Appendix E

Informational Videos

Study Overview Video

coastalstudy.texas.gov

or

www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=6XyVyqN8sVk

Tentatively Selected Plan Video

https://youtu.be/loVOog0fsp8
Appendix F

Meeting Presentation
COASTAL TX PROTECTION AND RESTORATION FEASIBILITY STUDY

Public Meetings
Dr. Kelly A. Burks-Copes, Project Manager
US Army Corps of Engineers
Galveston District

Lower Coast: November 27-29, 2018
Upper Coast: December 11-18, 2018

*The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.*
Why are we here?

1. **Provide** a status update on the study
2. **Describe** the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process
3. **Describe** the USACE study process
4. **Identify** the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP)
5. **Describe** the potential impacts, costs, & benefits of the TSP
6. **Receive** public comments
WHERE WE ARE TODAY

SCOPING
- Get Public Input

ALTERNATIVES FORMULATION
- Conduct Analysis

DRAFT REPORT
- Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) May 2018
- Public Review & Comment

RECOMMEND PLAN
- Agency Decision Milestone (ADM) Mar 2019

FINAL REPORT
- Chief's Report Feb 2021
- Provide Recommendation to Congress

Upcoming Public Meetings:
- Lower Coast: Nov 2018
- Upper Coast: Dec 2018
75-day review period
- Began: October 26, 2018
- Concludes: January 9, 2019

- Inviting public comment is required by NEPA
- All comments are welcome – positive or negative
- Remember: The more specific your feedback, the easier it will be for us to understand and address the issue(s)
- Public and agency input informs decisions
- All comments are fully evaluated prior to decision making
- Review & comment ensures decisions are based on the best available information
PROBLEMS

- Economic damage from coastal storm surge
- Inland shoreline erosion
- Gulf shoreline erosion
- Loss of T&E Critical Habitats
- Loss of Natural Delta Processes
- Disrupted Hydrology
**PROJECT GOALS & OBJECTIVES**

**Goals**

**Coastal Storm Risk Management (CSRM)**
Develop and evaluate coastal storm damage risk reduction measures for coastal Texas residents, industries and businesses which are critical to the nation’s economy.

**Ecosystem Restoration (ER)**
Increase the net quantity and quality of coastal ecosystem resources by maintaining, protecting, and restoring coastal Texas ecosystems and fish and wildlife habitat.

**Objectives**

- **Reduce economic damage** from coastal storm surge flooding to business, residents and infrastructure through 2085.
- **Reduce risk to critical infrastructure** (e.g. medical centers, government facilities, universities, and schools) from coastal storm surge flooding to the maximum extent practical and reduce emergency costs.
- **Reduce risk to public health and safety** from storm surge.
- **Increase the resilience** of communities, the economy, coastal ecosystems, and infrastructure, including existing coastal storm risk reduction systems, from sea level rise and coastal storm surge.
- **Enhance and restore coastal landforms** along Galveston Island and Bolivar Peninsula that contribute to reducing the risks of coastal storm surge damages.
- **Improve hydrologic connectivity** of area wetlands in the Texas-Louisiana coastal marshes, mid-coast barrier islands and coastal marshes.
- **Improve and sustain coastal marshes and bay shorelines** on barrier island and estuarine systems.
NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Population Centers
- 18 coastal counties
- 6.1 million residents
- >24% of the TX population

Navigation
- Nationally ranked deep-draft ports
  - Houston
  - Beaumont
  - Corpus Christi
  - Texas City
- 450 miles of Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW)

Industry
- 40% of the Nation’s petrochemical industry
- 25% of national petroleum-refining capacity

Critical Infrastructure
- NASA
- UTMB – Level 4 Viral Laboratory
SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCES

- **Critical coastal ecosystems** including wetlands, seagrass beds, oyster reefs, and sea turtle nesting habitat
- **Critical Habitat** threatened and endangered species
- 2 of 28 **National Estuary Program sites** - Galveston & Corpus Christi Bays
- **Central Flyway Migration Corridor**
- The **Laguna Madre** - a rare hypersaline lagoon
- **Nursery habitat** and **significant commercial fisheries** for oysters, shrimp, and finfish
- **Padre Island National Seashore**
- **12 National Wildlife Refuges**
USACE PLAN FORMULATION

- In USACE-speak, . . .
  - **Features** => levees, marshes, gates, etc
  - **Actions** => restoration, construction, raisings, etc
  - **Treatments** => nourishments, plantings, etc

- Are combined to produce **Measures**

- Combinations of Measures generate **Alternatives**
1. Data was produced by:
   - NOAA Sea Level Rise Viewer
   - Texas Shoreline Change Rates
   - National Structure Inventory Database
   - FEMA Inundation Mapping
   - NOAA’s Sea Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) Model

2. Features/actions/treatments were developed based on existing & past studies from:
   - GCCPRD
   - Texas A&M
   - SSPEED Center
   - USACE
   - GLO

3. AND from scoping meetings held in 2014.

4. Measures were then formulated meet the goals and objectives.
MEASURE SCREENING

Project Area (Coastal Zone)
Authorized Study Area
Regional Planning Units
- Region 1
- Region 2
- Region 3
- Region 4

Map showing regions:
- Region 1
- Region 2
- Region 3
- Region 4

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Evaluated</th>
<th>Carried Forward</th>
<th>Evaluated</th>
<th>Carried Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Evaluation & Comparisons

Feasibility studies evaluate alternatives to identify a plan that are:

✓ Engineeringly sound
✓ Environmentally acceptable
✓ Economically justified

MODELING TOOL
ERDC's Coastal Storm Modeling System (CSTORM-MS) is a system of highly-resolved numerical models, which are used to simulate coastal storm waves and water levels.

RESPONSE FROM A REPRESENTATIVE STORM
CAT 4 storm, (CP: 95 mb, Rmax: 24.5 nm). Maximum wind speeds reached 152 mph. Landfall was just south of Galveston Island but north of Freeport, TX, with an almost perpendicular angle of coastline. Significant reduction in storm surge has been observed with alternative A.
ALTERNATIVE A: COASTAL BARRIER

Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study

Alternative A
- Navigation and Environmental Gates
- Levees/Floodwalls
- Galveston Ring Levee
- Galveston Seawall Improvements
- Galveston Island Nonstructural Improvements
- Nonstructural Improvements

*One or both of these features may be selected*
Plan A

- Region wide CSRM system **focusing on all benefit categories**, Measured and Unmeasurable
- Provides **risk reduction** to the regions **critical navigation features**
- Potential induced damages in areas **where structures are already raised**
- The **Galveston Ring Levee** is only needed to address **wind driven surges** from the north.
- **As the regions population expands** westward and eastward the system provides **some level of risk reduction**
- **Maintains** the regions critical landscape features
- Provides **risk reduction to the regions evacuation routes**
- **System can easily be adapted** to address extreme events due the bay’s storage capacity

Plan D2

- Region wide CSRM system **focusing on dense industrial and commercial benefit area**
- **Leaves** the regions **critical navigation features outside of the system**
- Potential induced damages in areas **where surge can flank the system**
- The **Galveston Ring Levee** to address **wind driven surges** from the north AND induced stages
- **As the regions population expands** westward and eastward the system **leaves the population out**
- **System could be closed off** to address nuisance flooding if RSLR becomes an issue
- **Under extreme events** when the system is overtopped the area is immediately **inundated**, increasing the life safety risk
• Beneficial Use (BU) of dredge material has been used historically to offset long term erosion since 1988

• BU efforts uncertain when timing and funding is limited

• 2 miles of 12.5’ x 100’ dune

• 10-year renourishment cycles
Coast-wide system of ecosystem restoration and storm-risk management features

TSP supports the resilience of coastal communities and natural habitats in Coastal Texas

Coastwide:
Large scale ER features which focus on critical landscape features and areas of threatened biologically diverse ecosystems

Lower Coast:
CSRM Dune and beach restoration project on South Padre Island

Upper Coast:
CSRM surge barrier system to protect the Houston-Galveston Region (Coastal Spine)
TSP TOTAL PROJECT COST

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST FOR TSP
$23B - $32B

COASTWIDE ER MEASURES
ER (ALT 1-2) = $8.9B – $11.9B

LOWER COASTWIDE CSRM MEASURES
SOUTH PADRE ISLAND
(REACHES 3 & 4) = $71.6M – $83.1M

UPPER COASTWIDE CSRM MEASURES
ALTERNATIVE A
(COASTAL BARRIER) = $14.2B – $19.9B
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS & MITIGATION

• Direct Impacts
  Alt A (TSP): 4,525.3 acres
  Alt D2: 2,334.3 acres
  South Padre: 365.8 acres

• Indirect Impacts:
  • Altered tidal exchange
  • Reduced velocities in Galveston Bay

• Ecosystem Restoration Benefits
  • 160,000 acres of marsh, islands, dunes, beaches & oyster reefs

TOTAL MITIGATION COST RANGE:
$676 M – $906 M
ALTERNATIVE A: COASTAL BARRIER
PHASED DESIGN & OPTIMIZATION

Coastal Texas Study DIFR-EIS
- Used for Baseline Design and Cost development for alternative identification and evaluation
- Used to inform baseline Environmental Impacts
- Based on known designs and risk, based on existing projects

Focus on Scaling Measures and Features
- Continue to focus on avoiding, minimizing and reducing environmental impacts
- Focus on Risk and Reliability
- Focus on Operation Concerns
- Focus on Construction Cost Concerns

Conceptual Design Features

Conceptual Design Drawings

Conceptual Construction Position Within Navigation Areas
NEXT STEPS

ESTIMATED PROJECT SCHEDULE

Study Complete - Request Congressional Authorization for Project(s) 2021

Local Sponsor(s) Maintain Project

Congressional Appropriations for Authorized Projects

STUDY

DESIGN

BUILD

MAINTAIN

2-5 Years AFTER Authorization (Estimated)

10-15 Years Dependent on Congress (Estimated)

50+ Years (Project Life)

WE ARE HERE
COMMENT SUBMISSION OPTIONS

#1 - Attend a Public Meeting

Lower Coast
27-Nov | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Port Lavaca
Bauer Community Center
2300 TX-35, Port Lavaca, TX 77979

28-Nov | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Corpus Christi
Harte Research Institute Texas A&M Corpus Christi
6300 Ocean Drive, Corpus Christi, TX 78412

29-Nov | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Port Isabel
Port Isabel Event & Cultural Center
309 Railroad Avenue, Port Isabel, TX 78578

Upper Coast
11-Dec | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Winnie
Winnie Community Building
335 South Park Street, Winnie, TX 77665

12-Dec | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Galveston
Galveston Island Convention Center
5600 Seawall Blvd, Galveston, TX 77551

15-Dec | 1:00pm – 4:00pm | Crystal Beach
Crenshaw Elementary and Middle School
416 State Hwy 87, Crystal Beach, TX 77650

18-Dec | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Seabrook
Bay Area Community Center
5002 E NASA Parkway, Seabrook, TX 77586

#2 - Send a Letter

MAIL TO:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Galveston District
Attn: Ms. Jennifer Morgan
Environmental Compliance Branch
Regional Planning and Environmental Center
P.O. Box 1229
Galveston, TX 77553-1229

Deadline:
January 9, 2019

#3 - Send an Email

CoastalTexas@usace.army.mil
Coastal Texas Protection & Restoration Feasibility Study

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in partnership with the Texas General Land Office, began an examination in November 2015 of the feasibility of constructing projects for coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration along the Texas coast.

The Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study, also known as the Coastal Texas Study, will involve engineering, economic and environmental analyses on large-scale projects, which may be considered by Congress for authorization and funding.

The feasibility study and report will be complete in 2021. The Coastal Texas Study recommendations will enhance resiliency in coastal communities and improve our capabilities to prepare for, resist, recover and adapt to coastal hazards.
Appendix G

Meeting Photographs
Public meetings were held for the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study in November and December 2018. The public meetings were held in a combined open house and town hall style.

Upon arrival, attendees were asked to complete an attendee card and were provided with meeting materials including an agenda, comment form, and study summary handout.
During the open house portion of the meeting, attendees were invited to view the informational displays arranged around the meeting space.

Attendees were encouraged to discuss the study with available study team representatives.
Study team representatives were available to answer questions at each of the informational displays.

Attendees were encouraged to view the approximately 20-minute-long informational video about the study’s Tentatively Selected Plan. The informational study video was played on a loop during the open house portion of the meeting.
Following the open house, a study overview video was presented to attendees before beginning the formal presentation.

At the conclusion of the study overview video presentation, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Galveston District provided opening remarks to the meeting attendees.
The Texas General Land Office also provided opening remarks before beginning the formal presentation.

Following opening remarks, the USACE Project Manager for the study gave a formal presentation that included information about the study focus, plan formulation, alternatives for consideration, study alternatives, the TSP, effects on environmental quality, and the study process.
At the conclusion of the formal presentation, attendees had the opportunity to provide oral comments. Commenters were given one minute to speak and were called in the order in which they registered.

Oral comments were recorded and documented by certified court reporter during each public meeting.
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Public Notices & Stakeholder Mailing List
Federal Register Notice of Availability
BILLING CODE: 3720-58

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Joint Notice of Availability for the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study Draft
Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District (USACE) announces the release of the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (DIFR-EIS) for the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study, Texas. The DIFR-EIS documents the existing condition of environmental resources in and around areas considered for development, and potential impacts on those resources as a result of implementing the alternatives.

This public notice is also issued for the purpose of advising all known interested parties that there is pending before the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) a decision on water quality certification. A copy of the public notice, with a description of work, has been made available for review in the TCEQ's Austin office.

DATES: USACE will accept written public comments on the DIFR-EIS from October 26, 2018 to January 9, 2019. Comments on the DIFR-EIS must be postmarked by January 9, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Public comments can be mailed to: USACE, Galveston District, Attn: Mrs. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental Compliance Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental
Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553-1229 or emailed to

CoastalTexas@usace.army.mil. See website: http://coastalstudy.texas.gov/ for additional
information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mrs. Jennifer Morgan, (409) 766-3131.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: The lead agency for this proposed action is the USACE. This study has been
prepared under the standing authority of Section 4091, Water Resources Development Act of
2007, Public Law 110-114. The non-Federal sponsor is the Texas General Land Office.

Background: This DIFR-EIS was prepared as required by the National Environmental
Policy Act (NEPA) to present an evaluation of potential impacts associated with the Coastal
Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study (Coastal Texas) TSP. The USACE and the
non-Federal sponsor for the study, the Texas General Land Office (GLO), have conducted this
study and prepared the DIFR-EIS.

The study area for the Coastal Texas Study consists of the entire Texas Gulf coast from
the mouth of the Sabine River to the mouth of the Rio Grande, and includes the Gulf and tidal
waters, barrier islands, estuaries, coastal wetlands, rivers and streams, borrow sources, and
adjacent areas that make up the interrelated ecosystems along the coast of Texas. The study area
encompasses 18 coastal counties along the Gulf coast and bayfronts.

This report presents the proposed alternatives that would reduce the risk of storm damage to
industries and businesses critical to the Nation’s economy and protect the health and safety of Texas
coastal communities. The study analyzed alternatives that involved structural and nonstructural
measures. Additionally, the report discusses alternatives intended to address critical coastal
ecosystems in need of restoration, including wetlands, seagrass beds, sea turtle nesting habitat, piping
plover critical habitat, and bird rookery islands, as well as numerous Federal and State wildlife refuges.

**Tentatively Selected Plan:** The TSP consists of the Coastal Barrier Coastal Storm Risk Management (CSRM) System, South Padre Island CSRM measure, and a comprehensive set of ecosystem restoration (ER) measures. The Coastal Barrier is a risk reduction system made up of the following features: floodwalls, floodgates, seawall improvements, drainage structures, pump stations, and surge barrier gates. One fundamental feature of the TSP is surge barrier structures that include floating sector gates for navigation traffic and environmental lift gates across the span at Bolivar Roads between Bolivar Peninsula and Galveston Island. The alternative includes four reaches: Eastern Tie-in Reach, Bolivar Peninsula Reach, Galveston Ring Levee/Floodwall Reach, and West Galveston Island Reach in addition to features located at Clear Creek Channel and Dickinson Bayou. The South Padre Island CSRM measure consists of approximately 2.2 miles of dune and beach restoration along the barrier island on the Gulf, including renourishment cycles. The ER component of the TSP has been formulated to address the habitat loss and degradation from coastal processes. ER measures restore and create habitat and support structural CSRMs by providing a natural buffer from coastal storms. ER measures proposed in this study include a combination of features formulated in specific geographic locations to restore diverse habitats and coastal features that provide multiple lines of defense against coastal storms and long term coastal processes. Restoration measures include beach and dune complexes, oyster reefs, bird rookery islands, wetland and marsh complexes, and protection of submerged aquatic vegetation.

A final decision will be made following the reviews and higher-level coordination within the USACE to select a plan for feasibility-level design and recommendation for implementation.
The decision will be documented in the Final Integrated Feasibility Report (FIFR)-EIS. Coordination with the natural resource agencies will continue throughout the study process.

**Project Impacts and Environmental Compliance:** Preliminary studies indicate that the recommended plan’s surge barrier gates (proposed as features of the Coastal Barrier) may alter wetland functions by constricting tidal exchange and associated sediment transport, altering hydrosalinity gradients, reducing flow into and out of Galveston Bay, and increasing velocities near the gate openings at specific times. The TSP was formulated to reduce the risk of damages from coastal storms as well as avoid disturbance to environmentally significant resources. Where impacts could not be avoided, they were quantified, and a conceptual mitigation plan was formulated. Impacts would be fully compensated with the restoration of palustrine and estuarine emergent marsh in the amount determined during final feasibility planning. The Coastal Barrier would provide a level of protection to tidal and freshwater wetlands north of the barrier location by serving as a physical barrier against storm surge during coastal storms. The South Padre Island CSRM feature would restore the beach and dune complex; therefore, providing reduced risk to the area while sustaining and increasing beach habitat, and helping preserve existing wetland habitat on the bayside of the measure. Ecosystem restoration measures would restore the natural features of the Texas coast that provide habitat for many Federally threatened and endangered species and State species of concern. These measures will also maintain a natural buffer for upland areas from coastal processes, relative sea level rise (RSLR), and storm surge, while stabilizing the coastline by absorbing energy from waves and vessel wakes.

The DIFR-EIS presents an evaluation of the potential impacts to soils, waterbottoms, water quality, protected wildlife species, benthic organisms, essential fish habitat, coastal barrier resources, air quality, and noise. Additionally, potential impacts to floodplains, flood control,
protected/managed lands, and minority or low-income populations have been evaluated. Steps
would be taken to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any potential impacts to the best extent
practicable. The USACE is proposing to execute a Programmatic Agreement among USACE,
the Texas State Historic Preservation Office, and any NFS, in coordination with the Advisory
Council on Historic Preservation and Tribal Nations, to address the identification and discovery
of cultural resources that may occur during the construction and maintenance of proposed or
existing facilities.

Solicitation of Comments: The USACE is soliciting comments from the public, Federal,
State, and local agencies, elected officials, Tribal Nations, and other interested parties in order to
consider and evaluate the impacts of this proposed activity. Comments will be used in
preparation of the FIFR-EIS. Any comments concerning water quality certification may be
submitted to the TCEQ, 401 Coordinator, MSC-150, P.O. Box 13087, Austin, Texas 78711-
3087.

Meetings: The Galveston District will hold public meetings at 5:30 p.m. for the DIFR-
EIS on the following dates and locations: November 27, 2018 at Bauer Community Center,
2300 TX-35, Port Lavaca, TX 77979; November 28, 2018 at Harte Research Institute at Texas
A&M Corpus Christi, 6300 Ocean Dr, Corpus Christi, TX 78412; November 29, 2018 at Port
Isabel Event & Cultural Center, 309 Railroad Ave, Port Isabel, TX 78578; December 11, 2018
at Winnie Community Building, 335 South Park St, Winnie, TX 77665; December 12, 2018 at
Galveston Island Convention Center, 5600 Seawall Blvd, Galveston, TX 77551; and December
18, 2018 at Bay Area Community Center, 5002 E NASA Parkway, Seabrook, TX 77586.

Document Availability: Compact disc copies of the DIFR-EIS are available for viewing
at county libraries throughout the 18 county study area. The document can also be viewed and

[Signature]

Lars N. Zetterstrom, P.E.
Colonel, U.S. Army
Commanding
Mailed Notices
JOINT NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY
DRAFT INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT &
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE PROPOSED U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY, TEXAS
October 2018

The public is hereby notified of the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (DIFR-EIS) for the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study, Texas prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District (USACE) in partnership with the Texas General Land Office. The study was Authorized by Congress in Section 4091, Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law [P.L.] 110-114), as amended. The report will be available at the following URL address:

http://coastalstudy.texas.gov/

Compact disc (CD) copies of the report can be requested from Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental Compliance Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553-1229. In addition, CDs of the report are available for viewing at the following libraries:

- Rosenberg Library, 2310 Sealy St, Galveston, TX 77550
- Friendswood Public Library, 416 S Friendswood Dr., Friendswood, TX 77546
- Moore Memorial Public Library, 1701 9th Ave N, Texas City, TX 77590
- La Porte Library, 600 S Broadway St., La Porte, TX 77571
- La Marque Public Library, 1111 Bayou Road, La Marque, TX 77568
- Deer Park Library, 3009 Center Street, Deer Park, TX 77536
- Mae S Bruce Library, 13302 6th St, Santa Fe, TX 77510
- Pasadena Central Public Library, 1201 Jeff Ginn Memorial Dr., Pasadena, TX 77506
- Hitchcock Public Library, 8005 Barry Ave, Hitchcock, TX 77563
- Sterling Municipal Library, 1 Mary Elizabeth Wilbanks Ave, Baytown, TX 77520
- Dickinson Public Library, 4411 TX-3, Dickinson, TX 77539
• North Channel Library, 15741 Wallisville Road, Houston, TX 77049
• Evelyn Meador Library, 2400 North Meyer Avenue, Seabrook, TX 77586
• Chambers County Library, 202 Cummings Street, Anahuac, TX 77514
• Helen Hall Public Library, 100 W. Walker, League City, TX 77573
• Freeport Branch Library, 410 Brazosport Blvd., Freeport, TX 77541
• Clear Lake City-County Freeman Branch Library, 16616 Diana Ln, Houston, TX 77062
• Clute Branch Library, 215 North Shanks, Clute, TX 77531
• Lake Jackson Library, 250 Circle Way, Lake Jackson, TX 77566
• Aransas County Public Library, 701 E Mimosa St, Rockport, TX 78382
• Ed & Hazel Richmond Public Library, 110 N Lamont St., Aransas Pass, TX 78336
• Ellis Memorial Library, 700 W Ave A, Port Aransas, TX 78373
• Bay City Public Library, 1100 7th St, Bay City, TX 77414
• Port Isabel Public Library, 213 North Yturria St, Port Isabel, TX 78578
• Brazoria Library, 620 South Brooks Street, Brazoria, TX 77422
• Ingleside Public Library, 2775 Waco Street, Ingleside, TX 78362
• Sweeny Library, 205 West Ashley Wilson Road, Sweeny, TX 77480
• Bell Whittington Public Library, 2400 Memorial Pkwy, Portland, TX 78374
• Palacios Library, 326 Main Street, Palacios, TX 77465
• Corpus Christi Cllr-Times Library, 820 North Lower Broadway St, Corpus Christi, TX 78401
• Calhoun County Branch Library, 1 Lamar Street #1, Point Comfort, TX 77978
• Reber Memorial Library, 190 North 4th Street, Raymondville, TX 78580
• Laguna Vista Public Library, 1300 Palm Blvd, Laguna Vista, TX 78578
• Anita and W.T. Neyland Public Library, 1230 Carmel Parkway, Corpus Christi, TX 78401
Information meetings will be held along the Texas Coast during the public comment period:

- 5:30 PM - Tuesday, November 27, 2018 - Bauer Community Center, 2300 TX-35, Port Lavaca, TX 77979
- 5:30 PM - Wednesday, November 28, 2018 - Harte Research Institute at Texas A&M Corpus Christi, 6300 Ocean Dr., Corpus Christi, TX 78412
- 5:30 PM - Thursday, November 29, 2018 - Port Isabel Event & Cultural Center, 309 Railroad Ave, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- 5:30 PM - Tuesday, December 11, 2018 - Winnie Community Building, 335 South Park St, Winnie, TX 77665
- 5:30 PM - Wednesday, December 12, 2018 - Galveston Island Convention Center, 5600 Seawall Blvd, Galveston, TX 77551
- 5:30 PM - Tuesday, December 18, 2018 - Bay Area Community Center, 5002 E NASA Parkway, Seabrook, TX 77586

The USACE will accept written public comments on the integrated report for a 75-day period starting on October 26, 2018 and continuing through January 9, 2019. Comments on the report must be postmarked by January 9, 2019. You may send written comments or questions to the USACE, Galveston District, Attn: Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental Compliance Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553-1229, or you may email comments to: CoastalTexas@usace.army.mil

This public notice is also issued for the purpose of advising all known interested parties that there is pending before the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) a decision on water quality certification. Any comments concerning this application may be submitted to the TCEQ, 401 Coordinator, MSC-150, P.O. Box 13087, Austin, Texas 78711-3087. A copy of the public notice, with a description of work, has been made available for review in the TCEQ’s Austin office.

Date

Lars N. Zetterstrom, P.E.
Colonel, U.S. Army
Commanding
OFFICIAL BUSINESS
ATTN: CESWF-PEC-CC
Stakeholder Mailing List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUTJAK, LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANG, MERCEDES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANGNEY, KAY &amp; PATRICK J BOOMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANNER, TROY LEE &amp; JENNELLE KAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR, BETTY S, Est C/O SCOTT MILLER EXEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR, JAMES F &amp; PAMELA A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR, MICHAEL C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER, LAURENCE M, Jr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLE, WALTER S &amp; KAY F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPLETON, JOHN FOSTER &amp; ALLIE CHENG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERAN, JOSE L, MIERY &amp; KIMBERLY A VERNON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS DIVERSIFICATIONS LLC C/ORICHARD ROSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS FIRST BANK GALVESTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS FROG FEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS, CHARLES RAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS, EUGENIA MCDONALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS, GAYLYNN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVIS, NELLIE R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREVINO, REYNALDO R &amp; MARIA I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIBBLE, RICKY &amp; CYNTHIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUONG, NGA N &amp; TUYET N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURCO, STEVE &amp; MERRI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGA, OTTMAR TED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERDUN, DAVID RENE &amp; ERIC WADE VERDUN AND GERALD ANDRE’ VERDUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERRILL, MICHAEL &amp; LORA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEST, ROLLIN C &amp; MARY L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEZOS, EVDOKIA &amp; LEONIDAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICKERS, RODNEY C &amp; LAURA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICKERY, DUANE TR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICKERY, DUANE TRUSTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLA, DE MATEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRATIS, GEORGE &amp; LINDA CAREY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU, DAVID H &amp; CHRISTINA HAI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&amp;J SMITH FAMILY PRTNSHIP LTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Newspaper Notices

Anahuac Progress – The Vindicator – November 13, 2018
Brownsville Herald – November 9, 2018
Corpus Christi Caller Times – November 11, 2018
Galveston County Daily News – November 8, 2018
Houston Chronicle – November 9, 2018
Port Isabel-South Padre Press, November 9, 2018
Port Lavaca Wave – November 14, 2018
Valley Morning Star – November 9, 2018
Victoria Advocate – November 9, 2018
PUBLISHER'S AFFIDAVIT
State of Texas
County of Liberty

BEFORE ME, THE Undersigned Notary, Jennifer Richardson
ON THIS 13 Nov., 2012, PERSONALLY APPEARED
Calynn Owens, KNOWN TO ME TO BE A CREDIBLE PERSON AND OF
LAWFUL AGE, WHO BEING BY ME FIRST Duly SWORN, ON HIS/HER OATH, DEPOSES
AND SAYS:

The attached: Public Meeting
Approved by: Crouch Enuro
Appeared in THE VINDICATOR, a newspaper printed in LIBERTY, with General Circulation in
LIBERTY COUNTY, Texas for ONE week(s).
Starting: 11/09 and ending: 11/16.
Publisher's Cost: $423.50

Names: Calynn Owens (Publisher's Rep.)
Signed: Calynn Owens (Publisher's Rep.)

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME ON THE 13 day of Nov.,
2012, BY Calynn Owens [name of affiant]

[Personalized Seal]
JENNIFER GRAY RICHARDSON
Notary Public, State of Texas
Comm. Expires 10-06-2022
Notary ID 128406479

Jennifer Richardson
Notary Public's Signature
PUBLISHER'S AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF CAMERON

I Jose Andres Carrizales, being duly sworn on his oath states that he is a representative of The Brownsville Herald and that the attached notice appeared in the following issues:

Date: NOVEMBER 09, 2018

Acct: 83005008 CROUCH ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES / COASTAL TEXAS PUBLIC MEETING NOTICES

Ticket: 30107283

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this the 9th day of November 2018.

Notary Public, Cameron County
State of Texas
Certificate of Publication

In Matter of Publication of:

CROUCH ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.
402 TEETSHORN STREET
HOUSTON, TX 77009

State of Wisconsin
County of Brown

I, being first duly sworn, upon oath depose and say that I am a legal clerk and employee of the publisher, namely, the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, a daily newspaper published at Corpus Christi in said City and State, generally circulated in Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Duval, Jim Wells, Kleberg, Live Oak, Nueces, Refugio, and San Patricio Counties, and that the publication of which the annexed is a true copy, was inserted in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times on the following dates:

November 11, 2018

[Signature]
Legal Clerk

On this November 12, 2018, I certify that the attached document is a true and exact copy made by publisher.

[Signature]
Notary Public, State of Wisconsin, County of Brown

Ad#: 2160904
P.O.:
# of Affidavits: 0
The public is hereby notified of the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (DIFR-EIS) for the Tentatively Selected Plan of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District (USACE) in partnership with the Texas General Land Office, Authorized by Congress in Section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law [P.L.] 110-114), as amended, the draft report investigates and recommends efforts to reduce the risk of coastal storm damage to properties and businesses critical to the Nation’s economy and increase resiliency of Texas coastal communities. The report is available to view and download at: http://coastalstudy.texas.gov

The report is available for viewing at the following libraries:
- Rosenberg Library, 2310 Seabrook St, Galveston, TX 77550
- Friendswood Public Library, 416 S Friendswood Dr, Friendswood, TX 77546
- Moore Memorial Public Library, 1701 9th Ave N, Texas City, TX 77590
- La Porte Library, 600 S Broadway St, La Porte, TX 77571
- La Marque Public Library, 1111 Bayou Rd, La Marque, TX 77568
- Deer Park Library, 3090 Center St, Deer Park, TX 77536
- Mae S Bruce Library, 13302 6th St, Santa Fe, TX 77510
- Pasadena Central Public Library, 201 Jeff Gunn Memorial Dr, Pasadena, TX 77506
- Hitchcock Public Library, 6005 Barry Ave, Hitchcock, TX 77563
- Sterling Municipal Library, 1 Mary Elizabeth Willbanks Ave, Baytown, TX 77520
- Dickinson Public Library, 4411 TX-3, Dickinson, TX 77539
- North Channel Library, 15741 Wallisville Rd, Houston, TX 77049
- Evelyn Meador Library, 2400 North Meyer Ave, Seabrook, TX 77586
- Chambers County Library, 202 Cummings St, Anahuac, TX 77514
- Helen Hall Public Library, 100 W. Walker, League City, TX 77573
- Freeport Branch Library, 410 Brazosport Blvd, Freeport, TX 77541
- Clear Lake City-County Freeman Branch Library, 16616 Diana Ln, Houston, TX 77062
- Clute Branch Library, 215 North Shanks, Clute, TX 77531
- Lake Jackson Library, 250 Circle Way, Lake Jackson, TX 77566

Aransas Pass, TX 78336
- Ellis Memorial Library, 700 W Ave A, Port Aransas, TX 78373
- Bay Area Public Library, 1100 7th St, Bay City, TX 77714
- Port Isabel Public Library, 213 North Yturia St, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- Brazoria Library, 620 South Brooks St, Brazoria, TX 77422
- Ingleside Public Library, 2775 Waco St, Ingleside, TX 78362
- Sweeny Library, 205 West Ashley Wilson Road, Sweeny, TX 77480
- Bell Whittington Public Library, 2400 Memorial Pkwy, Portland, TX 78374
- Palacios Library, 326 Main St, Palacios, TX 77465
- Corpus Christi Caller-Times Library, 820 North Lower Broadway St, Corpus Christi, TX 78401
- Calhoun County Branch Library, 1 Lamar St #1, Point Comfort, TX 77779
- Reber Memorial Library, 190 North 4th St, Raymondville, TX 78580
- Laguna Vista Public Library, 1300 Palm Blvd, Laguna Vista, TX 78578
- Anita and WT. Neyland Public Library, 1230 Carmel Pkwy, Corpus Christi, TX 78401

Seven public information meetings will be held along the Texas coast during the public comment period:
- Tuesday, November 27, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Bauer Community Center, 2300 TX-35, Port Lavaca, TX 77979
- Wednesday, November 28, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Harte Research Institute at Texas A&M Corpus Christi, 6300 Ocean Dr, Corpus Christi, TX 78412
- Thursday, November 29, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Port Isabel Event & Cultural Center, 309 Railroad Ave, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- Tuesday, December 11, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Winnie Community Building, 335 South Park St, Winnie, TX 77665
- Wednesday December 12, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Galveston Island Convention Center, 5600 Seawall Blvd, Galveston, TX 77551
- Saturday, December 15, 1:00 - 4:30 PM - Crenshaw Elementary and Middle School, 416 Hwy 87, Crystal Beach, TX 77650
- Tuesday, December 18, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Bay Area Community Center, 5002 E NASA Pkwy, Seabrook, TX 77586

Formal presentations will begin at 6:30 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 7:00 PM. For the meeting to be held on Saturday, December 15, formal presentations will begin at 2:00 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 2:30 PM.

The USACE will accept written public comments on the report for a 75-day period starting on October 26, 2018 and continuing through January 9, 2019. Comments on the report must be postmarked by January 9, 2019. You may submit written comments or questions to the USACE, Galveston District, Attn: Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental Compliance Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553-1229, or you...
AFFP
Corp of Engineers

**Affidavit of Publication**

STATE OF TX )
COUNTY OF GALVESTON )

Donna Rhoades, being duly sworn, says:

That she is Donna Rhoades of the The Galveston County Daily News, a daily newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in Galveston, Galveston County, TX; that the publication, a copy of which is attached hereto, was published in the said newspaper on the following dates:

November 08, 2018

That said newspaper was regularly issued and circulated on those dates.

SIGNED:

Donna Rhoades

Subscribed to and sworn to me this 8th day of November 2018.

Lynette Tisdale, Notary Public, State of Texas, Galveston County, TX

My commission expires: February 11, 2020

18128307 00462972

Crouch Environmental Services, Inc.
402 Teetsorn St
Houston, TX 77009

Lynette Tisdale
Notary Public-State of Texas
My Commission Expires 2-11-2020
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

STATE OF TEXAS:

Before me, the undersigned authority, a Notary Public in and for the State of Texas, on this day personally appeared, the Newspaper Representative at the HOUSTON CHRONICLE, a daily newspaper published in Harris County, Texas, and generally circulated in the Counties of: HARRIS, TRINITY, WALKER, GRIMES, POLK, SAN JACINTO, WASHINGTON, MONTGOMERY, LIBERTY, AUSTIN, WALLER, CHAMBERS, COLORADO, BRAZORIA, FORT BEND, GALVESTON, WHARTON, JACKSON, and MATAGORDA and that the publication, of which the annexed herein, or attached to, is a true and correct copy, was published to-wit:

CROUCH ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE 0000183207 HC010446225
RAN A LEGAL NOTICE
SIZE BEING: 3 x116 L
Product Houston Chronicle
Date Nov 9 2018
Class Legal Notices
Page B 4

Victoria Bond AIR Clerk

NEWSPAPER REPRESENTATIVE

Sworn and subscribed to before me, this 9th Day of November A.D. 2018

Notary Public in and for the State of Texas
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

STATE OF TEXAS  
COUNTY OF CAMERON  

Before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for Cameron County, Texas, personally appeared

AURELIO QUIROGA

known to me to be Representative of The Port Isabel-South Padre Press, who solemnly swears that the attached is a true copy of the publication appearing in said newspaper, a weekly, published in the City of Port Isabel, Cameron County, Texas, continuously for more than one year, and that said publication appeared on the following dates:

November 8 2018
20
20
20

Port Isabel-South Padre Press

By

Newspaper Representative

Signed

Notary Public in and for Cameron County, Texas

Dated at Port Isabel, Texas

November 9 2018

My Commission Expires July 15, 2019

(Seal)

NOTE:

costs of this publication excluding Notary fee totals the sum of $_____________________, which is now payable to

THE PORT ISABEL-SOUTH PADRE PRESS
Port Isabel, Texas 78578
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
GALVESTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
P.O. BOX 1229  
GALVESTON, TEXAS 77553-1229  

JOINT NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY DRAFT INTEGRTED FEASIBILITY REPORT & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY  
October 2018

The public is hereby notified of the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (DIFR-EIS) for the Tentatively Selected Plan of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District (USACE) in partnership with the Texas General Land Office. Authorized by Congress in Section 4091, Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law [PL] 110-114), as amended, the draft report investigates and recommends efforts to reduce the risk of coastal storm damage to industries and businesses critical to the Nation’s economy and increase resiliency of Texas coastal communities. The report is available to view and download at:

http://coastalstudy.texas.gov

The report is available for viewing at the following libraries:

- Rosenberg Library, 2310 Sealy St, Galveston, TX 77550
- Friendswood Public Library, 416 S Friendswood Dr, Friendswood, TX 77546
- Moore Memorial Library, 1701 9th Ave N, Texas City, TX 77590
- La Porte Library, 600 S Broadway St, La Porte, TX 77571
- La Marque Public Library, 1111 Bayou Rd, La Marque, TX 77558
- Deer Park Library, 3009 Center St, Deer Park, TX 77536
- Mie S Bruce Library, 13002 6th St, Santa Fe, TX 77510
- Pasadena Central Public Library, 1201 Jeff Gim Memorial Dr, Pasadena, TX 77506
- Hitchcock Public Library, 8005 Barry Ave, Hitchcock, TX 77563
- Sterling Municipal Library, 1 Mary Elizabeth Wilbanks Ave, Baytown, TX 77520
- Dickinson Public Library, 4411 TX-3, Dickinson, TX 77539
- North Channel Library, 15741 Wallisville Rd, Houston, TX 77049
- Evelyn Meador Library, 2400 North Meyer Ave, Seabrook, TX 77586
- Chambers County Library, 202 Cummings St, Anahuac, TX 77514
- Helen Hall Public Library, 100 W. Walker, League City, TX 77573
- Freeport Branch Library, 410 Brazosport Blvd, Freeport, TX 77541
- Clear Lake City-County Freeman Branch Library, 16116 Diana Ln, Houston, TX 77062
- Clute Branch Library, 215 North Shanks, Clute, TX 77531
- Lake Jackson Library, 250 Circle Way, Lake Jackson, TX 77566
- Aransas County Public Library, 701 E Mimosa St, Rockport, TX 78382
- Ed & Hazel Richmond Public Library, 110 N Lamont St, Aransas Pass, TX 78336
- Ellis Memorial Library, 700 W Ave A, Port Aransas, TX 78373
- Bay City Public Library, 1100 7th St, Bay City, TX 77414
- Port Isabel Public Library, 213 North Yumia St, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- Brazoria Library, 820 South Brooks St, Brazoria, TX 77422
- Ingleside Public Library, 2775 Waco St, Ingleside, TX 78362
- Sweeny Library, 205 West Ashley Wilson Road, Sweeny, TX 77480
- Bell Whittington Public Library, 2400 Memorial Pkwy, Port Lavaca, TX 77374
- Palacios Library, 326 Main St, Palacios, TX 77465
- Corpus Christi Caller-Times Library, 820 North Lower Broadway St, Corpus Christi, TX 78401
- Calhoun County Branch Library, 1 Lamar St #1, Point Comfort, TX 77973
- Reuber Memorial Library, 150 North 4th St, Raymondville, TX 78550
- Laguna Vista Public Library, 1300 Palm Blvd, Laguna Vista, TX 78678
- Aniita and W.T. Neyland Public Library, 1250 Carmel Pkwy, Corpus Christi, TX 78401

Seven public information meetings will be held along the Texas coast during the public comment period:

- Tuesday, November 27, 5:30 – 9:00 PM – Bauer Community Center, 2300 TX-35, Port Lavaca, TX 77979
- Wednesday, November 28, 5:30 – 9:00 PM – Harte Research Institute at Texas A&M Corpus Christi, 6300 Ocean Dr, Corpus Christi, TX 78412
- Thursday, November 29, 5:30 – 9:00 PM – Port Isabel Event & Cultural Center, 309 Railroad Ave, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- Tuesday, December 11, 5:30 – 9:00 PM – Winnie Community Building, 336 South Park St, Winnie, TX 77665
- Wednesday, December 12, 5:30-9:00 PM - Galveston Island Convention Center, 5600 Seawall Blvd, Galveston, TX 77551
- Saturday, December 15, 1:00 – 4:30 PM – Clute/Crawford Elementary and Middle School, 416 Hwy 87, Crystal Beach, TX 77560
- Tuesday, December 18, 5:30 – 9:00 PM – Bay Area Community Center, 5002 E NASA Pkwy, Seabrook, TX 77586

Formal presentations will begin at 6:30 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 7:00 PM. For the meeting to be held on Saturday, December 15, formal presentations will begin at 2:00 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 2:30 PM.

The USACE will accept written public comments on the report for a 75-day period starting on October 26, 2018 and continuing through January 9, 2019. Comments on the report must be postmarked by January 9, 2019. You may send written comments or questions to the USACE, Galveston District, Attn: Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental Compliance Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553-1229, or you may email comments to: CoastalTexas@usace.army.mil.

This public notice is also issued for the purpose of advising all known interested persons that there is pending before the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) a decision on water quality certification. Any comments concerning this application may be submitted to the TCEQ, 401 Coordinator, MSC-150, P.O. Box 13087, Austin, TX 78711-3087. A copy of the public notice, with a description of work, has been made available for review in the TCEQ’s Austin office.
PUBLISHER'S AFFIDAVIT

THE STATE OF TEXAS §
COUNTY OF CALHOUN §

Shelly Bartels, being duly sworn on his/her oath states that he/she is an authorized representative of The Port Lavaca Wave and that said newspaper meets the requirements of Section 2051.044 of the Texas Government code, to wit:

1. It devotes not less than twenty-five percent (25%) of its total column lineage to general interest items;

2. It is published at least once each week;

3. It is entered as second-class postal matter in the county where it is published;

4. It has been published regularly and continuously since 1891;

5. It is generally circulated within Calhoun County.

Representative further deposes and says that the attached notice was published in said newspaper on the following date(s) to wit:

11/14, A.D. 2018

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN BEFORE ME by

_____X____ a) is personally known to me, or
_______ b) provided the following evidence to establish his or her identity ___________________________

On this the ______ day of Nov., A.D. 2018, to certify which witness my hand and seal of office

Judy Marek
Notary Public, State of Texas
Application has been made with the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission for a Mixed Beverage Restaurant Permit with Food and Beverage Certificate by Martin Franek dba Texas Traditions Grill & Bar, to be located at 234 E Main St., Port Lavaca, Calhoun County, Texas. The managing member of said limited liability company is Martin Franek.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
GALVESTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 1359
GALVESTON, TEXAS
77553-1229

JOINT NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY
DRAFT INTEGATED FEASIBILITY REPORT & ENVIRONMENTAL IMpACT STATEMENT (DIFR-EIS) FOR THE COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY
October 2018

The public is hereby notified of the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (DIFR-EIS) for the Tentatively Selected Plan of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study, presented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District (USACE) in partnership with the Texas General Land Office, Authorized by Congress in Section 4091, Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-14) as amended, the draft report investigates and recommends efforts to reduce the risk of coastal storm damage to industries and businesses critical to the Nation’s economy and increase resiliency of Texas coastal communities. The report is available for view and download at:

http://costalsituat.texas.gov

The report is available for viewing at the following libraries:
- Rosenberg Library, 2510 Sealy St, Galveston, TX 77550
- Friendswood Public Library, 418 S Friendswood Dr, Friendswood, TX 77546
- Galveston County Branch Library, 1100 7th St, Galveston, TX 77514
- Port Isabel Library, 922 N Market St, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- Brazoria Library, 620 South Brooks St, Brazoria, TX 77422
- Ingleside Public Library, 2775 Waco St, Ingleside, TX 78362
- Sweeney Library, 205 West Ashley Wilson Road, Sweeny, TX 77480
- Bell Whittington Public Library, 2400 Memorial Pkwy, Portland, TX 77874
- Palacios Library, 325 Main St, Palacios, TX 77565
- Corpus Christi Caller Times Library, 820 North Lower Broadway St, Corpus Christi, TX 78401
- Calhoun County Branch Library, 1 Lamar St, 1 Point Comfort, TX 77576
- Robe Memorial Library, 501 Main St, Robesonia, TX 77580
- Laguna Vista Public Library, 1300 Palm Blvd, Laguna Vista, TX 77587
- Antilla W. T. Neal Public Library, 1250 Commerce St, Corpus Christi, TX 78401
- Seven public information meetings will be held during the coastal Texas coast during the public comment period:
- Tuesday, November 27, 5:30 – 9:00 PM - Bauer Community Center, 2300 TX-35, Port Lavaca, TX 77979
- Thursday, November 29, 6:30 – 9:00 PM - Harte Research Institute at Texas A&M Corpus Christi, 9300 Ocean Dr, Corpus Christi, TX 78412
- Thursday, November 29, 5:30 – 9:00 PM - Port Isabel Event & Cultural Center, 206 S Park Ave, Port Isabel, TX 78576
- Tuesday, December 11, 5:30 – 9:00 PM - Winnie Community Building, 335 TX-12, Winnie, TX 77665
- Wednesday, December 12, 5:30-8:00 PM - Galveston Island Convention Center, 1600 Seawall Blvd, Galveston, TX 77551
- Saturday, December 15, 1:00 – 4:30 PM - Crenshaw Elementary and Middle School, 416 Hwy 87, Crystal Beach, TX 77540
- Tuesday, December 18, 5:30 – 9:00 PM - Bay Area Community Center, 5002 E NASA Pkwy, Seabrook, TX 77586

Formal presentations will begin at 6:30 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 7:00 PM for the meeting to be held on Saturday, December 15, formal presentations will begin at 2:00 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 2:30 PM.

The USACE will accept written public comments on the report for a 75-day period starting on October 30, 2018 and closing January 15, 2019. Comments on the report must be submitted by January 9, 2019. You may send written comments or questions to the USACE, Galveston District, Attn: Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental and Coastal Planning Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77559-1229, or you may email comments to: Coastal-Texas@usace.army.mil.

This public notice is also issued for the purpose of advising all known interested persons that there is pending before the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality an application submitted to the TCEQ, 401 Coordinator, MSC-150, P.O. Box 13087, Austin, TX 78711-3087. A copy of the application, with a description of work, has been made available for review in the TCEQ’s Austin office.

PUBLIC HEARING
CITY OF SEADRIFT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDG)

The City of Seadrift will hold a public hearing at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, November 19, 2018, at Seadrift City Hall, 501 S Main St, Seadrift, Texas 77985 regarding the CDG Program administered by the Texas Department of Agriculture. Citizens are encouraged to attend to discuss the citizen participation plan, local housing, community development needs, available funding, eligible activities, past use of funds, and development of CDG applications. Written comments may also be submitted to the City Secretary at the address above. Persons with disabilities or others requiring auxiliary aids or services to participate in this hearing should make arrangements with the City Secretary at 361-785-2251 at least two days prior to the hearing. Este aviso se puede encontrar en inglés y en español en las oficinas municipales de la Ciudad.

AVISO PARA OBTENER COMENTARIOS
CIUDAD DE SEADRIFT
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
La Ciudad de Seadrift tendrá una audiencia pública el día 19 de Diciembre de 2018, a las 5 pm en la sala municipal, 501 South Main Street, Seadrift, Texas 77985, en relación con el programa CDG administrados por el Departamento de Agricultura. Se anima a los ciudadanos a asistir a dichas audiencias, participar de manera ciudadana, la vivienda local, el desarrollo de la comunidad, los fondos disponibles, las actividades elegibles, el uso pasado de fondos, y el desarrollo de solicitudes de CDBG. Comentarios escritos pueden también ser enviados a la Secretaria de la Ciudad a la dirección que figura arriba. Las personas con discapacidades u otras personas que requieran ayudas o servicios auxiliares para participar en estas audiencias deben hacer arreglos con la Secretaria de la Ciudad al 361-785-2251 al menos dos días antes de la audiencia. Residentes que necesiten un intérprete deberán contactar a la ciudad por lo menos 24 horas antes de la audiencia pública.

NOTICE TO BIDDERS

Notice is hereby given that the Commissioners’ Court of Calhoun County, Texas will receive proposals for:

2018 CALHOUN COUNTY ROOF REPAIRS

A MANDATORY PRE-BID MEETING shall be held at 10:00 am, Tuesday, November 27, 2018 at G&W Engineers, Inc., 205 W. Live Oak St., Port Lavaca, TX. Attendance at this meeting by all prospective bidders is required and is a prerequisite to providing a bona fide bid.

A background check is required to access the roof curing equipment. Attendee check in at the Adult Detention Center. Call (361)553-4475 to obtain background check prior to the Mandatory Pre-Bid Meeting.

SEALED BIDS are due on or before 10:00 am, Tuesday, December 11, 2018 at the County Judge’s office, 211 S. Ann Street, Third Floor, Ste. 301, Port Lavaca, Texas 77979. At that time, all bids will be publicly opened and read aloud. The bids will be considered for award on Wednesday, December 19,
PUBLISHER'S AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF CAMERON

I, Jose Andres Carrizales, being duly sworn on his oath states that he is a representative of The Valley Morning Star and that the attached notice appeared in the following issues:

Date: NOVEMBER 09, 2018

Accnt: 83005008 CROUCH ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES / COASTAL TEXAS PUBLIC MEETING NOTICES

Ticket: 30107284

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this the ___ day of November 2018.

Notary Public, Cameron County
State of Texas
STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF VICTORIA

Before me, a Notary Public in and for said County and State, this day personally appeared PAMELA WILLIAMS, Multi Media Sales Assistant for the VICTORIA ADVOCATE published by the VICTORIA ADVOCATE in VICTORIA County, Texas and distributed in other surrounding Counties (Calhoun, Dewitt, Goliad, Gonzales, Jackson, Karnes, Lavaca, Matagorda, Refugio and Wharton); and who, after being duly sworn, did dispose and say that the following clipping of an advertisement was published in the above named paper on the following dates:

*Friday, November 9th, 2018*

Signed

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this ___ day of November 2018.

Notary Public

VICTORIA County, TX

[place notary seal here]

[attach actual copy of Newspaper ad clipping]
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
GALVESTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
PO. BOX 1229
GALVESTON, TEXAS 77553-1229

JOINT NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY
DRAFT INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY
October 2018

The public is hereby notified of the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (DIFR-EIS) for the Tentatively Selected Plan of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District (USACE) in partnership with the Texas General Land Office. Authorized by Congress in Section 4091, Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law [PL] 110-114), as amended, the draft report investigates and recommends efforts to reduce the risk of coastal storm damage to industries and businesses critical to the Nation’s economy and increase resiliency of Texas coastal communities. The report is available to view and download at:

http://coastalstudy.texas.gov

The report is available for viewing at the following libraries:

- Rosenberg Library, 2310 Sealy St, Galveston, TX 77550
- Friendswood Public Library, 416 S Friendswood Dr, Friendswood, TX 77546
- Moore Memorial Public Library, 1701 5th Ave N, Texas City, TX 77590
- La Porte Library, 600 S Broadway St, La Porte, TX 77571
- La Marque Public Library, 1111 Bayou Rd, La Marque, TX 77556
- Deer Park Library, 3009 Center St, Deer Park, TX 77536
- Man S Bruce Library, 13302 6th St, Santa Fe, TX 77510
- Pasadena Central Public Library, 1201 Jeff Grinn Memorial Dr, Pasadena, TX 77506
- Hitchcock Public Library, 8005 Barry Ave, Hitchcock, TX 77563
- Sterling Municipal Library, 1 Mary Elizabeth Wilbanks Ave, Baytown, TX 77520
- Dickinson Public Library, 4411 TX-3, Dickinson, TX 77539
- North Channel Library, 15741 Wallisville Rd, Houston, TX 77049
- Evelyn Meador Library, 2400 North Meyer Ave, Seabrook, TX 77586
- Chambers County Library, 202 Cummings St, Anahuac, TX 77514
- Helen Hall Public Library, 100 W. Walker, League City, TX 77573
- Freeport Branch Library, 410 Brazosport Blvd, Freeport, TX 77541
- Clear Lake City-County Freeman Branch Library, 16516 Diana Ln, Houston, TX 77062
- Clute Branch Library, 215 North Shanks, Clute, TX 77531
- Lake Jackson Library, 250 Circle Way, Lake Jackson, TX 77566
- Aransas County Public Library, 701 E Mimosa St, Rockport, TX 78382
- Ed & Hazel Richmond Public Library, 110 N Lamont St, Aransas Pass, TX 78336
- Ellis Memorial Library, 700 W Ave A, Port Aransas, TX 78373
- Bay City Public Library, 1100 7th St, Bay City, TX 77414
- Port Isabel Public Library, 213 North Yturria St, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- Brazoria Library, 620 South Brooks St, Brazoria, TX 77422
- Ingleside Public Library, 2775 Waco St, Ingleside, TX 78362
- Sweeney Library, 205 West Ashley Wilson Road, Sweeny, TX 77480
- Bell Whittington Public Library, 2400 Memorial Pkwy, Portland, TX 78374
- Palacios Library, 326 Main St, Palacios, TX 77465
- Corpus Christi Caller-Times Library, 820 North Lower Broadway St, Corpus Christi, TX 78401
- Calhoun County Branch Library, 1 Lamar St #1, Point Comfort, TX 77757
- Reber Memorial Library, 190 North 4th St, Raymondville, TX 78580
- Laguna Vista Public Library, 1300 Palm Blvd, Laguna Vista, TX 78587
- Anzal and W.E. Neyland Public Library, 1230 Carmel Pkwy, Corpus Christi, TX 78401

Seven public information meetings will be held along the Texas coast during the public comment period:

- Tuesday, November 27, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Bauer Community Center, 2300 TX-35, Port Lavaca, TX 77979
- Wednesday, November 28, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Harte Research Institute at Texas A&M Corpus Christi, 6500 Ocean Dr, Corpus Christi, TX 78412
- Thursday, November 29, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Port Isabel Event & Cultural Center, 309 Railroad Ave, Port Isabel, TX 78578
- Tuesday, December 11, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Winnie Community Building, 335 South Park St, Winnie, TX 77665
- Wednesday, December 12, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Galveston Island Convention Center, 5600 Seawall Blvd, Galveston, TX 77551
- Saturday, December 15, 10:00 - 4:30 PM - Crenshaw Elementary and Middle School, 416 Hwy 87, Crystal Beach, TX 77650
- Tuesday, December 18, 5:30 - 9:00 PM - Bay Area Community Center, 5002 E NASA Pkwy, Seabrook, TX 77586

Formal presentations will begin at 6:30 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 7:00 PM. For the meeting to be held on Saturday, December 15, formal presentations will begin at 2:00 PM and a verbal comment period will begin at 2:30 PM.

The USACE will accept written public comments on the report for a 75-day period starting on October 26, 2018 and continuing through January 9, 2019. Comments on the report must be postmarked by January 9, 2019. You may send written comments or questions to the USACE, Galveston District, Attn: Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental Compliance Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553-1229, or you may email comments to: CoastalTexas@usace.army.mil.
News Release - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

 Posted 10/26/2018

Release no. 18-050

AUSTIN, Texas (October 26, 2018) – Today The Texas General Land Office (GLO) and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) announce the release of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement, a milestone in the effort to reduce the risk along the Texas coast from dangerous storm surges and other threats. Since 2015, GLO and USACE have worked cooperatively on a first-of-its-kind feasibility study formulating risk reduction solutions to address coastal storm risks to the vast and important Texas coastline. A copy of the report can be downloaded here [http://coastalstudy.texas.gov/](http://coastalstudy.texas.gov/).

“Texas is not a state that happens to have a coast, Texas is a true coastal state,” said Texas Land Commissioner George P. Bush. “One storm can cost many lives and billions of dollars in damage, so the expense of doing nothing far outweighs the investment to protect and enhance our coast. Texas’ coast is home to one in every four Texans and 30% of the American oil refining sector resides here. The Coastal Texas Study is about protecting our people, our economy and our national security. The options selected are proven to be effective in mitigating the deadly effects of storm surge on our state. I thank the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and look forward to continuing this vital cooperative effort.”

“The Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study builds on the work of scientists, engineers and other experts from Rice University’s Severe Storm Prediction and Evacuation from Disasters (SSPEED) Center, Texas A&M University Galveston (TAMUG), Gulf Coast Community Protection and Recovery District (GCCPRD),” said U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Galveston District Commander Col. Lars Zetterstrom. “This is the only study to fully identify the environmental impacts and required mitigation of the proposed plan. The study also includes results and lessons learned from methods used to mitigate the dangerous impacts of floods and storm surges worldwide.”

The draft environmental impact statement released today includes the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) which uses a multiple lines of defense strategy to reduce risks to our communities and infrastructure along the entire Texas coastline. The TSP develops an integrated comprehensive plan for the coast of Texas that includes constructing surge gates to reduce coastal storm damage risks to the Houston Ship Channel, levees along Bolivar Peninsula and Galveston Island, beach and dune renourishment along the lower coast, and nine landscape scale ecosystem restoration projects to increase resilience and reduce risks to the coast of Texas. The features will work together to greatly increase the resiliency of the Texas Coast. The estimated cost is $23 to $31 billion.
The Coastal Texas Study complies with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and considers the impacts the project will have on natural, economic, social and cultural resources. The GLO and USACE entered into a cooperative agreement to create the Coastal Texas Study in 2015. The final feasibility report and EIS is expected in 2021.

The community is invited to review the plans and participate in a series of public meetings:

**Lower Coast**
27-Nov | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Port LaVaca
Bauer Community Center
2300 TX-35
Port Lavaca, TX 77979

29-Nov | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Corpus Christi
Harte Research Institute Texas A&M Corpus Christi
6300 Ocean Dr
Corpus Christi, TX 78412

29-Nov | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Port Isabel
Port Isabel Event & Cultural Center
309 Railroad Ave
Port Isabel, TX 78578

**Upper Coast**
11-Dec | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Winnie
Winnie Community Building
335 South Park Street
Winnie, TX 77665

12-Dec | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Galveston
Galveston Island Convention Center
5600 Seawall Blvd
Galveston, TX 77551

18-Dec | 5:30pm – 9:00pm | Seabrook
Bay Area Community Center
5002 E NASA Parkway
Seabrook, TX 77586

Public comments can be provided at: 1) the Public Meetings noted above; 2) mailed to USACE, Galveston District, Attn: Mrs. Jennifer Morgan, Environmental Compliance Branch, Regional Planning and Environmental Center, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553-1229; or 3) emailed to CoastalTexas@usace.army.mil. Comments must be postmarked by January 9, 2019.
To learn more about the Coastal Texas study, visit www.coastalstudy.texas.gov.
Website

coastalstudy.texas.gov
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Comment Database
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter ID</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Commenter Contact Information</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Mode of Comment</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whitlow</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Mayor of Port Lavaca</td>
<td>11/27/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Inland estuarine bays such as Lavaca and San Antonio bays have been left out of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whitlow</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Mayor of Port Lavaca</td>
<td>11/27/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>These are the initial habitat and breeding ground for the bigger bay systems and the Gulf, Wetland and beach replenishment, shoreline protection, and oyster reef restoration are necessary in these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boen</td>
<td>Cliff</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Would like the Austinites(?)/ Shoreline looked at for protection. It is a shell bank that protects the Lighthouse Trail area. It has eroded over the last several years and Harvey washed through the bank in several locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rubio</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>Supports the W-3 ecosystem restoration of the Port Mansfield jetty. This restoration will rebuild the eroding southern end of the Padre Island National Seashore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rubio</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>The northern jetty is now becoming undermined with seawater. If dredging is not conducted soon, the jetty could become disconnected from the park and erosion of the southern end of the Padre Island National seashore will continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frandsen</td>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>Dredging of Mansfield Channel will aid ecosystem restoration of the southern end of Padre Island National Seashore. The beach is eroding, jetty being undercut, and it is becoming dangerous for boats to navigate the channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frandsen</td>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>Need more sand retention on the north side of the jetty for the longevity of the Kemp’s ridley nesting program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zoteky</td>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Sounds like an opportunity to collaborate across studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zoteky</td>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Example, the study to deepen the Corpus Christi channel to 85 feet. They are evaluating options for dredging disposal. This group might be able to make use of the dredged material, or at least make recommendations to further the goals of the Coastal Texas Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rost</td>
<td>Cliff</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned about the water desalinization project proposed for Harbor Island and the other one around Aransas Pass. High saline water back into these sensitive ecosystems can be very detrimental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Have you coordinated with Port Corpus Christi for restoration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter ID</td>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Commenter Contact Information</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Mode of Comment</td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>A lot is planned up near Galveston, very little near Corpus Christi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>How will Harbor Island development affect breakwater production?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What is the environmental impact of lower salinity on ocean food chain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chadden</td>
<td>James (T.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Supports protecting shorelines but need more than the small areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chadden</td>
<td>James (T.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>St. Joseph Island is being torn up by storms (across from Port Aransas and the ship channel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chadden</td>
<td>James (T.C.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Need to protect all of Mustang Island and the rest of the National seashore and all of the Texas coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jushs</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Boca Chica should be included in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jushs</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Port of Brownsville and Brownsville itself are at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sanchez Gonzalez</td>
<td>Augusto</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>It will take 13 to 21 years to complete construction of all actions and alternatives. Within the next 10 years a second causeway will be built to access South Padre Island that will trigger development in the unincorporated coastal Cameron County that is not covered in the South Padre Island beach restoration project. It is imperative to include Cameron County beaches given the high erosion rates (up to 14 feet per year) as per the UTBEG (2012) and given the imminent development of Cameron County Beaches driven by the upcoming infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sanchez Gonzalez</td>
<td>Augusto</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Cameron County is finalizing a new Beach Access and Dune Protection Plan that allows for beachfront construction within the limitations imposed by current regulation. This is driven by the county's vision for economic development of its greatest asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter ID</td>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Commenter Contact Information</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Mode of Comment</td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cantu</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>It is contradicting for the GLO to ask as a requirement for Cameron County to implement an Erosion Response Plan because of the erosion issues along the lower coast and then for GLO to turn around and state that only 2 miles are affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cantu</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Requests reconsideration for a closer look along the lower coast regarding erosion issues, not only in the 2 mile stretch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cantu</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Coastal storm surge affects all of the coast, not just a small portion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cantu</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Cameron County has invested several millions of dollars but a lot of need is still there such as beach restoration, erosion rates are alarming and we need help to create and protect for a safer place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cantu</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Please add the north and south areas of the 2 mile stretch included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Cameron County has been working with the GLO on an erosion response plan and is very involved in providing the best protection, facilities, and environmental integrity to their beaches. Believe the study should include more than 2 miles of Cameron County’s beaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>South Padre Island is an attraction and a nature gift to south Texas and part of Mexico, all of the beaches should be studied and preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reyes</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Would like all of the southern most region of South Padre Island included in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sepulveda, Jr.</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>Cameron County Regional Mobility Authority</td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>COU</td>
<td>Requests that areas in the Cameron County jurisdiction, either accesses or beaches be made part of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Letter ID</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Commenter Contact Information</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Mode of Comment</td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>City of South Padre Island</td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Include reach 2, 5, and 6 on South Padre Island for nourishment/dune/ berm construction. These are huge economic engines for the local and state economies (hotels, convention center, etc.). This area is also a national jewel destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guthrie</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>City of South Padre Island</td>
<td>11/29/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Consider a nearshore berm as an option versus only berm option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jerilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Supports some kind of coastal protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jerilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>It should protect every single home or business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jerilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>It should protect the evacuation route for Bolivar Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jerilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Rollover Pass should be considered as part of this protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jerilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>With Hurricane Ike there was too much loss so something needs to be done. I was one of many who lost my beach house and belongings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Own a home on Bolivar Peninsula. This is our retirement home. Our property is approximately 200 feet on the south side of the Alternative A dune line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Alternative A is cost prohibitive by the number of properties which will have to be bought out by the Government which is tax money paid by me and my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The infrastructure (utilities) and evacuation route are at a higher risk as they are located on the south side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Property insurance will become an issue for those on the south side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Only a small portion of Bolivar Peninsula will be protected from the storm surge. My home will be in the path of an immediate back surge when the surge hits the wall and goes back out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Please look at other alternatives than the TSP (Alternative A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What will happen to property values outside of the barrier on the Gulf side?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>--------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Property value on Bolivar have already taken a downward trend just from talk of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Need to make it public that the line down 87 is not set in stone. Rumors have property already being purchased for the barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Richard and Lana</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>How do you expect us to live a normal life with a wall constructed next to our home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Richard and Lana</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will the water flow as normal when a storm surge hits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Richard and Lana</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Absolutely against all of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Richard and Lana</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The value and taxes of our home might change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Richard and Lana</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What effect will the N-S at Highway 124 barrier have on the east side of Highway 124?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Richard and Lana</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Knowing that there was 2-3 feet of water going across Highway 124 during Hurricane Harvey, wouldn't it flood the land on the east side?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Carlis</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Adamantly against the current preferred Coastal Barrier Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Carlis</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>My family home is on the south side if Highway 87. We have resided on Bolivar for nearly 30 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Carlis</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Our affiliate of KTB is KBB. We are guardians of Bolivar beaches which includes its wildlife, sea birds, and all its natural resources. No Barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tinsley</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Insurance costs and property values for Bolivar Peninsula are not being taken into consideration on making the decision to build the barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tinsley</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Residents need some kind of idea what they are looking at as far as tax evaluations and insurance costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tinsley</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>We have worked to improve our “compound” in anticipation of leaving a wonderful place for our children and grandchildren and hundreds of thousands of dollars we have spend seems in jeopardy of being almost worthless if this barrier is built along Highway 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tinsley</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>We are 2 lots over from Highway 87 and the storm surge would hit the wall and come back immediately and inundate our home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tinsley</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>There are about 2,200 homes/structures that would be outside the barrier, including mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tinsley</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Primary concern is induced flooding. My home would be 100-300 feet from the base of the barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tinsley</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Insurance rates and property values are a concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Menard</td>
<td>Huey</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Something needs to be done about the spine going to the north of all the beach homes in Bolivar. Plan A will destroy all those homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Support the USACE selection of the coastal spine as the best surge protection strategy for the upper Texas Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Based on over a decade of research, suggest 9 modifications to the present USACE TSP. These modifications would assure an effective Ike Dike strategy and allow the spine to better fit into the economic, environmental, social, and recreational fabric of our coastal communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Move the USACE proposed levee and floodwall land barriers from behind the coastal highways to the coast and construct the protection needed as natural appearing fortified dunes. The fortified dunes allow us control surge by stopping it at the coast so everyone is behind the protection, a basic premise of the Ike Dike strategy. The other basic Ike Dike principle is to reduce surge in the Bay by reducing water levels before and during a storm.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>25 4</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Add a western section on Follets Island and gate at San Luis Pass. Leaving San Luis Pass - the back door to Galveston Bay - open allows fore-surge and surge in through the pass, engorging the Bay and increasing surge when the Storm hits. This also disallows the strategy of sealing the Bay at low tide when a hurricane is approaching, obviously keeping water levels down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 5</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Institute and design for best practices for water management to reduce surge in the bay. There are other ways we can take advantage of the fact that the gates are an active system, for example by opening the Bolivar gates to direct a return surge out of Galveston Bay after a hurricane passes. Keeping water, hence surge, down in the Bay is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 6</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Rethink the size, complexity, and even the need for the Galveston ring Levee, and gate structures at Kemah and Dickinson Bayou. These additions to the basic Ike Dike are designs that evolved from options that attempted to deal with the full force of surge in the Bay not a surge that is already reduced by a properly designed and operated Ike Dike. These features can be reduced in size and complexity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 7</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The north-south eastern barrier running up from High Island can be reduced or eliminated. Recent modeling shows that any water getting into the Bay from the east enters a Bay area already reduced by the local winds from the approaching hurricane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 8</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Modify the Bolivar Roads water barrier to reduce the size of the ship gates and allow more flow in the environmental section by using barge and inflatable gates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 9</td>
<td>Merrell</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Work on more accurate costs. Believe the cost estimates are too high. We are conducting an independent study by Dutch experts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We respectfully request that the Corps and GLO consider these modifications when forming their final plan. We will forward all back-up material to the Galveston District.

(Dr. Merrell included a copy of the following report with his comments: Omission of a Western Dike Section in the Likely USACE Tentatively Selected Plan (Alternative A) Leads to an Increase in Storm Surge, Inundation, and Flood Risk throughout the Houston-Galveston Region. This report forms the basis for comments 3 thru 9 above.)

Should the barrier be built at the current proposed Alternative A plan, what would happen to the Gulf side of the barrier consisting of 12-14,000 parcels of land? This land will be destroyed by the first storm after the barrier is built.

Will these properties be in a buyout program?

None of the refineries on northern Galveston Bay have ever flooded simultaneously during any weather event. This industry has its own protection. Why is the Federal and State government willing to spend $30 billion in the name of Homeland Security to protect an industry that already protects itself?

What happens to the storm surge in Galveston Bay after a hurricane crosses the barrier?

Is it possible for another storm surge to build before reaching the Houston Ship Channel and surrounding industry?

The gates across Bolivar Roads will restrict water flow by 30 percent. How will this impact communities bordering the bay that drain into Galveston Bay should another rain event like Harvey occur? What do your models show?

Coastal residents have built structures to Federal, State, and local codes - FEMA, GLO, and county which require flow thru construction at ground level. How can the USACE and GLO support a plan that creates a surge event we are not built to withstand?

This is purposeful destruction of private property which was built to government standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter ID</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Commenter Contact Information</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Mode of Comment</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Millo</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>In support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benbel</td>
<td>Usoph</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>In support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Benbel</td>
<td>Usoph</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Keep us informed by newspaper, more people read newspapers than came to the meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hirsch</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The current plan would cause my house on Galveston's west end to flood badly as it is on the south side of the proposed wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hirsch</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What will happen to insurance costs and the islands tax base?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Concerned with how massive and invasive the project is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Unhappy that the project is trying to change the barrier island. Has seen the land move and change over time as that is what islands do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Concerned about transportation around the wall. How are people supposed to evacuate and return to Jamaica Beach after evacuating if there are no limited access points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Concerned about the cost for citizens who will ultimately have to pay for the upkeep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Concerned about how animals are supposed to traverse around the structure. It greatly alter habitat in ways we don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>As a citizen of the west end, concerned about my house value and aesthetics of the barrier.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman, Marci, 12/12/18 PMCC CITY</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Concerned about the size and cost of the barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman, Marci, 12/12/18 PMCC CITY</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Has faith that the USACE and GLO will make appropriate modifications that will appease the people that this will effect. Everyone comes to Galveston and Bolivar to see the beach, not a concrete structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman, Marci, 12/12/18 PMCC CITY</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Does not matter how much habitat restoration is included in the study project, the changes to nature from this will not offset that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kurtz-Hoffman</td>
<td>Marci</td>
<td>Alderman, Marci, 12/12/18 PMCC CITY</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>We know the risk of living on this island and will take those risks everyday if that means you don’t install a barrier, gate, ring levee, or whatever you like to call it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned that would raise the 3005 and those left on the southside would continue without protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Face higher insurance rates and lower property values if try to sell our home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned that the study does not protect everyone. How can you do that to so many?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Putting a barrier along 3005 on Galveston's west end is a foolish action. Damage from any storm will be more severe for those on the south side of 3005 as waves come in and hit the wall and return multiplying the height and damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Property values will decrease and insurance premiums will increase for anyone south of 3005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Put the barrier along the beach where it will protect everyone living on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dannenmaier</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Appears the study is following a sound and logical process. Please continue the process of relying on science and engineering rather than parochial interests of parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dannenmaier</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>12/12/18 PMCC PC</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Plan A seems to be the better of the plans.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>As a resident in Galveston that will experience significant impacts from the Tentatively Selected Plan, I strongly object to the repeated public comments by official representatives of the GLO that the plan is &quot;merely a line on a map&quot; and we are &quot;only 10 percent through the design process.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>This may be the largest engineering and construction project in USACE history and the only opportunity for public comments comes at a phase that is so incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sumpter</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The video sound is drowned out by crowd noise. Are subscripts available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sark</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Having a levee on the west end would be a death sentence to our homes on the beach side at Jamaica Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sark</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Building a dune is the best way to save our homes. Dunes down south are 10 to 12 feet tall and they protect the bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sark</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Water hitting a levee would cause a washing machine effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sark</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Who will be responsible for our homes if the levee destroys our beachside houses? 12,500 homes are on the beachside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sark</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What is the possibility of dunes on the west end and Bolivar, ring levee around Galveston, more dikes like the Texas City Dike?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andries</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Flamingo MUD Board Director</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>San Luis Pass has no gates planned. I understand this is because of the expected low volume of water that would be able to flow through the pass due to its shallow nature. Should modeling take into consideration back to back hurricanes, where the first hurricane might scour the pass to a much deeper depth and the second one could cause more severe flooding of infrastructure, cities, and homes in the West Bay area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andries</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Flamingo MUD Board Director</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>The existing Galveston seawall will be raised. Have you considered raising the seawall by building a 2 to 3 foot &quot;bench&quot; along the top of the Gulf side of the wall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Andries</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Flamingo MUD Board Director</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>In addition to increasing flood control, such a bench would improve safety of the current &quot;drop-off&quot; hazard of the walk/biking along the wall as well as create seating for viewing and enjoying the coastal views. Such a bench/walkway seawalls exist in Havana, Cuba and are very functional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andries</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Flamingo MUD Board Director</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>There are concerns about the long-term cost of maintenance of the coastal barrier system. Given the primary purpose is to protect infrastructure critical to the whole of the USA, I propose a small tax be added on each gallon/barrel of product produced/shipped from the protected infrastructure to appropriately share the cost with consumers of the output. Example: $0.01/gallon petrochemical product shipped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beeton</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Port of Galveston Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Supports the ring levee around Galveston and would like to see it built as quickly as possible and to not wait to build at the same time as the spine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beeton</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Port of Galveston Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Aware the ring levee is controversial, they must be resolved fast so the is protected before another disaster hits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Galveston ISD Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Concerned about the ring levee as it makes Galveston Island a giant bathtub that with high storm surge or failure of pumps just fills up with seawater and cannot drain. It will be like New Orleans all over again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Galveston ISD Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Instead of a ring levee, a surge gate at San Luis Pass should complete the barrier and protect the back end as long as the gates are closed at low tide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Galveston ISD Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>None of the pumps are east of 51st Street and the east end of Galveston floods the most.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Galveston ISD Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Seawall elevation - the study says it needs to increase 4 feet - just the seawall? The roadway too? Do not see any way you can raise the roadway 4 feet, it would destroy the seawall side of Galveston, tourism, business, etc. Protecting an island that ceases to be &quot;Galveston&quot; is not logical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Galveston ISD Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>The pumps in New Orleans get clogged and fail all the time. How will their problems be addressed with our pumps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Galveston ISD Trustee</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>Plan A without the posterior ring levee with a gate at San Luis Pass is a better options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Chula and Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The Ike flood was a 100 year occurrence and it would be much cheaper to leave things as they are since Galveston residents know what the risks of living in Galveston are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Chula and Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>If the objective is to protect the petrochemical industry, it would be much cheaper to build levees around the areas where the industry is located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Chula and Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Harden or protect crucial areas (i.e. UTMB, the historic district, CBD) but Galveston is a barrier island and inherently dynamic. We live here knowing the risks, but mostly live here for the natural beauty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Chula and Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Protect the refineries (though they have never been interested in any of this protection conversation). It would be cheaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Chula and Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>We do not want to live by a gate at Offatts or a pump station. We live there to see sunsets and sail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Chula and Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The 17 foot dune system on the beach is absurd. Draw that section to the ridge of a 17 foot dune system at a 30 degree slope and it would be in most beachfront homes. The beach is too narrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Chula and Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Why would we spend billions to save beach homes? Who would want to live with that in their front yard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The ring levee is not needed. You have cut complete neighborhoods out which will deem them worthless. Middle class families will be priced out of Galveston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Build a spine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Put a gate on San Luis Pass and Port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Our Federal taxes will pay for 80 percent of this project so residents of Galveston should have a say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ayers</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Let the people of Galveston decide about the ring levee, not the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Is there a citizens overview committee that reviews the plans, details, schedules, budgets, etc.? If so, how would one participate? If there is not one, why?</td>
</tr>
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<td>--------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Card</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>This is a necessary project to protect Galveston and Galveston County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Card</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>If it was possible to not put the levees on FM 3005 and the highway on Bolivar many homes could be saved that would otherwise be destroyed by being outside the levee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Card</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The ring levee around Galveston is absolutely necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Card</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Because of the high frequency of flooding caused by many parts of the strand system having no viable outlet during high tides when combined with intense rainfall, there needs to be coordination between the local drainage system and the GLO - USACE ring system of gates/levees and pumping stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Supports the coastal spine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Opposed to the ring levee. It will bring separation and destruction to the island. With the levee you will impact businesses, homes, families. It is a bad idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The west end of San Luis doesn't show a gate to allow for stoppage for water to go out and drain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rinn</td>
<td>Apryl</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Neither side of this barrier is protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rinn</td>
<td>Apryl</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>It is a waste of taxpayer funds. It is bad for the residents of Bolivar and Galveston and the business owners as well as the wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rinn</td>
<td>Apryl</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Supports the Rice University SPEED Centers Galveston Bay Park Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nicol</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Highway 87 on Bolivar Peninsula could be raised 6 to 8 feet rather than the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nicol</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>For beach restoration, jetties running parallel with the beach, 200 to 300 yards off the beach would restore the beachfront. Look at Holly Beach in western Louisiana. Satellite view will show the beach rebuilding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nicol</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Rollover Pass at Gilchrist should be closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lacher</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned that my house will be outside of the coastal barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blumentill</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Unsure what the necessity of the ring levee is. Seems like if the barrier is effective the ring levee would be redundant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blumentill</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>You have not produced statistics on the effectiveness relative to the cost in terms of likelihood versus consequences of a range of storms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
<td>Donell</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will a bridge from Galveston to Bolivar be included in this plan for evacuation purposes, perhaps to be built with/along with the flood gates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Neighborhood is on the outside of the floodwall and is concerned that they are not receiving protection form the Coastal Texas Protection Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned with access to an from my home during a storm event, i.e. would I not be able to leave my home and have access to Galveston after a certain point during a storm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned that property values from being on the outside of the floodwall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Would a floodwall make impacts from storm surge from the north/northeast worse for those on the outside of the floodwall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>My home is 16 feet above ground - would this elevation still be above the current flood elevation. This directly affects the cost of flood insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Supports the gate structure across the entrance of Galveston bay. Believes this will provide enough storm surge protection for their home that is already elevated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Against the Galveston ring levee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned that building the barrier on the north side of 3005 will make their home worthless and ruin them financially as they would be unable to pay the mortgage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter ID</td>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Commenter Contact Information</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Home is on the Gulf side (southside) next to FM 3005. If a levee is built on the north side across from FM 3005 when a storm occurs the water will hit the levee and bounce back and damage my home, much more than if the water freely flowed across the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Put the dunes or levees on the beach to protect the 1,000s of homes that are on the south side of FM 3005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>If a levee is built on the northside, our property values will be lowered and our insurance will skyrocket. I will be without insurance or will have to sell my home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What effect will losing the breeding areas for birds on Bolivar Peninsula have on the bird populations? It will decimate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Land was given by the Federal government for birding, viewing, and nesting that will be taken away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What effect will the levee have on Galveston's fishing and tourism industry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>If homes are destroyed in a storm (at least partially by the levee and backlash of flood waters), the island will lose a tremendous financial resource. Have any studies been done to show the economic impact this would have on the islands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Who will be responsible for paying for our homes if they are damaged during a storm, largely because of the levee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Petty</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Who will be responsible for maintaining the pump stations and gates after they are built?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>If the coastal spine goes in as tentatively planned, would suffer severe consequences in the remaining years of life. My retirement would be destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Insurance costs would go up and my home value would be reduced which we are relying on for future care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Question the efficacy of the financial plan as well and doubt that the real cost difference between the present plan versus a reinforced dune is enough to justify destroying the value of hundreds of homes and lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>How can a few hundred yards cost enough difference to make you pick and choose whose lives you disrupt or destroy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Feel that you are going to spend that much money that you should protect all the homes on the west end. Would be better to start at the west end of the seawall and go down 8 Mile Road and cross the bay at one of the narrower points and leave the west end Gulf side no worse off that we are today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Reconsider the plan and move the barrier over to the dunes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VanScoyoc</td>
<td>Ira</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Likes the idea of dredging offshore to improve the coastline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VanScoyoc</td>
<td>Ira</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned about the flood gates and how that will affect water flow restriction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VanScoyoc</td>
<td>Ira</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>How will water flow restriction affect the health of the bay system? Noticed a drop in the shrimp population with the flood gate at Seabrook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VanScoyoc</td>
<td>Ira</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Nothing is being done to San Luis Pass. Was told it is a higher elevation, but it is still a passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Santschi</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Supports Bill Merrell's suggestions for improving the Coastal Spine plan. Fortified dunes in front of highway near beach, etc. - Galveston Daily News December 12, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Galveston ring levee impacts houses along 103rd Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Galveston ring levee potentially affects current market values and ability to buy/sell houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The alignment needs to be further west to the vicinity of 8 Mile Road in order to not affect the western neighborhoods (103rs Street, Crash Boat Basin) already protected by the seawall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The magnitude and equipment required in order to construct a massive ring levee along 103rd Street would still require tearing down of existing houses in order to construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>8 Mile Road has less infrastructure and is not already protected by the seawall and could be a better location for such a feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>McCracken</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Why can't the timeline for completion be reduced to 10 years? The government did it for New Orleans and the East Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>McCracken</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Create a protection tax on all the businesses that are dependent on the ship channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cisneros</td>
<td>Marelou</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Opposed to the present plan. Our retirement funds were spent to purchase our beach home and it was destroyed to Hurricane Ike. It took over 4 years of fighting for insurance funds to rebuild.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cisneros</td>
<td>Marelou</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Please consider other alternatives. Do not want to lose our home again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cisneros</td>
<td>Myra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>It is important to raise the highway from High Island to Crystal Beach. This allows an alternate route to get off Bolivar Peninsula if there is a bad storm and the ferries are not running, a person cannot leave because the highway is flooded leading to Winnie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cisneros</td>
<td>Myra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>There should be no wall diving Bolivar Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cisneros</td>
<td>Myra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>More beach and adding natural eco-friendly barriers (more sand to the shoreline) would be a better solution than a giant levee along Highway 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>Charles E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What effect would a 20 to 30 foot wall have on wind and dispersion patterns thus affecting insect patterns and food chain effects? I.E. mosquito larvae breeding fields and upper chain organisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>Charles E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Upsetting the estuarine environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whitaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Raise concern over the lack of adequate risk analysis with the effects from disturbance and tidal fluctuations associated with the levees and gates across the channel between Bolivar Peninsula and Galveston Island.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>With the predicted tidal prism reduction, we can make some suppositions. With a reduction in the amount of water that is exchanged, there would be a corresponding reduction in the post larval shrimp and blue crab egg recruitment from the Gulf of Mexico to the Galveston Bay ecosystem. Reduced recruitment translates to reduced populations. Reduced populations of shrimp and crabs translates to reduced commercial and recreational harvest for shrimp and crabs. This translates to less availability of those species as food for gamefish and less availability to the marsh for shorebirds that rely on those species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Does a 17% reduction in tidal prism translate to a 17% reduction in commercial harvest of shrimp and crabs and food for other fish, gamefish, and bird populations that rely on them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Would seem to be significant impacts both economically and ecologically and we strongly urge a thorough assessment of the consequences of altering the flow of water between Galveston Bay and the Gulf of Mexico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society raises concern that the video presentation at the beginning of the public comment meetings contradicted our experience with this process and perception of the Tentatively Selected Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>As stakeholders, we were not notified of this document for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>None of the Houston Audubon Society properties were mentioned in the scope of the study document as protected areas warranting consideration in the proposed placement of the barrier system and hard structural features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Houston Audubon Society</td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>It is disingenuous to include preservation and improvement of ecosystem features for the express purpose of providing vital habitat for coastal bird species when the plan seems to pose significant direct disturbance to several existing managed sanctuaries of high economic and ecological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rinn</td>
<td>Apryl</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The barrier is not needed and I don't want it on Bolivar Peninsula. Don't feel that it protects anyone or anything and only hurts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter ID</td>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Commenter Contact Information</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Mode of Comment</td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Comment (may be paraphrased or summarized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greaff</td>
<td>William and Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Could not get into the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conner</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Against the dike because of increased water level on the Gulf side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Menard</td>
<td>Huey</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Believes the plan as it stands now will destroy Bolivar Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Menard</td>
<td>Huey</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Believes the plan will be detrimental to their home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Menard</td>
<td>Huey</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Believes the plan will be detrimental to the ecosystem and bay system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bolls</td>
<td>Francine Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Please keep the canal open that runs the length of Bolivar. It helps the surge water to run back out into the ocean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bolls</td>
<td>Francine Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Please make sure that we can get affordable insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bolls</td>
<td>Francine Ray</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Please do not use eminent domain to force people to move without compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Prefer Galveston Bay Foundation (protection in bay) and other environmental groups plan called the “Park Plan”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Do not build the coastal barrier as suggested by the GLO and USACE built on or behind Bolivars Highway 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will any funds be allotted for buyouts of all properties (houses, lots, land tracts, and commercial) south of the proposed wall on Highway 87?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>All properties south of the coastal barrier on Highway 87 will get the blunt of all the storm surge and will not be usable or be able to obtain any insurance.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Better to have the protection on the beach as a wall or higher and wider dunes. Even geotubes worked well with Hurricane Ike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Prefer raising Highway 87 more and construct a wall or higher and wider dunes on the beach (clay or soil, not sand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Oneal</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Failure to secure a modest “curve at 87” area does not provide confidence that a project of this undertaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The coastal barrier will degrade my property and property values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The coastal barrier will provide no protection to my home and will create a washing machine effect when a storm does hit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>There is no guarantee that the barrier will work for its intended purpose. Example, Addicks and Barker reservoirs created more flooding in Hurricane Harvey than it prevented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The coastal barrier will become an untested permanent structure that will degrade the natural wildlife habitats of the upper Texas coastline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The system was designed to protect upland development without consideration of water transition patterns, wildlife migrating patterns, and wetland and water habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>More financially selective areas will have their beaches rebuilt, while the Bolivar Peninsula area will be sacrificed without the opportunity to rebuild the beaches or even consideration of this coastal area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>These corporations (oil refineries and plants) with PACs and other financially driven political influence are making decisions at the hands of the USACE without consideration to homeowners, land owners, wildlife, or wetland habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>My tax dollars will pay for something I do not approve of, will pay for homes inside of the proposed levee to be raised or bought out, and when my home is imminent domain I will pay for the home I paid for again when the state is forced to buy me out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Christyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will this be put to a public vote, or is this a governmental decisions without the will of the people being considered?</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>My property will be detrimentally effected by the coastal spine. My house will be ruined by the washing machine effect any storm surge will create at it this the wall continually during a storm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>I will not be able to insure my home once the spine is built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Of great concern that this would be considered without public consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Do not have faith that the coastal spine will work. Look at the bowl system that the New Orleans levees creates, undoubtedly this will be what happens with the coastal spine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The coastal spine does not negate bay surge and flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The spine puts select homeowners above others by single handedly ruining the communities of High Island, Gilchrist, and Bolivar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The USACE is not offering to restore the beach like was done for South Padre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>McCann</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The coastal spine is not a viable option for homeowners along the upper Texas coast. It is an end to the upper Texas coast at the hands of government dictators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DeSantis</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>I support Plan D2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DeSantis</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The Tentatively Selected Plan will destroy the community of Crystal Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DeSantis</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Dunes would be the best solution and would protect all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Completely against the installation of a levee and gate system on Bolivar Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Suggest installation of shoreline protection further up Galveston Bay to protect the ports and refineries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Family house on Bolivar is over 100 years old and has never flooded or been destroyed during a storm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>A gate and levee may not hold back storm surge in the perfect scenario, but since Hurricanes wobble and rotate, any non-direct hit will make a closed gate worthless and flooding could still occur as seen with Harvey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Wind driven bay water can cause flooding, easily making a closed gate useless. Sixty inches of rain above Houston can also make a levee and gate system useless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Does not support building the coastal spine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>More effective to build a wall around certain areas that you are trying to protect, such as housing additions, refineries, and shopping malls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Use the money for a wall between Mexico and Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>This is a waste of tax payers money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>How much is the upkeep and maintenance going to cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What about the other states coastlines? Why would we be the only ones building a wall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Prefer Alternative D2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Destruction of property is good for future economy, it creates jobs and spending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Its why we have insurance, we are already covered for destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Let the refineries pay for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Does not agree with the cost or placement of the barrier on the Bolivar side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>There is no protection to the homes and businesses on the south side of Highway 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The levee from Gilchrist to High Island is on the beach. The beach and Highway 87 will wash out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The Bolivar Roads gate will detrimentally impact the water flow in and out of the bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The project will be extremely expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>If the project is about protecting vital industry then do it closer to the industrial areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>A dike on Bolivar does nothing to mitigate storm surge from the bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Buyout and raise homes in Shore Acres, Seabrook, Baycliff, and San Leon if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Tell Sylvester Turner that Houston fold from the bayous, not the bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>This project can still be done without sinking Bolivar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boyt</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>My home is on Bolivar, is over 100 years old and did not flood during Hurricanes Carla or Ike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>Alle</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Local resident, business owner, naturalist. Concerned.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tomlinson</td>
<td>Billy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned about the excessive cost for the project, lack of transparency, and possible end result leaving the Texas coast as a monument to big oil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned about what would happen if the 17 foot fence is built on the north side of Highway 87, to the drainage on the peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>There are over 20 canals, outfalls, and other drains used to drain rain water on the north side of Highway 87. It appears that these drains would be blocked by the fence and its 200 foot footprint. What are you plans for drainage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The Bolivar Peninsula Special Utility District has a 20-inch water line that runs on the north side of Highway 87 that would be covered by your proposed 17-foot fence and 200-foot footprint. What you plans to relocate this million dollar water line?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Likes the idea of replenishing beaches and building up the dunes so that they will better withstand any serious storm surge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Opposes the erection of 27 miles of gates that would be 17-20 feet tall and have a base of 200-500 feet along the northern part of Highway 87 on Bolivar Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Concerned that my home value would decline rapidly as nobody would want to live on a beach that has such a barrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>I built my home to the current Texas standards for construction in this area. My house was the only house within seven blocks that was still standing after Hurricane Ike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Doubt if my house could withstand a storm surge that goes under my house, then meets a 20 foot wall and is hurled back to my home and the Gulf with even greater force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Urge you to revise the study and find a better solution to protect the Gulf coast, our homes, and chemical plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Proposed a sand dune dike, with the 1,200 yard ship lane opening for boating traffic. Overlapping walls for beach traffic. The beach dike could be covered with sand. This proposal should not make a serious impact on wildlife.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Would the short distance form the highway to the beach really make a difference? Yes, it would to the home owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Strongly opposes the coastal barrier in its current state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The dike would amplify both the storm surge height as well as destroying structures on the entire Bolivar Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The coastal barrier is massive and expensive and will actually trap homes and businesses between the levee and the Gulf beachfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will unnecessarily endanger lives for those living in front of the levee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will cause property values to plummet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The coastal counties tax base will be whipped out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will create significant flood insurance issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will destroy the coastal economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will destroy the beauty of the beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will devastate the ecosystem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>See the Texas City levees for proof, which built much small levees directly around the petrochemical facilities located in the surge prone areas. These companies can easily afford to do this, but as a tax payer I am willing to help for this is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Build levees around Galveston to protect from surge.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Implement the SSPEED Galveston Bay Park plan with its many benefits for all. It is significantly lower cost and it can be built much faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Build a seawall like Galveston, or large sand dunes that look natural and keep the sand replenished over the years? This could be a way to slow down the storm surge and not lose our homes, businesses, and beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Need an efficient way off the peninsula in case of evacuation. We need a bridge all the way down Highway 87 to 124. This would insure a safe evacuation and save lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>How are you going to pay for maintenance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>How can you spend $30 billion when Texas vets aren't getting what they need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What about the flooding issues seen with Harvey?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>This will be destructive to the ecosystem, how you going to protect the sea turtles on Bolivar if they have no beach? They are currently listed on the Endangered Species Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What will this do to the Galveston Bay ecosystem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Will be economically disastrous to the oysters and shrimpers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Red wolves have recently been seen on Galveston Island. What will be done to insure they are protected from this plan? There are less than 30 red wolves left in the wild. They are protected by the Endangered Species Act. (commenter provided a website on where to find information on red wolves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Why do we need to protect so many miles of coastline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>--------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What would the protection look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>What would the protection cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>We need to protect the Houston Ship Channel. It is a vital area and it is prone to funnel a possible massive wave into it. I believe this is because the barrier island is not that wide and some huge wave could easily pass over and into Galveston Bay and then even gain greater height as it reaches the Houston Ship Channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The Mid-bay gate, or a more simple protective dike, closer to the Houston Ship Channel is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Forget the gate at Bolivar Pass and miles of walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The west side of Galveston Bay should not be hardened, at least not a long continuous wall running the entire way. This area doesn't have the &quot;funnel shape&quot; problem like the Houston Ship Channel and also is not as concentrated. Possibly some certain areas could be hardened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>The Corpus Christi barrier island is wider and possibly doesn't need such protection for its inner harbor. Freeport could possibly be protected some. Maybe a couple other areas need something too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Larimore</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>We cant protect our whole coastline and we don't want to look at a massive protection system, and we don't want to pay for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Balciunas</td>
<td>Rudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Once the project is completed, how will it be maintained over 50-years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Balciunas</td>
<td>Rudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Why will this take so long to complete?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Knowing the placement of the proposed coastal barrier and understanding the full scope of the project is critical for fully evaluating the impacts to people, property, and the environment, as well as the effectiveness of the proposed alternative. This is necessary for the public to be able to assess the study and DEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Many groups and other non-profits have asked the USACE to consider practicable non-structural and nature-based solutions as a multi-tiered approach that can provide multiple benefits to the community in addition to flood risk reduction at a lower coast and faster over a longer period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>There needs to be greater public, private, and corporate responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Industrial facilities should provide their own first line of defense and be required to protect themselves. This would further protect the general public from toxic spills during flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Need to be careful about proposing 70 plus miles of hard infrastructure that would likely incentivize development in flood-prone areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Land regulations are needed with this study to avoid this from happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>This could further be coordinated with the protection and conservation of lands that provide open space and flood capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>The study should prioritize the protection of existing natural storm defenses, not as a last resort, but as an integral and important part of the solution and future vision of the coast. This is especially timely given future climate and environmental changes, and their impacts on coastal habitats and natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Do not want to see the wall on the Highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Prefer to see artificial dunes that are partially permanent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>In favor of artificial islands to help protect the ocean side of Galveston.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>A wall would reduce our home values significantly as we are located on the beach side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Invest in infrastructure that is natural for example. See: Florida, El Dorado Royal Casitas in Cancun as an example of other locations that have been successful in this approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Opposed to al wall at 3005 because of the perceived backwash from the surge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Opposed to placing a wall on the beach and restricting our views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Aware of the dangers of having property on the Gulf exposure but chose to risk that and enjoy the Gulf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Opposed to any structure or protection from surge by developing hard dunes with structures and vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>A system of barrier islands in the Gulf/bay would protect the shore, we are in favor of eco-protection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Fenoglio</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Would like to see natural dunes and artificial islands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Fenoglio</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/18/18</td>
<td>PMCC</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Do not want to see a wall build in Spanish Grant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION &
RESTORATION FEASIBILITY STUDY
PUBLIC MEETING

HELD ON NOVEMBER 27, 2018
AT 5:30 P.M.
BAUER COMMUNITY CENTER
2300 TX-35
PORT LAVACA, TX 77979
APPEARANCES

SPEAKERS:

Colonel Lars Zetterstrom, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Tony Williams, Texas General Land Office

Kelly Burks-Copes, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Audience Members
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm pleased to be here tonight. I am Colonel Lars Zetterstrom, the Commander of the Galveston District. I welcome you to tonight's public meeting to review the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study. For the record, let me please state this public meeting was convened at 5:30 P.M. on November 27th, 2018, at the Bauer Community Center in Port Lavaca, Texas. Specifically, we are presenting information on accepting public comments on the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for this study that was released for public review on October 26th, 2018. A court reporter is here to transcribe these proceedings and all public comments.

The Corps of Engineers and the General Land Office has analyzed the Coastal Risk Reduction Solutions that would reduce the risk to the lives and property on the Texas Coast. Ten years ago the region experienced Hurricane Ike which disrupted many lives and resulted in extensive economic and infrastructural damages. The Texas Coast is also subject to ongoing coastal erosion, relative sea level rise, habitat loss and water quality degradation. These coastal hazards are placing the environment and economic health of the coast at risk which negatively impacts the state and national economy. This along with storms such as Hurricane Ike, Dolly, and Rita emphasized the need for enhanced resiliency of the coast to
not only reduce future damage and loss but improve our ability
to withstand to recover from future storms. It is important
to note that the Coastal Texas Study recommends structural
measures to reduce risks along the coast and that these
recommendations support multiple investments and risk
reduction the agencies and businesses are making along the
coast.

Coastal Texas is a part of a larger effort of
risk reduction actions to make the coast more resilient over
time. A cost effective plan has been identified that we
believe will significantly reduce the risk of damage from
tropical storms and hurricanes as well as increase the net
quality and quantity of coastal ecosystems. This meeting is
being held to describe the tentatively selected plan for TSD
and receive your comments. I hope that all of you have had an
opportunity to read the notice of availability either in the
Galveston District's website or the announcements that were
mailed to individuals and organizations that may have an
interest in these proceedings.

Before we go any further, I would like to
introduce a representative from the Texas General Land Office,
our study's non-federal sponsor, Mr. Tony Williams, the
Planning Senior Director of Coastal Resources.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Colonel Zetterstrom.

As he said, I'm Tony Williams, the Director of Coastal
Planning for the Texas General Land Office. Thank you for coming to learn more about the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study, also known as the Coastal Texas Study. I'd like to introduce the other GLO team members here. We have Carla Kartman with Coastal Planning, and Lee Schroer with our Corpus Christi Field Office, Dianna Ramirez with our La Porte Field Office and Caleb Bennet with Governmental Relations. And also we have Rob Mule with our Port Lavaca Oil Spill Office.

Addressing the issues on the Texas Coast including storm surges and ecosystem enhancement continues to be one of the top priorities of Commissioner Bush. You may be asking why the GLO is the non-Federal study sponsor. The GLO is a state agency responsible for the Coastal Management Program, was initially established to manage state-owned land including state-owned submerged land approximately 10 miles offshore. As the state agency responsible for implementation of the Coastal Planning Erosion and Response Act, we're also responsible for beach and dune protection, oil spill response in state waters, and certain roles in disaster recovery.

In November of 2015 the GLO signed a piece bill cost share agreement with the Corps of Engineers for the Coastal Texas study. This obligated GLO to funding approximately half of the $20 million to conduct the study much which is being done through work in kind. The Land
Office is committed to working with the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to increase the resiliency of the Texas Coast, to begin a regular approach that includes ecosystem restoration and enhancement all along the coast and storm surge barriers specifically in the Houston-Galveston region. The draft plan that is being presented today incorporates habitat restoration and enhancement as well as gates, levees, and flood walls to address erosion, habitat loss, and storm surge. These measures work together to increase the overall resiliency of the Texas Coast.

The proposed plan in the Coastal Texas State was developed to work in concert with the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan. The GLO is currently working with state holders along the coast to develop 2019 version of the Coastal Resiliency Restoration Plan that builds on the original plan that was released in 2017. The 2019 version of the Master Plan identifies projects that coastal experts have identified as the ones best suited to address issues along the coast. It also includes modeling that identifies future threats to the Texas Coast and how the proposed projects will reduce those threats. The plan will be completed in 2019 and presented to the Texas Legislature. The Coastal Texas State proposed plan or the tentatively selected plan as is referred to in Corps documents was jointly developed by the GLO and Corps of Engineers. We worked with engineering firms and
environmental firms, consulted with other groups addressing these issues including local universities and international organizations, navigation interests and environmental organizations. We met on a regular basis with resource agencies. As we move to the next phase of the study, it's important to get feedback from all state holders on the proposed plan and the Coastal Texas Study. Please remember the study's only about halfway done, and there's a lot of details that still need to be worked out. Again, we value your input and look forward to your comments. Thank you for taking the time to join us. I turn it back over to Colonel Zetterstrom.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: All right. Thank you, Mr. Williams. Next, I would like to recognize the public officials who are attending tonight. First, I have Mr. Tony Holladay, the Port Commissioner from the Calhoun Port Authority. Next, I have Mr. Jack Whitlow, the Mayor of Port Lavaca. Thank you, sir. Mr. Tim Dent, City Council, Port Lavaca. And finally, William Dilibero, City Manager of Port Lavaca. Thank you, gentlemen.

Additionally, I would like to introduce those that are with me from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. First, I'd like to recognize Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, Galveston District Project Manager for this study. Next, I'd like to recognize Sharon Tirpak, Galveston District Deputy Chief of
Project Management. Next, I'd like to recognize Dr. Himangshu Das, Galveston District Coastal Engineering Lead, Hydraulics and Hydrology. Mr. Brian Harper, Galveston District, Regional Planning Environmental Center, Chief of Civil Planning Branch. Mr. Travis Creel, New Orleans District, Regional Planning Environment Center, South Lead Planning. Ms. Caroline McCabe, Galveston District, Regional Planning Environmental Plan Formulator, Lead Planner for the Ecosystem Restoration. Mr. Kenny Pablo, Galveston District, Realty Specialist, Lead Real Estate Analyst for the Coastal Storm Restoration Measures. Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Galveston District, Regional Planning Environmental Center, Environmental Branch, NEPA Specialist and Environmental Lead; and then finally Mr. Jeffery Pinsky, Galveston District, Regional Planning Environmental Center, Acting Section Chief of the Environmental Branch.

I'd like to discuss the meeting ground rules and format at this time. I'd like to describe the ground rules before and after tonight's meeting. I hope everyone completed the registration form when they entered the meeting. The registration form is used to provide us your contact information so we can keep you updated on the status of the study. It can also be used to submit a written comment. If you would like to make a comment orally tonight, please make sure that you have indicated your intent on the sign-in sheet at the door. Those wishing to make an oral comment will be
given an opportunity to do so after the presentation. If
you'd prefer not to speak this evening, you may submit your
comments in writing by dropping them into the box provided or
send them to us by mail or an e-mail.

Following these opening remarks, Dr. Kelly
Burks-Copes, Project Manager, will present an overview of the
feasibility study. After her presentation, I'll open the
floor to public comments. Federal and State officials that
have requested to make a statement will be recognized first.
Next, representatives from the Federal and State Resource
agencies wishing to make a statement will be called upon.
Then I'll recognize each individual who has indicated that
they wish to make a comment. Please keep your remarks to one
minute as we would like for everyone to have an opportunity to
speak and we will only have this room until we are completed
this evening. Also we would like to emphasize that this will
not be a question and answer session. This meeting is to
provide everyone with an opportunity to publicly comment on
the plan. Please give all speakers the courtesy of not making
any comments during their presentation. Turn off your cell
phones, hold all applause or other reaction so that we can
have an orderly meeting and be respectful of everyone's time.
All individuals have an equal right to be heard. Now I would
like to present Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes to make our
presentation.
MS. BURKS-COPES: Thank you, sir. All right.

I'd like to start first -- I'm shorter than they are, sorry. I'd like to start first by laying out what I'm going to talk about, and we'll go through this very quickly. I'm going to first provide you with the status update on the study and describe the process that we are currently in that addresses the National Environmental Policy Act. Then I'll lay over that the USACE planning process and identify the Tentatively Selected Plan. I'll go ahead and describe the potential impacts of that plan, the costs and the benefits, and then I'll open the floor to receive public comments.

We're about halfway through in the study. It's a five and a half year study, and we're two and a half years in. We released the report as we mentioned earlier on October 26th. We are looking to go into phase two of the project in the next year. This first phase was to formulate measures and then combinations of measures to generate plans and then to select a tentatively selected plan which we offered up for public comments and review. Next year and the year after, we will focus then on the tentatively selected plan and do detailed engineering and design, write that up into a final report which our chief will sign and submit to Congress for consideration and authorization.

We have a series of public meetings now this week for the Lower Coast, today, tonight basically, tomorrow
night and the next. We have the week off and then we'll have these same types of public meetings in the Upper Coast area. You are free to come to any of these public meetings.

We are in a 75-day public review period. A typical Environmental Impact Statement is 45 days; but since the study is so large and somewhat complicated, we thought it would be prudent to offer you a little bit more time to review the report and provide your comments. So, the public period began on October 26th with a release of the report, and we will conclude on January 9th of 2019. We are inviting the public and agencies to comment. It's required by the NEPA process. I'll try not to acronym you to death. All comments are welcome, positive or negative. And remember, the more specific you are with your comments, the easier it will be for us to address and understand your concerns and issues and work on solutions. The public and agency input informs our decisions and all comments are fully evaluated prior to decision making. Review and comment ensures that our decisions are based on the best available information, and that's why it's so important that you're here.

The study first went about, the study team first went about identifying problems or concerns to address with our project. We have a series of these kind of highlighted and identified on the map. Obviously, you walked around the room and talked to us a little bit about this in
the first hour of the public meeting. We have some concerns for economic damages caused by hurricanes, coastal storm surges, specifically driven by hurricanes. There are inland erosion problems and coastal erosion problems. We have identified losses of habitats, critical habitats for threatened and endangered species. And we know that there are natural delta processes that are in jeopardy. There are a series of locations that are experiencing disruptive hydrology, and some of the solutions that we are proposing should be able to address those concerns.

So, the way that the Army Corps planning process works is that we establish a series of goals. This is a multi-purpose project which means that we were authorized to look at coastal storm risk management solutions as well as ecosystem restoration. Together they provide a multiple lines of defense strategy that should support and promote resilience for the coast.

To meet the goals, there are a series of objectives that we have outlined and detailed in terms of measure. We are proposing to reduce economic damage, reduce risk to critical infrastructure, reduce the risks to public health and safety as we mentioned earlier, increase resilience, enhance and restore coastal landforms, improve hydrologic activity, and improve and sustain coastal marshes and bay shorelines.
The study area has a series of nationally significant social and community features. We know for a fact that in our study area, there's approximately 6.1 million residents living there in the 18 counties, and that's about 24 percent of the population of Texas. We have numerous deep-draft ports. I've listed a few here, and you saw some on the video. We also have 150 miles of Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, which is shallow draft. There's significant industry in our region. Forty percent of the nation's petrochemical industry resides within our study area, and 25 percent of the national petroleum-refining capacity. We also have NASA; and in Galveston, we have the UTMB hospital that has a Level 4 Viral Laboratory.

In terms of natural resources, we have critical ecosystems up and down the coast. Habitat or threatened and endangered species, we have 2 of the 28 natural Estuary Program sites in our study area, and the Central Flyway Migratory Corridor runs straight through the study area. The Laguna Madre is in our study area which is one of six rare hypersaline lagoons in the world. As the video mentioned too, we have nursery habitat for oysters, shrimp, and finfish which are all commercial fisheries; and the Padre Island National Seashore is in the study area. All told, we have 12 National Wildlife Refuges scattered throughout the study.

I need to kind of explain to you how the Corps
talks and how we formulate plans so that you can get a feel for what we've been doing over the last couple of years. We have ideas like features. These are levees, marshes, gates. Actions that are restoration construction, raisings of buildings, and treatments such as beach nourishments or plantings of wetlands; and if you combine features, measures, and treatments into groupings, you end up -- I'm sorry, features, actions, and treatments into groupings, you end up with something we call measures. And combinations of measures are plans.

So, to develop the plans, we had to go back down to those treatments and actions. And so, we were in 2016 directed by the Water Resources Development Act to use all of the available data in the region. And so, we had access to things like the NOAA Sea Level Rise Viewer, FEMA's Inundation Mapping, we had SLOSH modeling to look at potential flooding. But we also had other studies ongoing in our area and we were directed specifically to take a look at those and incorporate those into our formulation. The GCCPRD just recently released a report. Texas A&M's Ike Dike is out there. The SSPEED Center's H-GAP plan is out there. In addition, Tony mentioned that the Texas Coastal Master Plan has been developing a series of reports and identifying ecosystem restoration sites up and down the coast, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have several studies in the study area already ongoing. And
so, the important part of what I'm trying to explain is that there's lots of things working in this region, and we were directed to not reinvent the wheel, to use as much of that as possible and then add to it. To begin in 2014 and 2015, we started with scoping meetings, something similar to what you're experiencing today, and with all of this information in tow, we started formulating those measures.

Initially there were a series of measures per region. Region 1 is up in the Houston-Galveston area, and then it just goes downstairs step as we go down to Brownsville. A series of measures were formulated for each of those regions, and then we used the goals and objectives to screen those and carry a set number forward to formulate the plans. So, these are just numbers. I know it's not very clear for you, but what I can do is explain that we were really looking in this first phase towards distinguishing between a coastal barrier plan or a rim barrier plan. They have similar features, but there are some critical distinctions. So, what I'm going to show you is some of the criteria we used to screen those and select amongst those tentatively selected plan. Corps of Engineers has three basic criteria for selecting that tentatively selected plan. It needs to be engineeringly sound, it needs to be environmentally acceptable, and it needs to be economically justified. And to reach those conclusions, we have a series
of tools that we can use including storm models to assess the
efficacy or the ability of the barriers that we are proposing
and restoration sites that we are proposing to function and to
provide an increased resilience for the coast.

So, I'm going to explain basically the two main
Region 1 or Upper Coast plans that we formulated. The first
one as you've seen and if you've walked around and listened to
the video is what we call the Coastal Barrier Plan. Now,
first thing's first. This is not the Ike Dike. This is not
the Coastal Spine. This is not the H-GAP plan that the SSPEED
Center developed. This is a coastal barrier plan that looks
at not only a barrier but a combination of ecosystem
restoration and some actions down in the South Padre area as
kind of a system-wide approach to improving resilience on the
Texas Coast. You can tell that what we do is started at the
High Island area, comes down to Bolivar, cross over the Nav
Channel and then form a ring barrier around the Galveston
city, City of Galveston. We tie into the seawall and run down
the Galveston Island to San Luis Pass. We do not close on San
Luis Pass. The triangles on the map are pump stations. The
ring barrier, for example, would be closed only during the
storm. It's porous. It would have openings for roads and for
railroads, but they would be closed during the storm and any
water that were to fall from the sky during the hurricane
would then be pumped out of these pump stations. We have gate
closures across the Nav Channel. We also have gate closures at Offats Bayou with a pumping station there. Up in the west side of the bay are features we call non-structural. Those are raisings of buildings and flood proofing of buildings; but we've also proposed two closures, one at Dickinson Bayou and one at Clear Creek Bayou with pump stations. Those of course will be only closed during the storm to prevent surge from moving up those trips and then we would open them back up and use the pumping stations to alleviate flow coming off the land.

If you'll notice on the Bay Rim Solution, we still have the ring barrier down in Galveston with a pump station. But this time the barrier itself is along the rim of Galveston Bay. Starting at San Jacinto, we would go across with the gate closure, come all the way down the bay to the Texas City Levee. We would have closures at the Dickinson and Clear Creek Bayou still. We would need to expand or extend the Texas Levee off to the west, and that's -- that's basically the rim barrier plan. So, you can see that there's some similarities between the two, but it's an essence either the rim or the barrier island plan.

Part of the course process then is to compare and contrast those two. Plan A, for example, the Coastal Barrier Plan, focuses on reducing risks on all benefit categories, whereas the D2 Plan, that rim barrier plan would
focus primarily on dense industrial and commercial areas. The critical navigation features under Plan A would be protected but there would be some under Plan D that would be outside of the barrier system. The Galveston Rim Levee in Plan A would be there basically to address storm -- wind-driven storm surge but in the Plan D, that levee leads do not only that but induced stages of flooding would need to be addressed. So, as you can tell, we've got some compare, some contrast for each of the plans, some similarities but there was a way to distinguish these using our three criteria, whether it was economically acceptable, whether it was environmentally acceptable, and engineeringly possible.

Remember, in addition to these two features or these two plans up in Region 1, down in South Padre Island, there is a serious erosion problem. It's been addressed so far with beneficial use placement, but beneficial use in that area is uncertain because the timing is not regular and funding is limited. And so, what we are proposing in addition to the barrier plan is to do two miles in two separate regions of 12.5 foot x 100 foot-long dunes and a 10-year renourishment cycle is being proposed.

In addition, because we're a multi-purpose project and we're looking at multiple lines of defense for our strategy, we have proposed nine separate measures that are going to focus on ecosystem restoration. We're proposing
160,000 acres of habitat restoration that would include marshes, beach and dune systems, seagrass preservation, oyster reef creation and island construction. The two sites that are most important to you in the Port Lavaca region are CA-5 and CA-6. CA-5 is the Keller Bay Restoration proposal where we would do some break waters out in front and then behind we would expect to see seagrass colonization as the water quality improved, and then the Magnolia-Port O'Connor Shoreline Protection and Restoration Project where we would again do some break waters and we would expect to see some marsh restoration in this area. Now, these sites were selected, all of these ecosystem restoration sites were selected on the basis of a series of criteria but we also brought in the natural resource agencies to help us pinpoint areas where activity was not taking place, where the restoration was missing and where there were hot spots. We looked at those and arranged those and screened those down to get to these nine separate sites.

The Tentatively Selected Plan then combines the Coastal Barrier with the nine ecosystem restoration sites and the South Padre Island. It provides large-scale restoration and protection -- well, let's just call it risk reduction, and it also focuses on this concept of resilience preparing for the next big storm.

The cost for the study ranges between 23
billion and 32 billion. About 40 percent of the cost is ecosystem restoration. A small portion is for the South Padre Island, and then the rest is for the Coastal Storm Risk Management Features. There will be potential impacts for this plan. We are expecting to see about 4500 acres of direct impact under a Plan A, and 2300 under Plan D. The South Padre Island we expect to see about 365, 366 acres impacted directly. Because we are proposing to put gates into the Nav Channel and the opening the two-mile wide opening into Galveston Bay, we will experience some constriction in flow into the bay which will alter the tidal exchange and will reduce the velocities in Galveston. So, those are indirect effects. We will be restoring approximately 160,000 acres of marsh, islands, dunes, beaches and oyster reefs under the ecosystem restoration aspect of the plan. All totalled, the total mitigation cost will range between $676 million and $906 million dollars.

Those costs can be defrayed or reduced through optimization. Optimization is the idea that now that we have honed in on a coastal barrier plan and not the rim barrier plan, we can go into the next phase of the study and do detailed design in engineering. In doing so, we can take a look at the gate structures that we've looked at thus far. We've proposed kind of a worse-case scenario of some flipping sector gates that are on islands and would close during the
storms but would open back up. They do cause some constriction of flow into the bay. Through optimization, we could redesign or improve upon those designs and possibly reduce that constriction, thereby reducing the need for mitigation and reduction of the impacts that we are expecting to see both through direct and the indirect. Optimization also will focus on the alignment of the barrier system down Bolivar and then down Galveston. We could see that we move the line based on the need to address economically, let's say defensible solutions that provide more risk reduction. We need to resize and look at the sizes of the levee heights and we need to look at pump stations sizes through optimization.

So, we're in the study phase about halfway through. We expect to present a report to Congress in 2021, April of 2021. Then if we are authorized and approved, we will go into design which could take two to five years after and this will be caveat on the idea that we would receive the funding. Once we go into design, we can move into building and it could take between 10 and 15 years to build what we are proposing to do if we receive all of the funding at the beginning. If we need to, we will come up with phasing so that we can build in pieces and parts based on a series of criteria that would be everything from improving and maximizing ecosystem production to minimizing risks. And we will then turn the project over to our cost share sponsor and
they are responsible for maintaining the project out passed
the 50-year life cycle. The study is funded right now 50/50
cost share. Going immediately into construction, it is 65
percent federal, 35 percent out of cost share.

So, the point of this meeting and why we have
asked you here is to give you a forum to provide comment. You
can come to the microphone and provide your comments. Please
sign up if you haven't done so already. If you're a little
shy or you're not ready, you can send in a letter and we I've
provided the address here for sending in that letter or you
can go to our mailbox and send in an e-mail for those
millenials in the room. The key here though is that we need
comments received by January 9th.

I talk fast. I presented a lot of
information. You've sat through two videos and I'm sure you
haven't had a chance to absorb everything. So, what I've done
is provided you here with the website again all of the details
of what I've presented as well as the posters and the two
videos will be posted up there. If you watch this website,
you can download the report itself, and you can hit the
mailbox and provide a comment through our website. And with
that, I'll turn it back over to Lars.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, very much, Dr.
Burks-Copes. So, I will now call upon members of the general
public who wish to make statements. I have asked Mr. Stokes
to assist me in keeping time. He will indicate when you have 15 seconds left to speak and when your time has expired. I ask that you stop speaking after one minute as allowed. When you are called upon, please come forward and speak into the microphone. Please identify yourself by your full name and the organization you represent, if any. First, I'd like to call upon Mr. Bill Harvey.

MR. HARVEY: I'm going to submit by e-mail, if that's okay.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Yes, sir. Thank you. Next, I would like to call upon Mr. Raymond Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Good evening. My name is Raymond Butler. I am with the Lavaca Bay Foundation, a recently organized nonprofit group looking over Lavaca Bay. Those of us who organized it all grew up here. I spent my entire life in the barge industry. Growing up here, grew up on this bay fishing and hunting, and I was fortunate enough to spend 10 years with the Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association where I ran the Intracoastal Waterway for its entire length and -- this is fast. Okay. Let me make my points. Please consider modeling the Galveston Bay effort. Okay? When you talk about putting the gate on the Intracoastal Waterway, model that. I was very involved with the two gates in New Orleans. That's critical. When you get down here, we have got some serious erosion problems in this bay system. Please pay particular
attention to that and the Intracoastal Waterway and Sargent Beach. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Butler. Next I would like to call upon Mr. Colby Jorrells.

MR. SORRELLS: Sorrells.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Sorrells, excuse me.

MR. SORRELLS: Can I just speak from here? I don't need a microphone. I'm just a fisherman, but I'm concerned about projects CA-6 to be specific. Specifically, part of the project I'm concerned about is the planned coastal 10-mile revetment system. This stretch of the coast is a very unique environment found nowhere else on the entire coast. The revetments that are planned are going to destroy that environment. I will be sending in a letter to detail this, and I'll be here afterwards if whoever's involved would like to discuss it. I do have one question, and I will address it to you after the meeting's over, if that's okay. That's it. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir. At this time we've gone through the list of those individuals that indicated that they would like to speak. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to speak at this time? (No audience response.) Well, in conclusion written comments on the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact
Statement must be received on or before January 9th, 2019, the conclusion of the 75-day comment period that began on October 26th, 2018. I would like to thank the Texas General Land Office for their efforts in assisting and preparing or holding this meeting this evening. I thank you for your attendance and interest that all of you have shown tonight. With that, I'd like to adjourn the meeting. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

(End of meeting.)
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MR. ZETTERSTROM: Good evening ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be here tonight. I am Colonel Lars Zetterstrom, Commander of the Galveston District. I welcome you to tonight's public meeting to review the Coastal Texas Protection & Restoration Study. For the record, let me state that this public meeting was convened at 5:30 p.m. on November 28, 2018 at the Harte Research Institute at Texas A&M Corpus Christi in Corpus Christi, Texas.

Specifically, we are presenting information and accepting public comments on the draft integrated feasibility report and environmental impact statement for this study that was released for public review on the 26th of October 2018. A court reporter is here to transcribe these proceedings and all public comments.

The Corp of Engineers and the Texas General Land Office have analyzed coastal risks reductions solutions that would reduce the risk to lives and property on the Texas Coast. Ten years ago, the region experienced Hurricane Ike which disrupted many lives and resulted in extensive economic and infrastructural damages. The Texas Coast is also subject to ongoing coastal erosion, relative sea level rise, habitat loss and water quality degradation. These
coastal hazards are placing the environmental and economic health of the coast at risk which negatively impacts the state and national economy.

This along with storms such as Hurricane Ike, Dolly, and Rita, emphasize the need for enhanced resilience of the coast to not only reduce future damages and loss but to improve our ability to withstand and recover from future storms. It is important to note that the Coastal Texas Study recommends structural measures to reduce risk along the coast. These recommendations support multiple investments in risk reductions that agencies and businesses are making along the coast. Coastal Texas is part of a larger effort of risk reduction actions to make the coast more resilient over time. The cost effective plan has been identified that we believe would significantly reduce the risk of damages from tropical storms and hurricanes as well as increased and net quality and quantity of coastal ecosystems.

This meeting is being held to describe to Tentatively Selected Plan or TSP and to receive your comments. I hope that all of you had an opportunity to read the notice and availability either on the Galveston District's website or the announcements that were mailed to individuals and organizations that may have an
interest in these proceedings.

Before we go any further, I would like to introduce a representative of the Texas General Land Office, our study's sponsor, Mr. Tony Williams, the Planning Senior Director of Coastal Resources.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Colonel Zetterstrom. Thank you everybody for coming out tonight to learn more about the Coastal Texas Protection & Restoration Feasibility Study also known as the Coastal Texas Study. I would like to introduce other members of the GLO here as well. We have Carla Kartman with our Planning Division Project Manager for the GLO. We have Kayla Bennett who is our Director of Governmental Relations and Lee Shore in our Corpus Christi field office.

Addressing the issues on the Texas Coast including the storm surges and ecosystem enhancement continues to be one of the top priorities for Commissioner Bush. You may be asking why is the GLO involved in this study. The GLO was established to manage state owned land, including submerged and tidal influence up to over ten miles offshore. The Land Office is also the State agency responsible for the coastal management program, coastal erosion plan response act limitation, beach and dune protection and
oil spill response to state waters. It is also responsible for certain roles in disaster recovery.

In November of 2015, the GLO signed a feasibility cautionary agreement with the Corps of Engineers for the Coastal Texas Study. This obligated the GLO to funding approximately half of the 20 million-dollars to conduct the study, much of which is being accomplished through work in-kind. The GLO committed to work with the Corp of Engineers to develop a plan to increase the resiliency of the Texas Coast through an integrative approach that includes ecosystem restoration enhancement along with storm surge barriers, specifically in the Houston-Galveston area.

The draft plan that is being presented today incorporates habitat restoration and enhancement as well as gates, levees and flood walls to address erosion, habitat loss and storm surge. These measures work together to increase the overall resiliency of the Texas Coast. The proposed plan in the Coastal Texas Study was developed to work in concert with the Texas Coastal resiliency master plan. The GLO is currently working with stakeholders along the coast to develop a 2019 version of the coastal resiliency master plan which builds on the original plan that was released in 2017.

The 2019 version of the master plan
identifies projects on the coast that experts have identified as ones best adapted to addressing resiliency along the coast. The 2019 version also includes modeling of future threats to the Texas Coast and the benefits of identifying projects. The plan will be completed in early 2019 and presented to the Texas legislature in the upcoming session.

The Coastal Texas Study proposed plan or Tentatively Selected Plan as is referred to in the Corp of Engineers documents was jointly developed by the Corp and General Land Office. We've worked with engineering and environmental firms, consulted with other groups addressing these issues including local universities and international organizations, had multiple meetings with resource agencies, navigation interests and environmental groups.

As we move forward to the next phase of the study, it is important to get feedback from all stakeholders on the measures that are recommended in the Coastal Texas Study by this plan. Please remember, the study is only about halfway done and there are a lot of details that still need to be worked out. Again, we value your input and look forward to your comments.

Thank you for taking time to join us. I will turn it back over to Colonel Zetterstrom.
MR. ZETTERSTROM: Next, I would like to recognize the public official that is attending the meeting tonight, Ms. Nita Nixon from the City of Corpus Christi, Director of Development Services. Thank you, ma'am.

Additionally, I would like to introduce the members of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers staff that are members of this study. First, I would like to recognize the project manager Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes Galveston District and project manager for the study.

Next, I would like to recognize Ms. Sharon Tirpak Galveston District Deputy Chief of Project Manager Branch. Also, Dr. Himangshu Das Galveston District, Coastal Engineering Lead, hydrolits and and hydrology. Mr. Brian Harper, Galveston District Regional Planning Environmental Center, Chief Civil Planning Branch. Mr. Travis Creel New Orleans District, Regional Planning Environmental Center Division South Lead Planner. Mrs. Caroline McCabe Galveston District Regional Planning Environmental Center Plan Formulator, Lead Planner for Ecosystem Restoration. Mr. Kenny Pablo, Galveston District, Realty Specialist, Lead Real Estate Analyst for Coastal Storm Restoration Measures. Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Galveston District Regional Planning Environmental Center Environmental Branch, NEPA
Specialist and Lead Environmentalist. Mr. Jeffrey Penski, Galveston District, Regional Planning Environmental Center, Acting Section Chief of the Environmental Branch. And additionally, we have Mr. Coraggio Maglio, Galveston District, Chief of Hydrology and Hydrolics.

Now I would like to describe the ground rules and format for tonight's meeting. I hope everyone completed a registration form when they entered the meeting. Registration form is used to provide us with your contact information so we can keep you updated on the status of the study. It can also be used to submit a written comment. If you would like to make your comment orally tonight, please make sure you indicated your intent on the sign-in sheet at the door. Those wishing to make an oral comment will be given an opportunity to do so after the presentation. If you prefer not to speak tonight, you may submit your comments in writing by dropping them in the box provided or send them out to us by mail or e-mail. Following the opening remarks, Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes Project Manager will present an overview of the feasibility study. After her presentation, I will open the floor to public comments. Federal and State officials that are requested to make a statement will be recognized first.
Next representative from Federal and State resource agencies wishing to make a statement will be called upon and then I will recognize each individual who has indicated that they wish to make a comment. Please keep your remarks to one minute as we would like to for everyone to have an opportunity to speak and we only have this room until 9:00 p.m. this evening.

Also we would like to emphasize this will not be a question and answer session. This meeting is to provide everyone with an opportunity to publicly comment on the plan. Please give all speakers the courtesy of not making any comments during their presentation. Please turn off your cell phones and hold all applause and other reactions so that we can have an orderly meeting and be respectable of everyone's time. All individuals have the right to be heard.

Now I would like to present Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes to make our presentation. Thank you.

MS. BURKS-COPES: So I am going to start out by giving you a little bit of feel for what my presentation is going to focus on and then we will go into the heart of the study. Tonight I need to provide you with a status update of where we are and then describe the National Environmental Policy Act process which is what we are involved in now. There is an
overlying or underlying process that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also follows and so I will describe that. Then we will go into the Tentatively Selective Plan, talk about its impacts, its costs and its benefits and then I will close and we will open the floor for comments.

So our study is a five and a half year study. We are about halfway through at this point. Scoping started in 2014. We are set to release a final chief's report in 2021. The draft report was released on October 26 and we are currently in the midst of hosting a series of public meetings down the lower coast, started last night, and will finish tomorrow night at Port Isabel. We will take a week off and then we will have some meetings in the upper coast area.

The study is large and complex and typically we have a 45-day public review period for an environmental impact statement. But because this study is so large, we have extended that period to a 75-day comment review period. So, we started with the release of the report on October 26 and that means it will conclude on January 9 of 2019. This public review comment period is required by NEPA. All comments are welcomed if they are positive or negative and we want you to remember that the more specific you are with your
comments, the easier it will be for us to understand what your concerns are or your issues are and to address those issues.

Public and agency input informs our decisions and all comments are equally valued. Reviewing comment basically ensures that our decisions are based on the best available information. So if you've talked to the folks in the back of the room and looked at the posters thus far and watched the video outside and now you've watched the video on the website, you understand that there are some issues, some problems along the coastline. They range from economic damage risk threats to inland and coastal shoreline erosion concerns. We have loss of critical threatened and endangered habitat up and down the coast. We have deltas and complex deltaic processes is what they call it that are of severe concern and we have disruptive hydrology in several areas.

Our study is a multi-purpose study. We were authorized to look at not only coastal storm risk management but ecosystem restoration. And in those instances where we can place two types of systems in the same location, we can establish multiple lines of defense. So in the corp speak we set up goals and then we set up a series of measurable objectives to meet
those goals. So in this case, our objectives are to reduce economic damage, to reduce the risk to critical infrastructure and to public health and safety, to increase resilience and to enhance and restore the coastal land forms connection of hydrologic conditions and to improve and sustain ecosystems such as marshes and the bay shorelines.

We are a federally authorized project which means we had to establish national significance. In this instance, there are 6.1 million folks living in our study area along the coastline. Eighteen counties are included in our study area. The population of 6.1 million is about 24 percent of the State of Texas population. We have several nationally ranked deep draft ports that I listed here, but we also have 450 miles of shallow draft traffic through or navigation traffic through the Gulf Coast Intracoastal waterway. We have 40 percent of the nations petrochemical industry and 25 percent of the national petroleum refinery capacity and we have NASA. And at the UTMB in Galveston, we have a Level 4 Bio Lab.

In addition to those communal significant resources, we have natural resources of concern. There are several types of critical ecosystems the at nav that range from marshes to oyster reefs to turtle nesting
beaches. We have critical habitat for threatened and endangered species specifically. Two of the 28 national estuary and program sites are in our study area. Twelve of the national federal wildlife refuges are in our study area. We also have the Padre Island National Seashore and the Central Flyway for migration for migrating birds runs straight through the study area. The Laguna Madre, as you probably know, is one of six hypersaline lagoons in the world. We have nursery habitat that support significant commercial and recreational fishing for oysters, shrimp and fin fish.

I have to teach you a little bit about how the corp does its planning process and that means you have to learn syntax so that we all speak the same language.

The Corp has a series of building blocks that it uses to make plans. At the very bottom are features, actions and treatments. Features are things like levees and marshes and gates. Actions are completing restoration activities, constructing infrastructure, razing houses, for example. And treatments themselves are things like nourishing beaches or planting marshes. When you combine features and actions and treatments together you get what we call a measure. Combinations of measures result in an
alternative or sometimes we call it a plan.

In 2016, we were directed by Congress to take advantage of all possible data in the region that had already been developed and other studies that were already ongoing or in the past so that we would not reinvent the wheel. So there are things like the NOAA sea level rise viewer that we could use. FEMA inundation mapping was out there. We had SLOSH modeling which was looking at simulated hurricanes in the area. The GCCPRD, Texas A&M, the Speed Center at Rice all have ongoing studies. I think some of you have probably heard of them, Ike Dike, for example. The Coastal Spine is another. The GLO has a master plan. They have been updating for the last two years, I think, Tony, and they have identified in that plan several locations for ecosystem restoration and so we took those in as well as ongoing and past U.S. Army Corps of Engineer studies and folded those all into what we have proposed tonight.

We also had scoping meetings back in 2014 and 2015 to engage the public and to engage natural resource agencies in the plan formulation process. Just to let you know -- it's not on this slide -- but we have every month an inner agency meeting at the district or virtually to engage the natural resource agencies in the study area and have them help us with the plan.
formulation and valuation of the various plans that we have come up with.

So measures were formulated by using all of this information together and then we started screening them based on the goals and objectives. Measure screening was kind of -- in this light at least -- kind of quartered off by the regions that we looked at. Region One is up in the Galveston-Houston area and then it goes down the coast two, three and four. We formulated several measures in each of those regions and then used the goals and objectives to screen them down and carry forward certain numbers of different measures that we then combined into plans.

Now for the first phase of the project -- so up into this moment, we have been looking at in the Region One, two types of solutions. One, where we would put a barrier along the coastal barrier island versus a barrier up in the bay on the rim. So the first phase of the study was to determine which of those was appropriate for and would best meet the goals and objectives.

In the Corps of Engineers we have three main criteria that we have to use to choose amongst plans. They need to be engineeringly sound. They need to be environmentally acceptable and economically
justified. To evaluate the plans, we use a suite of tools, things like simulated hurricanes. We have developed over 600 simulated hurricanes thus far that range in shape and size and direction and speed and intensity to basically run across the coast and determine what potential floods would be and then we look at the barriers and evaluate how the risks can be reduced with a barrier solution.

So what I will do next is kind of give you a feel for the two types of barrier plans that were ultimately were evaluated. The first is a coastal barrier and what I want you to notice is that the barrier itself runs along the barrier islands, crosses the nav channel. There is a ring barrier around the Galveston proper and then we tie into the seawall and move down all the way into San Luis Pass. The barrier gates that cross the channel are closed only during the storms and then they are opened back up again. The ring barrier or ring levee around Galveston is porous. In other words, there are openings for railroad tracks and roads, for example. But during the storm, those would be closed and the triangles on the map are pumping stations because with a hurricane, not only do you get surge obviously, but you get rainfall. So any rain trapped in the system needs to be pumped out. We would
use a gate closure at Offatts Bayou to complete that ring levee. Up on the left hand side at the top of the bay the hatched marking indicates nonstructural measures. I think in the video, that was mentioned as well. We are talking about flood proofings and razings of buildings. But at Clear Creek and at Dickinson Bayou there would be a gate structure that would be closed during the storm when the surge comes and opened again afterwards and a pumping station would be in position there as well to move water off the land as the rain falls.

Now if you will focus on the ring levee and I change the map what you will see is in the rim solution there is still a ring levee around Galveston but this time, the barrier starts up at Jacinto just above it, crosses San Jacinto and then runs along the edge of the bay all the way down to the Texas Dike system. It ties into the Texas City dike system and extends that to the west. There would be, again, a gate structure at Clear Lake and at Dickinson Bayou as well. We would still need, obviously, the pump stations down in the Galveston ring levee with a closure a Offatts. So between those two plans then we have to do some comparisons. One of the things that we look at is what the benefits are for the rim solution versus
the barrier island solution. Planning, for example, focuses on all the benefit categories whereas Plan D2, that rim barrier solution, focuses only on dense industrial areas. We look at navigation and whether the navigation features of the system have risk reduction with the measures. Plan A, the coastal barrier solution has critical navigation features if receiving risk reductions. Whereas, certain navigation features are not protected with Plan D2. So we can go through this system and actually ask and compare Plan A to Plan D2 and lay out the differences and then quantify, again, whether it is engineeringly possible to do this; what the environmental impacts are and whether it is economically justified.

Now we have components up and down the coast beyond just Region One's Galveston-Houston area. So, for example, in South Padre Island they have been since 1988 using beneficial use placement material to basically address long term erosion along the coastline. Those beneficial use efforts are uncertain because they are not regular. Their timing is dependent on funding and availability of material. So what we are proposing is that in that reach we would look at 2 miles and put in a 12.5-foot high dune system that is about 100-foot long. It is going to require about a ten year -- I'm
sorry 100-foot wide -- ten year re-nourishment cycles to maintain that. Tony was reminding me to point out that although we are just looking at the two regions right now as part of our plan, in the next phase of the study we are going to continue with optimization and honing this plan down and we might actually be extending the proposed features up into the reaches above and below the two central regions.

Remember that we are a multi-purpose study so it is just as important to do ecosystem restoration for the sake of establishing habitat and restoring habitat but also in terms of multiple lines of defense when we are putting features in place near or adjacent to the infrastructure that we propose for the barrier. So we have a series of nine separate ecosystem restoration sites where we are looking at 160,000 acres of habitat restoration ranging from marshes to sea grass beds to beach and dune nourishment to island restoration and to shoreline protection. In this area in particular, the yellow box in the bottom, SP1 is the Red Fish Bay. There are three islands there; Dagger, Ransom and Stedman. Along the backside, we'd be proposing to do breakwaters which are, if you will just think of long lines of rocks that are in chunks; there are cuts and breaks in between each one of them that allows for
exchange of hydrologic connection into the areas behind. That would reduce erosion along those areas because of the GIWW and the traffic in the GIWW. Along the front of those islands, we are talking about, again, a series of breakwaters that would have openings for tidal exchange and then immediately behind those would be oyster reef balls that would allow for cultivation of and colonization of oysters and then that would protect the shoreline along the front but also it would allow for marsh and sea grass beds to recolonize and to be enhanced. The habitat there is fairly cloudy. Water quality is fairly poor because of all of the erosion that is going on. So these features would reduce that and allow for higher quality of habitat and the sea grass would then colonize and come in.

The Tentatively Selected Plan then is a combination of one of the barrier solutions, the South Padre Island component and then the ecosystem restoration components. So our Tentatively Selected Plan is to deploy the barrier solution along the Bolivar and Galveston islands with the gates across the nav channel and the ring levee around Galveston with the non-structural measures along the west side of the bay. All nine ecosystem restoration sites and the South Padre component.
The estimated costs is somewhere between 23 billion and 32 billion. That's with a "B". Of that, approximately 40 percent is ecosystem restoration. So between 8 and 11 billion-dollars. Then the upper coast measures with the barrier would be between 14 and 19 billion-dollars. There is an additional cost for operation and maintenance. Our cost share sponsor would then have to shoulder. It is ranging between 100 and 130 million annually.

There are some impacts with the plan directly underneath the barrier lines. We are seeing approximately 45 hundred acres of habitat that would be impacted directed. D2 had approximately 2300, the rim plan. South Padre has 365 acres of direct impact.

Now when you put a gated structure across a bay opening, you are going to cause some constrictions. Our study will -- the gate configurations that we propose thus far has constriction of approximately 27 percent. We would like to get that down more and in optimization in the next phase. But with that constriction, we are expecting to see some changes in tidal exchange. We are also expecting to see changes in velocities in the bay. But on the positive side, the ecosystem restoration is proposing to enhance and restore 160,000 acres of marsh islands, dunes,
beaches and oyster reefs up and down the coast. Potential mitigation costs thus far are $676 million to 906 million-dollars with reconfigurations and realignments. That number can very well go down in the next phase of the study which is why I have this slide.

Optimization is our next stage. Right now in the study report you are going to find that we have floating sector gates, for example, as the main navigation closure. In optimization, in the next phase, we are going to bring in experts around the world to discuss and work on the forcings that are likely to be experienced in that cut and talk about different types of gates that might be able to be deployed that would have less environmental impacts.

In addition to the gates themselves, optimization will focus on the alignment of the barrier down Bolivar and down Galveston islands. We very well may find that there are more benefits to moving that line towards the ocean side and less impacts. So we will be assessing the alignment itself, the height of those barriers, the width of those barriers and types of those barriers so that we can maximize benefits and minimize as much as possible the environmental impacts.

So as we mentioned earlier, we are about halfway through the study itself but there are more
phases to come. We are shooting for a chief's report in 2021 which will then go to Congress and if authorized and we receive funding, we will move into the design phase where we will work on detailed engineering designs that could take somewhere between two to five years to complete, all dependent on the funding stream. Once we have designs, we can move into the build mode for the project and that could take upwards of 10 to 15 years to complete. All dependent again on funding. Then we turn over operation and maintenance to our cost share sponsors and we are looking in the study report it talks about a life cycle of about 50 years. This structure is likely to be out there much longer. So we are evaluating that. It could be 100 year life for the types of infrastructure that we are putting out there.

So we are very glad you are here. We welcome all of your comments. If you are too shy to stand up and provide a comment or if you would like to come to another public meeting, here is the list of where we are going in the next two weeks, three weeks actually. If you are too shy or do not want to comment today verbally, you can send a letter to Ms. Jennifer Morgan. You don't have to write this address down. You can go the our website and get that or if you like to send an email, you can go to our mailbox that is listed
here. The real critical point here is that we need to receive your comments by January 9 in order to include them in the public record.

With that, I know I talk extremely fast, so here is the website address so that you can get that. Everything you have been shown today will be posted on that website once the public meetings have concluded and you can download the report and read it yourself or you can contact us and ask more questions. With that, I am going to turn it back over to you Colonel. Thank you.

MR. ZETTERSTROM: At this point, I will call upon members of the general public who wish to make statements. I have asked Mr. Stokes to assist me in keeping time. He will indicate when you have 30 seconds left to speak and when your time is expired, I ask that you stop speaking after the minute has lapsed. When you are called upon, please come forward and speak into the microphone. Please identify yourself by your full name and the organization that you represent, if any.

I would now like to call upon Mr. Richard Roberson. (No answer)

Next I would like to call upon Ms. Caroline Bateman. (No answer)

Finally, I would like to call upon Mr. Chris Fayland if any of those individuals are still
present. (No answer)

Hearing that those individuals are not still present, next I would like to call upon anyone else in the audience that wishes to speak at this time. Seeing no additional members of the public or public officials or resource representatives, I would like to move into the conclusion of tonight's public meeting.

So in conclusion written comments on the draft integrated feasibility reports an environmental impact statement must be received on or before January 9, 2019. The conclusion of the 75-day commentary that began on October 26, 2018. I would like to thank the Texas General Land Office for their efforts and assistance in preparing for and holding this meeting this evening. And I thank all of you for your attendance and interests that you have shown tonight.

At this point, the meeting is adjourned. (7:15 p.m. End of Public Meeting.)
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COL. ZETTERSTROM: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm pleased to be here tonight. I am Col. Lars Zetterstrom, Commander of the Galveston District. I welcome you to tonight's public meeting to review the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study.

For the record, let me state that this public meeting convened at 5:30 p.m. on November 29th, 2018, at the Port Isabel Event and Cultural Center in Port Isabel, Texas.

Specifically, we are presenting information and accepting public comments on the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the study that was released for public review on October 26th, 2018.

A court reporter is here to transcribe these proceedings and all public comments. The Corps of Engineers and the General Land Office have analyzed coastal risk reduction solutions that would reduce the risk to lives and property on the Texas coast.
Ten years ago the region experienced Hurricane Ike, which disrupted many lives and resulted in extensive economic and infrastructural damages. The Texas coast is also subject to ongoing coastal erosion, relative sea level rise, habitat loss and water quality and degradation. These coastal hazards are placing the environmental and economic health of the coast efforts which negatively impacts the state and national economy.

This, along the storms such as Hurricane Ike, Dolly and Rita emphasized the need for enhanced resiliency of the coast to not only reduce future damages and loss, but to improve our ability to withstand and recover from future storms. It is important to note that the Coastal Texas Study recommends structural measures to reduce risk along the coast and that these recommendations support multiple investments in risk production that agencies and businesses are making along the coast. Coastal Texas is part of a larger effort to risk reduction actions to make the coast more resilient over time.

A cost effective plan has been identified that we believe would significantly reduce the risk of damage from tropical storms and
hurricanes, as well increase the net quality and quantity of coastal ecosystems.

This meeting is being held to describe the tentatively selected plan or the TSP and to receive your comments.

I hope that all of you had an opportunity to read the notice of availability either on the Galveston district's Web site or in the announcements that were mailed to individuals and organizations that may have an interest in these proceedings.

Before we go any further, I'd like to introduce a representative of the Texas General Land Office our study sponsor, Mr. Tony Williams, the senior director of coastal resources.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Col. Zetterstrom. Thank you, everyone, for coming out tonight to learn more about the Coastal Texas Protection Restoration Feasibility Study, also known as the Texas Coastal Study.

I'd like to introduce the other GLO team members here tonight. We have Carla Kartman, she is the project manager for GLO. We Kalob Bennett, he is our director of governmental relations, and we have Lee Schroer one of our field
biologists in our Corpus Christi Field Office.

Addressing issues on the Texas Coast, including storm surges and ecosystem enhancement continues to be one of the top priorities for Commissioner Bush. You may be asking, Why is the GLO involved in this study?

The GLO was established to manage owned state land, including state owned submerged land out ten miles offshore. The land office is also the state agency responsible for implementation of the coastal management program, implementation of the coastal erosion plan response act, protection of public beaches and dune protection act, response to oil spills in state waters, and also state agency tasked with certain possessory recovery roles, and that has increased significantly since Hurricane Harvey.

In November 2015 the GLO signed a piece building offshore agreement with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This obligated the GLO to fund approximately half of a $20 million study, much of which is being accomplished through time. The land office committed to working with the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to increase the resiliency of the Texas Coast through an integrated
approach, includes ecosystem restoration enhancement all along the Texas coast in storm surge, very specifically the Houston/Galveston region.

The draft plan that is being presented today incorporates habitat restoration enhancement, as well gates, levees and flood walls to address erosion, habitat loss and storm surge. The measures work together to increase the overall resiliency of the Texas coast.

The plan proposed in the Texas coastal study was developed to work in concert with the Texas coast resiliency master Plan. The GLO is currently working with stakeholders along the coast to develop a 2019 version to the coastal resiliency master plan that builds on the original version that was released in 2017. The 2019 version of the master plan identifies projects along the coast, the coastal experts have identified as the ones most effective enhancing coastal resiliency.

A 2019 version also includes modeling of risk of Texas coast and benefits of post projects within the plan. The plan will be completed in early 2019 and presented to the Texas legislator. The coastal Texas study coast plan or tentatively selected plan as referred to in the Corps documents
was jointly developed by the GLO and Corps of Engineers.

We have worked with engineering environmental firms, consulted with other groups putting these issues, including local universities and international organizations, have regular meetings with resource agencies, navigation interests and environmental organizations.

As we move to the next phase of the study it is important to get feedback from all stakeholders.

Please remember it is important, the study is only about halfway completed. There's a lot more details that need to be ironed out. We look forward to your comments. Thank you for taking the time to join us. Turn it back over to Col. Zetterstrom.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Tony Williams.

I would like to recognize the public officials for attending tonight. First I would like to recognize Tara Rios, the former Texas House Representative and former South Padre Island City Council.

Next I'd like to recognize Mr. David
A. Garcia, Cameron County commissioner Precinct 3.

Next I'd like to recognize Sofia C. Benavides, Cameron County Commissioner Precinct 1.

Mr. Carlos Reyes, Superintendent of Public Works.

Susan Guthrie, City Manager South Padre Island.

Mr. Joe E. Vega, Cameron County Parks Director and former Mayor of Port Isabel.

And finally, Mr. David Garcia Cameron County Administrator.

Additionally, I'd like to introduce those that are here with me with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, Galveston District Project Manager for the study.

Ms. Sharon Tirpak, Galveston District, Deputy Chief Project Management Branch.

Dr. Himangshu Das, Galveston District Coastal Engineering League Hydrology.

Mr. Bryan Harper, Galveston District Regional Planning Environmental Center Chief Civil Planning Branch.

Mr. Travis Creel, New Orleans District Regional Planning Environmental Center,
South Lead Planner.

Ms. Carolyn McCade, Galveston District Regional Planning and Environmental Center Plan Formulator Lead Planner for Ecosystem Restoration.

Mr. Kenney Pablo, Galveston District Reality Specialists, lead real estate for Coastal Storm Restoration Measures.

Ms. Jennifer Morgan, Galveston District Regional Planning Environmental Branch Specialist and lead environmentalist.

And finally, Mr. Jeffrey Pensky, Galveston District Regional Planning Center Acting Section Chief of the environmental branch.

Now, I would like to describe the ground rules for tonight's meeting. I hope everyone completed a registration form when they entered the meeting. The registration form is used to provide us your contact information so we can keep you updated on the status of the study.

You can also submit a written comment on one of the provided comment cards. If you would like to make a comment orally tonight, please make sure that you have indicated your intent on the sign-in sheet at the door. Those wishing to make an
oral comment will be given an opportunity to do so after the presentation. If you prefer not to speak tonight, you may submit your comment card in the box provided or send them to us by mail or e-mail.

Following these opening remarks, Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes project manager will present an overview of the feasibility study. After her presentation, I will open the floor for public comments.

Federal/state officials that have requested to make a statement will be recognized first. Next representatives from federal and state resource agencies wishing to make a statement will be called upon. Then I'll recognize each individual who has indicated that they wish to make a comment.

Please keep your remarks to one minute as we would like for everyone to have an opportunity to speak and we only have this room available until 9:00 PM.

Also, we would like to emphasize that this is not a question and answer session. This meeting is to provide everyone with an opportunity to publicly comment.

Please give all speakers the courtesy of not making any comments during their
presentation. Turn off your cell phones and hold all applause or other reactions so that we can have an orderly meeting and be respectful of everyone's time. All individuals have equal right to be heard.

Now I would like to present Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes to make our presentation.

MS. BURKS-COPES: So tonight I have a series of things that we need to achieve. I would like to provide you with a status update on the study and then describe the National Environmental Policy Act process that we are involved in now and overlay that with the Army Corps of Engineers planning process. I'll identify them to the tentatively selected plan and then we will walk through the potential impacts, costs and benefits of that plan. And then I will sit down and we will open the floor for public comment.

As Tony mentioned earlier, we are halfway through the study. We were authorized in 2015 to begin studying. We released the report in October 26 of this year, and we have approximately three years left to go. We are conducting a public comment, well, public meetings this week on the lower coast we're going to take a week off and then we have another series of public meetings the very
We have a chief's report that will be released at the end of the study wherein we're in a two phase process right now. The first phase is to focus on measures and accommodations of measures that formulate plans, and then we narrow those down and we go into detail engineering design in the latter phase of this study. So we're about ready to move into that phase, which is why we take a pause and we come to you and we ask you what you think and we take those comments in and hopefully we can address those with adaptations to the designs and informs everything that we're doing at this point.

Our chief's report is set to be released in April of 2021. It will then be signed by our chief and then go to Congress for authorization and then appropriations.

Normally when you work on environmental impact statements you afford the public approximately 45 days to comment and review the plan. This is a fairly large plan, very complex, and so what we have decided to do this time is a 75 day review period, which means we started on the day that the report was released, which is October 26th, and that means it will conclude on
January 9th, 2019.

Inviting public comment is part of the NEPA process, it's required, and all comments are welcome. They can be positive or negative.

Remember the more specific you are with your comments, the easier it will be for us to understand and address those issues, and public and agency input help to inform our decisions. All comments will be fully and equally evaluated and the review and comment ensures that are decisions are based on the best available information.

As you are probably very aware, the Texas coast has a series of problems that this study is focused on. All along the Coast there are potential for economic damages from when the coastal storms hit. We have inland and gulf shoreline erosion problems, significant losses of threatened endangered species habitats, losses of the natural delta processes and disruptive hydrology.

The way that the corps process works is that we establish a set of goals and then set up a series of objectives to measure our success in obtaining goals. In this study is fairly unusual, but we are looking at both coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration together. That
affords us an opportunity to develop plans that provide multiple lines of defense to enhance resilience coast-wide.

To meet the objectives, we're looking at reducing economic damage, reducing risks to both critical infrastructure and public health and safety, increasing resilience, I just mentioned, enhancing and restoring coastal habitats, improving the hydrologic connectivity, and improvements in critical ecosystem, such as marshes and coastal bays.

It's a federal study. The way that we received funding was to establish national significance. As you well know, the study area covers 18 counties along the Texas coast. Within that area 6.1 million folks reside. That's approximately 24 percent of the Texas population.

We have several nationally ranked deep draft courts and they are listed there, as well as 450 miles of gulf intercoastal waterway. This region provides 40 percent of the nation's petrochemical industry and 25 percent of the national petroleum refining capacity.

In addition we have NASA, and on the Galveston Island we have a hospital UTMB with a
level 4 vital life. Those were community resources. We also have significant natural resources along the coast.

We have critical habitat with threatened endangered species. We have wetlands, oysteries, sea turtle nesting areas, sea grass beds. We have the center flyaway running straight through the study area, and within our area of boundaries we have twelve national wildlife refuges. Two of the 28 national estuary program sites were found within our study area. And the Laguna Madre which you are very familiar with is one of six rear hypersaline lagoons in the world.

We have the Padre Island National Seashore and up and down the coast we have nursery habitats that are commercially fished for oysters, shrimp and finfish.

Now I have to give you kind of the 101 on course speed at this point, so that we can go through the Corps planning process.

In the Army Corps we use the concept of building blocks. Features are levees, marshes and gates. Actions are restoration, raisings or construction, and treatments are plantings or nourishments. And when you combine features and
actions and treatments you end up with something we call measure. And we evaluate the measures and then combine those into plans.

In 2016 we were authorized or we were directed by Congress to not reinvent the wheel. There were several ongoing studies looking at barrier plans for the Texas Coast and there were several agencies and entities in this area collecting data, and so we were directed by Congress to use that as much as possible.

So, for example, the NOAA's sea level rise viewer allows us to take a look at what the potential loss invasion would be if sea level rise were to happen in this area. FEMA had an inundation mapping that we could take a look at.

There were several ongoing studies, as I mentioned. The GCCPRD has a study map-- now, let me just say, this is not our plan, it's not the -- this is not the coastal spine. It's much broader than those two plans. It's not the HGAP plan either.

What we were directed to do was bounce off of those plans, add to them, the ecosystem restoration and look at those.

And so in 2014 we initiated a series
of scoping meetings up and down the coast to start
gaining this information and pulling together ideas
about what could be done, and we formulated measures
that we then used screening criteria based on goals
and objectives to formulate plans.

In essence, we looked at a series of
measures for ecosystem restoration and apply the
goals and objectives and screen them down to
measures to be carried forward. And then we did the
same thing with the coastal storms management
activities.

In the Corps we have pretty much
three big criteria that we use to compare and
contrast plans. Solution must be engineeringly
sound, environmentally acceptable and economically
justified. We have a series of tools that we can
use to quantify each of these different criteria,
storm modeling, for example.

For this study we generated 600
storms that have never been seen before and we
devised barrier plans and then ran the storms across
those barriers to see what the effectiveness was of
those barriers.

We have tools to assess the potential
risk reduction for dune and beach creation, and we
have habitat modeling tools to assess the productivity of different solutions up and down the coast.

So what I'll show you now is in Region One in the Houston/Galveston area, the barrier plans that evolve out all of that evaluation activity. They're somewhat similar. They have a few components that are equal in both cases, but the positioning of the barrier itself is different.

Plan A is coastal barrier solution. It starts in High Island, runs down to Bolivar and then runs all the way across the Nav Channel to the Galveston Island with a ring levee surrounding Galveston. It ties into the seawall and then continues down to San Luis Pass. Does not close off San Luis Pass. At the Nav Channel it does not close off the Nav Channel all the time. There are movable gates that would cross that two mile inlet that we close in advance of the storm and then open back up afterwards.

Around Galveston there would be somewhat we call porous ring levee. There are openings for roadways and railroads to get in, but during a storm those would be closed off.

Hurricanes bring with them a lot of rain. And so
there are pump stations that would be constructed to drain the water off the land while the rain levee is closed.

Up in the west side of the bay, the storm would probably move, open the barrier island into the bay and we would provide some -- we would implement some non-structural measures and, of course, that's raisings of buildings and flood dripping.

There are two big -- or tributary's in that area. One is Dickinson Bayou and the other is Clear Creek. We have proposed gates on those two tributary's with pump stations to draw off the water and then those would be opened again after the storm passed.

Now, if you see, this plan is the coastal barrier solution. An alternative would be a wind barrier solution that would start up at San Jacinto, could cross San Jacinto with a gate and a pump station again, come down the rim of the bay. We would have a closure at Clear Lake and at Dickinson with pump stations. We would tie in to the Texas City levee system and then extend that to the west.

Down on Galveston Island there would
still be a ring barrier with pump stations and a
closure at the end that again would be porous, it
would be closed during the storm event and then open
back up at least at the roadway and railroad
systems.

Now, the way that the Corps planning
process works is that we have to compare and
contrast those plans and ask which one is more
effective in reducing risks.

And so if you look at Plan A, for
element, we can expect to get all the benefit
categories met, whereas in Plan D we would likely
see only a focus on dense industrial and commercial
benefit areas.

In Plan A critical navigation
features are protected or risks are reduced versus
in Plan D some of those features are open and they
are left open.

Some of the structures would need to
be raised in Plan A, others would need to be raised
in Plan D, and the like. So there's a comparison
back and forth between the two plans as part of the
process.

In addition to the activities going
on up in the Houston/Galveston area there's a third
component: A coastal storm risk management component here on South Padre Island. Since 1988 we've been using beneficial use of dredge material to place material up on the shoreline in dune and beach features that provide risk reduction along the coast. The problem with this is that it's dependent on funding and so the timing is not regular.

What we have proposed in this plan is a two mile lane of beach and dune that's approximately twelve and a half feet high and a hundred feet wide and would be regularly nourished every ten years. Sorry. But that's not all.

We're proposing ecosystem restoration up and down the coast as well. Approximately, 160,000 acres of marsh, beach, dunes, oyster reefs, shoreline protection and islands. In this area we would propose a hydrologic connection for the Laguna Madre which would enhance water quality and would provide better habitat conditions for sea grass, for example.

So the tentatively selected plan is a combination of those components. We have selected Plan A, the coastal barrier, in combination with ecosystem restoration solutions, we provided up and down the coast approximately nine of those. It
provides multiple lines of defense because we have
marsh on the back and beach and dunes on the front.
As you go down the coast there are separate
individual sites that would be restored all the way
down to this area and the component for South Padre
beach and dune series for coastal storm risk
management is part of the tentatively selected plan.
The estimated cost for all of that is
between 23 and $32 billion. Forty percent of that
is ecosystem restoration, so between 8.9 and
11.9 billion, and I'm saying that with B. The lower
coast wide coastal storm risk management measures
here in South Padre would run between 71 and
83 million, and then the barrier up in Region One
would run between 14.2 and $19.9 billion.

There will be essential impacts as a
result of this feature, of this plan. Alternative A
will likely impact directly 4500 acres or more of
habitat directly under the line that you see on the
map, versus alternative D2 would affect 2300 plus or
minus acres, and the South Padre solution would
impact 365.8 acres. Those are just direct impacts.

We are anticipating indirect impacts
with closure of the bay. There's some restriction
when you put gates into play, and that would causal
altered title exchange between the ocean and the bay, as well as reduced velocities in Galveston Bay.  

On the other hand, the ecosystem restoration project would enhance the restoration benefits up and down the coast to the tune of approximately 160,000 acres. The total mitigation cost so far that we have estimated 676 to $906 million, but with optimization with improvements on the designs we are likely to see those numbers go down. Which is the point of optimization or at least one of the points of optimization.

By optimization what I mean is that in our study thus far and in the report you will find us proposing things like floating sector gates to close off in and out channel in Houston/Galveston area for the inland. There's actually one of those features elsewhere in the world so we know that it does work. But there could be alternatives to that gate design that we need to look at.

So when I talked about phases for this setting, the first phase was specifically focused on determining whether we should do a rim solution or a barrier island solution in the upper bay in the upper region.
Now that we've selected that solution, we are going to go into detailed engineering and take a look at different types of gates and ask whether they're environmentally acceptable, whether they're engineeringly sound and whether they are economically justified.

We can also look at things like realignments of the barrier itself, whether it should be along Highway 87 on Walter or maybe move towards the front of the Island, whether it be a levee itself or T-wall or whether we consider beach and dune combinations.

And in this area we have regions three and four, I believe, are posed. That may be wrong. I may have those numbers wrong. But what I'm trying to explain is that there were other regions that were not economically justified thus far. But in the next phase of the study as we go through optimization and we take in more information, we may be able to extend and expand that plan to go further up and further down the coast line.

So like I mentioned, we're only about halfway through the study. We're set to produce the report for our chief in 2021. That the will then go
to Congress for consideration and for authorization and appropriation. If we get authorization and funding to begin, we will start design and that could take up to five years. Then we would go into a build phase where we'd spend approximately ten to fifteen years constructing each of the elements of the barrier system. And then we turn the study, the project over to our sponsors for long-term maintenance.

The study plans suggests that that would be 50 years or more. These are large structures that will likely to have a life cycle beyond 50 years and so we will be taking that into account with our analysis.

We're at that critical moment where we can adapt. We can take your input into our consideration and help, that would help us with decision making.

We have this meeting tonight. We've already conducted two meetings further up the coast over the last two days and we still have four more public meetings to come. If you wish to offer us a comment you can come up tonight and speak. But if you're shy or not ready there are other ways.

You can fill out the comment form we
gave you tonight and turn it in at the basket up in the front, or you can send that or a letter even to us at this address, or you can go out to the Web site and tap into our e-mail box and send us a comment that way.

The critical thing here is that we receive your comments by January 9th so they can be incorporated into the public record.

I talk fast, I get it, and I have a weird accent. So if there's anything that you didn't quite understand or you want to sink your teeth into. We got a Web site out there, coastalstudy.texas.gov, and on that site are all the coasters in the other room, all of the information that I've provided here tonight will be posted up there. The video you just witnessed is on that site. And the report itself with all appendices are loaded, so you can get to any of the information that the subject matters have provided you tonight and you can get the information that I myself provided to you. The mailbox is on this site. So if you click you'll be able to get to that.

And with that, I'm close to my presentation and give the podium back to Col. Zetterstrom.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Dr. Burks-Copes. I now recognize elected officials who like to make a statement. First I would like to call on Mr. David A. Garcia, Cameron County Commissioner Precinct 3.

MR. GARZA: Where do we speak from? Thank you. For the record, my name is David A. Garza as written on the card here. And I know for some people it makes no difference, but to me personally my name is important.

With that being said, I wish to just tell you that your study has a lot of merit. It looks like a great instrument. But we are very minimally included in your study. Out of every one dollar that you're spending we are getting one-third of one penny spent in regions three and four south from Baffin Bay down; that is not adequate.

Lower Laguna Madre as you well mentioned is used as a funded item is one of six hypersaline lagoons in the world that needs to be protected. Your study does very little to protect it.

Yes, you include a little piece to increase, you know, the exchange of the title of the waves change, but then doesn't do anything to
protect it. By the time you get to realize that this part of Texas is in the county and in the State of Texas, we will proudly have eroded to the point where the lower Laguna Madre is going to be part of the Gulf of Mexico. So I ask and implore you please consider adding more projects for the Lower Laguna madre area and for Cameron County. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

My apologize for mispronouncing your name.

Next I'd like to call on Sofia C. Benavides, Cameron County Commissioner Precinct 1.

MS. BENAVIDES: Good evening. I'm Sofia Benavides and I'm the County Commissioner Precinct 1.

The Court passed a resolution requesting for the county beaches to be located on the island to be included in this feasibility study prepared by the Corps and by the GLO.

So I speak for my colleagues today and say that we need to preserve and protect our coastal beaches. We currently maintain 6.3 miles of beach on South Padre Island and 7.4 miles of beach on Boca Chica. Currently we are investing approximately 40 million to operate and maintain three coastal parks as well four public beach access
areas, not to mention millions being invested within the city.

Recognizing that the Island is growing and there is still room for future development on the north end of the island, I'm wondering why only 2.2 miles of beach in Cameron County was included in your study.

I urge you to take a look at our request. This is a priority to us and I hope it is a priority to the GLO and to the Corps. On behalf of the residence I represent and the Texas payers of this county, I ask you to please include Cameron County in your study. We will work with the federal and state agencies to continue to follow the process. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Next I call on Joe E. Vega Cameron County Parks.

MS. VEGA: Good evening, Colonel, and Tony Williams and members of you-all's staff. Thank you for being here.

Our County Judge Eddie Trevino sends his apologies. He had another commitment and wanted to be here this evening. We maintain four coastal parks and three public beach access areas on South Padre Island, one on the south -- one coastal park
in the south end, Isla Blanca County Park, and park on the north end and three public beach access on the north end, beach access three, beach access four, beach access five and beach access number six.

Your study only identifies 2.2 miles of restoration inside the city limits of South Padre Island. We're requesting that you include all the beaches on the, that are outside the city limits of South Padre Island to be part of the study.

Like Commissioner Benavides said, we are investing over $24 million in public beach access improvements to our coastal parks and it is important that those coastal parks are also included in your study. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Next I call Mr. David Garcia, Cameron County Administrator.

MR. GARCIA: Good evening, everybody, members of the public. My name is David Garcia. I'm the county administrator. And I just want to point out -- I just want to reference the comments made by everybody before me. And I also want to point out two facts or two comments. The first one is according to Wikipedia there were about 16 rain events from 2010 to 2017, most of those were in South Texas. In your
presentation there was nothing included for South
Texas.

The second point I want to add is your
mitigation alone is going to be almost one billion
dollars. For our area we were not even a hundred
million dollars. So I ask you to go back and talk
to your lead executive and leadership that is
working on this plan because the county is growing.
The county will grow will double or triple in size
on South Padre Island and plan to have development
in these areas and want to have it protected for
many years to come. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: I now call
members of the general public who wish to make
statements. I've asked Mr. Stokes to assist me in
timekeeping. He will indicate when you have 30
seconds to speak and when your time is expired. I'd
ask that you stop speaking at one minute.

When you are called upon, please come
forward and speak into the microphone. Please
identify yourself by your full name and organization
you represent, if any.

First, I'd like to call on Mr. John
Young.

MR. YOUNG: John Young, San Benito,
Texas. We have bayou -- a real resource that's unique in many ways. This plan isn't going to have but to rule out and time enough to do what's needed. We need to back this plan and move it forward as fast as we can. I see that we have twelve years. I don't think we have twelve years. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

Next I would like to invite Mr. Brandon Hill.

MR. HILL: Thank you very much.

My name is Brandon Hill. I'm the shoreline director for the City of South Padre Island. We maintain and manage five miles of beach front, 27 beach accesses, over 135 private beach accesses among hundreds of million dollars of residence and property that lie behind our beaches.

We thank the GLO and the Army Corps for the hard work and the fantastic effort that's been put in. This plan really is evidence of what could happen when folks work together, don't reinvent the wheel, and truly come out of a problem with a unique prospective.

The city moves forward to continuing to work with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as well as the GLO, especially when it comes to expanding the footprint of a project that is proposed for South
Padre Island.

    We request that Regions two five and six be reconsidered as part of this plan as they are crucial both to the economic and the safety factors for the Island. When you look at Beach two there's a large section that can easily be breached and cut off 90 percent of residents from the causeway only way in and out of the mainland. And when you look at the beach five and six you're talking almost a billion dollars worth of construction just in that area, as well as over $8 million annually in economic impact it would have to this local region which I think we can all agree is significant.

Thank you.

    COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

Next I call David Swang to make comments.

    MS. SWANG: I'm David Swang. I live on South Padre Island region five on the beach. I grew up around the Mississippi River and I know if you put a dike on the part of the river on each side it gets worse. So I'm pretty sure your plan will make my life worse, because you have a twelve foot sand barrier a few hundred feet south of where I live, the water is going to come around. Water is
really smart. It goes through wherever it can get to. So I think you need to study this island as a hole and understand the consequences of putting a partial barrier. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

Next I invite Mr. Pete Sepulveda to make comments.

Good evening, for the record, my name is Pete Sepulveda. I'm the executive director for the Cameron County Regional Mobility Authority. Thank you for the draft feasibility study, very detailed, very thorough. However, I would like to formally request and strongly urge that the Cameron County maintain beach areas located on South Padre Island, Texas, be included in your feasibility study.

The Cameron County Regional Mobility Authority along with the State of Texas Department of Transportation have invested millions of dollars in developing a second access project to South Padre Island with the General Land Office in developing hydra project for sea grass mitigation.

The proposed second access would be locate approximately one mile north of beach access five. This project is extremely important to the
economic health of South Padre Island, Cameron County and the State of Texas. Thus, I would urge that as part of your NEPA process you go back and include this county areas in your feasibility study. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Next I call on Leslie Tatum.

MS. TATUM: Hello. I'm Leslie Tatum and I'm not a public official obviously. My dad bought a house on the Island 1988 and he and his grandfathers came down here in 1930s, so you know the Island is an ever-changing thing. And I do see the complexity of the study and it looks like a lot of work was done.

I am a little frustrated that a lot of time is spent on the upper coast. I think in the film something was mentioned something about a berm and I don't know that that was mentioned beside the twelve foot, you know, twelve foot and five foot sand dunes. But I'd like to know more about what a berm is and whether we're going to have that.

And I agree with some of the folks that have commented about the water will find a way, and the dunes also find a way, but unfortunately with the huge amount of development on the Island in
the last 20 years many of the dunes have been destroyed.

So my understanding as a layman about the Island and the dunes is that they protect the shoreline as well. And if they have no room to redistribute and rebuild, you know, we're passed the point of, you know, over-building the Island. But I would hope that that is taken into consideration because, you know, the Island has a natural way of taking care of itself and unfortunately man made structures have almost destroyed that and -- but I love it down here and I'm glad that there's money it seems to be working on all this, so thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your time.

Next I'd like to call on Mr. Philip Hanley.

MR. HANLEY: My name is Phillip Hanley. I'm an environmental consultant that works with several of the landowners within these city limits of South Padre, as well as a lot of those own land north of the city.

As one who has written environmental impact statements and reviewed several, I feel that that 6.5 mile stretch from the city limits north to
the end of the road that you have kind of missed
something there, that you really need to take a hard
look at that.

  When you look at what's left of the
Island to develop in the city of South Padre Island,
the only direction it can could go is north. That
stretch of beach is also used by hundreds and
thousands of people from the Valley that come on
weekends to use it, and with a road that is
currently less than 400 feet from the water that
beach is in peril. So it needs to have more time
and consideration on your part and NIS to look at
that more carefully. Thank you.

  COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.
  Next I invite Mr. Barry Patel.
  Next I call on Mr. Christopher
Allison.

  MR. ALLISON: I'm from Christopher
Allison. I'm from San Antonio, Texas, and a
landowner on South Padre Island. I just wanted to
point out in 1982 the U.S. Government adopted a
Coastal Barrier Resource Protection Act and
basically set aside ten miles of Cameron County as
eligible for flood insurance, this includes the area
on the road north of the town six miles of what Bill
Henley just described. That act was reauthorized in 1990 and 2000. And I think the Corps should protect the land that the federal government made eligible for federal flood insurance being reimbursement. Thank you very much.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

I would like to invite Patty Matamoros to make comments.

MS. MATAMOROS: My name is Patty Matamoros. I'm the administrative assistant to Commissioner Sofia Benavides. I'm strongly urging that the beaches of Cameron County located on the north and south -- of the South Padre city limits be included in the Coastal Texas Study. These beach areas are eroding at a rate of approximately three to 14 feet per year causing potential future damage to private property, public infrastructure and hinder economic development.

Cameron County is currently investing approximately 24 million in improving beach access providing need for pavilions, dune walkovers, additional parking and dune conservation areas. These improvements are essential and necessary for protecting the environment, our natural resources and enhancing the quality of life for residents and
visitors.

This is another one reason why Cameron County beaches and coastal parks located around South Padre Island should also be located in the study as part of the routine maintenance, which include dune and beach restoration and beach maintenance in order to protect these highly visited public beach access and as many of our visitors enjoy the most. We appreciate your consideration.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, ma'am.

Next is Mr. Bill Berg present for comments.

MR. BERGH: Thank you. My concerns were addressed in the open house. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

Finally, I would like to invite Jamie Lopez to make comments.

THE WITNESS: Good evening. For the record, may people Jaime Lopez, I'm the deputy parks director for Cameron County.

I'd like to urgently request that the beaches to the south and north of South Padre Island city limits be included in the study.

Cameron County has invested -- is in
the process of investing over $20 million in public 
recreational infrastructure, which includes dune 
restoration. It is a known fact that these areas 
currently that are currently excluded are eroding at 
a high rate, and ask you to please consider the 
areas to be included in the study. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

At this time we have gone through our list of those 
who have indicated they wanted to make their 
statements.

At this time is there anyone else 
wishes to speak. You may step forward.

MR. ROSALES: Good evening, colonel, 
Mr. Williams. My name is Augusto Sanchez Gonzalez. 
I work with the University of Texas Rio Grande 
Valley and I've been working very closely with 
Cameron County in the new erosion response plan and 
beach access and the protection plan that will allow 
development for beach front construction projects.

Just to reiterate what other members 
of the public have said that development can only go 
north at this point, and that's precisely the area 
that's not covered by the current plan. With the 
new causeway and the current erosion rates as per 
the UTB study from the Gulf Coast -- Texas Gulf
Coast, I urge to include the north part of -- the north end of Cameron County beaches especially since by the time this project is completed it is going to be 13 to 20 years from now. So by that point there's going to be a lot of development in that area that's going to be not protected. And at that point 20 years from now it's going to be economically justifiable.

So I urge you to include that into your current plan. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that would like to make comments.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just have a question. The comments made tonight, did they tell you anything you didn't already know or did they enlighten you to further the study in South Texas?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Ma'am, this period is comment period. After we adjourn the public meeting, we will be happy to answer your question.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I misunderstood sorry.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Anyone else care to make a comment.
Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

In conclusion, written comments on the Draft Intergraded Feasibility Report and the Environmental Impact Statement must be received on or before January 9th, 2019, the conclusion of the 75 day comment period that began on the 26th of October 2018.

I would like to thank the Texas General Land Office for their office and assistance in preparing for holding this meeting this evening, and I thank all of you for your attendance and interest that all of you have shown here tonight. This adjourns the public meeting. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

(Public meeting concluded at 7:33 p.m.)
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Winnie Public Meeting Transcript
COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to be here tonight. I am Colonel Zetterstrom of the Galveston District of the US Army Corps of Engineers. I welcome you to tonight's public meeting to review the Coastal Texas Restoration Feasibility Study.

For the record, let me state that the public meeting was convened at 5:30 p.m. on December 11th, 2018, at the Winnie Community Building in Winnie, Texas.

Specifically, we are presenting information, accepting public comments on the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for this study that was released for public review on October 26th, 2018. A court reporter is here to transcribe these proceedings and all the comments.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Texas General Land Office have analyzed coastal risk reduction solutions that would reduce the risk to lives and property on the Texas Coast.

Ten years ago the region experienced Hurricane Ike, which disrupted many lives and resulted in extensive economic and infrastructure damages which the Texas Coast is subject to on-going coastal erosion, relative sea-level rise, habitat loss and actuary quality degradation.

These coastal hazards are placing the environmental and economic health of the Coast at risk, which negatively impacts the state and national economy.
Hurricane Ike, Dolly and Rita intensified the need for enhanced resilience of the Coast to not only reduce future damages and loss to the environment and to withstand and recover from future storms.

It is important to note that the Coastal Texas Study recommends structural measures to reduce risk along the Coast, and that the recommendations support multiple investments and risk reduction that agencies and businesses are making along the Coast.

The Coastal Texas Study is a part of a larger effort of risk-reduction actions to make the Coast more resilient over time. A cost-effective plan has been identified that we believe would significantly reduce the risk of damage from tropical storms and hurricanes as well as increase the net quality and quantity of the coastal ecosystems.

This meeting is being held to describe the Tentatively Select Plan, or the TSP, and receive your comments. I hope that all of you have had an opportunity to read the Notice of Availability on the Galveston District website and the announcements that were mailed to individuals and organizations that may have an interest in these proceeding.

Before we go any further, I would like to introduce a representative of the Texas General Land's Office, our Study's sponsor, Tony Williams, the Planning Senior Director of Coastal Resources.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Colonel Zetterstrom. And thank you all for coming out tonight to learn more about the Coastal Texas Study.

Protection and Restoration Feasibility also known as "Coastal Study." I would like to acknowledge the GLO team members that are here from both the upper-costal field office and from our Austin headquarters.

Raise your hands. We have several over here.

It is very important to Commissioner Bush to address issues along the Coast including storm surge and ecosystem enhancements. This is one of his hot priorities.

GLO is involved in this study. The Texas General Land Office was established to manage state-owned land including state-owned surge land under title influence from high tide ten miles offshore.

The Land Office is the state agency responsible for the implementation of the Coastal Management Program. The Coastal Erosion Plan Response Act, beach and dune protection, also respond a state water and environmental roles in the disaster recovery.

In November of 2015 GLO signed the Feasibility Cautionary Agreement with the Corps of Engineers for the Coastal Texas Study that delegated the GLO to planning a path of approximately a 20-million-dollar study, much of which is being established through working in time the Land Office committed with working with the Corps of Engineers to establish a land resiliency of the Texas Coast.

Their approach includes ecosystem restoration along the Coast, storm surge Houston/Galveston Region.

The Draft Plan is being presented today incorporated high tide restoration as well as gate levees, a flood wall to address are rosehip habitat, loss storm surge measure working together to increase the overall resiliency of the Texas Coast.

The proposed plan of the Coastal Texas Studies developed to working in concert with the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan.

The GLO is currently working with state holder along the Coast to develop the 2019 version of the Master Plan, which builds on the original plans released in 2017.

The 2019 version of the Master Plan identifies projects that coastal experts have identified as the most effective at increasing coastal resilience.

The Plan also includes modeling to identify future threat to the Texas Coast and to the benefit of identified projects. The Plan will be complete in early 2019, and presented to the Texas Legislature. The Coastal Texas Study Proposed Plan or Tentatively Selected Plan, as referred to in the Corps' documents, generally developed by the GLO Corps of Engineers.

We worked with engineering firms and environmental firms and consulting with other groups addressing these issues, local universities and international organizations.

We've had multiple meetings with resource agencies, national interests and environmental organizations. Remember, the study, we are only half through it. There are details that still need to be worked out.

We value your input and look forward to your comments. Thank you for taking the time to join us.

Colonel Zetterstrom.

COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Williams.

Now, I would like to recognize the public officials who are in attendance at this meeting.

First, I would like welcome Sheriff Brian Hawthorne, Chambers County Sheriff. Thank you, sir.

I would like to recognize Commissioner Jimmy E. Gore, Chambers County Precinct 1 Commissioner.

Thank you, sir.

And then, lastly, I would like to recognize State Representative elect Mayes Middleton, State Representative Elect for Texas House District 23.

Thank you, gentleman.

Additionally, I would like to recognize the Project Discovery Team from the US Army Corps of Engineers Team. If you can please stand and raise your hands so that way the public can recognize the Corps Team?

Thank you, team.

And, now, I will ascribe the ground rules and format for tonight's meeting:

I hope everyone completed an attendance card when they entered. The attendance card is used to provide us your contact information so that we can keep you updated on the status of the study.
If you would like to make a comment, please make sure that you have indicated your intent on your blue attendance cards and it is turned in to the meeting facilitator. If you haven't done that, please do so immediately with the facilitator out front. Those wishing to make an oral comment will be given an opportunity to do so after the presentation. If you prefer not to speak tonight, you can submit your comments in writing by dropping them in the box provided or send them to us by mail or e-mail.

Following these opening remarks, Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, the Project Manager, will present an overview of the feasibility study. After her presentation, I will open the floor for public comment. The state officials that have requested to make a statement will be recognized first. Next representatives from the Federal and State Resources Agencies wishing to make a statement will be called upon.

Then I will recognize individuals from the general public who have indicated they wish to make a comment. Please keep your remarks to one minute, as we would like for everyone to have an opportunity to speak. We would also like to emphasize that this will not be a question-and-answer session. This meeting is to provide everyone with an opportunity to publically comment on the Plan.

Please give all speakers the courtesy of not making any comments during their presentation. Please turn off your cell phone and refrain from applause or reactions so that we can have an orderly decision-making. Review of comments ensures that we use the best available information in our processing. You're very well aware of the vulnerabilities of the Texas Coast:

- We are vulnerable to the coastal storm surge damage. We have inlands and coastal-erosion problems.
- We have a loss of critical habitat due to erosion problems, but also the storms and potentially sea level rise, loss of natural delta processes, forming of delta and we have disrupted hydrology up and down the Coast.
- To address these problems we have been told by Congress to go after those goals.

In order to reserve federal dollars to do this study, we must establish national significance. As you are well aware, there are 18 counties within our study area. 6.1 million residents reside in the study area, which is approximately 24 percent of the population of Texas. We have several deep-draft ports in our study area; but, in addition, we have 450 miles of Gulf Intercoastal Waterway.

40 percent of the petrochemical industry exists within our study area. 6.1 million residents reside in the study area, which is approximately 24 percent of the population of Texas. We have a loss of critical habitat due to erosion problems, but also the storms and potentially sea level rise, loss of natural delta processes, forming of delta and we have disrupted hydrology up and down the Coast.

Coastal Storm Risk Management and Ecosystem Restoration. And the Corps what we do is establish a set of objectives to go after those goals.

So, in this study our objectives are to reduce economic damage; to reduce the risk to critical infrastructure; reduce the risk to public health and safety; to increase resilience up and down the Coast by enhancing and restoring coastal landforms; and improving hydrologic connectivity and improve and sustain coastal marshes and bay shorelines.

In order to reserve federal dollars to do this study, we must establish national significance. As you are well aware, there are 18 counties within our study area. 6.1 million residents reside in the study area, which is approximately 24 percent of the population of Texas. We have several deep-draft ports in our study area; but, in addition, we have 450 miles of Gulf Intercoastal Waterway.

40 percent of the petrochemical industry exists within our study area. 6.1 million residents reside in the study area, which is approximately 24 percent of the population of Texas. We have a loss of critical habitat due to erosion problems, but also the storms and potentially sea level rise, loss of natural delta processes, forming of delta and we have disrupted hydrology up and down the Coast.

Coastal Storm Risk Management and Ecosystem Restoration. And the Corps what we do is establish a set of objectives to go after those goals.

So, in this study our objectives are to reduce economic damage; to reduce the risk to critical infrastructure; reduce the risk to public health and safety; to increase resilience up and down the Coast by enhancing and restoring coastal landforms; and improving hydrologic connectivity and improve and sustain coastal marshes and bay shorelines.

In order to reserve federal dollars to do this study, we must establish national significance. As you are well aware, there are 18 counties within our study area. 6.1 million residents reside in the study area, which is approximately 24 percent of the population of Texas. We have several deep-draft ports in our study area; but, in addition, we have 450 miles of Gulf Intercoastal Waterway.
We have 12 National Wildlife Refuges up and down the Coast. We have a critical habitat for threatened and endangered species; critical coastal ecosystems including wetlands, sea-grass beds, oysters reefs and turtle-nesting habitat, for example.

If you just look out the window, you are going to see natural nesting habitat and significant commercial fisheries for oysters, shrimp and finfish.

So, now, I need to talk about how the Corps speak and syntax we use. In USACE speak we have features and actions and treatments to generate a measure, and then measures are combined to formulate alternatives.

In terms of the features, we are talking about things like increased marshes, levees, gates, et cetera.

For actions, we are talking about restoration, raisings, construction.

And for treatment, we are talking about things like four nourishments and planting.

So, we formed those into Combinations of Measure, and then the measures are combined to form alternatives. We then assess these alternatives.

We were told in the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 to use all available data, which we are doing. And if you know of other data that we don’t know of, please hand it over.

We have listed a series of data that we have used thus far.

For example, NOAA Sea Level Rise Viewer that you can project out to the future and determine potential projection of lands lost as a result of sea-level rise.

We know that there were ongoing studies or existing and historical studies looking at those problems. The GCCPRD has a plan; Texas A&M has a plan, the SSPEED Center has a plan.

We call it the Coastal Barrier because it includes both the ecosystem restoration and Coastal Risk Management in combination so that we can provide multiple lines of defense.

We know the US Army Corps of Engineers has several on-going studies and construction activities in the footprint of this study. So, we are taking those into account.

And we have also acknowledged the GLO is updating their Master Plan, and the studies that are identified in the GLO Master Plan are taken into the account when we propose our Economic System Restoration Site.

The idea is not to reinvent the wheel and not to step on each other’s territory, but to actually help to create a more resilient Coast by doing so.

We began the process in 2014 with a series of scoping meetings. And with all of this information in hand, we developed measures and then formulated those and screened those based on our goals and objectives.

We developed a series of measures by region. Region 1 is a region that you enable now. Region 2 is just down the coast, and 3

and 4 we have a series of measures that we used to the goal and objectives to scene down and then we formulate a plan.

The Corps of Engineers uses the three E’s to assess the plans.

Three E’s:

- Engineeringly sound -- I don’t know if that is a real word.
- Okay -- environmentally acceptable and economically justified.
- We have run a series of coastal storms across the barriers that we have proposed to determine what their effectiveness would be.
- We formulated over 600 never已被-seen storms that range from ten year all the way out to ten thousand-year event. This ranges from the rainfall to tropical storms to Category 1 all the way up to Category 5’s and beyond.

The intent is to look at all of the forces that come against the barrier and determine if the barriers are effective.

We also have used a series of storm hydrologic models to assess changes in the Bay, sedimentation changes in the Bay and velocities in the Bay if we were to put barriers in place.

The first phase of the study -- and this is something that I want to get across to you to ask the question where should we be placing a barrier? Should it be on the rim? Should it be across the Bay maybe tying into Texas City? Or running along the Barrier Islands?

So, what I am going to point out now is just kind of a general description of the two solutions that affectively where assessed in the study.

Starting at the High Islands going across the GIWW down to Bolivar with the levee system there would be a gate at the GIWW going down to Bolivar Island to the Galveston Inlet -- I am sorry -- Bolivar Peninsula. That word is hard for me. "Bolivar."

Now, going across the inlet with a series of gates and tying into the Seawall at Galveston and then tying into the bottom of the Seawall and taking that all the way down to San Luis.

Now, these features have an estimated height of approximately 17 feet, but that will change as we go through optimization, which is the next phase of the study.

Features are, as always, have a place holder or conceptual alignment. This alignment will change in the next phase of the study as well.

The features going across the two Bays are navigational gates that there is a 1200-foot span for the existing Houston Ship Channel and then on both sides of the Ship Channel are another 38 vertical-lift gate.

All of the gates tolled span the 2 mile stretch, and will only be closed during storms and during testing and operating and maintenance.

The Bays behind Galveston High Island Ring Barrier is open most of the time. Then the gates are closed when a storm comes. That is going to trap water inside the Ring Barriers.

So, the triangles on the map are actually pump stations that would draw off the water during the storm at the back of the Galveston

Estuarine Program sites are within our study area.

We have 12 National Wildlife Refuges up and down the Coast.
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1 Ring Levee itself, but you would need a gate there. So, now, when
2 storms come in would hit the barrier, the surge would be pulled back.
3 But, as they move over into the Bay, there is still
4 winds-driven surge that would bring some surge up into this side of
5 the Bay so that the hatched area on the left-hand side, what the Corps
6 calls non-structural measures, those are raising and flood proofing of
7 the existing structures.
8 We would need to put a gate at Clear Lake, Clear Creek. We
9 would also need to put one at Dickenson Bayou. And pump stations so
10 that, when we have those gates closed and the rainfall hits the land,
11 the water would be drawn off and put back into the Bay.
12 There is no closure at San Luis Pass in the proposed plan as
13 of today, but Texas A&M has been running some storm models that they
14 have agreed to share with us so that we can take that into account.
15 One thing to note, though, is that is one of the last natural
16 inlets along the Texas Coast and then Natural Resource Agencies are
17 concerned about closing off the San Luis Pass.
18 We looked at the four different plans. But, in the end, we
19 really liked two separate plans and compared and contrasted those.
20 So, what I want you to notice is that some of these features
21 are carried into the next plan.
22 The Rim Barrier Plan, which starts up at the San Jacinto and
23 crosses with a gate and pumping station, again, follows along the rim
24 of the Bay; crosses Clear Lake; crosses Dickenson; ties into Texas
25 City Levee; and then extends across to the west from the Texas City
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1 Levee.
2 We would maintain, again, the Rim Barrier and Galveston, the
3 pumping stations and a gate-offset bayou.
4 So, the way that the Corps process works is that we compared
5 and contrasted those two perhaps to determine if they are engineering
6 sound? Are they environmentally acceptable? Are they economically
7 justified?
8 I have given you a list of some of the compare/contrast of the
9 two plans to be considered.
10 The Island Barrier Plan Protection of reduces risk to the
11 GIWWT Gulf Coast, the Gulf Intercoastal Waterway, and the navigation
12 system, the Houston Ship Channel. Whereas, Plan D does not because
13 along the Rim Barrier, along -- Plan A provides protection to Bolivar
14 and provides protection to Galveston Island below the Ring Barrier as
15 Plan D does not.
16 And, so, these types of comparisons are used to determine what
17 the Tentatively Selected Plan would be. That's why we looked at those
18 two plans specifically in the first phase of the study and in addition
19 to what is happening in Region 1, what is being proposed to happen in
20 Region 1 down to South Padre.
21 There are a series of breaches where we have been doing
22 beneficial of drudge material on the beaches, but that has been
23 happening since 1988. But the efforts are not regular in that region
24 and that funding -- and that is because the funding is limited.
25 So, what we are proposing is a 2 mile dune-and-beach system
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1 that would be 12-and-a-half-feet tall and 100 feet wide and it will be
2 refurbished every ten years.
3 On top of all this you will remember that we are a
4 multi-purpose project. So, we formulated economic system restoration
5 solutions as well. In this region specifically we are proposing 55
6 miles of beach and dune restoration, 79 miles of breakwaters that
7 would then protect 1200 acres of marsh and 27,000 acres of
8 renourishments out in the years through 2065. And we would be
9 creating 19 acres of oyster reefs and 326 acres of island.
10 All tolled, the nine ecosystem restoration sites proposed at
11 160 acres of ecosystem restoration up and down the Coast. We would
12 need approximately a hundred million cubic yards of material to do the
13 restoration and to do the Coastal Storm Risk Management.
14 The total cost for this study is $25 billion to $32 billion.
15 40 percent of to ecosystem restoration.
16 7.9 to 11.9 ecosystem restoration. An additional 1 to
17 2 percent for South Padre.
18 That is 71.6 to 83.1 million. And then the area, itself,
19 would be 14.2 to $19.9 billion.
20 There will be direct impacts we estimate as a result of a
21 Barrier Solution.
22 Alternative A would impact 4500 acres plus or minus of habitat
23 along the Islands. It will cause a construction and flow into the Bay
24 putting features into an inlet that would cause some reconstruction.
25 We are proposing flood vertical lift-gates to close off the
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1 Bay during storms. That those -- that configuration would cause
2 approximately 27 percent constriction of the interchange with the Bay.
3 We hope to do optimization to bring that number down. But, as
4 it stands right now, we do expect to see some water title exchange and
5 we would have to mitigate for that.
6 The mitigation costs are ranging between 76.6 and $97.6. But,
7 added to that, the ecosystem restoration on top of that 160 acres of
8 marsh, islands, estuary, beaches and dunes.
9 What I want to impress upon you is that the lines that you are
10 seeing on posters and on these slides and on the website is conceptual
11 in nature at this point.
12 It is a placeholder. And the reason that it is a placeholder
13 is that we needed to compare and contrast a rim solution to the Bay to
14 Texas City to the Barrier Islands.
15 Now, that we selected the Barrier Islands' Solution and the
16 Tentatively Selected Plan, we go into something the Corps calls
17 "optimization."
18 We ask that -- the question now:
19 Should it be on the land where we have place? Or should we
20 move it to the back or the front? And should it be the same height
21 that we've been evaluating? Or does it need to be smaller or taller?
22 What kind of constructive materials can we use to build it? And can
23 it be engineered dunes with dunes in front of going down to dump into
24 a beach? Or do we need to do some kind of combination of the wall and
25 some engineered dune in combination?
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The idea is to manage the risks, reduce risks as much as possible for the cost.

We need to look at things like pump-station capacity and assessment of how big they need to be and we need to focus on the gates.

If we were to optimize the gauges, could we reduce the construction below the 27 percent?

We are setting a threshold that any gate configuration would not cost more than 27 percent. And, so, we would be looking at configurations that could bring that number down.

So, as I mentioned before -- I think we all mentioned this -- we are only part way through. We are two years in. We have three-and-a-half years to go.

We will be writing a chief report and submitting that to Congress in 2021. The way that works is that Congress has to authorize design and appropriate funding for us to go into design.

The study itself is a 50/50 cost share that, when we go into design with 35/65 percent design and construction, it could take two to five years to do the designs and that’s if we receive the money right up front.

If it is kind of parceled out, we would have to work sequencing the features. Which feature should be built first?

Second? Third?

Some of the ecosystem restoration, for example, could be done early on if we get through design within two to five years.
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And, if we receive all the money at the beginning of that, we would take 10 to 15 years to construct the entire plan.

Once it is constructed, the turnover to cost share so for operation or maintenance.

We do not at this point have a construction or an operation of maintenance cost share sponsor. That’s something that will have to be determined by the Texas Legislature.

There can be multiple cost-share sponsors depending on which features are cost share. And then, once we turn it over, operation and maintenance is the job or purview of the Cost-Share Sponsor.

We do have to estimate the -- estimate the cost of what it will take to operate and maintain these kind of features, and it would range between 100- and $130 million a year.

We expect that that is a large infrastructure. That it would have to withstand more than 50 years. We are looking at a scenario of out to 100 years.

So, we’re here today to ask for your comments and your feedback. We’ve held three of these meetings so far down the Lower Coast. You are the first in the Upper Coast. We have three more up here in the next week:

- Galveston tomorrow night.
- We have Crystal Beach on Saturday.
- And then Sea Brook on Tuesday of next week.

If you don’t want to provide a comment by coming up to the front and speaking into the microphone, you can write it on the comment cards and submit it into the basket, as we mentioned before.

Or you can write a letter to the address presented here on the screen or you can send us an e-mail.

But the key here is that we receive your comments by January 7th so that we can put them into the administrative record and take those into account.

I talk fast. I completely get that. There is a website out there called “coastalstudy.txdot.gov.” At the end of the public meetings we will be posting my slides. We will be -- we have already posted all of the posters, and we will be providing information as we go along in the study on this site.

You can also download the report. The report is 450-plus pages plus the 1500 pages of indices. Or you can read the 40-page summary. Or you can read the newsletter that you’ve got in your hands from when you walked in the door, which is very short.

If you have information for us, please provide it in the comments. We welcome all your comments at this time.

COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Thank you. I will now call upon members of the general public who wish to make a statement.

I will call five names at a time, and I ask that the individuals come up to the front row and sit in the several seats while you wait for your turn to speak.

I have asked Ms. Stansky to assist me in keeping time. She will indicate when you have 30 seconds left to speak and when your time is expired.
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I’d ask that you stop speaking after the minute has lapsed.

When you are called to come forward to speak in the microphone, please identify yourself by your name and the organization that you represent, if any.

First, I would like to call up the first five individuals:

- Elinor Tinsley, Brenda Flanagan, Lester Fontenot, Becky Fancher and Huey Menard. Would you please come forward?
- And, Ms. Elinor Tinsley, if you would like to begin with the first comment -- yes, ma’am. Thank you very much.
- Brenda Flanagan, if you would like to begin with your comments, please?
- MS. FLANAGAN: Yes. I am a homeowner, and I live in Crystal Beach. This is my retirement home.
- Currently the line, which could be moved, is real close to my property so that I have a chance to lose my property. But not only me but a lot of different people on the Bolivar Peninsula.
- I would like the consideration for that line to be moved either further to the north to land on the dune line.
- Thank you.

COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, ma’am, for your comments.
- Lester Fontenot.
- MR. FONTENOT: Yes. I am Lester Fontenot.
- I am curious will you be sharing the details of the financial analysis of this project?
- As you very well know, there could be some significant impact...
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I didn't see anything mentioned about -- maybe I missed it --

and put more sand out to make the beach. I see that as a huge

Then another plan or idea was to put the levee at the beach

So, I wouldn't -- I would encourage you to look at that.

Without the levee there is 10 feet of water about where my

house would be and most of Crystal Beach would be with a levee. It
goes 10 to 20 feet plus.

So, that kind of pretty much can wipe out everything south of

87. So, I would -- I would encourage you to look at that.

Then another plan or idea was to put the levee at the beach

and put more sand out to make the beach. I see that as a huge

maintenance issue years going down the road, and I think that ends up

on the county and tax payers.

I didn't see anything mentioned about -- maybe I missed it --

The evaluations -- the different alternatives that were conducted are

related to property values.

And I was interested if you are going to post that on your
website on the Detailed Analysis, the basis for that to climb the
property -- potentially increase in property value.

And as well as how did you determine the impacts of the
potential storms, you know, every two years? Every five years?

I would like to know what were the analysis bases for that and
will you be sharing that?

COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment, sir. Check
the analysis included in the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report
that's posted on the website.

Next I would like to call upon Becky Fancher.

Okay. Huey Menard?

MR. MENARD: Yes, sir. I am also a homeowner in Bolivar. I
am just wondering they keep saying that this is an "alternative plan."
That is not the last thing that we are going to see, but is
there other I guess plans out there that will still be looked at
because I haven't seen anything to indicate that?

That is what I am trying to say because I keep seeing the line
going right down in front of my house. Then I see my house going
away.

So, I'd ask if there was any plans out there that don't do the
line down the Bolivar?

COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Again, this is the comments-only period.
The evaluations -- the different alternatives that were conducted are
in the draft report that is available for the public to review on the
website.

Thank you for your comments.

Next I would like to call for the next five individuals who
wish to speak:

Harry Craig, Jeffery Laird, Bill White, G.L. Finch and Tyler
Fitzgerald.

If you individuals would please come forward, and we'll call
upon Mr. Harry Craig to speak first, if you are present.

MR. CRAIG: I am Harry Craig.

I own property in Crystal Beach, and I just would like to
encourage you to look very hard at the placement of this levee.

I looked at the Slide 10 I believe and had one of the reps
tell me -- show me the hundred-year or thousand-year, and it showed
the levee and without the levee.

Without the levee there is 10 feet of water about where my
house would be and most of Crystal Beach would be with a levee. It
goes 10 to 20 feet plus.

So, that kind of pretty much can wipe out everything south of

87. So, I would -- I would encourage you to look at that.

Then another plan or idea was to put the levee at the beach

and put more sand out to make the beach. I see that as a huge

maintenance issue years going down the road, and I think that ends up

on the county and tax payers.

I didn't see anything mentioned about -- maybe I missed it --
on an elevated escape route, an evacuation route. That is a huge
problem. Always has been. And hopefully that will be addressed with
this, as well.

COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment, sir.

All right. Any of the other four individuals still present or
still wish to make comments?

Seeing none, I would like to call upon the next group of
four individuals:

Larry Barron, Azure Bevington, James Maggio and Janie
Mayfield. If you would please come forward.

MS. BEVINGTON: Azure Bevington.

I have a number of comments on the plan, but specifically what
I want to talk about quickly is the presentation by Dr. Bush.

There's a couple of places where he misspoke. So, February of
2021 is not in three years. That is just over two years. So, you --
when you I saw there were three years left, that was incorrect.

You also mentioned that the scoping meetings were started in
2014. The Upper-Coast Scoping Meetings were started in 2012, and the
Lower-Coast Scope Meetings were done in 2014.

So, the last time any one in the Upper Coast was allowed to
come on this public was in 2012 when none of these concepts/ideas
were already well formed.

So, what I really want to say that the way the timing of
this public-comment period has been done, where it was really at the
end of October, goes through the Christmas -- you know, the Holiday
season -- and then ends early in 2019 is an enormous problem.

They could have extended it. You know, 45 days is a minimum.

Public-Comment Period be allowed some time later on because from what,
you know, the Army Corps and Dr. Bush were saying, this is only
10 percent done.

So, when you decide and you optimize that, we want to be able
to comment. This potentially has an affect on some of our homes. So,
you know, I would like to ask for that to happen.

Thank you.

COLONEL ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. MAGGIO: James Maggio.

Basically my concern is -- I support Alternative D to the Bay
and not the Plan A due to the fact of this -- the large seawall being
built from High Island to cross Bolivar. And with Harvey, of course,
on our minds and with all the rain events that we've had, it's not
unheard of to have fresh water 25 inches from a topical storm.

The concern was having any of the freshwater flow towards the
Gulf being inhibited by a wall and the amount of work to the pump
systems that you wouldn't have in place and the maintenance calls to
maintain them over the course of the time to the lifespan of the wall.

So, that was one of the concerns I had along with any
ecosystem that may not be able to cross to the other side of the Bay.

So, like I said, I support the Bay Rim, and I don't support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Mayfield:</strong> Yes. My name is Janie Mayfield. I am currently a property owner on Bolivar Peninsula. We have owned property in Galveston all of my life.</td>
<td><strong>Other options out there. We appreciate the comment times so that maybe some of us can have some ideas and throw it at you guys.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definite line that you’re intending, if it is not.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My concerns are not only with the Peninsula but also Chambers County.</strong></td>
<td><strong>An offshore barrier I know, after Ike, was talked about, but I never heard anything on that.</strong></td>
<td><strong>And I think that they would -- a lot of landowners down there -- and homeowners actually live there. A lot of landowners and homeowners would like to have a say so in it.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When we were growing up, we owned properties at Smith Point.</strong></td>
<td><strong>So, Chambers County, Bolivar Peninsula -- y’all have the Peninsula scared. We need to let everyone know that is not a final deal.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intending that -- if it is true, that it could be extended, extending that would be beneficial to everyone because now we know a little more than what we we did even last week at the meeting.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>So, we watched what the water can do, what Mother Nature can do since I was born.</strong></td>
<td><strong>So, a lot of people gapping on those. These were business people that were listening carefully. So, if this is not the final plan, drawing, whatever, you need to know you have everybody freaked out because right now it is already starting to hurt the Bolivar Peninsula seeing that red line. And it doesn’t take an engineer to look at that and see that, if anything is built along that highway, anything south of it will be devastated.</strong></td>
<td><strong>I’m extremely more informed now that I’ve talked to you guys, and I’m extremely informed on some information that I did not know before.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right now the current red line going down the middle of the Bolivar Peninsula has got everybody terrified. I am hearing y’all say that is not a done deal, but I think there were several people in the meeting the other day on the Peninsula that felt like we were pretty sure it is -- said that it is a final plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>So, it is a hard real-estate market. So, we need to look at those.</strong></td>
<td><strong>I think it would behoove y’all to let people know and give us more than that January the 9th to make comments on this.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Mayfield:</strong> I am going to continue making my conclusion statements.</td>
<td><strong>Thank you.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thank you.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ladies and gentlemen, this is the comment period. I would like to thank you and the Texas General Land’s Office for their assistance in preparing, holding this meeting.</strong></td>
<td><strong>MS. MAYFIELD: Thank you for your comments, sir. Are there any other members of the public that wish to come forward and speak at this time?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Okay. Thank you for your comments, ladies and gentlemen. Written comments of the Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement must be received on or before January 9, 2019.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I thank you for your attendance and the interest all of you have shown tonight.</strong></td>
<td><strong>MS. BEVINGTON: I have a question:</strong></td>
<td><strong>At the conclusion of the 75-day period that began on the 26th of October 2018.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The formal public meeting is adjourned.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Why did you limit it to one minute if you only had about 20 or 30 people who said they wanted to give verbal comments?</strong></td>
<td><strong>MS. BEVINGTON: I have a question:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Meeting ended)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thank you.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Okay. Thank you for your comments, ladies and gentlemen.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Galveston Public Meeting Transcript
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to be here tonight. I am Colonel Zetterstrom, the commander of the Galveston District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I welcome you to tonight’s public meeting to review the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study.

Before I begin, I would like to ask anyone that has a seat next to them to move in so, that way, our fellow citizens that are standing might have a chance to have a seat to sit in. Thank you.

For the record, let me state that this public meeting was convened at 5:30 p.m. on December 12, 2018 at the Galveston Island Convention Center in Galveston, Texas. Specifically, we are presenting information accepting public comments on the draft integrated feasibility report and environment impact statement for this study that was released for public review on the 26th of October, 2018. A court reporter is here to transcribe these proceedings and all public comments.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Texas General Land Office have analyzed coastal risk reduction solutions that would reduce the risk of lives and public property on the Texas coast.
Ten years ago, this region experienced Hurricane Ike, which disrupted many lives and resulted in extensive economic and infrastructure damages. The Texas coast is also subject to ongoing coastal erosion, relative sea level rise, habitat loss, and water quality degradation. These coastal hazards are placing the environmental and economic health of the coast at risk, which negatively impacts the state and national economy.

This, along with storms such as Hurricane Ike, Dolly and Rita, emphasize the need to enhance resiliency of the coast to not only reduce damages of and but to improve our ability to withstand and recover from further storms.

It's important to note that the Coastal Texas Study recommends structural measures to reduce risk along the coast and that these recommendations support multiple investments and risk reduction that agencies and businesses are making along the coast. Coastal Texas is a part of a larger effort of risk reduction actions to make the coast more resilient over time.

The cost effective plan has been identified that we believe would significantly reduce the risk of damages from tropical storms and
hurricanes as well as increase the quality and quantity of the coastal ecosystems. This meeting is being held to describe the Tentatively Selected Plan, or the TSP, and to receive any comments.

I hope that all of you had the opportunity to read the notice of availability either on the Galveston District's Web site or the announcements that were mailed to individuals and organizations that may have an interest in these proceedings.

Before we go any further, I would like to introduce the General Land Office, or the study's non-federal sponsor, Mr. Tony Williams, the planning senior director of Coastal Resources.

(Applause)

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Colonel Zetterstrom.

And I'd like to thank everyone for coming out tonight to learn more about the Coast Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study, also known as the Coastal Texas Study.

In the audience here tonight, we have several GOT members, their fine assistance. I would have several from our upper coast field office over there and some from our Austin headquarters.
Addressing issues on the coast, including storm surge and ecosystem restoration, continues to be one of Mr. Bush's top priorities. You may be asking why the GLO is involved with Coastal Texas Study. The Land Office was established to manage state-owned land, including submerged land, under tidal influence, from the mean high tide out to 10 miles offshore. The General Land Office is also a state agency responsible for implementation of the Coastal Management Program, the Coastal Erosion Planning and Response Act, protection of public beaches and dunes, responsible for oil spills in state waters and has certain roles in disaster recovery.

In November of 2015, the GLO signed the feasibility cost-sharing agreement with the Corps of Engineers. This obligated GLO to fund approximately half of the 20-million-dollar study to conduct the valuation of the Texas coast much which is being done through working in kind.

The Land Office is working with the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to increase the resiliency of the Texas Coast through an integrated approach that includes ecosystem restoration enhancement all along the coast and storm surge barriers specifically in the Houston/Galveston area.
The dry plan that is being presented tonight incorporates habitat restoration enhancement as well as gates, levees, and flood walls to address erosion, habitat loss, and storm surge. These measures work together to increase the overall resiliency of the Texas coast.

The proposed plan in the Coastal Texas Study was developed and works in concert with the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan. The GLO is currently working with stakeholders along the coast to develop the 2019 version of the Master Plan which builds on the 2017 version.

The 2019 version of the Master Plan identifies projects that experts up and down the coast have identified as the ones best suited to address resilience along the coast. The 2019 version will also include modeling the threats of the Texas coast and the effectiveness of the identified projects as reducing those threats. The plan will be completed in early 2019 and presented to the Texas legislature.

The coastal Texas state proposed plan or Tentatively Selected Plan as referred to in Corps documents was jointly developed by the GLO and Corps of Engineers. We’ve worked with engineering and environmental firms, consulted with other groups.
addressing these issues, including local universities and international organizations, had regular meetings with environmental groups, resource agencies, and navigation interests. And as we move forward, the next phase of the study is important to get feedback from all stakeholders.

We need your input on the proposed plan and how it will affect you. Please remember, the study is only about halfway completed and there are a lot of details that still need to be worked out. Again, we value your input and look forward to your comments. Thank you for coming out tonight.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Williams.

Now I would like to recognize the public officials who are attending tonight's public meeting. Mayor Jim Yarbrough, mayor of the City of Galveston; Councilman Robert Michetich, City Council, La Marque; Alderman Gregg Bisso, Surfside Beach; Superintendent Kyle Ohaven, Texas Parks and Wildlife Galveston Island State Park assistant superintendent; Michael Shannon, Galveston County engineer; Mr. Matthew J. Hay, Galveston Independent School District trustee; Mr. Gary Bell, Seabrook EDC; Mr. David Collins or, excuse me, Councilman David
Collins, City Council, City of Galveston;
Mr. Ken Jencks, Galveston ISD Trustee; Mr. Sean Hutchison, City Manager of City of Jamaica Beach;
Mr. Brett B. Milutin, Director of Operations, Port of Galveston; Councilman Jackie Cole, City Council, City of Galveston; Mr. Rodger Rees, the Port Director of the Port of Galveston; Mr. Todd Sullivan, Port of Galveston trustee; and finally Representative-Elect Mayes Middleton, Texas state resident -- representative-elect for House District No. 23.

(Applause)

Additionally, I would like to recognize the project delivery team from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. If my team could please stand to be acknowledged. Thank you.

(Applause)

And now I would like to describe the ground rules of the format for tonight's meeting. I hope that everyone completed the attendance cards when they entered the meeting. The attendance card is used to provide us with contact information so we can keep you updated on the status of the study. If you would like to make your comment orally tonight, please make sure you indicated your intent on your blue index card and turned it in to one of the meeting facilitators.
If you haven't done this now, please do so as soon as possible with the facilitators at the rear of the room.

Those wishing to make an oral comment will be given an opportunity to do so after the presentation. If you prefer not to speak this evening, you may submit your comments in writing by dropping them in the baskets provided or you may send them to us by mail or by e-mail.

Following these open remarks, Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, the project manager for this study, will present an overview of the feasibility study. After the presentation, I will open the floor for public comments.

First, federal and state officials that have requested to make a statement will be recognized. Next, representatives from federal and state resource agencies wishing to make a statement will be called upon. And then I will recognize each individual from the general public who indicated that they wish to make a comment.

Please keep your remarks to one minute as we would like for everyone to have an opportunity to speak. Also, we would like to emphasize that this will not be a question-and-answer session. This
meeting is to provide everyone with an opportunity to publicly comment on the plan.

Please give all speakers the courtesy of not making any comments during the presentation. Please turn off your cell phones and hold all applause or other reactions so that we have an orderly meeting and be respectful of everyone's time. All individuals here have a equal right to be heard

Now I would like to present Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, the project manager, to make the formal presentation.

Thank you.

MS. BURKS-COPES: Good evening. I am shorter than they are. Hold on just a minute.

I would like to start by explaining why we are here. We'd like to give you a status update on the study, walk you through the National Environmental Policy Act process, called NEPA for short, then describe how the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers planning process interfaces with the NEPA process. We will then identify the Tentatively Selected Plan and talk about the impacts and the benefits and the cost of that plan. And then we will go to the public comment period and ask for your input.

As both of the previous speakers
mentioned, we are about halfway through the study.

We're just coming up on the third year, about
two-and-a-half years left to go. The report was
released on October 26th. The next big step in the
study is to do detailed engineering and design.

What I want to focus on and make sure
and emphasize again is that up until now, the
information that has been distributed to you in the
draft report is placeholder information. We are here
to absorb your feedback, to discuss issues with you.

And then in the next phase of the study, we go into
something called optimization, which is where we take
your comments and we take additional data that we
derive from several different entities, fold that into
the plan, and adjust on the -- on the next phase of
the study. We are shooting for a targeted chief's
report that will be sent to Congress in 2021.

This is a large study. A typical
environmental impact statement under the NEPA process
requires 45 days of public comment. But because it's
large and complex, we have extended that to a 70-day
-- 75-day review period. It started on the first day
of the release of the report, which is
October 26th. So, 75 days later puts us at January
9th of 2019.
We are inviting all public comment, and that is part of the requirements of the NEPA process. All comments are welcome, be it negative or positive. Remember that the more specific you are with the comments, the easier it will be for us to understand your concerns and issues and to address those issues.

Public and agency input informs our decision-making process.

I will try to talk to this side as well. Sorry.

All the comments that we receive are going to be fully evaluated equally. And the review and the processing of these comments ensures that we make decisions on the best available data and information out there.

As you well know and as you saw in the video, we face a lot of problems in the Texas coastal region. We are subject to large coastal storm surges. We have both inland and coastal erosion problems. We are losing threatened and endangered critical habitat. We have losses of delta processes in our delta surges functioning now and we have hydrologic connectivity issues. These are the problems that our study is designed to address.

We have two specific mandates from
Congress, which are our goals -- coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration. To meet the goals in the Corps study process, we set up objectives. In this instance, our objectives are as follows: To reduce economic damage; to reduce risk to critical infrastructure but also to public health and safety; to enhance and restore coastal land forms and ecosystems; to improve the hydraulic connectivity of the those systems; and then to improve very specific ecosystems, such as marshes and bays.

We are receiving funding at the national level from Congress. To get that funding, to justify why we are doing the project, we have to lay out a series of nationally significant resources in the region. So, for example, you are probably well aware that the study area encompasses 18 counties in the state of Texas. In those counties, 6.1 million residents reside. That's more than 24 percent of the Texas population.

We also have within our study area several deep-draft ports. I have listed those there. But in addition, we have 450 miles of Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

Industry is prevalent in our area.

Forty percent of the nation's petrochemical industry
resides within the footprint of our study area, and that provides 45 percent to the national petrochemical refining capacity.

We also have critical infrastructure. NASA is in our study area. And here on the Island at UTMB we have a Level 4 viral lab. Because we are dually purposed, we also have to point out the national significant resources that are natural. We have within our study area one of only six hypersaline lagoons in the world, the Laguna Madre. We also have the Padre Island National Seashore and two of the 28 National Estuary Program sites.

We have 12 National Wildlife Refuges. And up and down the coast, we have habitat that's significant for nursery fishermen and for commercial and recreational fishing. This includes oysters, shrimp, and finfish. We have lots of threatened and endangered species in our study area and we have several types of critical ecosystems that we are focusing on for our study.

Now, I have to kind of explain how the Corps of Engineers formulates plans so I can lay out the process that we've been going through over the last three years. In engineering speak, we have building blocks that we put together that generate our
plans. Features are parts of those buildings blocks. They are things like levees and marshes and gates. Actions include things like construction and restoration. And treatments are things like beach renourishments and plantings of marshes. And when you combine those three, features, actions, and treatments, you get measures. And then measures are then combined into alternatives, a/k/a plans.

We were mandated in 2016 by Congress not to reinvent the wheel. We understand that there are several ongoing studies in this region that have been generating data for the last several decades. We were mandated to use that information and, if at all possible, when it was useful. So, I've listed a few things that we've been tapping into to do an analysis of not only the baseline or without project conditions but with the project conditions under the various plans.

We do know and acknowledge that GCCPRD, that the Rice SSPEED Center, that Texas A & M all have been formulating barrier plans and we have been ordered by Congress to take those in and to basically pull them together, bounce off of those with enhancements and then formulate our plan. So, what you are going to see tonight is not the -- is not the
coastal spine. We are proposing a coastal barrier system that incorporates not only the barrier solution, but ecosystem restoration. When together we formulate these, we get multiple lines of defense. That's why it's different. That's why it's bigger. And that's also why we were holding public meetings up and down the coast for everyone to engage.

We also know that the Army Corps of Engineers, being in the Army Corps of Engineers, we have several ongoing studies. We are approaching the Coastal Texas Study as a system. We know that those are happening. We know that they're either being studied or are in engineering and design or being constructed. We also know that the GLO has a master plan. And they, too are working on ecosystem restoration up and down the coast. Restore Act funded and great deal of work as well. The intent here is not to step on each other's toes but to work collaboratively to fill in gaps and then to operate as a system.

We started the process in 2014 with a series of scoping meetings. There were several other types of scoping meetings happening before that. But for this study up and down the coast, we focused on the Coastal Texas Plan and where we might take it. We
used that information with all the data that I just mentioned to start formulating measures.

We broke the system up into manageable units. Region 1 is the unit that you are living in now. Region 2, 3, and 4 march down the coast. And we formulated measures without each of the regions and used our goals and objectives to screen those down to a meaningful set of measures that could be combined to formulate plans that I will show you tonight.

In the Corps of Engineers, we have the three E’s. Now, the first one I’m not sure is a real word. We will have to go into the dictionary and look. Engineeringly sound is the first criteria that our plans must meet, environmentally acceptable, and then economically justified. So, in each condition, when we formulate a plan, we use these criteria to compare and contrast the effectiveness of the plans.

The reason I am telling you this is that we use a series of tools to quantify each one of these criteria. So, for example, if you came in earlier, you could talk to one of the subject matter experts in front of the storm modeling poster. We have formulated six -- we have actually simulated six never-before-seen storms and run them across the landscape to determine what levels of flooding we
would see. And then we placed the barriers in their path and we rerun the storms to determine what kind of effectiveness those barriers have.

The storms range from rainfall events of 10-year intervals to megastorms, 5-plus category storms that we've never seen before, such as a 10,000-year event. They bring with them ranges and surge. Some of the heights of surge are 12 to 27 feet.

We also use the series of models to assess what the potential impacts would be of a barrier system and we assess things like changes in salinity that we would like to see in the bay, changes in velocities, changes in sedimentation within the bay because all of these are important when we are looking at the environmental acceptability of a plan.

I give you all of this information so that I can caveat and say that we use these details to screen down the options to two large plans in this region specifically. The first plan is called Alternative A. It's called the Coastal Barrier. It starts at High Island with a 12-to-17-foot levee system. It goes down across the GIWW. There will need to be a gate at the GIWW. It would go down to the Bolivar peninsula all the way down to the crossing
at the Galveston inlet at Bolivar Roads.

We would need a series of gates to go across that the Roads pass and then tie it to the seawall up here on the island. We would enhance the seawall along the front of the island and propose a ring barrier on the backside of the island. We would then tie in at the bottom of the seawall and take that barrier all the way down to the Luis Pass.

Up in the left-hand portion of the map, you will see a hatched area that’s kind of a turquoise green. If you look on the screen, you might be able to see turquoise. That is an area where we propose nonstructural measures. And, of course, that’s razing some buildings and floodproofing of buildings. We need to deploy gates at the Dickinson Bayou and Clear Creek inlets or bayou, Clear Creek itself. We would also need a gate on the back of this island, on Offatts Bayou.

The triangles on the map are pumping stations. We recognize that when these gates are closed, there will likely be rainfall occurring. Every storm brings it. So, we would need pumping stations to basically draw off the water during the storms.

I want to point out a couple of
features that I need to specifically address because we are standing here in Galveston. The Galveston ring levee is -- and you will notice this in the report -- is a structural feature and nonstructural feature. It's a combination and a hybrid. The other thing I want to point out is, these lines are conceptual and placeholders. We use the existing GCCPDR alignment to start this study and compare this plan against other plans in the region but not on the barrier system just to begin the project.

The next phase of the study is called optimization. And that's when we realign and we look at detailed engineering of these features. The other thing to realize is that these gate systems are -- the ring levee, for example, and the gates are kept open most of the time. Big barrier systems around the world often, on average, are closed approximately six times a year for operation and maintenance for testing in advance of storms or for other purposes. And then they are closed only infrequently.

These gates would remain open for the majority of the time and would only be closed in anticipation of storms or for operation of maintenance and testing.

If you look at this plan, and then I
switch the screen, what you will see is a ring barrier. This is other plan that we assessed after we used our screening elements to come down to a choice for this plan.

The ring barrier would start at San Jacinto and would cross with a gated structure and a pumping station, would run along the rim of the Galveston Bay all the way down to the Texas City Dike. We would have to enhance the Texas City Dike system because there would no longer be a structure blocking surge as it moved into the bay. And then we would have to extend the Texas City Dike system to the west. It would still entail a porous ring levee system, which, remember, has nonstructural features with the pumping stations at Offatts Bayou.

One of the things that the Corps of Engineers is required to do once they formulate this plan is to compare and contrast them for benefits and costs. In addition, we have to look at the environment acceptability of each of these plans, the potential impacts that they will cause, and whether they are engineeringly sound.

We have listed here a series of criteria or a list of differences amongst Plan A and D. One of the examples Plan D, the rim solution,
does not provide protection to the Houston Ship Channel. It does not provide protection to the majority of the Galveston Island, nor does it provide the protection on the Bolivar peninsula. These types of things, these types of criteria allowed us to distinguish a plan and make a selection.

In the other regions of the state along the study area, we have also proposed additional measures for coastal storm risk management. Specifically on South Padre Island, they have been using beneficial use of dredge material to maintain a berm, beach berm system along the front of the island since 1988. The problem with that solution is that it's funding dependent. So, oftentimes, nourishment is intermittent.

What we propose to do is two miles of beach dune system, 12-1/2 feet high and 100 feet high. For about the two miles in the yellow boxes, we would propose to do a cyclical 10-year nourishment of those two reaches.

There is still time and interest in doing more analysis in the reaches to the north and south of the two yellow reaches to see if they can be economically justified or if they could become something called a locally preferred plan. A locally
preferred plan -- I will quit kicking that.

A locally preferred plan is where we are proposing something above and beyond the economically justified solution. And in that instance, the cost-share sponsor must shoulder 100 percent of the additional cost.

As we mentioned earlier, it's not all about coastal storm risk management. We are also proposing ecosystem restoration; in this instance, 160,000 acres of ecosystem restoration up and down the coast. It includes things like marshes, islands, sea grass restoration, beach and dune system, and complexes of all of these including oyster restoration. So, up and down the coast at nine different sites, we have proposed a series of configurations of restoration solutions that would offer not only ecosystem functionality increasing but some forms of multiple lines of defense when they are put in tandem with the coastal barrier solution.

So, the Tentatively Selected Plan is a combination of the Plan A, which is the barrier solution along the peninsula and along Galveston Island in combination with the nine ecosystem restoration sites and the coastal storm risk management solution along South Padre.
What this gives you here in Region 1 is 55 miles of beach and dune restoration. It gives you 79 miles of bay waters that then protect the marshes behind them on the GIWW, for example. That gives us approximately 1200 acres of marsh restoration. But in the out years as we continually nourish in anticipation of things like sea level rise and erosion, we are expecting to restore 27,000 acres of marsh in your region alone.

Nineteen acres of oyster restoration are also proposed and over 300 acres of ecosystem restoration. So, it's fairly significant, the ecosystem restoration that's being proposed in addition to the barrier system. And I want to point that out because people are comparing our plan and our costs to the Ike Dike, for example, and the coastal spine. And what you've got to realize is that 40 percent of the cost of the 32 to -- the twenty-three to $32 billion, 40 percent of that is ecosystem restoration that provides multiple lines of defense well into the future.

And then that would be approximately 8.9 to $11.9 billion of ecosystem restoration. Plus our barrier would be 14.2 to $19.9 billion, which is well within the ranges of the proposals from the
GCCPRD, for example. A small amount 71.6 to $83.1 million, this time with an "M," would be apportioned to the South Padre Island Coastal Storm Risk Management solution.

We are required and do acknowledge that we will be -- the plan does cause some impacts to the region. And we know that because we can assess what the line touches as we go down the system. 4500 acres of impact are anticipated at this point; 365 additional acres at the South Padre site. We do know that we are proposing to put a gate system across the Galveston Bay inlet. That system is actually a series of gates.

We will have -- or have proposed a floating sector gate. It looks like fans when they close. When they open up, they are 1200 feet wide across. And then on the left-hand and the right-hand side of those gates would be an additional 39 environmental vertical lift gates.

All of the gates will be in the open position the majority of the year. When the storms are coming, those gates will be closed; and then they will be reopened.

The configuration that we have proposed thus far constricts circulation into the bay by
27 percent. We are about to go into an optimizing phase of this study where we hope to get that number down a great deal.

Right now with the configuration that we have proposed, we estimate that the mitigation cost will range between 676 and $906 million. We can optimize that and bring down constriction to 15 percent or less. Then we won't have to mitigate as much. But do remember that there's still 160,000 acres of ecosystem restoration being constructed in addition to the mitigation that we are going to have to do.

Optimization is a key word here. That's a Corps word. My mom doesn't know what it means; so, let me explain. The line is a placeholder. It is a conceptual construct. It will change over the next two years. We are open and welcome your feedback on these lines and on the features that we have proposed throughout the plan. We will be looking at things like realignment where the line will be moved. It could be moved to the front of the island or front of the peninsula, for example.

Construction type is also part of optimization. Is it a T-wall, which is sort of gray infrastructure that has base and a wall on top of it
so it doesn't wiggle when the storm hits. But we also
can look at dunes. We can look at engineered dunes.
We can look at combinations of the two. We can look
at levees. We can also and intend to look at hybrids
where we put maybe an engineered dune with a beach
field in front or a dune field and beach and a berm.

These are ideas that are still being
worked through. We are interested in what you have in
mind, as well. And now is a perfect opportunity for
you to provide that information to us. We are only
three years in. We still have two-and-a-half years to
go. We do not like to wait until the end to show you
the plan. But we do want to be able to show you
something that you can actually comment on and provide
us feedback on, which leads me to almost my last line.

We are about halfway, a little bit more
than halfway through the study process. When we are
complete, we will be -- when it is complete, we will
produce a report that our chief will sign and send up
to Congress. Congress must authorize and appropriate
funds for us to move into the next phase, which would
be design.

We are estimating that if we receive
the funding, all the funding at the very beginning, it
will take two to five years to complete all the
designs, and then another 10 to 15 years to construct the entire plan. Once we are finished constructing, we go into maintenance mode. And the maintenance of the structure will be turned over to cost-sharing sponsor.

Cost-sharing in the Corps of Engineers speak is different when you're in different phases of the process. So, right now, the GLO, Texas GLO is our cost-share sponsor for this study. They are paying 50 percent of $19.8 million to conduct the study. When we move into design, we must seek a new cost-share sponsor. It can, again, be Texas GLO or it can be a collaboration of groups to go into design and construction. And this will be dependent on the Texas Legislature. And they will be making decisions about this in either the next legislative session or the one after.

The Corps of Engineers receives funding to design and build in something called Water Resource Development Acts. In the last few years, they've been happening approximately every two years. We are set to receive one in 2020 and one in 2022. We are hoping to be inserted into the 2022, which means that we could start construction soon thereafter, design and construction soon thereafter.
We know that the plan is large and that the budget is big. The operating budget of the Corps of Engineers on an annual basis nationwide is approximately 5 billion. We are asking for thirty-two. We understand that that's probably not going to happen in that manner. So, we are looking out into the future for the long term.

This is a generational infrastructure to build and a generational infrastructure to maintain. When we do finish, it will be turned over to a cost-share sponsor again, which has not been designated. But we are anticipating a cost of a hundred to 130 million to operate and maintain into the future annually.

There is time for you to provide us input. That's why we are here. We have already conducted several public meetings down the coast. We just had another public meeting in the upper coast last night at Winnie. We have two more planned after this, one in Bolivar this Saturday, and one next week in Seabrook.

The key here is that you can come up today and talk to the mic and give us your comments and we will record them. We have a court reporter here to record your comments. You can write them down
if you are shy. I used to be shy. So, you can write them down and place them in the baskets in the back. But if you want to go on home and cogitate on this a bit or if you want to look up some things and think about this some more or talk to your friends in your community or your elected officials, we welcome that, as long as you get it to us in time.

You can send it to us through the mail. The address is here, but I will also show you our Web site in a minute. You can hit us in our mailbox and send an e-mail and provide us comments that way. The key here is, we need your comments by January 9th for them to be incorporated into the administrative record. So, there is this deadline. We need you to think about it and get us your comments as soon as possible.

I talk fast. I get that. And I'm not from here. I was born in Mexico, but I've learned to talk in Texas. We have a Web site that you can go to see the slides that I'm presenting. They will be posted next week. All of the posters in the back of the room are already posted. The video I showed just a minute ago is on that Web site, and the video that was portrayed in the back room is different. We will be posting that as soon as the public meetings are
over, as well.

The report itself, all 450 glorious pages, are up on the Web site as well as the 1200 pages of appendices. There is a 40-page executive summary that you can read. But in your packet when you came in is the newsletter. It's a little bit smaller consumable. In the bottom left-hand corner is my e-mail address and Tony's e-mail address. Please feel free to contact us if you have questions.

And with that, I am going to turn the podium back over to my commander. And we will start the public comment period.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: At this time, I would now like to recognize elected officials who wish to make a statement. First, I would like to call upon Mayor Jim Yarbrough.

(Applause)

MAYOR YARBOUGH: Thank you, Colonel. Thank you. We appreciate you having a public hearing tonight. I wanted to make sure you knew that the City of Galveston has been on record since the very beginning stages of the discussions of any type of concept supporting a coastal spine. And we will give our written detailed questions and comments before
this January 9th deadline. We applaud the Corps. We think you chose the right framework when you had other options. Y'all went through the process. We think this coastal spine is the right framework.

We want to thank the Commissioner. And Tony, please convey our thanks to the General Land Office stepping up to be the local sponsor, the non-federal sponsor.

We have questions. We have concerns. The ring levee, we need to understand the necessity for the ring levee. We know it's a tentatively line in the sand. There's lots of constellation over there. We'll work with you on that. We need to work with you on our ecosystem restoration, making sure it's effective as well as natural, blend in in what we're trying to do here in Galveston. And we also have a concern and have discussions about the levee being on the landward side of our Highway 87 and 3005.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, Mayor.

Next, I would like to invite Councilman Robert Michetich to come forward.

COUNCILMAN MICHE蒂CH: No comment at this time.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Councilman.
Next, Mr. Matthew J. Hay, if you're present, please come forward.
MR. HAY: I pass on comments at this moment.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.
Mr. Roger Rees?
MR. REES: Just a couple of quick points. We, too, are supportive of the system the way it's set up in the coastal study. I do have a few concerns about the ring levee and the effect it will have on the port's operation. I know this is still a little ways off in making those decisions. But I do hope that there will be some reconsideration of how that works. And I think it seems to me to be a little bit redundant. It seems like there's other ways that we can control flood coming from the Galveston Bay back into, like, what happened in Ike.
And I would like to suggest one thing, is the possibility to extend the gates down past San Luis Pass because I think some of that water will come back up through the intracoastal waterway. And if we do the same type of gate, a smaller gate down the San Luis Pass, maybe that will help the flood
coming from the backside.

But we do -- we do support the issues here today. And I'm hopeful that, you know, there will be some considerations to the ring levee around Galveston.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your comments.

(Applause)

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Next, I would like to invite Mr. Todd Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Colonel, great presentation, by the way. I'm a huge supporter of our region. I'm going to echo both what Rodger Rees and the Mayor said concerning the impacts socially, real estate values, the ring levee, around the island, just kind of the social impacts we'll certainly endure by engaging this levee. I also feel strongly to be part of your quest interest in Galveston Bay and San Luis Pass to prevent the influence of water during a storm.

I am certainly an engineer, both environmental and structural. And my comments are also being in support of making sure the industry in Galveston for the first time in a long time continue growing. We don't want to impact it by having unnecessary barriers to the efficiency of the port.
Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

And, finally, I would like to invite Representative-Elect Mayes Middleton to come forward.

MR. MIDDLETON: Thank y'all for holding the meetings. Just real quick -- this is audience directed -- how many people are against the levee running north of 3005, north of 87, and everybody around Galveston?

(A showing of hands)

MR. MIDDLETON: Okay. That's a lot.

This plan -- look, I'm for a coastal barrier plan. I'm not for this current configuration. So, we need to relocate this. So, right now, it runs north of 3005 on the west end of the island. We have a ring levee around the east end from about 3rd Street, Fish Village, Bolivar, we have the levee running north of 87. We need to relocate that.

The original plan that we all thought was going to be on the end line. That's what we all thought. And this was, real frankly, a surprise to a lot of us, a big surprise. I'm very against it. And this is the purpose of the public comment period. I hope you all listen to everybody here tonight because
people want to be heard. This is really bad, bad plan right now, that configuration, for our community. We need to go back to the original intent of it, which is a dune line protection plan.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Representative-Elect, for your comments.

I will now call upon members of the general public who wish to make a statement. I will call five names at a time. Please be seated in the front row in the reserved seats and wait for your turn to speak. I'd also like to make a reminder that this is a comment period. We had the question-and-answer period earlier this evening.

I've asked Mr. Stokes to assist me in keeping time. He will indicate when you have 30 seconds left to speak and when your time has expired. I ask that you stop speaking after that one minute is up. When you're called upon, please come forward and speak into the microphone. Please identify yourself by your full name and the organization you represent, if any.

I would now like to call upon the first five individuals. Carol McCracken, Rodney Bulluch, Frank G. Incabera, Charlotte Sterling, and Jerry
Bentley, if you'd please come forward.

MALE VOICE: In that order?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: You are welcome to come forward. We will try to keep them in that order. But we are trying to bring five individuals forward to make it quicker for the transition.

Mr. McCracken, please come forward.

MR. MCCracken: My comments are really focused on how to fund this project rather than the project itself. And I'd like to see our elected officials, especially our representative, look at some innovative ways to do this. Maybe protection tanks on all the businesses that are dependent on the Ship Channel for the business.

That's it. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Rodney Bulluch? Frank G. Incabera?

MR. INCABERA: I am a former member of the Corps of Engineers almost 39 years and I designed many of the plans that we have for controlling flood protection. I have a lot of concerns. And I think I am going to write the City rather than to give you all of my views.

One last thing that I want to mention
is personal. When I get up in the morning -- I live on __________. I get in my car. I drive down the seawall. Believe it or not, the sun ray follows me all the way to __________. Then I turn north. And it's so impressive to me because I'm a Galvestonian. I really love that. If you put that wall up there and turn there the way you can't see the ocean anymore, that bothers me a whole lot. I know it won't bother me very much because I'm old. But it's going to bother a lot of people that want to visit Galveston. It's a beautiful city that we have here. And we want to keep it beautiful.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments. Next, Charlotte Sterling.

MS. STERLING: I am a resident of Bolivar peninsula. In recent years, coastal residents have built structures to federal, state, and local codes. FEMA, GLO, and the County, which require flow-through construction at ground level. How can the Corps and GLO support a plan that creates a surge on the Gulf side of the barrier that they are not built to withstand? This is purposeful destruction of private property which was built to government standards.
The proposed plan barrier and gates 30 to 40 miles for the Houston and industry will not prevent a storm surge from reaching these areas. This plan fails to protect Houston and industry from storm surge while sacrificing private property on the coast. For these reasons, I am against Plan A.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments. If you'd like to return to your original seats, please.

The next five individuals I would like to invite to make comments are Donna King, Kyle Vickison, Terry Carr, Frank Verbenin, and John McCoullum.

If one of you gentleman would like to go come forward, please.

MR. VICKISON: My name is Kyle Vickison and I live on [redacted]. That's, like, where the pump station is going in. I watched a lot of the things on the levees. I don't see how that can work, really.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. McCOULLUM: My name is John McCoullum. I'm a former member of the Corps of Engineers. I built some levees that did work really
well. I would like to support the ring levee and request that the City of Galveston and Galveston County both step up and become non-federal cost-share sponsors. I further request that priority construction of the ring levee so that pump stations can alleviate existing and worsening flooding in Galveston. The amount of water that is in Galveston Bay would be enough to flood the city with the north wind just like it did during Ike. So, I think we need to be careful.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

MR. CARR: My name is Terry Carr. I would like to have you take a close look at the spine levees on both Bolivar Island and down Galveston Island in terms of where you might place them and alternatives that might have less impact than the proposals that you currently have. I do support the ring levee. I would like to see the City of Galveston and the Corps of Engineers coordinate their efforts so that the flooding that occurs on a regular basis in Galveston can be alleviated either through separate or in coordination with your pumping stations.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
comments.

Next I would like to call for the next five individuals. David Hirsch, Greg Whittaker, Kelly Teichman, Maris Pappas, and Mark Zeller.

MR. HIRSCH: My name is David Hirsch.

I live where y'all have the levee placed now, just a line, during Ike, NOAA said we had 10 to 15 feet of storm surge. I had 22 inches of water because the water was able to go cross the island and then go back across the island with the seawall. If you built this on the north side of 3005, then we would have 15 feet of water in the house. So, that's my big issue.

The other one is, if you do build it there, the houses that are on the south side of that, then the property values go down or they get taken by eminent domain, a very large part of Galveston's tax base is going to disappear. And the 5-foot wall, the seawall will keep tourists here.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. WHITTAKER: I'm Greg Whittaker. I live at [redacted], which would then be what would be ring levee system. I have concerns about the fact that it's going to create this bowl that's going
to restrict the flow of water out.

We had an event that occurred on October 24th when Hurricane Willa was passing through the Houston area. It was a large lightning storm and a downfall of rain. And I stood in my backyard and I watched the channel that flows from Offatts Bayou into Lake Madeline rise more than 2 feet in 20 minutes. That was waterflow that was going into a deadened water source and it's directly related to rainfall coming down. If you put a gate across the Offatts Bayou end of that up by Teichman Road, it's going to restrict that water flow and flood houses within the levee.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MR. ZELLER: My name is Mark Zeller, owner of a unit at Seascape, which is 135 condominium unit directly on the beach about 100 yards west of the seawall, which it's already an engineered beach dealing with erosion caused by being at the seawall. What I would like to oppose is a barrier north side of 3005. It would suggest the coupling of a dune, an engineered dune with a sand side under it. I sat there and watched -- my unit overlooks the ocean at Hurricane Ike. And the
geotubes that we had under that dune totally protected our structure and was 100 percent intact at the end of Hurricane Ike. And I have pictures to show and prove it.

Additionally, we subsequently had a core, a clay-core dune. And the water cut through that like a hot knife through butter. So, I would urge that type of reinforced structure to do both, ecosystem and storm surge protection.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. PAPPAS: I live on [REDACTED]. I just want to get down that --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Speak up, please.

MR. PAPPAS: I'm sorry. Thank you, sir.

I just want to get on the record, we are opposed to the Teichman Road ring barrier there. If it were the case to be economical to buy out the properties, where a levee pump might go that would be on our property, if it were the case, it could be moved 200 yards to the east of the Texas A & M property. That might be more efficient.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MS. TEICHMAN: I'm Kelly Teichman. I would like to thank y'all for holding the meeting tonight. I agree with your project. I do believe that it could be modified to integrate economic, environmental, and social factors for the Texas coast. And I urge you to consider any suggestions to these modifications to your temporary plan. And, obviously, I am against the ring levee as well as some of the others.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Before I call up the next five individuals, I also want to clarify to the public, if you made comments, you are still allowed to make written comments tonight or submit comments by e-mail or mail, as well. So, the oral comments that you make do not prevent you from making any further comments through those other three efforts. Thank you.

Next, I would like to call for Lori Batias, Ron Gustafson, William and Margaret Dannemyer, and Shane Bonnot.

MS. BATIAS: My name is Lori Batias,
and I am here for Crystal Beach. I just want to note that what you have said is, this is not the final plan and that there is still various details of the study to be worked out and then a recommendation will be made to Congress. Why is the public only able to provide input in advance of the completed study? There's too many unknowns for us to understand how the project will actually impact all of us.

Because it impacts all of us economically and environmentally, it's our future and we feel that we should be able to have a voice in what plans will be presented for consideration.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MR. GUSTAFSON. I am Ron Gustafson from [redacted], which is just west of Jamaica Beach, the City of Jamaica Beach. I'm concerned about the houses, all the houses on the seaward side of the dike, which is the biggest percentage of all the west end. And mostly I am concerned about, when you get west of Jamaica Beach, where my property is, it doesn't involve 3005. It goes about six, 700 feet north of 3005 and take a bunch of other land including Indian Beach and a lot of the other developments out there. So, I'm not even
sure why it goes through there. It puts more property at risk. 

That's all.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. BONNOT. I am Shane Bonnot with the Coastal Conservation Association of Texas, Marine Nonprofit Group here. There's about 60,000 recreational members in our state. I will go back to the comments said previously. I will say it's difficult to give meaningful comment with regards to fisheries impact if we don't have the full plan. The plan is lacking in detail with regards to the fisheries impacts.

We are worried about when the gate -- the gate system across Bolivar Road and what that could mean for larvae transport of red drum and southern flounder larvae, increased sedimentation on our oyster reefs and seagrass beds and increased residence of fresh water in the upper regions of the bay and what that can do to existing oyster reefs and fishery.

As the plan is finalized, we would like another opportunity to look at it and give input and give some meaningful comment.
Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

Next, I would like to invite Marty Baker, Tom Devane, Jonathan Gerber, Brian Kuhn, and Richard White. Please come forward.

MR. BAKER: My name is Marty Baker. And I have been a resident of West Galveston Island for 45 years. I would like to speak strongly against the west end spine and where it's located on 3005. The way to solve the problem is with the beach side and an engineered beach and dunes. We had a mile and half of geotubes that worked for approximately a few years. What's going on now with geotubes is probably in the design and you could improve it.

I do commend you very much on your Plan D. I was going to suggest going north of the intracoastal and tying into the Texas City Dike. I think you beat me to it. I think this morning that Bill Earle commented on those things. I will leave you with that.

I think there is a lot of hard feelings about a fixed structure on the West Galveston Island. The slosh that would happen with a Cat 2 or Cat 3 storm would sit there and bounce off that and bounce
back. Where we may have 4 feet of water we are going
to have double that and we are going to get eroded on
our own backwash.

Thank you very much. Thank you for being
here.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. KUHN: I am Brian Kuhn. I am a
resident of Galveston. Restricting water flow up to
27 percent between Galveston Bay and the Gulf of
Mexico will have undetermined consequences on our
ecosystem. This ecosystem is one of our greatest
resources, and we should not create a risk. So, on
behalf of the shrimps, crabs, and the larvae, I am
strongly opposed to the gate system.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
comment.

MR. GERBER: Good evening. Thank you
for being here. My family and I built in Surfside for
its natural wonder. We can support soft structures
and ecosystem restoration but we cannot support your
Plan A. What does an Ike dike look like during
Harvey? A dam. Your plan will be ecologically
devastating. Not acceptable.

It’s not fiscally responsible to have a
federal government bailout of risk development,
picking winners and loser. Follets Island and Surfside are likely casualties. I have seen Army Corps projects fail and have no faith that you can turn the tides or stop Mother Nature.

Please reconsider. Have a good evening.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. DEVANE: My name is Tom Devane. I live on [redacted]. I just mainly want to speak in favor of having more forums and more open continuation of the process of hearing the folks who are current custodians and current caretakers for daily and small and large, you know, activities. For folks who live here, the most impacted folks, I think the impression could be taken for the project that it's something more along the lines of something for the benefit of many at the expense of a few. I would submit that this is a scrappy few with along with the issue of being very influential. And I think in the interest of the project being less something along the lines of utility, you should not ignore the input of those most impacted and keep an open forum and not let January the 9th be a cutoff for input.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.
MR. WHITE: Richard White, Texas which is just across the Bay. I am for this project. It needs improvements. But I am concerned if you are going to leave San Luis Pass open with the depth of the water, the length of the surge, how long is it going to be here? How deep is it going to be? We will have flooding. And is there going to be any mitigation because of that flooding? I think it would be better if you close off San Luis Pass.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Next, I would like to invite the next five individuals. Alice Wolford, Ross Novelly, Junior, Mona Goodson, Steve Hodgson, and Dick Tyson. Seeing those individuals not coming forward, I will call the next five individuals. Jay Paul Abadie, Bruce Reinhardt, Ruth T. Yoast, Peter Sauschy, and Jeffrey Starling.

MR. ABADIE: I'm Paul Abadie. I've been a resident on the west end for 25 years, a business owner here. In fact, back in '83, I worked with hydrology and hydraulics with the Corps just for a short stint. And I understand that water seeks its
own level. And like one comment, if we close off --
if we leave San Luis Pass open, then what's it going
to do? It's going to flood us out. This proposed
plan is now only Stewart Road that would evacuate.

I'm not for any structure on the west end, such as you are proposing, possibly, the ring
dike that we talked about. But we take that
responsibility when we build on the sand bar and we
know what can happen, and seawalls, as we see the
road, beaches and, you know, that's just not going to
work.

So, with some kind of structure, if we're trying to protect the business interests and up
the Ship Channel, then put the wall up there and let
the island fend for itself.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MR. REINHARDT: Hi. I'm Bruce Reinhardt. I'm a developer on the west end. I think
that the coastal spine is the right solution. I think
the location needs to be improved. I was fortunate
enough to go with Texas A & M to the Netherlands and
see what their natural fortified dune systems look
like. I think that would be a great attraction for
Galveston. And it would give us the same protection versus north 3005.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MR. STARLING: Hi. Good evening. I am Jeff Starling, and I am a full-time resident of the west end. My concern tonight is about the flood wall that's been proposed for the west end. I spoke with several members of the Corps earlier tonight and they said, hey, the placement is not certain. But it's been widely reported in the media that it's going to be north of F.M. 3005.

I'm concerned about that. And I think that -- I think that building a great wall down the middle of the west end is a bad idea. I think it would have a negative impact on the social fabric, the mobility, the property values, and wildlife and endangered species. And I would urge the project team to keep storm protection on the beach and fortify or re-engineer the existing dune system.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

Next, I would like to call upon Scott Jones, Rhonda and Greg Hirsch, Martha Wilson Rappaport, Kathy Tyrnine and Jeff Sineshire.
MR. JONES: Good evening. I'm Scott Jones. I am the Director of Advocacy for the Galveston Bay Foundation. I appreciate the opportunity to provide brief comments tonight. The foundation will be writing full written comments.

GBF is very concerned about the effects of the gate structures on the bay's ecology, especially its fisheries, both recreational and commercial. After review of the draft of the environmental impact statement, I do not believe it meets National Environmental Policy Act requirements, specifically Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1502.1 concerning purpose, and Part 1502.16 concerning environmental consequences.

While the Corps has provided discussion of the impacts that ties berms and circulation, there is no specificity as the impacts to species, including valuable fishery, crab, and oysters. Critically, a discussion of the movement of fishery and crabs, both golden and funnel forms in and out of a gate structure is likely.

Given these deficiencies and the fact that the environmental gates may take various forms, as we saw in the presentation earlier tonight, we believe the Corps should be required to prepare a
supplemental environmental impact statement and then allow the public to comment once again.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MS. HIRSCH: Good evening. Rhonda and Greg Hirsch. And I am a resident of Galveston Island. The first thing, I have to applaud you for this crowd. You didn't bring cookies. Inside joke.

Anyways, I do applaud the efforts that the State and the Corps of Engineers has put into this project. Gate system and the protection of our coastal ecosystem as well as the energy coast is very important to this day in Texas and into the nation. I believe that, as we're looking for funding for this and non-federal sponsors, we should go up the Ship Channel and look at the industry that we're protecting and think about some private money to help fortify a budget for this project.

I also have a concern that Galveston Island is such a unique microcosm. We're rowdy and we're historic and we're eclectic. But it's such a unique community. And I think the levee system is a very hard strong structure for something that is so precious. And I think we need to look at fortifying
our dunes, looking at strong beaches and dune systems and continuing that for the length of the project along the coast itself.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. SINESHIRE: My name is Jeff Sineshire. I live in **MISSISSIPPI**. I am fourth generation BOI. I'm speaking today as a private citizen rather than for the organization I share, the Surfrider Foundation of Galveston Chapter. This seems the proper forum to shed light on what I consider to be advanced to investigate needed changes to the democracy.

Public comment periods now seem to allow citizens to remark on how to regulate federal elections but not to question or have involvement in such activities. Public participation in this respect simply offers citizens the opportunity to react to plans, decisions and technologies already in the making rather than perfect them in the first place.

NEPA does not even prohibit agencies from making decisions that may be for our public concern. Final decisions around the proposed project could lawfully go against the public input obtained throughout NAIS public comment period.

Our public comment process should be a
model to the world, a government/public partnership rather than a current one-way system. More authentic two-way delivery participation and open dialogue, this will minimize contention and maximize positive outcomes.

Thanks for your dedication. God bless us all.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Next I would like to invite J.J. Kitterlan, Jo Lee Hughes, Robert Madison, Susan Fennerhal and Jordan Macha.

MS. HUGHES: I'm Jo Lee Hughes. I live on the island. I heard the Corps said about there's different ways to do the barrier. I think your best bet is going to be with the beachside dunes and --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Will you speak up?

MS. HUGHES: -- and the houses that we have that are already on the beach side as opposed to north 3005.

I asked the question about the pump system and where that water goes. And I was told that goes to the bay. I think that you probably need to figure out some ways to make it go back out to a ocean
or go both ways depending on what we need. And more water is likely to flood areas into the beach that are not in the levee system. And if it goes over the levee, then they are not going to work. So, that's all I have.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. KITTERLAN: I am J.J. Kitterlan. I live on the west end.

THE REPORTER: Excuse me. Can you please speak up?

MR. KITTERLAN: I am J.J. Kitterlan. My concern is about the moments or the construction period. What are we going to do to evacuate during all this construction period? Is there any plan to facilitate evacuation if a storm comes?

And then my other concern is: Who is going to bear the burden during the maintenance portion? Is it going to be everybody in Texas or just the coastal residents?

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MS. FENNERHAL: I am Susan Fennerhal. I live in Galveston. I am not on the west end. Most of your people are on the west end. But I want to
talk about the benefit cost ratio, which is really awful.

And it needs to be broken down into seconds for the benefit cost ratio. I haven't been able to reconcile Tables 4.26 and 5.1. But it's clear from Table 3.6 that the City of Galveston's Corps accounts for 50 percent of the benefit but it does not account for 50 percent of the cost. And if the ring levee needs to be separated out in the benefit cost ratio so that we can see how much benefit is derived from the gate and how much is derived from the west end and Bolivar levees and how much is derived from just a ring levee around Galveston, from the looks of it, the ring levee around Galveston survives the benefit cost analysis but the rest of the project does not. And we are spending more money to protect less and we're just throwing away tax dollars that way.

So, you need to be better and more explicit with your benefit cost ratio. You need to say that in the executive summary that there is real problems with the benefit cost ratio of this project.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

Next, I would like to call forward Anthony Brown -- sorry. Go ahead.
MS. MACHA: Thank you.

My name is Jordan Macha. I’m the Executive Director of Bayou City Waterkeeper. Thank you tonight for hosting and to the offices that are here tonight.

First and foremost, we are very concerned at the lack of specificity and comprehensive analysis on the environmental community impacts in the draft report DIS related to the coastal barrier alternative. For years prior to the release of this plan, Bayou City Waterkeeper and others have urged the Corps to provide these details. And to our disappointment, the draft DIS is woefully lacking.

Additionally, in conversations with the Corps, the beach alignment would require sand that we just don't have. And, so, to us, that means the beach alignment would mean a seawall.

For the public to provide meaningful comments on the DIS, the Corps must identify the proposed placement and total design for the coastal barrier levees and Bolivar Road surge gates, as well as a complete and comprehensive environmental review and analysis for public review and comment before finalization.

It's not acceptable to take these
comments tonight to finish the other 90 percent of the
design and issue a final plan of DIS without full
public comment on a detailed comprehensive plan. We
deserve more than a line on a map when we have so much
to lose in the name of our protection.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MR. BROWN: Hello. Thank you. My name is Anthony Brown. I live on the island. I serve on
the Galveston ISD board of trustees that serves not
only Galveston, but also the children on Bolivar
peninsula. In my day job, I'm legal counsel to the
Port, local business, and property owners.

I appreciate the work. I think the
coastal levee spine system is wonderful. I appreciate
Ms. Burks-Copes' comment that the line as drawn is
conceptual and not final. That causes a lot of
concern because there's approximately 1800 properties
that will need to be condemned through eminent domain
to build the various levees as currently shown on the
line. And over 14,000 parcels will be left
unprotected.

When the seawall was built 100 years
ago, it was unthinkable that it would not protect
everybody. And I think with some good engineering and study, you can put it on the dune line and protect everyone and do it in ways that will help everyone.

And for the record, Representative Middleton asked his question, a vast majority of hands went up in response to agreement.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

Next, I would like to invite Leonard Waterworth, Kristen Vale, James Buss, Herbert Turner and Dorothy Hogg.

MR. WATERWORTH: Are you ready for me to start.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Yes, sir.

MR. WATERWORTH: Hi. I'm Leonard Waterworth. I'm from Texas A & M Galveston. I'm here with Dr. Merrell, the concept developer of Ike DiKe 10 years ago.

The Corps of Engineers are doing a good job. This is a really tough process, appreciated. But Dr. Merrell has gone through every page. He's got nine separate comments from placement of the barrier to the dune line, leaving nobody in front of the barrier, a gate at San Luis Pass. Maybe that helps alleviate some of the levee ring wall and active
management of the gates. All of these things are
going to be provided to you.

We're also going to put it --

Dr. Merrell is going to put it in editorials starting
today and all nine points in editorials for the public
to see.

So, thank you very much. You are doing

a good job.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MS. VALE: Hello. My name is Kristen

Vale with the American Bird Conservancy. I am sharing

a similar sentiment, as others here, that there needs
to be another public comment period once the barrier
design is complete. And it needs to be a requirement
under the NEPA process. It is not fair nor possible
for the public to provide comments on a design that is
not even fully designed. And I have a feeling the
majority of the public is not aware there is no second
public comment scheduled once the design is finalized.

And the layout of the barrier can have

significant impacts to the ecosystem and the economy.

And that's it for now. I will provide

more later.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. TURNER: Good evening. My name is
Herbert Turner. I am a resident of the east end of Galveston Island, in connection with the university, which saw quite a bit of devastation from Hurricane Ike, particularly the UTMB area, and it crippled our capacity for medical treatment.

I believe that when I first came -- when I first started listening to this, I didn't realize how complex all this is. There is no one side. But I do believe, perhaps, you know, a gate system might prevent the kind of storm surge that impacted not only -- not only the east end, UTMB, but a significant amount -- a significant number of citizens of Galveston Island. I guess it's going to require a lot of more study. So, I just hope that transpires and you give more opportunity for people to comment.

Thank you very much.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MS. HOGG: I am Dorothy Hogg. I live on the island. This building project addresses only storm surge as is clearly stated on Page 11. Storm surge is only one of two sources of storm water damage. Rainfall events like Hurricane Harvey are neither addressed nor mitigated. They were not even
considered. See Section 1.0.1.

So, even with this project built, another not uncommon storm with catastrophic rainfall will be just as damaging, if not more damaging, because of the disrupted drainage and restricted outfall. So, you're only addressing one small part of the problem. Harvey 2 will be as bad, if not worse.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

I would like to invite Elizabeth Beaton for comments, please.

MS. BEATON: My name is Elizabeth Beaton, and I live in the core of the City of Galveston.

Please proceed as rapidly as possible with the ring levee around the City of Galveston. A well-designed levee can protect 95 percent of the City's residents, businesses, government buildings, and property values. Don't wait to build the levee until the coastal spine is constructed. Time is of the essence to protect Galveston, and the levee can be a standalone project that can be constructed much more rapidly and for significantly less cost than the spine.

Yes, the details of the location will
necessarily be controversial. But those can and must be resolved so that the city is protected before another disaster.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

That concludes the individuals that identified themselves that wish to make oral comments. Are there other individuals at this time that would like to come forward and make comments as well?

MR. MOHN: My name is Jerry Mohn, and I live on West Galveston Island. And I'm president of the West Galveston Island Property Owner's Association. It's about 40 property owner's association on West Galveston Island.

We are not very supportive of a coastal barrier on F.M. 3005 either north or on the highway. The West End represents about 50 percent of the tax base of the City of Galveston. About 70 percent of the homes are south of F.M. 3005. Having a barrier on F.M. 3005 will certainly decrease the property values and increase our insurance costs.

We have been supportive of Dr. Merrell's Ike Dike system since its inception in 2008 right after Ike. He has made presentations. I have made a lot of presentations on Ike Dike. So, we
are very supportive of the fortified dune system on the beach.

Thank you very much.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. FRENCH: Good evening. My name is Brian French. I'm a Galveston Island resident. I am speaking for myself. And I want to thank all of my neighbors for showing up for this and for actually caring about their community, and thanks to the Corps.

I know we need a plan, but I don't think it's this one. A couple reasons: First, environmental justice issues aren't really adequately addressed in this plan, particularly for the low-income communities along the west bay of Galveston. You're asking us to make a decision as to make comments on something that's only 10 percent done. I don't think anybody in this room would be content making a decision for long term like this with these consequences with only 10 percent of the information.

Last, I would ask the Corps or remind the Corps that this isn't a line in the sand. This is where people live. This is our community. And here, when you look at this, either you're outside, you're
inside, you're underneath this thing. These are our homes. This is where we live. If you would have been on Jamaica Beach last night and seen my neighbors and seen the looks on their faces when they realized that maybe their community is going to be gutted and decimated by this. Be aware how sensitive we need to be.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MS. JACKSON: Good evening. My name is Courtney Jackson. And I'm a proud Galveston resident and part of Galveston Corps, lost our home in Hurricane Ike, and was -- have been a part of restoration for Galveston.

And one of the things that I wanted to say was, first of all, thank you. I know it's hard work to bring all this together. I wanted to say thank you for working through the conceptualization. But one of the things that are so important for us, too, on Galveston is the ecosystem. I was very pleased to see that you looked at that as a whole and that one of the things that, when we look at it, is that we're going to have to consider for the whole island. So, there will be needs for compartmental
things and we have to look at not just the spine and not just the others, but perhaps that.

And to let you know that the bay side needs a lot, because during Hurricane Ike, that's what we lost. It came out through the bay side and devastated so much. And I live just right back here, behind here. And we're up high. We are considered the high part of the island. And we had 4 feet of water because it came in the back and knocked down the gates and all that.

Plus, also to consider this, is we get hurricane tornados that come in here. So, we have to consider that when we think of the storm surge.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MR. MORGAN: Hi. My name is Wendy Morgan. I am a resident on the island.

Several people have said they're not happy with the idea that we can't make further comment. And I would like to ask you directly to please have a public meeting after you have incorporated all of our comments so that we can hear how you heard us. I think that we are all owed that. I think I've seen that in a lot of cities where you
have a project, you go to the first meeting, you see
the plans, you make your comments on those plans, and
then you have another meeting showing you how you
incorporated that. So, I think our citizens deserve
that. In fact, we all do.

Thanks.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
comment.

Are there any other individuals that
would like to make a comment?

MS. GREGG: Hi. My name is Marcy
Gregg. I am a resident in Jamaica Beach. I will make
it short and sweet.

I like to drive the work and watch the
sun come up. I like to drive home from work and watch
the sun to go down. So, I don't want any wall. I
don't want anything to change major. I like it the
way it is. I think they feel the same way. This is
our island. I've lived here for 12 years. I just
bought my first home in my name, and I want it to stay
at a good value, so, property value is a big problem,
and whatever impact on nature, I would like to see a
lot more details in that regard.

That's it.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.
Any remaining individuals that would like to make a comment at this time?

MR. PASS: Hi. My name is William Pass. We are at Texas A & M University and we are looking at innovative concepts for the barrier gate system. And we would like to urge creativity and doing something that's not already been done before that we have seen, like in the Netherlands with the Eastern Scheldt, and coming up with something new to our unique situation and our unique island.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MS. WHITTAKER: Hello. I'm Margaret Whittaker. I am a resident on Galveston island. And I would like to, I guess, acknowledge and confirm some other comments about supporting additional time for us to comment on final plans. And we do need to take personal responsibility. We have chosen to live on this island. It's a shifting sands island. We know that. And permanent structures aren't consistent with that type of structure of the island and living. So, we really need to look at habitat restoration and consider some alternatives.

Thanks.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MS. HOGG: Okay. I am the one that said this doesn't fix the Harveys. My last concern is, if we did get the multi-billion-dollar thing to build this project and the next Harvey-like storm comes out we're out many, many more billions of dollars, if we hold our hands out for more money to fix this still unresolved issue and although, but "B," I have no doubt we'll be told had our chance. We already got plenty of money. This is no more coming. And we just get in our boats and run home.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Ma'am, can you please reidentify yourself?

MS. HOGG: I have already talked.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: I know you did.

Could you just please reidentify yourself.

MS. HOGG: Dorothy Hogg, Galveston resident, H-o-g-g.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you very much. Sir?

MR. LYNCH: Jerry Lynch. I live on west beach. And I wonder about the strength of the wall they're building, the gates. We had a home behind the 17th grocery store when Hurricane Ike
came. It was completely blown away, posts, house and all. So, I'm wondering -- I wasn't there. How high was the surge when it went over that building. And the storms continue to grow stronger. If we start spending money on a project like this, is there any amount of money for maintenance and to be expanded?

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

One last invitation for any remaining individuals?

So, just as reminder, anyone that made oral comments this evening, I ask you to provide additional comments, both in writing or e-mail, through our Web site, comment cards tonight, or by a formal letter.

So, in conclusion, written comment of the draft integrated feasibility report and environment impact statement must be received on or before January 9, 2019, the conclusion of the 75-day comment period that began on 26 October 2018.

I would like to thank the Texas General Land Office for their efforts and assistance in preparing for and holding this meeting. I thank you.
for your, in advance, interest all of you have shown here tonight.

The formal meeting is adjourned.

* * * * *
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COL. ZETTERSTROM: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am pleased to be here today. I am Colonel Lars Zetterstrom, the commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District. I welcome you to this afternoon's public meeting to review the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study.

For the record, let me state that this public meeting was convened at 1:00 p.m. on December the 15, 2018 at Crenshaw Elementary and Middle School in Crystal Beach, Texas.

Specifically, we are presenting information and accepting public comments on the draft integrated feasibility report and environmental impact statement for this study that was released for public review on the 26th of October 2018. A court reporter is here to transcribe these proceedings and all public comments.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Texas General Land Office have analyzed coastal risk reduction solutions that would reduce the risk to lives and property on the Texas coast. Ten years ago, the region was -- experienced Hurricane Ike, which disrupted many lives and resulted in expensive economic and infrastructure damages. The Texas coast
is also subject to ongoing coastal erosion, relative sea level rise, habitat loss, and water quality degradation. These coastal hazards are placing the environmental and economic health of the coast at risk, which negatively impacts the Texas and national economy.

This, along with storms such as Hurricane Ike, Dolly, and Rita, emphasize the need for enhanced resilience of the coast to not only reduce future damage and loss but to improve our ability to withstand and recover from future storms.

It is important to note that the Coastal Texas Study recommends a structural measure to reduce risk along the coast and that these recommendations support multiple investments and risk reduction that agencies and businesses are making along the coast. Coastal Texas is part of a larger effort of risk reduction action to make the coast more resilient over time. A cost effective plan has been identified that we would believe would significantly reduce the risk of damages from tropical storms and hurricanes as well as increase the net quality and quantity of coastal ecosystems.

This meeting is being held to describe the tentatively selected plan, or the TSP, and to
receive all of your comments. I hope that all of you had the opportunity to read the notice of availability either on the Galveston District's Web site or in the announcements that were mailed to individuals of organizations that may have an interest in the proceedings.

Before we go any further, I would like to introduce a representative of the Texas General Land Office, our study's non-federal sponsor, Mr. Tony Williams, the planning senior director for coastal resources.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Colonel Zetterstrom.

Thank you everyone for coming out today to learn more about the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study, also known as the Coastal Texas Study.

We have several members of the GLO here that many of you saw when you came in or saw answering questions. I want to thank them for being here. I believe some of them are still out answering questions, so, I'm not going to acknowledge them specifically.

Addressing issues on the Texas coast, including storm surge and ecosystem restoration
continues to be on Commissioner Bush's top priorities.

You may be asking why is the GLO the non-federal sponsor. The General Land Office was established to manage state-owned land, including state-owned submerged land from mean high tide out to more than 10 miles offshore.

The land office is also the state agency responsible for implementation of the coastal management program, protecting our beaches and dunes, implementation of the Coastal Erosion Plan and Response Act, oil spill response in state waters. GLO is also responsible for moving debris from bays and public beaches after storms. Personally, I spent a couple hundred hours after Ike removing debris from the bay behind Bolivar and was very instrumental in the beach removal, as well. We're also responsible for certain roles in the disaster recovery.

In 2015, in November, the GLO signed the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement with the Corps of Engineers. This obligated the GLO to funding approximately half of the million--of the 20-million-dollar study, much of which is being accomplished through work in kind. The land office committed to working with the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to increase the resiliency of the Texas
coast through an integrated approach that includes ecosystem restoration and enhancement all along the coast and storm surge barriers and gates in the upper Texas coast.

The plan is being presented today and incorporates habitat restoration and enhancement as well as gates, levees and flood walls to address erosion, habitat loss, and storm surge. These measures work together to increase the overall resiliency of the Texas coast.

The plan that is proposed in the Coastal Texas Study was developed to work in concert with the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan. The GLO is currently working on the 2019 version of the master plan which builds on the 2017 version. The 2019 master plan identifies projects that coastal experts have identified as the one best suited to address coastal resiliency. The 2019 version also models future threats to the Texas coast and the benefits of the identified projects. The plan will be completed in early 2019 and presented to the Texas Legislature.

The Coastal Texas Proposed Plan or Tentatively Selected Plan, as referred to in Corps documents, was jointly developed by the GLO and the
Corps of Engineers. We work with engineering and environmental firms, consulted with other groups addressing these issues, including local universities and international organizations. We consulted regularly with resource agencies, nonprofit organizations, and navigational interests.

And as we move into the next phase, it's important to get feedback from all stakeholders. We value your input. It's critical at this point in the study. Please remember the study is only about halfway done, a little over halfway; and we still have a lot of details that need to be worked out. Again, we value your input and look forward to your comments.

Thank you for taking the time to join us. I turn it back over to Colonel Zetterstrom.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: At this time, I would like to recognize the public officials or the representatives who are attending the public meetings this afternoon. First, I would like to acknowledge Mr. Jed Webb, who is representing U.S. Congressman Randy Weber, U.S. House of Representatives District 14. Next, I would like to recognize Representative James White, Texas House of Representatives for District 19; Mr. Braden Kennedy, representing Texas State Senator Brandon Creighton, Texas State Senate
Representative-Elect Mayes Middleton,
Representative-Elect for Texas House of Representatives District 23.
(Applause.)

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Commissioner Darrell A. Apffel, Galveston County Commissioner; Mr. Kenneth L. Jencks, Galveston Independent School District Trustee; Kelli Mutlon, Galveston Independent School District; and finally, Tracie Camp, principal of the Crenshaw School.

(Applause.)

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for allowing your facility to be used for today's public meeting.

And now I will describe the ground rules and format for this afternoon's meeting. I hope everyone has completed an attendance card when they entered the meeting. The attendance cards are used to provide us your contact information so we can keep you updated on the status of the study. If you would like to make your comment orally tonight, please make sure that you've indicated such for your -- on the blue attendance card and turn it in to the meeting facilitators. If you have not done this already, please do so immediately at the facilitators at the
front of the school.

Those wishing to make an oral comment will be given an opportunity to do so after the presentation. If you prefer not to speak tonight, excuse me, this afternoon, you may submit your comments in writing by drop them in the basket provided or sending them to us by mail or e-mail.

Following these opening remarks, Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, project manager for the study, will present an overview of this feasibility study. After her presentation, I will open the floor for public comments.

Federal and state officials that requested to make a statement will be recognized first. Next, representatives from federal and state resource agencies wish to make a statement will be called upon. And then I will recognize each individual from the general public who has indicated that they wish to make comments.

Please keep your remarks to one minute as we would like for everyone to have an opportunity to speak. We will need to adjourn this afternoon's meeting by 5:00 p.m. in order to depart the building on time as has been requested. Also, we would like to emphasize that this is not a question-and-answer
period. This meeting is to provide everyone an
opportunity to publicly comment on the plan.

Please give all speakers the courtesy
of not making any comments during their presentation.
Please turn off all of your cell phones and hold your
applause or reactions so that we can have an orderly
meeting and respect everyone's time. All individuals
here have an equal right to be here.

Now I would like to present Dr. Kelly
Burks-Copes, the project manager for this study to
make our presentation.

MS. BURKS-COPES: I will try not to
fall down the stairs. I'm a klutz. I'm a klutz.
It's -- you know, it's an action.

So, I need to start by -- I need to get
closer to the mic, obviously; and I'm going to kick it
all night long.

So, I need to start by kind of
explaining why we're here. And then we'll go through
a series of slides, it's pretty short, 24 slides. And
then we will open it up.

Okay. The idea tonight is for us to
provide a status update for the study, to walk through
the National Environmental Policy Act process, and to
describe how the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers planning
process interfaces with that process. Then I will identify the Tentatively Selected Plan and describe its impacts, its benefits, and its costs. And then we'll open the floor to receive your comments. As both the speakers before me mentioned, we're halfway through, only halfway through. And that's important for y'all to realize.

The report, we actually started in 2015. The report -- the draft report that you all are here about was released on October 26th. The comment period closes on January 9th of 2019. At that point, we will go into the second phase of the study, which is optimization. I'll talk a little bit more about that.

But it means that we will be looking at changing things like the alignment, changing the types of materials being used, changing the locations of different features or the capacities.

We are shooting for a report to Congress in 2021. After that, Congress would have to authorize and appropriate funds for us to continue with design and then construction.

The study is vast. It's huge. We understand that. A normal environmental impact statement period of comment runs 45 days. We recognized from the very beginning that this was so
large that we needed to give you a little more time. So, we have a 75-day period of review. That means it starts on October 26th with the release of the report and it goes through January 9th, as I mentioned. Inviting public comment is a requirement of the NEPA process. And all comments are welcome. Negative, positive, it's fine. Okay. Remember, the more specific you are with your comments tonight or on your cards or in your e-mails in the future, the better it is for us to understand the concerns and issues and to address those.

Public and agency input informs our decision process. And all comments are going to be fully evaluated and equally valued. Review of comment of the -- of the -- ensures, basically, that our decisions are made on the best informed information.

You are well aware living here what the concerns are for the coast. We know that we are faced with vulnerability to coastal storm surge. We know we have inland, shoreline erosion, and coastal erosion. We have a lot of threatened endangered species up and down the coast and we are losing our natural deltas. We have disrupted hydrology that is playing into all of that as well.

We were mandated by Congress to look at
two things specifically and jointly -- coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration. In doing so together, we can formulate solutions that provide multiple lines of defense while enhancing resilience up and down the coast.

In Corps speak, the way that we do this is by formulating goals and then laying out a series of objectives that measure the success of achieving those goals. In this instance, our objectives are focusing on economic damage reduction, looking for reducing risk to critical infrastructure but also to public health and safety, and to increasing resilience through the enhancement and restoration of coastal land forms as well as improving hydrologic connectivity and then improving coastal ecosystems up and down the coast.

Because we are receiving funding from Congress, we have to provide a justification at the national level that something should be done in this region. In this instance, as you are well aware, the study area encompasses 18 counties in Texas. 6.1 million people reside within that study area, which is more than 24 percent of the state population. We have several nationally or ranked deep draft ports, which I have listed here. But in addition, we have 450 miles
of Gulf Coast intrawaterways, GIWW. 40 percent of the nation's petrochemical industry resides in the study area and 25 percent of the national petroleum-refining capacity is experienced or determined inside this study area.

I want to focus on the fact that it's not just about industry; but it's about the people, the people that actually work at those plants, the people that rely on those plants.

In addition, we have NASA within our study area. And in overall Galveston, we have the UTMB, which has a Level 4 viral laboratory.

Remember that we are mandated, dually mandated to look not only at coastal storm risk management but also ecosystem restoration. So, we have to establish national significance for the natural resources as well. Within this study area, we have one of six in the world. Hypersaline lagoons, the Laguna Madre. We have 12 National Wildlife Refuges. We have the National Seashore of Padre Island. We have two of the 28 National Estuary Program sites in the country. We have critical habitat for threatened and endangered species up and down the coast and we have the Central Flyway Migration right through our study area.
Lastly, but sometimes most importantly, we have nursery habitat for commercial and recreational fishing. Oyster, shrimp, and finfish are prolific in this area.

I have to kind of explain how engineers work and how they speak. In the Corps of Engineers, we use building blocks to formulate plans. So, we identify things that are called features, treatments, and actions. And we combine those to make measures and then we combine those to make alternatives which is A/K/A a plan. All right?

Features, for example, are levees or marshes or gates across the channel. Actions include restoration or construction or even raisings of structures. And treatments include nourishments and plantings.

When we formulate those plans, we then need to assess their effectiveness. We were mandated by Congress in 2016 not to reinvent the wheel. We knew full well that other studies were either ongoing or complete in this area talking about coastal barrier systems. And we were directed by Congress to use, if at all possible, their data and their information and then bounce off of that so that we didn't waste any time.
We know that NOAA has a sea level rise viewer that allows us to look at this area and the areas up and down the coast with respect to different scenarios of sea level rise and understanding that we do not have to justify why it's happening. We are not interested in that part for this study. We are simply looking at it and asking what if it were to happen.

We know that the GCCPRD has alignments that they have been evaluating. So, we have used those. We know Texas A & M has been proposing things like the Ike dike and that the SSPEED Center has their own plan. I want to enforce the fact that this is not the Ike dike and this is not the SSPEED center H-gap plan, nor is this the spine. This is the coastal barrier because we were mandated to look at more than just a barrier system. We were -- we were mandated to look at that, plus ecosystem restoration, to provide multiple lines of defense up and down the coast, not only in this region.

If U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has several ongoing studies that are either in feasibility or in design or construction along the coast and we are including those in the study in terms of recognizing synergies, actually things that we can read together to enhance resilience. We also know, as
Tony mentioned, that the Texas GLO has a master plan for the area. We are trying very hard not to step on their toes. The idea is not to waste money in the same place at the same time, to actually fill gaps and look at doing a resilient host as a system systems.

We did do a series of reconnoiters, or I want to call them scoping meetings in 2014 before we launched. And we take all of that information together with the actions and the treatments and we form our measures and then we actually use the goals and objectives to screen those and formulate plans.

We broke the system up into four compartments or regions. And then we formulated measures by region, made combinations, and then used goals and objectives to screen those down into manageable features and plans.

The Corps of Engineers has three E's that they look at -- engineeredly sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. Every plan must meet these requirements.

We have a series of tools that we use to assess these particular criteria. For example, we have been running -- using the engineer research and development center's laboratory for storm modeling. We have developed a series of 600 simulated storms that have
been run across this area to determine what the potential no action plan would be. And then we put barriers in place and ask whether those provide risk reduction in the face of those storms. The storms range from a 10-year event, which is just a rainfall system, to a 10,000-year event, which is a five-plus Cat 5. Okay.

The -- in addition to that, we have proposed a series of gates to go across the navigation channel, the inlet in total, and we understand and recognize that there is a potential for constriction of flow into the bay. And, so, we have used a series of advanced hydrologic models to assess sediment movement in the bay, flow into and out of the bay, and salinity changes in the bay.

All of these tools allow us to compare and contrast a variety of plans in all of the regions to meet the goals and objectives to assess and protect the resilience of the Texas coast.

We ended up with approximately five plans that we took through the -- the analysis and formulated the benefits and the cost of each of the plans. We landed down on two specific plans. The first one is what we call Alternative A, the coastal barrier system. Starting at High Island, we come
across the GIWW with a gate. That's the blue square. We go down onto Bolivar peninsula, go across the navigation channel with the gate system, tie into the seawall on Galveston, make a ring barrier around Galveston. And then starting at the base of the seawall, the southernmost portion, continue on with the barrier all the way to San Luis Pass.

We are not proposing the closure of the pass at this point. We do understand that Texas A & M has been running some analyses for closing off San Luis. And we are meeting with them in January to take a look at that information and to incorporate that into our analysis.

In addition to the barrier along the island and the peninsula, we are also -- we understand that storms will still make it over the barrier and they will land inside the Galveston Bay and wind-driven surge is likely to push up into the Houston/Galve -- the Houston area. So, we have proposed a series of nonstructural measures -- in Corps speak, that's raisings and flood proofing -- to handle the wind-driven surge that still remains after the storm's passover. And we have proposed gates and pumping stations at Dickinson Bayou and Clear Creek. There are also three pump stations proposed for the
backside of Galveston Island and a gate at Offatts Bayou.

In terms of gates, we are talking about a series of different types of gates that would only be closed during the storm and then would be opened back up afterwards. The pumping systems would be designed to help and maintain and draw off the water while those gates are closed. Along the navigation and across that inlet, we're proposing two floating sector gates that look like fans. When they're closed, they're touching. And during most days, they would be wide open and on their own islands.

To the left and right side of those gates would be a series of 39 environmental lift gates. The sector gates are 1200 feet wide. The environmental lift gates are 100 feet wide. These would cause approximately 27 percent constriction of flow into the bay as estimated with our storm models and our advanced hydrologic models at this time.

Alternatively, we looked at a solution along the rim. It would start at San Jacinto and would cross with the gate and pumping station there. At this time, it would run along the rim of Galveston island, across Clear Lake with a gate and a pumping station again, across Dickinson Bayou at a different
location so that we can then tie into the Texas City levee. We would enhance and improve the Texas City levee and then extend it off to the west of the lower portion.

As you'll note again, a ring levee would be placed around Galveston Island with the pumping stations and the closure of Offatts Bayou. But in this instance, we would not be putting a barrier on the rest of the Galveston Island or the peninsula itself.

The way that the Corps of Engineers assesses and evaluates these plans mandates or requires that we do a compare and contrast of what features are different. And, so, in certain instances, and as you can well imagine, a coastal barrier would provide protection for the peninsula as well as Galveston Island all the way down to San Luis Pass, whereas a ring barrier would not. We know that a coastal barrier would provide protection to the GIWW and the Houston Ship Channel, whereas a ring barrier would not.

So, we do a comparison and contrast of each of these plans so that we can formulate and determine what the Tentatively Selected Plan would be.

In addition to Region 1, which is this
area, we have also proposed a coastal storm risk management feature in South Padre. Right now, that island actually nourishes a beach and dune system, but it's infrequent based on funding availability. What we would propose is a more regular nourishment of that system, every 10 years, for example. And we would propose 2 miles of the 12-1/2 foot by 100-foot wide dune in the two regions that are highlighted here.

We are receiving additional economic information from that region. And with that information, we are looking at extending this coastal storm risk management feature both north and south. Even if it turns out that that is not nationally economically defensible, the locally preferred plan can still take that into account and extend those features.

Remember, though, that we were funded and mandated to look at not only coastal storm risk management but ecosystem restoration. In this instance, we have formulated 160,000 acres of restoration up and down the coast.

In this area on this peninsula specifically, we are proposing 45 miles of beach and dune. We're proposing 36 miles of breakwaters along the backside, 664 acres of marsh would be created.
initially, and another 7,000 acres of marsh would be renourished into the future; 326 acres of islands would be formed and 18 acres of oyster reef are proposed for restoration.

Together with the ecosystem restoration and Plan A, Alternative A, the coastal barrier, and the coastal storm risk management measure in South Padre, we have proposed a Tentatively Selected Plan. It includes all nine features of ecosystem restoration, the barrier along the peninsula, the closure across the inlet that would only be closed during storms, the ring barrier around Galveston, all the way down to San Luis Pass, and then the nonstructural measures and the gates and pump stations at Dickinson Bayou and Clear Lake, along with the South Padre Region 3 and 4 beach and dune nourishment project.

All told, the cost is twenty-three to $32 billion, but let me point out that 40 percent of that cost is ecosystem restoration. 8.9 to $11.9 billion for ecosystem restoration, 14.2 to $19.9 billion for the barrier. That's in the same ballpark as what the GCCPRD plan is proposing, for example. The coastal storm risk management measure of the South Padre Island beach and dune
system would run 71.6 to $83.1 million.

We do acknowledge that there are likely
to be direct impacts of a barrier solution. We
understand that 45 -- based on our mapping thus far,
4500 acres would be directly impacted with Plan A and
the South Padre solution would additionally impact
365.8 acres. We do know the constriction to the inlet
is likely to cause indirect impacts, but we are also
creating 160,000 acres of restoration. The impacts,
both indirect and direct, will have to be mitigated or
optimization needs to buy those down. We are
expecting a bill of approximately 676 to $906 million
for mitigation.

Optimization is what's key here. I
want to stress to you that the barrier solution that
we have proposed, the line that you have seen, is a
placeholder. It is conceptual. We are only halfway
through the study, and we are interested in your
feedback and your comment on the alignment of that
feature. We are open to your comments, and we are
open to your suggestions. We know that we are only
halfway through the study. And the next phase of the
study, now that we have selected a barrier along the
coast, we need to go through what we call
optimization. We need to look at the alignment. We
need to reconfigure that so that we can maximize benefits for costs. We also need to look at the size and the type of barrier that it would be. It very well could be on the beach, an engineered dune with a series of dune fields in front and a berm and a beach in front of that.

It could be different configurations of that and T-walls, for example, in areas of very high erosion. We need to work through how to get over that to the beach, for example, or whether we need to have openings to be able to access the beach with sliding gates, as an example.

Okay. We also need to look at the pumping capacity for each of these pumping stations and determine how to optimize those and where and when we need to close off Offatts Bayou, Clear Lake, and Dickinson Bayou. All of these kinds of activities are what's to come. That is what we are planning on doing at the latter half of this study from here on out. And we are waiting for the comments from the public to begin that process.

As I mentioned earlier, but I want to reiterate, we are halfway through. We still have got a lot of time left to take in your comments and to incorporate those into our study. Once we are
finished with our study, we send a report to Congress in 2021. The very earliest we can expect Congress to consider and authorize a design phase would be 2022 under a Water Resources Development Act.

We also would need a cost-share sponsor at that point for design, and we will need a cost-share sponsor for building and constructing and anticipating.

Design, if we were -- received all of the money that we need to do the designs would take two to five years. Congress would have to give that to us. And then to build, it would take 10 to 15 years if we received all of the funding right off the bat.

Understanding that -- and likening the study to putting dams on the Mississippi River, it could take a lot longer depending on the availability of funds from Congress.

At the end of this study of construction, we turn the project over to the cost-share sponsor who is then responsible for operation and maintenance out into the future. We understand that we're talking about infrastructure that's generational. It will last more than 100 years. And, so, we're looking at operations and
maintenance over that time frame.

We expect that it will cost approximately, and we have estimated it will cost approximately 100 to 130 million to maintain the entire project. That includes the ecosystem restoration up and down the coast, the barrier itself, and the South Padre Island barrier.

We have conducted thus far six -- this is our one, two, three, four, five -- this is our sixth public meeting. They're all almost blurring together because it's been so crazy. This is your opportunity to stand up and give us your comments. We're not judging. We are open, and we're interested. Intentionally, we are here and not answering questions so we can get as much comment as possible.

There is one more meeting. And I want you to tell all the folks that didn't make it in the room, because it was so limited in space, that there is another meeting next week on Tuesday up in Seabrook that we invite you to.

If you're too shy to stand up -- I don't get to say this, I have to do this, stand up -- if you don't want to stand up in front of the group, that's fine. You can submit your comments on the cards that we gave you. And there's baskets out front
that will take those. If you want to take them home
and think about it a little more and then write them
out, I have given you the e-mail address and then the
mailing address that you can send those to. But the
key here is to get these in before January 9th so it
could be part of our administrator of record.

I talk fast. I completely admit that.

I have some kind of weird accent compared to y'all.
I'm from some other places. So, there is a Web site
out there. Once we are finished with all of the
public meetings, the slide deck that you just saw, the
videos in the other room, the one that you've been
kind of sitting through as we've been waiting for this
to start, all will be on the Web site. The report
itself is on the Web site, all glorious 450-plus pages
of it, plus 1200 pages of appendices. The newsletter
will be up there. The executive summary will be up
there. And we will start in the future showing a
series of seminars and Webinars that talk through
different aspects of the plan, which is part of our
information for you-all to absorb and to take in and
comment on.

So, with that, I think I'm going to
just close and let the Commander come back up and
start the public comment process.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Okay. I would like now recognize elective officials or the representatives who wish to make a statement. First, I would like to invite Commissioner Darrell A. Apffel, Galveston County Commissioner.

You are welcome to turn to face the audience or face --

MR. APFFEL: Thank you, Colonel Zetterstrom and Commissioner Bush and the GLO for coming to Bolivar Peninsula and attempting to educate us and allowing us to give you comments regarding this barrier system.

I am Darrell Apffel, the County Commissioner here on Precinct 1. My public comments for the record are as follows: If we are going to have a true coastal barrier, we want one that benefits all at the expense of no one. Interestingly, in my humble opinion, the current alignment runs contrary to a U.S. Army motto, "Leave no one on the wrong side of the barrier."

Today I understand Land Commissioner George P. Bush agrees that the barrier must be at the coastline. I commend him for that. I would warn, if you place it on the beach to protect from Ike events, you must look at what effect it will have on the
inside in Harvey-type events.

Ten days ago, we lost and mourned our 41st President. Mr. Pollock, please tell Commissioner Bush I want to thank him for the beautiful eulogy that he gave for his grandfather. He spoke of the family vacation home on Walter's Point in Kennebunkport, Maine. And I listened, as I'm sure many of you did intensely, he spoke of memories made and memories held there. I just want him to know and the GLO and United States Army Corps to understand, this is our Walker's Point in our Kennebunkport.

We ask you to thank Commissioner Bush of your vacation home and the effects this would have when fighting for us here. I will be asking Galveston County Commissioners Court, therefore, Galveston County, to speak --

MR. STOKES: Your time is up.

MR. APFFEL: Can I -- publicly -- just two seconds.

-- by passing a resolution for the barrier to leave no one unprotected from either surge or inland flooding.

Last, what I've learned, and most importantly, is if the United States Corps chooses to keep the levee at the current alignment, we can ask
for our state to do an alternate plan and pay for the difference. So, we should call on our state officials to help us with an alternate plan if the U.S. Army Corps does not do what we want them to do.

Thank you-all.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

I would ask to remind that -- the audience that we have a one-minute per individual to ensure that everyone here wishing to make a comment has an equal amount of time.

I would like to ask Representative James White, Texas House of Representatives District 19, for comments?

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Colonel. And I will go back to my officer briefing standard, be bold, be brief, be gone. Thank you for your service. Okay. And glad to see you got a Ranger badge on. Okay. Thank you for that.

With that, I want to thank the Corps and the land office and the principal and the school district for having this meeting and hosting us here. A lot of folks are probably wondering why I am here. My district is about an hour and 45 minutes north and east. But I have a lot of constituents that told me
to be here. So, we're complying with that.

But specifically, we know what this is about. A lot of us have asked for some type of barrier protection. Congress then has asked the Corps to do this work. And we know the situation you're in. But you have your three E's, and I have three C's. Let's make sure that we abide by common sense, that we are cost effective, and we come up with a plan that has consensus behind it. And right now, I think we have got some work on at least two of those.

So, thank you so much, very much. And Merry Christmas.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

Next, I would like to invite Mr. Jed Webb, representing Congressman Randy Webber, U.S. House of Representatives, District 14.

MR. WEBB: Thank you, Colonel.

Yeah. Jed Webb representing Congressman Webber. He wishes he was here. He's stuck in D.C., the whole shutdown, border conversation, working with the President.

With that being said, the Congressman is for common sense. He released a statement. We will give it to y'all so it's there. But he wants to protect folks. He's one of us. He's lived his whole
life here. He wants to make sure that everybody is okay.

And with that being said, he is not in favor of any specified red line or any specifics. But he does want study and the answers and the questions that you guys are asking and the comments that are being made to be answered, because we all deserve a voice and we all need to have answers on what these impacts are.

He has major considers about eminent domain, taking away people’s property, especially if it’s been in families since 1836. Is that what it was? Been in here for a while. Folks have fought and lived on the Gulf Coast because it’s important to them.

But just know that the congressman, he is actively engaged with our federal partners, with our state partners and with our local partners. But the most important thing is y’all’s voice. So, please, please, please, stay engaged. This isn’t a one-day conversation. This isn’t a one-week conversation. This is going forward and this is our livelihood.

Thank you so much and thank you for being out here.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

Next, I would like to invite Mr. Kenneth L. Jencks, Galveston Independent School District Trustee.

MR. JENCKS: Thank you for letting me speak. I'm Ken Jencks. I am a school board member for Bolivar, East Galveston, and Pelican Island. And yes, sir, there are students on Pelican Island, believe it or not.

But the whole key is, this affects GISD in a major way. Whether it's on that side of 87 or this side, it affects how the water will flow and things that will happen here. We do not -- it cost $11 million to build this school in 2007 when it opened. So, probably 50 to 60 million, I imagine right now. We don't have that laying around in the district, believe it or not. So -- but I am here as a representative. I believe in the representative form of government regardless of what I feel it should be. I will be representing Bolivar.

That will be in the talks we have at the administration building on this issue if we decide to take a stand. I can always say that I'm going to make sure it gets brought up. We talk about it. I am going to listen to each and every person that
wants to tell me. " TableCell:align="center"  is my e-mail or just go to the Galveston Independent School District Web site and find my e-mail there. I am open to phone calls as well.

My time is up. But I am here to represent you regardless of my own opinion because this is a wonderful place to live.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

I will now call upon members of the general public who wish to make a statement. I will call five members at a time. Please be seated in the front row to wait for your turn to speak. After your comments, if you could please return to your original seats.

As a reminder, if you make oral comments, you can still make written comments either on the blue cards this evening or written in mail or by e-mail. I've asked Mr. Stokes to assist me in keeping time. He will indicate when you have 30 seconds left to speak and when your time has expired. I ask that you stop speaking after your one minute has elapsed.

When you're called upon, please come forward, speak into the microphone, please identify yourself by your full name and the organization you
represent, if any.

I would now like to call on the first five individuals. Brad Mertz, Christyn McCann, Don and Lisa Juneau and Neil Spiller.

THE AUDIENCE: Is it okay if Representative Middleton gets a chance to speak?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: I apologize, Representative Elect. Your name was not on the initial sheet for comment.

MR. MIDDLETON: Let me just start off real quick: Raise your hand if you're opposed to the current levee configuration.

(Audience indicating.)

MR. MIDDLETON: Yeah. That's exactly what I thought. This is a very destructive plan for Bolivar. We've got 1800 homes and businesses that are going to be eminent domained and torn down in this process. And think of all the other houses and businesses that are not protected where the current levee is. We have got to change this. We have to. This can't happen with this current configuration. So, that's the bottom line. That's all there is to it.

That's all I have got. And I'm glad to hear from the rest of the people today. I hope they
-- I hear the same thing said in Galveston. They have got to listen to us because this is bad for our community the way it is right now. And we can't allow for this current plan to happen like that.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Once again, I would like to invite the first five individuals forward. Again, they are Brad Mertz, Christyn McCann, Don and Lisa Juneau and Neil Spiller.

You can start.

MR. SPILLER: Good afternoon. My name is Neil Spiller. I'm co-owner of the RE/MAX office here in Crystal Beach. And I'm speaking on behalf of the real estate community here.

If the -- the plan that's on the table right now, if that becomes the recommended plan, I would like to know what would be the impact on property values, the tax base of the peninsula, what would happen to floodplain insurance, and all of the impacts we will see in our community.

I also notice from the executive summary that there was supposed to be scoping meetings on the -- on the stakeholders. I'm not aware of anybody here on the peninsula who was invited to a
stakeholder meeting. Also, I would like to know will they include for divided dunes in the plan? Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MS. JUNEAU: I'm Lisa Juneau. This is my husband Don Juneau. We are property owners here on the peninsula as well as in Orange County. And our family owns property in Jefferson County. This plan is not good for any of us, any of those counties as far as I'm concerned. My first question would be, though, you know, January 9th is the deadline for our comments. You know, we're not unintelligent people; but we don't have sufficient time to study this plan like we need to. Why have we not received notification in the past about this?

With regards to the refineries, many of us, maybe even a majority of us, you know, that's where our livelihoods have come from. That's why we're able to have homes here. We want to protect those refineries as well. But this is not the plan to do that. This is -- this is protecting the refineries at the expense of thousands of people. And, so, we feel like there is a better plan for it.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.
MS. McCANN: My name is Christyn McCann. I'm a property owner and homeowner on the peninsula. I find this plan to be concerning in the fact that many homeowners were lost in the consideration of what would be done. It seems that it's being passed under the guise of protecting wildlife environmental attributes. And while that is important to consider, I think that it's something that is just kind of being swept under the rug from all of the homeowners and citizens of this area. And that I think that is the biggest concern to me. It seemed a little secretive of what's been taking place.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to call forward the next five individuals. Charles Osborne, David J. Wukoson -- excuse me if I mispronounce your name -- Suzy Chapman, Amery J. Champagne, and Jeanie Turk.

MR. OSBORNE: Can I start?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Yes, sir.

MR. OSBORNE: I don't know if I need this or not. I am going to try to make it real quick.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Please identify yourself.
MR. OSBORNE: I'm Charles Osborne. I own property here on the Bolivar peninsula. I want to thank one, what a challenge for the Corps of Engineers. I wouldn't want y'all's job on a bet for a project like this. But I want to thank y'all for trying to do what you think is the right thing. Right?

What a unique community that we all live in. Right? I've been in lots of different places. I've been in the Marshall Islands. I've been down below New Orleans. Every place is different.

Thirty seconds already?

All right. So, I want to say, the levee options are the biggest concern. Right? What's being posed is the one right down the middle of 87. But what I hear back here is that that's not the only option, but that's what we're all being told. If there's an option to go on the Gulf side, then that's what we all want. If there's got to be a levee, then that's where it needs to be. But that's not what we were told. If we were mistaken, then we were mistaken; but I don't think so.

I know my time is up.

I'm -- I'm worried about the property values. What are we going to do in the interim while
we are waiting on all this junk to work this thing out. I bought seven lots. What the heck am I supposed to do? Wait until 2012?

That's all I'm going to say. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MS. CHAPMAN: My name is Suzy Chapman.

I've been here since the Eighties. My family is from Port Arthur. My 89-year-old dad wanted me to say they built the seawall in Port Arthur. Hurricane Carla hit. Groves flooded. Homes were lost. You know, we've got this barrier talk. The water has got to go somewhere. We need to be more thoughtful about it.

No. 2, the fodder of all of this talk on the Internet is affecting our home values and it is affecting our community. We as Realtors are constantly getting e-mails, calls. You know, folks, when you're out there on the Internet, you know, be thoughtful because there's a lot of people that don't understand it. And we've got years of study to do.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. CHAMPAGUE: My name is Jim Champagne. I'm a property owner here on Bolivar. And
this is a repeat of a lot of what's been said here, the same sentiment that most of you have about the barrier being north of Interstate -- of Highway 87. I think the focus should be on the beach. The focus should be on beach nourishment, engineered dunes, those kinds of things.

And I was happy to hear that it was stated that the proposed barrier north of Highway 87 is not a done deal. I think the focus needs to be south. If a seawall can protect Galveston, why can't something like that protect us here.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. WUKOSON: Hello. My name is David Wukoson. My wife and I have owned property, beach houses on Bolivar for over 30 years.

I'm kind of offended by y'all. Y'all must think we're stupid. You use the idea of saying that Harvey is justification. Harvey was a flood event. If you have 50 inches of rain in Houston, that water is coming down here to drain. What y'all want to build is a dam. So, wherever you build a dam, Bolivar is going to be dead.

If you build it on the beach, we'll have no tourists. People won't come down here to
spend money. Everybody who owns a business down here, sell it now. Anybody who owns a beach house -- we have three acres on the beach. What are you going to pay us for our three acres and our house? What are you going to pay these folks, if you're not on the beach, who have property inland for their diminution of value claim? They can't sell their houses. They can't sell their property.

I'm offended also because this is a done deal. Y'all are hammers, and all you see are nails. You're going to build this thing because you're engineers. You have not come down to talk to us. You have not sought our opinion. You are coming in here half ass at the 11th hour after you've made up your mind. It's wrong. This thing should not be built any place on the peninsula.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

I would like to invite the next five individuals.

MS. TURK: Wait.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Oh, excuse me, ma'am. I'm sorry.

MS. TURK: Hi, everybody. I'm Jeanie Turk. I have a little bit more positive attitude
toward our property values and our homes on Bolivar peninsula.

And this coastal spine project that affects 40 percent of the United States economy and six to 8 million people in the Galveston infrastructure and the Houston infrastructure. And I am really pleased to tell you all that I am happy to be able to have input into this.

And I agree totally with Mayes Middleton that the line in the sand here that we are starting out with on Highway 87 is absolutely totally ridiculous. It devastates Bolivar peninsula. And it definitely should be changed to fortified natural dune systems that work on the beach side of the Bolivar peninsula.

And thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next five individuals for their public comments. James Fincher, Cathy Fincher, Stewart Hanley, Tad Felton, and Nelva Maxey.

MS. MAXEY: I'm going to pass, Nelva Maxey.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.
Sir, you may begin.

MR. FINCHER: If this has to be done -- this is my opinion, and I'm old, so, I'm going to read it.

My name is James Finch. My wife Cathy and I live in Crystal Beach. I will address the coastal barrier as the road dike in my proposal and opinion. As other senior citizens, as my wife and I that live on Bolivar peninsula have saved, worked hard, and planned for our retirement, my proposal is a sand dune -- now, this is if they have that have something -- my proposal is sand dune dike with a 1200 yard ship lane opening for boating traffic, overlapping walls for the beach traffic. The beach dike could be covered with sand. This proposal should not make a serious impact on wildlife.

In my opinion, this is a win-win for people, cost, maintenance, and wildlife.

I have given for my country as a veteran, Vietnam, four years military, steel worker 15 years, police officer 35 years, I'm 74 and still a paid public servant active. My thoughts are for my family, for your family, for our land, and wildlife.

In closing, would the short distance from the highway to the beach really make a
difference? Yes, it would, to the homeowners.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MS. FINCHER: Mine is short.

My name is Cathy Fincher. No barrier. We love our Beach. We love our homes. Just save our beach.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I’d like to invite the next five individuals to come make their public comments. Velinda Pachlhofer.

MS. PACHLHOFER: Pachlhofer.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Pachlhofer. Thank you for the correction.

Kathy Hazlett, Lauri Mathias, Mike Walz, and Shawn Pachlhofer, please come forward. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: If you would like to begin, you are the first one up.

MS. HAZLETT: Does the minute start when we say our name or after.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: You get a whole minute, ma’am.
MS. HAZLETT: Thank you.

My name is Kathy Hazlett. I have a home here on Bolivar peninsula and Nederland, Texas. I would like to stipulate that any quote that I say in my whole minute is from the GLO's Web site regarding the Coastal Erosion Planning and Response Act. This program provides funding on a bi-annual basis for the following types of projects and studies: Beach nourishment on both Gulf and bay beaches, shoreline stabilization, habitat restoration and dune restoration.

I would like to request that you perform these projects since you are already authorized to do them and you are already authorized to do it every two years. It's never been done on this island.

I had a whole lot more to say. But let me tell you this: If you continue with the barrier plan as outlined today, I will continue to fight it whether in Austin or Washington because as the old saying goes, it's not the size of the dog in the fight but the size of the fight in the dog. And you, ladies and gentlemen, have just kicked the dog.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, ma'am.
Are any of the four individuals that were invited to the last group still wanting to make comments? If not, I will move to the next group of five individuals.

I would like to invite the next five individuals forward then. Lynda Smith, William Comeaux, Ange Scheibel --

MR. COMEAUX: Comeaux.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Comeaux. Thank you for the correction on the pronunciation.

Angie Scheibel, Peter Chase, and Winifred Burkett.

If you would like to begin while you are still standing.

MR. CHASE: My name is Peter Chase and -- representing a property owner here on Bolivar. And, basically, I just want to say that the boondoggle of $30 billion being spent on a gate system when the doctor already second-guessed it and said it may not work for wind-driven bay water which is what flooded Rockport. I was in Harvey. We've owned property out here since the Twenties. And God blessed us with a barrier island system. Yes, it will flood. It will wash over it. But if you close a gate and you have a wobbling hurricane that goes north, the north wind
will flood everything anyway.

So, the gate, all the money spent on it, it's worthless. And also, the hurricanes come every 10, 20, 30, 40 years. Port Aransas wasn't hit by a hurricane for 47 years until Harvey. It was a flood system with all the rain in Houston. The gate system, the $30 billion, which is probably on the low end, is just going to be worthless money spent. So, spend it somewhere else. Okay. The gate system is not going to work. That's it.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MS. BURKETT: My name is Winifred Burkett. I live in Port Bolivar. I am here concerned about the unknown impacts to the Galveston Bay ecology associated with the gate system. Have been told that it will constrict the tidal flow 27 percent. We would like to suggest that a corresponding 27 percent reduction in post larvae shrimp and blue crab egg recruitment from the Gulf to nursery in the bay will occur. This will mean a 27 percent reduction in the shrimp and crab population in the bay complex. And that logically translate to 27 percent reduction in recreational and commercial catch of crab and shrimp. Also, this is 27 percent less food
available for finfish and food fish and 27 percent less food available for birds. This is a significant impact on the bay's ecology and on the region's economy. And we think it should be studied.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MS. SCHEIBEL: My name is Angie Scheibel. I live here in Crystal Beach. I grew up 10 miles inland from Surfside and wanted to live at the beach all of my life. I finally got to move here full time in 2008. Ike washed away my house and most of my neighbors. We built back stronger and higher. And we understand the risk of living on the coast.

What I resent, I never thought I would say, is our government doing something to us to take away our dreams. We build stronger. I planned for my children and my grandchildren. And this is an assault from our government on our way of life.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

I would like to invite the next five individuals for their public comments. Melinda McWhite, Matt Pace, Hollis Gassen, Jeannie Martin and Don Juneau.

MS. McWHITE: Are you ready for me to
My name is Melinda McWhite. I own a small plain pre-ike cabin on the beach side of ___. The most important fact to me about this cabin is, it’s currently above base flood, at least on the ground floor. You raised that base flood a couple of feet and I go from losing my stairs to losing my house. The immediate impact on me is the decrease in real estate value. And it makes sense that when somebody increases your risk of losing a property, the value of the property goes down. What am I going to do about this? Well, the only thing I can see to get my money out is to convert my family retreat to a rental house. What’s the impact of increased rental houses on a society, it’s negative. Look at Airbnb that’s currently plagued New Orleans. Now, I’m going to switch shift to economic justified. The Corps of Engineers is currently the target of litigation arising from its increased risk to property owners out in Barker and
Addicks reservoirs in Houston and also there's first
condemnation litigation occurring in Fort Bend and, I
believe, several other jurisdictions. What I want to
see is that you factor in your cost analysis,
litigation cost and potential damage awards, since you
admit that you are increasing our risk if you slide it
on 87.

Finally -- and this is directed to the
GLO -- five years ago, we reported to the GLO that
there were several significant dune cuts by private
property owners in front of blue water. The G -- the
GLO increased -- admits that it's illegal. Five
years, they're still there. So, excuse me if I don't
have a lot of faith in the commitment of the GLO to
protect Bolivar. Please prove me wrong. Do not let
Bolivar become a sacrificial limb.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. PACE: I'm Matt Pace. I used to
insure quite a few homes in this area. You call your
plan the Coastal Barrier Plan. I would like to refer
to it more as the barrier system plan. For brevity,
I'll call it the "BS plan."

The -- the concern -- one of the main
things you say is the intention of the plan is to
protect the refineries in those areas on the northwest barrier of the Galveston Bay system. That's great. Why don't we have the refineries build 10-foot levees around themselves and protect themselves from storm surge.

Secondly, if you want to protect that Galveston -- west Galveston Bay shoreline, those wonderful communities over there, there is an excellent alternative, the Rice University Galveston Bay Park plan. If you have not had to chance to evaluate that plan yet because it just came out, so, please evaluate that plan. It's not a great supplement to your plan. It's a great alternative to your plan. We don't want the BS plan on 87. We don't want the BS plan down on the dunes. We want the BS plan built up there where you want to protect those areas.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. GASSEN: Hello. My name is Hollis Gassen. I have a house down in Crystal Beach at Sandpiper subdivision. I represent the president of the homeowner's association for Sandpiper's subdivision.

The first thing I would like to say to
Mayes Middleton, I agree with you 100 percent what you had to say.

The second one, if they do build this thing down 87, you're going to have the beach side and you're going to have the bay side. If you have a storm come in here, the highway is on -- 87 is on the beach side. You're going to cut off evacuation for people leaving out of here. And if you have a storm coming in here, after the storm is over, people will not be able to get down on the peninsula to evaluate damage to their houses.

And the second one I am hearing, also, is looking at protecting the refineries and chemical plants. I retired from Shell after 35-1/2 years. We have never had a plant shut down because of a hurricane. We have reduced -- reduced skeleton crews working the plants. And after the hurricane was over, the plant came back up.

So, I like your Alternative 2 plan. And I'd appreciate it if you look at that to consider that very heavily versus the one you have now.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next five
individually to come forward and speak. Gwen Sifford, Sharla Marek, Greg Whittaker, Patsy Stockton, and Ellis Pickett.

You can go first.

MS. SIFFORD: I don't have a whole lot of new stuff to present, but I want you to see who the residents are. We're permanent residents here in Crystal Beach.

THE REPORTER: Speak into the microphone.

MS. SIFFORD: We moved here in 2016. We've owned our home for over 25 years. We love living here. I can't tell you how stunned I was that I didn't know that there was public comments available in 2014. I'm just hearing about that around now. I'm not happy about that. So, that's why I'm here today.

I am not happy with being on the side where we're going to be inundated with the flood, with the water, et cetera. We're on the wrong side of that coastal spine on that wall. That wall needs to be down by the beach. Why can't we do fortified dunes? Why can't we do something other than black out all these residences, all these businesses, right? I love this place. I love living here. And all of my neighbors love living here. All of my friends love
living here. And we're not going to be able to.
Right? I know the end of time is coming. I know the
water is coming. No wall is going stop it. But don't
rush it what you are going to do with that wall.
Okay?

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
comment.

MR. WHITTAKER: My name is Greg
Whittaker, and I am speaking on behalf of the Houston
Audobon Society. Houston Audobon Society publicly
raises our concerns that the video presentation at the
outset of today's public meeting seems to contradict
our experience with that process and perception of the
Tentatively Selected Plan.

Houston Audobon is one of the largest
landowners on the Bolivar peninsula with several
sanctuaries managed as resident and migratory bird
habitat.

As stakeholder that actively
participated and provided input over several years, we
were not notified of the release of this document for
review. We were also surprised to note that none of
the Houston Audobon properties were mentioned in the
scope of this study document as protected areas
weren't in consideration in the proposed placement of the barrier systems and hard-structure features.

It seems disingenuous to include preservation and improvement of ecosystem features for the expressed purpose of providing vital habitat for coastal bird species when the plan seems to pose significant direct disturbance to several existing managed sanctuaries of high economic and ecological importance.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. PICKETT: My name is Eric Pickett. I've been coming to Bolivar since 1955. I've enjoyed it every time I come down. I've surfed here, fished here, flounder-gigged here, camped here, cut donuts on the beach, everything.

But I'm with Surfrider Foundation. I'm a volunteer. Most people don't know about us. We're a 501-C-3 coastal nonprofit organization. Public beach access is our main issue on this -- on this project.

And if the thing is built on the beach, I haven't really seen a provision that says they are going to be able to maintain a public beach in front of the thing. It costs about 18 to $30 million a mile
to renourish beaches in Texas. I don't see where we're going to have enough money, especially since in order to be elected with -- no offense to any elected officials, but the easiest way to get elected in Texas is to say "no new taxes."

To maintain this -- this -- this project, Texas taxpayers are going to have to come up with a lot more than they're talking about. This is the owner's manual for the Texas coast. I recommend that everyone read it. It's the formation and future of the upper Texas coast by Dr. John Anderson at Rice. If you haven't got a copy, you can get one at Amazon.

You can talk to the Corps of Engineers the way they need to be talked to. You will know the information.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

I would like to invite the next five individuals to come forward for their public comments. Mike and Penny Everitt, Myra Cisneros, Kristian Koengeter, and Seawillow Edward.

If you would like to begin since you are still standing.

MR. EVERITT: I am going to let her talk.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Yes, sir.

Ma'am, would you like to go? Or whichever one of you individuals would like to do to go first, please.

MS. EVERITT: My name is Penny Everitt. We just built our house on Bolivar. It's been my dream since I was 9 years old.

Anyway, you know, you can draw a line on paper so it looks straight, but it doesn't mean it's straight. They can do all of their investigations, but it doesn't mean they're right. It doesn't mean they're going to work.

I have heard a lot of comments from the people here, factual comments. I don't think we're receiving facts from them. I was taught when I was little, don't lie. Were y'all told that when y'all were little?

We don't want the wool pulled over our eyes. We want the truth; and we want options, good options. Plus, why haven't they been down here on our beaches? After Ike, nobody came down to rebuild our beaches or our dunes. Who built them? We did. Where have they been?

THE AUDIENCE: In their office.

MS. EVERITT: Thank y'all.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. EVERITT: The only thing I want to say: I hope that everything that's been said here today up till now is not going in one ear and right out the other.

That's all I've got to say to you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Sir, please state your name for the record.

MR. EVERITT: My name is Mike Everitt, and I'm with her, on a house here on the Bolivar island. I'm just saying that I hope everything that's been said, seriously, is not going in one ear and straight out the other. I hope there is something in between here blocking it to where something is going to catch it. Okay?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MS. CISNEROS: Good afternoon. My name is Myra Cisneros. I am speaking on behalf of the Cisneros family. We purchased a home here in Crystal Beach. This was a family dream of ours. After we lost in Ike, we all had to go through, all right, is it the wind that blew the house down or is it the flood that took the house down. And litigation
ensued. Right? And then we had to build our house no
longer 8 feet, it had to be 18 feet tall and all that stuff.

So, we couldn't afford that. We dipped into our family savings to rebuild because we were still very passionate about living here. This is our home. This is our family, where we come for vacation, make memories. My dad had his pulse on what was going on with the city, with the government; and at no time did we ever hear about this line down 87. If anything, we heard that the freeway was going to increase, because I was really happy since I knew that sometimes we can't commit to the ferries to get us off this island. So, if they get rid of that, there is no way for us to get off. If it floods, my parents can't get off this island.

So, that's what I want to see. That's what I thought this was about. I don't want there to be a wall. There is no reason for a wall. I understand about if we want to. I've been a part of places where we were given options. I don't see where we are given options. They're talking about a wall. We don't need a wall.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
MS. KOENGETER: Hello. My name is Cristian Koengeter. I am from Germany. And I moved here 10 years ago. I am a builder here in Bolivar at a house on 87 right by the ferry.

And when we had a wall in Germany, it got torn down when I was 7. We were real happy about it. I don't know why we need a wall in Bolivar. I was thinking -- I mean, Holland has no wall. England probably has no wall through their country. You know, they have building in the front of the wall, they have dunes to protect themselves. So, I mean, I hear you guys working always international. So, I think they wouldn't say, you know, build a wall on Bolivar.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MS. EDWARDS: Hello. My name is Seawillow Edwards. My family has owned property on the peninsula since 1952. Thank you for your ecosystem restoration portion of your proposal. I think we definitely need it. We have obviously been very negligent on that area.

I am disappointed that our public comments are being heard before the completion of the
study. To me, that doesn't make sense. You should really decide what you're going to do and then let us at least have some, you know, comments after the study is completed. I think it's pretty immature almost. You don't know where you are going to turn on this.

Also, I'm looking at your proposal for South Padre CSR. It involves strictly dune and beach restoration and ours involves a coastal barrier. I would like to see us move more towards the dune -- more emphasis on the dune and beach restoration portion of it and hopefully not do a coastal barrier wall.

You used the Netherlands gate as a -- I hear you -- you used the Netherlands gate as a study. But wouldn't it make more sense the way that that was set up, to put the gate by Baytown instead of way across the gulf, I mean, across the bay? But if you look at that Netherlands project, it was a very small canal instead of -- it's a very different structure. So, I don't really understand how you feel that that is a good comparison.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next five

Go ahead, sir.

MR. SWAIM: My name is David Swaim. It is my understanding that several years prior to Hurricane Harvey that USACE issued an 11-page document regarding Addicks and Barker reservoir and their levees and gates were no longer in a condition to adequately protect downstream properties in the event of a major rain event and that this could possibly involve lawsuits against USACE. The decision was made to risk the lawsuits and to do some minor repairs and not to do major structural work that was known to be needed. This was reported in the Houston Chronicle.

We all know what happened to thousands of people downstream after Hurricane Harvey. Why should I believe that USACE continues to officially maintain an upgrade of 30-billion-dollar coastal barrier and flood system? They're not already taking care of what they've already got. And the lawsuits are happening already. I own property there. I own property here. My wife and I vote in every single election. I want that to be aware. Everyone.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
Any of the other four individuals that I previously commented upon available for their comments?

Sir, are you one of those four individuals?

MR. NANTZ: I am.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Please begin, sir.

MR. NANTZ: Hello, I am all about Bolivar peninsula and support a lot of communities, people homeowners, organizations, churches. And there are -- there has got to be other alternatives as far as jetties out along the beach, dredging, bringing the sand back in. The 17-foot barrier is ridiculous. And there is nobody here that is going to put up the bat. There are better alternatives.

And I just want to comment that, yes, it could be used better in certain areas, maybe the Ship Channel, maybe the refineries. But Bolivar peninsula has been here for over 2000 years and it's going to stay without the 17-foot barrier.

Thanks.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment, sir.

If none of the other three individuals
from the last group are here for comments, I will move to the next five individuals. I would like to invite Sam Johnson, Phillip Marin, George Morgan and Amy and Jim Delliger, please come forward.

I see none of those individuals coming forward. I would move to the next five individuals. Linda and Bob Brown, Richard L. Rodriguez, Susan Standefer Taylor and Kerry Aycock.

If you would like to begin, sir.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.

First of all, thank you to all of you for the presentation. It's very informative. I know a little bit about project management. This is a huge, huge effort to do this.

Bluntly, if Mother Nature kicks my butt, I can live with it. I can't live with my government doing it. Sorry. I think it's time to get the lawyers involved. I don't know how many attorneys we have got in the room here, but our property values are getting trashed. If you can get flood insurance when this thing goes live, you are going to pay a fortune for it. We have been burdened negatively. And I believe more than three people constitutes a class-action lawsuit. The 30 billion can go to fifty.

But in closing, this is a cool place.
You know, please don't trash it. You can stand in front of people in a cowboy hat and shorts and feel okay about it. That's what this is. It's not a place. It's a state of mind.

Thank y'all.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Are there any of the other group from the last five individuals I have called for present for comments, please?

MS. TAYLOR: I am Susan Standefer Taylor. We've been coming here since '65. My folks help start Kona-Kai. And to lose that place or lose Bolivar like we know it, I don't think you are thinking about the people. I've been touched by people who are homeowners here who have lived here a long time. I'm concerned about the gates, the increase in the philosophy, and what's it's going to do with fishing in the bay. The bay side is phenomenal for sport fishermen.

And -- okay. The -- we have cattle grazing on the land and you're going to have eminent domain on it if you put the road down 87. I think that will affect the whole appearance. I was concerned with the water coming down from Houston.
And if you have gates shutting everything off, how is it going to get out? I don't know that y'all have considered all of that.

I have seen problems with Clear Creek and the gates there. Okay. The school, I believe, needs to be protected.

And -- okay. And I just don't like this project at all. I am concerned about the gates because they are not anchored well as the Netherlands.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next five individuals forward for their comments. Jo Ball, Dana Carroll, Ray Thompson, and Andrea Sims-Kaptchinskie. I apologize. Thank you, ma'am. I apologize for the pronunciation. Francine I. Roy Bolls.

MS. SIMS-KAPTCHINSKIE: My name is Andrea Sims-Kaptchinskie. I cashed in my 401(k) and bought a house here, cashed in my 401(k) and built a business here -- you're not going to tell me I have 30 seconds -- because you want to take away my life, my business, my home. Your red line goes right on top of my business. My house is on the seaward side. Ironically, both my business and my house both survived Hurricane Ike.
You are not building this to protect this peninsula. You're building it because you're an engineer, and you like to build. I get it. Build it where it's needed over those petrochemical plants. Let them help pay for it. We live here. This is our life. This is our family. Every one of these people are my family. How dare you. How dare you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. BALL: Hello. My name is Joe Ball. I'm the general manager of the company the current water utility on this district. I seen the breakdown of the funds you had earlier. Nowhere did I see relocation of critical infrastructures. Early estimates for us is twenty to $30 million to relocate the funds or the water lines currently. Right now, you have your barrier going right down 40 miles of 20-inch water line that is the sole supply of current water usage for this peninsula.

No. 2, have you given any thought on where you're going to relocate us? If you relocate us on the beachside, you've done away with the complete water system. Ike nearly took care of it then. It cost us over $4 million to rebuild then.

Have you given any thought to what
you're going to do to the utilities down here when we lose half our customer base from the first hurricane, plus the 1800 homes you're going to take just to build the levee. We current have about $17 million in debt with the Texas Water Development Board, your neighbors in the building right upstairs from you. Oh, well.

Are you going to pay our debt off that with that as well, because once you decrease our customer base, we can no longer use our debt. You can ask anybody in this room, because I talk to them all the time, they already think our water bills are too high at $50. Can you imagine what you're going to do to them when you take half of our customer base? It's going to do the same thing to energy and the same thing to the water bill. They're going to be two or $300 a month to provide you services.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next five individuals for their public comments. Jennie Vickers, Danny Stafford, Bill Billings, Katricia Billings and Gerald M. Brones.

MR. STAFFORD: My name is Danny Stafford. I'm a homeowner here. My comment is to the
public official of Galveston, mainly. If I'm south of this barrier, why would I ever pay my taxes again if I have a homestead? Why would the Government take, or I'm going to say the government, the Corps take my tax dollars to build something to destroy me and protect someone else?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Are any of the four individuals that were called in the last group of five citizens so wishing to make their comments?

The next individuals I would like to call for further comments are Dorma B. Brones, Azure Bevington, and Mary Fergeson.

MR. BRADFORD: Hi. My name is Mary Fergeson Bradford. I am a lawyer who has -- now has an encore career with a local shop here I opened for my autistic son on Bolivar peninsula. I was an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Beaumont and a plaintiff's trial attorney in Beaumont for a full career.

I'm here not just to ask y'all to pull Alternative A that runs the wall down 87 off the things being considered. I'm asking you to do it immediately. This has already -- people are freaked out. Our property values are already -- we cannot
sell things. I had somebody who was going to buy a lot. They were getting ready to sign and came in and said: Everything is off because of this Ike Dike. I am not going to do a thing on this peninsula.

If y'all don't immediately issue a public statement that this Alternative A that runs down 87 is off the table, y'all are going to strangle hold us and kill us in very short order.

This is my third go-round with this. I've had a beach house for 20 years. I have my badge on from the last time that y'all came. This is the third time people have come after us on this peninsula to take our property values away without paying us any money for it. The first time was, they tried to throw us out of TWIA, the windstorm. We got over that. The second one after Ike, they tried to do away with the Texas Windstorm Insurance Exchange, which would have made our properties have no value.

This is the third time that y'all are trying to kill us by taking our property values away. I'm asking y'all to immediately act and pull this Highway 87 wall down before we are over -- it's happening fast. Please act fast. Y'all please pull that barrier down Highway 87 off immediately and let it be known publicly.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments. I appreciate it.

MS. BEVINGTON: So, my name is Azure Bevington. I have met you. I am just really quickly going to say the 87 placement is unconscionable. And I'm glad that you came here on a beautiful sunny Saturday and you got to see what you drew that line on top of.

The gate system will destroy the ecological productivity of the Galveston Bay. You have done no studies to even look at that. And if you did or if you do in the future, which I don't have a ton of faith that you will, because I have talked to a number of your ecologists and none of them can tell me the adequate studies the will be conducting.

Partial transfer is not larval -- larval movement. None of your answers are sufficient. I will be sending more about that eventually in writing.

So, the beach placement is unacceptable. It is equally as bad. I know it sounds better. I know it's in front of people's house. It's better from that perspective. It will -- if we wanted to sacrifice the beach. The beach is why we live here. What will happen with that placement along the
beach? It will exacerbate the effect of sea level rise. Y'all like to show the sea level rise and what will happen if Bolivar cease and subsides and the sea level rises, that is bunk if you let the natural processes work.

I am going to explain, because Colonel Zetterstrom expressed to a number of people at the meeting in Winnie that this would protect us from sea level rise. That is extremely false. An introductory coastal processes class at any university would teach you that. I have taught people that, and I am happy to teach everyone else that.

We will lose our beach if we build it there. There is not enough sand to cover a wall. There is no such thing as an engineered dune. There are dunes, and then there are walls covering sand. That is it.

The dunes and the natural processes and the beach renourishment that is in this plan are good. They will protect us. They will let the sand move over across the peninsula and build it up like it has been done for thousands of years. That is what natural coastal barriers are. That is what barrier islands are. That is what this peninsula is. That is what we need to allow to happen. Build gates up
there. That's fine.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you very much for your comments. I appreciate it.

At this time, that concludes the list of individuals that have identified themselves to make oral comments. Is there anyone in the audience that didn't previous make it onto the list that would like to come forward for further comments?

MS. KERRY: That would be me.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Ma'am, I think there's a few gentlemen that are already standing.

MS. CARROLL: I was standing. I'm just short. By the way, I'm late for work.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Could you please identify yourself.

MS. KERRY: I'm Deborah Kerry. I live in Crystal Beach. I've been coming here my whole life.

What I want to know is if you put that thing down 87, how are we going to get down Diamond Road or East Canal or West Canal? Are you going to put a gate at every road or are you going to block off all the roads? That's what I want to know. But you're not here to give answers. You're just here to pretend you care about us. You're just giving --
Letting us -- you to be a sound board. That's all you are. Because if you want to do it, you are going to do it. There ain't no two ways about it. This is just ridiculous. Okay? Because you're going to do it whether we say so or not. Thank you.

And I have a house in Trinity. I can go there. But I want to be right here. It's my American right to be right here. And I am a native American. I was here first.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment. I appreciate them.

Sir, if you would like to come forward and please identify yourself for the comments.

MR. McCLELLAND: My name is Craig McClelland. I am a graduate of Texas A & M University at Galveston. Whoop. I'm an attorney in Houston. I represent property owners throughout the state of Texas in dealing with property values against appraisal districts. I now reside here in Bolivar.

And I have looked at this plan. The gate is going to ruin oystering. Oystering is a major industry in this area. If you don't shrimp, you oyster if you work on the water. It's going to increase the fresh water back into the bay, which is going to drown the oysters.
Additionally, the current placeholder was a terrible placeholder, if it was just that. It really riled everybody up. Not only did it rile up, it has tanked the real estate industry. If it is going to be a real wall, it is going to plow through churches. It's going to go plow through our water supply. Literally, our water tanks are going to have to be torn down, not mention other homes and businesses in the area.

It is going to make -- our only significant store is going to be bulldozed. No one is going to be able to live here even if their houses were on the protected side of the wall.

The other side of the wall is going to be subjected to extra storm surge damage, which, I believe, our Commissioner Bush said was, this was supposed to be preventing Ike-like damage. That is going to be encouraging Ike-like damage, not to mention the photos of Harvey that you had on there, which is actually going to be a backup of water behind the dam that you put across the channel.

The wall on the beach is a least objectionable alternative, although we are a barrier island. We are already the barrier. We don't need a gate in there. I already pay at the pump and every
time I buy something plastic for chemical in the store for those multi-billion-dollar corporations to build their own barriers around their plants.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. DEERBON: My name is Tim Deerbon.

I'm actually a new owner. I just bought September 2018. So, I've only owned for two-and-a-half months. But it's just as important to me to say, I've just put over, you know, half a million in investment in the area. So, it's important to me.

What I would say is, I tried to review all 442 pages of the document. It says that the purpose is to make us be more resilient and less vulnerable. But the whole report contradicts that because nowhere in the report does it say any of the people that live here are going to be more resilient and less vulnerable. In fact, it says the opposite, that we're going to be at higher risk and we are going to have induced flooding and there is going to be greater surge and wave impacts during storm.

So, my question is: Based on your own criteria, you should have already ruled out this plan because it does not even meet your own objectives for this community. So, what I say is, go back and come
up with a plan that does meet your objectives and not hurt this community. I am strongly against this plan.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Are there any other individuals that would like to make a comment? Please come forward, ma'am.

MS. DEFORD: My name is Pam Deford. About two months before Harvey hit, we bought our forever home. And I just want you to know, this community is really neat. And there is a lot of wonderful people here. And I have my own business. My husband has his own business. And we're looking to bring our children, our grandchildren, and just to enjoy this wonderful place we've been coming to all our lives. And I'm glad to be a part of this community.

And I just -- I don't want to see this. I want to make sure my grandchildren get to still come and my great grandchildren can know that GiGi loved them.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Anymore comments?

MR. COTAR: My name is Tom Cotar. My
family is new to the peninsula with some of you folks. My father bought the property on Caplen Beach between Gilchrist and Crystal Beach in 1954. We built a house then before there was permitting on the peninsula. So, we build a ground level. So, if water came, it would either blow us away -- back then you didn't have FEMA flood insurance for those kind of stuff.

But anyway, the home got too small. So, we tore it down in 19 -- 20 -- excuse me -- 2006, rebuilt a new one by all the specs and by all the regulatory people and moved in it in September of '08 and it was gone. When we went to inspect it, we had three pilings leaning toward Texas City and the water meter. We since rebuilt. We're beach front.

And from what I have absorbed today or learned from this, there's too much incomplete information to really decide from what I've heard of what is best for this peninsula. But I would favor retaining our beach, the beach front. And I appreciate y'all giving us an opportunity to talk.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. WREN: My name is Jason Wren. I am a property owner here on the peninsula. I am not in favor of the current alignment and plan that is in
place. I ask today for one of the options to be in place is a no build where nothing is done here on the peninsula.

I would like to thank all you guys for coming out and supporting everyone here. Visit Bolivar.org. All of you guys, we're putting up a fight for you. That's a voice here for the peninsula. You talk about the line, you know, the line on the map or the line on the sand. You guys here have drawn the line on the sand here today. And I hope you guys listen to these folks.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Chuck Taylor. Our family has had a place here since 1965. And I would like to say a few things. Y'all are doing a fine job, by the way, of opposing this. I applaud you.

I have got some additional things to say about the plan. First of all, don't do anything that is going to restrict the flow of water out of Galveston Bay. We need to have that all open or else we will all be flooding up in there.

Secondly, it's been stated that a reason for the barrier is because the risk to the nation -- to the nation of future storm surge is
economically catastrophic. The front -- the refineries and the petrochemical plants up there, they need to mitigate these hazards themselves. They have money to do that. I worked in the chemical plants. And what we do is, we look at what's a risk; and we eliminate that.

And the third thing, just briefly, is:

Do something with the -- make sure you get approval of these plans from the Houston and Galveston pilots.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Are there any other additional citizens that would like to make oral comments at the time?

MR. RUNTY: Good afternoon. My name is Allen Runty. I am a property owner here on Bolivar peninsula for 15 years. I live in Jefferson County. And what I'd like to encourage -- I'm not going to get in the emotions of everything. Clearly, people are here because we expect our property to be protected and our investments.

But I think we are missing the point here on the impact -- and the gentleman who spoke just in front of me mentioned that -- on water retention. I have lived all my life behind what we know as a seawall in Jefferson County. It protects in south mid
Jefferson County. My home is currently above what's required for flood insurance. But pretty much everybody that lives in that area has always owned flood insurance because of the concern of the rising water.

Drainage District 7, which controls that system that the Corps of Engineers maintains is a good system. It's got 20 pump stations. It pumps 6 -- it pumps 8.2 million gallons per minute, which sounds like an awful lot of water. That equates to about 12 billion gallons of water a day.

Conservatively, Harvey dropped a trillion gallons of water on Harris County, 19 trillion gallons of water in southeast Texas. Most of the -- all of the flooding occurred not from storm surge. One in five people in south mid Jefferson County were impacted by rising rainwater.

So, my question is, is I haven't seen anything on how you are going to handle actually removing the water that could be backed up from that. People north of Interstate 10 suffered greatly from that as well. We're in a different environmental condition now with rainfall. And, so, I'm very concerned about that.

Thank you.
COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment, sir.

MS. RINN: My name is April Rinn. I represent "savebolivar.org." Just want to tell everybody that this fight is going to be fought and won in the Congress and the Senate. So, you need to go to the Web site "savebolivar.org" and you need to write letters, e-mails, do what you need to do. You will find all the content information on this Web site, "savebolivar.org." So, everybody get involved.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Are there any other individuals that would like to make comments?

GENTLEMAN'S VOICE: Why aren't y'all answering any questions, by the way?

WOMAN'S VOICE: Because he told us he wasn't here to answer questions.

GENTLEMAN'S VOICE: Yeah. But why aren't they answering any questions?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Ma'am, if you would like to make your comments, please.

MS. PERKINS: My name is Claudia Perkins. I am property owner here at the community
with all my friends.

Earlier in a conversation, which I know is not part of the public record because it was a poster question, which I guess is on purpose. But one of the gentlemen said he had been contacted by his insurance agent and was told if one shovel of dirt is dug for this project, they cancel his insurance. So, I have got a mortgage that requires flood insurance. Then what happens? I can't get insurance? I walk away from my mortgage? Or do I pay off my house, which is why I have a mortgage. Tell us what we should do, because probably most people have a mortgage that's requiring flood insurance.

My insurance, it was over $8,000. Luckily, I had help to get it down to 3,000. My house is valued at like one-fifty. Tell me how I can pay for that?

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Sir, are you coming to make comments?

MR. DROMATIX: Yeah, please.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

MR. DROMATIX: Again, I want to thank you for coming up here own presentation. I know you
are the messenger and you are getting hit pretty hard.

My name is Kent Dromatix. And I bought a beach house beachfront about two years ago, about half a million. You know, beach front is not cheap.

I have got a question. Why can't we build that dike -- build a dike on the north side of the intracoastal canal where there's nothing out there? We don't have -- we have insurance to protect ourselves here. We've all -- it's not going to affect our insurance one way or the other. It will probably go up a lot.

That's just something I was thinking about. Why don't we put it on the north side of the intracoastal canal so it's not a threat to all these businesses.

Thank you for your time.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

Any last individuals that would like to come make comments.

GENTLEMAN'S VOICE: I have a question.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Sir, are you going to make a comment.

GENTLEMAN'S VOICE: I have a question.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: This is a comment
period to make sure that we have equitability amongst all the meetings.

GENTLEMAN'S VOICE: It's something that was said earlier about extending the comment period perhaps a month. Can you tell us about that.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Sir, this is a comment period.

Are there any other individuals that have not spoken yet that would like to make a comment?

GENTLEMAN'S VOICE: We have time. I mean, we're not at 5:00 o'clock yet. Why don't you answer the questions?

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Are there other individuals that would like to make a comment?

Please make a comment, sir.

MR. O'NEILL: My name is O'Neill. I am a business owner born and raised in Houston, Texas. My whole family is there. So, I know about Harvey firsthand. I was down here for the storm.

As near as I can tell, that fellow just said all these trillions of gallons of water were dropped over a short period of time, but, you know, that water has got to go somewhere, you know. And I can't believe that people would be surprised that they live on the coast and they're surprised that we will
get a storm from time to time. You know, if I lived
in Oklahoma, flat out, I would expect a tornado. If I
lived in California, I am going to expect an
earthquake. And there's really nothing that will say,
"Hey, I'm surprised by this."

So, by putting a wall there to trap,
how many, 19 trillion gallons of water which, roughly,
put that over the entire United States, you know, if
you were to do that, it's got to go somewhere. So,
it's trapped.

Plus, you've got all the houses over
here being hammered on it. I just don't understand
how anybody can actually believe that this dike is a
good idea for anybody, whether it's a resident, people
in Houston. It floods there all the time. I have
seen it. I swam in the bayous when they're
overflowing. It happens. But nobody in Houston says,
"Oh, my God, we're getting a lot of rain." They
didn't say that during Alicia. They didn't say that
during Allison. They didn't say that during Harvey.
Well, they kind of said it in Harvey because we got
more than we expected.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
comments.

MR. O'NEILL: It doesn't make any sense
how anybody could stand behind this and say this is a great idea. You know, it's made to help nobody but the people who are receiving the money for it.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. O'NEILL: I am glad you rushed me off.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Any last individuals who would like to make comments in the comment period?

Ma'am, have you made comments before?

MS. VELASTRO: I have not.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Please make your comments.

MS. VELASTRO: My name is Caudia Velastro. I didn't choose to make a comment because I would be too emotional. So, really, my only comment is that this minute limitation is ridiculous.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

In conclusion, written comments on the draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environment Impact Statement must be received on or before January 9, 2019, the conclusion of the 75-day comment period that began on October 26, 2018.

I would like to thank the Texas General
Land Office for their efforts and assistance in preparing for holding this meeting. I thank you for your attendance and the interest all you have shown here tonight.

The meeting is adjourned.

* * * * *
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COL. ZETTERSTROM: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am pleased to be here this evening. I am Colonel Lars Zetterstrom, the commander of the Galveston District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I welcome tonight's public meeting to review the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study.

For the record, let me state that this public meeting was -- has -- was convened at 5:30 p.m. on 18 December 2018 at the Bay Area Community Center in Seabrook, Texas.

Specifically, we are presenting information and accepting public comments on a draft integrated feasibility report and environmental impact statement for this study that was released for public review on the 26th of October, 2018. A court reporter is here to transcribe this proceeding and all public comments.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Texas General Land Office have analyzed coastal risk reduction solutions that would reduce the risk to lives and property on the Texas coast.

Ten years ago, the region experienced Hurricane Ike which disrupted many lives and resulted in extensive economic infrastructure damages. The
Texas coast is also subject to ongoing coastal erosion, relative sea level rise, habitat loss and water quality degradation. These coastal hazards are placing the environmental and economic health of the coast, which negatively impacts the state and national economy.

This, along with storms such as Hurricane Ike, Dolly, and Rita emphasize the need for enhanced resiliency of the coast and not only reduce future damage and loss but to improve our ability to withstand and recover from future storms.

It's important to note that the Coastal Texas Study recommends structural measures to reduce risks along the coast and that these recommendations support multiple investments and risk reduction that agencies and businesses are making along the coast today. Coastal Texas is part of a larger effort of risk reduction actions to make the coast more resilient over time.

A cost-effective plan has been identified that we believe would significantly reduce the risk of damage from tropical storms and hurricanes as well as increase the net quality and quantity of coastal ecosystems. This meeting is being held to describe the tentatively selected plan for the TSP,
and to receive your comments.

I hope that all of you had an opportunity to read the notice and availability either on the Galveston District’s Web site or announcements that were mailed to individuals or organizations that may have an interest in these proceedings.

Before we go any further, I would like to introduce a representative of the Texas General Land Office, our study’s non-federal sponsor, Mr. Tony Williams, the planning senior director of coastal resources.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Colonel Zetterstrom.

I want to thank everyone for coming out tonight to learn a little bit more about the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Feasibility Study, also known as the Coastal Texas Study.

I want to thank our GLO folks here. We have several representatives from our upper coastal field office and Austin headquarters. They’ve been here to provide assistance. Thank you for showing up tonight.

Addressing the issues on the Texas coast, including storm surges and ecosystem enhancement continues to be one of the top priorities
for Commissioner Bush. You may be asking why is the GLO involved in this study.

The land office was established to manage state-owned land including state-owned submerged land under tidal influence over 10 miles offshore. The land office is also the State agency responsible for implementation of the coastal management program, the coastal erosion plan and response act, beach and dune protection, oil spill response in state waters, and certain roles in disaster recovery.

Personally, I've been involved in debris removal in Galveston Bay after Harvey and Ike. And I don't know if y'all remember the cars that were in Seabrook Slough, one of our contractors wanted to use a helicopter to pull those out to minimize impact. So, I've been here for a while dealing with these kind of issues.

In November of 2015, the GLO signed the feasibility cautionary agreement with the Corps of Engineers for the Coastal Texas Study. This obligated the GLO to fund approximately half of the 20-million-dollar study, much of which is being accomplished through work in kind.

The land office committed to working
with the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to increase the resiliency of the Texas coast through an integrated approach that includes ecosystem, restoration enhancement, along with infrastructure.

The dry plan that is being presented incorporates habitat restoration and enhancement as well as gates, levees and flood walls to address erosion, habitat loss, and storm surge. These measures work together to increase the overall resiliency of the Texas coast.

The plan that's being proposed in the Coastal Texas Study was developed to work in concert with the Texas Coast Resiliency Master Plan. The GLO is currently working with stakeholders along the coast to develop the 2019 version of the master plan, which builds on the original plan that was released in 2017. The 2019 version of the master plan identifies projects that coastal experts have identified as the ones most effective at increasing coastal resiliency.

The 2019 version also includes modeling the identified threats to the Texas coast and benefits of identified projects. The 2019 version of the Coast Resiliency Master Plan will be completed early next year and presented to the Texas legislature.

The Coastal Texas Study proposed plan
or tentatively selected plan, as is referred to in the Corps of Engineers documents, was jointly developed by the GLO and Corps of Engineers. We worked with engineering environmental firms, consulted with other groups looking into these issues, including local universities and international organizations, had multiple meetings with resource agencies, environmental groups and navigation interests.

As we move into the next phase of the study, it's important to get feedback from all stakeholders on the proposed plan. Please remember that the study is only a little over halfway through and there's still a lot of details that need to be worked out. Again, we value your input and look forward to your comments.

Thank you for joining us here and taking the time to learn more about the study.

Colonel Zetterstrom.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Williams.

I would like to recognize public officials that are attending this evening's meeting.

First, I would like to recognize Congressman Randy Weber, U.S. House of Representatives District 14.

(Applause)
Beverly Ferguson and other representatives representing Congressman Brian Babin, U.S. House of Representatives District 36. (Applause)
Representative Dennis Paul, Texas House of Representatives District 129. (Applause)
Paula Nelson, representing Texas House Representative Briscoe Cain, Texas House of Representatives District 128. (Applause)
Kara Rose, representing Texas House Representative-elect Mayes Middleton, Texas House of Representatives District 23. (Applause)
Mayor Michael Bechtel, Mayor of the City of Morgan's Point. (Applause)
Mayor Pro Tem Amanda Fenwich, Mayor Pro Tem of Clear Lake Shores. (Applause)
Mayor Pro Tem Natalie Picha, Mayor Pro Tem of the City of Seabrook. (Applause)
If I mispronounced the name, I
apologize. Neil Moyer, Shoreacres City Council. (Applause)
Larry Millican, League City Council. (Applause)
And Wanda Zimmer, City of Kemah City Council. (Applause)
Additionally, I would like to recognize members of the project delivery team of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Team, if you could raise your hand to be recognized. (Applause)

And now I would like to describe the ground rules and format for tonight’s meeting. I hope that everyone completed an attendance card when you entered the meeting. That attendance card is used to provide us with your contact information so we can keep you updated on the status of the study. If you would like to make your comment orally tonight, please make sure you have indicated your intent on your blue attendance card and you’ve turned it in to the meeting facilitators. If you have not done this already, please do so immediately with the facilitators at the
front of the room.

Those wishing to make an oral comment will be given an opportunity to do so after the presentation. If you prefer not to speak this evening, you may submit your comments in writing by dropping them in the basket provided or send them to us by mail or e-mail.

Following these open remarks, Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, the project manager, will present an overview of this feasibility study. After her presentation, I will open the floor for public comments. Federal and state officials that are requested to make a statement will be recognized first. Next, representatives from federal and state resource agencies wishing to make a statement will be called upon. And then I will recognize each individual from the general public who has indicated that they wish to make a comment.

Please keep your remarks to one minute, as we would like for everyone to have an opportunity to speak. Also, we would like to emphasize, this will not be a question-and-answer session. This meeting is to provide everyone to publicly comment on the plan. Please give all speakers the courtesy of not making any comments during their presentation.
Please turn off your cell phones and hold all applause or other reactions so that we can have an orderly meeting and be respectful of everyone’s time. All individuals here have an equal right to be here.

Now I would like to present to you Dr. Kelly Burks-Copes, the project manager, to make our presentation. Thank you.

MS. BURKS-COPES: Good evening. I’m short. Hold on just a minute. All right. So, what I need to do is kind of lay out why you’re here and what we’re intending to do as a part of this process.

Tonight, we are here to provide you with an update on the status of the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study. I would like to then describe the National Environmental Policy Act and describe how that interfaces with the United States Army Corps of Engineers planning process. I’ll identify the selected plan and then walk through the benefits, the impacts, and the cost of the plan. And then we’ll open the floor for public comment for each of you to have an opportunity to comment on the plan.

As the two previous speakers mentioned, we’re only halfway through the study. We’re about the end of the third year. We have two-and-a-half years to go. We began in 2015, and we’re targeting report
to Congress in the early spring of 2021. The draft report was released in October the 26th and this is seventh -- this is the final of seven public meetings that we've held up and down the coast for the last month and a half.

The study is massive. It's enormous. It's complex. Usually when you do an environmental impact statement, you allow for a 45-day public review comment. Because the study was so large, we decided to extend that to 75 days, which means that it began on the day that the report was released in October of twenty -- October 26th of this year, and it will close then on January 9th of 2019.

Inviting public comment is mandated by the NEPA; and all comments are welcome, positive or negative. Remember, the more specific you are with your comments, the easier it will be for us to understand what your concerns and issues are and to address those you issues.

Public and agency input then informs our decisions, and all comments that are provided will be evaluated equally. The review and the comment, then, ensures that our decisions are based on the best available information.

You're very well aware of the threats
to this region. We know that there is a threat to the economy based on -- as a result of coastal storm surge. We know we have inland erosion as well as coastal erosion. We're losing -- threatening endangered habitat up and down the coast. And we're losing our deltas, the natural processes that form that. We also experience a great deal of disruptive hydrology.

In the Corps of Engineers, the way that you work through the planning process is that you identify goals and objectives. In terms of goals, Congress mandated that we not only look at coastal storm risk management but also ecosystem restoration. And by doing both of those simultaneously, we can come up with multiple lines of defense to promote resilience up and down the coast.

To meet the goals, we set up a series of measurable objectives. In this instance, our objectives are highlighted here, to reduce economic damage, to reduce risk to critical infrastructure but also to public health and safety, and to increase resilience by enhancing restoring coastal land forms as well as improving hydrologic connectivity up and down the coast and then keying in or honing in on critical habitats such as coastal marshes and bays.
We received funding at a national level from Congress, which means that we have to justify the significant resources in our region to receive that funding.

In this instance, as you're well aware, the study area covers 18 counties. Within that area, there's 6.1 million people, which is about 25 percent of the Texas population. We also have a series of deep-draft ports, which we have listed here, and 450 miles of Gulf intra-coastal waterway. Forty percent of the nation's petrochemical industry resides in the footprint and 25 percent of the national petroleum refining capacity happens within our study area. But in addition to that, we have NASA. And down on Galveston Island, we have UTMB, which has a Level 4 Viral Lab.

Because we were dually funded for both coastal storm risk management and ecosystem restoration, we have to highlight and point out the national -- national significant resources that are natural. In this instance, we have one of only six in the world, rare hypersaline lagoon, the Laguna Madre. The Padre Island National Seashore is in our study area, as well as 12 National Wildlife Refuges. We have 2 of the 28 National Estuary
Program sites and the central flyway migration corridor runs straight through the study area.

All told, we have critical habitat up and down the study area for threatening endangered species. And in terms of ecosystems, we're talking about wetlands, seagrasses, oyster reefs, and sea turtle nesting habitat.

Now, the way the Corps works is that we formulate plans in sort of like a building block process. We combine features and actions and treatments to formulate measure, and then combine measures to generate plans, or alternative is another word.

In this instance, features are levees and marshes and gates. The actions are things like restoration and construction. And the treatments are things we might do now and also in the future, such as plantings or renourishments. When we combine those together, we get measures and then we get plans.

In 2016, we were mandated by Corps -- the Congress not to reinvent the wheel. Several agencies and entities in the region have been accumulating data. For example, NOAA has a sea level rise viewer that you can go out and look at different scenarios to determine what might be inundated under
our variety of sea level rise scenarios. FEMA has the inundation mapping already. We also have several other types of studies going -- ongoing in the region. The GCCPRD has a plan. Texas A & M has the Ike Dike, for example. GCCPRD has the coastal spine. SSPEED Center has something called -- they call the H-Gaps plan. This is not those, but this starts with those.

We were directed by Congress to bounce off of those, take what we could from those plans, combine them and formulate a plan much bigger in terms of not only Coastal Storm Risk Management, but to combine ecosystem restoration with the plan.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has several ongoing studies in the area, particularly after post Harvey with the Recovery Act. And, so, we were looking at something of a systems-of-systems approach where we could fill gaps where those plans were not focused. GLO also has a master plan, as Tony mentioned, where they have identified numerous sites up and down the coast for ecosystem restoration. And, so, our plan fills gaps that that plan does not cover.

The Restore Act as well as Autobahn has sites out here. And those sites are connected. And we were looking for synergies when we proposed the sites that we had proposed in the plan.
We began in 2014 with a series of scoping meetings in the region. And we took all of that information together with the goals and objectives and formulated our plans. The measures were kind of caveated by region. Each region had a series of concerns and issues that needed to be addressed. And, so, we formulated measures to address those concerns. We used screening criteria, including the goals and objectives to bring those down to a manageable number. And then we made plans from those measures.

We assess plans and their success or their functionality on the basis of the three E's in the Corps of Engineers -- engineering sound, which I'm not sure that's a word; environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

We have used the series of tools to assess each of these criteria. So, for example, we have developed a series of novel coastal storms using ADCIRC, which is an advanced circulation model, to basically set up storms that we have never seen before.

Six hundred storms were actually created with the tools. And then we ran them against the coast and assessed what the water levels were with
each of those storms. And then we put barriers in place and looked at the reductions in risks and then assessed benefits of putting barriers in place.

In addition to the storm models, we also ran something called ADH, which is an advanced hydrologic model, that looked at constrictions that might be caused by the barriers put in the channel and what that would do to the back bays. So, in other words, would it affect salinity, would it affect sedimentation, would it affect velocities and currents.

And, so, we used these tools to compare and contrast a variety of plans and then to ultimately select a tentatively-selected plan that met these criteria.

So, I'm going to talk about two of the final plans that we actually looked at. The first one we call the Coastal Barrier are Alternative A. It starts at High Island. It moves across the GIWW with the gate. And then it runs down the Bolivar peninsula to the inlet. We have navigatable gates that connect to the seawall on the Galveston side. We tie into the ring levee, and then we run down the rest of Galveston Island to San Luis Pass, keeping San Luis Pass open.

Around Galveston, there is a ring levee
proposed with pumping stations. That's what the triangles are on the map. And a closure at Offatts. Up on the west side of the Galveston Bay, we do anticipate, even though the surge barrier would reduce the storm surge or capture that storm surge of the front, once the storm moves over the peninsula and lands in the back bay, it would still have wind-driven surge that would push up into this area. So, we are proposing two gated systems, one at Dickinson and one at Clear Creek. And as we expect, when those gates are closed, water could potentially back up behind them. So, we had proposed pumping stations at those locations to draw the water off until we raise the gates back up as the storm passes.

The wind-driven surge could potentially affect some of the locally - some of the communities here. So, we have proposed what the Corps calls "nonstructural measures" in the area. That's raisings and flood-proofing, looking at evacuation routes, and potentially buyouts, but not necessarily. And, ultimately, that would be a last effect.

Keep this plan in mind when I move to the next plan. This one is along the coast, whereas the second plan is along the rim. The idea would be that we would start at San Jacinto and cross with a
gated structure and a pumping station and then run a barrier along the rim going across again at Clear Lake and at Dickinson Bayou with much larger structures this time because the water would be held back from the entire barrier and we would need larger pumping stations. We would tie into the Texas City levee and enhance the levee system and then extend it off to the west.

In this plan, we would still have a ring barrier around Galveston that would need to be closed on the back. And water that comes in during the storm would need to be pumped out. We'd still need a gate at Offatts Bayou. The thing to be aware of is that the Galveston ring levee would need to -- the ring levee would need to be higher because it would have to withstand the full front of the forces that are coming at it.

In the Corps of Engineers, when we generate these plans, then we have to compare and contrast the pros and cons of each of the plans. So, for an example, Plan A does provide risk reduction to the nav channel, to the navigation channel, and to the Gulf Coastal Interwaterway. The Plan D does not. It is up along the rim. And, so, it exposed -- it leaves them exposed.
Plan A provides benefits for all of the different streams of benefits, whereas, Plan D does not. And, so, what we do is, we prepare and contrast the plans in this fashion. And we determine what the benefit cost ratio is and then we select a tentatively selected plan.

Now, all of this is focused on Region 1, which is up in this region, the Houston/Galveston area. Down in the South Padre Island area, they have been using beneficial use of dredge material to build up dunes and beaches along that beach shorefront. But it's intermittent. It's dependent on funding. And, so, it doesn't happen regularly.

So, what we're proposing is a 2-mile-long stretch of 12-1/2 by 100-foot dunes that would be renourished every 10 years. It's currently economically defensible in reaches 4 and 3. But we are receiving new economic input. And in the next phase of the study, we will continue to access the other reaches in that region.

But remember that our mandate was not only coastal storm risk management, but ecosystem restoration. So, in this instance, we have proposed nine separate locations where we would restore
marshes, beaches and dunes, islands and seagrass, for example, to the tune of approximately 160,000 acres of restoration up and down the coast. They not only provide habitat for critical species, but they also provide first and second lines of defense. If we put beaches and dunes out in front of the coastal barrier and marshes in the back, then we're providing one after another after another line of defense for coastal storm surge.

So, the tentatively selected plan is a combination of Plan A, which is the coastal barrier, in addition to the nine ecosystem restoration sites and the coastal risk management structures in South Padre. The cost is 23 billion to $32 billion. But remember that 40 percent of that cost is ecosystem restoration. The barrier system would run approximately 400 -- sorry -- 14 to 19 billion. And the ecosystem restoration would run approximately 8.9 to 11.9 billion.

The thing to remember is that the cost of the barriers in this plan mimic or are very similar to the GGCP RD's proposal.

We do anticipate impacts with the plan. We will be directly impacting approximately 4500 acres on shore of different types of habitats as we move
down the coast. But we also know that the barrier that we have proposed that crosses the navigation channel will cause a constriction.

The system is open most of the time. It is a proposed flooding sector gate like a fan. When the storm comes, it closes; but the rest of the year, it's open. It has to reside on artificial islands, and those islands take up a cross section inside the nav channel or across that inlet, for example.

We have those two planned in addition to a recreational gate which will allow smaller ships to move through, smaller boats. And then to the right of that and the left of that would be another 38 vertical lift gates, all closing off the paths when necessary when the storms are coming but staying open the rest of the year.

Each time you have something in the water, it's causing a reduction in the cross section. So, it causes a constriction. So, at this point and -- at this time in our plan, we are estimating a 27 percent constriction. In the next phase of the study, we are hoping to bring that down.

Right now, we expect that mitigating that will cost between 676 and $906 million. But that
is in addition to the 160,000 acres of ecosystem restoration that we are proposing.

What I need to point out, what I really need to emphasize tonight is that this system is still a placeholder. It is conceptual. In the next phase of the study, once we receive input from yourselves and others from the other public meetings, as well as feedback that we've received through our mailbox and through the mail, we will be refining the plan. Refining includes realignments where we would move the line in different directions. It could come, for example, on Bolivar towards the ocean. We are looking at types of features that can be used. It does not all have to be gray infrastructure. It can be combinations of dunes and T-walls. It can also include ecosystem restoration in front and back. And, so, we're talking about a system of multiple lines of defense.

As part of the optimization, we have to look at types of gates. We would like to minimize the -- the impacts that we're seeing and bring that constriction number way down below 27 percent. Any design that we are proposing from here on out will never exceed the 27 percent constriction for benefit cost reasons. But we also need to look at pumping
stations and the capacity of the pumping stations and
the gates at Dickinson, Clear Creek, Offatts, and the
GIWW.

So, it's early. It's early in the
process, and that's why we are here. We've proposed
something, and we're asking for your feedback. We
have about two-and-a-half years left for the study.
And then we generate a report that we present to
Congress. Congress needs to then authorize us to
continue to the design phase and appropriate funds for
us to do so. Once they have done that, we begin the
design process. If we receive all the funding all at
once, we can start the design. And it would take two
to five years. But if it's piecemealed out, then it
will take longer.

We will also need to have a cost-share
sponsor identified at that point to go into design.
Right now, the study is 50/50 cost shared with the
Texas GLO. We do not have a cost-share sponsor
identified yet for design. The Texas legislature is
meeting in January. They may be able to take it up
this year. If they can't, then we have to wait till
2021 for the next cycle.

We do realize that -- or you need to
realize that the Corps of Engineers is funded through
Water Resource Development Acts. And those happen approximately every two years. So, once we present to Congress the report, the next Water Development Act is in 2022, if they continue funding as they have in the last two or three cycles.

Building and construction would begin, then, after the two to five years of design, if all goes well. And it could take up to 15 years to build. Once it’s constructed, we turn it over to the cost-share sponsor for operations and maintenance. 100 percent of the cost is shouldered by the cost-share sponsor.

We are anticipating or we estimated that operation and maintenance would cost between 100 and $130 million each year annually. The same thing.

So, here is the point. It’s early in the process. We are trying to gather comment from the public. We have held six meetings thus far. This is our seventh, and concluding meeting so far. If you would like to come up to the mic tonight and provide comments, that would be great. If you don’t want to do that, you have comment cards that were handed out today. You can fill those in and place those in the baskets in the back of the room.

I think one of the things we need to
mention is that you can do both. You can come up and
comment, and then you can go back and turn in a card
as well. You can send a letter. We have the address
here, or you can hit our mailbox and send an e-mail.
But the key here is, that we need the comments by
January 9th to be able to incorporate them into the
administrative record and our process.

Now, I talk very fast. I have a funky
accent. I completely get that. There is a Web site
out there, "coastalstudy.texas.gov." It houses the
reports and all of the appendix -- appendixes. The
video that you just saw as well as the video in the
corner will be out there starting tomorrow. All of
the posters have been loaded up. And my presentation
will be loaded up so you can review it at your
leisure.

But that's -- that's basically it. We
have the information up there and we are interested
and very, very interested in what you have to say,
what your feedback would be, and any kind of specific
comments that you can provide us informs our
decision-making process.

So, I want to thank you for coming	onight. I want to encourage you to talk to us. If
you're a little bit shy, fill in the comment cards.
It works the same.
Thank you very much.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Ladies and gentlemen, at this point of this evening's public meeting, I would like to call upon the elected officials or the representatives that have indicated that they would like to make oral comments for the record this evening.

First, I would like to invite Congressman Randy Weber, U.S. House of Representative District 14 for his comments.

CONGRESSMAN WEBER: Well, thank you, Colonel.

I am Randy Weber, the congressman from Galveston County, Jefferson County, southern half of Brazoria County. I've lived in a 20-mile radius for 65 years.

For my own survey, how many of y'all had lived here 65 years in a 20-mile radius? There's about a dozen of you. We're old-timers, aren't we?

I'm talking about you guys.

This is an important area. You guys know this. This is an absolute salt-of-the-earth population that lives along the Texas Gulf Coast. I'm going to read from the study here in just a little
bit. It talks about how important Texas is.

I've got 30 seconds remaining? Man,

this guy is tough. You know -- you know, more points
of how long a minute depends on which side of the
bathroom you're on.

So, my kids -- two of my kids got
married at the NASA Road Hilton, People. I know this
area like the back of my hand. I grew up here. I
learned to ski in Offatts Bayou when I was -- in 1969.

I know this area well. I know it well. It's
important to us. You know, the salt-of-the-earth
people live here, play here, work here, go to church
here and the industry, they have their jobs here.

I'm going to read from the very own --
y'all's very own quotes on Page 6. I'm quoting now.

It says: "This country needs what flows from Texas
Coast."

I'm here to say that if we recognize
that, we ought to have extreme painstaking care to
make absolutely sure we get this right. And I'm going
to read what else this says: "This includes tourism,
recreational fishing, commercial fishing, the state's
ports, intracoastal waterway, and energy production."

Let me read this last sentence. Y'all
listen to this. It's in the study. It's on Page 6.
"Texas' transportation and energy hubs cannot be replicated anywhere else."

This is an important area. This is an important undertaking. Galveston is extremely concerned about the ring levee and what that will do. We want the least amount of eminent domain. We want the most consideration. We want to protect family, lives, jobs, kids, and livelihoods.

So, I just want to make sure y'all know that we're working on this. For the audience's benefit, we have requested through our office a 45-day further extension period for more input. We want to make sure everybody gets their voice heard.

I apologize on the overtime. But this is very, very important. Thank y'all for being here. Thank you for the indulgence.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your comments.

Next I would like to invite Beverly Ferguson, representing U.S. Congressman Brian Babin, U.S. House of Representatives District 36.

MS. FERGUSON: Good evening. We are here representing Congressman Brian Babin to hear your input. So, if you have anything, your comments, we
I want to hear your comments. And we also have put in a letter of support for a 45-day extension so that you can provide your comments and, so, to give you time to do that. So, thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Next I would like to invite Paula Nelson, representing Texas House of Representative Briscoe Cain, Texas House of Representatives District 128.

MS. NELSON: We'll e-mail you our further questions.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Yes, ma'am.

MS. NELSON: But we are in support of it.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

Next I'd like to invite Commissioner Ken Clark, Commissioner for Galveston County, Precinct 4.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Colonel.

I'm Ken Clark, County Commissioner, Galveston County, Precinct 4. I just want to encourage you to do the 45-day increase in the time because even though you started this process in October, we are just now really kind of getting a
sense of what y'all are presenting. We need input from our citizens to be able to make good decisions.

In the season of Christmas and the holidays, public agendas are limited. Some councils only meet once a month, once in December. And we have a 72-hour posting requirement. Plus, it takes us time to get our thoughts together and come up with our comments moving forward. And we could use the extra time. Because if we do that, we'll make better decisions on this first round of public comment. So, hopefully, in the end, we will shorten the gap up and have a better project moving forward.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, Commissioner.

Now, I would next like to invite Dennis Paul, Texas House of Representatives, for his comments.

MR. PAUL: Thanks a lot, Congressman. I've been here 58 years. I ain't got 65. But I would like to say support for the project. I think we're really interested in getting this going forward and making it happen. Hopefully Congress can fund it off of this report when it comes out.
Also, I would like to say, I really want to make sure we emphasize the coastal spine Option A, as well as maybe looking at the gate at San Luis Pass if that's necessary. That might be something that we could use. And we are going to be working hard on this in this session to make sure that we get the necessary State requirements to do -- to get this done and be in partner with y'all. Thank you for what you are doing. And we look forward to hearing the final part of this study and working what we can do to get it done.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir. Next I would like to invite Mayor Pro Tem Amanda Fenwick, Mayor Pro Tem of Clear Lake Shores.

MS. FENWICK: I have no comments.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you. I would like to invite Councilman Neil Moyer, Shoreacres City Council.

MR. MOYER: Good evening. I am a resident of Shoreacres, a member of the City Council there. Shoreacres has about 650 residents. More than half of them were affected and damaged by storm surge of Hurricane Ike and more than 10 percent of them were
effected by storm surge as a result of Harvey.

Needless to say, managing, mitigating, minimizing storm surge on Galveston Bay, Clear Lake, Taylor Lake, and up through Taylor Bayou are absolutely necessary. Those are the sources, as well as Galveston Bay, of these storm surge and flooding which occurred in Ike and subsequently with Harvey. Needless to say, we are strongly interested in seeing a plan and, ultimately, implementation. I’m hoping I might be around by the completion of that, to see that approach taken.

We also strongly recommend the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Agency be specifically drawn into environmental studies under NEPA.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite Councilman Larry Millican, League City City Council.

MR. MILLICAN: Yes, sir. Thank you very much for having an open house and an informative session tonight.

I’m concerned about two things: One being the conveyance of water from Clear Creek and
Dickinson Bayou with the additional storm surge protection there, those two outlets, worrying about the need for the increased conveyance currently right now on both those watersheds and if putting some sort of storm surge protection would affect that in any way because the need to increase that.

The other thing is, that I would say is, I'm concerned about which to do first. And I think that the storm surge barrier along the perimeter of the Gulf Coast would be better served to build that first than worry about inland reconstruction.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

I will now call -- excuse me. I will now call members of the general public who wish to make a statement. I'll call three names at a time. Please be seated in the front row to wait your turn to speak. I've asked Mr. Stokes to assist me in keeping time. He will indicate when you have 30 seconds left to speak and when your time has expired. I ask that you stop speaking after your one minute has elapsed.

When called upon, please come forward, speak into the microphone, please identify yourself by your full name and the organization you represent, if any.
I will now call upon the first members of the general public to come forward. Mike Chambers, Sandra Chambers, and Phyllis Clary, if you could please come forward for your comments.

MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you, Colonel. My name is Mike Chambers. I represent the residents, I guess, along the coastline. My wife and I recently purchased a lot at "[redacted]". We have plans of retirement there. And we just closed on it and found out -- we just now found out about this plan. So, we have some concerns, and the whole neighborhood that I am with out there is concerned. The barriers that we have recently heard about, you know, one is the barrier along 3005 and we're concerned with the backwash there. We're concerned if that barrier was placed on the Gulf side shore that it also would affect our views. So, we are in favor of the more natural ecological views of structured dunes.

That is what we support.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

Were two of the other individuals present for their comments? If not, I will move to the next three individuals. Joe Camarata, Jay
Williams, and Joan Addison, if you could please come forward.

MS. ADDISON: I have my comment card.

MR. CAMARATA: Howdy. I am Joe Camarata. I was affected by Ike and also affected by Harvey. I lost property over in Bolivar. And, of course, Harvey put 18 inches of water in my house. So, I am glad that we are doing something. I appreciate it, the effort. And I am more of a natural one instead of the walls and stuff like that. But I just appreciate that you are going to get something going. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir. I'll move on to the next three individuals. I would like to invite Marvin Davis, Marcus Rives, Director of Galveston County Consolidated Drainage District, and Lori Westerman, if you are available for your comments.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Marvin Davis. I have a home down on the west end of Galveston. It's not my primary home. It's a secondary place. But I think y'all are doing a lot of good work here. I know that the pumping stations and the levee in Texas City have provided lots of protection for Texas City.
They've been great. Myself and my family lived in Texas during Hurricane Carla before the levee was built and, wow, what a mess we had.

As I have looked at everything around, all the posters and everything, I have had trouble understanding why there's not a barrier being built at San Luis Pass. They've tried to explain it. I haven't been able to quite justify it in my mind because that worries us that we're going to get a surge from the backside of the new levee when you put it in. So, just take that into consideration. I am sure you are already.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Ma'am, if you'd like to come forward.

MS. WESTERMAN: I am Lori Westerman. I am a business owner here in Seabrook. We were affected greatly during Ike, not so much during Harvey. We appreciate all the information you have given us. And the approach that you are taking looks to be something that we're very excited about, that it's actually happening much better than going up 146 which would have left off way too many of us.

My concern is, though, that we've been to so many of these meetings. We've always put our
name down to please contact us of things going on.
The information going out that these public meetings
are being held is not going out well. And, so, for
future public meetings, please, please, try to inform
our city. The Seabrook people are doing really well
in disseminating any information they find, but they
aren't getting some of the information either. If we
can get a better dissemination of information, you'll
have this room flooded with people standing outside.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next three members. Hubert Brasseaux, Georganna Collins, and Shady Henry.

MR. HENRY: Thank you, Colonel.

My name, I'm Shady Henry. I am a resident of Seabrook, Texas. I am encouraged by what you are doing and by the time and expense you are taking to communicate with us. Thank you very much for that.

I would like to echo some of the comments by the League City official. It's to stress the focus on the coastal barriers as seen by the models, seem to be much more effective.

Also I would like to ask you, consider
the rainfall, the rate of rainfall during a storm as a very important part when a storm surge situation is coming to our area. Rainfall comes, and it greatly affects our city. And the drainage from that will collect somewhere. So, I want to encourage you to consider that in some of the models.

I have seen on the NOAA Web site that there are some estimates on that -- on that and history of data of previous storms. We can probably use that to consider that and the rate of drainage that we don't create another barrier that just collects water behind the levees.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir.

MR. BRASSEAUX: I'm Hubert Brasseaux.

I have lived here 57 years.

I guess in looking at your proposal, one of the things I am concerned about is the dams or the flood gates in the Clear Creek channel and Dickinson Bayou and the engineering of those. I thought they were going to be natural but, you know, in part of the presentation, I heard of pumps needed as well. You know, kind of a -- those could easily become dams in a Harvey situation. And we also have problems with electricity at times of the storm so
trying to get that -- that there.

I do appreciate y'all actually looking at the program and looking at doing something. It is one of my concerns. I do agree with the Bolivar thing. And then I was thinking with the -- with the gates across the channel, are y'all thinking of putting a road on that as well to bridge across Galveston Bay versus continuing or relying on a ferry?

I know during a time of a hurricane, it's also very difficult getting in and out of Bolivar because the ferry stops running after a certain point.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

MS. COLLINS: Thank you. I'm Georganna Collins. My family moved here to Texas in 1904, and my mom was born on Galveston Island.

I've worked with Berdache and we're developing international guidance documents for natural endangered base features. So, I wanted to encourage the Corps to look at opportunities to undertake engineering with nature, which is an intentional alignment of engineering and environmental sciences. And we've developed a plan where we can link restoration and protection, not have them
separate. And the plan actually shows or highlights a $50$-million-dollar benefit to the oyster industry, huge water quality benefits, additional habitat, $30,000$ jobs being created, as well as millions of dollars of damages being avoided when we also use natural nature-based features in Galveston Bay.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next three individuals for their comments. Paul Grout, Deb Hale, and John E. Wilson. And just as a reminder, if you're cued for your comments, there are chairs reserved for you.

MR. GROUT: My comments have been expressed already.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, sir. Any other two individuals I called still available for comments?

I would like to invite the next three individuals. Holly Larsen, Melissa Terrell, and Craig and Sherry Weisiger.

I'm seeing those individuals not coming forward. I will move to the next three. Dave Peterson, Diane Humes, and Charles Taylor.
Thank you. I'm Diane Humes. I'm a volunteer who spent about 20 years living here doing prairie and wetland restoration and also water quality testing. And I would just like to encourage you to do as much ecological restoration in your project as possible because I think it will have maximum and multiple benefits for everybody in every facet.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. TAYLOR: I would like to turn this around because I want to speak to you all out there. I would like to draw your attention to the structures going across the mouth of the inlet to Galveston Bay. You saw it in the video, and you can see it back there. And if you haven't -- if you missed that, you can catch it on the Houston Chronicle, on the Web, an the article of November 12. So, those structures, I would like you to stay focused on those structures. It shows the large swing gate and some other smaller structures in line with that. Now, those are lift gates. And in between each one is a concrete structure. It's 38 gates, 39 structures, 102 feet each. So, that adds up to 4,000 feet across this 9,000-foot opening. That's quite a restriction.
We don't want restriction of water out of the bay. We need that. So, now they told me that it's a 27 percent increase in restriction. My calculations were a lot more. They're probably right, but we don't want any.

I think they are trying and I believe it's -- they are really trying to do that. But Hurricane Ike was $30 billion of damage. That's a hurricane. Hurricane Harvey was $125 billion of damage. That was a rain event for Houston, for Houston, Harvey, a rain event, of which we have many. So, my message to you is, don't let them put up any restriction across the mouth of Galveston Bay. We need to let that water flow out. That's the important part.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

I would like to invite the next three individuals. Thomas E. Diegelman, Dale Coulthard, and Joe Bryan.

MR. DIEGELMAN: My name is Tom Diegelman. I am a resident of Seabrook. I've been here for 40 years. I have seen a few things come and go called storms. And despite the fact that there are some people that ecologically think this is a
challenge, I think that can be addressed because I've seen that done. I was part of the wetlands board in the City of Seabrook. I know what you can do when you put your mind to it.

So, you know, I think we know how to build walls, although the big challenge would appear to me to be not how to construct this and ecologically sound but to get the funding for these walls, because as I see going on now, walls are a popular thing.

And that aside, the will to do it and you put a singular plan out there that is not going to die a death of a thousand cuts, which is what's happened to our space program, happened to many other things in this country, you have to say: This is what we need to do, we need to go do it and here is the reason why. The other alternatives don't measure up.

Sir, this is so many dollars, and move on.

That's what we need to see. And I hope we can get there in the study.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. COULTHARD: My name is Dale Coulthard. I live in Houston. It seems like a big part of this study is focusing on the refinery capacity in the Baytown area and protecting that. To
do that, how about just put a levee around Baytown refineries and leave it at that? It worked well in Texas City. And leave the coastline, the 70 miles of protection alone and let natural habitat exist.

That's it.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

I would like to invite the next three individuals. John Powell, Christina Vazquez, and Mark Kramer.

MS. VAZQUEZ: Hello. Thank you for being here tonight. I am Christina Vazquez. I am a League City resident but we have a secondary property on the Bolivar Peninsula.

Our little home actually survived Ike with only garage damage. And I do ask that you guys give full consideration to the residents not only of Bolivar but to Galveston Island as well. We have a lot of concerns over the backflow, and not only that, but the insurability and the property value of our homes there.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. KRAMER: Mark Kramer, resident of
the Galveston Bay Area. I have a special interest in
Galveston Bay as someone who loves to paddle and fish
in the area.

And I know from an estuarine
perspective how critical salinity levels are in
waterways like Galveston Bay. Estuaries are a place
where rivers meet the sea, where seawater and fresh
water mix. And by my understanding of the complexity
of how rainfall rates are changing in Houston as we've
experienced in Hurricane Harvey, how impermeable
services are increasing in Galveston Bay watershed,
and how increasingly development, since Hurricane
Carla, which was my first hurricane to go through here
that happened, that there is a significant change in
fresh water influence and to be concerned, for me,
about how that tidal influence is going to be altered
over time.

I'm curious why we don't have a
comparative analysis if we're going to spend
$34 billion, why it all has to be structural, if there
is any reason why we can't spend money on other
alternatives. I have a family that comes from New
Orleans and I have had an opportunity to witness
structural solutions and pump solutions. And we here
in Harris County recently had a ballot measure that
enabled citizens to give some input in their flooding opinions. I encourage you to consider the same thing.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

The next individuals who have asked to speak this evening that I would like to invite forward are Allen Hill, Teresa Morris, and Leslie Clift.

MS. MORRIS: I'm Teresa Morris. I'm here representing Turtle Island Restoration Network.

Eighty percent of the water in Galveston Bay comes through Bolivar Roads. Any restriction of flow will significantly impact the species that rely on that pass for their life cycles, including brown and white shrimp, blue crab, gray snapper, red drum, specks, sandies, southern flounder, Atlantic croaker, black drum, sheepshead, gafftops, and Gulf whiting.

Mullet, menhaden, and anchovies rely on this pass for foraging. Commercial landings and fish and shellfish in Galveston Bay accounted for $127 billion from '06 to 2015. Tourists to the Texas coast accounted for $10 billion in 2014 alone.

Hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing on our coast accounts for $5 billion a year. This study states that there will be impacts to these
species but they do not quantify them. So, we are asking the Corps to quantify the loss of each species listed in the study due to increases and decreases in pollution, dissolved oxygen, sedimentations, salinity, acidification, habitat loss, algal blooms, water flow, velocity, and tidal prism.

We need to see not only the expected loss of population estimates and negative impacts on our food web but also the net profit loss for Texan income on top of the exorbitant tax fees we are expected to pay.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MS. CLIFT: My name is Leslie Clift, and I've been a resident of Galveston since 1988. This is my third time moving back to Galveston. I would not buy a home if the system were in place, and I would not buy it if it goes under water either. Galveston is a sand-barrier island. Because of that, and with climate change, it may not be my forever home and I'm okay with that. I've lived on islands for almost my entire adult life. I don't want to pay for the structural system, but I do want to pay and would pay for land acquisition for conservation, dune and wetland restoration.
I am very concerned with the biological, ecological, chemical, and geological impacts to Galveston and its bays. Also, I think industry, the oil and gas industry, should pay for the protection of its own products.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

I would like to invite the next three individuals. Kristen Vale, Rodrigo Cantu, and Jeff Steinhaus.

MS. VALE: My name is Kristen Vale, and I am with the American Bird Conservancy.

I am opposed to the proposed barrier and gates. I am for habitat restoration but not in combination with the barrier and at the expense of permanently impacting our environment.

I believe it is unfair that the Corps releases the USACE report to the public just before the holiday season and expect everyone to have the appropriate amount of time to read and understand the 400-odd-page report and 2,000-page appendix to provide critical and knowledgeable comments to the Corps.

This is a mega study and first of its kind in Texas. And if the barrier is built, it will have severe environmental impacts to our coastline and ecosystem.
around Galveston Bay.

And if it wasn't for a concerned group of organizations who wrote Colonel Zetterstrom asking the Corps to double the public comment to 90 days instead of the standard 45 days, I believe the public would still only have 45 days to comment. We now have 75 days, but it would be better to have 90.

The proposed barrier and gates will negatively impact critical bird habitat that has been spoken of tonight.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. CANTU: Yes. My name is Rodrigo Cantu. I am an attorney with Lone Star Legal Aid representing an area nonprofit called Caring for Pasadena Communities.

One, we would like to reiterate the previous request to extend the comment period by 45 days, if not more. Two, in reading through the E[... the plan, there is just a lot of vague issues around dredging. We know that dredging of the area is going to be required; and we're concerned about where you are going to put that dredge material, while being stored temporarily. We want to emphasize that not be
put in residential areas, especially where people live. It could provoke a lot of health hazards.

There's also a lot of issues around wetland restoration. The plan talks about so many thousand acres of mitigation. But when it actually goes through the plan, it doesn't identify all the areas of wetland restoration. So, we would encourage you to actually name those areas, show us where they are on a map, and then talk a little bit about how that wetland restoration is going to mitigate the wetlands that we are going to be losing.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

MR. STEINHAUS: My name is Jeff Steinhaus. I am a Galveston Island resident by choice. With the current placement of the coastal barrier system, over 1,800 homes in Galveston Bolivar will be destroyed due to eminent domain and more than 12,600 houses will be induced in an induced flood zone. This project will cost taxpayers 35 percent of a $31 billion billed in the 155 million per year to maintain, which counties will be responsible for paying. How will Galveston County fund this project with the homes that were lost. And tourism and
fisheries will become nonexistent.

Complete financial impact that needs
and done, I expect losses to tourism and fisheries,
the Port of Galveston. If this wall is built on
Galveston and Bolivar, how will emergency services get
to and from residential areas before, during, or after
a storm? Who will be there to open the highway gates
and clear the debris? How much will that cost to our
local municipalities? At what point is the cost of
impacts too great to complete this project?

I am asking the Corps to expand the
comment period since we are restricting oral comments
to only one minute.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your
comment.

I would like to invite the next three
individuals. Joanie Steinhaus, W. Brad Boney, and
Scott Jones.

MS. STEINHAUS: Joanie Steinhaus, I am
representing Turtle Island Restoration Network. I
live and work in Galveston.

In the environmental supporting
document, it states all loggerhead nests had been
south of the study area on the upper Texas coast.
This is incorrect information, as we have had four
Loggerhead nests in the upper Texas coast since 2008. It also states that there had been no Kemp's Ridley nests in Galveston or Bolivar. There have been 77 viable nests since 2008. Without correct information, this project would violate the Endangered Species Act.

We implore the Corps and the GLO to provide accurate data and facts not only considering mitigation efforts but when looking if the project should even occur within this specific habitat. Any barrier across Galveston Bay channel will increase beach erosion along Galveston and Bolivar and this project will actively reduce nesting habitat for a critically endangered species as well as contributing to depleting foraging opportunities and impacted wetlands. At what point will the environmental impact be too high for this project to be completed?

From the preliminary study, you are not contributing adequate weight to the consequences of these irreparable impacts and the long-term problems that will last longer than this barrier wall.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comment.

MR. BONEY: Good evening. Colonel, thank you have very much. I want to say thank you to
Congressman Randy Weber and Brian Babin. Ten years ago Hurricane Ike hit. It's amazing seeing where we are today. Thank you for doing this work.

There is a lot of discussion about what is and what isn't right. I encourage to go forward.

I also ask for a 45-day extension to keep going forward on this.

When the Houston Ship Channel was dug, we're living with it today. We hear about a lot of water and flow, what it's going to change. What did the Houston Ship Channel do to Galveston, we don't know.

Here's some questions: What I am asking for, additional 45 days. And sincerely from the heart, thank y'all very much. I live on the Galveston Island west end. I think this is a smart move. We spent $32 billion, the Federal Government, to recover after Ike. This is mitigation. This is taking care of, it's preventative. I think this is a good place to start. I think we can work out the details.

Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you.

MR. JONES: Good evening. I'm Scott Jones, director of advocacy for the Galveston Bay
Foundation. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

We do recognize the tremendous amount of work that the Corps has completed thus far.

However, we do not believe that the draft environmental impact statement meets NEPA requirements. First, there's uncertainty on the barrier alignment. We understand from the Corps that you're looking at an alignment either across Bolivar Peninsula in Galveston Island or a West Beach alignment. So, that's been thrown out there as a possibility. Those are polar opposites.

This is a change event that cost ratio and the environmental impacts. I also understand the Corps is looking at different types of environmental gates. That would also change the benefit, cost ratio, and the environmental impact as well.

While indirect impacts on wetlands have been modeled, the same cannot be said for the impacts to our critical commercial and recreational fish, shrimp, crab, and oysters.

We understand from talking to y'all in January of this year that a 30 percent constriction to the pass will be detrimental. We need to see the analysis that a 27-1/2 percent constriction is okay. And we also need to make sure that that con -- that
measurement is right.

Finally, it's not appropriate for the public to have to comment on a project that's only 10 percent along in the project design. Therefore, we are requesting a supplemental draft environmental impact statement and would certainly also support at least a 45-day extension period on the current DEI. Thank you.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments.

That exhausts the list of individuals that have previously indicated that they wish to make an oral statement. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to come forward to make their comment at this time?

Sir, if you would like to come forward.

MR. PETERSON: I think you misread my name earlier.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: I apologize.

MR. PETERSON: Good evening, my name is Doug Peterson. And I'm a Clear Lake resident. And I just want to support what I heard from the two elected officials, Congressmen, and a number of others, that we need more time.

I think it's really disadvantageous to
the public to have this kind of sudden, as one of the people just said, 400-page report proposal without having adequate time to review it. And there are a lot of questions. I am wondering, with this type of barrier, would the Clear Lake area be protected? I live in Clear Lake. And it's been suggested all along that this is going to help in Clear Lake. But if there is a storm surge coming from the east, I don't think this is going to help. And there is a mid bay proposal out there and I haven't heard that mentioned. I guess that was one that was set aside.

But there's other questions. Like, if this is going to cost $31 billion, I read in the paper that 10 billion are going to have to come from local funding sources. And I don't know whether that's the State of Texas is going to spend 10 billion or Harris County is going to spend another 10 billion or what? Those are a lot of important questions. We need more time. I would say 90 days more, please.

COL. ZETTERSTROM: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Would there be any other individuals that would like to come forward for their comments at this time? Seeing no additional individuals, I
would like to begin with our conclusion, excuse me, end with our conclusion.

In conclusion, written comments of the draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environment Impact Statement must be received on or before January 9, 2019, the conclusion of the 75-day comment period that began on the 26th of October 2018.

I would like to thank the Texas General Land Office for their efforts and assistance with preparing for and holding this meeting. And I would like to thank all of you for your attendance and the interest that you have shown in this study this evening.

The meeting is adjourned. Thank you and have a good evening.
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