

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS PUBLIC MEETING

October 6, 2015

7:00 p.m.

Price Auditorium
John Gray Center at Lamar University
855 Jim Gilligan Way
Beaumont, Texas

Appearances:

- Lieutenant colonel Jared Erickson
- Mr. Ray Newby
- Mr. Fred Jackson
- Mr. James Wolfe
- Dr. Edmond Russo
- Ms. Sharon Tirpak
- Ms. Sherry Willie
- Ms. Lauren Kruse
- Ms. Janelle Stokes
- Mr. Winston Denton

Court Reporter:

TAMARA CASTILLE DEROUEN, CSR
Nell McCallum & Associates, Inc.
Firm Registration No. 143
2615 Calder Avenue, Suite 111
Beaumont, Texas 77702

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: Good morning,
3 ladies and gentlemen. I'm pleased to be here tonight on
4 behalf Colonel Richard Pannell, the risk manager of the
5 Galveston District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I'm
6 Lieutenant colonel Jared Erickson. I'm the deputy
7 commander of the Galveston District. I welcome you to
8 tonight's public meeting concerning the Sabine Pass to
9 Galveston Bay, Texas, Coastal Storm Risk Management and
10 Ecosystem Restoration Study. For the record, let me
11 state that this public meeting is being convened at
12 7:00 p.m. on October 6th, 2015, at the John Gray Center,
13 Lamar University, in Beaumont, Texas.

14 Specifically we are presenting a commission and
15 accepting public comments on the draft, the greater
16 Feasibility Report, and Environmental Impact Statement
17 for this study that was released for public review on
18 September 11th, 2015. The court reporter is here to
19 transcribe these proceedings and all public comments.

20 The Corps of Engineers and the Texas General
21 Land Office have been conducting a study analyzing
22 potential coastal storm risk management measures that
23 will reduce the risk of tropical storm surge impact to
24 the lives and property in the Golden Triangle and the
25 Freeport area of the upper Texas Gulf Coast.

1 Seven years ago the region experienced a
2 near-miss from Hurricane Ike that disrupted many lives
3 and resulted in extensive damages in the Sabine and
4 Galveston regions. The Nation came within one foot of an
5 economic depression when the storm surge nearly
6 overtopped existing hurricane flood protection projects
7 in Port Arthur and in Texas City. Had the areas
8 protected by these systems had been flooded, the Nation
9 would have been experience significant disruptions in
10 gasoline and other petrochemical supplies that we all
11 depend upon. A cost effective plan has been identified
12 that we believe would significantly reduce the risk of
13 storm surge impact in the Sabine and Brazoria regions.
14 This plan, which we refer to as the Tentatively Selected
15 Plan, or the TSP, will be described later in this
16 meeting.

17 I hope that all of you had an opportunity to
18 read the notice of availability either on the Galveston
19 District's website or on the announcements that were
20 mailed to individuals and organizations that may have
21 interest in these proceedings. It contains a summary of
22 the Tentatively Selected Plan and its environmental
23 impact.

24 Before we go any further, I would like to
25 introduce a representative of the Texas General Land

1 Office, our study's nonfederal sponsor, Mr. Ray Newby,
2 coastal geologist with the G.L.O.'s coastal resources
3 program. Thank you for being here.

4 MR. NEWBY: Thank you.

5 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: At this time
6 would you like to make any statements, Mr. Newby?

7 MR. NEWBY: I guess I could stand here.
8 I'd just like to say on behalf of Commissioner Bush,
9 we're proud to be partners with the Corps of Engineers on
10 this important project. And, Colonel, you mentioned
11 we've dodged a couple of bullets; but this area has taken
12 on the chance several times and it's just a matter of
13 time before it happens again. So, Commissioner Bush has
14 made it one of his priorities to protect the economic and
15 environmental resources of the Texas Coast, the jewel
16 that it is. Thank you.

17 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: Thank you.

18 I would also like to recognize the public
19 officials who are attending tonight: Mr. Fred Jackson,
20 representing Jefferson County; and Mr. James Wolfe
21 representing the city of Orange. Additionally, I would
22 like to introduce those that are here with me from the
23 Corps of Engineers: Dr. Edmond Russo, Galveston
24 District, deputy district engineer for programs and
25 project management; Ms. Sharon Tirpak, Galveston District

1 project manager for this study; Ms. Sherry Willie,
2 Regional Planning Center. She's with the planning
3 section; Ms. Lauren Kruse, Regional Planning Center,
4 planning lead; and Ms. Janelle Stokes, Regional Planning
5 Center, environmental lead.

6 Now I'll describe the ground rules and format
7 for tonight's meeting. I hope everyone completed a
8 comment form when they entered the meeting. A comment
9 form is used to provide us your contact information so we
10 can keep you updated on the status of the study. It can
11 also be used to submit a written comment. If you would
12 like to make your comment orally tonight, please make
13 sure that you have indicated your intent on the sign-in
14 sheet at the door. Those wishing to make a comment will
15 be given an opportunity to do so after the presentation.
16 If you prefer not to speak tonight, you may submit your
17 comments in writing by dropping them in the box provided,
18 which you see up there on that divider, or send them to
19 us by mail or e-mail.

20 Following these opening remarks, Ms. Sharon
21 Tirpak, project manager, will present an overview of this
22 feasibility study. After her presentation, I'll open the
23 floor for public comments. We don't have any federal or
24 state officials here; but had they been here, they would
25 have been requested to make a statement to be recognized

1 first other than Mr. Newby.

2 MS. TIRPAK: We have Winston Denton from
3 the Parks & Wildlife.

4 MR. DENTON: Texas Parks & Wildlife.

5 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: I'm sorry,
6 sir.

7 Next, representatives from federal and state
8 resource agencies wishing to make a statement will be
9 called upon. Then I'll recognize each individual as
10 indicated if they wish to make a comment.

11 At this time I don't think we've established a
12 limit for comments given the size of the audience, but we
13 do have the room until 8:30. So, that will be the
14 driving force behind that.

15 I would like to emphasize that this will not be
16 a question-and-answer session. This meeting is to
17 provide everyone with an opportunity to publicly comment
18 on the plan. Please give all speakers the courtesy of
19 not making any comments during their presentation. Turn
20 off your cell phones and hold all applause or other
21 reactions so that we can have an orderly meeting and be
22 respectful of everyone's time. All individuals have an
23 equal right to be heard.

24 Now, I would like to present Ms. Sharon Tirpak
25 to make our presentation.

1 MS. TIRPAK: Thanks, everyone, for coming
2 out tonight. We're going to talk about the Sabine Pass
3 to Galveston Bay study for coastal storm risk management
4 and ecosystem restoration.

5 (SLIDE PRESENTATION)

6 MS. TIRPAK: Next slide.

7 We're here to present the Tentatively Selected
8 Plan -- or you'll hear me refer to it as the TSP in the
9 presentation -- and to gather your comments on the plan
10 and its environmental impacts. This is a Tentatively
11 Selected Plan based on a preliminary engineering design
12 and tentative alignment. The TSP is being reviewed
13 concurrently by the public, internal Corps of Engineers,
14 and independent technical reviewers, and Corps
15 headquarters. The plan may change in response to these
16 comments and technical issues identified during the final
17 feasibility analysis.

18 Since 1854, 61 tropical storms have hit the
19 upper Texas coast. Certainly the most recently -- recent
20 one is the 2008 Hurricane Ike. It was the third most
21 destructive in U.S. history with 112 deaths, thousands of
22 homes destroyed, and 29 billion in losses.

23 In this area, also especially Hurricane Rita, in
24 2005, 111 deaths mainly attributed to incidents during
25 the mass of evacuation, and 10 billion in losses.

1 And then there was Tropical Storm Allison, which
2 was in the Houston area.

3 And certainly one of most historic storms in the
4 Texas Coast, and even in the country, the 1900 storm was
5 6,000 deaths and 20 million in losses.

6 So, a congressional study background, a
7 congressional resolution gives the Corps the authority to
8 study and recommend projects to reduce the risk of surge
9 damages in this region. And our mission and authorities
10 do not allow us to address wind-related impacts.

11 The study is being conducted by the Corps in
12 conjunction with our non-federal study sponsor, the Texas
13 General Land Office. The purpose of the study is to
14 evaluate vulnerability to storm surge impacts in the
15 upper six counties in the Texas Gulf Coast and to develop
16 projects that reduce the risk of storm surge impacts to
17 people, infrastructure, the economy, and the environment.

18 For this study the scope was ultimately reduced
19 to focus on CSRM and projects in the Sabine and Brazoria
20 regions. So, as originally scoped, the study covered all
21 six counties and recommended projects for three regions
22 shown here: The Sabine, the Galveston, and the Brazoria
23 region.

24 Let me turn this off.

25 The Sabine region, the Galveston region, and

1 Brazoria region.

2 However, the level of effort and associated risk
3 for the large and complex regional study was determined
4 to be too high. And it was agreed that this study would
5 focus on recommending CSRM solutions for the Sabine and
6 Brazoria regions only.

7 The coastal service management solutions for the
8 large and extremely complex Galveston Bay region and ER
9 opportunities throughout the six-county area are included
10 in the ongoing and separate coastal Texas feasibility
11 study and the Jefferson County ecosystem restoration
12 study.

13 So, the revised study scope includes a
14 programmatic discussion on the entire six-county area and
15 a focus study effort on the Sabine and Brazoria region.
16 The cost of the study is \$4.4 million. And the time
17 frame to complete it is 3.9 years.

18 The coastal storm risk management problems have
19 been evaluated and a TSP developed for the Sabine region,
20 which is the Orange and Jefferson counties and the
21 Brazoria region, which is the Freeport area.

22 This is Hurricane Ike surge impact in the Orange
23 and Jefferson counties. After Hurricane Ike a study was
24 commissioned by Orange County to evaluate potential
25 solutions for surge impacts like those caused by

1 Hurricane Ike. The study found that the surge generated
2 by the storm caused widespread flooding in industrial,
3 commercial, and residential areas of Orange County. The
4 cities of Orange, Bridge City, West Orange, Pinehurst,
5 Vidor, and Rose City, as well as unincorporated areas,
6 suffered extreme damages. Approximately one-third of the
7 city of Orange was flooded, primarily the downtown and
8 commercial districts of the city. Rose City also
9 suffered major damages from the surge that traveled up
10 the Neches River.

11 Virtually 100 percent of Bridge City was
12 flooded, including most residential and commercial
13 property. The Chemical Row area of Orange County also
14 received major damage, and production stopped --
15 production stoppage because of Ike's storm surge
16 flooding. Estimates of damages and production losses
17 exceed 500 million.

18 There were fewer impacts in Jefferson County,
19 due in large part to the higher based ground elevations;
20 and minor damages occurred to the ExxonMobil refinery on
21 the Neches River just south of the city of Beaumont.
22 The Sabine Neches Navigation District reported
23 considerable damages along Taylor's Bayou.

24 Extensive in Jefferson County, the existing
25 Port Arthur and vicinity, Hurricane Flood Protection

1 Project really helped this area during Hurricane Ike.
2 Extensive damages would have occurred except for the
3 protection provided by the levee system.

4 While the existing system performed well, it
5 came close to being overtopped by the surge. The picture
6 on the right was taken -- this one here was taken at
7 Highway 365 after the storm when waters were still very
8 close to the top of the flood wall in that area.

9 Areas not protected by the existing project were
10 heavily impacted. The image at the bottom is of a barge
11 lying across Highway 73 near Taylor's Bayou.

12 The Freeport area, on the extreme margin of this
13 storm's effects, experienced tidal flooding up to 6 to 8
14 feet in areas not protected by the existing Hurricane
15 Flood Protection Project.

16 Next slide.

17 The Port Arthur, Texas City, and Freeport
18 Hurricane Flood Protection Projects were built as a
19 result of storm surge damages from Hurricane Carla in
20 1961. Although it came ashore in Port O'Connor, some of
21 the most dangerous impacts were felt in the Freeport
22 area. Carla was a Category 4 storm when it came ashore
23 with storm surges up to 22 feet. The black and white
24 picture shows the post-storm impact.

25 In these existing hurricane protection levees,

1 all of them performed pretty well during the most recent
2 hurricane.

3 So, within our study process, we have to
4 evaluate a set of alternative plans. Several phases of
5 alternative analysis were conducted during the study.

6 Shown here is the final array of alternatives
7 that were evaluated to determine the Tentatively Selected
8 Plan.

9 For the Sabine region, CSRSM alternatives
10 developed by the Orange County study were evaluated and
11 plans -- plans which would protected nearly all of Orange
12 County and northern Jefferson County were advanced for
13 further screening.

14 Structural alternatives included construction
15 of a new levee system in Orange and northeast Jefferson
16 County and improving the existing Port Arthur Hurricane
17 Flood Protection Project. One alternative included
18 construction of a large surge gate in the Neches River
19 with the levee system connecting to the new levee system
20 in Orange County and the existing levee -- the Port
21 Arthur hurricane levee system.

22 In Brazoria County, improvements to the existing
23 Freeport Hurricane Flood Protection Project were advanced
24 for further screening.

25 Non-structural alternatives were also

1 considered, and those which are within the Corps'
2 authority to implement were advanced for further
3 screening.

4 Next slide.

5 The Neches River surge gate alternative, I want
6 to talk a little bit about that. It included three
7 components: A new levee and flood wall system along the
8 Sabine River and Sabine Lake, and a large surge gate in
9 the Neches River with levees connecting to the Orange and
10 Port Arthur systems. So, this would be a new levee.
11 There would be a gate here that would connect to the
12 existing flood protection system.

13 The Neches River surge gate would need to be
14 large enough to accommodate large oceangoing tankers and
15 other vessels which use the river to access numerous
16 petrochemical facilities in the Port of Beaumont. The
17 channel is currently 40 feet deep, and deepening the
18 channel to 48 feet is authorized.

19 This alternative was compared to a levee system
20 which protected the same areas to where no surge gate
21 would be needed in the Neches River. The construction
22 cost of the gate was estimated to be about 865 million
23 more than all the levee -- than the all-levee approach.
24 The gate would need to be very large across the Neches
25 River. And large pump stations would also be needed to

1 prevent upstream flooding while the gate is closed.

2 In addition, considerable operations and
3 maintenance costs would be needed to maintain and operate
4 the gate into the foreseeable future. For these reasons,
5 the gate was determined not to be cost effective and was
6 eliminated from further screening.

7 So, on this slide, this shows the final array of
8 alternatives that we have moved past the initial
9 screening; and we have looked at these as we were working
10 toward at the Tentatively Selected Plan.

11 And, as always in a Corps process, you always
12 address the no action or future without project
13 condition. In the Sabine region we have the new levees,
14 flood walls in Orange and Jefferson counties, and, also,
15 improvements to the existing Port Arthur Hurricane Flood
16 Protection System. And, of course, we always look at
17 non-structural alternatives.

18 For the Brazoria region alternatives we have the
19 improvements to the Freeport existing Hurricane Flood
20 Protection System and then non-structural alternatives.

21 So, in Orange and Jefferson counties the CSRSM
22 alternative reaches that we evaluated: Costs, economic
23 benefits, and environmental impact of each of the Orange,
24 Jefferson CSRSM reaches were compared.

25 Orange Reaches 1 and 2, which are up here

1 (indicating). And Beaumont Reach B and C were eliminated
2 from the proposed -- proposed levee system because costs
3 to protect these areas would exceed the economic
4 benefits.

5 For Orange Reach 1, there was an estimated
6 average annual benefits of 275,000 with an average annual
7 cost of over 2 million. If it were expressed in a
8 benefits to cost ratio, it would be a 0.13. And
9 generally in the Corps process we need at least a 1.0 to
10 retain in the plan. So, the benefits to cost has to at
11 least be unity.

12 Orange Reach 2 had an average annual benefit of
13 42,000 and an average annual cost of 1.8 million, with a
14 BCR of 0.02. So, that also fell out.

15 These were compared to Orange Reach 3, which had
16 and an average annual benefit of 24.7 million and an
17 average annual cost of 14.9, or a BCR of 1.65. And that
18 was Orange Reach 3, which is this entire -- entire reach.

19 So, the proposed TSP for the Orange, Jefferson
20 Coastal Storm Risk Management is a 27.2 mile long levee
21 and flood wall system that would be constructed from
22 Interstate 10 at the Sabine River, down the west bank of
23 the river, across the north bank of Sabine Lake, up the
24 east bank of the Neches River to the vicinity of the
25 junction of Orangefield Road and Highway 1135. So,

1 basically that's this area here that I just talked about
2 (indicating).

3 Surge gates on Adams Bayou and Cow Bayou would
4 need to be constructed where the levee system crosses
5 these bayous. Existing navigation would be maintained
6 during and after construction.

7 In addition, an 11-mile long levee and flood
8 wall system would be constructed in northern Jefferson
9 County to connect with high ground near the existing
10 Port Arthur Hurricane Flood Protection Project.
11 Protection northwest of this section is not needed
12 because shoreline elevations are sufficiently high. So,
13 this is the proposed levee system in Jefferson County,
14 which would tie into the existing Hurricane Protection
15 System.

16 The levee flood wall systems would be
17 constructed to a minimum elevation of 11 feet. And
18 elevations during final feasible analysis may result in
19 higher heights of those levees. The alignment as laid
20 out now is tentative, and there's a high likelihood that
21 it will change as a result of public comments and
22 technical reviews. Some residents and structures would
23 likely be impacted by construction of the new system. In
24 the event the project acquires property and displaces
25 residences or businesses, the property would be purchased

1 at the current fair market value and assistance with
2 moving cost would be provided. Relocations of pipelines
3 and utilities would also probably be required.

4 Relocation costs are a non-federal responsibility.

5 And here's just a -- for the Port Arthur
6 Hurricane Protection System, here's a listing of the
7 proposed improvements under the Tentatively Selected Plan
8 moving from north to south.

9 Replacing and raising of railroad and vehicle
10 closure structure and raising 2.3 miles of levee by
11 1 foot at the north end of the Sabine-Neches Canal. So,
12 that's -- that's in this area (indicating).

13 Reinforcing the existing I-wall and raising
14 about 1.3 miles of adjacent levee by 1 foot near a tank
15 farm at the south end of the Sabine-Neches Canal.

16 Reinforcing the existing the I-wall near Valero
17 and raising about a half mile of levee by 1 foot in the
18 Taylor Bayou Basin.

19 And reinforcing the 8 to 10 foot I-wall and
20 raising about one-third of a mile of levee by 1 foot west
21 of Taylor's Bayou.

22 Most of the construction activities would occur
23 within the existing project right-of-way.

24 And, again, this is a tentatively -- a tentative
25 plan. It could change as a result of the ongoing public

1 and technical reviews. At this time we believe the plan
2 may impact some existing structures.

3 For the Freeport vicinity area, the proposed TSP
4 from north to south is raising about 2 1/2 miles of levee
5 along North Oyster Creek by 1 to 3 feet. That would be
6 in here (indicating).

7 Raising about 2 1/2 miles of the east storm
8 levee by 1 foot and constructing a new surge gate and
9 pump station at the mouth of the DOW Barge Canal.
10 Navigation would maintained during the construction.
11 That would be in here (indicating).

12 Raising about a half mile of levee at the DOW
13 Thumb by 1 foot and installing erosion control and scour
14 protection features on about 3 miles of the levee in this
15 area.

16 We would also reconstruct about 700 feet of the
17 Tide Gate I-wall, raising it by 1 foot and raising about
18 4/10 of a mile of adjacent levee by a foot.

19 And we would reconstruct about a half mile of
20 the Freeport dock floodwall.

21 Most of the construction activities would occur
22 within the existing project right-of-way. And, again,
23 this is a tentative plan. It could change as a result of
24 the ongoing public and technical reviews. However, at
25 this point, the plan does not impact any existing

1 structures.

2 For the environmental impact, based on the
3 Tentatively Selective Plan, the Port Arthur, Freeport
4 plans have negligible environmental impacts that would
5 require no mitigation. The Orange, Jefferson CSR plan
6 avoids and minimizes wetland impacts to the greatest
7 extent possible. Trade-offs have been necessary to
8 balance environmental impacts against impacts to homes
9 and businesses.

10 Construction would directly impact about
11 300 acres of wetlands, marshes, and wetland forests.
12 Indirect fisheries access impacts would occur to about
13 2,200 hundred acres of marsh in Adams and Cow Bayou
14 floodplains with installation of flood gates at Adams and
15 Cow Bayou.

16 The value of direct and indirect wetlands impact
17 would have be determined with the Wetlands Value
18 Assessment Model in coordination with resource agencies.

19 No known hazardous or toxic waste releases,
20 violations, or sites of concern would be affected by the
21 construction.

22 No significant impacts to cultural resource --
23 resources are anticipated and no endangered species
24 impacts are expected.

25 We have developed a Conceptual Mitigation Plan.

1 An adverse impact on ecological resources resulting from
2 construction of the TSP have been avoided or minimized to
3 the extent practicable.

4 Further refinements to the plan will occur
5 during final feasible analysis, and efforts will be made
6 to further avoid and reduce these impacts.

7 Remaining unavoidable impacts will be fully
8 mitigated as required by law.

9 The wetlands value assessment modeling will be
10 conducted to quantify the benefits of mitigation
11 measures. Selection of potential mitigation sites and
12 modeling of benefits will be conducted in coordination
13 with the resource agencies.

14 We anticipate that the recommended plan will
15 include impacts to Texas Parks & Wildlife property. We
16 plan to work with Texas Parks & Wildlife so that those
17 impacts will be mitigated on Parks & Wildlife property.

18 The final mitigation plan will be developed and
19 presented in the final Integrated Feasibility Report and
20 EIS.

21 So, we have identified some areas where marsh
22 restoration could occur. And that would -- the marsh
23 restoration evaluation areas have been identified in
24 Bessie Heights and Old River Cove vicinities.

25 Areas targeted for evaluation exclude areas

1 already identified for beneficial use or mitigation in
2 conjunction with other projects.

3 Sediments from regular maintenance dredging of
4 the adjacent Sabine-Neches could be used to restore marsh
5 in areas of open water.

6 For forested wetlands: Areas on the Neches and
7 Sabine Rivers north of Interstate 10 contain large,
8 undeveloped tracts of forested wetlands, including
9 cypress-tupelo swamps and bottomland hardwood -- forest.

10 We will evaluate the acquisition of long-term
11 conservation of forested wetland areas to mitigate
12 impacts of this project. Additional benefits could be
13 earned by making improvements to the forested wetlands
14 conservation areas, such as improving tidal flows in
15 impounded areas or the removing and controlling invasive
16 species such as Chinese tallow.

17 So, what does all this cost? These are
18 preliminary cost estimates. Construction would be cost
19 shared 65 percent federal and 35 percent non-federal.

20 We currently have indications from Orange County
21 and Jefferson County that they would be our non-federal
22 sponsors for the construction of the Orange and Jefferson
23 CSR plan. And Jefferson County Drainage District No. 7
24 could also be the sponsor for the Port Arthur vicinity
25 coastal storm risk management.

1 In Freeport, Velasco Drainage District has
2 indicated an interest in sponsoring improvements to the
3 Freeport vicinity CSRSM plan.

4 And, again, these are preliminary costs. And as
5 we further develop the working up to the recommended
6 plan, these costs will be refined.

7 So, what are our next steps? The final
8 feasibility analysis, after all of the comments are
9 received from all the concurrent reviews, there could be
10 potential changes in the levee alignment location.

11 Development of feasibility level engineering
12 design will occur. An analysis of effects of relative
13 sea-level rise could result in increases to the
14 recommended height and width of new Orange, Jefferson
15 CSRSM plan, and the Port Arthur and Freeport plans.

16 The analysis of potential changes in the
17 environmental impact could occur in development of the
18 environmental mitigation and monitoring plan will be
19 finalized.

20 Now, we wanted to talk a little bit about the
21 relative sea-level change. This table presents a range
22 of estimated increases in sea level by the year 2080 in
23 the Sabine and Brazoria regions. The low, intermediate,
24 and high estimates are based on a landmark National
25 Resource Council study from 1987. The high rate is

1 within the range predicted by current studies.

2 In the Sabine region the relative sea-level
3 rise could range from about 1 foot to about 3 and a
4 quarter feet. And in Brazoria, it can range from about
5 three-quarters of a foot to about 3 feet by 2080.

6 These future projections will be taken into
7 account when developing the levee and floodwall heights
8 for the final recommended plan.

9 So, our schedule for the study completion is in
10 front of you. This is -- to complete the study, we
11 anticipate releasing the final Integrated Feasibility
12 Report and EIS for State and Agency Review in August of
13 next year. However, we want to say if the public and
14 technical reviews that are ongoing right now result in
15 significant changes to the TSP, another public comment
16 may be warranted. The potential additional comment
17 period is not included in the schedule that you see here.
18 It would delay the completion of the report.

19 When the final Feasibility Report is completed,
20 notices will be mailed to everyone who has expressed an
21 interest or is an affected landowner, and copies of the
22 final report will be available on the Galveston District
23 website.

24 We are currently collecting comments. Comments
25 must be submitted by October 26th. And we have an

1 address where you can submit your comments to; or if you
2 have comments, you can write them down. We have comment
3 forms and a comment box at the back of the room, or you
4 can come up after I'm done and say your comment tonight
5 if you have -- if you have any.

6 And I believe that's the end of the
7 presentation. Now we'll start the public comment period.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you leave
9 Slide 26 up.

10 MS. TIRPAK: Yeah, we can leave Slide 26
11 up.

12 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: Okay. For
13 the record, I'm told that no one has indicated on the
14 sign-in sheet that they would like to speak. I would
15 like to offer the opportunity to the representative from
16 the Texas Department. Sir, do you wish to --

17 MR. DENTON: I didn't bring any prepared
18 comments.

19 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: Okay.
20 Mr. Jackson?

21 MR. JACKSON: No. We've made our comments
22 many times.

23 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: And
24 Mr. Wolfe?

25 MR. WOLFE: The only concern I would

1 have -- and I don't know the intimate details about where
2 the study has been thus far. So, it may have been
3 addressed. But we have numerous storm sewer pipes.
4 They're old pipes. They are pipes that were put in by
5 the Navy back during the second World War along the
6 Sabine River. And we can't account for all of them. And
7 occasionally I'll find -- I'll stumble across an old map
8 and see evidence of where one might be. But over the
9 years there's -- there's quite a few storm sewer pipes
10 that connect the storm sewer systems within the city of
11 Orange to the Sabine River and in some cases even Adams
12 Bayou.

13 Since about 1950 the city of Orange and over
14 three or four drainage studies that I'm aware of -- and
15 I've only been with the city about 17 years. So, some of
16 it is just digging around through old manuals and books
17 and studies. But where they knew that they had these
18 storm sewer pipes that connected to either Adams Bayou or
19 the Sabine River, they provided for a stop log gap of
20 some kind or a flat gate or a closed gate mechanism. So,
21 I would -- I would ask that that be taken into
22 consideration.

23 And the information I have I'll be happy to
24 share it with anybody. This would be most applicable
25 along -- immediately south of I-10 as you work down

1 the -- that east bank of the Sabine River -- the west
2 bank -- excuse me -- all the way down into that shipyard.
3 And years ago -- I have an old photograph that years ago
4 that Navy shipyard had its own retaining wall in there
5 for -- for some degree of flood protection.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. STOKES: It still shows up on the topo
8 map.

9 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: Okay. Thank
10 you.

11 I'd like to offer any members of the general
12 public who wish to make a statement.

13 (NO RESPONSE)

14 LIEUTENANT COLONEL ERICKSON: Okay. In
15 conclusion, written comments on the draft of the
16 Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact
17 Statement must be received on or before October 26th of
18 2015, the conclusion of the 45-day comment period that
19 began on September 11, 2015.

20 I'd like to thank the Texas General Land office
21 for their efforts and assistance in preparing for and
22 holding this meeting. I thank you for your attendance
23 and the interest that all of you have shown tonight.

24 This meeting is adjourned.

25 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:36 P.M.)

1 THE STATE OF TEXAS XX
2 COUNTY OF JEFFERSON XX
3

4 I, TAMARA CASTILLE DEROUEN, a Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter, hereby certify that I reported the U.S. Army
6 Corps of Engineers Public Meeting, and that the foregoing
7 26 pages contain and constitute a true and correct
8 transcript of my shorthand notes taken on October 6,
9 2015.

10

11 To which I certify on this the 23rd day
12 of October, 2015.

13

14



15

TAMARA CASTILLE DEROUEN, Texas CSR No. 3700

16

Expiration Date: December 31, 2016

17

Nell McCallum & Associates, Inc.

18

Firm Registration No. 143

19

2615 Calder, Suite 111

20

Beaumont, Texas 77702

21

(409) 838-0333/FAX (409) 832-4501

22

23

24

25