoration in combination with resource-specific restoration; this is the preferred alternative. Alternative B focuses on restoring as directly as practical for assessed injuries. Alternative C defers restoration plan development in favor of continued injury assessment with development of a comprehensive plan at a later date. Alternative D is the natural recovery/no-action alternative. The alternatives were evaluated under the following OPA standards: 1) cost; 2) extent to which goals and objectives are met; 3) likelihood of success; 4) extent of preventing future injury and avoiding collateral injury as a result of implementation; 5) extent to which more than one natural resource and/or service is benefitted; 6) effect on public health and safety; and 7) consistency with programmatic Trustee goals and the restoration types.

The Trustees developed four (4) programmatic goals for restoration: 1) Restore and Conserve Habitat; 2) Restore Water Quality; 3) Replenish and Protect Living Coastal and Marine Resources; and 4) Provide and Enhance Recreational Opportunities. Restoration types were developed as sub-categories to the larger programmatic goals. The two (2) restoration types under Restore and Conserve Habitat are: 1) Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats and 2) Habitat Projects on Federally Managed Lands. Both of these restoration types were proposed to benefit habitats as well as injured species of fish and invertebrates in the water column, marine mammals, and birds by providing food, shelter, breeding, and nursery habitat.

Goals of the Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats Restoration Type are to: 1) restore a variety of interspersed and ecologically connected coastal habitats to maintain ecosystem diversity with a particular focus on maximizing ecological functions for the range of resources injured by the spill; 2) restore for injuries in habitats in the geographic areas where the injuries occurred while considering

approaches that provide resiliency and sustainability; and 3) restoration of habitats in appropriate combinations for any given geographic area by considering design factors such as connectivity, size, and distance between projects to address injuries to the associated living coastal and marine resources and restore the ecological functions provided by those habitats. Specific projects were not evaluated in the PDARP; however, Under Alternative A, controlled Mississippi River diversions, such as MBSD, are one such restoration approach for implementation to accomplish the goals of this restoration type.







SHEET NO. DESCRIPTION

- 1 TITLE SHEET
- 2 GENERAL NOTES, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS
- 3 PROJECT LAYOUT
- 4 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL LAYOUT
- 5 OVERALL ROADWAY AND RAIL PLAN
- 6 CHENIER TRAVERSE BAYOU PUMP STATION SITE
- 7 TYPICAL CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION (1 OF 2)
- 8 TYPICAL CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION (2 OF 2)
- 9 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTION (1 OF 2)
- 10 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTIONS (2 OF 2)
- 11 DISPOSAL AREA
- 12 POTENTIAL SEDIMENT DEPOSITION/LAND BUILDING AREA



20,000' 10,000' 0' 20,000' 40,000'

APPLICATION BY: CPRA P.O. BOX 44027 BATON ROUGE, LA 70804 COASTAL PROTECTION & RESTORATION AUTHORITY 450 LAUREL STREET		MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION PROJECT	TITLE SHEET		
	BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA / 0001		STATE PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153	DATE: JUNE 2016	
DRAWN BY. K. CANTU	DESIGNED BY K. GUILLORY, P.E.	APPROVED BY: R. SIMONEAUX, P.E.	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER:	SHEET 1 OF 12	

GENERAL NOTES

1 THESE PLANS WERE DEVELOPED USING 2010 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY, NAD83, LOUISIANA STATE COORDINATE SYSTEM, SOUTH ZONE.

2. ALL ELEVATIONS SHOWN ARE IN NAVD 88

3. AS-BUILT DRAWINGS WILL BE SUBMITTED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT TO THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, COASTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION, P.O. BOX 44487, BATON ROUGE, LA 70804-4487

4. THE PERMIT APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE LOUISIANA ONE CALL SYSTEM (1-800-272-3020) A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY EXCAVATION (DIGGING. DREDGING, JETTING, ETC.) OR DEMOLITION ACTIVITY.

5. ALL NORTHING / EASTING AND LATITUDE / LONGITUDE VALUES ARE BASED ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN DATA AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

6, ALL ELEVATIONS ARE BASED ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN DATA AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

FEATURE LOCATION TABLE

DESCRIPTION	NORTHING / LATITUDE	EASTING / LONGITUDE
POB CHANNEL BASELINE	426308.37 / 29° 39' 54.20" N	3717488.25 / 89° 57' 30.31" W
POE CHANNEL BASELINE	417902.28 / 29* 38' 32,30" N	3706292.82 / 89° 59' 38.32" W
DIVERSION GATE STRUCTURE	424567.11/29" 39' 37.24" N	3715169.19/89* 57' 56.83" W
BACK STRUCTURE	418983,06 / 29° 38' 42,84" N	3707732.23 / 89" 59' 21.86" W
POB PUMP STATION BASELINE	424556,45 / 29° 39' 38.77" N	3701081.76 / 90" 00' 36.50" W
POE PUMP STATION BASELINE	424331.16 / 29* 39' 36 65" N	3700158.86 / 90* 00' 46 99" W



ABBREVIATIONS

AFFROA	APPROXIMATE
B/L	BASELINE
CFS	CUBIC FEET PER SECOND
CL	CENTERLINE
DWG	DRAWING
E	EASTING
EL, ELEV	ELEVATION
HORIZ	HORIZONTAL
HWY	HIGHWAY
LA	LOUISIANA
MHW	MEAN HIGH WATER
MLW	MEAN LOW WATER
MR&T	MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES LEVEE
N	NORTHING
NO	NUMBER
NOV	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE LEVEE
POB	POINT OF BEGINNING
POE	POINT OF ENDING
RD	ROAD
ROW	RIGHT OF WAY
STA	STATION
TBD	TO BE DETERMINED
TYP	TYPICAL
VC	VERTICAL CURVE
VERT	VERTICAL
W	WESTING
	Little a los

450 LAUREL STREET

DESIGNED BY: K. GUILLORY, P.E.

APPLICATION BY

CPRA

P.O. BOX 44027

BATON ROUGE, LA 70804

DRAWN BYCANTU

























Potential Waters of the U.S., Including Wetlands Memorandum

То	Micaela Coner, Liz Davoli Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana		
From	Brooke Savant, James Thomas, HDR		
СС	Neil McLellan, Betty Dehoney, HDR		
Date	July 30, 2014	Job No.	BA 153-01

RE: Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153), Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, Report for Delineation and Evaluation of Potential Waters of the U.S., Including Wetlands, July 2014 Amendment

Introduction

The Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA) authorized HDR to perform a delineation and evaluation of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD, or proposed project). The intent of this memorandum is to disclose the findings of HDR's:

- on-site evaluation and delineation of waters of the U.S. as defined by the Clean Water Act, including wetlands, for the preliminary proposed channel footprint
- expanded desktop delineation of a portion of the proposed project's immediate outfall

The information included in this memorandum is considered a complete evaluation of existing wetland conditions and delineation report for waters of the U.S., including wetlands, and will be used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) New Orleans District to support its jurisdictional determination, evaluation of fill impacts, and permit decision for the proposed project.

The proposed project would divert Mississippi River sediment-laden water through a new diversion structure installed in the Mississippi River and Tributary (MR&T) levee north of Ironton, Louisiana, into degraded marshes in the Barataria Basin to the west. The MBSD would provide sediment and nutrients to restore, build, and maintain wetlands. HDR completed a wetland delineation, proposed jurisdictional determination, and habitat classification of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, to assess potential impacts of dredged and fill placement activities necessary to construct the proposed project.

Methods

The evaluation included both the preliminary diversion channel footprint and an area of the immediate outfall using a combination of on-site and remote sensing methods, consistent with the flexibility allowed for conducting routine determinations in the USACE 1987 *Wetland Delineation Manual* (USACE 1987) and regional supplements. The delineation of waters of the U.S. was originally completed within the proposed project construction area limits or channel footprint (including a 200-foot construction servitude) in November 2012 for submittal to USACE as part of the Joint Application pursuant to Programmatic General Permits and Coastal Use Permits for the geotechnical investigations and as a required attachment in the Joint Application for an Individual Permit submitted on July 23, 2013.


The on-site field delineation included examination of habitats within the preliminary boundary of the proposed project's footprint (that is, an approximately 1,400-foot-wide corridor, 12,000 feet in length).

Data collected during the field visit included photographs as well as information on vegetation, soils, and hydrology as specified in the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region* (Version 2.0) (USACE 2010) and recorded on wetland determination data forms. These data forms and corresponding site photos are included in Attachment B. Additionally, 35,000 acres of the proposed diversion outfall area (U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC] #80903010408) were evaluated through a desktop evaluation or Level 1 routine determination (USACE 1987) of existing wetland and habitat conditions for inclusion in the project's proposed jurisdictional determination.

The methods employed for the delineation and proposed jurisdictional determination of waters of the U.S. varied between the proposed diversion channel footprint—lying primarily between the MR&T levee and the Non-Federal Levee (that is, the back levee)—and the outfall area, consisting primarily of intertidal and subtidal estuarine wetlands and open water habitats, including natural sloughs, bayous, and ponds, as well as excavated channels and collapsed marsh. The following subsections describe the methods and objectives for each evaluation.

Diversion Channel Footprint

The on-site delineation and habitat evaluation of waters of the U.S., including wetlands for the proposed channel footprint (preliminary study limit) was conducted on November 12 and 13, 2012, by HDR wetland scientists and experienced delineators Joe Moake, Christine Magers, and Richard Wilson. During the field visit, HDR scientists generally walked transects (Figure 1) both north and south of the proposed project centerline to collect data on the wetland habitats present within the proposed diversion channel footprint limits. Data were collected (Attachment B) as described above for various soil, vegetation, and hydrologic conditions along these transects to evaluate habitat quality and the approximate percentage of wetland conditions. In addition, HDR noted the presence of other aquatic and excavated drainage features.

Spatial data for the evaluation of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, within the proposed channel footprint limits were collected using a 2010 Trimble GeoXT handheld Global Positioning System (GPS) unit and were post-processed using Trimble GPS Analyst for ArcGIS 10 to ensure sub-meter accuracy. Following the collection of spatial data, the preliminary extent of waters of the U.S. was mapped in ArcGIS 10 based on the field data collection and recent aerial photography.

The latest spatial soil map units for the diversion channel footprint were obtained from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey website. Additionally, the NRCS database information for each soil map unit was evaluated to determine which soil types are listed as hydric and under what conditions. Finally, during on-site routine delineation and jurisdictional determination surveys, soil conditions were assessed at each data point (see data sheets in Attachment B) taken within wetland vegetation communities, with the exception of those exhibiting signs of sufficient hydrology indicators or prolonged inundation. For flooded or ponded areas, an aquic moisture regime and hydric soils can be inferred due to the length of inundation or saturation leading to anaerobic conditions.

The field delineation was conducted within 3 months of Hurricane Isaac, which caused substantial flooding throughout the area resulting in atypical hydrologic and vegetation indicators (rack and debris lines, water marks, vegetation modification, etc.). These indicators are typically most reliable where the soils have been heavily modified (agriculture, drainage improvements, etc.) and can present false positive indicators of wetland conditions in a major flooding event.



Figure 1. Preliminary delineation and proposed jurisdictional determination - waters of the U.S. in MBSD footprint

Consistent with the recommended methodology for atypical situations, additional data and information on the normal conditions were collected from other recent aerial photography and previous delineation and jurisdictional determination documentation. Subsequently, this delineation was updated based on information from USACE. Rob Heffner of the USACE New Orleans District, Regulatory Branch, provided information on recent, valid jurisdictional determinations (Attachment C) for the majority of the area within the limits of the diversion channel footprint (personal and electronic communications on January 18, 2013). This information was used in conjunction with recent aerial photography, including Pictometry® oblique photography taken before Hurricane Isaac, to refine the delineation boundary.

In March 2013, the proposed diversion site was revisited for the purpose of conducting geotechnical investigations. Normal site conditions observed during this field visit were consistent with the refined results of the HDR delineation report. Typical hydrologic and vegetation conditions have reestablished on the site and are consistent with the delineation and preliminary jurisdictional determination provided herein and in the Joint Permit Application submitted to the USACE and Office of Coastal Management in July 2013.

Diversion Outfall Area

Given the anticipated size of the deltaic land building restoration area for the MBSD project and the welldocumented tidal marsh and elevation conditions in the Barataria Basin (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2011; USGS 2011a, 2011b; U.S. Department of Agriculture 2010), HDR employed remote sensing for the evaluation of the proposed diversion outfall area using a variety of publicly available datasets and aerial photographs. The primary objective of the evaluation was to determine the spatial extent, quantity, and configuration of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, other special aquatic sites, deep water habitats (>6.6 feet deep), and uplands (not waters of the U.S.) for consideration during alternatives analysis, evaluation of project effects, and the USACE's use in the Section 404(b)(1) water dependency determination. Since a key objective of the project is to restore coastal wetlands in the Barataria Basin, and given the dynamic nature of the estuarine ecosystem, remote sensing methods were determined to be adequate for project planning and permitting activities in lieu of on-site delineations of the expansive outfall study area.

Given that delineation is needed to assess existing wetland conditions in areas where potential fill would be placed, either directly or indirectly, and because no Area of Potential Effects has been defined from sediment modeling thus far, USGS HUC #080903010408, which includes 35,000 acres of the immediate outfall area, was assumed to be a sufficient study area for delineation efforts within the Barataria Basin. HDR wetland specialists and geographic information system (GIS) analysts developed delineation maps for the outfall delineation study. This area is bounded by the Non-Federal Levee (that is, the back levee) on the east, Barataria Waterway on the west, Cheniere Traverse Bayou to the north, and Lake Judge Perez, Lake Laurier, and Round Lake to the south. The outfall limits were selected based on preliminary modeling information regarding the anticipated extent of sediment deposition in the Barataria Basin as a result of the MBSD project. At a future date, if modeling identifies a larger extent of delta/land building, the outfall area limits can be expanded for delineations of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, and the report can be amended at that time. The proposed outfall area is a portion of the Mid-Barataria Basin consisting of a complex mosaic of marshes, bayous, subtidal ponds, shallow open water areas, vegetated shallows, excavated channels, spoil banks, and a few developed upland areas featuring residential and industrial sites. For the purposes of the delineation and evaluation of the outfall area, HDR analyzed publicly available spatial datasets (Table 1) to develop an accurate depiction of the following:

• spatial location of waters of the U.S., including special aquatic sites such as wetlands, vegetated shallows, and mudflats

- differentiation of wetland types/classifications (estuarine emergent marsh, palustrine wetlands, scrub/shrub habitats, forested wetlands, etc.), to the extent practicable
- location of uplands
- differentiation of natural open water habitats, shallow subtidal areas, and excavated canals

The following matrix in Table 1 provides an overview of the key characteristics of each dataset evaluated for use in this analysis and an assessment of the applicability to achieve the objectives defined above.

Dataset	Year of imagery/ publication	Data	Constraints
Sasser et al. (2014) - USGS Marsh Vegetation Classification	2014	Includes an estimate of the extent of marsh types (that is, intermediate, brackish, saline) across the Louisiana Coastal Zone	Overestimates marsh by not accurately differentiating open water areas
USDA National Agriculture Imagery Program Satellite Imagery	2010	Most recent and detailed view of existing Basin land uses and vegetation community extents and conditions	Mosaic images create discrepancies in pixel values for similar cover types; difficult to distinguish submerged vegetation and shallows from areas of turbidity given the limitations of aerials (for example, cloud cover, signature inconsistencies)
NWI Mapping	Aerial: 1988, 1989 Publication: 2011	Comprehensive, detailed mapping of wetland and open water types (habitat classifications); provides historical context	Developed from 25-year-old image sources; not reflective of recent marsh loss or marsh creation projects; classification polygons misaligned from aerial base in some areas
USGS Land/Water Classification	2010	Most recent depiction of open water areas	30-meter resolution proved insufficient to identify localized conditions for MBSD project scale; overestimates water area by not capturing vegetated shallows and other marsh areas as land when compared with recent aerial imagery; no differentiation of wetland and open water types
USGS Land Area Change	2011	Assists with identification of marsh loss on a regional basis from 1973 to 2009	30-meter resolution proved insufficient to identify localized conditions for MBSD project scale; no differentiation of wetland types
USGS National Land Cover Database	2011	Recent land cover, including differentiation of wetland extents and types	30-meter resolution provided insufficient level of detail for MBSD project evaluation area; no differentiation of wetland types; overestimated marsh area

Table 1.Dataset overview

Notes: MBSD = Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion, USDA = U.S. Department of Agriculture, USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NWI - USFWS National Wetland Inventory , USGS = U.S. Geological Survey

For the purposes of this analysis, multiple datasets were used to support the desktop analysis to delineate jurisdictional waters and wetlands in the outfall study area. This analysis supported the differentiation between wetland and open water, as well as differentiating between different types of wetland habitats (that is, estuarine emergent marsh, palustrine wetlands, scrub/shrub habitats, forested wetlands, etc.) at a scale appropriate for the outfall study area. Although it is the most recent of datasets, the 2013 USGS marsh classification dataset does not provide the local level of mapping or differentiation detail required for the analysis. The USGS marsh classification data were collected through aerial transect surveys and photographic interpretation for the entire Louisiana coast. Although these data provide an overview of recent regional conditions, they showed inconsistencies in open water areas when compared with regional USGS 2010 land/water classification data and recent aerial photographs. For example, smaller areas in the MBSD outfall study area that have undergone marsh collapse during the past several decades are currently subtidal open water areas, but were classified in the USGS 2013 classification as brackish marsh. As a result, the USGS vegetation dataset overestimates marsh acreage in the outfall study area (HUC #080903010408) and underestimates open water areas by more than 17,000 acres. Because of these inconsistencies, the USGS marsh classification dataset was not used for the delineation and classification of marsh in the MBSD outfall study area.

Other datasets were reviewed and were not incorporated because of various constraints in the adequacy or applicability of the data. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Agriculture Imagery Program's (NAIP's) aerial imagery provides a relatively recent and detailed view of Barataria Basin conditions, but would require a substantial amount of time to develop into a classified land cover dataset given inconsistencies between photographs across the large study area. Other available datasets such as the USGS land/water classification, land area change, and land cover datasets were developed for the entire Louisiana coast at a resolution scale of 30 meters, which, as described above, proved too coarse to provide enough detail for delineation and classification. Additionally, a comparison of these spatial datasets with recent aerial photography identified substantial discrepancies in either the classification of marsh or submerged, open water habitats (Figures A-1 to A-3 in Attachment A). So while these datasets can be beneficial to estimate land to water ratios for large areas along the coast, they are too coarse to classify habitat areas and, when overlaid on top of the 2010 imagery, showed an overestimation of areas of water, which the NWI mapping accurately depicted as wetlands.

The process of overlaying the more recent datasets such as the 2010 USGS land/water classification dataset with the NWI mapping to perform spatial updates was evaluated but ultimately ruled out because of the discrepancies in mapping resolution. In other words, overlaying the USGS data that was created at a 30-meter resolution and does not adequately depict smaller areas of wetlands and marsh with the more detailed NWI mapping would have introduced a substantial amount of error.

Selected Approach for Diversion Outfall Area

Based on the evaluation of existing spatial data (USGS mapping, NWI mapping, NRCS mapping, aerial photos, Coastwide Reference Monitoring System [CRMS] data, tidal gauge data, etc.), the predominance of wetlands plant communities, and the consistency of mapping and conditions observed during a site visit to the proposed diversion outfall area in July 2012, it was determined a Level 1 (Onsite Inspection Unnecessary) Routine Determination was suitable for the outfall area. In accordance with the 1987 Wetlands Delineation Manual, a Level 1 determine the presence of wetlands and upland conditions over the entire study area. This guidance was primarily written to ensure wetland areas (waters of the U.S.) were not inadvertently determined to be uplands (that is, false negatives) that would result in unpermitted fill activities. The 1987 Delineation Manual provides flexibility for the use of professional judgment for applying Level 1 methods for expansive study areas with data to support a determination

that wetland conditions are highly likely to occur. Due to the high-quality aerial photography, the prevalence of open water and marsh habitats, and the detailed hydrologic and soils mapping for the area, a Level 1 determination as described in Section D, Subsection 1 of the 1987 Manual is appropriate.

Wetland Vegetation Community Analysis

The approach selected as the best method to achieve the stated objectives for the outfall area was to utilize the USFWS NWI dataset with minor modifications to include recently constructed uplands (dredge placement) and marsh creation areas not included in the NWI base mapping. The USFWS NWI dataset delineates the areal extent of wetlands and surface waters as defined by Cowardin et al. (1979). Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the national mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect submerged wetlands types (sea grasses, submerged aquatic vegetation found in the intertidal and subtidal zones, etc.). The mapping was produced as topical overlays using USGS topographic maps as the base and stereoscopic aerial photo interpretation to determine wetland habitat types and uplands. The hard-copy product is a composite map showing topographic and planimetric features from the USGS map base and wetlands and deepwater habitats from USFWS's topical overlay. The maps were then converted to digital files. The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of collateral data, and the amount of ground verification work conducted.

Although the base imagery used for the NWI mapping is approximately 25 years old, based on a comparison with other collected publicly available datasets and recent high resolution aerial photography, it is the best available representation of the location, type, extent, and spatial configuration of wetlands and other special aquatic habitats. While more recent datasets do provide high resolution mapping to differentiate between vegetated and non-vegetated water habitats, they do not provide the differentiation needed between wetland types. These datasets were generated from imagery classification of aerial photographs at 30-meter resolution, resulting in a substantial underestimation of vegetated areas (Figures A-1 to A-3 in Attachment A). The modified NWI dataset provides the best classification of wetlands, other special aquatic sites (vegetated shallows, tidal mudflats, etc.), non-vegetated deep water habitats (natural and excavated), and uplands. To classify various types of NWI features into the groupings mentioned above for the diversion outfall limits area, HDR wetland scientists overlaid the NWI data with the more recent 2010 satellite imagery. This aided in the process of assigning both the HDR Type classification (that is, open water, wetlands and uplands) as well as the HDR subtypes (that is, forested, scrub/shrub and emergent for wetlands and uplands) as well as the HDR subtypes (that is, forested, scrub/shrub and emergent for wetlands and vegetated shallows, natural and excavated for open water) to specific NWI classifications.

Several modifications were made to the original NWI mapping to improve its accuracy and currentness. First, gaps in the source data were reviewed on the 2010 aerials and were determined to largely be spoil banks of excavated canals that are predominantly scrub/shrub wetlands, with the possibility of minor upland inclusions. Next, minor modifications of the NWI dataset were made to account for recent humaninduced land changes not captured in the base imagery, including the addition of a developed/upland map unit category for improved areas such as the Myrtle Grove Marina, which includes constructed uplands, as well as oil and gas development areas in the marsh consisting of dredged material and infrastructure. Overall, this category accounts for a very small percentage of the study area. Additionally, the data were edited to include the 2009 development of the BA-39, a marsh restoration project occurring in the northeastern portion of the proposed MBSD diversion outfall. BA-39 involves piping renewable river sediment into the area of degraded marsh to encourage sediment accretion and the establishment of marsh vegetation. Due to the operations of BA-39, this area in the upper northeastern corner of the outfall delineation area changed from a predominately subtidal, open water, degraded habitat type to emergent marsh surrounded by a low ring levee. Finally, while the majority of the NWI mapping was well-aligned to the 2010 satellite imagery, small sections of the NWI data were slightly shifted in a certain direction. These areas were adjusted to better align with the imagery.

While the modified NWI classification does overestimate the amount of emergent marsh due to the basinwide loss of marsh through various hydrogeologic processes (e.g., tidal erosion, relative sea level rise, lack of sediment, and tropical storm surge erosion) leading to marsh collapse, it is still the most accurate representation of the spatial extent of special aquatic sites in the study area.

Upon completion of all spatial and tabular modifications to the source NWI data, acreages were calculated for all wetland types and subtypes. These acreages are summarized by both by habitat types as well as individual wetland classifications in Tables 4 and 5 in the following results section. Based on an overall spatial and visual comparison of the older NWI classifications with the more recent 2010 satellite imagery and the USGS Land/Water Classification data, the primary change in the diversion outfall delineation area has been the conversion of intertidal estuarine emergent marsh to subtidal estuarine unconsolidated bottom (submerged) areas. HDR wetland scientists and GIS analysts estimated the loss of marsh (since the base mapping was completed in 1989) to be approximately 10 to 20 percent basin-wide, but such loss is highly variable depending on site-specific conditions and varies from approximately 5 to 50 percent. Based on a site visit to the proposed MBSD immediate outfall area of the Basin in July 2012, several of the subtidal vegetated shallow areas were observed to consist of rooted and floating submergent vegetation, dominated by Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*) and widgeon grass (*Ruppia maritima*). Delineation of vegetated shallows is likely underestimated given substantial changes that can occur seasonally and in response to tropical storm surges.

Hydrologic Conditions Analysis

A wetland water budget is the total inflows and outflows of water from a wetland. Coastal wetlands such as those in Barataria Basin, while also receiving direct runoff, precipitation, and groundwater inflow, are strongly influenced by surface water (permanent and seasonal) and tidal cycles, particularly in areas of subsidence or lower elevations (CPRA 2011). Sufficient hydrology for the support of wetlands in the diversion channel and outfall area include surface water and streamflow from natural and artificial bayous and canals, freshwater surface flows from the Naomi siphon, Davis Pond diversion, and the Intracoastal Waterway, groundwater discharge, and tides (CPRA 2011).

Using data from a hydrologic modeling effort completed in 2014 by HDR, an elevation analysis was performed for wetland habitat types within the diversion outfall area to perform a comparison with water level and tidal elevation ranges to observe the influence hydrology sources had on ponding, flooding, and soil saturation. Conclusions and data are presented in the results section discussed further in the document.

Continuous hydrologic water surface elevation data were also collected from the CRMS. However, only four CRMS locations were within the delineation boundary for the diversion outfall area (HUC #080903010408). Given the data from only four locations (CRMS 0225, 0276, 3601, 3617) within the 35,000-acre study area, no single water surface elevation or combination of these locations can serve as a representative value for such a dynamic landscape with fluctuating service elevations and subsidence rates. Therefore, average elevation data for the outfall study area and a comparison with tidal elevation trends was conducted to evaluate the hydrologic conditions in vegetated areas.

Soils Analysis

The predominant soils found in the NRCS soils map unit spatial files and documentation were evaluated for the diversion channel footprint and the outfall area. The NRCS National Hydric Soils List was referenced to determine which soils in the study limits were on the list and under which criteria. Site conditions were assessed based on field conditions and aerial photographs for non-forested habitats to

determine whether the soils were similar to the map unit descriptions and if they included hydric conditions or smaller hydric components (that is, inclusions). Hydrology and elevation data were also used in the diversion outfall delineation area to infer that soil saturation likely occurs in the upper 12 inches of the soil profile for at least 3 weeks in the majority of the study area, with the exception of those areas built up with fill, due to tidal inundation and other sources of flow.

Results

Diversion Channel Footprint

Results of the delineation and habitat evaluation for waters of the U.S., including wetlands, are presented in Figure 1 and Table 2. Representative photographs of the proposed project site are presented later in this memorandum and following corresponding wetland determination data forms in Attachment B. The diversion channel footprint of approximately 362 acres contains forested wetlands, emergent wetlands, and open water habitats considered waters of the U.S., including canals that were excavated for agriculture, drainage, and potential access. Additionally, the study area contains numerous smaller ditches excavated for drainage associated with historical agricultural practices. Drainage channels within wetlands or that have relatively permanent water and are contiguous or adjacent to traditional navigable waters (TNWs) are generally considered jurisdictional waters of the U.S., whereas other excavated ditches and an excavated pond that are not connected to other tributaries or not adjacent to waters of the U.S. are typically considered non-jurisdictional. Both circumstances occur within different portions of the diversion channel footprint.

Table 2.	Aquatic habitats considered waters of the U.S.
in the div	ersion channel footprint

Туре	Acres
Forested wetland	10.0
Emergent wetland	85.2
Open water (canal)	7.3
Total	102.5

At the northeastern portion of the diversion channel footprint, forested wetlands occur in the batture area between the MR&T levee and the Mississippi River. The entire area appears to be seasonally flooded but well-drained due to slopes. Primary hydrology indicators present are drift deposits and inundation that can be seen on aerial photography. Supportive dominant vegetation in the overstory is primarily obligate (OBL) and facultative-wet (FACW) species including black willow (*Salix nigra*), with Chinese tallow (*Triadica sebifera*), swamp privet (*Forestiera acuminata*), smartweeds (*Polygonum* spp.), coco-yam (*Colocasia esculenta*), and peppervine (*Ampelopsis arborea*). This habitat type appears to consist of early successional vegetation, including exotic and invasive species (Chinese tallow and coco-yam).

Within the proposed footprint from the MR&T levee to Belle Chasse Highway (LA 23), a mixture of uplands and forested wetlands occurs. Within this area, three forested wetland depressions occur that appear to be seasonally inundated within their entire extent. The remaining area surrounding the wetland depressions is slightly higher uplands. For forested wetland areas, primary hydrology indicators are water marks, water-stained leaves, and inundation seen on aerial photography. These forested wetlands areas are dominated by OBL species but consist of boxelder (*Acer negundo*), Chinese tallow (exotic), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), rough-leaf dogwood (*Cornus drummondii*), and peppervine. Other non-dominant woody species present include deciduous holly (*Ilex decidua*), water oak (*Quercus nigra*), and black willow. This

vegetation composition is characteristic of regrowth colonizing and non-native species rather than true bottomland hardwood forest (see data forms in Attachment B for site-specific hydrology indicators and dominant vegetation). Between LA 23 and the back levee adjacent to marsh, the proposed footprint contains pasture and numerous drainage ditches excavated for and remaining from past agricultural practices. Near LA 23 a small pond also exists that was likely excavated for livestock watering and borrow material. Three excavated canals cross the area that carry drainage to pumps at the Wilkinson Canal near Myrtle Grove to the southeast. The current use of the pasture habitat in the proposed footprint appears to be cattle grazing. To the southwest, closest to the marsh, the pasture habitat transitions from uplands primarily vegetated with bermudagrass (*Cynodon dactylon*) to wetland increasingly dominated by smartweed and cattail (*Typha* sp.). This emergent wetland appears to be the result of inundation/saturation resulting from subsidence. In this wetland, given the problematic vegetation and hydrology indicators from the recent Hurricane Isaac (late August 2012), the wetland boundary was estimated using transects and reviewing recent aerial photography.

The soils within the diversion channel footprint limits are heavily modified by past agricultural, flood control, and transportation improvements. However, several of the soils within the delineation area exhibit frequently flooded characteristics or are positioned in depressional landscape areas due to the seasonal high water table and high annual precipitation and are listed on the current NRCS Hydric Soils List. The soil series and map units located within the diversion channel footprint include those listed in Table 3 with a description of each following below. Soil series descriptions and map units located within the MBSD footprint are displayed in Figure 2. Some soils, such as Cancienne Silty Clay Loam, include associated soil components or "inclusions" which occur within depressional areas and form hydric soil conditions when seasonal inundation or saturated conditions occur in the upper soil profile.

Soil map unit	Landscape position	Hydric soil list/Component
Clovelly Muck	Marshes	Yes/Hydric
Cancienne Silt Loam	Natural levees	Yes/Hydric inclusions of Gramercy soils (10%)
Cancienne Silty Clay Loam	Natural levees	Yes/Hydric inclusions of Gramercy soils (10%)
Carville, Cancienne, & Schriever Soils, frequently flooded	Batture, natural levees, depressions and backswamps	Yes/Hydric
Harahan Clay	Backswamps	Yes/Hydric
Westwego Clay	Backswamps	Yes/Hydric

Table 3. Soil map units located within diversion channel footprint

The Clovelly series consists of very deep, very poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils. These soils formed in moderately thick accumulations of herbaceous organic material overlying very fluid clayey alluvial sediments. These soils are on broad coastal marshes that are nearly continuously flooded with brackish water.



Figure 2. Preliminary delineation and proposed jurisdictional determination - soils in MBSD footprint

The Cancienne series consists of very deep, level to gently undulating, somewhat poorly drained mineral soils that are moderately slowly permeable. These soils formed in loamy and clayey alluvium. They are on high and intermediate positions on natural levees and deltaic fans of the Mississippi River and its distributaries. Cancienne series can contain hydric inclusions of Gramercy soils which do occur in the eastern portion of the diversion channel footprint between LA 23 and the MR&T Levee. The Gramercy series consists of fine, very deep, poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils that formed in clayey over fine-silty alluvium. These soils are on alluvial flats and on the lower parts of natural levees on the alluvial plain of the Mississippi River and its distributaries.

The Carville series consists of coarse-silty, very deep, somewhat poorly drained, moderately permeable soils that formed in recent loamy alluvium. These soils are on nearly level to very gently sloping natural levee positions on flood plains, mainly along the Mississippi River and its distributaries.

The Harahan series consist of very deep, poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils. They formed in moderately thick firm clayey alluvium overlying fluid clayey sediments. These soils are on broad backswamp positions on the lower Mississippi River flood plain.

The Schriever series consists of very fine, deep, poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils that formed in clayey alluvium. These soils are on the lower parts of natural levees and in backswamp positions on the lower Mississippi River alluvial plain.

The Westwego series consist of very fine, deep, poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils. They formed in semifluid clayey alluvium and organic material that dried and shrank irreversibly in the upper part as the result of artificial drainage. These soils are on broad, drained former swamps along the lower Mississippi River and its distributaries.

Diversion Outfall Area

Based on the analysis of land cover and vegetation datasets and aerial imagery, the 35,000-acre diversion outfall area studied is a mosaic of coastal habitats including palustrine wetlands; estuarine/palustrine, subtidal, and intertidal wetlands; scrub/shrub wetlands, and forested wetlands. Upland areas are mainly found near developed industrial and residential areas along excavated canals, but there is the potential for a minor component (<1 percent) of upland inclusions not readily observable using the remote sensing (Level 1) methods. Results of the delineation and habitat evaluation for waters of the U.S., including wetlands, are presented in Figure 3 (Sheets 1 to 4) and Table 4. The classifications used in Table 4 are summary categories of habitats typically depicted in delineations of waters of the U.S.

As described above, the data presented below are primarily based on detailed NWI mapping with minor modifications and likely overestimate the current extent of emergent marsh habitat types while underestimating open water (natural) and vegetated shallows. Table 5 represents the NWI habitat classification codes used to sub-categorize existing marsh types in the area of the diversion outfall.

Table 4.	Aquatic habitats considered waters of the U.S. in the	ķ
propose	diversion outfall area (HUC #080903010408)	

Туре	Acres
Waters of the U.S.	
Open water – natural	8,173
Open water - artificial (excavated)	2,175
Wetlands - vegetated shallows	1,849
Wetlands – emergent marsh	20,489
Wetlands – scrub/shrub	1,669
Wetlands – forested	532
Subtotal – waters of the U.S.	34,887
Uplands/dredge disposal	189
Total	35,076







Figure 3. Preliminary delineation and proposed jurisdictional determination – waters of the U.S. in outfall area (Sheet 2)







Figure 3. Preliminary delineation and proposed jurisdictional determination – waters of the U.S. in outfall area (Sheet 4)

Table 5.National Wetland Inventory classifications and current habitat types in the diversion outfall study area
(HUC #080903010408)

NWI code	NWI description	Updated habitat/ Land use types	Water of the U.S.
E1AB4L5	Estuarine, Subtidal, Aquatic Bed, Floating Vascular, Subtidal, Mesohaline	Emergent Marsh Wetland; Vegetated Shallows	Yes
E1AB5L5	Estuarine, Subtidal, Aquatic Bed, Unknown Submergent, Subtidal, Mesohaline	Vegetated Shallows	Yes
E1UBL	Estuarine, Subtidal, Unconsolidated Bottom, Subtidal	Open Water (natural and excavated)	Yes
E1UBL5	Estuarine, Subtidal, Unconsolidated Bottom, Subtidal, Mesohaline	Open Water (natural)	Yes
E2ABL	Estuarine, Intertidal, Aquatic Bed, Subtidal	Vegetated Shallows	Yes
E2EM1N5	Estuarine, Intertidal, Emergent, Persistent, Regularly Flooded, Mesohaline	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes
E2EM1P5	Estuarine, Intertidal, Emergent, Persistent, Irregularly Flooded, Mesohaline	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes
E2EM1Pd	Estuarine, Intertidal, Emergent, Persistent, Irregularly Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes
E2EM1Pd*	Estuarine, Intertidal, Emergent, Persistent, Irregularly Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched	Uplands / Dredged Disposal	No
E2EMPh	Estuarine, Intertidal, Emergent, Irregularly Flooded, Diked/Impounded	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes
E2SS1P	Estuarine, Intertidal, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Irregularly Flooded	Scrub/Shrub Wetland	Yes
E2SS1P5	Estuarine, Intertidal, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Irregularly Flooded, Mesohaline	Scrub/Shrub Wetland	Yes
E2SSs	Scrub/Shrub	Scrub/Shrub Wetland	Yes
E2USN5	Estuarine, Intertidal, Unconsolidated Shore, Regularly Flooded, Mesohaline	Emergent Marsh Wetland; Vegetated Shallows	Yes
PEM1Cdh	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Seasonally Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched, Diked/Impounded	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes
PEM1Cdh*	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Seasonally Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched, Diked/Impounded	Uplands / Dredged Disposal	No
PEM1R	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Seasonal-Tidal	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes
PEM1Rd	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Seasonal-Tidal, Partially Drained/Ditched	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes
PEM1Rd*	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Seasonal-Tidal, Partially Drained/Ditched	Uplands / Dredged Disposal	No
PEM1T	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Semipermanent-Tidal	Emergent Marsh Wetland	Yes

Table 5.National Wetland Inventory classifications and current habitat types in the diversion outfall study area
(HUC #080903010408)

NWI code	NWI description	Updated habitat/ Land use types	Water of the U.S.
PFO1/3R	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous/Broad-Leaved Evergreen, Seasonal-Tidal	Forested Wetlands	Yes
PFO1Ad	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Temporarily Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched	Forested Wetlands	Yes
PFO1Ad*	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Temporarily Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched	Uplands / Dredged Disposal	No
PFO1Cd	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched	Forested Wetlands	Yes
PFO1R	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonal-Tidal	Forested Wetlands	Yes
PFO1S	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Temporary-Tidal	Forested Wetlands	Yes
PSS1/3R	Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous/Broad-Leaved Evergreen, Seasonal-Tidal	Forested Wetlands	Yes
PSS1Cd	Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched	Scrub/Shrub Wetland	Yes
PSS1Cd*	Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched	Uplands / Dredged Disposal	No
PSS1Cdh	Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded, Partially Drained/Ditched, Diked/Impounded	Scrub/Shrub Wetland	Yes
PSS1R	Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonal-Tidal	Scrub/Shrub Wetland	Yes
PSS1T	Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Semipermanent-Tidal	Scrub/Shrub Wetland	Yes
PUBH	Palustrine, Unconsolidated Bottom, Permanently Flooded	Open Water (excavated)	Yes
PUBHx	Palustrine, Unconsolidated Bottom, Permanently Flooded, Excavated	Open Water (excavated)	Yes
R1UBV	Riverine, Tidal, Unconsolidated Bottom, Permanent-Tidal	Open Water (natural)	Yes
n/a	Developed Land	Uplands / Dredged Disposal	No

Note: NWI categories classified as uplands/dredged disposal areas are based on recent (2010–2013) aerial photography or land use mapping comprising approximately 189 acres (0.5%) of the outfall study area.

Based on a site visit in July 2012 and available vegetation data in the CRMS for sites within the outfall study area, vegetative shallows are dominated by Eurasian watermoil and widgeon grass. Emergent marsh habitats are dominated by salt meadow cordgrass (*Spartina patens*), smooth cordgrass (*S. alterniflora*), and chairmaker's bulrush (*Schoenoplectus americanus*), with co-dominant species including needlegrass rush (*Juncus roemerianus*) and saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*).

Dominant species occurring on the spoil banks parallel to the excavated channels include saltwater false willow (*Baccharis angustifolia*), and Chinese tallow, with understory herbaceous subdominants including saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*) and saltmarsh morning glory (*Ipomoea sagittata*).

Hydrologic Conditions

In an effort to evaluate hydrologic influence to wetlands in the outfall area, baseline information was used to extract elevations for existing marsh types. Performing a GIS analysis, the latest surface elevation model from July 2014 was used to generate representative sampling locations at 20-foot increments across the delineation study area. Each data point was assigned an elevation value corresponding to that location from the model as well as corresponding marsh type information. Over 3 million individual sampling points were generated from this exercise and were subsequently summarized to obtain an average elevation (in feet) for each marsh type. The ranges derived from these values provide estimated elevations that can be used, in combination with tidal range information, to evaluate hydrologic conditions. Areas with wetland hydrology indicators in the project ecoregion would be inundated or saturated within the upper 12 inches of the soil surface for a duration of at least 3 weeks annually. Seasonally, tides tend to be highest in late summer through mid-fall (August to November) and lowest in the winter and early spring (December to March) (CPRA 2011). With typical tidal ranges of approximately 0.25 to 2.5 mean sea level (msl) within the outfall area, these habitats experience inundation or saturation for prolonged periods with a high probability of producing anaerobic soil conditions needed for hydric soil conditions to develop. The average elevations in the wetland and vegetated shallows range from -2 to 1.7 feet msl, while average depths in the open water and excavated areas are approximately -3 to -8 msl. Based on the evaluation of mean high tide in the project outfall area and the average elevations, there is evidence to indicate the majority of the outfall study limits meet the wetland hydrologic criteria. This is consistent with on-site conditions observed by the project team, NRCS soil mapping, USGS mapping, and NWI mapping.

Soils Conditions

The soils in the Louisiana Coastal Zone formed in either alluvial sediments or loess, and may have many accumulations of organic matter in the upper part. Deltaic processes have played a significant role in the types of soils present in the study area. The types of soils present today in this area are characterized by the depositional environments associated with the natural episodic deltaic cycle (CPRA 2011). Soils are a significant resource and a critical element of coastal habitat which supports vegetation growth and open water benthic productivity (CPRA 2011).

A desktop query was used to identify soils in the diversion outfall area. Several are listed as current NRCS Hydric Soils and are included in Table 6 with a description of each following below. Soil series descriptions and map units located within the MBSD outfall area are displayed in Figure 4 (Sheets 1 to 4).

Soil map unit	Landscape position	Hydric soil list/Component
Clovelly Muck	Marshes	Yes/Hydric
Cancienne Silty Clay Loam	Natural levees	Yes/Hydric inclusions of Gramercy soils (10%)
Gentilly Muck	Marshes	Yes/Hydric
Harahan Clay	Backswamps	Yes/Hydric
Lafitte – Clovelly Association	Marshes	Yes/Hydric
Lafitte Muck	Marshes	Yes/Hydric
Schriever Clay	Backswamps	Yes/Hydric
Westwego Clay	Backswamps	Yes/Hydric

Table 6. Soil map units located within study area delineation limits

The Clovelly series consists of very deep, very poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils. These soils formed in moderately thick accumulations of herbaceous organic material overlying very fluid clayey alluvial sediments. These soils are on broad coastal marshes that are nearly continuously flooded with brackish water.

The Cancienne series consists of very deep, level to gently undulating, somewhat poorly drained mineral soils that are moderately slowly permeable. These soils formed in loamy and clayey alluvium. They are on high and intermediate positions on natural levees and deltaic fans of the Mississippi River and its distributaries

The Gentilly series consists of very deep, very poorly drained, very slowly permeable slightly to moderately saline soils. These soils formed in thin accumulations of herbaceous plant remains and semifluid clayey alluvium over consolidated clayey deposits.

The Harahan series consist of very deep, poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils. They formed in moderately thick firm clayey alluvium overlying fluid clayey sediments. These soils are on broad backswamp positions on the lower Mississippi River flood plain.

Lafitte-Clovelly soils are level, poorly drained soils that have a thick or moderately thick mucky surface layer and clayey underlying material in brackish marshes. The Lafitte series consists of very deep, very poorly drained, moderately rapidly permeable organic soils formed in herbaceous plant remains over mineral sediments in intermediate and brackish marshes in the extreme lower Mississippi River Delta and coastal areas.

The Schriever series consists of very fine, deep, poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils that formed in clayey alluvium. These soils are on the lower parts of natural levees and in backswamp positions on the lower Mississippi River alluvial plain.

The Westwego series consist of very fine, deep, poorly drained, very slowly permeable soils. They formed in semifluid clayey alluvium and organic material that dried and shrank irreversibly in the upper part as the result of artificial drainage. These soils are on broad, drained former swamps along the lower Mississippi River and its distributaries.

















Discussion

The proposed MBSD project footprint area should be monitored during the continued planning and design phases of the project to evaluate changes in infrastructure or existing drainage systems that could result in changes in the extent or type of wetlands present. Additionally, if the proposed footprint or location changes, additional delineation efforts may be required if the new right-of-way or construction servitude is not included in previously surveyed areas, or if more than 5 years have passed since the date of USACE verification.

With regard to the delineation of wetlands in the MBSD outfall area, careful evaluation of multiple spatial datasets and comparison with recent aerial photography indicate the USFWS NWI mapping provides the most accurate depiction of the types and spatial configuration of waters of the U.S. and special aquatic sites, including wetlands, in the outfall area. While other databases provide valuable information of trends (marsh loss, salinity trends, relative percentage of vegetated cover, etc.), none of the other datasets are useful for identifying the types and spatial extent of wetlands and special aquatic sites in the Barataria Basin necessary for the delineation and proposed jurisdictional determination. Also, trying to generate a combined GIS map to represent the current extent of submerged types while maintaining the NWI vegetated wetland classifications is not practicable due to the minor differences in resolution and spatial georectification between the datasets. However, as described above, given the age of the aerial imagery used as the base map for the NWI data and the continued degradation and dynamics of the system, it is likely that it overestimates the current extent of marsh habitats in the basin. Therefore, HDR recommends continued evaluation of new spatial data and mapping sources to further refine this evaluation. USGS is currently developing a 2013 land/water classification spatial database. When available, this dataset should be evaluated to determine whether the vegetated and submerged habitat areas are more accurately captured within the outfall area than under the existing mapping. If so, the 2013 data could be used to perform a GIS analysis of the previous marsh areas that have collapsed and converted to a submerged habitat type (vegetated shallows or open water).

Representative Site Photographs: Diversion Channel Footprint

1. Top of MR&T Levee. Batture area is presented on the left toe of levee and forested habitat on the right.



2. Forested wetland habitat dominated by black willow in the batture adjacent to the Mississippi River.





3. Forested wetland depression in the area between MR&T levee and LA 23.

4. Forested upland habitat in the area between MR&T levee and LA 23.



5. Upland pasture habitat with excavated pond in the background, facing southwest, from LA 23.



6. Pre-Isaac (July 2012 site visit): Canal and subsiding vegetation on the protected side of the Non-Federal Levee (NFL, back levee) on the background (right side).



7. Post-Isaac (2012): Emergent wetland near canal on protected side of NFL (back levee) with flooding impacts from Hurricane Isaac.



8. Aerial image of pasture (partially wetland) southwest of LA 23, with cattle and drainage ditches visible.



9. Post-Isaac (2012): Canal transecting the study area between pasture with emergent wetland to the south, nearest the NFL (back levee).



10. Aerial image of emergent wetland in subsided pasture and drainage channels near west canal by the NFL (back levee) at the southwestern end of the proposed diversion channel footprint.



11. Post-Isaac (2012): Emergent wetland in pasture with wetland conditions attributable to subsidence (note the vegetation community impacts resulting from saltwater flooding during Hurricane Isaac).



Representative Aerial Photographs: Outfall Area

12. Example of broken emergent marsh habitat near the proposed outfall with a mosaic of natural open water, submerged areas (previously marsh), excavated canals, and scrub/shrub (spoil banks).



13. Pre-Isaac (summer 2012): Emergent marsh habitat on southern edge of BA-39 marsh restoration area, submerged vegetated shallows to the left, and open water in background.



14. Previous emergent marsh habitat in north-central portion of outfall area with only remnant marsh areas, submerged areas (previously marsh), and scrub/shrub (spoil banks) along oil and gas canals.



15. Pre-Isaac (summer 2012): Natural open water area with the remnants of field structures.



16. Pre-Isaac (summer 2012): Scrub shrub habitats on low spoil berms from excavated oil canal excavation. Typical elevation is within 12 inches of mean high tide, allowing establishment of marsh on lower intertidal elevations and shrubs in intermittently and seasonally flooded areas.



17. Emergent marsh habitat near Bayou Dupont in outfall area.



18. Emergent marsh habitat in central Barataria Basin with marsh collapse in background; natural bayous and excavated canals with scrub/shrub (bright green vegetation) along spoil banks; lighter brown vegetation in lower right quadrant of the photograph is predominantly *Spartina patens*.



19. Pre-Isaac (July 2012): Open water in collapsed marsh area consisting of both vegetated shallows and deep water habitats.



20. Emergent marsh habitat near the confluence of Bayou Dupont and Round Lake, presumably protected by natural sand deposition ridges, with marsh collapse beginning in the interior likely because of effects of saltwater intrusion and tidal erosion in areas with smaller particle and organic soils.


References

- Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). 2011. Myrtle Grove Delta Building Diversion Modeling Effort in Support of the LCA Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging Project.
- Cowardin, L. M., and F. C. Golet. 1979. "Wetland Classification: A Review." Vegetation 118: 139-152
- Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2014. "Web Soil Survey." Accessed July 9, 2014. <u>websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/</u>.
- Sasser, C. E., J. M. Visser, Edmond Mouton, Jeb Linscombe, and S. B. Hartley. 2014. "Vegetation Types in Coastal Louisiana in 2013: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Map 3290." 1 sheet, scale 1:550,000. Accessed June 9, 2014. <u>dx.doi.org/10.3133/sim3290</u>.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*. Environmental Laboratory. Technical Report Y-87-1, Department of the Army, Waterways Experiment Station.
 - ———. 2010. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region (Version 2.0). Eds. J. S. Wakeley, R. W. Lichvar, and C. V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-10-20. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2010. "National Agriculture Imagery Program Satellite Imagery." Accessed June 7, 2011. <u>datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov</u>.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011. "NWI Data." Accessed January 21, 2013. www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html.
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2010. Land/Water Classification, acquired by email from Brady Couvillion. USGS SIM 3164. November 8, 2013.
- ———. 2011a. "Land Area Change in Coastal Louisiana." USGS SIM 3164. Accessed June 11, 2013. pubs.usgs.gov/sim/3164/.
 - . 2011b. "NLCD Land Cover." Accessed April 23, 2014. <u>www.mrlc.gov</u>.

Attachment A. Dataset Comparison Figures

This page is intentionally left blank.

Figure A-1. 2010 USGS Land/Water Classification Dataset compared with 2010 aerial imagery (Microsoft Corp. and its data suppliers). Visual estimate of 25 to 30 percent of emergent marsh misclassified as open water.





Figure A-2. 2011 USGS National Land Classification Dataset compared with 2010 aerial imagery (Microsoft Corp. and its data suppliers). Visual estimate of 15 to 20 percent of emergent marsh misclassified as open water.



Figure A-3. 2013 NRCS Soil Mapping (web soil survey) compared with 2010 aerial imagery (Microsoft Corp. and its data suppliers). Visual estimate of 25 to 30 percent of emergent marsh misclassified as open water.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Attachment B. Wetland Determination Data Forms and Site Photographs

This page is intentionally left blank.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals	State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-1
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: N/A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.); Batture	Local relief (concave, convex, none): None	Slope (%): 2
Subregion (I RR or MI RA). Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat. 29.62	22 N Long 89.9631 W	Datum [.] NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name. Carville, Cancienne, and Schriever soils, f	frequently flooded NWI classif	ication. PFO1R
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of w	ear? Ves X No (If no explain in	Remarks)
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology significantly	v disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances"	nresent? Ves No X
Are Vegetation, on Hydrology significantly	replamatio? (If peeded, explain any answ	vora in Romarka)
Are vegetation, soit, or Hydrology hattraity pr	obiematic? (in needed, explain any answ	
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing	g sampling point locations, transect	s, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No	Is the Sampled Area	
Hydric Soil Present? Yes X No	within a Wetland?	No
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No		
Remarks:		
Between river and levee.		
HYDROLOGY		
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	Secondary India	cators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required: check all that apply)		il Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	13)	egetated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	5) (LRR U)	atterns (B10)
Saturation (A3)	Odor (C1) Moss Trim	Lines (B16)
Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizosph	heres along Living Roots (C3) 🔲 Dry-Seasor	Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	ced Iron (C4) 📃 Crayfish Bu	irrows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)	ction in Tilled Soils (C6) Saturation `	√isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	e (C7)	c Position (D2)
I Iron Deposits (B5)	Remarks)	uitard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		al Test (D5)
Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Field Observations:		moss (D8) (LRR 1, U)
Field Observations:	-)·	
Water Table Present? Ves No X Depth (inches	s).	
Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches	s): Wetland Hydrology Prese	ent? Yes X No
(includes capillary fringe)		
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial phot	tos, previous inspections), if available:	
Aenais: 2010 ESRI & USDA		
Remarks:		

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

Sampling Point: DP-1

201	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species
1. Salix nigra	20	Y	OBL	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>5</u> (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: <u>6</u> (B)
4				
5.				Percent of Dominant Species
6				
7				Prevalence Index worksheet:
Q				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
0	20	- Tatal Car		OBL species x 1 =
		= Total Cov	er 1	FACW species x 2 =
50% of total cover: <u>10</u>	20% of	total cover	4	FAC species x 3 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	4.0		0.51	FACIL species x 4 =
1. Salix nigra	10	Y	OBL	
2. Triadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	OPL species X 5 =
3				Column Totals: (A) (B)
4				Prevalence Index = $B/A =$
5.				
6				
7				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7				2 - Dominance Test is >50%
δ	20			3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
40	20	= Total Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: 10	20% of	total cover	4	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Physalis angulata	40	Y	FACU	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Colocasia esculenta	20	Y	FACW	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3. Persicaria hydropiperoides	20	Υ	OBL	Tree Meedy plants evaluating vince 2 in (7.6 cm) or
4. Cardiospermum halicacabum	10	Ν	FAC	more in diameter at breast height (DBH) regardless of
5 Brunnichia ovata	10	N	FACW	height.
6				One line (Ohen han Mission han han han han han han han han han ha
7				than 3 in DBH and greater than 3 28 ft (1 m) tall
7				
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11				height.
12				
	100	= Total Cov	er	
50% of total cover: ⁵⁰	20% of	total cover:	20	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size · 30' radius				
<u>······</u> ,				
··				
2				
3				
4				
5				Hydrophytic
	0	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover		Present? Yes <u>^ No</u>
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations bel	ow).			
······································				

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the de	oth needed to docur	nent the	indicator	or confirm	the absence	of indicate	ors.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redo	<u>x Feature</u>	s1	. 2				
(inches)	Color (moist)		Color (moist)	%	Туре				Remarks	
<u>-0-5</u>	10YR 3/2	100				·	Sandy clay loam			
5-14	10YR 4/2	95	10YR 3/6	S	C	M	Sandy clay loam			
				<u> </u>	·	<u></u>				
					·					
					·	·				
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM	=Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Masked	d Sand G	ains.	² Location:	PL=Pore L	ining, M=Mat	ix.
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to al	LRRs, unless other	rwise not	ed.)		Indicators	for Proble	matic Hydric	Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ce (S8) (I	_RR S, T, L	J) <u> </u>	/luck (A9) (I	LRR O)	
Histic Ep	oipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	irface (S9) (LRR S ,	T, U)	2 cm N	/luck (A10)	(LRR S)	
Black Hi	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LR	R O)		ed Vertic (F	18) (outside	MLRA 150A,B)
	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix ((F2)			ont Floodpl	ain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
	Bodies (AB) (I RR P	TIN	I Depleted Ma ■ Redox Dark 3	uix (F3) Surface (F	-6)			aious Bright 2 A 153 B)	Loamy Sons	(F20)
	cky Mineral (A7) (LF	, i, o) RR P. T. U	Depleted Dark	rk Surface (i	e (F7)			arent Mater	ial (TF2)	
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR U	u, ., . I)	Redox Depre	essions (F	8)		Very S	hallow Dar	k Surface (TF	12)
🔲 1 cm Mu	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)	,	Marl (F10) (L	.RR U)	,		Other ((Explain in	Remarks)	,
Depleted	d Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Ocl	hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)				
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	es (F12)	(LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indic	ators of hy	drophytic vege	tation and
	rairie Redox (A16) (I		A) Umbric Surfa	ce (F13)	(LRR P, 1	r, U)	wet	land hydrol	ogy must be p	resent,
Sandy IV	lucky Mineral (S1) (I	LRR 0, 5)		(F17) (IVIL tic (E18) /	_RA 151) (MI DA 1/	50A 150B)	unie	ess disturbe	ed or problema	ALIC.
Sandy B	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	uc (FTO) (odplain S		(MIRA 14	(A P)			
	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous E	Bright Loa	mv Soils ((MLR)	A 149A. 153C	. 153D)		
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	S, T, U)			,	,	,	,,		
Restrictive L	_ayer (if observed)	:								
Туре:									X	
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present?	Yes X	No
Remarks:										

Data Point 1



WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

Project/Site: MBSD		City/County: Plaq	uemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Rar	m Terminals		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-2
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Section, Township	, Range: N/A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc	.): Batture	Local relief (conca	ve, convex, none): None	Slope (%): 2
Subregion (I RR or MI RA). Out	ter Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat. 2	9.6608 N	Long: 89.9629 W	Datum [.] NAD 83
Soil Man Unit Name. Carville,	Cancienne, and Schriever so	oils, frequently flooded	NWI classifi	cation: PFO1R
Are climatic / hydrologic conditio	ons on the site typical for this time	of year? Yes X	lo (If no explain in F	Remarks)
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology	control disturbed?	Aro "Normal Circumstancos"	prosont? Vos No X
	, or Hydrology signific			present? Tes No
Are vegetation, Soll	, or Hydrology hatura	lly problematic? (ir needed, explain any answe	ers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site map show	wing sampling point	nt locations, transects	s, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Prese	nt? Yes X No	la tha Carr		
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X No	within a W	pieu Area	No
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X No			
Remarks:				
Between levee and r	iver.			
HTDRULUGT	***		Cocondon India	ators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of	1 5: of one is required: check all that a	nnly)		Cracks (B6)
		2 (B13)		CIACKS (DU)
High Water Table (A2)		a (B13) 5 (B15) /I RR II)		gelated Concave Surface (Do)
\square Saturation (A3)	Hvdrogen Sul	lfide Odor (C1)	Moss Trim L	ines (B16)
Water Marks (B1)	Oxidized Rhiz	zospheres along Living R	coots (C3) Dry-Season	Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	Presence of F	Reduced Iron (C4)	Crayfish Bu	rrows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)	Recent Iron R	Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)	/isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	Thin Muck Su	urface (C7)	Geomorphic	Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)	🔲 Other (Explain	n in Remarks)	Shallow Aqu	uitard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aeri	al Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutra	l Test (D5)
Water-Stained Leaves (B	Э)		Sphagnum i	moss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Field Observations:	Y			
Surface Water Present?	Yes <u>No </u> Depth (in	iches):		
Water Table Present?	Yes <u>No </u> Depth (in	iches):		X X
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes No <u>^</u> Depth (in	iches):	Wetland Hydrology Prese	nt? Yes <u>^</u> No
Describe Recorded Data (stre	am gauge, monitoring well, aerial	photos, previous inspect	tions), if available:	
Aerials: 2010 ESRI	& USDA			
Remarks:				

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

Sampling	Point:	DP-2
----------	--------	------

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1. Salix nigra	70	Y	OBL	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 7 (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: 7 (B)
4.				
5				Percent of Dominant Species
6				That Are OBL, FACW, of FAC: (A/B)
7				Prevalence Index worksheet:
/				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
8	70			OBL species x 1 =
	70	= Total Cov	er	
50% of total cover: <u>35</u>	20% of	total cover	14	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				FAC species x 3 =
1. Forestiera acuminata	5	Υ	OBL	FACU species x 4 =
2.				UPL species x 5 =
3				Column Totals: (A) (B)
A				
	·			Prevalence Index = B/A =
				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7				✓ 2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8				\square 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
	5	= Total Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% of	total cover	1	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: ^{30'} radius)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wotland hydrology must
Persicaria hydropiperoides	30	Υ	OBL	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2 Ampelopsis arborea	20	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata
2. Saururus cernus	10	N	OBI	Deminions of Four Vegetation Ottata.
Colocasia esculenta	10		FACW	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or
4. Uibiagua magabautag	10	<u>N</u>		more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
	- 10			neight.
6. Physalls angulata	5	N	FACU	Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7. Boehmeria cylindrica	5	N	FACW	than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10.				We advise Allowed wines are start than 2.00 ft in
11				height
12				noight.
12.	90	- Total Cav		
FO0/ - 64-4-1 15			- 18	
	∠∪% 01	iotal cover:	10	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>50 radius</u>)	10	V		
1. Ampelopsis arborea	10	Y	FAC	
2. Campsis radicans	5	Y	FAC	
3. Brunnichia ovata	5	Υ	FACW	
4				
5.				Hydrophytic
	20	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation
50% of total cover: 10	20% of		4	Present? Yes $\frac{X}{2}$ No
	20% 01		<u> </u>	
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	ow).			

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docun	nent the	indicator	or confirm	n the absence	of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	es			
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-8	10YR 4/2	97	10YR 4/6	3	C	M	Sandy clay loam	
8-14	10YR 5/2	95	10 YR 4/6	5	С	Μ	Sandy clay loam	
				·				·
				·				
				·				
¹ Type: C=Co	ncentration D=Den	letion RM:	Reduced Matrix MS	S=Maske	d Sand Gr	ains	² Location:	PI =Pore Lining M=Matrix
Hydric Soil	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless other	wise not	ted.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
	(A1)		Polvvalue Be	low Surfa	, ace (S8) (l	.RR S. T. L		/uck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	pipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	rface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)	2 cm N	/luck (A10) (LRR S)
Black Hi	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduc	ed Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		🔲 Loamy Gleye	d Matrix	(F2)		L Piedm	ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	l Layers (A5)		Depleted Mat	trix (F3)			L Anoma	alous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark S	Surface (F6)			RA 153B)
5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (LF	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Dar	k Surface	e (F7)			arent Material (TF2)
	esence (A8) (LRR U))		ssions (F	-8)		U Very S	Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
	ICK (A9) (LRR P, I)	a (A11)	Mari (F10) (L	.RR U)		E4)	U Other	(Explain in Remarks)
	ark Surface (A12)	e (ATT)			(IVILKA I		T) ³ Indic	pators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	rairie Redox (A16) (I	MI RA 150	Umbric Surfa	ce (F13)	(I RR P. T	LINK 0, 1, LUN	vet	land hydrology must be present
Sandy M	luckv Mineral (S1) (I	LRR O. S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (M	LRA 151)	, .,	unle	ess disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	leved Matrix (S4)	-,-,	Reduced Ver	tic (F18)	(MLRA 15	60A, 150B)		,
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain S	、 Soils (F19)	(MLRA 14	9A)	
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous B	Bright Loa	my Soils (F20) (MLR	A 149A, 153C	, 153D)
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	S, T, U)						
Restrictive I	_ayer (if observed):	:						
Туре:								X
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes X No
Remarks:								

Data Point 2a



Data Point 2b



WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

upplicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals State: LA Sampling Point: CP-3 westgato(s): CM, JM, RW Sector, Township, Range: NA andtom (fillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland Local relef (concave, convex, none); COnCave Slope (%): 1 subregion (LR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6617 N Long: 89.9645 W Datum: NAD we dimatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes No (If no, explain in Remarks.) we vegetation Soll , or Hydrology naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.) SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. hs campling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophylic Vegetation Present? Yes No xo within a Wetland? Yes No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No xo xo xo Xo Hydrophylic Indicators:	Project/Site: MBSD		City/C	_{county:} Plaquemines		_ Sampling Date: <u>11/13/12</u>
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW Section, Township, Range: MA andform (fillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland Local relief (concave, convex, none): Concave Slope (%): 1 subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6617 N Long: 89.6645 W Datum: NAD 83 subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6617 N Long: 89.6645 W Datum: NAD 83 ve Usgetation Soil or Hydrology X significantly disturbed? No (If no, explain in Remarks.) ve Vegetation Soil or Hydrology M naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.) SUMMARY OF FINDINGS - Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No X Wetand Hydrology Present? Yes No X is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes No X Wetand Hydrology Indicators: No X Starface Soil Creaks (RB) Sparaely Vegetation or sequiraci) Burder Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Sparaely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) Sparaely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) Migrid Water Katek (B1) Outdate Rhizophytic Res (B15) (LRR U) Sparaely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) Denainge Patterns (B10) Starface	Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ran	n Terminals	-		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-3
andform (hillslope, terrace, etc.) Delta / Fastland Local relief (concave, convex, none). CONCAVE Slope (%): 1 bitregion (LRR or MLRA); Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6617 N Long: 69.9645 W Datum; NAD 83 biol Map Unit Name: Cancienne silt loam NWI classification: Upland ver Vegetation Soll or Hydrology X significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes No X ver Vegetation Soll or Hydrology naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.) SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No X Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes No X Remarks: Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical conditions and hydrologic indicators: Hydrophytic logic present? Yes No X Bartware sing Ling Roots (C3) Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical conditions and hydrologic indicators: Hydrophytic logic present? Hydrophytic diducter check all that apply Bartset Vegetated Concave Surface (BB) Between river lave (A2) And Deposits (B1) (LRR N) Between river lave Carces (B1) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Byarset Vegetated Concave Surface (BB) Between river lave (C2)	Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Sectio	on, Township, Range: N	/A	
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat 29.6617 N Long: 89.9645 W Datum: NAD 83 Soid Map Unit Name: Cancienne silt Ioam NWI classification: Upland we climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes X No (If no. explain in Remarks.) we Vegetation Soil or Hydrology aignificantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes No X SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No X Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? No X Wetland Hydrologi Indicators: Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical conditions and hydrologic indicators. 4/DROLOGY Wetland Hydrologi Indicators: Sparsely Vegetate Concave Surface (B8) Primary Indicators (Iminium of one is required_check all that apply) Sparsely Sol Cracks (B6) Water Mak (B1) Outidzed Ritzospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Saturation (X3) Hydrogen Sufface O(C1) Dry Beason Avera Table (C2) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Freeence of Reduced iron (C4) Saturat	Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.	.): Delta / Fastland	Local	relief (concave, convex,	_{none):} concave	Slope (%): 1
Soli Map Unit Name: Cancienne silt loam NWI classification: Upland ve climatic / hydrologic conditions on the sile typical for this time of year? Yes X No (If no, explain in Remarks.) No X ve Vegetation Soli or Hydrology inducators or Hydrology inaturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.) SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No X Welland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Welland Hydrology Indicators: No X Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required, check all that apply) Surface Soli Cracks (B6) Burder Marks (B1) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Hydroposits (B15) (LRR U) Darasen Vegestation frame (B16) Hydroposits (B15) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Darasen Vegestate (B16) Burdace Static Cracks (B6) Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Stuffae C(2) Hydrogen Stuffae C(2) Cravifsh Burrows (C3) Darasen (C4) Bediveen rows (B3) Recent fron Reduction in Tilled Sois (C6) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Hydrogen Stuffae C(2) Cravifsh Burrows (C3) Darasen (C4) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Bediveen Tabe (B3) Cravifsh Burrows (C3) <	Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Out	er Coastal Plain (LRR T)	_{Lat:} 29.6617 N	Lona: 8	9.9645 W	Datum: NAD 83
we climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes X No (If no, explain in Remarks.) we Vegetation Soil or Hydrology X significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes No X SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No Yets No within a Wetland? Yes	Soil Map Unit Name: Cancienr	ne silt loam		0	NWI classific	_{cation:} Upland
we VegetationSoilor Hydrology Xsignificantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes No X we VegetationSoilor Hydrologynaturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.) SUMMARY OF FINDINGS - Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes XNo X	Are climatic / hvdrologic conditio	ons on the site typical for t	his time of vear? Y	_{′es} Χ _{No}	(If no. explain in F	Remarks.)
we vegetation	Are Vegetation . Soil	. or Hydrology X	significantly distur	bed? Are "Normal	Circumstances" ı	present? Yes No X
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc. Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes No X Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes No X Remarks: Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical conditions and hydrologic indicators. Secondary Indicators (minimum of one is required: check all that apply) Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required) Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required: check all that apply) Surface Soil Cracks (86) Drainage Patterns (810) Surface Water (A1) Mart Deposits (B15) (LRR U) Drainage Patterns (B10) Drainage Patterns (B10) Surface Soil Cracks (B2) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Sutration Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Geomorphic Position (C2) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Jagi Mat Crossible (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (C3) Shallow Aquitard (C3) High Water Table (A2) Hink Mudrade (C7) Shallow Aquitard (C3) Shallow Aquitard (C3) Mater Table (B5) Other (Explain	Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology	naturally problema	atic? (If needed e	explain any answe	ers in Remarks)
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No within a Wetland? Yes No X Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X within a Wetland? Yes No X Remarks: Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical conditions and hydrologi indicators. Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required) Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required: check all that apply) Surface Soli Cracks (B6) Surface Soli Cracks (B6) Burdare Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Surface Soli Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) High Water Table (A2) Hydrogen Sufface Odd (C1) Most Trible Deposits (B12) Drainage Patterns (B10) Saturation (A3) Oxidade Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Sediment Deposits (B2) Presence of Reduced from (C4) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Geomorphic Position (D2) Hundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Othic Kurface (C7) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquatard (D3) Hundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Saturation Present? Yes No X <	SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site ma	p showing sam	npling point locatio	ons, transects	s, important features, etc.
Remarks: Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical conditions and hydrologic indicators. HYDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)	Hydrophytic Vegetation Preser Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	nt? Yes X Yes Yes	No No _X No _X	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No <u>X</u>
Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical conditions and hydrologic indicators. HyDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) High Water Table (A2) High Water Table (A2) Gasturation (A3) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Sediment Deposits (B1) Prisence of Reduced Iron (C4) Sediment Deposits (B2) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Water-Stained Leaves (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? </td <td>Remarks:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Remarks:					
HYDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Secondary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Brimary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) High Water Table (A2) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Sufface Odr (C1) Moss Trim Lines (B16) Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Sufface Odr (C1) Moss Trim Lines (B16) Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Recent Iron Reduction In Tilled Soils (C6) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Tin Muck Surface (C7) Geomorphic Position (D2) Inon Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (D3) Field Observations: Sphagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U) Field Observations: Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Sphagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U) Vater Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X No X Saturation Present?	Between river levee a hydrologic indicators	and Highway 23.	Hurricane Is	aac has resulted	in atypical o	conditions and
HYDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply) Surface Scil Cracks (B6) Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Drainage Patterns (B10) High Water Table (A2) Marl Deposits (B15) (LRR U) Droseason Water Table (C2) Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Droseason Water Table (C2) Drift Deposits (B2) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Droseason Water Table (C2) Drift Deposits (B3) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Geomorphic Position (D2) Inon Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (D3) Invadar Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Shallow Aquitard (D3) FAC-Neutral Test (D5) Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): No X Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:						
Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required) Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) High Water Table (A2) Marl Deposits (B15) (LRR U) Drainage Patterns (B10) Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Sulfde Odor (C1) Moss Trim Lines (B16) Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Geomorphic Position (D2) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (D3) Inundation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Uincludes capillary fringe) No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Sutration Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Material photos, previous inspections), if available: Aeerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false posit	HYDROLOGY					
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna (B13) Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) High Water Table (A2) Marl Deposits (B15) (LRR U) Drainage Patterns (B10) Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Moss Trim Lines (B16) Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Sediment Deposits (B2) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Geomorphic Position (D2) Inon Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (D3) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) FAC-Neutral Test (D5) Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) No X Depth (inches): No X Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane. Atypical situation,	Wetland Hydrology Indicator	'S:			Secondary Indica	ators (minimum of two required)
□ Addustic Faulta (B13) □ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B6) □ High Water Table (A2) □ Marl Deposits (B15) □ Drainage Patterns (B10) □ Saturation (A3) □ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) □ Doss Trim Lines (B16) □ Water Marks (B1) □ Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) □ Dry-Season Water Table (C2) □ Sediment Deposits (B2) □ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) □ Crayfish Burrows (C8) □ Drift Deposits (B3) □ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) □ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) □ Adjal Mat or Crust (B4) □ Thin Muck Surface (C7) □ Geomorphic Position (D2) □ Iron Deposits (B5) □ Other (Explain in Remarks) □ Shallow Aquitar 103) □ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) □ FAC-Neutral Test (D5) Sphagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U) Field Observations: □ □ No X Depth (inches): □ Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): □ No X □ <	Primary Indicators (minimum o	f one is required; check a	II that apply)		Surface Soil	Cracks (B6)
Iman beposits (FI) (Litt O) Iman beposits (FI) (Litt O) Saturation (A3) Iman beposits (FI) (Litt O) Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Sediment Deposits (B2) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Drift Deposits (B3) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Geomorphic Position (D2) I ron Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (D3) I nundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) FAC-Neutral Test (D5) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Sphagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U) Field Observations: Surface Water Present? Yes No X Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane. Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	High Water Table (A2)		ic Fauna (B13) Deposits (B15) /I PI	2 11/		getated Concave Surface (B8)
Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Sediment Deposits (B2) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Drift Deposits (B3) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Geomorphic Position (D2) Iron Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (D3) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) FAC-Neutral Test (D5) Water Table Present? Yes No X Sufface Water Present? Yes No X Vater Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	$\square Saturation (A3)$		ogen Sulfide Odor (((0)		ines (B16)
Water Math (Dr) Charled Hillesspineres and prime filters (OS) Differences (OS) Dif	Water Marks (B1)		zed Rhizosnheres a	long Living Roots (C3)		Water Table (C2)
Image: Second	\square Sediment Deposits (B2)		nce of Reduced Iro	n (C4)	Cravfish Bur	rrows (C8)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Geomorphic Position (D2) Iron Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Remarks) Shallow Aquitard (D3) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) FAC-Neutral Test (D5) Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Sphagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U) Field Observations: Surface Water Present? Yes Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes Cincludes capillary fringe) No X Depth (inches): Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	$\square \text{ Drift Deposits (B3)}$		nt Iron Reduction in	Tilled Soils (C6)	Saturation V	(isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
☐ Iron Deposits (B5) ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks) ☐ Shallow Aquitard (D3) ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5) ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Field Observations: Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Baturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Algal Mat or Crust (B4)		Auck Surface (C7)		Geomorphic	Position (D2)
☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5) ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Field Observations: Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches):	Iron Deposits (B5)	Other	(Explain in Remark	(S)	Shallow Aqu	uitard (D3)
Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Field Observations: Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Inundation Visible on Aeria	al Imagery (B7)	(I	7	FAC-Neutral	l Test (D5)
Field Observations: Surface Water Present? YesNo XDepth (inches): Water Table Present? YesNo XDepth (inches): Saturation Present? YesNo XDepth (inches): Saturation Present? YesNo XDepth (inches): Uncludes capillary fringe) Wetland Hydrology Present? YesNo X Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Water-Stained Leaves (B9	∂)			Sphagnum r	moss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe) No X Depth (inches): Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Field Observations:	<u>·</u>				
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Uncludes capillary fringe) Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Surface Water Present?	Yes <u>No X</u>	Depth (inches):			
Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Includes capillary fringe) Depth (inches): Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available: Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Water Table Present?	Yes No X C	Depth (inches):			
Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes <u>No X</u> C	Depth (inches):	Wetland H	lydrology Prese	nt? Yes <u>No X</u>
Remarks: Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Aerials: 2010 ESRL		i, aenai priotos, pre			
Atypical situation, false positive indicators due to hurricane.	Remarks:	u ooda				
	Atypical situation, fal	se positive indica	itors due to h	urricane.		

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

Sampling	Point:	DP-3
----------	--------	------

201	1	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' rac	lius)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1. Carya aquatica		10	Y	OBL	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 7 (A)
2. Cornus drummondii		20	Υ	FAC	Total Number of Deminent
3.					Species Across All Strata: 7 (B)
1					
					Percent of Dominant Species
5		·			That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100 (A/B)
6		·			Broyalanca Index warkshoot
7					
8					Iotal % Cover of:Multiply by:
		30	= Total Cov	ver	OBL species x 1 =
	50% of total cover 15	20% of	total cover	- 6	FACW species x 2 =
Sopling/Shrub Stratum (Diatai	. 30' radius	20/001			FAC species x 3 =
Sapling/Sillub Stratum (Plot Siz	(e. <u>66 radias</u>)	20	V	EAC	FACU species x 4 =
		30	<u> </u>	FAC	
2. Acer rubrum		10	Y	FAC	
3					Column Totals: (A) (B)
4.					Drovelence Index - D/A -
5					
0		·			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
б		·			1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7					✓ 2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8					$\boxed{\square}$ 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^{1}$
		40	= Total Cov	ver	\square Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Evaluin)
	50% of total cover 20	20% of	total cover	- 8	
Lianh Strature (Distaine, 30' rai	dius	20/0 01			
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 00 rat)	F	V		¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Saururus cernus		5	Y	OBL	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Ampelopsis arborea		5	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3					Tree Meadurelante evolution vince 2 in (7.0 em) en
4					I ree – woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or more in diameter at breast height (DBH) regardless of
		·			height.
5		·			
6		·			Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7					than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8					Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9.					of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10					
10.					Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
					neight.
12					
		10	= Total Cov	/er	
	50% of total cover: 5	20% of	total cover	2	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:	30' radius				
1 Ampelopsis arborea	,	5	Y	FAC	
1. <u> </u>					
Z		·			
3		·			
4					
5					Hydrophytic
		5	= Total Cov	ver	Vegetation
	50% of total cover 2.5	20% of	total cover	. 1	Present? Yes X No
Demonstra (If the end of the form		2070 01		·	
Remarks: (If observed, list mor	phological adaptations belo	ow).			

SOIL

Profile Desc	cription: (Describe	to the dept	n needed to docur	ment the	indicator	or confirm	the absence of inc	dicators.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	es1	. 2			
(inches)	Color (moist)	<u> % </u>	Color (moist)	%	Type'			Remark	<u>s</u>
0-14	101 R 4/1	99	101R 4/0		<u> </u>	IVI			
						·			
						·			
						·			
						·			
1						·			
'Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	etion, RM=F	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Maskeo	d Sand Gr	ains.	Location: PL=F	Pore Lining, M=Ma	atrix. ic Soile ³ :
					eu.)	DDCTI			10 30115 .
	(A1) ninedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	inface (SQ	ice (58) (I	_RR 5, 1, U T II)	$D_2 \text{ cm Muck}$	A9) (LRR U) A10) (I RR S)	
Black Hi	istic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduced Ve	rtic (F18) (outsid	e MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	en Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix ((F2)		Piedmont Fl	oodplain Soils (F1	19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	d Layers (A5)		Depleted Ma	trix (F3)			Anomalous	Bright Loamy Soil	s (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	F6)		(MLRA 15	3B)	
5 cm Mu	ucky Mineral (A7) (L i	RR P, T, U)		rk Surface	e (⊢7)		Red Parent	Material (TF2)	· [10)
		")	Marl (F10) (I	RR II)	0)		Other (Eynla	v Dark Surface (1	F12)
	d Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)		hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)			
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)	、 ,	Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	es (F12)	(LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indicators	of hydrophytic ve	getation and
Coast Pi	rairie Redox (A16) (I	MLRA 150A)) 🔲 Umbric Surfa	ace (F13)	(LRR P, 1	r, U)	wetland h	nydrology must be	e present,
Sandy M	/lucky Mineral (S1) (LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (MI	LRA 151)		unless di	sturbed or proble	matic.
Sandy G	Deved Matrix (54)		Reduced Vel Dedmont Ele	nic (F18) Indolain S	(IVILRA 1:	MI PA 14	0.4)		
	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous E	Bright Loa	mv Soils ((MERA 14) (F20) (MLR	A 149A. 153C. 153I)	
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	S, T, U)		5	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-78	- ,,	,	
Restrictive I	Layer (if observed)								
Туре:									X
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil Pres	ent? Yes	No
Remarks:	odov oppopt	rationa r	ot common						
К		rations r	IOL COMMON.						

Data Point 3



WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

Project/Site: MBSD		City/Co	_{unty:} Plaquemines		Sampling Date: <u>11/13/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Rai	m Terminals	-	8	State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-4
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Sectior	n, Township, Range: N/	A	· · ·
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc	_{):} Delta / Fastland	Local re	elief (concave, convex, r	none): none	Slope (%): 2
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Ou	ter Coastal Plain (LRR T)	Lat: 29.6605	Lona: 8	9.9642	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancien	ne silt loam		0	NWI classifi	_{cation:} Upland
Are climatic / hvdrologic conditio	ons on the site typical for t	his time of vear? Ye	s X No (If no. explain in F	Remarks.)
Are Vegetation . Soil	. or Hydrology X	significantly disturb	ed? Are "Normal	Circumstances"	present? Yes No X
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology	naturally problemat	ic? (If needed e	xplain any answe	ers in Remarks)
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site ma	p showing sam	oling point locatio	ns, transects	s, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Prese	nt? Yes X	No	Is the Sampled Area	`	
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes	No X	within a Wetland?	Yes	No X
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes	No X			
Remarks:	and Highway 22	Hurricopo loo	as has resulted	in at mical	conditions and
Between river levee	and Highway 23.	Hurricane Isa	ac has resulted	in atypical	conditions and
nydrologic indicators	· .				
HYDROLOGY					
Wetland Hydrology Indicato	rs:			Secondary Indic	ators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of	of one is required; check a	II that apply)		Surface Soil	Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	Aquat	tic Fauna (B13)		Sparsely Ve	getated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	Mari [Deposits (B15) (LRR	U)	L Drainage Pa	atterns (B10)
Saturation (A3)	Hydro	ogen Sulfide Odor (C	1)	Moss Trim L	ines (B16)
Water Marks (B1)		zed Rhizospheres alo	ong Living Roots (C3)	Dry-Season	Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)		ence of Reduced Iron	(C4)	Crayfish Bu	rrows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)		nt Iron Reduction in T	illed Soils (C6)	Saturation V	isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)		Muck Surface (C7)	`	Geomorphic	Position (D2)
\square Iron Deposits (B5)		(Explain in Remarks)		litard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aeri	al Imagery (B7)				1 lest (D5)
Field Observations:	5)				
Surface Water Present?	Yes No X [Depth (inches):			
Water Table Present?	Yes No X [Depth (inches):			
Saturation Present?	Yes No X	Depth (inches):	Wetland H	ydrology Prese	nt? Yes <u>No X</u>
(includes capillary fringe)	om gougo monitoring wo	l coricl photos prov	in the second		
Apriale: 2010 ESRI		ii, aeriai priotos, prev	ous inspections), il avai	lable.	
Remarks:	& UODA				
Atypical cituation fal	leo positivo indioc	tore due to bu	urricano		
Alypical situation, iai	se positive indica				

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

Sampling	Point:	DP-4
----------	--------	------

20 radius	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 radius</u>)	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species
	35	Y N	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: _/ (A)
2. Iriadica sebitera	10	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant
3	·			Species Across All Strata: (B)
4				Percent of Dominant Species
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>100</u> (A/B)
6	·			Drevelan ee in deu weekek eet
7				Prevalence index worksneet:
8				I otal % Cover of: Multiply by:
	45	= Total Cov	er	OBL species x 1 =
50% of total cover: <u>22.5</u>	20% of	total cover	9	FACW species x 2 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				FAC species x 3 =
1. Acer negundo	15	Υ	FAC	FACU species x 4 =
2. Cornus drummondii	10	Y	FAC	UPL species x 5 =
3 Morella cerifera	5	Y	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)
4	·			
5	·			Prevalence Index = B/A =
3	·			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
0	·			☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
/	·			2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8				\square 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
	30	= Total Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: <u>15</u>	20% of	total cover	6	
<u>Herb Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Echinochloa colona	30	Y	FACW	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Ampelopsis arborea	5	N	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3. Acer negundo	5	N	FAC	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in (7.6 cm) or
4				more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5				height.
6.				Sanling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7.				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8	·			
9	·	·		of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10	·			
10	·			Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
10	·			neight.
12	40	Tatal Car		
500/ stately 20		- Total Cov	8	
50% of total cover: 20	20% of	total cover	<u> </u>	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>50 radius</u>)	F	V	FAC	
			FAC	
2	·			
3	·			
4				
5	·			Hydrophytic
	5	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% of	total cover	1	Present? Yes <u>^ No</u>
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	ow).			

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dept	n needed to docum	nent the i	indicator	or confirm	the absence o	of indicators.)		
Depth	Matrix		Redox	<u> Feature</u>	s1	. 2		_		
(inches)	Color (moist)	<u> % </u>	Color (moist)		Type'		Texture	Rem	arks	
0-16	10YR 4/2	99	10YR 4/6	1	С	M	Silty clay			
					- <u> </u>					
					·					
					·					
					·	·				
					·	<u> </u>				
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=F	Reduced Matrix, MS	=Masked	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location: F	PL=Pore Lining, M	=Matrix.	
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all L	RRs, unless other	wise not	ed.)		Indicators fo	or Problematic Hy	ydric Soils":	
	(A1)		Polyvalue Bel	low Surfa	ce (S8) (L	.RR S, T, U		ack (A9) (LRR O)		
Black Hi	stic (A3)			Mineral) (LKK S, (F1) (I RF	1, U) 2 O)		ICK (ATU) (LRR 5) d Vertic (F18) (out	side MI RA 150	Δ R)
	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleve	d Matrix ((F2)	,	Piedmor	nt Floodplain Soils	(F19) (LRR P, S	5, T)
Stratified	Layers (A5)		Depleted Mat	rix (F3)	· · ·		Anomalo	ous Bright Loamy S	Soils (F20)	
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark S	Surface (F	=6)			A 153B)		
5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (LI	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Dar	k Surface	e (F7)		Red Par	ent Material (TF2)		
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR L))		ssions (F	8)			allow Dark Surface	e (TF12)	
	CK (A9) (LRR P, T) Below Dark Surfac	e (Δ11)		KK U) uric (E11)	(MIRA 1	51)		xplain in Remarks	5)	
Thick Da	rk Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangane	ese Mass	es (F12) (LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indica	tors of hydrophytic	vegetation and	
Coast Pi	airie Redox (A16) (I	MLRA 150A)	Umbric Surfa	ce (F13)	(LRR P, T	, U)	wetla	ind hydrology mus	t be present,	
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (I	LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric ((F17) (ML	_RA 151)		unles	ss disturbed or pro	blematic.	
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)			tic (F18) ((MLRA 15	0A, 150B)				
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flor	odplain S	Soils (F19)	(MLRA 14	9A)	4.52D)		
Dark Su	face (S7) (I RR P \$	зт II)		ngni Loai	my Solis (F20) (IVILR	A 149A, 153C,	153D)		
Restrictive I	ayer (if observed)	:								
Type:	,									
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil P	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>	
Remarks:	,									
R	edox concent	rations r	ot common.							

Data Point 4



WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

Project/Site: MBSD		City/County: Plaq	uemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12				
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ran	n Terminals		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-1				
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Section, Township	Section, Township, Range: N/A					
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.	_{):} Batture	Local relief (conca	Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%); 2					
Subregion (I RR or MI RA). Out	er Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat [.] 2	9.622 N	Long. 89.9631 W	Datum [.] NAD 83				
Soil Map Unit Name. Carville,	Cancienne, and Schriever so	ils, frequently flooded	NWI classifi	PF01R				
Are climatic / hydrologic conditio	ins on the site typical for this time	of year? Yes X	lf no explain in f	Remarks)				
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology signific	antly disturbed?	Are "Normal Circumstances"	present? Ves No X				
Are Vegetation, Soil	, or Hydrology signific			oro in Romarka)				
			(in needed, explain any answ					
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site map show	wing sampling poi	nt locations, transects	s, important features, etc.				
Hydrophytic Vegetation Preser	nt? Yes X No	Is the Sam	nlod Aroa					
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X No	within a W	otland? Vos X	No				
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X No							
Remarks:								
Between river and le	vee.							
Wetland Hydrology Indicator	·c·		Secondary Indic	eators (minimum of two required)				
Primary Indicators (minimum o	f one is required check all that a	(vlac	Surface Soi	Cracks (B6)				
Surface Water (A1)	Aquatic Faun	a (B13)	Sparsely Ve	egetated Concave Surface (B8)				
High Water Table (A2)	Marl Deposits	(B15) (LRR U)	Drainage Pa	atterns (B10)				
Saturation (A3)	Hydrogen Sul	fide Odor (C1)	🔲 Moss Trim I	_ines (B16)				
Water Marks (B1)	Oxidized Rhiz	ospheres along Living F	Roots (C3) 🔲 Dry-Season	Water Table (C2)				
Sediment Deposits (B2)	Presence of F	Reduced Iron (C4)	🔲 Crayfish Bu	rrows (C8)				
Drift Deposits (B3)	Recent Iron R	eduction in Tilled Soils (C6) 🗌 Saturation \	/isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)				
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	L Thin Muck Su	rface (C7)	Geomorphic	: Position (D2)				
Iron Deposits (B5)	🔟 Other (Explain	n in Remarks)	Shallow Aqu	uitard (D3)				
Inundation Visible on Aeria	al Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutra	Il Test (D5)				
Field Observations:))		<u> </u> Spnagnum	moss (D8) (LRR 1, U)				
Surface Water Present?	Yes No X Depth (in	ches).						
Water Table Present?	Yes No X Depth (in	iches):						
Saturation Present?	Yes No X Depth (in	ches):	Wetland Hydrology Prese	nt? Yes ^X No				
(includes capillary fringe)		······						
Describe Recorded Data (strea		photos, previous inspec	tions), if available:					
Aeriais. 2010 ESRI	a USDA							
Remarks.								

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

Sampling Point: DP-1

201	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species
1. Salix nigra	20	Y	OBL	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>5</u> (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: <u>6</u> (B)
4				
5.				Percent of Dominant Species
6				
7				Prevalence Index worksheet:
Q				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
0	20	- Tatal Car		OBL species x 1 =
			er 1	FACW species x 2 =
50% of total cover: <u>10</u>	20% of	total cover:	4	FAC species x 3 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	10		0.01	FACIL species x 4 =
1. Salix nigra	10	Y	OBL	
2. Triadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	UPL species
3				Column Totals: (A) (B)
4				Prevalence Index = $B/A =$
5.				
6				
7				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7				2 - Dominance Test is >50%
δ	20			3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
40	20	= I otal Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: 10	20% of	total cover:	4	
<u>Herb Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Physalis angulata	40	Y	FACU	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Colocasia esculenta	20	Y	FACW	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3. Persicaria hydropiperoides	20	Υ	OBL	Tree Meedy plants evaluating vince 2 in (7.6 cm) or
4. Cardiospermum halicacabum	10	Ν	FAC	more in diameter at breast height (DBH) regardless of
5 Brunnichia ovata	10	N	FACW	height.
6				One line (Ohen han Mission han han han han han han han han han ha
7				than 3 in DBH and greater than 3 28 ft (1 m) tall
7				
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11				height.
12				
	100	= Total Cov	er	
50% of total cover: ⁵⁰	20% of	total cover:	20	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size · 30' radius				
<u>······</u> ,				
··				
2				
3				
4				
5				Hydrophytic
	0	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover:		Present? res <u>~</u> No
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations bel	ow).			
	,			

SOIL

Depth (inches)MatrixRedox Features0-510YR 3/2100%Type1Loc2TextureRemarks5-1410YR 4/29510YR 3/6SCMSandy clay loam
(inches) Color (moist) % Color (moist) % Type* Loc* Texture Remarks 0-5 10YR 3/2 100
0-5 10YR 3/2 100 Sandy clay loam 5-14 10YR 4/2 95 10YR 3/6 S C M Sandy clay loam
5-14 10YR 4/2 95 10YR 3/6 S C M Sandy clay loam
¹ Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, MS=Masked Sand Grains. ² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.) Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
🛄 Histosol (A1) 📃 Polyvalue Below Surface (S8) (LRR S, T, U) 📃 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Epipedon (A2) Thin Dark Surface (S9) (LRR S, T, U) 2 cm Muck (A10) (LRR S)
Black Histic (A3) Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (LRR O) Reduced Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B) History Outside MLRA 150A,B) Discourse Outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) Pledmont Floodplain Solis (F19) (LKR P, S, T) Stratified Layers (A5) Depleted Matrix (F3) Apamalous Bright Loamy Solis (F20)
Organic Bodies (A6) (LRR P. T. U) Redox Dark Surface (F6) (MLRA 153B)
5 cm Mucky Mineral (A7) (LRR P, T, U) Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
Muck Presence (A8) (LRR U)
1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR P, T) Marl (F10) (LRR U) ÚD Other (Explain in Remarks)
Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) Depleted Ochric (F11) (MLRA 151)
I Thick Dark Surface (A12) I Iron-Manganese Masses (F12) (LRR O, P, T) Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and
Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) (I RR O. S) Delta Ochric (E17) (MI RA 151) unless disturbed or problematic
Sandy Gleved Matrix (S4)
Sandy Redox (S5) Piedmont Floodplain Soils (F19) (MLRA 149A)
Stripped Matrix (S6)
Dark Surface (S7) (LRR P, S, T, U)
Restrictive Layer (if observed):
Depth (inches): No
Remarks:

Data Point 1



WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

Project/Site: MBSD		City/County: Plaq	uemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12				
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Rar	m Terminals		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-2				
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Section, Township	Section, Township, Range: N/A					
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc	Batture	Local relief (conca	Local relief (concave, convex, none): None Slope (%); 2					
Subregion (I RR or MI RA). Out	ter Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat. 2	9.6608 N	Long: 89.9629 W	Datum: NAD 83				
Soil Man Unit Name. Carville,	Cancienne, and Schriever so	ils, frequently flooded	NWI classifi	PF01R				
Are climatic / hydrologic conditio	ons on the site typical for this time	of year? Yes X	lo (If no explain in F	Remarks)				
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology	confluences in the second s	Aro "Normal Circumstances"	procent? Voc No X				
	, or Hydrology signific			present? Tes No				
Are vegetation, Soll	, or Hydrology hatural	ly problematic?	(ii needed, explain any answ	ers in Remarks.)				
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site map show	ving sampling poi	nt locations, transects	s, important features, etc.				
Hydrophytic Vegetation Prese	nt? Yes X No	la tha Cam						
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X No	within a W	otland? Vos X	No				
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X No			NO				
Remarks:								
Between levee and r	iver.							
HTDRULUGT	***		Cocondon India	ators (minimum of two required)				
Primary Indicators (minimum of	rs: of one is required: check all that a			LCracks (B6)				
		(B13)		r cracks (D0)				
High Water Table (A2)		(B15) (I RR U)		gelaieu concave sunace (bo) atterns (R10)				
\square Saturation (A3)	Hydrogen Sul	fide Odor (C1)	Moss Trim L	ines (B16)				
Water Marks (B1)	Oxidized Rhiz	ospheres along Living F	Roots (C3) 🔲 Dry-Season	Water Table (C2)				
Sediment Deposits (B2)	Presence of F	Reduced Iron (C4)	Crayfish Bu	rrows (C8)				
☑ Drift Deposits (B3)	Recent Iron R	eduction in Tilled Soils (C6)	/isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)				
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	🛄 Thin Muck Su	rface (C7)	Geomorphic	c Position (D2)				
Iron Deposits (B5)	L Other (Explain	n in Remarks)	Shallow Aqu	uitard (D3)				
✓ Inundation Visible on Aeri	al Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutra	ıl Test (D5)				
Water-Stained Leaves (B	9)		<u> </u> Sphagnum	moss (D8) (LRR T, U)				
Field Observations:		ah a a).						
Surface water Present?	Yes No X Depth (in	ches):						
Saturation Present?	Yes No X Depth (in	ches).	Wotland Hydrology Proso	nt2 Vos X No				
(includes capillary fringe)		ciles).	wettand Hydrology Frese					
Describe Recorded Data (stre	am gauge, monitoring well, aerial	photos, previous inspec	tions), if available:					
Aeriais: 2010 ESRI	& USDA							
Remarks:								

VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

Sampling	Point:	DP-2
----------	--------	------

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1. Salix nigra	70	Y	OBL	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 7 (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: 7 (B)
4.				
5				Percent of Dominant Species
6				That Are OBL, FACW, of FAC: (A/B)
7				Prevalence Index worksheet:
/	·			Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
8	70			OBL species x 1 =
	70	= Total Cov	er	
50% of total cover: <u>35</u>	20% of	total cover:	14	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				FAC species x 3 =
1. Forestiera acuminata	5	Υ	OBL	FACU species x 4 =
2.				UPL species x 5 =
3				Column Totals: (A) (B)
A	·			
	·			Prevalence Index = B/A =
	·			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6	·			1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7	·			✓ 2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8				\square 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
	5	= Total Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% of	total cover:	1	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: ^{30'} radius)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wotland hydrology must
Persicaria hydropiperoides	30	Υ	OBL	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2 Ampelopsis arborea	20	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata
2. Saururus cernus	10	N	OBI	Deminions of Four Vegetation Ottata.
Colocasia esculenta	10		FACW	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or
4. Uibiagua magabautag	10	<u></u>		more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of beight
	<u> </u>			neight.
6. Physalls angulata	5	N	FACU	Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7. Boehmeria cylindrica	5	N	FACW	than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10.				We advise Allowed wines are start than 2.00 ft in
11				height
12	·			noight.
12.	90	- Total Cav		
50% of total access 45	000/		18	
	20% Of	iotal cover:	10	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	10	V	540	
1. Ampelopsis arborea	10	Y	FAC	
2. Campsis radicans	5	Y	FAC	
3. Brunnichia ovata	5	Y	FACW	
4				
5.				Hydrophytic
	20	= Total Cov	or	Vegetation
50% of total cover: 10	20% of		4	Present? Yes $\frac{X}{2}$ No
	20% 01	total cover.	<u> </u>	
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	ow).			

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dept	h needed to docun	nent the i	indicator	or confirm	the absence	of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redox	<u>k Feature</u>	s			
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-8	10YR 4/2	97	10YR 4/6	3	С	M	Sandy clay loam	
8-14	10YR 5/2	95	10 YR 4/6	5	С	Μ	Sandy clay loam	
						·		
		· ·			·	·		
						·		
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Masked	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all I	RRs, unless other	wise not	ed.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ce (S8) (l		J) 1 cm N	/luck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	ipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	rface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)	2 cm N	/luck (A10) (LRR S)
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Mucky	/ Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduc	ed Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	d Matrix ((F2)			ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
	Layers (A5)		Depleted Mat	rix (F3)	-0)			alous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, I, U) D D T IIV		Surface (F	-6) (E7)			RA 153B)
		(K F, I, U)		ssions (F	; (F7) 8)			alent Material (TF2)
	ck (A9) (LRR P. T)	,	Marl (F10) (L	RR U)	0)		Other	(Explain in Remarks)
Depleted	Below Dark Surface	e (A11)	Depleted Och	nric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)		
Thick Da	rk Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangane	ese Mass	es (F12) (LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indic	ators of hydrophytic vegetation and
Coast Pr	airie Redox (A16) (N	ILRA 150A) 🔲 Umbric Surfa	ce (F13)	(LRR P, T	', U)	wet	land hydrology must be present,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (L	.RR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (ML	RA 151)		unle	ess disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ver	tic (F18) ((MLRA 15	50A, 150B)		
Sandy R	edox (S5)			odplain S	iolls (F19) my Soila ((MLRA 14	9A)	1520)
Dark Sur	face (S7) (I RR P S	ти		nyni Loa	iny sons (A 149A, 155C	, 1550)
Restrictive L	aver (if observed):	, , , , , ,						
Type:								
Depth (inc	ches):						Hvdric Soil	Present? Yes X No
Remarks:								
Remarks.								

Data Point 2a



Data Point 2b



WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region

Project/Site: MBSD		City/C	ounty: Plaquemines		Sampling Date: 11/13/12			
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Rar	n Terminals	-		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-3			
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Sectio	Section, Township, Range: <u>N/A</u>					
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc	.): Delta / Fastland	Local	relief (concave, convex,	none): concave	Slope (%): 1			
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Out	ter Coastal Plain (LRR T)	_{Lat:} 29.6617 N	Lona: 8	9.9645 W	Datum: NAD 83			
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancien	ne silt loam		0	NWI classific	_{cation:} Upland			
Are climatic / hvdrologic conditio	ons on the site typical for t	his time of vear? Y	es X No	(If no. explain in F	Remarks.)			
Are Vegetation . Soil	. or Hydrology X	significantly distur	bed? Are "Normal	Circumstances" ı	present? Yes No X			
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology	naturally problema	atic? (If needed a	explain any answe	ers in Remarks)			
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site ma	p showing sam	pling point location	ons, transects	s, important features, etc.			
Hydrophytic Vegetation Preser Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	nt? Yes X Yes Yes	No No _X No _X	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No <u>X</u>			
Remarks:								
Between river levee hydrologic indicators	and Highway 23.	Hurricane Isa	aac has resulted	in atypical o	conditions and			
HYDROLOGY								
Wetland Hydrology Indicator	rs:			Secondary Indica	ators (minimum of two required)			
Primary Indicators (minimum c	one is required; check a	ill that apply)			Cracks (B6)			
High Water Table (A2)		IC Fauna (B13) Deposits (B15) (I RE	2 11)		getated Concave Surface (B8)			
\square Saturation (A3)		ogen Sulfide Odor (((0)		ines (B16)			
Water Marks (B1)		zed Rhizospheres a	long Living Roots (C3)	Dry-Season	Water Table (C2)			
Sediment Deposits (B2)		nce of Reduced Iro	n (C4)	Cravfish Bur	rows (C8)			
Drift Deposits (B3)		nt Iron Reduction in	Tilled Soils (C6)	Saturation V	isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)			
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	Thin M	Muck Surface (C7)		Geomorphic	Position (D2)			
Iron Deposits (B5)	D Other	(Explain in Remark	s)	Shallow Aqu	itard (D3)			
Inundation Visible on Aeri	al Imagery (B7)			FAC-Neutral	Test (D5)			
✓ Water-Stained Leaves (BS)	9)			Sphagnum r	noss (D8) (LRR T, U)			
Field Observations:								
Surface Water Present?	Yes <u>No X</u> C	Depth (inches):						
Water Table Present?	Yes No X C	Depth (inches):			X			
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes <u>No X</u> C	Depth (inches):	vious inspections) if ava	lydrology Preser	nt? Yes <u>No X</u>			
Aerials: 2010 FSRI	& USDA	i, denai prietoe, pre	nodo mopodicilo), il ava					
Remarks:								
Atypical situation, fal	se positive indica	itors due to h	urricane.					
Sampling	Point:	DP-3						
----------	--------	------						
----------	--------	------						

201	1	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' rac	lius)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1. Carya aquatica		10	Y	OBL	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 7 (A)
2. Cornus drummondii		20	Υ	FAC	Total Number of Deminent
3.					Species Across All Strata: 7 (B)
1					
					Percent of Dominant Species
5		·			That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100 (A/B)
6		·			Broyalanca Index warkshoot
7					
8					Iotal % Cover of:Multiply by:
		30	= Total Cov	ver	OBL species x 1 =
	50% of total cover 15	20% of	total cover	- 6	FACW species x 2 =
Sopling/Shrub Stratum (Diatai	. 30' radius	20/001			FAC species x 3 =
Sapling/Sillub Stratum (Plot Siz	(e. <u>66 radias</u>)	20	V	EAC	FACU species x 4 =
		30	<u> </u>	FAC	
2. Acer rubrum		10	Y	FAC	
3					Column Totals: (A) (B)
4.					Drovelence Index - D/A -
5					
0		·			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
б		·			1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7					✓ 2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8					$\boxed{\square}$ 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^{1}$
		40	= Total Cov	ver	\square Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Evaluin)
	50% of total cover 20	20% of	total cover	- 8	
Lianh Strature (Distaine, 30' rai	dius	20/0 01			
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 00 rat)	F	V		¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Saururus cernus		5	Y	OBL	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Ampelopsis arborea		5	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3					Tree Meadurelante evolution vince 2 in (7.0 em) en
4					I ree – woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or more in diameter at breast height (DBH) regardless of
		·			height.
5		·			
6		·			Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7					than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8					Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9.					of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10					
10.		·			Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
					neight.
12					
		10	= Total Cov	/er	
	50% of total cover: 5	20% of	total cover	2	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:	30' radius				
1 Ampelopsis arborea	,	5	Y	FAC	
1. <u> </u>					
Z		·			
3		·			
4					
5					Hydrophytic
		5	= Total Cov	ver	Vegetation
	50% of total cover 2.5	20% of	total cover	. 1	Present? Yes X No
Demonstra (If the end of the form		2070 01		·	
Remarks: (If observed, list mor	phological adaptations belo	ow).			

SOIL

Profile Desc	cription: (Describe	to the dept	n needed to docur	ment the	indicator	or confirm	the absence of inc	dicators.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	es1	. 2			
(inches)	Color (moist)	<u> % </u>	Color (moist)	%	Type'			Remark	<u>s</u>
0-14	101 R 4/1	99	101R 4/0		<u> </u>	IVI			
						·			
						·			
						·			
						·			
1						·			
'Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	etion, RM=F	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Maskeo	d Sand Gr	ains.	Location: PL=F	Pore Lining, M=Ma	atrix. ic Soile ³ :
					eu.)	DDCTI			10 30115 .
	(A1) ninedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	inface (SQ	ice (58) (I	_RR 5, 1, U T II)	$D_2 \text{ cm Muck}$	A9) (LRR U) A10) (I RR S)	
Black Hi	istic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduced Ve	rtic (F18) (outsid	e MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	en Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix ((F2)		Piedmont Fl	oodplain Soils (F1	19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	d Layers (A5)		Depleted Ma	trix (F3)			Anomalous	Bright Loamy Soil	s (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	F6)		(MLRA 15	3B)	
5 cm Mu	ucky Mineral (A7) (L i	RR P, T, U)		rk Surface	e (⊢7)		Red Parent	Material (TF2)	· [10)
		")	Marl (F10) (I	RR II)	0)		Other (Eynla	v Dark Surface (1	F12)
	d Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)		hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)			
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)	、 ,	Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	es (F12)	(LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indicators	of hydrophytic ve	getation and
Coast Pi	rairie Redox (A16) (I	MLRA 150A)) 🔲 Umbric Surfa	ace (F13)	(LRR P, 1	r, U)	wetland h	nydrology must be	e present,
Sandy M	/lucky Mineral (S1) (LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (MI	LRA 151)		unless di	sturbed or proble	matic.
Sandy G	Deved Matrix (54)		Reduced Vel Dedmont Ele	nic (F18) Indolain S	(IVILRA 1:	MI PA 14	0.4)		
	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous E	Bright Loa	mv Soils ((MERA 14) (F20) (MLR	A 149A. 153C. 153I)	
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	S, T, U)		5	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-70	- ,,	,	
Restrictive I	Layer (if observed)								
Туре:									X
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil Pres	ent? Yes	No
Remarks:	odov oppopt	rationa r	ot common						
К		rations r	IOL COMMON.						



Project/Site: MBSD		City/Co	_{unty:} Plaquemines		Sampling Date: <u>11/13/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Rai	m Terminals	-	8	State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-4
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Sectior	n, Township, Range: N/	A	· · ·
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc	_{):} Delta / Fastland	Local re	elief (concave, convex, r	none): none	Slope (%): 2
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Ou	ter Coastal Plain (LRR T)	Lat: 29.6605	Lona: 8	9.9642	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancien	ne silt loam		0	NWI classifi	_{cation:} Upland
Are climatic / hvdrologic conditio	ons on the site typical for t	his time of vear? Ye	s X No (If no. explain in F	Remarks.)
Are Vegetation . Soil	. or Hydrology X	significantly disturb	ed? Are "Normal	Circumstances"	present? Yes No X
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology	naturally problemat	ic? (If needed e	xplain any answe	ers in Remarks)
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site ma	p showing sam	oling point locatio	ns, transects	s, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Prese	nt? Yes X	No	Is the Sampled Area	`	
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes	No X	within a Wetland?	Yes	No X
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes	No X			
Remarks:	and Highway 22	Hurricopo loo	as has resulted	in at mical	conditions and
Between river levee	and Highway 23.	Hurricane Isa	ac has resulted	in atypical	conditions and
nydrologic indicators	· .				
HYDROLOGY					
Wetland Hydrology Indicato	rs:			Secondary Indic	ators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of	of one is required; check a	II that apply)		Surface Soil	Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	Aquat	tic Fauna (B13)		Sparsely Ve	getated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	Mari [Deposits (B15) (LRR	U)	L Drainage Pa	atterns (B10)
Saturation (A3)	Hydro	ogen Sulfide Odor (C	1)	Moss Trim L	ines (B16)
Water Marks (B1)		zed Rhizospheres alo	ong Living Roots (C3)	Dry-Season	Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)		ence of Reduced Iron	(C4)	Crayfish Bu	rrows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)		nt Iron Reduction in T	illed Soils (C6)	Saturation V	isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)		Muck Surface (C7)	`	Geomorphic	Position (D2)
\square Iron Deposits (B5)		(Explain in Remarks)		litard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aeri	al Imagery (B7)				1 lest (D5)
Field Observations:	5)				
Surface Water Present?	Yes No X [Depth (inches):			
Water Table Present?	Yes No X [Depth (inches):			
Saturation Present?	Yes No X	Depth (inches):	Wetland H	ydrology Prese	nt? Yes <u>No X</u>
(includes capillary fringe)	om gougo monitoring wo	l coricl photos prov	in the second		
Apriale: 2010 ESRI		ii, aeriai priotos, prev	ous inspections), il avai	lable.	
Remarks:	& UODA				
Atypical cituation fal	leo positivo indioc	tore due to bu	urricano		
Alypical situation, iai	se positive indica				

Sampling	Point:	DP-4
----------	--------	------

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 radius</u>)	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species
	35	Y N	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: _/ (A)
2. Iriadica sebitera	10	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: (B)
4				Percent of Dominant Species
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>100</u> (A/B)
6				December of the december of the set
7				Prevalence Index worksneet:
8				I otal % Cover of: Multiply by:
	45	= Total Cov	/er	OBL species x 1 =
50% of total cover: <u>22.5</u>	20% of	total cover	9	FACW species x 2 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				FAC species x 3 =
1. Acer negundo	15	Y	FAC	FACU species x 4 =
2. Cornus drummondii	10	Y	FAC	UPL species x 5 =
3 Morella cerifera	5	Y	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)
4				
5				Prevalence Index = B/A =
				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
0				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
/				2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8	20			3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
45	30	= Total Cov	/er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: 15	20% of	total cover	. 0	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Echinochloa colona	30	Y	FACW	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Ampelopsis arborea	5	N	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3. Acer negundo	5	N	FAC	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines 3 in (7.6 cm) or
4				more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5				height.
6				Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9.				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10.				We alter the data with the second state of the
11				woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in height
12				noight
	40	= Total Cov	/er	
50% of total cover: 20	20% of	total cover	. 8	
Weedy Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius	2070.01			
A Ampelopsis arborea	5	Y	FAC	
1. <u>• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •</u>				
2				
3				
4				
5				Hydrophytic
	5	= Total Cov	/er	Vegetation Present? Ves X No
50% of total cover: <u>2.5</u>	20% of	total cover	: <u>1</u>	
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations below	ow).			
				I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the depth	n needed to docum	nent the i	indicator	or confirm	the absence o	of indicators.)		
Depth	Matrix		Redox	Feature	s1	. 2		_		
(inches)	Color (moist)	<u>%</u>	Color (moist)		Type'		Texture	Rem	larks	
0-16	10YR 4/2	99	10YR 4/6	1	С	M	Silty clay			_
					- <u> </u>					_
					·					-
					·					-
					·	·				-
					·	·				-
										-
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=F	Reduced Matrix, MS	=Masked	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location: F	PL=Pore Lining, M	=Matrix.	
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all L	RRs, unless other	wise not	ed.)		Indicators f	or Problematic H	ydric Soils":	
	(A1)		Polyvalue Bel	ow Surfa	ce (S8) (L	.RR S, T, U		JCK (A9) (LRR O)		
Black Hi	stic (A3)			Mineral	(E1) (I RE	1, U) 2 (0)		d Vertic (F18) (ou t	tside MI RA 150A F	3)
	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleve	d Matrix ((F2)	,		nt Floodplain Soils	(F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	Layers (A5)		Depleted Mat	rix (F3)	· · ·		Anomale	ous Bright Loamy	Soils (F20)	
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark S	Surface (F	=6)		(MLR	A 153B)		
5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (LI	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Dar	k Surface	e (F7)		Red Par	rent Material (TF2)	1	
	esence (A8) (LRR L))		ssions (F	8)			allow Dark Surfac	e (TF12)	
	CK (A9) (LRR P, T) Below Dark Surfac	e (Δ11)		KK U) tric (F11)	(MIRA 1	51)		-xplain in Remarks	3)	
Thick Da	rk Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangane	ese Mass	es (F12) (LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indica	tors of hydrophytic	c vegetation and	
Coast Pr	airie Redox (A16) (I	MLRA 150A)	Umbric Surfac	ce (F13)	(LRR P, T	, U)	wetla	and hydrology mus	t be present,	
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (I	LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric ((F17) (ML	_RA 151)		unles	ss disturbed or pro	blematic.	
Sandy G	ileyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ver	tic (F18) ((MLRA 15	0A, 150B)				
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flor	odplain S	Soils (F19)	(MLRA 14	9A)	4620)		
Dark Su	face (S7) (I RR P \$	зт II)		ngni Loai	my Solis (F20) (IVILR	A 149A, 153C,	153D)		
Restrictive L	ayer (if observed)	:								
Type:	,									
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil F	Present? Yes	No X	_
Remarks:	,						5			
R	edox concent	rations r	ot common.							



Project/Site: MBSD		City/County: Plaq	uemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Rar	n Terminals		_{State:} LA	Sampling Point: DP-5
Investigator(s); CM, JM, RW		Section. Township	Range: N/A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc	.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (conca	ve, convex, none): none	Slope (%): 2
Subregion (LRR or MLRA). Out	er Coastal Plain (LRR T)	. 29.6607 N	Long: 89.9659 W	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name. Cancieni	ne silt loam	·	NWI class	ification. Upland
Are climatic / hydrologic conditic	ons on the site typical for this t	me of year? Yes X	lo (If no explain it	Remarks)
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology X sig	nificantly disturbed?	Aro "Normal Circumstancos	a" procent? Voc No X
	, or Hydrology sign			
	, or Hydrology hat	urally problematic?	In needed, explain any ans	wers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site map sh	nowing sampling poi	nt locations, transed	ets, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Preser	nt? Yes X No	Is the Sam	nled Area	
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X No	within a W	etland? Yes	No X
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes No	<u>×</u>		110
Remarks:				
Between river levee	and Highway 23. Hu	irricane Isaac has	resulted in atypica	l conditions and
hydrologic indicators				
HYDROLOGY				
Wetland Hydrology Indicator	'S:		Secondary Ind	licators (minimum of two required)
	it one is required; check all tha	at apply)	Surface S	oil Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)		auna (B13)	<u> </u>	Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)		SITS (B15) (LRR U)		Patterns (B10)
\square Saturation (A3)		Sulfide Odor (C1)		n Lines (B16)
\square Water Marks (B1)		cf Reduced Iren (C4)	Crowfieh	Sh water Table $(C2)$
		n Reducted Iron (C4)		Visible on Asriel Imagen (CO)
Algol Mat or Crust (B4)				aic Position (D2)
		Jain in Remarks)		auitard (D3)
	al Imagery (B7)	Jain in Kemarkay		ral Test (D5)
Water-Stained Leaves (BS				n moss (D8) (LRR T. U)
Field Observations:	· /		<u> </u>	
Surface Water Present?	Yes <u>No X</u> Depth	n (inches):		
Water Table Present?	Yes <u>No X</u> Depth	(inches):		
Saturation Present?	Yes <u>No X</u> Depth	n (inches):	Wetland Hydrology Pres	sent? Yes <u>No X</u>
Describe Recorded Data (strea	am gauge, monitoring well, ae	rial photos, previous inspec	tions), if available:	
Aerials: 2010 ESRI	& USDA			
Remarks:				
Atypical situation, fal	se positive indicator	s due to hurricane		
	-			

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1. Quercus nigra	20	Y	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>13</u> (A)
2. Acer negundo	10	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant
3. Acer rubrum	10	Y	FAC	Species Across All Strata: <u>15</u> (B)
4. Celtis occidentalis	10	Y	FACU	Percent of Dominant Species
5				That Are OBL. FACW. or FAC: ⁸⁷ (A/B)
6				
7				Prevalence Index worksheet:
8				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
	50	= Total Cov	er	OBL species x 1 =
50% of total cover: ²⁵	20% of	total cover:	10	FACW species x 2 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				FAC species x 3 =
1. Acer negundo	20	Y	FAC	FACU species x 4 =
2 Triadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	UPL species x 5 =
3 Quercus nigra	5	N	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)
4	·			
+	·			Prevalence Index = B/A =
5	·			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
8	·			1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
<i>1</i>	·			2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8	25			3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
17.5		= Total Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: <u>17.5</u>	20% of	total cover:	1	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	-			¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Ampelopsis arborea	5	Y	FAC	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Ligustrum sinense	1	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3. Triadica sebifera	1	Y	FAC	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in, (7.6 cm) or
4. Quercus nigra	1	Y	FAC	more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5. <u>Sambucus nigra</u>	1	Y	FAC	height.
6. Acer negundo	1	Y	FAC	Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7. Rubus trivialis	1	Υ	FACU	than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8	·			Herb – All berbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10.				Weedwaine All weedwaines greater than 2.29 ft in
11.				height.
12				
	11	= Total Cov	er	
50% of total cover: 5.5	20% of	total cover	2.2	
Weedy Vine Stratum (Plat size: 30' radius	2070.01			
Ampelopsis arborea	5	Y	FAC	
Toxicodendron radicans	5	<u></u>	FAC	
			FAC	
3	·			
4	·			
5	·			Hydrophytic
	10	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation
50% of total cover: <u>5</u>	20% of	total cover:	2	Present? fes <u>~</u> No
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	ow).			

SOIL

00.2								
Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dept	h needed to docur	nent the i	ndicator	or confirm	n the absence	e of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Features	S1		_	
<u>(inches)</u>	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type'		Texture	Remarks
0-14	10YR 4/1	97	10YR 4/6	3	С	M	Clay	
·						·		
							·	
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, M	S=Masked	Sand G	rains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless other	rwise note	ed.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
	(A1)			low Surfa	oo (SQ) (I	ррет		
	(AI)					- KK 3, 1, 1		
	atia (AQ)			inace (59)) (LKK 5,	1, 0)		Muck (ATU) (LRR S)
	STIC (A3)			y Mineral	(F1) (LRI	R ()		ced Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix (F2)			ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	l Layers (A5)		Depleted Ma	trix (F3)			L Anoma	alous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	', T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	-6)		(ML	RA 153B)
🔲 5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (LI	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Date	rk Surface	e (F7)		Red P	arent Material (TF2)
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR U	J)	Redox Depre	essions (F	8)		U Very S	Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
1 cm Mu	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)		Marl (F10) (L	.RR U)			Other	(Explain in Remarks)
Depleted	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Oc	hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)		
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)	()	Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	、 es (F12)	LRR O. P	. T) ³ India	cators of hydrophytic vegetation and
Coast Pr	airie Redox (A16) (I	MI RA 150A		ce (F13) ((,,,,,,,,,	, , we	tland hydrology must be present
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (I			(F17) (MI	RA 151)	, .,	unl	ess disturbed or problematic
	loved Metrix (64)			(I I I I) (IIIE		50A 150D	N	
				uc (F10) () 40 A)	
	edox (SS)			oopiain S			49A)	
	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous E	Bright Loar	my Solls	(F20) (MLF	RA 149A, 153C	, 153D)
Dark Su	face (S7) (LRR P, S	S, T, U)					1	
Restrictive L	_ayer (if observed):							
Туре:								
Depth (inc	ches).						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes X No
Demenden								
Remarks:								

Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals	State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-6
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: <u>N/A</u>	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave	Slope (%): <u>1</u>
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.	6598 Long: 89.9653 W	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancienne silt Ioam	NWI classifica	ation: PFO1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time o	f vear? Yes X No (If no, explain in Re	emarks.)
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology X significa	ntly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" pr	resent? Yes No X
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology naturally	problematic? (If needed, explain any answer	s in Remarks)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map show	ing sampling point locations, transects,	important features, etc.
		•
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes <u>~</u> No No	Is the Sampled Area	
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No	— within a Wetland? Yes X	No
Remarks:		
Depression between river levee and Highwa	y 23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted	in some atypical
conditions.		
HYDROLOGY		
	Secondary Indicat	ors (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required: check all that app	IV) Surface Soil C	Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	(B13) Sparsely Veg	etated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	B15) (LRR U)	terns (B10)
Saturation (A3)	le Odor (C1) 🗌 Moss Trim Lir	nes (B16)
Water Marks (B1)	spheres along Living Roots (C3) 🛛 📃 Dry-Season V	Vater Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	duced Iron (C4)	ows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)	duction in Tilled Soils (C6)	sible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	ace (C7)	Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)	n Remarks) Shallow Aquit	ard (D3)
✓ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		rest (D5) oss (D8) (LPP T LI)
Field Observations:		
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (incl	nes):	
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (incl	nes):	
Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (incl	nes): Wetland Hydrology Present	t? Yes X No
(includes capillary fringe)		
Aprials: 2010 ESPI & USDA	iotos, previous inspections), il available.	
Remarks:		
Duckwood (Lompa cp.) op soil surface. Alth	auch atypical situation due to hurrie	ana aroa annoars ta
baye bydrology under normal conditions	Sugir alypical situation due to nume	alle, alea appeals lo
nave nyurology under normal conditions.		

201		Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' rad	ilus)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1. Salix nigra		20	Y	OBL	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 5 (A)
2. Triadica sebifera		25	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant
3. Acer rubrum		10	Ν	FAC	Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)
4					(_)
5					Percent of Dominant Species
<u> </u>					That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100 (A/B
6					Prevalence Index worksheet:
7					Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
8					
		55	= Total Cov	rer	
	50% of total cover: 27.5	20% of	total cover	11	FACW species x 2 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot siz	ze: 30' radius)				FAC species x 3 =
1 Triadica sebifera	/	10	Y	FAC	FACU species x 4 =
2					UPL species x 5 =
2					Column Totals: (A) (B)
3					
4					Prevalence Index = B/A =
5					Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6					1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7.					$\boxed{\mathbf{V}}_{2}$ - Dominance Test is >50%
8.					\square 2 - Dominance rest is 200 %
		10	= Total Cov		$\square 3 - Prevalence index is \leq 5.0$
	50% of total approx 5	200/ of		. 2	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation' (Explain)
20' 10	50% of total cover: <u> </u>	20% 01	total cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 50 Tag	uius)	-		0.01	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Lemna sp.		5	Y	OBL	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2					Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3					Tree Woody plants evoluting vince 2 in (7.6 cm) of
4.					more in diameter at breast height (DBH) regardless of
5					height.
6					
0					Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
/					
8					Herb - All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9					of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10					Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11					height.
12.					
		5	= Total Cov	er	
	50% of total approx 2.5	200% of		. 1	
	30' radius	20 /0 01		· <u> </u>	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size))	F	V	EAC	
1. Ampeiopsis arborea		5	ř	FAC	
2					
3					
4					
5.					Hydrophytic
		5	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation
	50% of total approx 2.5	200% of		. 1	Present? Yes X No
		20 % 01		·	
Remarks: (If observed, list mor	phological adaptations belo	w).			

SUL								5	ampling Point	
Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docun	nent the	indicator	or confirm	n the absence	e of indicato	ors.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	S					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture		Remarks	
0-2	10YR 3/1	100					Clay			
2-16	10YR 5/1	90	10YR 4/6	10	C	М	Clay			
	10110.0/1	50		10	0		Olay			
·		·								
1							2			
Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Masked	d Sand Gr	ains.	Location:	PL=Pore L	.ining, M=Matr	IX.
Hydric Soli I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRS, unless other	wise not	ea.)			s for Proble	matic Hydric	Solis":
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ce (S8) (l	_RR S, T, I	U) <u> </u> 1cm 	Muck (A9) (l	LRR O)	
Histic Ep	oipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	rface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)	2 cm	Muck (A10)	(LRR S)	
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Mucky	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduc	ced Vertic (F	18) (outside	MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	d Matrix ((F2)		Piedm	ont Floodpla	ain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	l Layers (A5)		✓ Depleted Mat	trix (F3)			L Anom	alous Bright	Loamy Soils	(F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark S	Surface (F	-6)		(ML	RA 153B)		
🔲 5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (LF	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Dar	k Surface	e (F7)		Red F	Parent Mater	ial (TF2)	
Muck Pre	esence (A8) (LRR U)	Redox Depre	ssions (F	8)		U Very S	Shallow Darl	k Surface (TF	12)
🔲 1 cm Mu	ick (A9) (LRR P, T)		🔲 Marl (F10) (L	RR U)			U Other	(Explain in I	Remarks)	
Depleted	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Och	nric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)				
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangane	ese Mass	es (F12) (LRR O, P	, T) ³ Indi	cators of hyd	drophytic vege	etation and
Coast Pr	airie Redox (A16) (N	/LRA 150/) 🗍 Umbric Surfa	ce (F13)	(LRR P, T	, U)	we	tland hydrol	ogy must be p	oresent,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (L	RR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (MI	_RA 151)		un	less disturbe	ed or problema	atic.
Sandy G	leved Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ver	tic (F18)	(MLRA 15	50A, 150B))			
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain S	Soils (F19)	(MLRA 14	49A)			
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous B	Fright Loa	my Soils (F20) (MLF	RA 149A, 1530	C, 153D)		
Dark Sur	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	5, T, U)		0			·			
Restrictive L	_ayer (if observed):									
Type [.]	,									
Dopth (inc	One Observation: (Description: (Description: (Description: Redox Features Color Color Color									
	nes).						Hydric Sol	I Flesent?	165	
Remarks:										



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals	State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-7
Investigator(s): <u>CM</u> , JM, RW	_ Section, Township, Range: <u>N/A</u>	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	_ Local relief (concave, convex, none): <u>concave</u>	Slope (%): <u>1</u>
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6	596 Long: 89.9656	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancienne silt Ioam	NWI classific	ation: PFO1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of	year? Yes X No (If no, explain in R	emarks.)
Are Vegetation , Soil , or Hydrology X significant	ly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" p	present? Yes No X
Are Vegetation , Soil , or Hydrology naturally p	oroblematic? (If needed, explain any answe	rs in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showin	g sampling point locations, transects	, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No Hydric Soil Present? Yes X No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No Remarks: No	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes X	No
Depression between river levee and Highway conditions.	23. Hurricane Isaac has resulted	in some atypical
HYDROLOGY		
Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna (B High Water Table (A2) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Sulfide Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizosp Sediment Deposits (B2) Presence of Redu Drift Deposits (B3) Recent Iron Redu Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Other (Explain in Inon Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Field Observations:	Secondary Indica Surface Soil 113) 15) (LRR U) Odor (C1) Pheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season uced Iron (C4) uction in Tilled Soils (C6) Saturation Vie Shallow Aqui FAC-Neutral Sphagnum m	tors (minimum of two required) Cracks (B6) getated Concave Surface (B8) tterns (B10) nes (B16) Water Table (C2) rows (C8) sible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Position (D2) itard (D3) Test (D5) noss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inche Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inche Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inche Cincludes capillary fringe) Yes No X Depth (inche Cincludes capillary fringe)	es): es): Wetland Hydrology Presen	ut? Yes X No
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial pho Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA	tos, previous inspections), if available:	
Remarks:		
Although atypical situation due to hurricane, a conditions.	area appears to have hydrology ur	ıder normal

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:	
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species	
1. Acer rubrum	40	Y	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 8 (A))
2. Acer negundo	10	Ν	FAC	Total Number of Dominant	
3. Triadica sebifera	10	Ν	FAC	Species Across All Strata: <u>9</u> (B))
4. Quercus nigra	5	Ν	FAC		,
5.				That Are OBL EACW or EAC 89 (A)	/B)
6					(0)
7				Prevalence Index worksheet:	
8				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:	
0	65	- Total Cov		OBL species x 1 =	
50% of total accurate 32.5	200% of		. 13	FACW species x 2 =	
Solvi of total cover.	20% 01			FAC species x 3 =	
Saping/Sinub Stratum (Piot size. 00 radius)	20	v	FAC	FACU species x 4 =	
	10			UPL species x 5 =	
2. Acei negundo	10			Column Totals: (A) (F	R)
3. Diospyros virginiana	-	¥	FAC		5)
4. <u>Cornus drummondii</u>	5	N	FAC	Prevalence Index = B/A =	
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
7				$\sqrt{2}$ - Dominance Test is >50%	
8.				\square 3 - Prevalence Index is <3 0 ¹	
	45	= Total Cov	rer	\square Broblemetic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Evplain)	
50% of total cover: 22.5	20% of	total cover	9		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius					
A Saururus cernus	10	Y	OBL	Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must	t
	5	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Verstetion Strate:	
2. Public trivialis	5	· 	FACU	Demnitions of Four vegetation Strata:	
	5			Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm)	or
4. Ampelopsis arborea	5	ř	FAC	more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless	of
5				neight.	
6				Sapling/Shrub - Woody plants, excluding vines, les	s
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.	
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardles	ss
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.	
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in	
11				height.	'
12.					
	25	= Total Cov	er		
50% of total cover: 12.5	20% of	total cover	5		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius			·		
Vitis rotundifolia	5	Y	FAC		
1					
2					
3					
4					
5				Hydrophytic	
	5	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation	
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% of	total cover	1		
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	w).				

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docur	nent the	indicator	or confirn	n the absence	e of indicators.)
Depth	 Matrix		Redo	x Feature	s			,
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-2	10YR 2/1	100					Clay	
2-16	10YR 5/1	95	10YR 4/6	5	С	М	Clav	
		· <u> </u>				· <u>····</u>		
		·						
				<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
	-	·						
		·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·		
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM	=Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Maske	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless other	rwise not	ed.)		Indicators	s for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	elow Surfa	ace (S8) (I		U) 🛄 1 cm 1	Muck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	ipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	ırface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)	2 cm I	Muck (A10) (LRR S)
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	L Reduc	ced Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix	(F2)		Piedm	nont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	l Layers (A5)		✓ Depleted Ma	trix (F3)			L Anom	alous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (I	F6)			RA 153B)
5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (LF	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Dai	rk Surface	e (F7)			Parent Material (TF2)
	esence (A8) (LRR U)		essions (F	8)			Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)	- (1 1 1)	<u> </u>	RRU)		E4)	U Other	(Explain in Remarks)
	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)		nric (F11)		51) (IDD O D	T) ³ Indi	esters of hydrophytic vegetation and
	nk Sunace (A12)	AL DA 150			(1 DD D 1	LKK U, P, ' III	, i) indic	tland bydrology must be present
	airie Redox (A10) (i lucky Mineral (S1) (i	PPO S		(E17) (MI	(ERR F, 1	, 0)	we	less disturbed or problematic
Sandy M	leved Matrix (S4)	-111 0, 3)		(i i /) (iiii	(MI R Δ 14	50A 150B))	
Sandy B	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odolain S	Soils (F19)	(MI RA 14	/ 19A)	
	Matrix (S6)			Bright Loa	my Soils (F20) (MI R	2A 149A, 153C	(153D)
Dark Sur	face (S7) (LRR P. S	6. T. U)			, eene (/ (.,,
Restrictive L	ayer (if observed):	, -, -,						
Type:								
Depth (inc	ches):						Hvdric Soi	I Present? Yes ^X No
Remarks:							,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Remarks.								



Project/Site: MBSD		City/County: Plac	luemines	Sampling Date: <u>11/13/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram	Terminals		State: L	A Sampling Point: DP-8
Investigator(s): <u>CM, JM, RW</u>		Section, Township	o, Range: <u>N/A</u>	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.):	Delta / Fastland	Local relief (conca	ve, convex, none):	none Slope (%): <u>1</u>
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer	Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 2	29.6591 N	Long: 89.9661	W Datum: NAD 8
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancienne	silt loam		NV	VI classification: Upland
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions	s on the site typical for this time	e of year? Yes X	No (If no, e)	(plain in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation, Soil	_, or Hydrology X signifi	cantly disturbed?	Are "Normal Circum	stances" present? Yes No X
Are Vegetation , Soil	, or Hydrology natura	ally problematic?	(If needed, explain a	any answers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	 Attach site map sho 	wing sampling poi	nt locations, tra	ansects, important features, et
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X No Yes No X	Is the Sam	pled Area etland?	Yes No X
hydrologic indicators.				
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:			Second	lary Indicators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of c	one is required; check all that a	ipply)	🔲 Su	rface Soil Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	Aquatic Faun	na (B13)		arsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)		s (B15) (LRR U)		ainage Patterns (B10)
Water Marks (B1)		inde Odor (CT) zospheres along Living F	Roots (C3) \Box Dr	-Season Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)		Reduced Iron (C4)		avfish Burrows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)	Recent Iron F	Reduction in Tilled Soils	(C6) 🔲 Sa	turation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	Thin Muck Si	urface (C7)	🗌 Ge	omorphic Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)	Uther (Explai	in in Remarks)	🔲 Sh	allow Aquitard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aerial	Imagery (B7)		FA	C-Neutral Test (D5)
✓ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)			└_ Sp	hagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Field Observations:				
Surface Water Present? Y	res <u>No X</u> Depth (ii	nches):		
Water Table Present? Y	res <u>No X</u> Depth (ii	nches):		
(includes capillary fringe)		ncnes):	wetland Hydrolog	Jy Present? fes No
Describe Recorded Data (stream	gauge, monitoring well, aerial	photos, previous inspec	tions), if available:	
Aerials: 2010 ESRI &	USDA			
Remarks:				
Atypical situation, false	e positive indicators	due to hurricane		

201	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:	
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species	
1. Acer rubrum	10	Y N	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>8</u> (A)	
2. Acer negundo	10	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant	
3. Ilex decidua	10	Y	FACW	Species Across All Strata: <u>10</u> (B)	
4. Iriadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	Percent of Dominant Species	
5	·			That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>80</u> (A/E	3)
6				Drevelence Index werkeheet:	
7					
8					
	40	= Total Cov	er		
50% of total cover: 20	20% of	total cover	8	FACW species x 2 =	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				FAC species x 3 =	
1. Ilex decidua	10	Y	FACW	FACU species x 4 =	
2. <u>Acer negundo</u>	20	Υ	FAC	UPL species x 5 =	
3				Column Totals: (A) (B)
4				Prevalence Index = B/A =	
5.				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
6.				1 Ponid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
7.					
8	·			\square 2 - Dominance Test is >50%	
···	30	= Total Cov	er	\square 3 - Prevalence index is ≤ 3.0	
50% of total cover: 15	20% of	total cover	6	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation' (Explain)	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius	2070 01			1	
Allium canadense	5	Y	FACU	Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must	
Viola bicolor	5	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strate:	
2. Brunnichia ovata	5	· Y	FACW	Demittons of Four vegetation Strata.	
3. Brownionia ovala	5	<u> </u>	FACU	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) of	or
	1	N	FAC	more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of height)f
5. Sambucus nigra	1		FAC	hoight	
6	1			Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less)
	·	IN	OBL		
8	·		·	Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless	s
9	·			of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.	
10	·			Woody vine - All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in	
11			·	height.	
12					
	23	= Total Cov	er		
50% of total cover: 11.5	20% of	total cover	4.6		
<u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5				Hydrophytic	
	0	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation	
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover		Present? Yes X No	
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	w)				
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				

SOIL

	rintion: (Deceribe	ta tha dant	h needed to deeu	nont the i	ndiaatar	or confirm	the choose of i	ndiaatar		
Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dept	n needed to docur		ndicator	or confirm	the absence of I	nuicators	5.)	
Depth (inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	<u>x Feature</u> %	s Type ¹	\log^2	Texture		Remarks	
0-16	10YR 3/1	98	10YR 4/6	2	<u> </u>	<u></u> M	Silty clay		Remarks	
	101110/1			. —		<u> </u>				
		· ·								
		· ·								
							·			
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, M	S=Masked	I Sand Gr	ains.	² Location: PL=	=Pore Lin	ing, M=Matri	X.
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all L	RRs, unless othe	rwise not	ed.)		Indicators for	Problem	atic Hydric S	Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ce (S8) (l	.RR S, T, U) <u> </u> 1 cm Muck	(A9) (LR	RR O)	
Histic Ep	ipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	Irface (S9)) (LRR S,	T, U)		(A10) (L	.RR S)	
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)		/ertic (F18	8) (outside N	(LRA 150A,B)
	n Sulfide (A4)			ed Matrix (F2)			Floodplair	n Solis (F19)	(LRR P, 5, 1)
	Rodies (AS)	тт		uix (F3) Surface (F	6)			5 DHYHLL 1538)	oarriy Solis (i	-20)
\square 5 cm Mu	ckv Mineral (A7) (LF	, ,, o, RR P. T. U)	Depleted Da	rk Surface	(F7)		Red Paren	t Material	I (TF2)	
Muck Pre	esence (A8) (LRR U)	Redox Depre	essions (F	8)		Very Shall	ow Dark S	Surface (TF1)	2)
🔲 1 cm Mu	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)		Marl (F10) (L	.RR U)	,		Other (Exp	lain in Re	emarks)	
Depleted	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Oc	hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)				
Thick Da	rk Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	es (F12) (LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indicator	s of hydro	ophytic veget	ation and
	airie Redox (A16) (N	ALRA 150A) Umbric Surfa	ice (F13) ((LRR P, T	, U)	wetland	l hydrolog	gy must be pr	esent,
	lucky Mineral (S1) (I loved Matrix (S4)	_RR 0, 5)		(F17) (IVIL tic (E18) (.RA 151) MI DA 18	OA 150B)	uniess	disturbed	or problemat	liC.
Sandy G	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain S	oils (F19)	(MI RA 14	94)			
	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous E	Bright Loar	mv Soils (F20) (MLR.	A 149A. 153C. 15	3D)		
Dark Sur	face (S7) (LRR P, S	5, T, U)	—	5	,	-7.	-,, -	- /		
Restrictive L	ayer (if observed):	-								
Туре:										
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil Pre	sent?	Yes X	No
Remarks:										



	City/County: Plaq	uemines		Sampling Date: <u>11/13/12</u>
m Terminals		State:	LA	Sampling Point: DP-9
	Section, Township	, Range: N/A		
.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (conca	ve, convex, none	: concave	Slope (%): 1
ter Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6	6600 N	Long: 89.96	75 W	Datum: NAD 83
ne silt loam		_	NWI classifica	tion: Upland
ons on the site typical for this time of	fyear? Yes X	No (If no,	explain in Re	marks.)
, or Hydrology X significar	ntly disturbed?	Are "Normal Circu	umstances" pr	esent? Yes No X
, or Hydrology naturally	problematic?	(If needed, explai	n any answers	s in Remarks.)
S – Attach site map showi	ng sampling poi	nt locations,	transects,	important features, etc.
nt? Yes X No Yes X No Yes No X	Is the Sam	pled Area etland?	Yes	No <u>X</u>
	I			
and Highway 23. Humoa				
of one is required; check all that appl Aquatic Fauna (Marl Deposits (E Hydrogen Sulfid Oxidized Rhizos Presence of Red Recent Iron Red Thin Muck Surfa Other (Explain in al Imagery (B7)	l <u>y)</u> B13) B15) (LRR U) le Odor (C1) spheres along Living F duced Iron (C4) duction in Tilled Soils (ace (C7) n Remarks)	C6)	Surface Soil C Sparsely Vege Drainage Patt Moss Trim Lin Dry-Season W Crayfish Burro Saturation Vis Geomorphic F Shallow Aquita FAC-Neutral T Sphagnum mo	cracks (B6) etated Concave Surface (B8) erns (B10) es (B16) /ater Table (C2) ows (C8) ible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Position (D2) ard (D3) Fest (D5) oss (D8) (LRR T, U)
V				
Yes No A Depth (inch Yes No X Depth (inch Yes No X Depth (inch am gauge, monitoring well, aerial ph	nes): nes): nes): notos, previous inspec	Wetland Hydro	logy Present	? Yes No_X
& USDA				
se positive indicators du	ie to hurricane			
	m Terminals .): Delta / Fastland ter Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29. ne silt loam ons on the site typical for this time of, or Hydrology X significar, or Hydrology naturally S – Attach site map showi nt? Yes X No Yes No Yes No and Highway 23. Hurrica rs: of one is required; check all that app Aquatic Fauna (Marl Deposits (f Hydrogen Sulfid Oxidized Rhizos Presence of Re Recent Iron Red Thin Muck Surfa Other (Explain i al Imagery (B7) Yes No X Depth (inch Yes No X	m Terminals	m Terminals State: Section, Township, Range: N/A _); Delta / Fastland Local relief (concave, convex, none) ter Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6600 N Long: 89.96 ne silt loam	City/County: Plaquemines m Terminals State: LA Section, Township, Range: NA

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species
1. Acer negundo	20	Y	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: _/ (A)
2. Triadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant
3. Salix nigra	10	Υ	OBL	Species Across All Strata: <u>7</u> (B)
4				Demonstrat Deminant Creation
5				That Are OBL_EACW_or EAC: 100 (A/B)
6.				
7.				Prevalence Index worksheet:
8				Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
···	40	= Total Cov	/er	OBL species x 1 =
50% of total cover: 20	20% of	f total cover	. 8	FACW species x 2 =
Sapling/Shruh Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius	2070 01			FAC species x 3 =
Triadica sebifera	30	Y	FAC	FACU species x 4 =
				UPL species x 5 =
2				Column Totals: (A) (B)
3				
4				Prevalence Index = B/A =
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7				$\boxed{2}$ - Dominance Test is >50%
8				\square 3 - Prevalence Index is <3.0 ¹
	30	= Total Cov	/er	\square Broblematic Hydrophytic V/constation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: ¹⁵	20% of	f total cover	6	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			·	
1 Saururus cernus	5	Y	OBL	Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
Acer negundo	1	N	FAC	Definitions of Four Versetation Strates
2				Deminions of Four vegetation Strata.
3				Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or
4				more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5				neight.
6				Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11				height.
12.				
	6	= Total Cov	/er	
50% of total cover: 3	20% of	f total cover	. 1.2	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1 Campsis radicans	5	Y	FAC	
o Ampelopsis arborea	5	Y	FAC	
		·		
3				
4				
5			·	Hydrophytic
	10	= Total Cov	/er	Vegetation Present? Yes X
50% of total cover: <u>5</u>	20% of	f total cover	2	
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations bel	ow).			

SOIL

Profile Desc	cription: (Describe	to the dep	oth needed to docu	ment the i	ndicator	or confirm	n the absence	e of indicato	ors.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redo	ox Feature	s				- ,	
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture		Remarks	
)-14	10YR 4/1	97	10YR 4/1	3	С	Μ	Clay			
								·		
						·				
						·				
						·				
Type: C=C	oncentration, D=Dep	oletion, RM	=Reduced Matrix, M	S=Masked	d Sand G	ains.	² Location	: PL=Pore L	ining, M=Mat	rix.
lydric Soil	Indicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless othe	rwise not	ed.)		Indicator	s for Proble	matic Hydric	: Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue B	elow Surfa	ce (S8) (I	LRR S, T,	U) <u> </u> 1 cm	Muck (A9) (I	_RR O)	
	pipedon (A2)		Thin Dark S	urface (S9)) (LRR S,	T, U)		Muck (A10)	(LRR S)	
	ISTIC (A3)			(y Mineral od Motrix ((F1) (LRI (F2)	R ()		cea vertic (F	-18) (outside ain Saila (E10	MLRA 150A,E
	d Lavers (A5)		Loarny Gley	eu Maliix (atrix (E3)	FZ)			noni Fiooupi alous Bright	ain Solis (Fis	(E20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (I RR F	рт ш	Redox Dark	Surface (F	6)			RA 153R)	Loanty Sons	(120)
5 cm Mi	icky Mineral (A7) (I	, , , , , RR P. T. U) Depleted Da	ounace (i irk Surface	(F7)			Parent Mater	ial (TF2)	
	resence (A8) (I RR I	N	Redox Depr	essions (F	8)			Shallow Darl	k Surface (TF	12)
1 cm Mi	uck (A9) (LRR P. T)	-)	Marl (F10) (0)		Other	(Explain in I	Remarks)	
Deplete	d Below Dark Surfac	ce (A11)	Depleted Oc	hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)		(,	
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)	()	Iron-Mangar	nese Mass	、 es (F12)	, (LRR O, P	, T) ³ Indi	cators of hyd	drophytic veg	etation and
Coast P	rairie Redox (A16) (MLRA 150	A) 🔲 Umbric Surfa	ace (F13) ((LRR P, 1	Γ, U)	We	etland hydrol	ogy must be j	present,
Sandy N	/lucky Mineral (S1) (LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (ML	RA 151)		un	less disturbe	ed or problem	atic.
Sandy G	Gleyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ve	rtic (F18) (MLRA 1	50A, 150B))			
Sandy F	Redox (S5)		Piedmont Fl	oodplain S	oils (F19) (MLRA 14	49A)			
Stripped	l Matrix (S6)		Anomalous	Bright Loai	my Soils	(F20) (MLF	RA 149A, 1530	C, 153D)		
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	S, T, U)					-			
Restrictive	Layer (if observed)	5								
Type:	ches):						Hydric Soi	il Present?	Vos X	No
Pomorko:	ciies).						Tryunc Sol	irresent:	163	
(emarks:										



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: <u>11/13/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals	Sta	ate: LA Sampling Point: DP-10
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: <u>N/A</u>	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, nc	ne): concave Slope (%): 1
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T)	Lat: 29.6587 N Long: 89.	9694 W Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancienne silty clay loam	0	NWI classification: Upland
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for t	his time of year? Yes X No (If	no, explain in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation , Soil , or Hydrology X	significantly disturbed? Are "Normal C	ircumstances" present? Yes No X
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology	naturally problematic? (If needed, exp	blain any answers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site maj	o showing sampling point location	s, transects, important features, etc.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes <u>^</u>	No Is the Sampled Area	
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes	No X within a Wetland?	Yes No <u>X</u>
Remarks:		
Between river levee and Highway 23.	Hurricane Isaac has resulted in	n atypical conditions and
hvdrologic indicators.		
HYDROLOGY		
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	S	econdary Indicators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check a	II that apply)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	ic Fauna (B13)	Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	Deposits (B15) (LRR U)	Drainage Patterns (B10)
$\Box Saturation (A3) \qquad \Box Hydro$	gen Sulfide Odor (C1)	Moss Trim Lines (B16)
\square Water Marks (B1) \square Oxidiz	ed Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	nce of Reduced Iron (C4)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)
\square Algol Mat or Cruct (R4) \square Thin M		Coomerphic Position (D2)
\square Iron Deposits (B5) \square Other	(Explain in Remarks)	Shallow Aquitard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Water-Stained Leaves (B9)	Ī	Sphagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Field Observations:		
Surface Water Present? Yes No X D	epth (inches):	
Water Table Present? Yes No X D	epth (inches):	
Saturation Present? Yes <u>No X</u> C (includes capillary fringe)	epth (inches): Wetland Hyd	drology Present? Yes No $\frac{X}{2}$
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring wel	i, aerial photos, previous inspections), if availa	ble:
Aeriais: 2010 ESRI & USDA		
Remarks:		
Atypical situation, false positive indica	tors due to hurricane.	

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:		
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species		
1. Acer rubrum	10	Y	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 6 (A)		
2. Acer negundo	20	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant		
3. Quercus virginiana	5	Ν	FACU	Species Across All Strata: 6 (B)		
4.						
5				Percent of Dominant Species		
6				That Are OBL, FACW, of FAC: (A/B)	'	
7				Prevalence Index worksheet:	-	
<i>1</i>				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:		
8	35			OBL species x 1 =		
17.5	30	= Total Cov	er			
50% of total cover: <u>17.5</u>	20% of	total cover:	/			
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)						
1. Triadica sebifera	20	Y	FAC	FACU species x 4 =		
2. Fraxinus pennsylvanica	5	Y	FACW	UPL species x 5 =		
3 Quercus nigra	2	Ν	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)		
⊿ llex decidua	3	N	FACW			
5						
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:		
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation		
7				2 - Dominance Test is >50%		
8				\Box 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$		
	30	= Total Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)		
50% of total cover: 15	20% of	total cover:	6			
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius				¹ Indicators of hydric coil and wattend hydrology must		
Ampelopsis arborea	20	Y	FAC	be present unless disturbed or problematic		
	2	N		Definitions of Four Vegetation Strate	_	
2. Triadica sobifora	2	<u>N</u>	EAC	Demnitions of Four vegetation Strata:		
	<u>∠</u>		FAC	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or		
4. Commelina sp.	1	<u>N</u>		more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of		
5. Brunnichia ovata	1	N	FACW	neight.		
6				Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less		
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.		
8.				Harb All berbasseus (non woody) planta regardless		
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.		
10						
				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in		
11				height.		
12						
	26	= Total Cov	er		_	
50% of total cover: <u>13</u>	20% of	total cover:	5.2			
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)						
1. Toxicodendron radicans	10	Y	FAC			
2						
3						
3						
4						
5				Hydrophytic		
	10	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation Present 2 Veg X No		
50% of total cover: <u>5</u>	20% of	total cover:	2	resent? res <u>~</u> No		
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	w).			1	_	
	,					

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dept	n needed to docun	nent the	indicator	or confirm	n the absence	of indicators	5.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	s	2				
(inches)	Color (moist)	<u>%</u>	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture		Remarks	
0-14	10YR 4/2	96	10YR 4/6	4	С	M	Clay			
						·				
						·				
						·				
						·				
1						·				
'Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	oletion, RM=F	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Maske	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lin	ing, M=Matri	X. Reile ³ :
Hydric Soli I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all L	RRS, unless other	wise not	ea.)			for Problem	atic Hydric	Solis
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ace (S8) (L	_RR S, T, l	U) <u> </u>	luck (A9) (LR	(RO)	
Histic Ep	oipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	rface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)		1uck (A10) (L	RR S)	
	stic (A3)			/ Mineral	(F1) (LRF	(O)		ed Vertic (F18	B) (outside l	
	n Sullide (A4)		Loamy Gleye		(FZ)			ont Floodplair	1 Solis (F19)	(LKKP, 5, 1)
	Layers (Ab)	T 11		IIX (FS) Surface /I				IIOUS DIIGHLL	oarny Solis (F20)
	cky Minoral (A7)	, I, U) DD D T II\		bullace (i	-0) - (E7)			(A 1556)		
		ιν Γ, Ι, Ο)		esions (F	= (F7) :8)			hallow Dark S	Surface (TE1	2)
	ck (A9) (I RR P. T)	')	Marl (F10) (I	RR U)	0)		Other (Fxnlain in Re	emarks)	2)
	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Och	nric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)			,	
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)	()	Iron-Mangane	ese Mass	ses (F12) ((LRR O, P,	, T) ³ Indic	ators of hydro	ophytic vege	tation and
Coast Pr	airie Redox (A16) (I	MLRA 150A)	Umbric Surfa	ce (F13)	(LRR P, T	, U)	wet	land hydrolog	ly must be p	resent,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (MI	LRA 151)		unle	ess disturbed	or problema	tic.
🔲 Sandy G	ileyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ver	tic (F18)	(MLRA 15	50A, 150B))			
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain S	Soils (F19)	(MLRA 14	49A)			
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous B	right Loa	my Soils ((F20) (MLR	RA 149A, 153C	, 153D)		
Dark Su	face (S7) (LRR P, S	6, T, U)								
Restrictive L	ayer (if observed)	:								
Туре:									X	
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present?	Yes X	No
Remarks:							•			
1										
1										



Project/Site: MBSD		City/County: Pla	quemines	Sampling Date: 11/13/12		
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram	n Terminals	, ,	_{State:} LA	Sampling Point: DP-11		
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW		Section. Townsh	Section Township Range: N/A			
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.)	_{):} Delta / Fastland	Local relief (cond	cave, convex, none): Nor	ne Slope (%): 2		
Subregion (LRR or MLRA). Oute	er Coastal Plain (LRR T)	at. 29.6574 N	Long. 89.9687 W	/ NAD 83		
Soil Man Unit Name. Cancienn	e silty clay loam		NWL c	lassification. Upland		
Are climatic / bydrologic condition	ns on the site typical for this	time of year? Yes X	No (If no expla	nin in Remarks)		
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology X si	anificantly disturbed?	Aro "Normal Circumsta	ncos" prosont? Vos No X		
	, or riydrology si					
	, or Hydrology na		(If needed, explain any	answers in Remarks.)		
	3 – Attach site map s	showing sampling po	oint locations, trans	sects, important features, etc.		
Hydrophytic Vegetation Presen	t? Yes X No	ls the Sa	mpled Area			
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes X No	within a	Wetland? Yes	s No X		
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes <u>No</u>	<u>x</u>				
Remarks:						
Between river levee a	and Highway 23. H	urricane Isaac has	resulted in atypi	ical conditions and		
hydrologic indicators.						
HYDROLOGY			0			
Wetland Hydrology Indicators	5: i ana ia nanuinadu akaalu all 44	at a sub ()	Secondary	/ Indicators (minimum of two required)		
				ce Soli Cracks (Bo)		
Ligh Water Table (A2)		-auna (B13)		ery Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)		
$\square Saturation (A2)$		DSIIS (D15) (LKK U)		Trim Lines (B16)		
Water Marks (B1)		Rhizospheres along Living		111111111111111111111111111111111111		
Sediment Denosits (B2)		of Reduced Iron (C4)		sh Burrows (C8)		
Drift Deposits (B3)	Recent Ir	on Reduction in Tilled Soils	s (C6) Satura	ation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)		
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	Thin Muc	$\Box \text{ Geomorphic Position (D2)}$				
Iron Deposits (B5)	Other (Ex	kplain in Remarks)	Shallo	w Aquitard (D3)		
Inundation Visible on Aeria		FAC-N	Veutral Test (D5)			
✓ Water-Stained Leaves (B9))		🔲 Sphag	num moss (D8) (LRR T, U)		
Field Observations:	N N					
Surface Water Present?	Yes No X Dep	th (inches):				
Water Table Present?	Yes <u>No X</u> Dep	th (inches):		X		
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes <u>No X</u> Dep	th (inches):	Wetland Hydrology F	Present? Yes <u>No ^X</u>		
Describe Recorded Data (strea	m gauge, monitoring well, a	erial photos, previous inspe	ctions), if available:			
Aerials: 2010 ESRI &	§ USDA					
Remarks:						
Atypical situation, fals	se positive indicato	rs due to hurrican	э.			

20 radius	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:	
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species	
	20	ř V		That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A)	
2. Acer negunao	20	<u>ř</u>	FAC	Total Number of Dominant	
3. Fraxinus pennsylvanica	5	N	FACW	Species Across All Strata: <u>7</u> (B)	
4	·			Percent of Dominant Species	
5	·			That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>86</u> (A/E	B)
6	·			Descelar es la des sus risches t	
7	·			Tatal % Cause of Multiply by	
8	. <u> </u>			I otal % Cover of: Multiply by:	
	50	= Total Cov	/er	OBL species X 1 =	
50% of total cover: <u>25</u>	20% of	total cover	10	FACW species x 2 =	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				FAC species x 3 =	
1. Triadica sebifera	20	Y	FAC	FACU species x 4 =	
2. Acer negundo	10	Y	FAC	UPL species x 5 =	
3. Cornus drummondii	5	N	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B	;)
4	·			Dravelance Index D(A	
5	·			Prevalence Index = B/A =	
3	·			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
0	·			1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
/	·			2 - Dominance Test is >50%	
8				$\boxed{}$ 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$	
	35	= Total Cov	/er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)	
50% of total cover: <u>17.5</u>	20% of	total cover	: 7		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must	
1. Allium canadense	15	Y	FACU	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.	
2. Ampelopsis arborea	10	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:	
3. Rubus trivialis	5	Ν	FACU	Tree Weedy plants evoluting vince 2 in (7.6 cm)	.
4.				more in diameter at breast height (DBH) regardless of	or of
5				height.	
6				Senling/Shrub Weedy plants evoluting vince loss	
7	·			than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.	,
8	·				
0	·			Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardles	s
9	·			or size, and woody plants less than 5.20 it tall.	
10	·			Woody vine - All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in	
11	·		<u> </u>	height.	
12					
	30	= Total Cov	/er		
50% of total cover: <u>15</u>	20% of	total cover	: 6		
<u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)					
1. Ampelopsis arborea	5	Y	FAC		
2					
3					
4.					
5				I hadrow basilio	
···	5	- Total Cov	/or	Vegetation	
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% at		. 1	Present? Yes $\frac{X}{NO}$ No	
	20% 0I	lotal cover	· <u> </u>		
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	ow).				

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docur	ment the	indicator	or confirm	the absence	of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	<u>s</u>	. 2	- ,	
(inches)		100	Color (moist)	%	Type	Loc	<u>l exture</u>	Remarks
0-0	101R 4/2	100						
6-16	10YR 4/2	98	10YR 4/6	2	C	M	Clay	
				<u> </u>	·			
					·			
1 Type: C=C		lotion PM		S-Maskor	d Sand Cr	aine	² Location:	PL-Poro Lining M-Matrix
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless other	rwise not	ed.)	airis.	Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
	(A1)		Polvvalue Be	elow Surfa	ce (S8) (I	RR S. T. U) 1 cm N	/uck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	vipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	urface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)	2 cm N	Muck (A10) (LRR S)
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduc	ed Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix ((F2)		Piedm	ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	Layers (A5)		✓ Depleted Ma	trix (F3)				alous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	F6)			RA 153B)
	CKY MINERAL (A7) (LI	κκ Ρ, Ι, U) Ν	Depleted Dal Depleted Dal Depleted Dal	rk Surface	e (F7)			arent Material (TF2)
	ck (A9) (I RR P T))	Marl (F10) (I	RR II)	0)			(Explain in Remarks)
	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Oc	hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)		
Thick Da	rk Surface (A12)	()	Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	es (F12) (LRR O, P,	T) ³ Indic	ators of hydrophytic vegetation and
Coast Pr	airie Redox (A16) (I	MLRA 150	A) 🔲 Umbric Surfa	ace (F13)	(LRR P, 1	', U)	wet	land hydrology must be present,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (I	_RR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (ML	_RA 151)		unl	ess disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ver	rtic (F18) ((MLRA 15	50A, 150B)		
Sandy R	edox (S5)			odplain S	iolis (F19)	(MLRA 14	9A) A 140A 152C	1520)
Dark Sur	face (S7) (I RR P S	хт II)		Sright Loa	my Solis (F20) (IVILR	A 149A, 153C	, 1550)
Restrictive L	ayer (if observed)	;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;						
Type:	,							
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes X No
Remarks:	/							
1								



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemin	nes	Sampling Date: 11/13/12		
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals		_{State:} LA	Sampling Point: DP-12		
Investigator(s); CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Rang	le: N/A			
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.); Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, cor	vex. none); none	Slope (%): 1		
Subregion (I RR or MI RA). Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T)	9.6578 N	ng. 89.9711 W	Datum [.] NAD 83		
Soil Map Unit Name. Cancienne silty clay loam	2	NWI classifi	cation. Upland		
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time	of year? Yes X No	(If no, explain in F	Remarks)		
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology X signific	antly disturbed? Are "No	ormal Circumstances"	present? Yes No X		
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology signific	ly problematic? (If peer	ded explain any answ	ers in Remarks)		
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map show	ving sampling point loc	cations, transects	s, important features, etc.		
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes <u>No</u> No	Is the Sampled A	rea	N/		
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X	within a Wetland	? Yes	No <u>×</u>		
Remarks:					
Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurri	cane Isaac has resul	Ited in atypical	conditions and		
hydrologic indicators.					
HYDROLOGY					
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:		Secondary Indic	ators (minimum of two required)		
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that ap	οριγ <u>)</u>		Cracks (Bb)		
L Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna	(B13) (B15) (LDD LI)	Drainage D	getated Concave Surface (B8)		
	(DIS) (LKK U) fide Odor (C1)		ines (B16)		
Water Marks (B1)	ospheres along Living Roots ((Water Table (C2)		
\Box Sediment Deposits (B2) \Box Presence of B	educed Iron (C4)	Cravfish Bu	rrows (C8)		
Drift Deposits (B3)	eduction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Saturation \	/isible on Aerial Imagery (C9)		
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	Thin Muck Surface (C7)				
Iron Deposits (B5)	n in Remarks)	$\square Shallow Aquitard (D3)$			
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutral Test (D5)			
✓ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)		Sphagnum	moss (D8) (LRR T, U)		
Field Observations:					
Surface Water Present? Yes <u>No X</u> Depth (in	ches):				
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (in	ches):		X		
Saturation Present? Yes <u>No X</u> Depth (in (includes capillary fringe)	ches): Wetla	and Hydrology Prese	nt? Yes <u>No X</u>		
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial	photos, previous inspections),	if available:			
Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA					
Remarks:					
Atypical situation, false positive indicator du	le to hurricane.				

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1. Quercus nigra	30	Y	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 5 (A)
2. Acer rubrum	10	Ν	FAC	Tatal March and Chambrand
3. Acer negundo	10	Ν	FAC	Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)
4 Melia azedarach	5	Ν	UPL	
5				Percent of Dominant Species
<u>.</u>				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A/B)
0:			<u> </u>	Prevalence Index worksheet:
<i>1</i>				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
8	55			OBL species x 1 =
07.5	55	= Total Cov	er	
50% of total cover: 27.5	20% of	total cover:	11	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				
1. Cornus drummondii	10	Y	FAC	FACU species X 4 =
2. Triadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	UPL species x 5 =
3. Acer negundo	5	Ν	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)
4. Quercus nigra	5	Ν	FAC	Dravalance Index - P/A -
5 Liquidambar styraciflua	5	N	FAC	
c Ligustrum sinense	5	N	FAC	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
0				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
<i>1</i>				2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8	40	·		3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
	40	= Total Cov	er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: 20	20% of	total cover:	8	
<u>Herb Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Ampelopsis arborea	5	Υ	FAC	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Rubus trivialis	1	Ν	FACU	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3. Quercus nigra	1	Ν	FAC	
4				Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or more in diameter at breast beight (DBH) regardless of
5				height.
3				
8				Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
<i>I</i>			<u> </u>	
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11				height.
12				
	7	= Total Cov	er	
50% of total cover: 3.5	20% of	total cover:	1.4	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
Ampelopsis arborea	5	Y	FAC	
1. <u>• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •</u>		<u> </u>		
2			<u> </u>	
3	. <u> </u>		<u> </u>	
4				
5				Hydrophytic
	5	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% of	total cover:	1	Present? Yes <u>^ No</u>
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	w).			1
SOIL

Profile Desc		-	Theeded to docum			· · · · · · ,	
Depth	Matrix	0/	Redox	Features	Tartan	Dama	
(inches)			Color (moist)	% Type Loc		Rema	rks
0-14	10YR 4/3	100			Slity clay		
					<u> </u>		
1 T			Deduced Metrix, MC	-Maakad Canal Onsina	21	DI - Dana Lining M-I	Matuit
Hydric Soil	Indicators: (Appli	pieuon, ruvi-r	RRs unless other	-Masked Sand Grains.		for Problematic Hy	dric Soils ³ .
	(AI)			face (S0) (IPP S T II)			
	stic (Δ 3)			Mineral (E1) (LRR 3, 1, 0)		ad Vertic (F18) (outs	ide MI RA 150A B)
	n Sulfide (A4)			Matrix (F2)		ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (I RR P. S. T)
	Lavers (A5)		Depleted Mat	rix (F3)		llous Bright Loamv S	oils (F20)
	Bodies (A6) (LRR F	P. T. U)	Redox Dark S	urface (F6)	(MLF	RA 153B)	0
5 cm Mu	icky Mineral (A7) (L	.RR P, T, U)	Depleted Darl	(Surface (F7)		arent Material (TF2)	
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR I	U)	Redox Depres	ssions (F8)	Uery S	hallow Dark Surface	(TF12)
🔲 1 cm Mu	ick (A9) (LRR P, T)		Marl (F10) (LI	RR U)	Other (Explain in Remarks)	
Depleted	d Below Dark Surfac	ce (A11)	Depleted Och	ric (F11) (MLRA 151)			
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangane	se Masses (F12) (LRR O, P,	, T) ³ Indic	ators of hydrophytic	vegetation and
Coast Pi	rairie Redox (A16) ((MLRA 150A)	Umbric Surfac	ce (F13) (LRR P, T, U)	wet	and hydrology must	be present,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) ((LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric (F17) (MLRA 151)	unle	ess disturbed or probl	lematic.
Sandy G	Bleyed Matrix (S4)			ic (F18) (MLRA 150A, 150B))		
Sandy R	edox (S5)			odplain Soils (F19) (MLRA 1 4	49A)	4520)	
	Matrix (S6)	0 T II)		ight Loamy Soils (F20) (MLR	(A 149A, 153C)	, 153D)	
Dark Su	rfaco (S7) (I DD D	S I IN					
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P,	5, I, U) \·					
Dark Sur	rface (S7) (LRR P, _ayer (if observed)	S, I, U)):					
Dark Sur Restrictive I Type:	rface (S7) (LRR P, : _ayer (if observed)	s, ī, u)):				December 10	N. X
Dark Sur Restrictive I Type: Depth (inc	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed)):			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sur Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P , i _ayer (if observed) ches):):			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P , i _ayer (if observed) 	s, i, u)): 			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	<u>s, 1, 0)</u>):			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, _ayer (if observed) 	<u>s, 1, 0)</u> :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, : _ayer (if observed) 	s, i, u) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	s, i, u) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	s, i, u) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	s, i, u) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	<u>s, 1, 0)</u> :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	s, i, u) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	s, i, u) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	s, i, u) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed)	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) ches):	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>
Dark Sun Restrictive I Type: Depth (ind Remarks:	rface (S7) (LRR P, i _ayer (if observed) 	S, 1, U) :			Hydric Soil	Present? Yes	<u>No X</u>

Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	:	Sampling Date: <u>11/13/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-13
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: N/	A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, r	_{none):} concave	Slope (%): 2
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.	6573 N Lona: 8	9.9716 W	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancienne silty clay loam		NWI classifica	_{tion:} Upland
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of	fvear? Yes X No (If no explain in Re	marks)
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology X significar	ntly disturbed? Are "Normal	Circumstances" pr	esent? Yes No X
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology naturally	problematic? (If needed e	xplain any answers	in Remarks)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showi	ng sampling point locatio	ns, transects,	important features, etc.
			-
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes <u></u> No	— Is the Sampled Area		
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X	within a Wetland?	Yes	No <u></u>
Remarks:			
Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurric	ane Isaac has resulted	in atypical co	onditions and
hydrologic indicators.			
, ,			
HYDROLOGY			
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:		Secondary Indicate	ors (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that app	<u>ly)</u>	Surface Soil C	racks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	(B13)	Sparsely Vege	etated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	315) (LRR U)	Drainage Patte	erns (B10)
Saturation (A3)	e Odor (C1)	Moss Trim Lin	es (B16)
	spheres along Living Roots (C3)	Dry-Season W	(ater Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	duced Iron (C4)	Crayfish Burro	WS (C8)
Algol Mat or Crust (B4)			losition (D2)
\square Iron Denosits (B5) \square Other (Explain i	n Remarks)	Shallow Aquita	(D2)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)	(internetice)	FAC-Neutral T	iest (D5)
Water-Stained Leaves (B9)		Sphagnum mo	oss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Field Observations:			
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inch	nes):		
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inch	ies):		
Saturation Present? Yes <u>No X</u> Depth (inch	nes): Wetland H	ydrology Present	? Yes No <u>X</u>
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial ph	otos, previous inspections), if avai	lable:	
Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA			
Remarks:			
Atypical situation, false positive indicators du	le to hurricane.		

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:	
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 radius</u>)	<u>% Cover</u>	<u>Species?</u>	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species	
	10			That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: _/ (A	4)
2. Acer negunao	10	ř V		Total Number of Dominant	
3. Cornus drummondii	10	Y	FAC	Species Across All Strata: <u>7</u> (E	3)
4				Percent of Dominant Species	
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100 (A	√B)
6		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Brovalanco Index workshoot:	
7		. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	Total % Cover of: Multiply by:	
8		. <u> </u>	<u> </u>		
	40	= Total Cov	rer		
50% of total cover: 20	20% of	total cover	8	FAC w species x 2 =	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				FAC species X 3 =	
1. Ilex decidua	20	Y	FACW	FACU species x 4 =	
2. Acer negundo	10	Y	FAC	UPL species X 5 =	(=)
3. Triadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	Column Totals: (A) ((B)
4				Prevalence Index = B/A =	
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
6.				\square 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
7.					
8.				\square 2 - Dominance rest is >30 %	
	40	= Total Cov	er	\square S - Prevalence index is ≤ 3.0	
50% of total cover 20	20% of	total cover	8		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	20/001		·	1	
Ampelopsis arborea	1	N	FAC	Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology mus	st
 Triadica sebifera 	1	N	FAC	Definitions of Four Vagetation Strate:	
2	· <u>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </u>	<u> </u>		Deminions of Four Vegetation Strata.	
3				Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or
4				more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless	s of
5			<u> </u>	noight.	
6			<u> </u>	Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, let	SS
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 it (1 m) tail.	
8		·	. <u> </u>	Herb - All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardle	ess
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.	
10		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft i	in
11				height.	
12			<u> </u>		
	2	= Total Cov	er		
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover			
<u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)					
1. Ampelopsis arborea	10	Y	FAC		
2.					
3.					
4.					
5	<u> </u>			Lu droph tio	
···	10	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation	
50% of total cover: 5	20% of	total cover	. 2	Present? Yes X No	
Demerker (If cheers of list mer believed started	20% UI	ioial cover	·		
	Jw).				

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docum	nent the i	ndicator	or confirm	n the absence	of indicate	ors.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redox	K Feature	s					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture		Remarks	
0-2	10YR 3/1	100					Silty clay			
2-14	10YR 4/2	96	10YR 4/6	4	С	Μ	Clay			
		·								
		·								
1		· <u> </u>								
Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Masked	Sand Gr	ains.	Location:	PL=Pore L	ining, M=Mati	TIX.
Hydric Soli I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRS, unless other	wise not	ea.)			for Proble	matic Hydric	Solis
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Bel	low Surfa	ce (S8) (L	.RR S, T, U	J) <u> 1 cm N</u>	luck (A9) (I	LRR O)	
Histic Ep	pipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	rface (S9)) (LRR S,	T, U)		luck (A10)	(LRR S)	
Black His	stic (A3)		Loamy Mucky	/ Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)		ed Vertic (F	18) (outside	MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	d Matrix (F2)			ont Floodpl	ain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
	Layers (A5)		Depleted Mat	rix (F3)				alous Bright	Loamy Soils	(F20)
	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, I, U)	Redox Dark S	Surface (F	-6)			(A 153B)		
	CKY Mineral (A7) (LF	(R P, I, U)		K Surrace	e (F7)			arent Mater	ial (TF2)	10)
	esence (A8) (LRR U)		SSIONS (F	8)			nallow Dari		12)
	CK (A9) (LKK P, I) Bolow Dark Surface	o (A11)		$\mathbf{K}\mathbf{K} \mathbf{U}$		51)		,⊏xpiain in i	Remarks)	
	ark Surface (A12)	e (ATT)					T) ³ India	ators of hw	drophytic year	atation and
	airie Redox (A16) (N	AI RA 150	1 Impric Surface	ce (F13) (· IN	wet	land hydrol	oav must be r	resent
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (I		Delta Ochric	(F17) (MI	RA 151)	, 0)	unle	ess disturbe	ed or problem:	atic
Sandy G	ileved Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ver	tic (F18) (MLRA 15	0A. 150B)				
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain S	oils (F19)	(MLRA 14	19A)			
	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous B	right Loar	mv Soils (F20) (MLR	A 149A. 153C	. 153D)		
Dark Sur	face (S7) (LRR P, S	5, T, U)	-	5	5	-7.	-,	, ,		
Restrictive L	ayer (if observed):									
Type:										
Depth (inc	ches):						Hvdric Soil	Present?	_{Yes} X	No
Remarks:	/						,			
rtemanto.										



Project/Site: MBSD		City/Cou	_{nty:} Plaquemines		Sampling Date:	11/13/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Rar	n Terminals		·	_{State:} LA	Sampling Point:	DP-14
Investigator(s); CM, JM, RW		Section.	Township, Range: N/	A	1 3	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc	.): Delta / Fastland	Local rel	ief (concave, convex, r	none): None	Slop	_{be (%):} 2
Subregion (I RR or MI RA). Out	er Coastal Plain (LRR T)	Lat. 29.6559 N	Long. 89	9.9709 W	'	
Soil Map Unit Name. Cancieni	ne silty clay loam		Long	NWI classifi	cation. Upland	<u> </u>
Are climatic / hydrologic conditic	ons on the site typical for t	his time of year? Ves	X No (I	lf no, explain in F	Remarks)	
Are Vegetation Soil	or Hydrology X	significantly disturbed	d2 Aro "Normal	Circumstancos" i	procent? Vec	No X
	, or riverology				present: res	NO
				xpiain any answe	ers in Remarks.)	
SUMMARY OF FINDING	S – Attach site ma	p showing samp	ling point location	ns, transects	s, important fe	etures, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Prese	nt? Yes X	No Ia	the Sampled Area			
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes	No X	vithin a Wetland?	Ves	No X	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes	No X		163	NO	-
Remarks:						
Between river levee	and Highway 23.	Hurricane Isaa	ac has resulted	in atypical of	conditions a	nd
hydrologic indicators	-					
HYDROLOGY						
Wetland Hydrology Indicator	rs:			Secondary Indica	ators (minimum of	two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum c	<u>of one is required; check a</u>	II that apply)	·	✓ Surface Soil	Cracks (B6)	
Surface Water (A1)	Aquat	ic Fauna (B13)		└── Sparsely Ve	getated Concave	Surface (B8)
\square High Water Table (A2)		Deposits (B15) (LRR U)	Drainage Pa	itterns (B10)	
\square Saturation (A3)		gen Sulfide Odor (C1)			ines (B16)	
\square Water Marks (B1)		zed Rhizospheres alor			water Table (C2)	
Sediment Deposits (B2)		at Iron Poduction in Til	lod Soils (C6)		isible on Aorial Im	radon(C0)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)		Auck Surface (C7)			Position (D2)	lagery (C3)
\square Iron Deposits (B5)	Other	(Explain in Remarks)		Shallow Aqu	itard (D3)	
Inundation Visible on Aeria	al Imagery (B7)	()		FAC-Neutral	I Test (D5)	
Water-Stained Leaves (BS	ə)			Sphagnum r	noss (D8) (LRR T	΄, U)
Field Observations:						
Surface Water Present?	Yes <u>No X</u>	Depth (inches):				
Water Table Present?	Yes No X [Depth (inches):				
Saturation Present?	Yes No _X [Depth (inches):	Wetland H	ydrology Presei	nt? Yes	No <u>X</u>
Describe Recorded Data (strea	am gauge, monitoring wel	l, aerial photos, previo	us inspections), if avai	lable:		
Aerials: 2010 ESRI	& USDA					
Remarks:						
Atypical situation, fal	se positive indica	itors due to hur	ricane.			

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	<u>% Cover</u>	<u>Species?</u>	<u>Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species
	40	ř V	FACU	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u></u> (A)
2. Acer negundo	20	Y	FAC	Total Number of Dominant
3. Ilex decidua	10	N	FACW	Species Across All Strata:6 (B)
4				Percent of Dominant Species
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>83</u> (A/B)
6				Describer of his law works have f
7				Prevalence index worksneet:
8				I otal % Cover of: Multiply by:
	70	= Total Cov	ver	OBL species x 1 =
50% of total cover: <u>35</u>	20% of	total cover	14	FACW species x 2 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum(Plot size: ^{30'} radius))				FAC species x 3 =
1. Ilex decidua	10	Y	FACW	FACU species x 4 =
2 Triadica sebifera	10	Y	FAC	UPL species x 5 =
Acer negundo	10	Y	FAC	Column Totals: (A) (B)
Cornus drummondii	5	N	FAC	
4				Prevalence Index = B/A =
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7				
8				\Box 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^{1}$
	35	= Total Cov	/er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover: <u>17.5</u>	20% of	total cover	7	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>30'</u>)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. <u>Acer negundo</u>	1	Ν	FAC	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2. Quercus virginiana	1	Ν	FACU	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3. Brunnichia ovata	1	Ν	FACW	Tree March relate avaluation visco 2 in (7.0 arr) or
4.				more in diameter at breast height (DBH) regardless of
5				height.
6				
7				than 3 in DBH and greater than 3 28 ft (1 m) tall
·				
0				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				or size, and woody plants less than 5.20 it tall.
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11				height.
12				
	3	= Total Cov	ver	
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	:	
<u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30'</u>)				
1. Vitis rotundifolia	5	Y	FAC	
2. Brunnichia ovata	1	Ν	FACW	
3.				
4.				
5				Understatio
···	6	= Total Cov		Hydrophytic Vegetation
50% of total covor: 3	20% of	total covor	. 1.2	Present? Yes \times No
	20 % 01		·	
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations beic	W).			

SOIL

	• •						in the absence		- /	
Depth	Matrix		Rede	ox Features	S	0				
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture		Remarks	
0-16	10YR 4/2	99	10YR 4/6	1	С	Μ	Silty clay			
							·			
							·			
							·			
							. <u> </u>			
		plation PM	-Roduced Metrix M	S-Maakad	Sand C	roino	² L coation:	DI -Doro Li	ning M-Matri	
	ndicators: (Appli	cable to all	I RRs unless othe	rwise not		iallis.			natic Hydric	soils ³ .
					eu.)					50115 .
	(A1)			elow Surfa	ce (S8) (LRR S, T,		luck (A9) (L	RR O)	
	olpedon (A2)		I hin Dark S	urface (S9)		, T, U)		luck (A10) (
	stic (A3)			ky Mineral	(⊢1) (LR	R 0)		ed Vertic (F	18) (outside l	MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gley	ed Matrix (F2)			ont Floodpla	in Soils (F19)	(LRR P, S, T)
	Layers (A5)			atrix (F3)				alous Bright	Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR I	P, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	6)			RA 153B)		
5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (L	.RR P, T, U) <u> </u>	ark Surface	(F7)			arent Materia	al (TF2)	
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR	U)	Redox Depr	essions (Fa	8)		L Very S	hallow Dark	Surface (TF1	2)
1 cm Mu	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)		<u> </u>	LRR U)			U Other	Explain in F	Remarks)	
Depleted	Below Dark Surfa	ce (A11)	Depleted Oc	chric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)	2			
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangar	nese Masse	es (F12)	(LRR O, P	, T) Indic	ators of hyd	rophytic vege	tation and
Coast Pi	airie Redox (A16)	MLRA 150	A) 📙 Umbric Surf	ace (F13) (LRR P,	r, U)	wet	land hydrolc	gy must be p	resent,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1)	(LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	: (F17) (ML	.RA 151)		unle	ess disturbe	d or problema	tic.
Sandy G	ileyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ve	ertic (F18) (MLRA 1	50A, 150B	5)			
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Fl	oodplain S	oils (F19) (MLRA 1	49A)			
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous	Bright Loar	ny Soils	(F20) (MLI	RA 149A, 153C	, 153D)		
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P,	S, T, U)					-			
Restrictive I	_ayer (if observed):								
Туре:										
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present?	Yes	No X
Remarks:										
R	aday aanaan	trations	not common.							
	edux concen									
	edux concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edux concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edox concen									
	edux concern									
	edux concern									

Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines		Sampling Date:	11/13/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Ram Terminals	, <u> </u>	State: LA	Sampling Point:	DP-15
Investigator(s); CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: N/	Α	1 3 -	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, i	none): concave	Slope	e (%): 2
Subregion (LRR or MLRA). Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat. 29.65	559 N Long 8	9.9713 W	Dat	um. NAD 83
Soil Man Unit Name. Cancienne silty clay loam	Long	NWI classific:	ation. Upland	um
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of y	ear2 Ves X No (If no, explain in Re	amarke)	
Are Vagetation $Solid and a statistical of this time of y$	disturbed?	Circumotonooo" n	recent? Vec	No X
Are vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly		Circumstances p	resent? res	NO
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally pr	oblematic? (If needed, e	xplain any answer	's in Remarks.)	
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing	g sampling point locatio	ns, transects,	, important fe	atures, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No Hydric Soil Present? Yes No X Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No_X	-
Remarks:				
Between river levee and Highway 23. Hurricar hydrologic indicators.	ne Isaac has resulted	in atypical c	onditions ar	nd
HYDROLOGY				
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:		Secondary Indicat	tors (minimum of t	two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)	<u> </u>	Surface Soil (Cracks (B6)	
Surface Water (A1)	13)	Sparsely Veg	etated Concave S	Surface (B8)
High Water Lable (A2) I Mari Deposits (B1	5) (LRR U)	🔟 Drainage Pat	terns (B10)	
Water Marks (B1)	Odor (C1) Deres along Living Roots (C3)		Nes (B10) Nater Table (C2)	
Sediment Deposits (B2)	ced Iron (C4)	Cravfish Burn	compare (C8)	
Drift Deposits (B3)	ction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Saturation Vis	sible on Aerial Ima	agery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	e (C7)	Geomorphic I	Position (D2)	0,000
Iron Deposits (B5)	Remarks)	Shallow Aquit	tard (D3)	
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutral	Test (D5)	
✓ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)		Sphagnum m	oss (D8) (LRR T,	U)
Field Observations:	、 、			
Surface Water Present? Yes <u>No </u> Depth (inches	s):			
Water Table Present? Yes No Concern Depth (inches	S):			No X
(includes capillary fringe)	s): Wetland H	yarology Presen	t? res	
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial phot	os, previous inspections), if avai	lable:		
Aerials: 2010 ESRI & USDA				
Remarks:				
Atypical situation, false positive indicators due	e to hurricane.			

20 radius	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:	
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 radius</u>)	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species	
	10	ř V		That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: // (/	A)
2. Salix nigra	10	Y		Total Number of Dominant	
3. Cornus drummondii	20	Y	FAC	Species Across All Strata: <u>8</u> (E	B)
4				Percent of Dominant Species	
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 88 (A	A/B)
6	·			Prevalence Index worksheet:	
7		<u> </u>		Total % Cover of: Multiply by:	
8		<u> </u>			
	45	= Total Cov	ver		
50% of total cover: <u>23</u>	20% of	total cover	9	FACW species X 2 =	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				FAC species X 3 =	
1. Acer negundo	30	Y	FAC		
2. Cornus drummondii	20	Y	FAC	UPL species X 5 =	
3. Triadica sebifera	10	Ν	FAC	Column Totals: (A)	(B)
4				Prevalence Index = B/A =	
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
6				\square 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
7.				\checkmark 2 Deminence Test in $>50\%$	
8.				\square 2 - Dominance rest is >50%	
···	60	= Total Cov	/er	\square 3 - Prevalence index is ≤ 3.0	
50% of total cover: 30	20% of	total cover	. 12		
Horb Stratum (Plot size: 30'	2070 01			1	
Brunnichia ovata	3	Y	FACW	Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology mus	st
Ampelopis arborea	2	Y	FAC	Definitions of Four Vegetation Strates	
		<u> </u>		Deminions of Four Vegetation Strata.	
3		. <u> </u>		Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm	n) or
4				more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless	s of
5	- <u> </u>			neight.	
6	- <u> </u>	·	<u> </u>	Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, le	ess
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.	
8			<u> </u>	Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardle	ess
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.	
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft	in
11	<u> </u>			height.	
12					
	5	= Total Cov	ver		
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% of	total cover	1		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30'</u>)					
1. Ampelopsis arborea	5	Y	FAC		
2.					
3					
4	·				
5	·				
J	5	- Total Ca		Hydrophytic Vegetation	
50% of total anyon 2.5			. 1	Present? Yes $\underline{\times}$ No	
	20% 0I	total cover	· <u> </u>		
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations belo	ow).				

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docu	ment the i	ndicator	r or confiri	m the absence	of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	S1	. 2	_	
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type'		Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 4/6	99	10YR 4/6	1	С	Μ	Silty clay	
							· · ·	
							·	
						-	·	
							·	
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=De	pletion, RM	Reduced Matrix, M	S=Masked	d Sand G	rains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil	Indicators: (Applie	cable to all	LRRs, unless othe	rwise not	ed.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polvvalue Be	elow Surfa	ce (S8) (LRR S. T.	U) 1 cm N	/luck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	bipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	urface (S9)) (LRR S	, T, U)	2 cm N	/luck (A10) (LRR S)
Black Hi	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LR	R 0)	Reduc	ed Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gley	ed Matrix (F2)	,	D Piedmo	ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	Layers (A5)		Depleted Ma	trix (F3)	,			alous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR I	P, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	-6)		(MLF	RA 153B)
5 cm Mu	icky Mineral (A7) (L	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Da	rk Surface	(F7)		Red Pa	arent Material (TF2)
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR I	U)	Redox Depr	essions (F	8)		U Very S	hallow Dark Surface (TF12)
🔲 1 cm Mu	ick (A9) (LRR P, T)		Marl (F10) (I	_RR U)	,		Other ((Explain in Remarks)
Depleted	d Below Dark Surfac	ce (A11)	Depleted Oc	hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	151)		· · ·
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangar	ese Mass	es (F12)	(LRR O, P	, T) ³ Indic	ators of hydrophytic vegetation and
Coast Pi	rairie Redox (A16) (MLRA 150	A) 🔲 Umbric Surfa	ace (F13) ((LRR P, [·]	T, U)	wet	land hydrology must be present,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) ((LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (ML	.RA 151))	unle	ess disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ve	rtic (F18) (MLRA 1	50A, 150B)	
Sandy R	ledox (S5)		Piedmont Fle	odplain S	oils (F19) (MLRA 1	49A)	
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous I	Bright Loar	my Soils	(F20) (MLF	RA 149A, 153C	, 153D)
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P,	S, T, U)						
Restrictive I	_ayer (if observed)):						
Type:								
Depth (inc	ches).						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes No X
Pomorks:								
Remarks.	edox concen	trations	not common					



Project/Site: MBSD	_ City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: <u>11/12/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Midway Cattle Ranch		State: <u>LA</u> Sampling Point: <u>DP-16</u>
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: N/	A
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, i	none): none Slope (%): 1
Subregion (LRR or MLRA); Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.6	6475 N Long: 8	9.9843 W Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Harahan clay		NWI classification: PEM1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of	vear? Yes X No (If no. explain in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation X , Soil X , or Hydrology X significan	tly disturbed? Are "Normal	Circumstances" present? Yes No X
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally	problematic? (If needed, e	xplain any answers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing	ng sampling point locatio	ns, transects, important features, etc.
I kudranku tia V anatatian Dracento V an X		
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes <u>**</u> No Hydric Soil Present? Yes X No	- Is the Sampled Area	×
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No	within a Wetland?	Yes <u>×</u> No
Remarks:	-	
Pasture between canal and levee adjacent to	marsh. Hurricane Isaa	ac has resulted in atypical
conditions and hydrologic indicators. Cattle to	ampling evident	
	ampling oridont.	
HYDROLOGY		
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:		Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that appl	<u>()</u>	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	313)	Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	15) (LRR U)	Drainage Patterns (B10)
Saturation (A3)	e Odor (C1)	Moss Trim Lines (B16)
U Water Marks (B1)	pheres along Living Roots (C3)	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	uced Iron (C4)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)	uction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	ce (C7)	Geomorphic Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)	Remarks)	Shallow Aquitard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Eicld Observations:		Sphagnum moss (D8) (LRR 1, 0)
Surface Water Present? Vec No X Depth (inch		
Water Table Brocent? Yes No Depth (inch	=s)	
Valer Table Present? Yes X No Depth (inch		
(includes capillary fringe)		ydrology Present? res
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial ph	otos, previous inspections), if avai	lable:
Aerials: 2007 Pictometry, 2010 ESRI & US	DA	
Remarks:		
Although atypical situation due to hurricane,	area appears to have h	nydrology under normal
conditions.		

20' radius	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:	
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)	
2				Total Number of Dominant	
3				Species Across All Strata: <u>1</u> (B)	
4				Percent of Dominant Species	
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A/E	3)
6				Provalence Index worksheet:	
7				Total % Cover of Multiply by	
8				OBL species x1=	
	0	= Total Co	/er	EACW species x 2 =	
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	:	FAC species x 3 =	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 radius</u>)				FACU species x 4 =	
1				UPL species x 5 =	
2				Column Totals: (A) (B)
3					<i>'</i>
4				Prevalence Index = B/A =	
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:	
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation	
7				2 - Dominance Test is >50%	
8				3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$	
	<u> </u>	= Total Co	/er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)	
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	:		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	5	V	EACU	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must	
	5	т	FACU	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.	
2				Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:	
3				Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) of	or
4				more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless c	f
5				noight.	
6				Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less	
/					
8 9.				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.	3
10.				We advantage All was drawing a prostor them 2.20 ft in	
11.				height.	
12.					
	5	= Total Co	/er		
50% of total cover: 2.5	20% of	total cover	<u>1</u>		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5				Hydrophytic	
	0	= Total Co	/er	Vegetation	
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	:	Present? Yes <u>×</u> No	
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations bel	ow).				_
Herb stratum with dead Cynodon dacty	lon and	dead P	ersicari	a hydropiperoides (30% cover).	
Hurricane disturbed vegetation so with	other in	dicators	s, hydro	phytic vegetation assumed.	

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docum	nent the	indicator	or confirm	n the absence	of indicate	ors.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redox	k Feature	S					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture		Remarks	
0-2	10YR 3/1	100					clay			
2-6	7.5YR 2.5/2	100					clay			
6-10	10YR 4/1	100					clay			
10-14	10YR 4/1	98	10YR 3/6	2	С	Μ	clay			
		·								
				·	·					
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Masked	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location:	PL=Pore L	ining, M=Mat	rix.
Hydric Soil I Histosol Histic Ep Black Hi Hydroge Stratified Organic 5 cm Mu Muck Pr 1 cm Mu Depleted Thick Da Coast Pr Sandy M Sandy R Stripped Dark Su	ndicators: (Applic (A1) oipedon (A2) stic (A3) n Sulfide (A4) I Layers (A5) Bodies (A6) (LRR P cky Mineral (A7) (LR esence (A8) (LRR U ck (A9) (LRR P, T) d Below Dark Surface ark Surface (A12) rairie Redox (A16) (N lucky Mineral (S1) (L lucky Mineral (S4) edox (S5) Matrix (S6) face (S7) (LRR P, S	able to all RR P, T, U) e (A11) MLRA 150/ .RR O, S)	LRRs, unless other Polyvalue Bel Thin Dark Sur Loamy Mucky Loamy Gleye Depleted Mat Redox Dark S Depleted Dar Redox Depre Marl (F10) (LI Depleted Och Iron-Mangane A) Umbric Surfar Delta Ochric (Reduced Veri Piedmont Flo Anomalous B	wise not low Surfa rface (S9 / Mineral d Matrix (rix (F3) Surface (F k Surface (F13) Surface (F11) ese Mass ce (F13) (F17) (MI tic (F18) odplain S right Loa	ed.) icce (S8) (L) (LRR S, (F1) (LRF (F2) =6) ⇒ (F7) ⊗) (MLRA 1 (MLRA 151) (MLRA 15 Soils (F19) my Soils (51) (LRR O, P (LRR O, P (LRR O, P (URR 14 (MLRA 14 F20) (MLF	Indicators U) 1 cm M 2 cm M Reduce Piedmo Anoma (MLR Red Pa Very Sl Vory Sl Vory Sl Other (, T) ³ Indic: weth unle (49A) RA 149A, 153C,	for Proble luck (A9) (I luck (A10) ed Vertic (F ont Floodpl lous Bright A 153B) arent Mater hallow Dari Explain in Explain in ators of hyd and hydrol ess disturbe 153D)	matic Hydric LRR O) (LRR S) E18) (outside ain Soils (F19 Loamy Soils ial (TF2) k Surface (TF Remarks) drophytic veg ogy must be j ed or problem	MLRA 150A,B) (IRR P, S, T) (F20) (F20) (F20) (F20) (F20) (F20)
Type:	ayer (if observed):									
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present?	Yes X	No
Remarks: M CC	apped as hyd oncentrations	lric soil. for hyd	Likely past a ric soil indicato	gricult ors.	ural di	sturbar	nce has rer	noved	typical re	dox



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines Sampling Date: 11/12/12					
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Midway Cattle Ranch	State: LA Sampling Point: DP-17					
Investigator(s): RW,CM,JM	Section, Township, Range: N/A					
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, none): none Slope (%): 1					
Subregion (LRR or MLRA); Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.64	75 N Long: 89.9846 W Datum: NAD 83					
Soil Map Unit Name: Harahan clay	NWI classification: Upland					
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of ye	ar? Yes X No (If no, explain in Remarks.)					
Are Vegetation X Soil X or Hydrology X significantly	disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes No X					
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology naturally pro	blematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)					
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing	sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.					
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No X Hydric Soil Present? Yes No No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X Remarks: Pasture between canal and levee adjacent to r conditions and hydrologic indicators. Slight hig	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes No X narsh. Hurricane Isaac has resulted in atypical h between old agricultural ditches.					
HYDROLOGY						
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)					
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)					
Surface Water (A1)	3) Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)					
Saturation (A3)	\square Drainage Patients (B10)					
Water Marks (B1)	pheres along Living Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2)					
Sediment Deposits (B2)	ed Iron (C4)					
Drift Deposits (B3)	tion in Tilled Soils (C6)					
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	(C7) Geomorphic Position (D2)					
Iron Deposits (B5)	emarks) II Shallow Aquitard (D3)					
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)	FAC-Neutral Test (D5)					
Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Field Observations:						
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches)						
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches)	·					
Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches)	: Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X					
(includes capillary fringe)						
Aerials: 2007 Pictometry, 2010 ESRI & USD	A					
Remarks:						
Atypical situation, false indicators due to hurric	ane.					

	Absolute	Dominant India	ator Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius) 1.	% Cover	Species? Sta	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)
2			Total Number of Dominant
3			Species Across All Strata: 0 (B)
4			
5			That Are OBL_EACW_or_EAC: 0 (A/B)
6.			
7.			Prevalence Index worksheet:
8			Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
···	0	= Total Cover	OBL species x 1 =
50% of total cover	20% of	total cover:	FACW species x 2 =
Sanling/Shruh Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	2070 01		FAC species x 3 =
			FACU species x 4 =
1			UPL species x 5 =
2		<u> </u>	Column Totals: (A) (B)
3			
4			Prevalence Index = B/A =
5			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6			1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7			2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8			3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
	0	= Total Cover	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)			¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Cynodon dactylon	2	N FAC	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2			Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3		·	Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in, (7.6 cm) or
4			more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5.			height.
6.			Sanling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7.			than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8			
9			Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless of size, and woody plants less than 3 28 ft tall
10			
10			Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in heinkt
10			neight.
12	2		
		= Total Cover	
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover:	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			Hydrophytic
	0	= Total Cover	Vegetation
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover:	Present? Yes <u>No X</u>
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations bel	ow).		
Horb stratum class with dood Ourseday	 doctulo:-	(05%	r) due te hurrigene disturbance
nero stratum also with dead Cynodon	uactylon	(90% COVE	a) que lo numcane disturbance.

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	e to the de	oth needed to docu	ment the	indicato	r or confiri	m the absence of	indicators.)
Depth (inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	<u>x Featur</u> %	es Type ¹	loc^2	Texture	Remarks
0-1	10YR 2/2						Organic	Romano
1-16	10YR 4/1	95	10YR 4/6	5	<u>C</u>	M	<u> </u>	
110			1011(4/0					
							. <u> </u>	
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration. D=De	pletion. RM	Reduced Matrix. M	 S=Maske	ed Sand G	irains.	² Location: PL	_=Pore Lining, M=Matrix,
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Appli	cable to al	I LRRs, unless othe	rwise no	ted.)		Indicators for	r Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	elow Surf	ace (S8)	LRR S, T,	U) 1 cm Muc	ck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	oipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	urface (S	9) (LRR S	, T, U)	2 cm Muc	k (A10) (LRR S)
Black Hi	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	ky Minera	I (F1) (LR	R O)		Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge			Loamy Gleye Depleted Ma	ed Matrix	(FZ)			s Bright Loamy Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
	Bodies (A6) (LRR I	P, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface ((F6)		(MLRA	153B)
5 cm Mu	icky Mineral (A7) (L	.RR P, T, U) 🔲 Depleted Da	rk Surfac	e (F7)		Red Pare	nt Material (TF2)
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR	U)	Redox Depre	essions (l	F8)		U Very Shal	llow Dark Surface (TF12)
1 cm Mu	ick (A9) (LRR P, T)	(111)	Marl (F10) (L	RRU)		454)	U Other (Ex	plain in Remarks)
	ark Surface (A12)	ce (ATT)		nric (FTT ese Mas) (IVILKA Ses (F12)	151) (IRR O P	T) ³ Indicato	ors of hydrophytic vegetation and
Coast Pr	airie Redox (A16) (MLRA 150	A) Umbric Surfa	ace (F13)	(LRR P,	(LIUCO, I T, U)	wetlan	d hydrology must be present,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1)	(LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (M	LRA 151)	unless	disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ve	rtic (F18)	(MLRA 1	50A, 150B	3)	
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain :	Soils (F19) (MLRA 1	49A)	520)
Dark Su	rface (S7) (I RR P .	S. T. U)		Singht Loa	arny Solis	(F20) (IVILI	KA 149A, 155C, 15	550)
Restrictive L	_ayer (if observed):						
Туре:								
Depth (inc	ches):						Hydric Soil Pro	esent? Yes X No
Remarks:							-	
M	apped as hy	dric soil	. Likely past a	agricul	tural d	isturbar	nce.	



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: <u>11/12/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Midway Cattle Ranch	State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-18
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	_ Section, Township, Range: <u></u>	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, none):	e Slope (%): _1
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.64	174 W Long: 89.9848 W	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Harahan clay	NWI cla	assification: PEM1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of y	ear? Yes X No (If no, explai	n in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation X, Soil X, or Hydrology X significant	y disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstan	ces" present? Yes No X
Are Vegetation , Soil , or Hydrology naturally p	roblematic? (If needed, explain any a	inswers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showin	g sampling point locations, trans	ects, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No	Is the Sampled Area	
Hydric Soil Present? Yes X No	within a Wetland? Yes	X No
Remarks:	-	
conditions and hydrologic indicators. Appears	lower than adjacent DP-17.	esuled in alypical
HYDROLOGY		
Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna (B High Water Table (A2) Marl Deposits (B1 Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Sulfide Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhizosp Sediment Deposits (B2) Presence of Redu Drift Deposits (B3) Recent Iron Redu Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Surfac Iron Deposits (B5) Other (Explain in Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Water-Stained Leaves (B9)	Secondary Secondary Surface 13) 5) (LRR U) Odor (C1) heres along Living Roots (C3) Liced Iron (C4) ction in Tilled Soils (C6) e (C7) Remarks) Shallov FAC-N Sphagr	Indicators (minimum of two required) Soil Cracks (B6) Iy Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) ge Patterns (B10) 'rim Lines (B16) ason Water Table (C2) h Burrows (C8) cion Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) orphic Position (D2) v Aquitard (D3) eutral Test (D5) hum moss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Surface Water Present? Yes <u>No X</u> Depth (inche	s):	
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inche Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inche (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial pho	s): Wetland Hydrology P tos, previous inspections), if available:	resent? Yes X No
Aerials: 2007 Pictometry, 2010 ESRI & USE	A	
Remarks:		
Although atypical situation due to hurricane, a conditions.	rea appears to have hydrolog	y under normal

	Absolute	Dominant Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>) 1.	<u>% Cover</u>	Species? Status	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A)
2.			
3.			Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)
4.			(-,
5.			Percent of Dominant Species That Are ORL EACW or EAC: 0 (A/R)
6			
7			Prevalence Index worksheet:
8			Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
···	0	= Total Cover	OBL species x 1 =
50% of total cover	20% of	total cover:	FACW species x 2 =
Sopling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius	2070 01		FAC species x 3 =
			FACU species x 4 =
1			UPL species x 5 =
2			Column Totals: (A) (B)
3			
4			Prevalence Index = B/A =
5			Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6			1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7			☐ 2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8			3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
	0	= Total Cover	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover:	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)			¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Cynodon dactylon	10	Y FACU	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2.			Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3.			
4.			I ree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5			height.
6			Conting/Charte Mandumberts evoluting visco loss
7			than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
Q			······································
0			Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9			or size, and woody plants less than 5.20 it tall.
10			Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11			height.
12			
-	10	= Total Cover	
50% of total cover: <u>5</u>	20% of	total cover: 2	
<u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			Hydrophytic
	0	= Total Cover	Vegetation
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover:	Present? Yes X No
Remarks: (If observed list morphological adaptations bel	ow).		
Horb stratum class with dood Owned and		and dood Dom	piparia hydropinaroidae (60% eaver)
	uactylon	and dead Pers	sicana nyuropiperoides (60% cover).
Hurricane disturbed vegetation so with	other in	dicators, hydro	phytic vegetation assumed.

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docur	nent the	indicator	or confirm	n the absence	e of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	s			
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type'	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-2	7.5YR 3/1	·					Clay	·
2-5	7.5 YR 3/2						Clay	High Organic Matter
5-16	10 YR 4/1	95	7.5YR 3/4	5	С	Μ	Clay	
		·				·		
		·				·		
		·				·		·
		·		- <u> </u>				
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, M	S=Maske	d Sand Gi	ains.	² Location:	: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil	Indicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless other	rwise not	ted.)		Indicators	s for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ace (S8) (I	_RR S, T, U	ן) 1 cm ו	Muck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	pipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	Irface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)		Muck (A10) (LRR S)
	stic (A3)			y Mineral	(F1) (LRI	R O)		ced Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
				triv (E3)	(FZ)			nont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR F, S, T)
	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	. T. U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F6)		(ML	.RA 153B)
5 cm Mu	icky Mineral (A7) (LF	, , , , RR P, T, U)	Depleted Da	rk Surface	e (F7)		Red F	Parent Material (TF2)
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR U)	Redox Depre	essions (F	8)		Very S	Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
🔲 1 cm Mu	ick (A9) (LRR P, T)		<u> </u>	.RR U)			Other	(Explain in Remarks)
Depleted	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Ocl	hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)	2	
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	ses (F12)	(LRR O, P,	T) [°] Indi	cators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	rairie Redox (A16) (I lucky Mineral (S1) (I	PPOS	A) I Ombric Suria	(E17) (M	(LKK P, 1 1 DA 151)	, 0)	We	less disturbed or problematic
Sandy R	leved Matrix (S4)			(i 17) (ivi tic (F18)	(MLRA 1	50A. 150B)	un un	less disturbed of problematic.
Sandy R	ledox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain S	Soils (F19)	(MLRA 14	19A)	
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		🔲 Anomalous E	Bright Loa	my Soils ((F20) (MLR	, A 149A, 1530	C, 153D)
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	5, T, U)						
Restrictive I	_ayer (if observed):							
Туре:								N.
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soi	il Present? Yes X No
Remarks:			1.1.1	· .			1	
IV	lapped as nyd	ric soll.	Likely past a	agricul	ural di	sturban	ice.	
l								
l								
l								
1								

Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquer	nines	Sampling Date: 11/12/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Midway Cattle Ranch		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-19
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Ra	inge: N/A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, o	convex, none): concave	Slope (%): 1
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29	0.6469 N	Lona: 89.985 W	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Harahan clay		NWI classifica	ation: PEM1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time	of vear? Yes X No	(If no explain in Re	emarks)
Are Vegetation X_{1} , Soil X_{2} , or Hydrology X_{2} signification	antly disturbed? Are	"Normal Circumstances" p	resent? Yes <u>No X</u>
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturall	y problematic? (If ne	eeded, explain any answer	s in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map show	ving sampling point I	ocations, transects,	important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No	Is the Sampled	d Area	
Hydric Soli Present? Yes X No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No	within a Wetla	nd? Yes X	No
Remarks:			
conditions and hydrologic indicators. Area a	to marsh. Hurricar Idjacent to old exc	avated ditch.	ted in atypical
HYDROLOGY			
Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that ap Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fauna High Water Table (A2) Marl Deposits Vater Marks (B1) Oxidized Rhize Drift Deposits (B3) Recent Iron Re Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Sur Iron Deposits (B5) Other (Explain Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Water tit	ply) (B13) (B15) (LRR U) ide Odor (C1) ospheres along Living Roots educed Iron (C4) eduction in Tilled Soils (C6) face (C7) in Remarks)	Secondary Indicat Surface Soil (Sparsely Veg Drainage Patt Moss Trim Lir s (C3) Crayfish Burn Saturation Vis Geomorphic I Shallow Aquit FAC-Neutral Sphagnum m	ors (minimum of two required) Cracks (B6) etated Concave Surface (B8) terns (B10) nes (B16) Vater Table (C2) ows (C8) sible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Position (D2) tard (D3) Test (D5) oss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Field Observations:	abos):		
Water Table Present? Yes No Depth (ind Saturation Present? Yes X No Depth (ind includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial present)	ches): <u>10</u> ches): <u>8</u> workshotos, previous inspections	etland Hydrology Presen	t? Yes X No
Aerials: 2007 Pictometry, 2010 ESRI & US	SDA		
Remarks: Although atypical situation due to hurricane conditions.	, area appears to ł	nave hydrology un	der normal

	Absolute Dominant Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius 1.)	<u>% Cover Species? Status</u>	- Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)
23		Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: ⁰ (B)
4		Percent of Dominant Species
6.		- That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A/B)
7		Prevalence Index worksheet:
8		Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
	0 = Total Cover	OBL species X 1 =
50% of total cover:	20% of total cover:	FAC w species X 2 =
<u>Sapling/Shrub Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)		FAC species X 3
1		
2		Column Totals: (A) (B)
3		- (B)
4		Prevalence Index = B/A =
5		- Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6		1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7		– 🔲 2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8		- \square 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
	0 = Total Cover	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover:	20% of total cover:	-
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>30 radius</u>) 1)		¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2		Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3		- Tree - Woody plants, excluding vines 3 in (7.6 cm) or
4		more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5		height.
6		_ Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7		than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8		 Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10		 Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11		_ height.
12		-
	= Total Cover	
50% of total cover:	20% of total cover:	-
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)		
1		-
2		-
3		-
4		-
5	0	- Hydrophytic
	= Total Cover	Vegetation Present? Yes ^X No
50% of total cover:	20% of total cover:	-
Herb stratum with dead Persicaria hyd Hurricane disturbed vegetation so with	ropiperoides (30% cov other indicators, hydro	ver) and Typha sp. (10% cover). ophytic vegetation assumed.

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docur	nent the	indicator	or confirm	n the absence	of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	s			
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-9	10YR 4/1	90	7.5YR 4/6	10	С	Μ	Clay	
9-12	10YR 2/1	100					Silty clay	
		·			·			
				· ·		·		
		·						
		·		·	·	·		
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Dep	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Masked	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless other	rwise not	ed.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ice (S8) (I		J) 1 cm M	luck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	pipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	Irface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)	2 cm M	luck (A10) (LRR S)
🔲 Black Hi	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduce	ed Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)		Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix ((F2)		Piedmo	ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	l Layers (A5)		Depleted Mat	trix (F3)			L Anoma	lous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR P	, T, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	=6)		(MLR	RA 153B)
🔲 5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (Lf	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Dar	rk Surface	e (F7)		Red Pa	arent Material (TF2)
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR U)	Redox Depre	essions (F	8)		L Very Sł	hallow Dark Surface (TF12)
1 cm Mu	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)		└── Marl (F10) (L	.RR U)			U Other (Explain in Remarks)
Depleted	Below Dark Surfac	e (A11)	Depleted Och	nric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51)	0	
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Iron-Mangan	ese Mass	es (F12) ((LRR O, P,	, T) ³ Indica	ators of hydrophytic vegetation and
Coast Pi	airie Redox (A16) (I	MLRA 1504) 📙 Umbric Surfa	ce (F13)	(LRR P, 1	⁻ , U)	wetl	and hydrology must be present,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (I	_RR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (MI	_RA 151)		unle	ess disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ver	tic (F18)	(MLRA 15	50A, 150B)		
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	odplain S	Soils (F19)	(MLRA 14	19A)	
	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous E	Bright Loa	my Soils (F20) (MLR	RA 149A, 153C,	153D)
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, S	6, T, U)					1	
Restrictive	_ayer (if observed):							
Туре:								×
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes <u>^</u> No
Remarks:								
IV	apped as hyc	Iric soil.	Likely past a	gricult	ural di	sturban	ice.	



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemine	es	Sampling Date: 11/12/12
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Midway Cattle Ranch		State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-20
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range	e: N/A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, con	vex, none): <u>concave</u>	Slope (%): <u>1</u>
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.64	483 N Lon	9.9866 W	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Cancienne silty clay loam		NWI classifica	ation: PEM1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of y	/ear? Yes X No	(If no, explain in Re	emarks.)
Are Vegetation X , Soil X , or Hydrology X significantl	y disturbed? Are "No	rmal Circumstances" p	resent? Yes No X
Are Vegetation , Soil , or Hydrology naturally p	roblematic? (If need	ed, explain any answer	s in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showin	g sampling point loc	ations, transects,	important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No Hydric Soil Present? Yes X No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No Remarks: Ketter Ketter	Is the Sampled Ar within a Wetland?	rea Yes <u>X</u>	No
Pasture between canal and levee adjacent to conditions and hydrologic indicators.	marsh. Hurricane	Isaac has resul	ted in atypical
HYDROLOGY			
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:		Secondary Indicat	tors (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply	10)	Surface Soil (Cracks (B6)
High Water Table (A2)	13) (5) (1 PP 11)	Drainage Pat	etated Concave Sufface (B8)
Saturation (A3)	Odor (C1)		pes (B16)
Water Marks (B1)	heres along Living Roots (C	(3) Dry-Season V	Vater Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	uced Iron (C4)	Cravfish Burr	ows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)	ction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Saturation Vis	sible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	e (C7)	Geomorphic I	Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)	Remarks)	Shallow Aquit	ard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		FAC-Neutral	Test (D5)
Water-Stained Leaves (B9)		🔲 Sphagnum m	oss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Field Observations:			
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inche	s):		
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inche	s):		
Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inche (includes capillary fringe)	s): Wetla	nd Hydrology Presen	t? Yes X No
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial pho	tos, previous inspections), if גע	f available:	
Remarka			
Although at minor aituation due to huminoppe a	ree ennears to be		
Although alypical situation due to humcane, a	rea appears to nav	ve nyarology un	
conditions.			

201	Absolute Dominant Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>) 1	<u>% Cover Species? Status</u>	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)
2 3		Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 0 (B)
4 5		Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A/B)
6		Prevalence Index worksheet:
/		Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
8		OBL species x 1 =
		FACW species x 2 =
50% of total cover:	20% of total cover:	FAC species x 3 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>50 radius</u>)		FACU species x 4 =
1		UPL species x 5 =
2		Column Totals: (A) (B)
3		
4		Prevalence Index = B/A =
5		Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6		1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7		2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8		\square 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
	0 = Total Cover	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover:	20% of total cover:	
Heid Stratum (Piot Size. oo reactor) 1.		¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic. Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3 4		Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5		neignt. Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7		than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall. Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9		of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10 11		Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in height.
12		
	U = Total Cover	
50% of total cover: <u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	20% of total cover:	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		Hydrophytic
	0 = Total Cover	Vegetation
50% of total cover:	20% of total cover:	Present? Yes <u>×</u> No
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations be	low).	
Herb stratum with dead Cynodon dact	vion (90% cover) and d	ead Persicaria hydronineroides (10%
cover). Hurricane disturbed vegetation	so with other indicators	s. hvdrophytic vegetation assumed.

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	th needed to docun	nent the i	indicator	or confirm	n the absence	of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	S1	. 2	- ·	
(inches)		<u> % </u>	Color (moist)	%	I ype'	LOC		<u> </u>
0-2	10YR 3/1	100			· . <u></u>	·	Clay	Organic matter
2-14	10YR 5/1	95	10YR 4/6	5	С	Μ	Clay	
						·		
				·	·	·		
					·		. <u> </u>	
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Der	letion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, MS	S=Masked	d Sand Gr	ains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil	Indicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless other	wise not	ed.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	low Surfa	ce (S8) (L		U) 🛛 1 cm N	Muck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	pipedon (A2)		Thin Dark Su	irface (S9) (LRR S,	T, U)	2 cm N	Muck (A10) (LRR S)
Black Hi	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	y Mineral	(F1) (LRF	R O)	Reduc	ced Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	en Sulfide (A4)		🔲 Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix ((F2)		L Piedm	ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, T)
Stratified	d Layers (A5)		Depleted Mat	trix (F3)			L Anoma	alous Bright Loamy Soils (F20)
Organic	Bodies (A6) (LRR F	P, T, U)	Redox Dark S	Surface (F	-6)			RA 153B)
5 cm Mu	ıcky Mineral (A7) (L	RR P, T, U)	Depleted Dar	rk Surface	e (F7)			arent Material (TF2)
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR l	J)	Redox Depre	essions (F	8)		H Very S	Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
1 cm Mu	ick (A9) (LRR P, T)		Marl (F10) (L	.RR U)			U Other	(Explain in Remarks)
	d Below Dark Surfac	ce (A11)		nric (F11)	(MLRA 1	51) // DD O D	T) 31	a terre a film da su la dia ana a terre a su d
	ark Surface (A12)			ese Mass	es (F12) (, I) India	cators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	rairie Redox (A16) (Augla: Minoral (S1) (A) Dolto Oobrio	(E17) (MI	(LKK P, I	, U)	wei	liand hydrology must be present,
Sandy R	lucky Milleral (ST) (LKK 0, 3)		(F17) (IVIL tic (E18) (MIDA 1	50A 150B	N	ess disturbed of problematic.
Sandy C	Redox (S5)			odplain S	oils (F19)	(MI RA 1	/ 49 4)	
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous B	Bright Loai	my Soils (F20) (MLF	RA 149A, 153C	, 153D)
Dark Su	rface (S7) (LRR P, \$	S, T, U)	—	0	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
Restrictive I	Layer (if observed)	:						
Туре:								
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes X No
Remarks:							•	
LI	kely past agr	icultural	disturbance.					



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: <u>11/12/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Midway Cattle Ranch	State: LA	Sampling Point: DP-21
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: N/A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave	/e Slope (%): 1
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T) Lat: 29.64	152 N Long: 89.9878 W	Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Westwego clay	NWI class	ification: PEM1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of y	ear? Yes X No (If no, explain ir	ı Remarks.)
Are Vegetation X, Soil X, or Hydrology X significantly	y disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances	s" present? Yes <u>No X</u>
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally pr	roblematic? (If needed, explain any ans	wers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing	g sampling point locations, transec	ts, important features, etc.
Undrankutia Vegetatian Dresent? Veg X		
Hydrophylic Vegetation Present? Yes X No	Is the Sampled Area	
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No	within a Wetland? Yes <u>^</u>	No
Remarks:		
Pasture between canal and levee adjacent to	marsh. Hurricane Isaac has res	ulted in atypical
conditions and hydrologic indicators.		51
HYDROLOGY		
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	Secondary Ind	icators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)	Surface S	oil Cracks (B6)
Surface Water (A1)	13) 📃 Sparsely \	/egetated Concave Surface (B8)
High Water Table (A2)	5) (LRR U) Urainage I	Patterns (B10)
Saturation (A3)	Odor (C1) 📃 Moss Trim	Lines (B16)
U Water Marks (B1)	heres along Living Roots (C3) 🛛 🔲 Dry-Seaso	on Water Table (C2)
Sediment Deposits (B2)	ced Iron (C4)	urrows (C8)
Drift Deposits (B3)	ction in Tilled Soils (C6)	Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4)	e (C7) 🗹 Geomorph	ic Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5)	Remarks)	quitard (D3)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)		
Eigld Observations:		(LRR 1, 0)
Surface Water Present? Ves No X Denth (inches	e).	
Water Table Present? Vos X No. Depth (inches	s). <u>5</u>	
Saturation Procent? Voc X No Dopth (inches	wotland Hydrology Pros	cont2 Vos X No
(includes capillary fringe)		
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial phot	tos, previous inspections), if available:	
Aeriais: 2007 Pictometry, 2010 ESRI & USL	JA	
Remarks:		
Although atypical situation due to hurricane, a	rea appears to have hydrology	under normal
conditions.		

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30 radius)	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: (B)
4				Percent of Dominant Species
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A/B)
6				Prevalence Index worksheet:
/				Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
8				OBL species x 1 =
50% (1.1.1			/er	FACW species x 2 =
50% of total cover:	20% 01	total cover	:	FAC species x 3 =
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>50 radius</u>)				FACU species x 4 =
1				UPL species x 5 =
2				Column Totals: (A) (B)
3				(-)
4				Prevalence Index = B/A =
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
7				2 - Dominance Test is >50%
8			<u> </u>	\Box 3 - Prevalence Index is $\leq 3.0^1$
	0	= Total Cov	/er	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	:	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			EAGU	¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
1. Cynodon dactylon	1	N	FACU	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
2				Definitions of Four Vegetation Strata:
3				Tree – Woody plants, excluding vines, 3 in. (7.6 cm) or
4				more in diameter at breast height (DBH), regardless of
5				height.
6				Sapling/Shrub – Woody plants, excluding vines, less
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater than 3.28 ft (1 m) tall.
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-woody) plants, regardless
9				of size, and woody plants less than 3.28 ft tall.
10				Woody vine – All woody vines greater than 3.28 ft in
11				height.
12				
	1	= Total Cov	/er	
50% of total cover: <u>-</u>	20% of	total cover	:	
<u>Woody Vine Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				Hydrophytic
	0	= Total Cov	/er	Vegetation
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	:	Present? Yes <u>^ No</u>
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations be	low).			1
Herb stratum with dead Cvnodon dacty	/lon and	dead T	vpha sr	o. (20% cover). Hurricane disturbed
vegetation so with other indicators hvo	drophytic	; vegeta	tion ass	sumed.

SUL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describ	e to the de	oth needed to docu	ment the	indicato	or or confir	m the absence of	of indicators.)
Depth (inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	ox Featur %	es Type ¹	\log^2	Texture	Remarks
0-5	10YR 3/1	100					Organic matter	Komano
5-16	7 5YR 2 5/1	97	7 5YR 3/4	3	<u>C</u>	M	Clay	
0-10	7.011(2.0/1		7.511(5/4					
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration. D=De	epletion. RM	=Reduced Matrix. M	S=Maske	ed Sand C	Grains.	² Location:	PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix,
Hydric Soil	ndicators: (Appl	icable to al	LRRs, unless othe	rwise no	ted.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histosol	(A1)		Polyvalue Be	elow Surf	ace (S8)	(LRR S, T,	U) 1 cm M	uck (A9) (LRR O)
Histic Ep	oipedon (A2)		Thin Dark S	urface (S	9) (LRR \$	S, T, U)	2 cm M	uck (A10) (LRR S)
Black Hi	stic (A3)		Loamy Muck	ky Minera	I (F1) (LF	RR O)		ed Vertic (F18) (outside MLRA 150A,B)
Hydroge	n Sulfide (A4)			ed Matrix	(F2)			ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR P, S, I)
	Bodies (A6) (LRR	P. T. U)	Redox Dark	Surface	(F6)		(MLR	A 153B)
5 cm Mu	cky Mineral (A7) (LRR P, T, U) 🔲 Depleted Da	rk Surfac	e (F7)		Red Pa	rent Material (TF2)
Muck Pr	esence (A8) (LRR	U)	Redox Depr	essions (F8)		L Very St	nallow Dark Surface (TF12)
1 cm Mu	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)	Marl (F10) (I	LRR U)			U Other (I	Explain in Remarks)
	Below Dark Surfa	ace (A11)		hric (F11) (MLRA Ses (E12)) T) ³ Indica	ators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	rairie Redox (A16)	(MLRA 150	A) Umbric Surfa	ace (F13)	(LRR P.	T. U)	, r) multication wetla	and hydrology must be present.
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1)	(LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (N	LRA 151)	unle	ss disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	leyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ve	rtic (F18)	(MLRA [·]	150A, 150E	3)	
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Fl	oodplain	Soils (F1	9) (MLRA 1	49A)	
Dark Su	Matrix (S6)	S T III	Anomalous I	Bright Lo	amy Soils	(F20) (ML	RA 149A, 153C,	153D)
Restrictive I	_aver (if observed	0, 1, 0) 1):						
Type:		.,-						
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes ^X No
Remarks:	,							
М	apped as hy	dric soil	. Likely past a	agricul	tural c	listurba	nce.	



Project/Site: MBSD	City/County: Plaquemines	Sampling Date: <u>11/12/12</u>
Applicant/Owner: CPRA / Midway Cattle Ranch	State:	LA Sampling Point: DP-22
Investigator(s): CM, JM, RW	Section, Township, Range: N/A	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Delta / Fastland	Local relief (concave, convex, none):	none Slope (%): 1
Subregion (LRR or MLRA): Outer Coastal Plain (LRR T)	29.6443 N Long: 89.990	7 W Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Westwego clay		WI classification: PEM1C
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this t	ime of year? Yes X No (If no e	explain in Remarks)
Are Vegetation $\underline{X}_{}$, Soil $\underline{X}_{}$, or Hydrology $\underline{X}_{}$ sig	nificantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circum	nstances" present? Yes No <u>X</u>
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology nat	urally problematic? (If needed, explain	any answers in Remarks.)
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map sl	nowing sampling point locations, tr	ansects, important features, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes X No Hydric Soil Present? Yes X No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes X No	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes X No
Remarks: Pasture between canal and levee adjace	ent to marsh. Hurricane Isaac be	as resulted in atvnical
conditions and hydrologic indicators. Bet	ween old excavated ditches.	as resulted in atypical
HYDROLOGY		
Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	Secon	dary Indicators (minimum of two required)
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that Surface Water (A1) Aquatic Fa High Water Table (A2) Marl Depo Saturation (A3) Hydrogen Water Marks (B1) Oxidized Fa Drift Deposits (B2) Presence Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Thin Muck Iron Deposits (B5) Other (Exp Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Hagal Mator	at apply) Image: Stress St	urface Soil Cracks (B6) parsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) rainage Patterns (B10) oss Trim Lines (B16) ry-Season Water Table (C2) rayfish Burrows (C8) aturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) eomorphic Position (D2) nallow Aquitard (D3) AC-Neutral Test (D5) ohagnum moss (D8) (LRR T, U)
Field Observations:		
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (includes capillary fringe) Ves No X Depth Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, ae Aerials: 2007 Pictometry, 2010 FSRI &	n (inches):n n (inches): Wetland Hydrolo rial photos, previous inspections), if available:	rgy Present? Yes X No
Remarks:	000/	
Although atypical situation due to hurrica conditions due to subsidence.	ne, area appears to have hydro	ology under normal
VEGETATION (Four Strata) – Use scientific names of plants.

Sampling Point: DP-22

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:		
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius) 1.	<u>% Cover</u>	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC	; 0	(A)
23				Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata:	1	(B)
4						. (-)
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC	;: 0	(A/B)
6						- (' ' /
7				Prevalence Index worksheet		
8				I otal % Cover of:	Multiply by:	—
	0	= Total Cov	rer	OBL species	x 1 =	_
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	·	FACVV species	x 2 =	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				FAC species	x 3 =	—
1					x 4 =	_
2				OPL species	x 5 –	(D)
3					(A)	(B)
4				Prevalence Index = B/A	. =	
5				Hydrophytic Vegetation Indi	cators:	
6				1 - Rapid Test for Hydrop	hytic Vegetation	
7				2 - Dominance Test is >5	0%	
8				3 - Prevalence Index is ≤	3.0 ¹	
	0	= Total Cov	rer	Problematic Hydrophytic	Vegetation ¹ (Expla	ain)
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover				,
Herb Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and w	vetland hydrology	must
1. Cynodon dactylon	10	Y	FACU	be present, unless disturbed of	or problematic.	
2				Definitions of Four Vegetation	on Strata:	
3				Tree – Woody plants, excludir	ng vines. 3 in. (7.6	cm) or
4				more in diameter at breast hei	ght (DBH), regard	lless of
5				height.		
6				Sapling/Shrub – Woody plan	ts, excluding vine:	s, less
7				than 3 in. DBH and greater that	an 3.28 ft (1 m) tal	Ι.
8				Herb – All herbaceous (non-w	/oody) plants, rega	ardless
9				of size, and woody plants less	than 3.28 ft tall.	
10				Woody vine – All woody vine	s greater than 3.2	8 ft in
11				height.	0	
12						
	10	= Total Cov	rer			
50% of total cover: <u>5</u>	20% of	total cover	2			
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5				Hydrophytic		
	0	= Total Cov	er	Vegetation Present2 Ves X	No	
50% of total cover:	20% of	total cover	·			
Remarks: (If observed, list morphological adaptations be	low).					
Herb stratum with dead Cynodon dact	lon and	dead P	ersicari	a hydropiperoides (10)% cover).	
Hurricane disturbed vegetation so with	other in	dicators	, hydro	phytic vegetation assu	umed.	
5						

SOIL

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe	to the dep	h needed to docu	ment the i	ndicator	or confirr	n the absence	of indicators.)
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	s			
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-12	10YR 3/1	97	2.5YR 2.5/3	3	С	Μ	Clay	
¹ Type C=Co	ncentration D=Der	pletion RM=	Reduced Matrix M	S=Masked	Sand G	rains	² Location	PI =Pore Lining M=Matrix
Hydric Soil I	ndicators: (Applic	able to all	LRRs, unless othe	rwise not	ed.)		Indicators	for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
	(Δ1)			Now Surfa	, ce (S8) (IRRST		
	(A2)		Thin Dark Su	urface (SQ)			$\square 2 \text{ cm} M$	
	stic (A2)			Minoral		, I, U) P ()		ad Vortic (E18) (outside MI BA 150A B)
	$\operatorname{Suc}(A3)$			y Matrix ((F1) (ER	K U)		ed Verlic (FTO) (OUISIde MILRA ISOA,B)
					FZ)			ont Floodplain Soils (F19) (LRR F, S, T)
	Layers (A5)			itrix (F3)				alous Bright Loamy Solis (F20)
	Bodies (Ab) (LRR F	', I, U)	Redox Dark	Surface (F	-0) (F7)			(A 153B)
	cky Mineral (A7) (L	KR P, I, U) 		rk Surface	(⊢7)			arent Material (TF2)
	esence (A8) (LRR L	J)		essions (F	8)			hallow Dark Surface (TF12)
	ck (A9) (LRR P, T)	<i></i>	∐ Marl (F10) (L	RR U)			U Other ((Explain in Remarks)
	Below Dark Surfac	ce (A11)		hric (F11)	(MLRA 1	151)	 3	
	irk Surface (A12)			iese Mass	es (F12)		, I) °Indic	ators of hydrophytic vegetation and
	airie Redox (A16) (ace (F13) ((LRR P,	r, u)	wet	land hydrology must be present,
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1) (LRR O, S)	Delta Ochric	(F17) (ML	.RA 151)		unle	ess disturbed or problematic.
Sandy G	ileyed Matrix (S4)		Reduced Ve	rtic (F18) (MLRA 1	50A, 150B)	
Sandy R	edox (S5)		Piedmont Flo	oodplain S	oils (F19) (MLRA 14	49A)	
Stripped	Matrix (S6)		Anomalous I	Bright Loar	my Soils	(F20) (MLF	RA 149A, 153C	, 153D)
Dark Su	face (S7) (LRR P, S	S, T, U)						
Restrictive L	ayer (if observed)	:						
Туре:								
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil	Present? Yes X No
Remarks	,						-	
M	apped as hyd	dric soil.	Likely past a	agricult	ural di	isturbar	nce.	
			51	0				

Data Point 22



Attachment C. Supplemental Preliminary Jurisdictional Determinations Provided by USACE for Reference (by others) This page is intentionally left blank.



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT. CORPS OF ENGINEERS P.O. BOX 60267 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70160-0267 MAY ~ 5 2009

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

Operations Division Surveillance and Enforcement Section

Mr. Barton Rogers Gulf Engineers & Consultants 9337 Interline Ave. Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Reference is made to your request, on behalf of Conoco-Phillips, for a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) jurisdictional determination on property located in Sections 5 & 16, Township 16 South, Range 11 East, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana (enclosed map). Specifically, this property is identified as a 656 acre proposed borrow pit west of LA Highway 23 near Alliance, LA.

Based on review of maps, aerial photography, and soils data, we have determined that part of the property is wetland and may be subject to Corps' jurisdiction. The approximate limits of the wetland are designated in red on the map. A Department of the Army (DA) permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act will be required prior to the deposition or redistribution of dredged or fill material into wetlands that are waters of the United States. Additionally, a DA permit will be required if you propose to deposit dredged or fill material into the waters of the US designated in blue on the map.

You and your client are advised that this preliminary jurisdictional determination is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of this letter unless new information warrants revision prior to the expiration date or the District Engineer has identified, after public notice and comment, that specific geographic areas with rapidly changing environmental conditions merit re-verification on a more frequent basis.

Please be advised that this property is in the Louisiana Coastal Zone. For additional information regarding coastal use permit requirements, contact Ms. Christine Charrier, Coastal Management Division, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources at (225) 342-7591.

Should there be any questions concerning these matters, please contact Mr. Brian Oberlies at (504) 862-2275 and reference our Account No. MVN-2009-00898-SY. If you have specific questions regarding the permit process or permit applications, please contact our Eastern Evaluation Section at (504) 862-2766. The New Orleans District Regulatory Branch is committed to providing quality and timely service to our customers. In an effort to improve customer service, please complete and return the enclosed Customer Service Survey or complete the survey on our web site at http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html.

Sincerely,

Rent a stiffer

Pete J. Serio Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosures







DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS P.O. BOX 50267 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70160-0267

FEB 1 0 2012

Operations Division Surveillance and Enforcement Section

Mr. Josh McEnany Gulf South Research Corporation 8081 GSRI Avenue Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70820

Dear Mr. McEnany:

EPLY TO

ATTENTION OF

Reference is made to your request, submitted on behalf of RAM Terminals, LLC, for a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) jurisdictional determination on property located in Sections 5, 6, and 7, Township 16 South, Range 25 East, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana (enclosed map). Specifically, this property is identified as a 600 acre tract of land on and east of LA-23 along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at river mile 61.

Based on review of recent maps, aerial photography, soils data, and the information submitted with your request, we have determined that part of the property is wetland and may be subject to Corps' jurisdiction. The approximate limits of the wetland are designated in red on the map. A Department of the Army permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act will be required prior to the deposition or redistribution of dredged or fill material into wetlands that are waters of the United States. Additionally, a DA permit will be required if you propose to deposit dredged or fill material into other waters subject to Corps jurisdiction. On the protected side of the levee, other waters that may be subject to Corps' jurisdiction are indicated in blue on the map. Furthermore, the Mississippi River and the wetlands on the river side of the levee are also subject to Corps' jurisdiction under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. A DA Section 10 permit will be required prior to any work in this waterway or the wetlands on the river side of the levee.

You and your client are advised that this preliminary jurisdictional determination is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of this letter unless new information warrants revision prior to the expiration date or the District Engineer has identified, after public notice and comment, that specific geographic areas with rapidly changing environmental conditions merit re-verification on a more frequent basis.

Please be advised that this property is in the Louisiana Coastal Zone. For additional information regarding coastal use permit requirements, contact Ms. Christine Charrier, Coastal Management Division, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources at (225) 342-7953.

You are advised that you must obtain a permit from a local assuring agency, usually a Levee Board or Parish Council, for any work within 1500 feet of a federal flood control structure such as a levee. You must apply by letter to the appropriate agency including full-size construction plans, cross sections, and details of the proposed work. Concurrently with your application to the assuring agency, you must also forward a copy of your letter and plans to Ms. Amy Powell, Operations Manager for Completed Works of the Corps and to the appropriate regional office of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LA DOTD) or the Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration (OCPR) for their review and comments concerning the proposed work. The assuring agency will not issue a permit for the work to proceed until they have obtained letters of no objection from both of these reviewing agencies. For additional information, please contact Ms. Amy Powell at (504) 862-2241.

Should there be any questions concerning these matters, please contact Mr. Brian Oberlies at (504) 862-2275 and reference our Account No. MVN-2011-02552-SY. If you have specific questions regarding the permit process or permit applications, please contact our Eastern Evaluation Section at (504) 862-2766. The New Orleans District Regulatory Branch is committed to providing quality and timely service to our customers. In an effort to improve customer service, please complete and return the enclosed Customer Service Survey.

Sincerely,

- Plant a Haffin

Pete J. Serio Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosures





2013 Joint Permit Application





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District Telephone: 504-862-2766 Website: www.mvn.usace.army.mil/ops/regulatory

Joint Permit Application

For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone

What is the purpose of the Joint Permit Application?	This Joint Permit Application was developed to facilitate the state and federal permit application process administered by the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources/Office of Coastal Management (OCM) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) for work within the Louisiana Coastal Zone.					
	To simplify the permit application process, the Joint Permit Application is a multi-purpose application. It may be used to apply for a Coastal Use Permit (CUP) and/or a Department of the Army Permit under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and/or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This application may also be used to apply for a Solicitation of Views (SOV) or an OCM Request for Determination (RFD). Review the instructions below, then proceed to Step 1.					
Instructions	There are two parts to the Joint Permit Application package:					
How do I complete the	 Joint Permit Application, and Maps and Drawings. 					
Application?	 An accurate/complete application is required for processing; inaccurate/missing information may delay processing. Follow the instructions below to complete the application. Specific instructions are provided with each step. Type or print clearly using black or blue ink; Steps 1 through 16 must be completed; write "N/A" if information does not apply to your proposed project. It is not necessary to write "N/A" on the Steps that you have been asked to skip; When additional space is needed, include an 8½ x 11 sheet of paper identifying the Step number. When you have questions or need assistance in completing the application package: Refer to the "Glossary of Terms" (See page 10.); Contact the Office of Coastal Management at 1-800-267-4019 or 225-342-7591; or Contact your local coastal parish program (See page 11.). (http://dnr.louisiana.gov/CRM/coastmgt/interagencyaff/lcp/lcp.asp)					
Step 1 of 16	Complete the following info	ormation about the	e applicant.			
Who is the	Applicant/Company Name:	Coastal Protection	on & Restoration Authori	ty of Louisiar	na (CPRA)	
applicant for the	,	Individual Person or	Corporation/Company			
project?	Mailing Address:	P.O. Box 44027 Capitol Station				
	inaling / adi ocoi	Street Address or P.	D. Box		Unit/Apa	rtment #
Note: Applicants		Baton Rouge		L	Α	70804-4027
landowner, person		City		St	tate	Zip
or company that is responsible for the	Contact Information:	Micaela Coner		Micaela.C	oner@la.go)V
proposed project.		Name of Contact Pe	rson (not the agent)	E-Mail Addre	ess	
		(225)	342-2799	(225)	242	2-3555
		Area Code Daytim	e Telephone Number	Area Code	Fax N	lumber

Step 2 of 16	Is an agent being used for the proposed project?					
ls an agent being used for	 □ NO (If NO, proceed to Step 3.) ☑ YES (If YES, complete the following information.) 					
the proposed project?	Company Name:	HDR Engineering, Inc. Corporation/Company				
Note: An agent is	Mailing Address:	201 Rue Iberville			Suite 1	15
not required.	Manny Address.	Street Address or P.O. Box			Unit/Apart	tment #
		Lafayette			LA	70508-3281
		City			State	Zip
	Contact Information:	Brooke Savant		brooke.sava	ant@hdrinc.co	m
		Name of Contact Person		E-Mail Address	S	
		(<u>337</u>) <u>347-5606</u> Area Code Davtime Teleph	one Number	(<u>337</u>) <u>3</u> Area Code	47-5601 Fax Ni	Imper
		Alea oode Daytime relepi		Alca Obac	T dx Htt	
Step 3 of 16	Check 🗹 the approp	riate box(es) to indicate th	ne type of permit or act	ion that you	would like to re	quest.
What type of permit or action would you like to request? Note: You may need the approval of other federal.	Coastal Use Perm The purpose of the C the Louisiana Coasta The purpose of the De Clean Water Act is to	it (CUP), Clean Water Act UP is to ensure that any activity I Resource Program. epartment of the Army permit p review and evaluate proposals	Permit (Section 404), R y affecting the Coastal Zone rogram under Section 10 of p for dredging, filling, and/or	Rivers and Ha	arbors Act (Sec a manner that is Harbors Act and S tructures in watery	tion 10) consistent with Section 404 of the vays and wetlands
state or local agencies	in order to determine	whether a permit should be gra	anted or denied based on ex	xpected impacts	s to the overall pub	olic interest.
for your project. Note: For questions concerning the CUP, SOV or RFD, call OCM at: • 1-800-267-4019 or • 225-342-7591	 Solicitation of Views (SOV) – OCM only If you wish to find out if your project is in the Coastal Zone or if you wish to determine if there are special features of the area that may impact your project design you may request a SOV. No application fee is assessed for SOV requests. The following Steps must be completed to obtain an informal determination. Step 1, Step 2, Step 6, Step 14, Step 16; and Step 13 - (Vicinity plat showing project location and extent is required; cross section and plan views are useful, if available.) Request for Determination (RFD) If you wish to obtain a formal determination as to whether or not a CUP would be required for a particular activity, you may submit a RFD. The appropriate application fee will be assessed for RFD requests. The following Steps must be completed to obtain a RFD. Step 1, Step 2, Step 5, Step 6, Step 8, Step 10, Step 14, Step 16; and; 				of the area that may ing Steps must be eful, if available.) you may submit a d to obtain a RFD.	
Step 4 of 16 Have you participated in a Pre-Application or Geological Review Meeting	 If you think that a. Have you particit NO (If NO YES (If YE) Date meeting was held 	pated in a Pre-Application , proceed to Step 4b.) (If you S, complete the following in d: <u>12 / 5 / 2012</u>	st provide a statement explain n or Geological Review u would like to schedule a pr formation.)	Meeting for the second se	hink a permit is no the proposed p neeting, please cal	roject? II 1-800-267-4019)
or obtained a wetland determination?	Attendees: James T Individual	Thomas / Liz Davoli or Company Representative	Karl Morgan / Chris M OCM Representative	Velton	Mike Farabee COE Repres	(12/6/2012) sentative
Note: To schedule a Pre-Application and/or a Geological Review Meeting, call OCM at 1-800-267-4019. Note: To apply for a wetland determination,	 b. Have you obtained an official wetland determination from the COE for the project site? b. Have you obtained an official wetland determination from the COE for the project site? i NO (If NO, proceed to Step 4c.) i YES (If YES, include a copy with this application.) i JD Number: (See Page 13 for additional info) 					
call the COE at 504-862-1627.	c. Is this application ✓ NO (If NC → YES (If YE OCM Permit Nu	on a mitigation plan for an D, proceed to Step 5.) S, identify the permit number mber: <u>P</u>	other CUP? er of the project requiring	mitigation.)		

Step 5 of 16 What permits/ certifications have you previously requested for the proposed project? Note: Additional sheets may be required for agency name, permit number and status information.	 a. Describe the project. The MBSD is a large and complex civil works and restoration project with a diversion complex composed of many different features and elements. The MBSD, when in operation, would divert up to 75,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) of sediment-laden water from the Mississippi River through a self- contained channel with guide levees roughly 1.5 miles long, before outfalling past the back levee into the mid-Barataria Basin. (See additional Pages 13-14) b. Is this application a change to an existing permit? ✓ NO (If NO, proceed to Step 5c.) ✓ YES (If YES, identify the existing permit number.) OCM Permit Number: P ✓ Please explain c. Have you previously applied for a permit or emergency authorization for all or any part of the proposed project?
	Image: No (If NO, proceed to Step 6.) Decision Status Decision Date YES (If YES, complete the following information for the proposed project.) Agency Name Permit Number Decision Status Decision Date OCM
Step 6 of 16 Where will the proposed project be located? Note: The following websites may provide assistance in completing the latitude/longitude and directions: • Sonris on OCM website • MapQuest.com • Topozone.com.	Complete the following information to identify the exact location of the proposed project. a. Physical Location: Plaquemines / Jefferson Ironton (vicinity) 70083 Parish Louisiana State Highway 23 (LA 23) Street Address (If known) Zip Mississippi River (Mile 60.7) / Barataria Basin Water Body (if known) Mississippi River (Mile 60.7)
	b. Latitude and Longitude: Must be included in all applications. Latitude: <u>29</u> Degrees 39 Minutes Longitude: <u>89</u> Degrees 57 Minutes 48.600 Seconds c. Section, Township, Range: (if available) Section #(s) <u>3,2,1,41,19 Section #(s) Section #(s) Section #(s) Section #(s) Section #(s) Section #(s) Section #(s)</u>
Note: Directions may include the following: • Nearest town/city • Highways • Intersections • Street names • Landmarks • Start/end point	d. Lot #, Tract #, Parcel # or Subdivision Name: (if known)

Step 7 of 16	Complete the following information to notify adjacent landowners whose property adjoins the proposed project site.							
Who are the adjacent	Adjacent Landowner #1:	River Rest, LLC						
Note: Adjacent	Mailing Address:	820 Fairfield Avenue		Unit/Apartment #				
landowner information is usually available through the office of		<u>Gretna</u> ^{City}	<u>Jefferson</u> Parish	<u>LA</u> 70056 _{State} _{Zip}				
the tax assessor in the parish where the proiect is to be	Adjacent Landowner #2:	Woodland Borrow Pits, LLC Name of Adjacent Landowner	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
developed.	Mailing Address:	<u>401 Westbank Expy.</u> Address Gretna	Plaquemines	Unit/Apartment #				
Note: Additional information may be	Adiacant Landounar #2	City	Parish	State Zip				
included in the area provided on page12.	Adjacent Landowner #3:	Name of Adjacent Landowner						
may be required if there are more than eight adjacent	Mailing Address:	605 South America Street Address Covington	Plaquemines	Unit/Apartment #				
eight adjacent landowners.		City	Parish	State Zip				
	Adjacent Landowner #4:	Entergy Louisiana Name of Adjacent Landowner						
	Mailing Address:	P.O. Box 61000 Address		Unit/Apartment #				
		New Orleans	<u>Plaquemines</u>	_ <u>LA</u> <u>70113</u> State Zip				
Step 8 of 16	Complete the following inform	nation to identify the purpose a	nd need for the proposed pro	oject.				
What is the purpose of the	a. Project Name and/or Title	a. Project Name and/or Title: Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153)						
proposed project? Note: We are required	 b. Project Type: (Check	he appropriate box. See the "Glossa	ry" on page 10 for the definitions of	terms.)				
<i>justifications and needs</i> <i>for your project.</i>	c. Source of Funding	Federal State	🗆 Local 🛛 🗆 Priva	te				
Providing detailed information at the time of application may	d. Check ☑ the appropriate	box(es) to identify what will be	e done for the proposed proje	ect.				
expedite processing of your proposal.	Bridge/Road Bulkhead/Backfill	Drill site	☑ Pilings ☑ Pipeline/Flow line	Site Clearance				
Note: Additional sheets	Drainage Improvements	Home Site/Driveway	Plug/Abandon Production Barge/Structure	Subdivision				
may be required to explain why the proposed project is needed	 Dredging Drill Barge/Structure Other 	Aajor Industrial Commercial Marina	 Prop Washing Remove Structures 	Wharf/Pier/Boathouse				
	excavation for conve	eyance channel / levee tie-ins						
	e. Why is the proposed pro	ject needed?						
	The project is needed to restore the connection between the Mississippi River and mid-Barataria Basin, to divert sediment- laden water into the Basin to build land. Coastal Louisiana has lost 1,883 square miles of land in the last 80 years, with an additional 1,756 square miles at risk for disappearance over the next 50 years. The impacts of coastal land loss threaten Louisiana's economy, commerce, infrastructure, and culture.							
	L							

Step 9 of 16	Complete the following information to in	ndicate the start/end dates and t	he current status of the proposed project.	
What is the status of the	a. Proposed project start date:8	<u>_/ 15 _/ 2015</u> Proposed pro	ject completion date: <u>8</u> / <u>15</u> /2019	
proposed project? Note: Show and identify planned, in progress, completed work and dimensions for excavations and fill on the Plan View and Cross Section Drawings.	 b. Is any of the project work in program ☑ NO (If NO, proceed to Step 9 ☑ YES (If YES, show and idention 2) ☑ Please explain 	r ess? ∂c.) fy the work in progress on the Plar	view and Cross Section Drawings.)	
	 c. Is any of the project work comple ☑ NO (If NO, proceed to Step ☑ YES (If YES, show and identi ☑ Please explain 	te? 10.) fy the work completed on the Plan	View and Cross Section Drawings.)	
Step 10 of 16 How would you describe the proposed project?	 Complete the following information to describe structures, materials and methods for the proposed processing of the proposed processing of the proposed by using this formula. (Length (ft.) X Width (ft.) X Depth (ft.) divided by 27 = Cubic Yards Acres are determined by using this formula. (Length (ft.) X Width (ft.) divided by 43,560 = Acres) Example: 250 ft. X 250 ft. divided by 43,560 = 1.43 Acres 			
	a. Excavation : 3,850,0	00.00	288.00	
Note: To apply for a wetland determination	Cubic Yards	Ā	cres	
<i>call the COE at</i> 504-862-1627.	b. Fill : 59,151,9	999.00	10,554.00	
Mate. Information	Cubic Yards	Α	cres	
provided in this Step must be consistent with	c. What fill materials will be used for the control of the contro	the proposed project? licate the cubic yards for each type of t	ill material.)	
Maps and Drawings.	Concrete	371,293.00 Cubic Yards ■ Rock (rip/s	ap) <u>65,676.00</u> Cubic Yards	
	Crushed Stone or Gravel	102,290.00 Sand	Cubic Yards	
Note: For any equipment used, show the access	Excavated & Placed on site	1,100,000.00 Iv Hauled in Cubic Yards	Topsoil/Dirt 584,035.00 Cubic Yards	
route and construction right	Excavated & Hauled off site	2,300,000.00 Cubic Yards		
and Drawings.	✓ Other (<i>Please specify</i>): Riverine S	ources (See Pages 15-16)	55,000,000.00 Cubic Yards	
	d. What equipment will be used for th	e proposed project? (Check 🗹 t	he appropriate box(es).)	
	🗹 Airboat	Bulldozer/Grader	🗹 Marsh Buggy	
	Backhoe	Dragline/Excavator	Other Tracked or Wheeled Vehicles	
	Barge Mounted Bucket Dredge	☐ Handjet	Self Propelled Pipe Laying Barge	
	Barge Mounted Drilling Rig	Land Based Drilling Rig	✓ Tugboat	
	☐ Other (Please specify.)			

Continue	to page	6 for step	11.	Ŕ
----------	---------	------------	-----	---

Step 11 of 16

What impact

Note: You will be notified by OCM if a

field investigation is

required to determine

if the proposed project will impact wetlands.

Note: Additional sheets may be required to adequately respond to 11b. 11c. 11d

and/or 11e.

Note: Providing detailed information at

may expedite

processing of your proposal.

the time of application

will the proposed project have? b. What alternative locations, methods and access routes were considered to avoid impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

As part of the engineering and design phase, alternatives are selected considering the use of existing access roads and drives to minimize impacts to wetlands. The following alternatives analysis represents the cumulative descriptions of decisions and efforts that support the selected alternative location for the MBSD project. (See Pages 16-19 for additional information)

c. What efforts were made to minimize impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

The analysis and design of the MBSD was developed using the minimum channel width and guide levee footprint practicable to maximize conveyance of sediment- laden water to the mid-Barataria Basin. The channel alignment was developed for efficient sediment conveyance from the river to the mid-Barataria Basin. Best Management practices (BMPs) are being developed for access routes to minimize disturbance to wetlands between the MR&T levee and the back levee.

d. How are unavoidable impacts to vegetated wetlands to be mitigated? (Please note that a willingness to perform mitigation does not relieve the applicant from adequately addressing justification for (step 8e) and alternatives to (step 11b & 11c) the proposed activity)

This project is self-mitigating. The project's purpose is to divert sediment- laden water from the Mississippi River to mid-Barataria Basin (Basin), which will mimic historic deltaic sediment deposition and build land. Based upon previous completed modeling for land building analysis, it is anticipated that over 10,000 acres of wetlands will be created in Barataria Basin over a 50 year horizon. This equates to 100:1 acres of wetlands created for restoration to acres of wetlands impacted for the project construction and operation.

Landowner Rights

- The affected landowner(s) whose property may be impacted by the proposed project has (have) the option of requesting that compensatory mitigation be done on their property.
- Once OCM determines that mitigation is required, they will notify the applicant and all affected landowners of the extent and type of habitat impacted. The landowner(s) will be given thirty (30) days to formally request or waive their mitigation option. (This can cause substantial delays in processing of the application.)

Applicant Responsibilities

- Coordinate with the affected landowner(s) to develop a conceptual compensatory mitigation plan. This plan should be designed to offset the adverse impacts to vegetated wetlands which will occur from the proposed project. (This can also cause substantial delays in processing of the application.)
- To avoid delays, it is recommended that, prior to sending the application to OCM, you contact affected landowner(s) to:

Inform them of possible wetland impacts and discuss their compensatory mitigation rights; and
 Ask them to indicate their intentions regarding compensatory mitigation on the form.

• Submit the Landowner Compensatory Mitigation Request/Waiver form along with your application.

Step 12 of 16

What are the requirements for notification of landowners and oyster lease holders of the proposed project site?

Note: OCM and COE both have mitigation requirements under different laws, rules and regulations; therefore, specific agency requirements may vary.

Note: If a property has multiple owners with undivided interest in the property, each person owning an interest is considered to be a landowner and must be notified.

Note: Additional sheets may be required if there are more than two landowners.

Note: Compensatory miligation is not a monetary settlement to be used at the discretion of the landowner(s).

Note: A copy of the "Landowner Compensatory Mitigation Request/ Waiver" form is included with this application. To obtain additional copies, visit the OCM website or call: -1-800-267-4019 Or •225-342-7591

Note: See our FAQ for a list of regulations that may be applicable. Be aware that this list is for example proposes and does not purport to be complete or indicate applicability in any particular situation or project. It is the applicant's responsibility to be fully aware of all regulatory requirements, to list those requirements and certify that thy will be in compliance.

a. Are you applying for a Coastal Use Permit?

NO (If NO, proceed to Step 12b.)

YES (If YES, read the following information.)

Requirements for Notification of Landowners

It is the responsibility of the applicant to notify the landowner(s) of the property about this proposed project. Notification must include providing each impacted landowner with a copy of the permit application (form and plats) at the time the application is submitted to the Office of Coastal Management.

Requirements for Notification to Oyster Lease Holders

It is the responsibility of the applicant to notify all affected oyster lease holders about this proposed project. Notification must include providing each affected oyster lease holder with a copy of the permit application (form and plats) at the time the application is submitted to the Office of Coastal Management. The location of leases, and the name and contact information of the lessee can be obtained by contacting the LDWF Oyster Lease Survey Section at 504-284-5279. You also can use the OCM GIS interactive map on our website at http://sonris-www.dnr.state.la.us/www root/sonris portal 1.htm. Please note that copies of the lease holder notification letters must be included with your application packet at the time of submittal. For more information regarding notification requirements please contact the Oyster Lease Survey Section or visit our website at http://dnr.louisiana.gov/crm/coastmgt/permitsmitigation/oyster.asp.

While these are legal requirements to ensure that property owners/oyster lease holders are aware of proposals which might impact their land/oyster lease, it also serves as a proactive measure to initiate communication between the applicant and the landowner(s)/lease holders, especially when mitigation might be necessary. Since mitigation can be a lengthy process, taking proactive steps early in the process may significantly reduce the time necessary to receive an authorization.

b. Are you the sole owner of the property on which the proposed activity is to occur?

- **YES** (If YES, proceed to Step 12c.)
- **NO** (If NO, follow the instructions below.)

Check I the appropriate box(es) and complete the landowner information to attest to OCM that a copy of this application has been sent to all landowners whose property will be impacted by the project.

- The applicant is an owner of the property on which the proposed described activity is to occur.
- □ The applicant has made every reasonable effort to determine the identity and current address of the owner(s) of the land on which the proposed described activity is to occur, which included, if necessary, a search of the public records of the parish in which the proposed activity is to occur.

Z The applicant hereby attests that a copy of the application has been distributed to the following landowners.

Landowner/Lease Holder #1:	Ram Terminals, LLC.		
	Name of Landowner / Lease Holder		
Mailing Address:	7733 Forsyth Blvd.		
/	Street Address or P.O. Box		Unit/Apartment #
	St. Louis		MO 63105-1836
	City	Parish	State Zip Code
Landowner/Lease Holder #2:	Phillips 66		
	Name of Landowner / Lease Holder		
Mailing Address:	P.O. Box 2197		
-	Street Address or P.O. Box		Unit/Apartment #
	Houston		TX 77252
	City	Parish	State Zip Code

c. Does the project involve drilling, production, and/or storage of oil and gas?

NO (If NO, proceed to Step 13.)

YES (If YES, review and complete the certification below. You must attach a list of all state and federal laws and rules and regulations dealing with spill prevention and containment. Your signature on step 14 certifies that you are aware of the terms and conditions of each requirement and that you will remain in compliance at all times.)

	hereby certify that I am the	
(Name of officer)		(Name of Office)

(Name of Office) , hereinafter referred to as the Applicant and that I have authority to

of

(Full legal name of the entity seeking a permit)

act on behalf of and bind that legal entity, and by my signature below I certify that the information in the application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, that Applicant has provided a complete list of the requirements for protection of health, safety and the environment, and that Applicant is in full compliance with all applicable safety and environmental regulations as listed on the attached sheet, specifically including when applicable, LAC 43:XIX.111 Diverter Systems and Blowout Preventers.

Note: The following websites may provide assistance in completing the Vicinity Map: •Sonris on OCM website •MapQuest.com •Topozone.com Note: For additional assistance with specific requirements, refer to the samples provided in this application package.	 Vicinity Map - Illustrates access to and the local Plan View Drawing - Illustrates an overhead view Cross Section Drawing - Illustrates a side view In general, all Maps and Drawings should be: Legible and clearly labeled on single sided 8½ > 8½ x 11 format are not acceptable if the scale is and easy to read after reproduction in the Public Drawn to scale with the scale identified graphical scale, you may submit the dimensions of the production Black and white ONLY (Colored Maps and Draw Accurate and reproducible; Placement of the north arrow, title, legend and set Information provided in Steps 1 through 12 muss Inadequate or poor Maps and Drawings are the p Sample Maps and Drawings are provided with the Link to sample plats: http://dnr.louisiana.gov/crm/coastmgt/cup/sampleplats.asp 	tion of the proposed project relative to surrounding aw of the proposed project; and of the proposed project. (11 size paper; (large drawings that are reduced in no longer accurate and if the dimensions and detai Notice); ally on each drawing; (if you cannot provide Maps ar posed and existing features of the work area displa wings will NOT be accepted); scale bar must be consistent on Maps and Drawings t be consistent with the Maps and Drawings. Trimary reason for delays in the permitting proce is Joint Permit Application package for your ass	areas; size to fit the ils are not clear nd Drawings to iyed); ;; and ;; and ;; ss. ;istance.
Step 14 of 16 Who needs to certify and sign this application? Note: The application must be signed and dated by the applicant who desires to undertake the proposed activity.	 Read the following information. Print your name Application is hereby made for a permit or pe To the best of my knowledge the proposed at conducted in a manner that is consistent with I certify that the information in this application If applicable, I also certify that the declaration If applicable, I also certify that the declaration I will abide by the conditions of the permit or I authorization. Permission is granted to the agencies response representative, to enter the property site durin If applicable, I authorize the agent identified i will furnish, upon request, information in support 	, sign and date to certify this application for pro- rmits to authorize the work described in this application ctivity described in this permit application complies we the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program. It is complete and accurate. It is in Step 12, notification to landowner(s), are complete is in Step 12c, oil spill response, are complete and a license if issued and will not begin work without the multiple for authorization of this work, or their duly author ing working hours for inspection purposes. In Step 2 to act in my behalf as agent for this application.	cessing. tion. with and will be lete and accurate. accurate. appropriate norized ation and the agent
Note: If an agent is being used, the applicant and agent must sign and date this application.	Clearly Print Name of Applicant As the agent, I further certify that I possess the additional duly authorized agent of the applicant. Clearly Print Name of Authorized Agent 18 U.S.C. Section 1001 provides that: Whoever, in any manne and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, schen or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or documents and \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned n	Applicant Signature uthority to undertake the work described herein or a Authorized Agent Signature er within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the Un ne, or disguises a material fact or makes any false, fictitious or nent knowing same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulen an 5 wears or both	// Date m acting as the // Date ited States knowingly r fraudulent statements t statements or entry,

Quality Maps and Drawings are required to process the Joint Permit Application and for Public Notice. They must visually reflect what will be done in the proposed project and are key to the overall evaluation.

The following Maps and Drawings must be submitted with the Joint Permit Application and must show both

Step 13 of 16

obtain a permit?

Why are Maps and Drawings

required to

(]

existing and proposed conditions.

Step 15 of 16	The following fees apply	and must be received in order to process the application.		
What fees are required for permit processing and what methods are available for payment?	 a. Check I the appropriate box to indicate the fee type: (See the "Glossary" on page 10 for the definitions of terms.) \$100.00 - Non-Residential \$20.00 - Residential If your activity involves dredging or filling, OCM will bill you on the basis of \$.04 per cubic yards for residential uses and \$.05 per cubic yards for all other uses. Fees may not apply if the Joint Permit Application is being processed by the local Parish. Additional fees may be assessed for mitigation processing. 			
COE and Local Parish Program fees will be assessed separately at the end of the process.	 b. Check I the appropriate box to indicate payment method: Check/Money Order Credit Card (Visa or MasterCard only) Bescrow Account Make Check/Money Order payable to the Office of Coastal Management. To pay by Credit Card, Electronic Transfer or Escrow Account, call OCM at 1-800-267-4019 to provide specific account information or provide account information on a separate sheet of paper and include with application. Cash is not accepted. 			
Step 16 of 16 How do I submit the Joint Permit Application and Maps and Drawings for processing? If your project is in the Galveston or Vicksburg District of the Corps of Engineers, please see page 12. <i>Note: Please keep a copy of the completed application for your records.</i>	To submit this permit ap Image: mail in this permit ap Image: mail in this permit ap </th <th>plication, Maps and Drawings and all supporting documentation, select an option below. Office of Coastal Management P.O. Box 44487 Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4487 If you select the MAIL option, submit the original Joint Permit Application, Maps and Drawings and supporting documentation. Office of Coastal Management 617 North 3rd Street, Suite 1078 Baton Rouge, LA 70802 Phone: 225-342-7591 If you select the EXPRESS MAIL option, submit the original copies of the Joint Permit Application, Maps and Drawings and supporting documentation. 225-342-6760 Attention: Office of Coastal Management, Joint Permit Application Processing • Include a cover sheet with the total number of pages; and • Include a cover sheet with the total number of pages; and • Include a cover sheet should be made prior to faxing your application by calling OCM at 1-800-267-4019.</th>	plication, Maps and Drawings and all supporting documentation, select an option below. Office of Coastal Management P.O. Box 44487 Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4487 If you select the MAIL option, submit the original Joint Permit Application, Maps and Drawings and supporting documentation. Office of Coastal Management 617 North 3rd Street, Suite 1078 Baton Rouge, LA 70802 Phone: 225-342-7591 If you select the EXPRESS MAIL option, submit the original copies of the Joint Permit Application, Maps and Drawings and supporting documentation. 225-342-6760 Attention: Office of Coastal Management, Joint Permit Application Processing • Include a cover sheet with the total number of pages; and • Include a cover sheet with the total number of pages; and • Include a cover sheet should be made prior to faxing your application by calling OCM at 1-800-267-4019.		

The following information may provide a better understanding of terms that are used throughout this application. If the terms defined in this section do not help you, please contact OCM at one of the following, 1-800-267-4019 or 225-342-7591.

Adjacent Landowner

Property owners or lessees whose property is contiguous or shares a common border with that being developed.

Affected Landowner

The owner of the land on which a proposed activity will occur. If a property has multiple owners with undivided interest, each person owning an interest is considered to be an affected landowner.

Coastal Use Permit

A permit required by 214.30 of the SLCRMA. The term does not mean or refer to, and is in addition to, any other permit or approval required or established pursuant to any other constitutional provision or statute.

Compensatory Mitigation

As defined by OCM, replacement, substitution, enhancement, or protection of ecological values to offset anticipated losses of ecological values caused by a permitted activity.

As defined by the COE, compensating for unavoidable adverse impacts to wetlands by restoring areas to wetlands, creating wetlands, or enhancement of wetlands. Most compensatory mitigation involves purchase of mitigation credits in a private mitigation bank. The amount of credits purchased is dependent on the amount of wetland values that would be lost because of the permitted project.

Cross Section

A side view of a project area illustrating elevations of features such as natural ground; buildings; bulkheads; piers; and depressions such as waterways, ditches, ponds, etc. Cross sections also show side views of proposed work such as dredging and filling.

Discharge

The placement or movement of fill or excavated material using methods including, but not limited to dragline or backhoe buckets, bulldozers, front loaders, dump trucks, hydraulic dredge pipes, wheel-washing or prop-washing, jetting, etc.

Dredged Material (Spoil)

Material that is excavated as part of a specific project.

Ecological Value

The ability of an area to support vegetation, fish and wildlife populations.

Excavate

To dig out, remove or move earthen material, or to form a cavity or hole including linear features. Methods include, but are not limited to, draglines, backhoes, bulldozers, front loaders, hydraulic dredges, wheel-washing or prop-washing, jetting, etc.

Fastlands

Lands surrounded by publicly-owned, maintained, or otherwise validly existing levees or natural formations as of January 1, 1979, or as may be lawfully constructed in the future, which levees or natural formations would normally prevent activities, not to include the pumping of water for drainage purposes, within the surrounded area from having direct and significant impacts on coastal waters.

Fill Material

Any material including, but not limited to, soil, rocks, sand, clay, construction debris, trees, wood chips, broken concrete and asphalt, etc., whose placement replaces any portion of a waterbottom or wetland with dry land or changes the elevation of wetlands or waterbottoms. This material may come from on-site or be imported from an off-site source.

Mean High Water

The average position (elevation) of the high water mark.

Mean Low Water The average position

The average position (elevation) of the low water mark.

Mitigation All actions taken by a permittee to avoid, minimize, restore, and compensate for ecological values lost due to a permitted activity.

Non-Residential

Includes all actions that do not meet the requirements for the Residential category.

Non-Vegetated Waterbottoms

Waterbottoms that lack the presence of rooted vegetation.

Non-Wet Areas

Any area that has sufficiently dry conditions that indicate hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and/or wetland hydrology are lacking.

Off-site

Not within or adjoining the area directly modified by the permitted activity and not directly related to implementation of the permitted activity.

On-site

Within or adjoining the area directly modified by the permitted activity or directly related to implementation of the permitted activity.

Residential

Any coastal use associated with the construction or modification of one single-family, duplex, or triplex residence or camp. It shall also include the construction or modification to any outbuilding, bulkhead, pier, or appurtenance on a lot on which there exists a single-family, duplex, or triplex residence or camp or on a water body which is immediately adjacent to such lot. Uses which do not fit this definition are non-residential. The Coastal Use Permit application fee for residential projects is \$20.

Unavoidable Net Loss of Ecological Values

The net loss of ecological value that is anticipated to occur as the result of a permitted/authorized activity, despite all efforts, required by the guidelines, to avoid, minimize, and restore the permitted/authorized impacts.

Vegetated Waterbottoms

Waterbottoms that exhibit the presence of rooted vegetation.

Wetlands

For the purposes of §724 (as defined in R.S. 49:21.41), Open water areas or areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances, do support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.

The following questions and answers may assist you during the application process. For an expanded version of frequently asked questions, visit our website at http://dnr.louisiana.gov/CRM/faq.asp

What gives the Office of Coastal Management (OCM) the right to regulate private property?

OCM does not regulate private property. OCM regulates activities that have a direct and significant impact on state public resources. OCM's authority derives from Louisiana Revised Statute 49:214.21 et seq. Visit the legislative website for additional information at http://www.legis.state.la.us/lss/tsrssearch.htm.

How does the Joint Permit Application process work?

In general, an application is submitted which details the location and scope of the proposed work. OCM – Permits & Mitigation Division, which serves as a central collection point for the applications, distributes the applications to interested parties for their review and comment. OCM - Permits & Mitigation Division and the commenting agencies review the application for conformance with programmatic requirements and look for ways of minimizing impacts to coastal resources (e.g., vegetated wetlands, bird rookeries, endangered species, etc.). If necessary, negotiations are entered into to find locations, technologies or methods of implementing the project which will accommodate the needs of the permit applicant while conforming with the mandates of the various state and federal agencies. Once consensus is reached an appropriately conditioned permit is issued.

Who receives a copy of my Joint Permit Application?

The following agencies/offices receive a copy of your application:

- OCM Permit Section;
- · Local Programs Section, (if necessary);
- OCM Support Services Staff;
- OCM Field Investigator;
- The Army Corps of Engineers; and
- State Land Office.

How long does it take to obtain a permit?

The following schedules are offered with the assumption that all of the information required by OCM is included in the application and the plats are adequate, clear and legible. For activities that are exempt from permit requirements, the determination is normally issued in under seven days. Projects that are determined to have no direct or significant impacts to coastal resources are issued in 4 to 10 days depending on location. Authorizations for activities that qualify for a General Permit are issued in 10 to 15 days. For those activities that require full public notice, a minimum of 45 days is required. During review of the permit application, for more complex activities, additional information may be requested. The more promptly the applicant can furnish this information the less time it will require to issue the authorization. The requirement for mitigation of wetland impacts is one of the factors that increases the time required for permit application review, as does coordination with other State agencies for activities affecting resources of concern to that agency

How do I check the status of a submitted Joint Permit Application?

Information regarding submitted permits may usually be obtained on the OCM website: <u>http://sonris.com/direct.asp?server=sonris-</u> www&path=/sonris/cmdPermit.jsp%3Fsid%3DPROD.

How does OCM protect the information that I provide throughout this application?

Information provided on the application is used to evaluate the activity that is proposed for permitting, and this information is generally available for inspection and copying by the public, pursuant to the Louisiana Public Records act. There are some limited exceptions to the public records laws to protect certain types of records or information from public inspection. Please contact our office, <u>before</u> you submit any records or information that you would prefer not be available for public inspection or copying. In any case, simply marking a document "CBI" or "confidential business information" will not guarantee that the records or information will be protected from public inspection and copying.

May I submit a Joint Permit Application to the Parish instead of OCM?

Yes, if your project is located in a parish with an approved Local Coastal Program (Calcasieu, Cameron, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. James, St. Tammany or Terrebonne) then you may submit your application to either the approved local program or the state office. If you submit the application to the state office, it will be input into the system and reviewed at that time. If you submit your application to the state office to be input into the system and reviewed. Please allow additional time to receive a response if you choose the latter option.

What other permits may be required?

If your project involves dredging or filling of wetlands you may need a Water Quality Certification from the Department of Environmental Quality. Other approvals may be required but are not limited to the following:

- State Land Office;
- Department of Wildlife and Fisheries;
- · Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism;
- · Department of Transportation and Development; and/or
- Department of Health and Hospitals.

These agencies will notify you of their requirements as part of the Joint Public Notice process.

When I receive my permit from OCM, may I begin work?

Following the determination from OCM, work may begin only after obtaining any necessary permit(s) from the COE, including any required mitigation, and any approvals or permits required any local authority or agency or by any state or federal agency, as may be required by law for said activity or the construction of the referenced project.

How may I receive an extension for a permit?

If you have not begun work on your project within two years of the date of permit issuance, the initiation period can be extended for an additional two years if you submit a request to OCM no less than sixty days and no more than one-hundred and eighty days before the initial two year period expires. The expiration date can be extended. Follow the same rules. There is an \$80.00 extension fee.

If I began my project without a permit, what will happen?

OCM processing of any pending Joint Permit Application for the project will be suspended until the violation is resolved. You may be required to remove any structures installed and restore any impacted habitat. You may be subject to fines of up to \$12,000and may be jailed up to six months. The penalties assessed by the Army Corps of Engineers may be significantly more expensive and more complicated.

Did I break the law if I have already done some clearing?

A representative from LDNR will perform a field investigation and project evaluation in order to determine the extent of any impacts and if you have violated any laws.

Contact OCM at 1-800-267-4019 for assistance.

What is Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act?

Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 prohibits the obstruction or alteration of navigable water of the United States without a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

What is Section 404 of the Clean Water Act?

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States without a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

How do I receive additional information on the Joint Permit Application process?

For additional information regarding the Joint Application Process, contact OCM at 1-800-267-4019 or visit the website at: <u>http://dnr.louisiana.gov/crm/</u>. You may also contact the Army Corps of Engineers at 504-862-2766 or visit the website at: <u>www.mvn.usace.army.mil/ops/regulatory</u>.

Continue to page 12 for "Contacts and Additional Landowner Information" . $\stackrel{\mathcal{U}}{\Rightarrow}$

If your project is in the Galveston or Vicksburg COE District, submit your application directly to them. See addresses listed below.



COE District Contact Information:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Galveston District Attention: CESWG-PE-R P.O. Box 1229 Galveston, TX 77553-1229 Phone:409-766-3930 Fax:409-766-3931

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Vicksburg District Attention: CEMVK-OD-F 4155 Clay Street Vicksburg, MS 39183-3435 Phone:601-631-5276 Fax:601-631-5459

Additional Landowner Information (if necessary):

Adiacent Landowner #5:	See additional landowner information attached Name of Adjacent Landowner				
Mailing Address:					
	Street Address or P.O. Box			Unit/Apartment #	
	City	Parish	State	Zip	
Adjacent Landowner #6:					
	Name of Adjacent Landowne	r			
Mailing Address:	Street Address or P.O. Box	Unit/Apartment #			
	City	Parish	State	Zip	
Adjacent Landowner #7:					
-	Name of Adjacent Landowne	r			
Mailing Address:					
	Street Address or P.O. Box			Unit/Apartment #	
	City	Parish	State	Zip	
Adjacent Landowner #8:					
-	Name of Adjacent Landowne	r			
Mailing Address:					
	Street Address or P.O. Box			Unit/Apartment #	
	City	Parish	State	Zip	

Additional Project Information - Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153)

4b. Have you obtained an official wetland determination from the COE for the project site?

No official wetland determination has been obtained specifically for the entire footprint of the MBSD project. A field visit for delineation and habitat evaluation of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, was conducted on November 12 and 13, 2012, by HDR wetland scientists and experienced delineators. The field evaluation was confined to the 1400-foot width of the preliminary project footprint. It is worth noting that the field investigation was conducted within three months of Hurricane Isaac which caused substantial flooding throughout the study area resulting in atypical hydrologic and vegetation indicators. Therefore, the preliminary delineation was considered a conservative evaluation and likely overestimates the extent of wetland conditions in the project area.

Consistent with the recommended methodology for atypical situations, additional data and information on the normal conditions was collected from recent aerial photography and previous delineation and jurisdictional determination documentation. Rob Heffner of the USACE New Orleans District, Regulatory Branch, provided information on recent preliminary jurisdictional determinations (PJD # MVN-2009-00898-SY and # MVN-2011-02552-SY) covering approximately seventy (70) percent of the MBSD project footprint. No official jurisdictional determination has been received specific to the entire footprint of MBSD project. The Preliminary Jurisdictional Determinations provided for portions of the project area, in combination with recent aerial photography and field data collected by HDR wetland scientist, were used in the wetland calculations presented in step 11a.

5a. Describe the Project.

In order to maximize sediment capture, the diversion would be operated when the Mississippi River flows above 600,000 cfs at the Belle Chasse gauge. Anticipated project benefits include building, sustaining, and maintaining land. Secondary long-term project benefits include minimizing flooding risks to coastal communities and both restoring and preserving critical coastal ecosystems.

The main elements of the project are the diversion structure and the conveyance channel. The channel will be located at River Mile 60.7, south of the Phillips 66 Alliance Refinery and north of the community of Ironton, and it will consist of a gated intake structure approximately 800 feet west of the Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) levee. The design of the structure will allow for adaptability in controlling flows and the capture of sediment. The conveyance channel will cross the back levee and outfall into the Basin. Guide levees will be constructed parallel to the conveyance channel and will tie into the MR&T levee and the back levee systems. Construction will be sequenced so that the MR&T Levee will continually provide protection. The back levee is currently being brought into the Federal protection system under the USACE New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Project. The MBSD may include a surge protection structure east of the NOV Hurricane Protection Levee right-of-way which will be designed to tie into the levee.

Railroad, roadway, and drainage infrastructure improvements are included as part of the MBSD Project because they are needed to accommodate the construction and operation of the diversion structure and the diversion channel. The New Orleans & Gulf Coast Railway (NOGC RR) will require a bridge crossing over the conveyance channel as well as track realignment into the eastern most portion of the LA 23 right- of -way north of the conveyance channel for approximately two (2) miles. LA 23 is a four-lane divided state highway that serves as the hurricane evacuation route for lower Plaquemines Parish. A four-lane highway bridge will span the conveyance channel and would be located within the existing LA 23 right-of-way just west of the existing highway alignment to accommodate lane transitions. During construction, LA 23 will remain open to traffic through the construction of a temporary detour route that will be located west and outside of the existing LA 23 right-of-way within temporary construction servitude.

The diversion channel will bifurcate existing drainage and isolate properties north of the project area, including drainage for LA 23. Forced drainage is currently provided by Wilkinson Canal Pump Station located near Myrtle Grove to the south for the project area. The MBSD will require the modification of internal drainage collection swales and the construction of a new drainage pump station north of the conveyance channel in order to capture and convey area drainage north of the channel to the Basin. Construction and operational benefits have been analyzed for the proposed pump station. The current selected alternative from the drainage study places the proposed pump station at Chenier Traverse Bayou, north of West Ravenna Road where an aggraded channel intercepts the back levee. A pump station at this location would provide a more centralized drainage outfall location for the newly created north forced drainage area. Right-of-way and road access will be required for the construction and maintenance of the proposed pump station.

Relocations of water and electrical utility lines will be needed in order to accommodate the construction and operation of the diversion channel and the proposed LA 23 and NOGC RR bridges. A 22 inch crude oil pipeline is located immediately west of the proposed channel outfall. Alternatives for protection and/or relocation will be evaluated. All infrastructure and utility improvements and relocations will be based upon continued service during construction and will be designed and constructed using utility owner criteria and guidelines and addressing hurricane criteria during interim and final phases of construction.

An Operations and Maintenance Plan will be developed for the MBSD prior to construction. The currently anticipated operations plan includes opening the diversion structure when the Mississippi River flows above 600,000 cfs at the Belle Chasse gauge, diverting up to 75,000 cfs of sediment- laden water. The MBSD structure will be closed during extreme weather events and hurricanes.

An Adaptive Management Plan will be developed to maximize sediment transport from the Mississippi River to the Basin to build, sustain, and maintain land. The Adaptive Management Plan would monitor the diversion control structure and outfall area and allow for variable flow rates to respond to seasonal, sediment, and Basin conditions, maximizing the benefits of sediment transport for restoration. Monitoring stations will be placed in the Mississippi River at RM 60.7 (and other locations, as well as in the Basin at the channel outfall and other areas, to be determined).

Step 10a. Excavation					
Location	Habitat Type (existing)	<u>Feature</u>	_	Area (acres)	Excavation (CY)
Mississippi River	Riverine	Diversion Channel		14.0	350,000
Batture	Forested Wetlands	Diversion Channel		4.2	202,796
MR&T levee west to LA 23	Forested Wetlands	Diversion Channel		3.2	127,050
LA 23 west to back levee	Emergent Wetlands	Diversion Channel		30.9	1,247,510
	Open Water Canal/ Drainage (WOTUS)	Diversion Channel		1.8	57,112
MR&T levee to back levee	Non-wetland (uplands)	Diversion Channel		230.0	1,765,532
Barataria Basin	Waterbottom	Outfall Transition Zone		4.0	100,000
Cumulative Subtotals	Riverine			14.0	350,000
	Wetlands			38.3	1,577,356
	Open Water Canal/ Drainage (WOTUS)			1.8	57,112
	Waterbottom / Emergent wetlands			4.0	100,000
	Non-wetland (uplands)			230.0	1,765,532
			Total	288.0	3,850,000

Step 10b & 10c. Fill					
Location	Habitat Type (existing)	<u>Feature</u>	Material	Area (acres)	Fill (CY)
			Soil,		
MR&T levee west to LA 23	Forested Wetlands	Construction access	gravel	2.4	11,568
		Guide Levees	Soil, rock, concrete	2.4	25.931
			Soil.		
LA 23 west to back levee	Emergent Wetlands	Construction access	gravel	22.8	110,207
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	24.7	221,031
			Soil,		
LA 23 west to back levee	Open Water Canal/ Drainage (WOTUS)	Construction access	gravel	2.1	10,261
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	2.4	23,293
			Soil,		
MR&T levee to back levee	Non-wetland (uplands)	Construction access	gravel	64.5	311,964
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	41.5	1,129,746
Construction Devites			Soil,	4.5	0.000
Construction Routes	Non-wetland (uplands)	Access / Haul Roads	gravei	1.5	8,000
Parataria Pacin (Ponofite)	Waterbettem / Emergent wetlands	Nourishment Dispesal Area	ropson,	200*	2 200 000
Barataria Basiri (Berlerits)	waterbottom / Emergent wetlands	Nouristiment Disposar Area	Bivor	390	2,300,000
	Waterbottom / Emergent wetlands	Barataria Basin land building	sediment	10,000 ⁺	55,000,000.00
Cumulative Subtotals	Wetlands			52.3	368,736
	Open Water Canal/ Drainage (WOTUS)			4.5	33,553
	Non-wetland (uplands)			107	1,449,710
	Waterbottom / Emergent wetlands	Land / marsh building		10,390	57,300,000
			Total	10,554.2	59,151,999

10b & 10c. Supplemental Fill information to Table on Page 16.

- Note: Due to preliminary design stage, the amount of fill material by type (e.g., soil, rock, concrete, etc.) is approximate.
- * Earthen fill excavated from channel and placed in Barataria Basin as Nourishment Disposal.
- ⁺ Sediment Riverine Sources, via the diversion channel. CY based on preliminary modeling over a 45 year period.

11a. Total acres of wetlands and/or waterbottoms filled and/or excavated:

- Wetlands excavated = 38.3 acres
- Wetlands filled = 52.3 acres
- Waterbottom excavated = 19.8 acres
- Waterbottom filled = 10,395 acres

11b. What alternative locations, methods and access routes were considered to avoid impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

The MBSD alternatives analysis consists of alternative evaluations from the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) Program, Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Ecosystem Restoration Study, LCA Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging Feasibility Study, the State/NGO Myrtle Grove Delta Building Diversion Modeling Effort in Support of LCA Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging, the 2012 Louisiana Coastal Master Plan, and MBSD engineering and design.

Alternative Analysis

CWPPRA and the LCA Ecosystem Restoration Study

As indicated in the LCA Ecosystem Restoration Study Main Report, the development of alternative configurations for this restoration feature stretches over a number of years. The CWPPRA planning process identified and approved investigation of a number of possible projects at various sites in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove. The potential projects included management of the existing Naomi siphon, construction of an additional siphon, creation of wetlands through dedicated dredging, and others. CWPPRA provided funding for the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution study (MRSNFR) to investigate and optimize the reintroduction of river resources into coastal wetlands and initiated a comprehensive evaluation study to coordinate all CWPPRA efforts as well as possible larger-scale diversion opportunities.

Originally, the MRSNFR study identified and developed two scales of diversion, 5,000 and 15,000 cfs, in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove. A draft report was developed for the MRSNFR study and adopted by the CWPPRA Task Force as the basis for a number of diversion projects that were approved for detailed design. Several locations for a diversion were assessed, and the primary area of impact varied slightly. According to the report, "the findings of this overarching assessment of riverine potential lead to the initiation of the comprehensive evaluation study in the Myrtle Grove area."

In 2001, the CWPPRA Task Force approved the Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove detailed design study. The initial federal sponsor of the study was the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); however, the Federal sponsorship of the study was later transferred to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New Orleans District, under the Louisiana Coastal Area program.

The second, comprehensive CWPPRA study of Myrtle Grove was initiated in March 2002 with the issuance of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to complete an EIS; a series of four public scoping meetings were conducted focusing on the specific problems, needs, and opportunities of the Barataria Basin in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove. An interagency Plan Development Team (PDT) reviewed and screened the public input from the scoping meetings, identifying and formulating alternative restoration plans. These plans incorporated the previously identified CWPPRA and MRSNFR projects, as well as new feature ideas, combinations, and scales developed from the scoping input. A key commonality between all of the previously identified alternatives was their basic fit within a local ecosystem. The nature of the marsh in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove was broken and was continuing to deteriorate rather than being completely open or nearly lost. As such, the alternatives developed in the previous CWPPRA and MRSNFR efforts capitalized on synergistically working with the remaining wetlands.

The result of the 2002 scoping effort was a range of diversion options between 2,000 and 15,000 cfs in combination with the direct creation of marsh using dredged sediments. From this scoping effort, hydraulic and salinity modeling of the immediate Myrtle Grove outfall area was completed along with the development of potential marsh creation sites.

The scoping and formulation effort for the LCA Ecosystem Restoration study was undertaken two to three months subsequent to scoping for the Myrtle Grove CWPPRA comprehensive study effort. The LCA effort also considered possible features near Myrtle Grove but did so in a larger context of restoration for an entire province, or designated area within the Chenier or Deltaic Plain. As a result, the LCA formulation, while identifying alternatives similar to the CWPPRA study, also identified large to extremely large diversions as possible alternatives. The alternative frameworks for Subprovince 2, consisting of the hydrologic boundary for the Barataria Basin, included potential diversions in the Myrtle Grove vicinity ranging from 5,000 – 150,000 cfs with various combinations of marsh creation, and sediment introduction to the diversions. Hydraulic and ecological modeling of the subprovince frameworks and a cost effectiveness analysis to develop the complete range of possible coastwide frameworks were performed.

Through the LCA plan, the a Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging project was conditionally authorized for construction by Congress in the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 as a near-term, critical restoration feature. The alternative selection was based on the premise that construction for restoration features could begin within 5 to 10 years, subject to approval of feasibility-level decision documents by the Secretary of the Army.

The Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging was authorized in Title VII Louisiana Coastal Area of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 section 7006 entitled, "Construction." WRDA 2007, section 7006(c)(3) requires a construction report submitted by the Secretary of the Army documenting any modifications to the project prior to the construction of the project.

Louisiana State/NGO effort

In 2008, the State entered into an agreement with the Environmental Defense Fund and its partner, the National Wildlife Federation and the National Audubon Society, to complete the Myrtle Grove Delta Building Diversion Modeling Effort. It was the intent of EDF and CPRA to utilize the modeling effort to initiate the process of satisfying the WRDA requirements in order to hasten construction of a diversion at Myrtle Grove. A multi-disciplinary team was established to conduct

extensive riverine and basin data collection, sediment transport analyses, numerical and physical modeling, and additional conceptual design.

Investigative and screening level modeling was conducted to evaluate design flows; explore river side concerns (sediment load changes, velocity, and downstream effects); identify the optimal location and size to maximize sediment capture; explore bay side impacts (salinity, water elevation, and velocity); and evaluate geomorphology of the receiving basin and assess the land building potential.

Completed in December 2011, the Myrtle Grove Delta Building Diversion Modeling Effort in Support of the LCA Project evaluated alternative alignments (USACE Alignment and Modified Alignment) and alternative locations (RM 60.2 and RM 60.7) for flows of 15,000 cfs to 45,000 cfs, along with larger flows of up to 250,000 cfs to examine optimum diversion designs, land building potential and ecosystem impacts. Numerical modeling results were used to quantify the anticipate volume of sediment deposition, with and without consolidation, over a 10, 25 and 45 year period. Bayside hydrodynamic modeling was performed to evaluate the upper limit of feasible diversion flows. Six diversion flow scenarios of 15,000 cfs, 45,000 cfs, 75,000 cfs, 150,000 cfs, 240,000 cfs and 300,000 cfs were modeled in combination with a nominal flow rate for the Davis Pond Diversion. Model results provided an estimate of the anticipated effects within the Basin due to changes in water surface elevation and velocity from the diversion.

Design features for the conveyance channel were refined to increase the diversions ability to capture sediment and to improve the sediment to water ratio. The diversion structures investigated included the original USACE Alignment and Modified Alignment, with intake structures located RM 60.2 and RM 60.7. Simulations for three diversion sizes (15,000 cfs, 45,000 cfs and 75,000 cfs) were performed. The model results showed that the larger 75,000 cfs diversion would intercept more sediment, resulting in higher sediment to water ratios while conversely leaving a higher percentage of water in the River, thereby minimizing potential river and bayside effects. The preferred alternative for engineering and design was a diversion with a capacity up to 75,000 cfs located at RM 60.7 with a straight alignment.

LCA Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging Feasibility Study

The ongoing State/USACE Federal feasibility level study effort for the MDMG Project (2010present) is evaluating diversion alternatives ranging from 15,000 cfs to 125,000 cfs, with varying scales of dedicated dredging. The feasibility analysis considered a range of locations for placing the diversion at Myrtle Grove from RM 49.3 – 61.5. Supported by work from the State/NGO effort, along with additional alternatives analysis criteria, the Project Delivery Team is currently in support of the Modified Alignment at RM 60.7 AHP. The recommended diversion size has not yet been determined.

Louisiana State Master Plan

As part of Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast 2012 (2012 Master Plan), the land building potential for the MDSD Project was further evaluated for three diversion flow regimes (5,000 cfs, 50,000 cfs, and 250,000 cfs) under various future environmental scenarios which varied factors such as Mississippi River discharge, subsidence, and sea level rise. Historic Mississippi River flow data from 1990 to 2009 were used to establish river flow thresholds. Near-term land building (20 year horizon) and long-term land building (50 year horizon) model results concluded that a 50,000 cfs Mid-Barataria diversion has the potential to build and maintain 50 square miles of land over 50 years

depending on future environmental conditions. Based on these results, the MBSD Project was selected to address long-term land building and coastal sustainability needs. The project was recommended for first period implementation (2012 to 2031) within the 2012 Master plan. Various data sets are available on project level and Master Plan level, including accretion, water level, salinity, elevation, percent land, vegetation, and ecosystem services.

MBSD Detailed Design

As part of the current analysis for CPRA's MBSD engineering and design, hydraulic and sediment modeling will be conducted to refine the design of the following features: conveyance channel width, side slope and invert, channel typical section transitions; guide levee geometry; revetment/channel protection; intake structure (type, size and location); back structure/surge protection (type, size and location); outfall treatment/transition; guide levee tie-in to MR&T and NOV levee systems; and railroad and roadway alignments and their associated bridge structure types and locations. Each of these features will be evaluated to determine the optimal flow regime necessary to maximize sediment capture and minimize impacts. Modeling will be conducted to determine optimum land building scenarios including the cumulative effects with recently constructed marsh creation projects as well as those near-term authorized projects.

12b. – MBSD LANDOWNER/ LEASE HOLDERS

1)	Ram Terminals, LLC. Attn: Gary Voiron/Charlie Wesley 7733 Forsyth Blvd. St. Louis, MO 63105-1836 Gary Voiron: (504)430-0268 Charlie Wesley: (720)883-2966	6)	River Rest, LLC. Attn: John Newman 820 Fairfield Avenue Gretna, LA 70056 (504) 393-1024 Jefferson Parish
2)	Phillips 66 Attn: Arthur Pollock/Dennis Nuss P.O. Box 2197 Houston, TX 77252 Arthur Pollock: 504-656-3171 or 504-656-7711 Dennis Nuss: (504)373-3092	7)	Woodland Borrow Pits, LLC. Attn: Terry White (previously CLL Limited Partnership, Ltd.) 401 Westbank Expy. Gretna, LA 70053 Plaquemines Parish (504)616-7787
3)	Midway Cattle Ranch, LLC. Attn: Khai Nguyen 707 Jump Basin Rd. Venice, LA 70091 (504)534-9577 Plaquemines Parish	8)	Entergy Louisiana (previously LP&L) Attn: Clint Capdepon PO Box 61000 New Orleans, LA 70113 Physical : 1001 Harimaw Court W Metairie, LA 70001 office: 504-576-4207 cell: (505)495-6179
4)	Canard Land, LLC. Attn: John Newman 605 South America St. Covington, LA 70433 (985)801-4300	9)	CHS, Inc. of Minnesota (f/k/a Harvest States Cooperatives) Attn: Steve Talbot 550 Cenex Dr. Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077-1733 (504)235-8128
5)	Wildlife Lands, LLC. Attn: Shawn Killeen/Christian T. Brown 5100 Jourdan Road New Orleans, LA 70126 (504) 275-4222	10)	New Orleans & Gulf Coast Railway Company Attn: Bob Howery 9387 Highway 23 Belle Chasse, LA 70037-2149 (504)347-8237 x3

11)	Plaquemines Parish Government Attn: Blair Rittiner 8056 Hwy. 23 Ste. 200 Belle Chasse, LA 70037 (504)297-5577 Plaquemines Holdings, LLC. Attn: Janet Cagley PO Box 336 Livingston, LA 70754-0336	18)	BNB Partners, LLC P.O. Box 531 Belle Chasse, LA 70037-0531 Plaquemines Parish Lafitte Area Independent Levee District Attn: Nicole Cooper 2654 Jean Lafitte Blvd. Lafitte LA 70067
	(225)686-2252		(504)689-2208
13)	Lena Curol Est. c/o Mrs. John A. Rojas, Sr. Attn: Gwen 819 Barbe Street Westwego, LA 70094 (504)458-2390 Jefferson Parish	20)	Leon, Rojas and John Estate, et al c/o Wayne J. Nolan 4517 Loveland Street Metairie, LA 70006 Plaquemines Parish
14)	Fabre, Alton S., Jr. et al 2597 Privateer Blvd. Barataria, LA 70036 Plaquemines Parish	21)	LeBlanc, Loretta R. et al 2497-A Jean Lafitte Blvd. Lafitte, LA 70067-5210 Jefferson Parish
15)	Rivet, Genice R. et al 5214 Jean Lafitte Blvd. Lafitte, LA 70067-5210 Plaquemines Parish	22)	Rojas, Beatrice Est. et al. c/o Carissima Fisher 5024 Jean Lafitte Blvd. Lafitte, LA 70067 Jefferson Parish
16)	William Adam P.O. Box 141 5135 William Adam St. Lafitte, LA 70067 Jefferson Parish	23)	Knuppel, Anestize PO Box 294 Lafitte, LA 70067
17)	Richard, Adam B., Jr., et al P.O. Box 123 5030 Jean Lafitte Blvd. Lafitte, LA 70067	24)	Rojas, Doris M. PO Box 209 Venice, LA 70091

25)	Whittington, Warren D., Jr. 3608 Lake Michel CT Gretna, LA 70056 (504)621-2148 Jefferson Parish	29)	Elliot, William H. 4000 Westbank Expressway Apt. 68 Marrero, LA 70072
26)	Decamp, Aletha C. c/o Ann Ford 5116 Highland Drive Marrero, LA 70072	30)	Coulon, Gervin 4820 Jean Lafitte Blvd. Apt. C Lafitte, LA 70067 (504)689-2040
27)	Jackie A. Trachant, et al 2921 Doreen Lane Marrero, LA 70072 Plaquemines Parish	31)	Defelice Family Corp. Attn: Savare J. Defelice Sr. P.O. Box 696 Belle Chasse, LA 70037 (504)394-4728
28)	Nunez, Jules L. et al P.O. Box 126 Lafitte, LA 70067 (504)689-2389 Plaquemines Parish	32)	




STATE OF LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION AUTHORITY ENGINEERING DIVISION

MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION STATE PROJECT NO. BA-153 PLAQUEMINES PARISH, LOUISIANA

INDEX OF DRAWINGS

DWG NO. DESCRIPTION

- G-01 COVER SHEET
- G-02 GENERAL NOTES, ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS
- C-01 SITE OVERVIEW
- C-02 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SHEET LAYOUT
- C-03 OVERALL ROADWAY AND RAIL PLAN
- C-04 CHENIER TRAVERSE BAYOU PUMP STATION SITE
- C-20 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL PLAN AND PROFILE (1 OF 4)
- C-21 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL PLAN AND PROFILE (2 OF 4)
- C-22 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL PLAN AND PROFILE (3 OF 4)
- C-23 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL PLAN AND PROFILE (4 OF 4)
- C-30 TYPICAL SECTIONS (1 OF 3)
- C-31 TYPICAL SECTIONS (2 OF 3)
- C-32 TYPICAL SECTIONS (3 OF 3)
- C-33 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTIONS (1 OF 2)
- C-34 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTIONS (2 OF 2)
- C-40 CHENIER TRAVERSE PUMP STATION PROFILE
- C-41 ROADWAY AND RAILROAD PROFILES
- C-50 DISPOSAL AREA SITE
- C-51 POTENTIAL SEDIMENT DEPOSITION / LAND BUILDING AREA

 \mathbb{N} The Pen PROJECT BARATARIA BASIN VICINITY Myrtle Grove Marina PERMIT SUBMITTAL 20,000' 10,000' 0' 20,000 40,000 FOR PERMIT COORDINATION ONLY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

STATE OF LOUISIANA INSET MAP

Clpworking/da1d044		HOR Engineering. Inc.						
pm File Name	hX					Some Poole and Mae:		
3013 Time: 5:11	HDR Engineering, Inc.				-GE,S /0-01		D E: 201	
late: Jul 16, 2		CPRA	None and a second	D DD	DES G ED : PGG	PPED: P.ME GES.GGE., P.E.	DG. G.O1	S EE 1 0 1

GENERAL NOTES

1. THESE PLANS WERE DEVELOPED USING 2010 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY, NAD83, LOUISIANA STATE COORDINATE SYSTEM, SOUTH ZONE.

2. ALL ELEVATIONS SHOWN ARE IN NAVD 88.

3. AS-BUILT DRAWINGS WILL BE SUBMITTED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT TO THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, COASTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION, P.O. BOX 44487, BATON ROUGE, LA 70804-4487.

4. THE PERMIT APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE LOUISIANA ONE CALL SYSTEM (1-800-272-3020) A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY EXCAVATION (DIGGING, DREDGING, JETTING, ETC.) OR DEMOLITION ACTIVITY.

5. ALL NORTHING / EASTING AND LATITUDE / LONGITUDE VALUES ARE BASED ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE DURING FINAL DESIGN.

6. ALL ELEVATIONS ARE PRELIMINARY AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

ABBREVIATIONS

HDR Engineering, Inc.

APPROX	APPROXIMATE
B/L	BASELINE
CFS	CUBIC FEET PER SECOND
CL	CENTERLINE
DWG	DRAWING
E	EASTING
EL, ELEV	ELEVATION
HORIZ	HORIZONTAL
HWY	HIGHWAY
LA	LOUISIANA
MHW	MEAN HIGH WATER
MLW	MEAN LOW WATER
MR & T	MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES LEVEE
Ν	NORTHING
NO	NUMBER
NOV	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE LEVEE
POB	POINT OF BEGINNING
POE	POINT OF ENDING
RD	ROAD
ROW	RIGHT OF WAY
STA	STATION
TBD	TO BE DETERMINED
TYP	TYPICAL
VC	VERTICAL CURVE
VERT	VERTICAL
W	WESTING
YR	YEAR

AND RES

FEATURE LOCATION TABLE DESCRIPTION NORTHING / LATITUDE EASTING / LONGITUDE POB CHANNEL BASELINE 426308.37 / 29° 39' 54.20" N 3717488.25 / 89° 57' 30.31" W POE CHANNEL BASELINE 417902.28 / 29° 38' 32.30" N 3706292.82 / 89° 59' 38.32" W DIVERSION GATE STRUCTURE 424567.11 / 29° 39' 37.24" N 3715169.19 / 89° 57' 56.83" W BACK STRUCTURE 418983.06 / 29° 38' 42.84" N 3707732.23 / 89° 59' 21.86" W

3701081.76 / 90° 00' 36.50" W

3700158.86 / 90° 00' 46.99" W

S□EE□ 2 o□1

424556.45 / 29° 39' 38.77" N

424331.16 / 29° 39' 36.65" N

POB PUMP STATION BASELINE

POE PUMP STATION BASELINE



D.... DD DES(G.ED...: PGG

EGIEEIIGDIISI

General Genera

	DPPDDDED DD:	P_MEGES[GGE_, P]E	$D \square \square \square G$	G 🖸 2
--	--------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	-------



















NOTES:

1. CONVEYANCE CHANNEL ROW IS 1,600 FT WIDE ON THE WEST SIDE OF HIGHWAY 23 AND 1,400 FT WIDE ON THE EAST SIDE OF HIGHWAY 23.

















A2: Section 408 Permissions Request



State of Louisiana

JOHN BEL EDWARDS GOVERNOR

January 13, 2017

Colonel Michael N. Clancy District Commander **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers** 7400 Leake Ave. New Orleans, LA 70160-0267 Certified Mail No. 7010 0290 0003 5243 7704

SUBJECT: 33 U.S.C. 408 Request to alter the Mississippi River Ship Channel (MRSC) Baton to the Gulf, Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) and New Orleans to Venice (NOV), Louisiana Projects with Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Step 2: Written Request

Dear Col. Clancy:

As you are aware, the State of Louisiana through the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) re-submitted a permit application in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) (hereinafter "Section 404") and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, as amended (33 U.S.C. 403) (hereinafter "Section 10") for the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) Project. CPRA further understands that a permission application will also be required by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as defined in Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, as amended (33 U.S.C. 408) (hereinafter "Section 408"). The Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board of Louisiana (CPRAB), the co-non-Federal sponsor for the New Orleans to Venice, Louisiana Project (NOV) Project in accordance with Section 408, requests permission to permanently alter the MRSC, MR&T and NOV Projects with the MBSD project.

The MBSD Project consists of the construction of an intake control structure ("structure") on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River, at approximate MRSC River Mile 60.7, through a section of the existing MR&T Project's Mississippi River Levee (MRL). The structure would be operated by CPRA to reestablish the connection between the Mississippi River and the mid-Barataria Basin by transporting sediment, freshwater, and nutrients through the structure into an approximate 2-mile long and 1,600 foot wide gravity conveyance structure, leading across land and through the future federal NOV Hurricane Protection Levee, to an outfall or receiving area in the mid-Barataria Basin. The proposed MBSD Project will intersect the MR&T within the MRL near MRSC River Mile 60.7 between Stations 1090+00 to 1120+00. The proposed MBSD Project will intersect the NOV project NOV-NF-W-05a.1 between Stations 328+00 to 352+00. Written statements from Plaquemines Parish Government (PPG) per EC 1165-2-216 for both federal projects will be provided under separate cover.

The following list addresses the minimum requirements of Procedures Step 2: Written Request of Engineering Circular 1165-2-216 (Water Resource Policies and Authorities: Policy and Procedural Guidance for Processing Requests to Alter US Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Projects Pursuant to 33 USC 408) (30 Sep 15):

Post Office Box 44027 • Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-4027 • 150 Terrace Avenue • Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802 (225) 342-7308 • Fax (225) 342-9417 • http://www.coastal.la.gov An Equal Opportunity Employer Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion, Section 408 Request January 13, 2017 Page 2

- i. A complete description of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion project is enclosed within CPRA's Section 10/404 Department of the Army (DA) and a Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR) Coastal Use Permit (CUP), Permit DA No. MVN 2012-02806-EOO dated June 22, 2016.
- CPRA is pursuing authorizations pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403), Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), and the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Coastal Use Permit (CUP). The 10/404/CUP permit, DA No. MVN 2012-02806-EOO was resubmitted on June 22, 2016 (Enclosure 1).
- iii. At this time CPRA does not desire to preserve its eligibility to seek credit for this alteration under Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended, by executing an In-Kind Memorandum of Understanding, prior to the construction of the alteration being initiated. CPRA may, at a later date, seek to preserve it's eligibility to seek In-Kind credit.
- iv. This alteration will not require the use of federally-owned real property. The State of Louisiana, the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) the CPRA Board, or Plaquemines Parish Government (PPG) have care, custody, control, or sufficient property interests therein for construction and operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of this alteration. This alteration to MR&T and NOV Levee segment will require the acquisition of new property interests (permanent or temporary).
- v. A written statement of concurrence from the NOV co-non-federal sponsor, Plaquemines Parish Government (PPG) is attached (Enclosure 2).
- vi. Written statements of endorsement, from the non-federal sponsors, PPG for the MR&T, and Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LaDOTD) Mississippi River Ship Channel Project, Gulf to Baton Rouge are attached (Enclosure 3).

It is the understanding of CPRA that the alteration, as described in Section 10/404 Department of the Army (DA) and a Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR) Coastal Use Permit (CUP) Permit, DA No. MVN 2012-02806-EOO dated June 22, 2016 (Enclosure), complies with the 408 initiation requirements in accordance with Engineering Circular 1165-2-216 (30 Sep 15). CPRA requests early involvement and coordination with USACE-MVN beginning prior to the 35 percent design level. Approval of this alteration requires satisfactory USACE District technical reviews, an Agency Technical Review, and an Independent External Peer Review – Safety Assurance Reviews demonstrating the alteration will "not be injurious to the public interest or affect the USACE project's ability to meet its authorized purpose." This review process and alteration approval shall be accomplished through the implementation of a USACE/CPRA mutually agreed to 408 Review Plan. The 408 Review Plan will outline the milestone reviews, review schedules, review process, and the vertical review and approval process to receive the Section 10/404 permit and the Section 408 permission for construction of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion.

Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion, Section 408 Request January 13, 2017 Page 3

All correspondence concerning this request should be directed to the following:

For CPRA Board: Executive Director Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana 150 Terrace Avenue Baton Rouge, LA 70802 (225) 342-5362

Respectfully,

Michael Ellis Executive Director Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana

- Enclosure 1: Section 10/404 Department of the Army (DA) and a Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR) Coastal Use Permit (CUP) Permit DA No. MVN 2012-02806-EOO, dated June 22, 2016
- Enclosure 2: Written Statement of concurrence from PPG for the NOV Project
- Enclosure 3: Written Statement of endorsement from LaDOTD for the Mississippi River Ship Channel and PPG for the MR&T Project
- cc: Johnny Bradberry, Chairman, CPRA Board Brad Barth, CPRA, Program Director Brad Inman, USACE, 408 Coordinator Jeffery Varisco, USACE, Project Manager Amos Cormier III, President, PPG L.V. Cooley, Special Assistant Parish Attorney, PPG Vince Frelich, Director of Coastal Restoration, PPG

		Joir For Wo	nt Permit A ork Within 1 Coastal 2	pplicatio he Louis Zone	on siana		ir ii
Louisiana Depa Resc Office of Coas	rtment of Natural burces tal Management					U.S. Arm New	y Corps of Engineers (COE) Orleans District
Application Num	ber: 15540		Permit Numb	er: P2013 ⁻	1098 D	ate Received:	06/22/2016
Step 1 of 15 - Ap	olicant Information						
Applicant Name:	Coastal Protection (CPRA)	& Restoration	Authority of Lou	iisiana	Applicant Type:	GOVERNMENT	AGENCY
Mailing Addr :	P.O. Box 44027 Ca Baton Rouge, LA 7	apitol Station 08044027					
Contact Info:	Elizabeth Davoli						
Phone:	(225) 342-4616	Fax: (225) 242-3550	Email:	elizabet	h.davoli@la.gov	
Contact Info: Phone:	-	Fax: -		Email:			
Step 3 of 15 - Per	mit Type						
🗙 Coastal Use F	Permit (CUP)	Solicita	ation of Views (SOV)	Reques	st for Determina	tion (RFD)
Step 4 of 15 - Pre	-Application Activity						
a. Have you p	articipated in a Pre-A	pplication or (Geological Re	view Meetir	ng for the pi	roposed projec	t?
	No	Yes	Date m	eeting was	held: 05	/19/2016	
Attendees:	Elizabeth Davo (Individual or Com	li (CPRA) pany Rep)	(OCI	Stephanie Z M Represen	umo tative)	B	rad LaBorde Representative)
b. Have you o	btained an official we	etland determi	nation from th	e COE for	the project s	site?	
-			If Voc Block		ony with w	our application	
			JD N	umber:	copy with y		





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Step 5 of 15 - Project Information

a. Describe the project.

The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion is a large-scale, complex civil works and ecosystem restoration project. When operated, up to 75.000 cubic feet per second (cfs) of sediment-laden water would be diverted from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin to deliver sediment, freshwater, and nutrients to reduce land loss and sustain wetlands.

b. Is this application a change to an existing permit?

🔁 No	Yes	OCM Permit Number:
------	-----	--------------------

c. Have you previously applied for a permit or emergency authoriation for all or any part of the proposed project?

	No	Yes		
Agency	Contact	Permit Number	Decision Status	Decision Date
ОСМ	Stephanie Zumo	P20131098	Pending	
COE	Brad LaBorde	MVN-2012-02806- ETT	Pending	
Other				

Step 6 of 15 - Project Location

a. Physical L	ocation								
Street:	Louisiana	a State High	1way 23 (LA 2	3)					
City:	Ironton (vicinity)		Parish: F	laquemi	nes		Zip:	70083
Water Body:	Mississip	pi River (M	ile 60.7) / Bara	ataria Basin					
b. Latitude a	nd Longit	ude							
Latitude	: 29	39	42.5	Longitude:	-89	57	48.6		
c. Section, To	ownship,	and Range	1						
Section	#: 516	47 48 49	Точ	vnship #:16S		Range #:	25E		
Section	#: 321	41 19	Tov	vnship #:17S		Range #:	24E		

d. Lot, Tract, Parcel, or Subdivision Name





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) **New Orleans District**

Louisiana Department of Natural

Resources

Office of Coastal Management

Parcel #:

Tract #:

Subdivision Name:

e. Site Direction

START- From I-10 in New Orleans, take US-90Bus W across Mississippi River. Continue on US-90Bus W / Westbank Expy for 4 miles. Take exit #7 for LA 23 / Lafayette St. Continue south on LA 23 for 21 miles to the project area between the Phillips 66 Alliance Refinery and the community of Ironton, near Mississippi River Mile 60.7 - END

Step 7	of 15 - Ad	jacent Landowners	-	See attached list
--------	------------	-------------------	---	-------------------



e. Why is the proposed project needed?

The impacts of coastal land loss threaten Louisiana's economy, commerce, infrastructure, and culture. The Barataria Basin is suffering from significant land loss--approximately 75,000 acres between 1985 and 2010, with projected loss by 2060 ranging from 105,000 to 150,000 acres. Historically, Mississippi River overbank flooding deposited sediment, freshwater, and nutrients in the Barataria Basin during annual flooding cycles, building land and sustaining wetland habitats. Levees and Mississippi River channelization have altered natural fluvial interaction and sediment transport from the river into the basin, removing the source of sediment and freshwater that built and maintained wetlands relative to subsidence and sea level rise. In addition, recent hurricane events and the Deepwater Horizon (DHW) oil spill have exacerbated land loss impacts in the basin. The purpose of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin; the project is needed as a long-term resilient, sustainable strategy to reduce land loss rates and sustain DWH injured





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

wetlands through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients.

Step 9 of 15 - Project Status								
a. Proposed start date:	01/01/2020	Proposed completion date:	01/01/2025					
b. Is any of the project wo	b. Is any of the project work in progress?							
🔀 No	Yes							
c. Is any of the project wo	rk completed?							
🔀 No	Yes							

Step 10 of 15 - Structures, Materials, and Methods for the Proposed Project

a. Excava	ations							
3,8	50,000 Cubic Yard	S	288 Ac	cres				
b. Fill Are	eas							
4,152,0	001,00 Cubic Yard	S	554.30 Ac	cres				
c. Fill Ma	terials							
	Concrete:	371,293	Cubic Yards	s	ē	Rock:	65,676	Cubic Yards
2	Crushed Stone or Gravel:	102,290	Cubic Yards	5		Sand:		Cubic Yards
	Excavated and Placed onsite :	1,100,000	Cubic Yards	3	×	Hauled in Topsoil/Dirt:	584,035	Cubic Yards
×	Excavated and hauled offsite:	2,300,000	Cubic Yards	6				



Step 11 of 15 - Project Alternatives

a. Total acres of wetlands and/or waterbottoms filled and/or excavated.

484.6 acres

b. What alternative locations, methods, and access routes were considered to avoid impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

As part of the engineering and design phase, construction and staging areas would consider the use of existing access roads and drives to minimize impacts to wetlands. See pp. 16-19 for additional information on alternatives (location, capacity, and structure type) analysis conducted since 1996 that resulted in the location of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion at River Mile 60.7 with a capacity of 75,000 cfs.

c. What efforts were made to minimize impact to wetlands and/or waterbottoms?

The analysis of the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion was developed using the minimum construction footprint to maximize the conveyance of sediment-laden water from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin. The gravity conveyance alignment was developed for efficient sediment conveyance between the river and the basin. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are being developed for access routes to minimize disturbance to wetlands between the MR&T and NOV levees.

d. How are unavoidable impacts to vegetated wetlands to be mitigated?

The project is self-mitigating. The purpose of the Project is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and the Barataria Basin as a long-term resilient, sustainable strategy to reduce land loss rates and sustain DWH injured wetlands through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients.

Step 12 of 15 - Permit Type and Owners

a. Are you applying for a Coastal Use Permit?

Louisiana Du R Office of Co	epartment of Natural lesources loastal Management		Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District			
	No	⊠	Yes				
b. Are you	the sole landowner	/ oyst	er lease holder?				
	No		Yes				
	The applicant is an	owne	of the property on which the proposed described	activity is to occur.			
⊠	The applicant has made reasonable effort to determine the identity and current address of the owner(s) of the land on which the proposed described activity is to occur, which included, a search of the public records of the parish in which the proposed activity is to occur.						
×	The applicant hereby attests that a copy of the application has been distributed to the following landowners / oyster lease holders. See attached list.						
c. Does the	e project involve dril No	ling, p Yes	roduction, and/or storage of oil and gas? If yes, you must attach a list of all state a regulations	nd federal laws and rules and			

Step 13 of 15 - Maps and Drawing Instructions

Note: OCM Compiled Plats consist of a complete and current set of plats that have been pieced together by OCM using only the most current portions of the plat files provided by the applicant/agent. All out-of-date plats have been excluded.

06/22/2016 03:29:40 PM
06/22/2016 03:29:40 PM
07/24/2013 01:31:40 PM
06/22/2016 03:29:41 PM
06/22/2016 03:29:41 PM

Step 14 of 15 - Payment

The fee for this permit is: \$ 100.00

Step 15 of 15 - Payment Processed

Applicant Information

Applicant Name: Coastal Protection & Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA) Address: P.O. Box 44027 Capitol Station Baton Rouge, LA 70804--4027





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

To the best of my knowledge the proposed activity described in this permit application complies with, and will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the Louisiana Coastal Resources Program. If applicable, I also certify that the declarations in Step 12c, oil spill response, are complete and accurate.

Landowners List

Lan	downer
Phil	llips 66
P.0	. Box 2197
Ηοι	uston, TX 77252
Lan	downer
Ran	n Terminals, LLC
773	3 Forsyth Blvd.
St.	Louis, MO 63105-1836
Adja	acent Landowner
Am	eripure Processing Company, Inc.
803	Willow St.
Fra	nklin, LA 70538
Adja	acent Landowner
Ben	njamin X. & Gwendolyn Becnel, Jr.
1619	98 Highway 23
Bell	le Chasse, LA 70037
Adja	acent Landowner
СН	S-SLE Land LLC c/o Francis J. Lobrano
147	Keating
Bell	le Chasse, LA 70037
Adja	acent Landowner
Can	nard Land, LLC c/o John W. Newman
605	South America Street
Cov	vington, LA 70433



Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Adjacent Landowner
Entergy Louisiana c/o John A. Braymer
639 Loyola Avenue, 26th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70113
Adjacent Landowner
Eugene & Jacey Linder
119 E. St.
Α
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
Loch Leven 7 LLC c/o Michael Jeansome
850 Engineers Road
Belle Chasse, LA 70037
Adjacent Landowner
Lois F. Landry
1401 St. Andrew St.
208
New Orleans, LA 70130
Adjacent Landowner
Michael A. Neeb
221 W. 9th St.
Rushville, IN 46173
Adjacent Landowner
Midway Cattle Ranch LLC c/o Khai Q. Nguyen
1051-A W, Ravenna Rd.
Belle Chasse, LA 70037





U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Adjacent Landowner	
Plaquemines Parish Government	
Rollo Chasse I A 70027	
Belle Chasse, LA 70037	
	_
1001 Amelia St.	
Gretna, LA 70053	
	_
Adjacent Landowner	
River Rest, LLC c/o John W. Newman	
605 South America Street	
Covington, LA 70433	
Adjacent Landowner	
Shawn E. Dugas and Ken Dugas	
515 Moncla Ave.	
Belle Chasse, LA 70037	
Adjacent Landowner	
Stone Energy Corp.	
625 Kaliste Saloom Road	
Lafayette, LA 70508	
Adjacent Landowner	
Walter Landry	
111 Landridge Dr.	
Belle Chasse, LA 70037	



Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management

Joint Permit Application For Work Within the Louisiana Coastal Zone



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) New Orleans District

Adjacent Landowner

Woodland Borrow Pits, LLC c/o Phyllis Adams

1074A Highway 1

Thibodaux, LA 70301



SHEET NO. DESCRIPTION

- 1 TITLE SHEET
- 2 GENERAL NOTES, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS
- 3 PROJECT LAYOUT
- 4 CONVEYANCE CHANNEL LAYOUT
- 5 OVERALL ROADWAY AND RAIL PLAN
- 6 CHENIER TRAVERSE BAYOU PUMP STATION SITE
- 7 TYPICAL CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION (1 OF 2)
- 8 TYPICAL CONVEYANCE CHANNEL SECTION (2 OF 2)

N

- 9 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTION (1 OF 2)
- 10 TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTIONS (2 OF 2)
- 11 DISPOSAL AREA
- 12 POTENTIAL SEDIMENT DEPOSITION/LAND BUILDING AREA



STATE OF LOUISIANA



STATE OF LOUISIANA

INSET MAP

APPLICATION BY: CPRA P.O. BOX 44027 BATON ROUGE, LA 70804	COASTAL P RESTORATIO 450 LAI BATON ROUG	ROTECTION & DN AUTHORITY JREL STREET EE, LOUISIANA 70801	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION PROJECT	TITLE SHEET
			STATE PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153	DATE: JUNE 2016
DRAWN BY: K. CANTU	DESIGNED BY: K. GUILLORY, P.E.	APPROVED BY R. SIMONEAUX, P.E.	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER:	SHEET 1 OF 12
GENERAL NOTES

ABBREVIATIONS

APPROX

B/L

CL

E

CES

DWG

EL, ELEV

HORIZ

HWY

MHW

MLW

MR&T

LA

N

NO

NOV

POB

POE RD

ROW

STA

TBD

VC.

W

VERT

1 THESE PLANS WERE DEVELOPED USING 2010 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY, NAD83, LOUISIANA STATE COORDINATE SYSTEM, SOUTH ZONE

2. ALL ELEVATIONS SHOWN ARE IN NAVD 88

3. AS-BUILT DRAWINGS WILL BE SUBMITTED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT TO THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, COASTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION, P.O. BOX 44487, BATON ROUGE, LA 70804-4487.

4. THE PERMIT APPLICANT SHALL CONTACT THE LOUISIANA ONE CALL SYSTEM (1-800-272-3020) A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY EXCAVATION (DIGGING, DREDGING, JETTING, ETC.) OR DEMOLITION ACTIVITY.

5. ALL NORTHING / EASTING AND LATITUDE / LONGITUDE VALUES ARE BASED ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN DATA AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE

6, ALL ELEVATIONS ARE BASED ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN DATA AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

CUBIC FEET PER SECOND

APPROXIMATE

BASELINE

DRAWING

EASTING

HIGHWAY

NORTHING

NUMBER

ROAD

TYPICAL

WESTING

ELEVATION

HORIZONTAL

MEAN HIGH WATER

MEAN LOW WATER

POINT OF BEGINNING POINT OF ENDING

RIGHT OF WAY

TO BE DETERMINED

VERTICAL CURVE

MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES LEVEE

NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE LEVEE

CENTERLINE

FEATURE LOCATION TABLE

DESCRIPTION	NORTHING / LATITUDE	EASTING / LONGITUDE
POB CHANNEL BASELINE	426308.37 / 29° 39' 54.20" N	3717488.25 / 89° 57' 30.31" W
POE CHANNEL BASELINE	417902.28 / 29° 38' 32.30" N	3706292.82 / 89* 59' 38,32" W
DIVERSION GATE STRUCTURE	424567.11/29" 39' 37 24" N	3715169.19 / 89* 57' 56.83" W
BACK STRUCTURE	418983.06 / 29° 38' 42.84" N	3707732.23 / 89° 59' 21.86" W
POB PUMP STATION BASELINE	424556,45 / 29" 39' 38,77" N	3701081.76 / 90" DD' 36.50" W
POE PUMP STATION BASELINE	424331 16 / 29" 39' 36 65" N	3700158.86 / 90* 00' 46 99" W



YR	YEAR					
APPLICATION BY: CPRA P.O. BOX 44027 BATON ROUGE, LA 70804		COASTAL PH RESTORATIO 450 LA	ROTECTION AND ON AUTHORITY UREL STREET	MID-BARATARIA SEDIMENT DIVERSION PROJECT	GENERAL NOTES, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMB	
		BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70801		STATE PROJECT NUMBER: BA-153	DATE. JUNE 2016	
DRAWN BYCANTU		DESIGNED BY: K. GUILLORY, P.E.	APPROVED BY, R. SIMONEAUX, P.E.	FEDERAL PROJECT NUMBER:	SHEET 2 OF 12	





















P20131098 Needs and Alternatives Justification

Background

The proposed sediment diversion project was initially identified as part of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) funded Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient and Freshwater Redistribution Study (MRSNFR) in 2000. Subsequent studies ensued relevant to the sediment diversion alternatives analysis including location, diversion flow, and ancillary features such as various combinations of marsh creation and sediment introduction. In 2001, the CWPPRA task force approved study of the Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove (BA-33) with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as the federal sponsor; a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was published in the Federal Register in 2002 and the public scoping resulted in a range of diversion operation for further analysis. The project was evaluated as a near-term critical restoration feature in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Final Programmatic EIS dated 2005 and included in the LCA restoration plan. The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 authorized USACE to carry out the Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove in accordance with the LCA restoration plan. As a result, the CWPPRA project was de-authorized in 2008 and transferred to USACE for implementation. Also in 2007, the State of Louisiana included the CWPPRA Mississippi River Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging in the Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (Master Plan). The Master Plan was updated in 2012 and the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion was identified as a project in the First Implementation Period (2012-2031). In 2016, the Natural Resources Damage Assessment (NRDA) Trustees established Mississippi River Diversions as an approved restoration alternative to restore resources injured by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion (Siphon) (BA-24) (1996-1998)

The Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion was moved forward under CWPPRA for further study with NMFS as the federal sponsor. Conceptual design consisted of a multiple pipe system capable of delivering up to 2,100 cfs of water from the Mississippi River to the back marsh area west of Myrtle Grove.

Myrtle Grove Ecosystem Restoration Project—Coast 2050 (1997-1998)

The Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force (a federal-state multi-agency partnership), in partnership with the Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Authority, published *Coast 2050: Toward a Sustainable Coastal Louisiana* in December 1998. *Coast 2050 set* forth a new approach to 1) sustain a coastal ecosystem with the essential functions and values of the natural ecosystem; 2) restore the ecosystem to the highest practicable acreage of productive and diverse wetlands; and 3) accomplish restoration through an integrated program that has multiple use benefits for all coastal Louisiana communities and resources.

The 15,000 cfs delta-building diversion at Myrtle Grove was identified for near-term implementation (1-5 years) following completion of the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution (MRSNFR) Feasibility Study. The rationale was the Myrtle Grove diversion would provide information to assist in the planning of the next Mississippi River diversion.

Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution (MRSNFR) Study

(draft report & environmental resources document dated July 2000)

The CWPPRA Task Force funded the MRSNFR feasibility study with USACE as study lead. A Myrtle Grove Sediment Diversion with a capacity of 15,000 cfs through gated culverts at the Mississippi River was included as a major sediment diversion in the Initial Alternatives. Also included in the Initial Alternatives was a 5,000 cfs Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion through a siphon. The screening process resulted in both the Myrtle Grove Sediment Diversion and the Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion at Ironton being carried forward into the Intermediate Array of Alternatives.

The Myrtle Grove Freshwater Diversion would run at a capacity of 5,000 cfs and freshen or stabilize salinities in the Round Lake/Lake Laurier vicinity. Although not a sediment diversion, it was expected that this diversion would introduce sediment into the Barataria Basin, creating over 1,400 ac of marsh and sustaining approximately 6,500 ac of emergent wetlands over 50 years. The total cost was estimated to be \$29,679,827. Located at River Mile 59 AHP, the diversion structure would consist of four 10 ft x 10 ft gated concrete box culverts approximately 400 ft long under LA 23. The highway would be relocated closer to the railroad so the culverts could be placed under both facilities. In order to efficiently capture freshwater, the invert of the entrance channel would be placed at a depth of -10 NGVD with a radius of 130 ft; the conveyance channel would run 6,000 feet from the entrance channel to the outlet channel and would be 100 feet wide. Parallel guide levees would be constructed to maintain hurricane protection and a pump station would be constructed to provide local drainage.

The Myrtle Grove Sediment Diversion would run at a capacity of 15,000 cfs to freshen the lower Barataria Basin. Located at RM 59 AHP, the diversion structure would consist of five 16 ft x 16 ft gated concrete box culverts approximately 400 feet long under LA 23. The highway would be relocated closer to the railroad so the culverts could be placed under both facilities. In order to efficiently capture sediment, the invert of the entrance channel would be placed at a depth of -15 ft NGVD with a radius of 450 feet and proceed 800 feet to 1,000 feet into the box culverts for transport to the basin. A channel with a 230 ft bottom would be dredged to Wilkinson Canal; this channel would bend with a radius of 700 feet as it approached the canal in order to provide better flow conditions. Channel closures would be placed in channels intersecting Wilkinson Canal. Approximately 6,000 ac of marsh would be created; at the end of 50 years 12% of the 1990 marsh acreage would be lost but there would still be approximately 28,000 more acres of marsh than if the diversion had not been implemented.

A diversion at Myrtle Grove with locks was also evaluated. A 15 ft long pilot channel would be excavated from the Mississippi River to Barataria Bay. The bottom width of the pilot channel would be 200 feet and the invert would be -10 ft NGVD. Two 45 ft x 130 ft x 830 ft lock chambers would be constructed in the initial project year with additional chambers constructed in years 10 and 35. Approximately 5 years after construction, a closure would be constructed across the Mississippi River channel in order to divert river flow down the pilot channel. Without locks, approximately 70% of Mississippi River flow and sediment would be diverted into the Barataria Basin.

Myrtle Grove Ecosystem Restoration Project (CWPPRA)

Primary purpose of study, conducted under MRSNFR, was identification of the recommended plan to provide maximum benefit to the study area while taking into account sustainability and cost. The project objective was creation of a sustainable, functional ecosystem with a focus on sediment delivery through the restoration of fresh and intermediate marshes in the upper, highly deteriorated portions of the study area and to restore marsh and reduce land loss rates in the southern portions of the basin and reduce average annual salinities throughout the study area. Study focused on a diversion located on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River between RM 61.3 and 60.8.

The study integrated the alternatives identified in the MRSNFR. Studied flow rates included 2,500 cfs, 5,000 cfs, and 15,000 cfs in addition to dedicated dredging.

Myrtle Grove—LCA Recommended Restoration Plan (2000-2005)

The study team defined the primary area of wetland restoration to be bounded on the east by the Citrus Lands levee, on the north by the southern extent of "The Pen," on the west by the Barataria Bay Waterway and the Bayou Grande Cheniere ridge, and on the south by the southern extents of Round Lake and Lake Laurier. The team adopted the LCA proposed alternatives for diversion capacities of 5,000 cfs and 15,000 cfs and modified an LCA proposed alternative to an operation of 5,000 cfs 4 out of 5 years and 15,000 cfs in the 5th year. The team also proposed a diversion capacity of 2,500 cfs.

As part of the LCA feasibility study, a total of five operation scenarios were evaluated for Myrtle Grove. These scenarios were: 1) a 5,000 cfs diversion; 2) a 15,000 cfs diversion; 3) a 38,000 cfs diversion with sediment enrichment; 4) a 75,000 cfs diversion with sediment enrichment; and 5) a 150,000 cfs diversion with sediment enrichment. Plan formulation resulted in a medium diversion (5,000 cfs – 15,000 cfs) and a large diversion (greater than 15,000 cfs) carried forward. Following further evaluation, the medium diversion was selected as the alternative to carry forward.

As proposed in the LCA feasibility study, the Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging considered an operation range between 2,500 cfs and 15,000 cfs to create up to 19,700 new acres of wetlands. This diversion would be operated in conjunction with the Davis Pond Freshwater Diversion, which is authorized for control of salinities in the Barataria Basin; the operation of the Davis Pond project would be modified in order to achieve the goals of the Myrtle Grove project. A total of 19 to 23 sites would be selected for the placement of dredged material to create a total of 6,500 acres of marsh; approximately 2 million cubic yards of material would be dredged from the Mississippi River for the dedicated marsh creation.

CWPPRA Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove (BA-33) (2001-2008)

In 2001, the CWPPRA Task Force approved feasibility study for a project titled Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove with NMFS as the federal sponsor. As proposed, this project would combine a freshwater diversion of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove with dedicated dredging from borrow sites in the Mississippi River to create marsh in the vicinity of Bayou Dupont, the Bayou Barataria Waterway, and/or the Wilkinson Canal. A NOI to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register

and the public scoping resulted in a range of diversion operations from 2,500 cfs to 15,000 cfs for further analysis.

Per the project fact sheet, the project would install five 16 ft x 16 ft gated box culverts on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Myrtle Grove. The intake structure would be set at -15 ft NGVD and convey a maximum of 15,000 cfs to the outfall at the basin. Sediment capture would be maximized through a reverse curve inflow channel. Other project features would include a conveyance channel with parallel mainline flood control levees, and outflow channel with guide levees, and, potentially, a pump station.

In 2006, the process began to de-authorize the project and transfer it from CWPPRA to USACE's LCA program. The rationale was the project was beyond traditional CWPPRA efforts in terms of scope and cost; also, a Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging project was identified as a critical near-term restoration project in the LCA Chief's Report.

Louisiana Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (2007)

A Technical Group of scientists evaluated conceptual scenarios for Mississippi River diversions in 2006 at the "Envisioning the Future of the Gulf Coast" symposium. A freshwater diversion at Myrtle Grove was recommended. The Mississippi River Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging was evaluated in the Master Plan; the evaluated diversion would operate at a flow between 2,500 cfs to 15,000 cfs to transport freshwater from the Mississippi River to the basin and dredged material from the river would be transported to the Barataria Basin via pipeline.

Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging (LCA, 2008-2014)

WRDA 2007 included an authorization for USACE to prepare a feasibility study and EIS for the Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging under the LCA program. This project was conditionally authorized in the 2005 LCA Chief's Report, pending the completion of a feasibility study. For the Myrtle Grove cost-shared study, the project was described as a freshwater diversion ranging from 2,500 cfs to 15,000 cfs coupled with dedicated dredging to create up to 19,700 ac of new wetlands.

The dog-legged alignment, referred to as Original USACE Alignment at RM 60.2, was designed to carry a flow of 15,000 cfs to the basin; the sediment/water ratio (SWR) was 0.26. A Modified Alignment of a straight channel from river to basin, located at RM 60.7, was modeled with capacities of 15,000 cfs, 45,000 cfs, and 75,000 cfs. The results were published in 2011 in a report titled, "Myrtle Grove Delta Building Diversion Modeling Effort in Support of the LCA Medium Diversion at Myrtle Grove with Dedicated Dredging Project Data Collection, Preliminary Design and Modeling Initiative."

Louisiana Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (2012)

Modeling conducted for the evaluation of projects against the Future Without Action scenario showed that sediment diversions are essential to sustaining coastal Louisiana. The 2012 Master Plan focused on sediment diversions, rather than freshwater diversions, as a land-building restoration tool. A 50,000 cfs sediment diversion at Myrtle Grove was included in the First Implementation Period (2012-2031).

BA-153, State Only E&D (2012-2014)

CPRA entered into a contract with HDR Engineering in 2012 to provide services for the design of the LCA recommended 75,000 cfs diversion structure at RM 60.7 to capture and transport sediment and freshwater from the Mississippi River and convey it to the mid-Barataria Basin through a constructed channel. The project utilized the SWR results and Modified Alignment from the State-NGO modeling.

Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (2016)

Under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA), the Trustees evaluated injuries to natural resources and natural resource services and then identified the actions to restore, replace, or acquire natural resources or services equivalent to those injured by the Deepwater Horizon BP Spill. When implemented, the goal for these actions is to return the natural resources and natural resource services to the condition they would have been in if the incident had not occurred. OPA defines natural resource services as "the functions performed by a natural resource for the benefit of another natural resource (ecological services) and/or the public." This evaluation was documented in a Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (PDARP).

A total of three (3) action alternatives were evaluated along with the No Action Alternative. Alternative A, Comprehensive Integrated Ecosystem Restoration, emphasizes the broad ecosystem benefits that can be realized through coastal habitat restoration in combination with resource-specific restoration; this is the preferred alternative. Alternative B focuses on restoring as directly as practical for assessed injuries. Alternative C defers restoration plan development in favor of continued injury assessment with development of a comprehensive plan at a later date. Alternative D is the natural recovery/no-action alternative. The alternatives were evaluated under the following OPA standards: 1) cost; 2) extent to which goals and objectives are met; 3) likelihood of success; 4) extent of preventing future injury and avoiding collateral injury as a result of implementation; 5) extent to which more than one natural resource and/or service is benefitted; 6) effect on public health and safety; and 7) consistency with programmatic Trustee goals and the restoration types.

The Trustees developed four (4) programmatic goals for restoration: 1) Restore and Conserve Habitat; 2) Restore Water Quality; 3) Replenish and Protect Living Coastal and Marine Resources; and 4) Provide and Enhance Recreational Opportunities. Restoration types were developed as sub-categories to the larger programmatic goals. The two (2) restoration types under Restore and Conserve Habitat are: 1) Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats and 2) Habitat Projects on Federally Managed Lands. Both of these restoration types were proposed to benefit habitats as well as injured species of fish and invertebrates in the water column, marine mammals, and birds by providing food, shelter, breeding, and nursery habitat.

Goals of the Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats Restoration Type are to: 1) restore a variety of interspersed and ecologically connected coastal habitats to maintain ecosystem diversity with a particular focus on maximizing ecological functions for the range of resources injured by the spill; 2) restore for injuries in habitats in the geographic areas where the injuries occurred while considering

approaches that provide resiliency and sustainability; and 3) restoration of habitats in appropriate combinations for any given geographic area by considering design factors such as connectivity, size, and distance between projects to address injuries to the associated living coastal and marine resources and restore the ecological functions provided by those habitats. Specific projects were not evaluated in the PDARP; however, Under Alternative A, controlled Mississippi River diversions, such as MBSD, are one such restoration approach for implementation to accomplish the goals of this restoration type.

5a. Describe the Project

The Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) is one of 33 conceptual projects identified by CPRA for the first implementation period (2012-2031) in Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast (2012 Master Plan). The Project footprint is from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin, just west of the back levee, spanning a length of approximately two miles and width of approximately 1600 feet for the gravity conveyance structure and appurtenant structures.

The Project consists of the construction of an intake control structure on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at River Mile 60.7, through a section of the existing Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) levee. The structure would be operated to reestablish the connection between the Mississippi River and the mid-Barataria Basin by transporting sediment, freshwater, and nutrients through the gravity conveyance structure, leading across land and through the future federal New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to an outfall or receiving area in the mid-Barataria Basin. The outfall area is located south of the Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery Project (BA-39), the Mississippi River Long Distance Sediment Pipeline (BA-43EB), and the Bayou Dupont Marsh and Ridge Creation (BA-48). Additional Project features include relocation and replacement of segments of Louisiana Highway 23 and the New Orleans Gulf Coast Rail Road over the gravity conveyance structure.

The project also incorporates a pump station to be located in the northwestern portion of the Project area. Forced drainage is currently provided by Wilkinson Canal Pump Station located near Myrtle Grove to the south of the project area. The Project will require the modification of internal drainage collection swales and the construction of a new drainage pump station north of the conveyance channel in order to capture and convey area drainage north of the channel to the Barataria Basin. Right-of-way and road access will be required for the construction and maintenance of the pump station.

Relocations of water and electrical utility lines will be needed in order to accommodate the construction and operation of the diversion channel and the proposed LA 23 and New Orleans Gulf Coast Rail Road bridges. A 22 inch crude oil pipeline is located immediately west of the proposed channel outfall. All infrastructure and utility improvements and relocations will be based upon continued service during construction and will be designed and constructed using utility owner criteria and guidelines and addressing hurricane criteria during interim and final phases of construction.

An Operations and Maintenance Plan will be developed for the Project prior to construction.

An Adaptive Management Plan will be developed to maximize sediment transport from the Mississippi River to the mid-Barataria Basin to reduce land loss rates and sustain wetlands through the delivery of sediment, freshwater, and nutrients. The Adaptive Management Plan would monitor the diversion control structure and outfall area and allow for variable flow rates to respond to seasonal, sediment, and basin conditions, maximizing the benefits of sediment transport for restoration.

Step 8.c. Funding

CPRA anticipates construction the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion with Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) funds allocated to the State of Louisiana by the Deepwater Horizon BP Spill Consent Decree (dated April 2016).

Step 10a. Excavation					
Location	Habitat Type (existing)	<u>Feature</u>		Area (acres)	Excavation (CY)
Mississippi River	Riverine	Diversion Channel		14.0	350,000
Batture	Forested Wetlands	Diversion Channel		4.2	202,796
MR&T levee west to LA 23	Forested Wetlands	Diversion Channel		3.2	127,050
LA 23 west to back levee	Emergent Wetlands	Diversion Channel		30.9	1,247,510
	Open Water Canal I Drainage {WOTUS)	Diversion Channel		1.8	57,112
MR&T levee to back levee	Non-wetland {uplands)	Diversion Channel		230.0	1,765,532
Barataria Basin	Waterbottom	Outfall Transition Zone		4.0	100,000
Cumulative Subtotals	Riverine			14.0	350,000
	Wetlands			38.3	1,577,356
	Open Water Canall Drainage {WOTUS)			1.8	57,112
	Waterbottom I Emergent wetlands			4.0	100,000
	Non-wetland {uplands)			230.0	1,765,532
			Total	288.0	3,850,000

Step 10b & 10c. Fill					
Location	Habitat Type (existing)	Feature	Material	Area (acres)	Fill (CY)
			Soil,		
MR&T levee west to LA 23	Forested Wetlands	Construction access	gravel	2.4	11,568
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	2.4	25,931
			Soil,		
LA 23 west to back levee	Emergent Wetlands	Construction access	gravel	22.8	110,207
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	24.7	221,031
			Soil,		
LA 23 west to back levee	Open Water Canal I Drainage {WOTUS)	Construction access	gravel	2.1	10,261
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	2.4	23,293
			Soil,		
MR&T levee to back levee	Non-wetland {uplands)	Construction access	gravel	64.5	311,964
			Soil, rock,		
		Guide Levees	concrete	41.5	1,129,746
			Soil,		
Construction Routes	Non-wetland {uplands)	Access I Haul Roads	gravel	1.5	8,000
			Topsoil,		
Barataria Basin (Benefits)	Waterbottom I Emergent wetlands	Nourishment Disposal Area	soil	390*	2,300,000
Cumulative Subtotals	Wetlands			52.3	368.737
	Open Water Canall Drainage (WOTUS)			4.5	33,554
	Non-wetland {uplands)			107.5	1,449,710
	Waterbottom I Emergent wetlands	Land I marsh building		390	2,300,000
			Total	554.3	4,152,001

10b. and 10c. Supplemental Fill Information

Note: Due to preliminary design stage, the amount of fill material by type (e.g., soil, rock, concrete, etc.) is approximate.

* Excavated from channel and placed in Barataria Basin.

11a. Total acres of wetlands and/or waterbottoms filled and/or excavated:

- Wetlands excavated = 38.3 acres
- Wetlands filled = 52.3 acres
- Waterbottom excavated = 4.0 acres
- Waterbottom filled = 390 acres







State of Louisiana

BOBBY JINDAL GOVERNOR

July 23, 2013

Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management 617 North Third Street Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Re: Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153) Application Fee Waiver

To Whom It May Concern:

Attached is the Joint Permit Application for the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (BA-153), a coastal restoration project in Plaquemines Parish. This project is part of, or complementary to, the CPRA's Annual Plan and, therefore, the State's Comprehensive Master Plan, pursuant to R.S. 49: 213.6. Therefore, the CPRA is requesting an exemption from application and processing fees for the enclosed application as per R.S. 49: 214.30.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at (225)342-2799.

Sincerely,

icail of coner

Micaela Coner

Enclosures

Plaquemines Parish Government

Directors

Administration - To Be Announced Operations - Stanley Wallace Public Service - Michael W Jiles

November 28, 2016

INTERIM PARISH PRESIDENT Edward P Theriot

8056 Hwy. 23, Suite 213 Belle Chasse, Louisiana 70037 (504) 297-5537 Fax (504) 433-8324 eMail: etheriot@ppgov.net

Council Members

District 1 - John L Barthelemy Jr. District 2 - William "Beau" Black District 3 - Kirk M Lepine District 4 - Irvin Juneau Jr. District 5 - Benedict "Benny" Rousselle District 6 - Charlie Burt District 7 - Audrey Trufant-Salvant District 8 - Jeff E Edgecombe District 9 - Nicole Williams

Colonel Michael N. Clancy District Commander **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers** P.O. Box 60267 New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

SUBJECT: Written Statement from Plaquemines Parish Government per EC 1165-2-216 33 U.S.C. 408 Request to alter the New Orleans to Venice (NOV), Louisiana Project with **Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion**

Dear Col. Clancy:

The Plaquemines Parish Government (PPG), the co-non-Federal sponsor with the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board (CPRA Board), for the New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Project, in accordance with Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (codified at 33 U.S.C. 408), and further in accordance with EC 1165-2-216 (Water Resource Policies and Authorities Policy and Procedural Guidance for Processing Requests to Alter US Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Projects Pursuant to 33 USC 408), Section 7c(2)(b)v (Procedures), submits this letter of "No Objections" in response to the CPRA Board's request for permission to permanently alter the NOV Project with the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion project. PPG has "No Objection" to CPRA Board's proposed project.

PPG understands this written request as a requirement to initiate the 408 review process, and further understands that this letter of concurrence does not further obligate PPG for Operation Maintenance Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) or funding responsibilities related to this project. PPG understands that the CPRA Board is responsible for the OMRR&R of this alteration at no cost to the PPG or the Government. Nonetheless, PPG acknowledges that it is not prevented from entering into separate agreements with the CPRA Board for the performance of the OMRR&R of the NOV Project as it relates to this alteration.

PPG looks forward to the delivery of this project to restore our working coast.

Respectfully,

P. Thereat

Edward Theriot President

Plaquemines Parish Government

Directors

Administration - To Be Announced Operations - Stanley Wallace Public Service - Michael W Jiles

INTERIM PARISH PRESIDENT Edward P Theriot

8056 Hwy. 23, Suite 213 Belle Chasse, Louisiana 70037 (504) 297-5537 Fax (504) 433-8324 eMail: etheriot@ppgov.net

Council Members

District 1 - John L Barthelemy Jr. District 2 - William "Beau" Black District 3 - Kirk M Lepine District 4 - Irvin Juneau Jr. District 5 - Benedict "Benny" Rousselle District 6 - Charlie Burt District 6 - Charlie Burt District 7 - Audrey Trufant-Salvant District 8 - Jeff E Edgecombe District 9 - Nicole Williams

November 28, 2016

Colonel Michael N. Clancy District Commander **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers** P.O. Box 60267 New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

SUBJECT: Written Statement from Plaquemines Parish Government per EC 1165-2-216 33 U.S.C. 408 Request to alter the Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T), Louisiana Project with Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion

Dear Col. Clancy:

The Plaquemines Parish Government (PPG), the non-Federal sponsor for the Mississippi River and Tributaries, Louisiana Project (MR&T), in accordance with Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (codified at 33 U.S.C. 408), and further in accordance with EC 1165-2-216 (Water Resource Policies and Authorities Policy and Procedural Guidance for Processing Requests to Alter US Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Projects Pursuant to 33 USC 408), Section 7c(2)(b)v (Procedures), submits this letter of "No Objections" in response to the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board's (CPRA Board) request for permission to permanently alter the MR&T Levee with the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion project.

PPG understands this written request as a requirement to initiate the 408 review process, and further understands that this letter of "No Objections" does not further obligate PPG for Operation Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) or funding responsibilities related to this project. PPG understands that the CPRA Board is responsible for the OMRR&R of this alteration at no cost to the PPG or the Government. Nonetheless, PPG acknowledges that it is not prevented from entering into separate agreements with the CPRA Board for the performance of the OMRR&R of the MR&T as it relates to this alteration.

PPG looks forward to the delivery of this project to restore our working coast.

Respectfully,

word P. Sheriat

Edward Theriot President



Office of Multimodal Commerce PO Box 94245 | Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9245 ph: 225-379-3038 | fx: 225-379-3070

John Bel Edwards, Governor Thomas M. Clark, Commissioner

December 28, 2016

Colonel Michael N. Clancy District Commander U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 7400 Leake Ave. New Orleans, LA 70118-3651

SUBJECT: Written Statement from LaDOTD per EC 1165-2-216 33 U.S.C. 408 Request to alter the Mississippi River Ship Channel (MRSC) Project Gulf to Baton Rouge, Plaquemines Parish Louisiana with Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion

Dear Colonel Clancy:

The Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LaDOTD), the non-Federal sponsor for the Mississippi River Ship Channel Project, Gulf to Baton Rouge, in accordance with Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (codified at 33 U.S.C. 408), and further in accordance with EC 1165-2-216 (Water Resource Policies and Authorities Policy and Procedural Guidance for Processing Requests to Alter US Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Projects Pursuant to 33 USC 408), Section 7c(2)(b)v (Procedures), submits this Written Statement of "No Objection" in response to the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Board's (CPRA Board) request to document the initiation of the Section 408 process for the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project.

LaDOTD understands this written request is a requirement to initiate the 408 review process (Step 2. of EC 1110-2-216) for the MBSD, and further understands that CPRA will be required to obtain a letter of "No Objection" from LaDOTD once USACE has approved the 408 permission for construction of the MBSD.

This letter does not obligate LaDOTD for Operation Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) or obligate DOTD to funding responsibilities related to this project. LaDOTD understands that the CPRA Board is responsible for the OMRR&R of this alteration at no cost to the LaDOTD or the Government.

If you have any questions, please contact Phil Jones at 225-379-3030 or Phil.Jones@la.gov.

Respectfully,

M. Clark

Thomas M. Clark Commissioner of Multimodal Commerce

A3: Agency Invitation and Response Letters

Agency Invitation Letters



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT 7400 LEAKE AVENUE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Brad Rieck Acting Field Supervisor, Louisiana Ecological Services Office U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 646 Cajundome Boulevard, Suite 400 Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

Dear Mr. Rieck:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

V. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT 7400 LEAKE AVENUE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

David R. Callahan, Commander U.S. Coast Guard, Sector New Orleans 200 Hendee Street New Orleans, Louisiana 70114

Dear Mr. Callahan:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- b. Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT 7400 LEAKE AVENUE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Phil Boggan Assistant Secretary, Office of Cultural Development State Historic Preservation Office Post Office Box 44247 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Dear Mr. Boggan:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,



Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)

cc: appropriate Tribal Nations (e-mail)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT 7400 LEAKE AVENUE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

David Bernhardt Chief, Protected Resources Division National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional District 263 13th Avenue South Saint Petersburg, Florida 33701

Dear Mr. Bernhardt:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin. The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- b. Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)
cc: Richard Hartman

National Marine Fisheries Service % LSU Center for Wetlands Resources Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803-7535



NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Jolie Harrison Chief, Permits Division National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources 1315 East-West Highway, Room 13635 Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dear Ms. Harrison:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- b. Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. PARABEE OD-SE

MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOY 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Noel Ardoin Environmental Engineer Administrator, Environmental Section Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development Post Office Box 94245 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9245

Dear Ms. Ardoin:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- b. Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Vence Haggard Regional Administrator Federal Railroad Administration, Region 5 4100 International Plaza, Suite 450 Fort Worth, Texas 76109

Dear Mr. Haggard:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Carl M. Highsmith Federal Highways Administration Louisiana Division 5304 Flanders Drive, Suite A Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

Dear Mr. Highsmith:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- b. Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Ron Curry Regional Administrator U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

Dear Mr. Curry:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- a. Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013) cc: Rhonda M. Smith, Office of Planning and Coordination, NEPA Program Barbara Keeler (e-mail) Raul Gutierrez (e-mail)



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Reid Nelson, Director Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 803 Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. Nelson:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we invite you to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS. Your designation as a cooperating agency does not imply you support the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) final implementing regulations for NEPA (40 C.F.R. § 1501.6 and § 1508.5), the Corps requests your assistance and participation in the NEPA process in the following ways:

- Attendance at and input during agency coordination meetings, including prescoping and scoping;
- b. Comment and feedback on the EIS schedule, overall scope of the document, significant issues to be evaluated in the EIS, environmental impacts, study and assessment methodologies, range of alternatives and proposed compensatory mitigation, if applicable;
- c. Guidance on relevant technical studies required as part of the EIS;
- d. Identification of issues related to your agency's jurisdiction by law and special expertise;
- e. Participation, as appropriate, at public meetings and hearings;
- f. Review of the administrative and public drafts of the Draft EIS and Final EIS.

Please provide your written acceptance or declination of this invitation within 30 days from the date of this letter. Should you decline to accept our invitation to be a cooperating agency, we advise that you provide a copy of your response to CEQ as specified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.6(c). We look forward to working with your agency on the preparation of the EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our respective roles and responsibilities during the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV . 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Vincent W. Frelich Director of Coastal Restoration Plaquemines Parish Government 8056 Highway 23, Suite 200 Belle Chasse, Louisiana 70037

Dear Mr. Frelich:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Tomma Barnes Branch Chief, Coastal Restoration Assessment Branch U.S. Geological Service 700 Cajundome Boulevard Lafayette, Louisiana 70506-3152

Dear Ms. Barnes:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Kevin Norton State Conservationist Natural Resources Conservation Service 3737 Government Street Alexandria, Louisiana 71302

Dear Mr. Norton:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Jeff Landry Attorney General State of Louisiana Post Office Box 94005 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Dear Mr. Landry:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Charlie Melancon Secretary, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Post Office Box 98000 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70898-9000

Dear Mr. Melancon:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,



Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)

cc: Dave Butler, Permits Coordinator



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Mike Lockwood Director, Environmental Affairs Jefferson Parish Government 4901 Jefferson Highway, Suite E Jefferson, Louisiana 70121

Dear Mr. Lockwood:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

William Rachal Chief of Staff Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness 7667 Independence Boulevard Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

Dear Mr. Rachal:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Moises Dugan Deputy Regional Administrator Federal Emergency Management Agency FRC 800 North Loop 288 Denton, Texas 76209-3698

Dear Mr. Dugan:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)

cc: Randy Meshell, Director National Preparedness Division



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOY 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Andy Velayos Southwest Region Federal Aviation Administration 10101 Hillwood Parkway Fort Worth, Texas 76177

Dear Mr. Velayos:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Director of Environmental Support Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base 400 Russell Avenue New Orleans, Louisiana 70143

Gentlemen:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Thomas Harris Office of the Secretary Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Post Office Box 94396 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9396

Dear Mr. Harris:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER OD-S

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)

cc: Keith Lovell, Assistant Secretary Office of Coastal Management



NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Johnny Bradberry Executive Assistant for Coastal Activities Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Post Office Box 44027 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-4027

Dear Mr. Bradberry:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.
The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE MAYER

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT 7400 LEAKE AVENUE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

NOV 1 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Mike Celata Regional Director, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region Bureau of Ocean Energy Management 1201 Elmwood Park Boulevard New Orleans, Louisiana 70123-2394

Dear Mr. Celata:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin. The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

M. FARABEE OD-SE AYER

Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, NEW ORLEANS DISTRICT 7400 LEAKE AVENUE NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70118

NOV * 0 2016

Operations Division Regulatory Branch

Chuck Carr Brown Secretary, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality Post Office Box 4301 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-4303

Dear Mr. Brown:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), New Orleans District (CEMVN) is initiating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, for the proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project, submitted by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana (CPRA). The MBSD project would be located along the right descending bank of the Mississippi River at approximately 60.7 miles above "Head of Passes" in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Based on information provided by the CPRA in its Department of the Army (DA) permit application, the proposed activities will require Corps authorization under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408); Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 USC 403); Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (86 Stat. 816; 33 USC 1344); and, Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4332). CEMVN has assigned Corps File number MVN-2012-02806-EOO to the application.

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have an interest in the applicant's proposed project based on your jurisdiction by law and/or special expertise. As the lead Federal agency under NEPA, we are requesting your participation as a commenting agency during the development of the EIS. Your designation as a commenting agency does not imply you support to the applicant's proposed project nor does it diminish or otherwise modify your agency's independent statutory obligations and responsibilities under applicable local, state and federal laws, regulations and Executive Orders.

The proposed project consists of constructing a diversion intake through the levee on the west side of the Mississippi River, a concrete channel and appurtenant structures from east to west with its outfall through the future New Orleans to Venice (NOV) Hurricane Protection Levee, to allow water from the Mississippi River to flow into Barataria Basin.

The applicant's stated project purpose is to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sediment deposition process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. However, the Corps has not yet determined the basic and overall project purpose.

We anticipate that scoping meetings for this EIS will start in the not too distant future. Once that schedule has been worked out with the applicant and the meetings are set, CEMVN will provide you with due notice of that schedule. We look forward to input from your agency as we prepare this EIS. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the NEPA process in more detail, please contact Brad LaBorde at 504-862-2225 or brad.laborde@usace.army.mil or Jeff Varisco at 504-862-2853 or jeffery.j.varisco@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,



Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch

Enclosure: NOI to prepare an EIS for this proposal. (published in the Federal Register on 4 October 2013)

cc: Scott Guilliams Water Permits Division, LDEQ Post Office Box 4313 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-4313 Agency Response Letters

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Region 6 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200 Dallas, TX 75202-2733

1 4 DEC 2016

Mr. Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch US Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District 7400 Leake Avenue New Orleans, LA 70118

Subject: Proposed Resource Mid-Barataria Bay Sediment Diversion Project

Dear Mr. Mayer:

The letter is in response to the Army Corps of Engineers' Notice of Intent letter dated, November 10, 2016, to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project. Since the EIS will analyze the impacts of the proposed project to the human and natural environment, EPA accepts the invitation to participate as a cooperating agency. As a cooperating agency, the EPA will:

- Provide expertise on NEPA compliance and other applicable subject matters;
- Provide timely technical reviews and comments on preliminary documents, reports, analyses, and sections of the Draft and Final EIS;
- Participate in meetings, as resources allow;
- Provide available information during preparation of the Draft and Final EIS in areas in which EPA has expertise; and
- Review and comment on the Draft and Final EIS pursuant to our regulatory responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

EPA anticipates that a cooperative team approach will streamline the environmental process and result in a high quality EIS. We look forward to continued involvement and cooperation in the EIS development for this project. If you have any further questions, please contact Robert Houston of my staff at (214) 665-8565 or by e-mail at <u>houston.robert@epa.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Stacey B. Durger

Stacey B. Dwyer, P.E. Acting Director Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division





United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE 646 Cajundome Blvd. Suite 400 Lafayette, Louisiana 70506

December 2, 2016

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

Dear Colonel Clancy:

Please reference the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) November 10, 2016, letter requesting our assistance as a cooperating agency in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Mid-Barataria Bay Sediment Diversion (MBSD). That project was proposed by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Louisiana Coastal (CPRA) to reconnect and re-establish the natural or deltaic sedimentation process between the Mississippi River and Barataria Basin. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) offers the following comments in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (83 Stat. 852; 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The Corps and the Service have formally committed to work together to conserve, protect, and restore fish and wildlife resources while ensuring environmental sustainability of our Nation's water resources under the January 22, 2003, Partnership Agreement for Water Resources and Fish and Wildlife. Accordingly, the Service would be pleased to serve as a cooperating agency in developing the EIS for the proposed project in accordance with applicable NEPA/Council on Environmental Quality guidance. Our participation will be specifically limited to: 1) participating in meetings and field trips to obtain baseline information on project-area fish and wildlife resources; 2) evaluating the proposed project's impacts to wetlands and associated fish and wildlife resources, and assisting in the development of measures to avoid, minimize, and/or compensate for those impacts (including project alternatives); and 3) providing technical assistance in the development of a Biological Assessment describing the impacts of the proposed activity to federally listed threatened or endangered species and/or their critical habitat. Agreeing to be a cooperating agency does not preclude the Service from providing comments on the draft and final NEPA documents and does not ensure our support of the final selected plan.



We appreciate the opportunity to participate during the early planning stages of the proposed action. If you have any questions or require further information, please contact Catherine Breaux (504/862-2689) of this office.

Sincerely, 100AM

Joseph Ranson Supervisor Louisiana Field Office

cc: New Orleans District, LA (Attn.: Martin Mayer, Dr. William Klein) CPRA, Baton Rouge, LA

۰,

NOV 2 9 2016



Environmental Section PO Box 94245 | Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9245 ph: 225-242-4502 | fx: 225-242-4500

John Bel Edwards, Governor Shawn D. Wilson, Ph.D., Secretary

November 22, 2016

Mr. Martin S. Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch New Orleans District Corps of Engineers 7400 Leake Avenue New Orleans, LA 70118

Dear Mr. Mayer,

I am in receipt of your letter, dated November 10, 2016, wherein the Corps invited the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD) to be a cooperating agency with the Corps in the development of the EIS for the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) project. This project has the potential to affect river navigation, levees, rail and highways.

DOTD is interested in the marine and rail issues associated with the project. Moreover, the crossing of LA 23 by the project will require a permit from DOTD. Given the Department's interest in the marine, rail, and highway issues associated with the MBSD, we accept your invitation to be a cooperating agency.

For your convenience, included below are the contacts at DOTD for the above mentioned areas of interest.

Ports & Waterways: Sharon Balfour (225) 379-3035 (<u>sharon.balfour@la.gov</u>) Freight & Passenger Rail Development: Dean Goodell (225) 379-3031(<u>dean.goodell@la.gov</u>) Bridge Design: Paul Fossier (225) 379-1302 (<u>paul.fossier@la.gov</u>) Right of way permits in District 02: Darlene LaMarca (504) 437-3130 (darlene.lamarca@la.gov)

If you need additional information, please let me know. I can be contacted by phone at (225) 242-4501 or by email at <u>noel.ardoin@la.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Noel Ardoin Environmental Engineer Administrator

na pc:

Ms. Sharon Balfour (DOTD Section 65)
Mr. Dean Goodell (DOTD Section 66)
Ms. Simone Ardoin (DOTD Section 24, Attn: Ms. Joy Johnson)
Mr. Paul Fossier (DOTD Section 25)
Mr. Chris Morvant (DOTD District 02)
Ms. Darlene LaMarca (DOTD District 02)





BILLY NUNGESSER LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR State of Louisiana Office of the Lieutenant Governor Department of Culture, Recreation & Tourism Office of Cultural Development Division of Archaeology RENNIE S. BURAS, II DEPUTY SECRETARY

PHIL BOGGAN Assistant Secretary

21 November 2016

Mr. Martin Mayer Chief, Regulatory Branch New Orleans District, Corps of Engineers 7400 Leake Avenue New Orleans, LA 70118

Re: Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project

Dear Mr. Mayer:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 10 November 2016 concerning the development of an Environmental Impact Statement for the above-referenced project. The Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office accepts the invitation to participate in the development of the Statement for this project. We look forward to working with your office toward that goal.

If you have any questions please contact Chip McGimsey at the Division of Archaeology by email at <u>cmcgimsey@crt.la.gov</u> or by phone at 225-219-4598.

Sincerely,

Phil Boggan

State Historic Preservation Officer



November 22, 2016

Brad LaBorde U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans District 7400 Leake Avenue New Orleans, LA 70118

RE: Proposed Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion (MBSD) Project

Dear Mr. LaBorde:

I have reviewed the above referenced project for potential requirements of the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA).

Projects are subject to FPPA requirements if they may irreversibly convert farmland (directly or indirectly) to nonagricultural use and are completed by a federal agency or with assistance from a federal agency. For the purpose of FPPA, farmland includes prime farmland, unique farmland, and land of statewide or local importance. Farmland subject to FPPA requirements can be forest land, pastureland, cropland, or other land, but not water or urban built-up land.

The project map and narrative submitted with your request indicates that the proposed construction areas will potentially impact the following prime or unique farmland soils:

Soil Symbol and Mapunit Name	Acres	RV
Cm – Cancienne silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	65.6	94
Co – Cancienne silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	74.6	100
Ha – Harahan clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	202.2	28
Total Acre	s 342.4	Avg. RV 56

Please find attached a CPA-106 'Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects' form with our agencies information completed.

For specific information about the soils found in the project area, please visit our Web Soil Survey at the following location: http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/

For more information on FPPA requirements or the process to receive a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (Form AD-1006 or CPA-106) please visit the following location: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/landuse/fppa/

> Natural Resources Conservation Service State Office 3737 Government Street Alexandria, Louisiana 71302 Voice: (318) 473-7751 Fax: 1-844-325-6947 An Equal Opportunity Provider and Employer

Brad LaBorde, Page 2

Please direct all future correspondence to me at the address shown below.

Respectfully,

11

Acting for: ⁷ Kevin Norton State Conservationist

Attachment

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Natural Resources Conservation Service

NRCS-CPA-106 (Rev. 1-91)

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) 3. Dat		3. Date	of Land Evaluation	n Request	4. Sheet 1	4. Sheet 1 of		
1. Name of Project Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion Project 5. Fe		5. Fede	deral Agency Involved USACOE					
2. Type of Project Diversion Canal 6. Cou		6. Cour	inty and State Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana					
PART II (To be completed by NRCS) 1. Date 11/		1. Date 11/	Request Received by NRCS 2. Person Completing Form 14/16 M.Mouton					
 Does the corridor contain prime, unique statewide or local important farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - Do not complete additional parts of this form).).	YES 🖌 NO 🗌		4. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size 1,577 686			
5. Major Crop(s)	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction 7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPP/				Defined in FPPA			
Citrus, Vegetables	Acres: 59,262 % 6.6 Acres: 43,270 %				% 3.0			
8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used Plaquemines Parish LESA	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System 10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 11/22/16							
PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	A			ive Corridor For Segment				
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly								
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly. Or To Receive	B Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly. Or To Receive Services			-				
C. Total Acres In Corridor							-	
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluat	ion Information							
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland		342.4					
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland								
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Uni	C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted		.57%					
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value		100						
PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information Criterion Rel		Relative	56					
PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corrido	n - 100 Folinis)	lovimum						
Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7	CFR 658.5(c))	Points						
1. Area in Nonurban Use		15						
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use		10						
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed		20						
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government		20						
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average		10						
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland		25						
7. Availablility Of Farm Support Services		5						
8. On-Farm Investments		20						
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services		25						
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use		10						
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS		160	0	0		0	0	
PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)								
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)		100	56	0		0	0	
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a loca assessment)	l site	160	0	0		0	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)		260	56	0		0	0	
1. Corridor Selected: 2. Total Acres of Farm Converted by Proje	nlands to be 3. act:	Date Of S	Selection:	4. Was	A Local Sit	e Assessment Use	ed?	

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part:

DATE

NOTE: Complete a form for each segment with more than one Alternate Corridor

NRCS-CPA-106 (Reverse)

CORRIDOR - TYPE SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The following criteria are to be used for projects that have a linear or corridor - type site configuration connecting two distant points, and crossing several different tracts of land. These include utility lines, highways, railroads, stream improvements, and flood control systems. Federal agencies are to assess the suitability of each corridor - type site or design alternative for protection as farmland along with the land evaluation information.

How much land is in nonurban use within a radius of 1.0 mile from where the project is intended? More than 90 percent - 15 points 90 to 20 percent - 14 to 1 point(s) Less than 20 percent - 0 points

(2) How much of the perimeter of the site borders on land in nonurban use? More than 90 percent - 10 points 90 to 20 percent - 9 to 1 point(s) Less than 20 percent - 0 points

How much of the site has been farmed (managed for a scheduled harvest or timber activity) more than five of the last (3)10 years? More than 90 percent - 20 points 90 to 20 percent - 19 to 1 point(s) Less than 20 percent - 0 points

Is the site subject to state or unit of local government policies or programs to protect farmland or covered by private programs (4)to protect farmland? Site is protected - 20 points

Site is not protected - 0 points

Is the farm unit(s) containing the site (before the project) as large as the average - size farming unit in the County ? (Average farm sizes in each county are available from the NRCS field offices in each state. Data are from the latest available Census of Agriculture, Acreage or Farm Units in Operation with \$1,000 or more in sales.) As large or larger - 10 points

Below average - deduct 1 point for each 5 percent below the average, down to 0 points if 50 percent or more below average - 9 to 0 points

If the site is chosen for the project, how much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of (6)interference with land patterns? Acreage equal to more than 25 percent of acres directly converted by the project - 25 points Acreage equal to between 25 and 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 1 to 24 point(s)

Acreage equal to less than 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 0 points

Does the site have available adequate supply of farm support services and markets, i.e., farm suppliers, equipment dealers, (7)processing and storage facilities and farmer's markets? All required services are available - 5 points

Some required services are available - 4 to 1 point(s) No required services are available - 0 points

Does the site have substantial and well-maintained on-farm investments such as barns, other storage building, fruit trees (8) and vines, field terraces, drainage, irrigation, waterways, or other soil and water conservation measures? High amount of on-farm investment - 20 points Moderate amount of on-farm investment - 19 to 1 point(s)

No on-farm investment - 0 points

Would the project at this site, by converting farmland to nonagricultural use, reduce the demand for farm support (9)services so as to jeopardize the continued existence of these support services and thus, the viability of the farms remaining in the area? Substantial reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 25 points Some reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 1 to 24 point(s) No significant reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 0 points

Is the kind and intensity of the proposed use of the site sufficiently incompatible with agriculture that it is likely to (10)contribute to the eventual conversion of surrounding farmland to nonagricultural use? Proposed project is incompatible to existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 10 points Proposed project is tolerable to existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 9 to 1 point(s) Proposed project is fully compatible with existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 0 points