# In Re: USACE Pearl River Flood Risk Management

Transcript of 6:00 Meeting
July 10, 2024

All depositions & exhibits are available for downloading at << www.brookscourtreporting.com>>

Please call or e-mail depo@brookscourtreporting.com if you need a **Username** and **Password.** 



Mississippi - Louisiana - Tennessee - New York 1-800-245-3376 TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING OF
USACE PEARL RIVER FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT
PROJECT MEETING

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

DATE: JULY 10, 2024, AT 6:00 P.M.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Vicksburg District
Public Meeting for the Pearl River Flood Risk
Management Project

Held at the Mississippi Trade Mart at

1200 Mississippi Street,

Jackson, Mississippi

Beginning at 6:00 p.m.

REPORTED BY:

ELLA J. HARDWICK, CVR-M, CCR #1749

```
1
                        APPEARANCES:
 2
     Members of the Army Corps of Engineers:
 3
        Mr. Thomas R. Shaw
        Ms. Robyn Colosimo
 4
        Colonel Christopher Klein
 5
        Mr. Brandon Davis
        Mr. Keith Turner
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	MR. SHAW: Good afternoon, everybody.
2	My name is Tom Shaw. I want to welcome
3	you to our second public meeting for the
4	Draft Environmental Impact Statement for
5	the Pearl River Flood Reduction Project.
6	I want to thank you all for taking time
7	out of your days to attend. And so, we
8	will go ahead and get started.
9	This is the second of four public
10	meetings that we're hosting. We had a
11	virtual public meeting back on the 27th of
12	June, and if you will, this is a follow on
13	to that.
14	At this time, I would like to make
15	welcome to our panel over to my left, to
16	your right, and Brandon Davis is another
17	one of our briefers. He is right back
18	here behind the screen a little bit.
19	But so, with us today, we have Robyn
20	Colosimo. She's the Deputy Assistant
21	Secretary for the Army for project
22	planning and for policy reviews. We have
23	Mr. Eric Bush. Mr. Bush is Director of
24	Planning and Policy at headquarters,
25	United States Army Corps of Engineers, or

1	we call it USACE.
2	We have Colonel Jeremiah Gipson, the
3	incoming Vicksburg District Commander. I
4	mentioned Brandon Davis. And on the end
5	over there, we have Keith Turner, and he
6	is representing the Rankin-Hinds Pearl
7	River Flood Control and Drainage District.
8	And so, let's do a couple of little
9	quick things here. As you came in, we
10	would ask that, if you would, to please
11	sign the attendee list so that we can have
12	a record of you being here. Everything
13	that we're doing here is to satisfy our
14	NEPA requirements.
15	And so, one of the things that we will
16	do is, the briefing itself, the
17	PowerPoint, the testimony that's given,
18	the Q and A session will all become part
19	of the public record.
20	And so, the other thing that you will
21	notice behind you as you came in, there
22	are several study boards, if you will,
23	that describe various features of the
24	project and what we have looked into,
25	investigated, and are trying to bring to

1	everyone's attention.
2	So, at this time, I will ask that
3	there'll be a slide that comes up in just
4	a minute, and you'll see there's actually
5	a QR code. So if you have a smartphone,
6	you can click on the QR code, which will
7	actually take you to the project website.
8	The project website has all of the
9	information that we're making public, such
10	as our press releases, posting of the
11	Environmental Impact the Draft
12	Environmental Impact Statement itself,
13	different things like that, so that you
14	can stay abreast on what's going on with
15	the project itself.
16	And so, at this time, we're going to
17	go to our if you will, it's a little
18	opening statement by our those of you
19	that attended the May 2023, we had, like,
20	a scoping meeting. Colonel Christopher
21	Klein was our Commander at the time. He
22	has since received another mission, and
23	Colonel Gipson is our new Commander, and
24	this is a message from the two of them.
25	So if you would, please play it.

1	(TRANSCRIPTION OF VIDEO.)
2	COL. KLEIN: On the 2nd of June in
3	2024, the Vicksburg District published a
4	Draft Environmental Impact Study, a
5	pivotal step in our journey towards
6	mitigating the flood risks plaguing the
7	Pearl River Basin.
8	Publishing the Pearl River Basin DEIS
9	forms a significant milestone in our
10	collaborative efforts with the community
11	and local leaders to deliver a flood risk
12	management strategy tailored to the unique
13	needs of the City of Jackson and its
14	surrounding areas.
15	We're committed to providing a
16	solution that manages flood risk and, at
17	the same time, enables a wide range of
18	additional benefits. It was an honor to
19	lead the team through the publication of
20	this important document.
21	My time in the Vicksburg District,
22	however, has come to an end, as the Army's
23	transitioned me to another role in a
24	district serving our war fighters, allies,
25	and partners in the Middle East. The good

1	news, though, is that the Army chose a
2	very capable leader to continue the good
3	work in the District. I'd like to
4	introduce Colonel Jeremiah Gipson.
5	Colonel Gipson most recently served as
6	Deputy of the Mississippi Valley Division
7	in Vicksburg and has been following the
8	development of this plan for months.
9	Colonel Gipson Jeremiah, welcome.
10	COL. JEREMIAH: Thank you, Chris
11	Klein, and for your dedication and
12	leadership. To our partners, I assure you
13	that the mission entrusted to us will
14	continue with the same vigor and result.
15	Together, we will navigate the
16	complexities of the Pearl River Basin with
17	diligence and foresight.
18	For decades, flooding along the Pearl
19	River has disrupted lives and livelihoods.
20	Various proposals have been presented, yet
21	none garnered definitive support. In July
22	2022, the Rankin-Hinds Pearl River Flood
23	and Drainage Control District presented a
24	locally-preferred plan to the Assistant
25	Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, the

1	Honorable Michael Connor. This set the
2	stage for the Corps' involvement.
3	Secretary Connor tasked us with
4	bridging data gaps, identifying the
5	National Economic Development Plan, and
6	evaluating the merits of that plan.
7	Through extensive public engagement, we've
8	gained valuable insights ranging from the
9	need for recreational areas, concerns
10	about water quality, and existing concerns
11	in the lower Pearl River.
12	As we move forward, your engagement is
13	critical. We invite you to attend our
14	scheduled public meetings or submit your
15	thoughts via email or mail. Your voices
16	will shape the future of flood risk
17	management in our region.
18	In closing, I urge each of you to
19	participate. Together, we can forge a
20	resilient future for those who are
21	affected by the Pearl River Basin and
22	those who rely on its many benefits.
23	Thank you.
24	(END OF VIDEO.)
25	MR. SHAW: Okay. And so, I mentioned

1	a QR code. There's the information that
2	describes the public meetings that will be
3	ongoing. The QR code will take you
4	actually directly to the project website.
5	So this is the second this is the last
6	meeting that we're having in Jackson.
7	Tomorrow, we start out at 11:00 in
8	Slidell, Louisiana, and then over to
9	Monticello at 6:00 p.m. Let's go to the
10	slide deck, please. Okay. Next slide.
11	And so, if you would, today's
12	presentation will be made up kind of three
13	parts. The first part will be the
14	presentation itself, the second part will
15	have an open mic for questions and
16	answers, and then the third part when we
17	dismiss from there is our subject matter
18	experts will be back at the study boards
19	if you have some detailed questions that
20	you would like to ask.
21	But, as we begin, I would like to
22	point out a couple things on the rules of
23	engagement. When it comes time for the
24	open mic, first, we would ask that you
25	please wait to be recognized so that we

1	can all get a turn to speak, so to speak.
2	If you could, please limit your statements
3	to about three minutes, and please don't
4	interrupt.
5	And then, lastly, your comments can be
6	generated basically three ways: You can
7	submit comments by the email address
8	there; you can submit comments by the U.S.
9	Postal Service; and then, of course, we
10	have comment cards that you can fill out
11	in the back. Okay.
12	Next slide, please. Okay.
13	Ms. Colosimo.
14	MS. COLOSIMO: Hi, everyone. As it's
15	been said, my name is Robyn Colosimo, and
16	I'm the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the
17	Army for Project Planning and Review in
18	the Assistant Secretary of the Army for
19	Civil Works office. Very long statement.
20	What you've heard here today is the
21	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil
22	Works, Mr. Michael Connor, who oversees
23	the Civil Works Program the Corps of
24	Engineers carries out, was tasked in law
25	with an ability to implement develop

1	and implement a solution that resolves
2	longstanding challenges in the flooding
3	arena.
4	So I'm here on his behalf to help
5	guide this process, with my partner, Eric
6	Bush in Corps of Engineers, as well as
7	Rankin-Hinds and you, most importantly, as
8	the public. I want to thank all of you
9	for taking the time today and at other
10	times, hopefully in the past as well as
11	the future, to help inform and guide this
12	process with your knowledge on the ground.
13	Our main goal really is to hear from
14	you, from our other partners, and
15	understand what you see and how our
16	analyses help reflect that or need to be
17	adjusted and help formulate solutions.
18	Overarchingly, the work reflected in
19	the draft EIS that was released was guided
20	by direction from my boss. It seeks to
21	resolve that decades of repetitive
22	flooding, but most importantly, it also
23	looks to leverage the bipartisan
24	infrastructure law monies that were set
25	aside to implement a project. It's a huge

1	deal, these monies. It's a huge
2	opportunity for Jackson.
3	That work that you've seen encompasses
4	new modeling. It builds upon prior
5	studies by the Corps and Rankin-Hinds and
6	others. And it outlines alternatives that
7	can be implemented within current
8	authorities. That's really the challenge
9	here, is how do we outline and craft a
10	solution that can be implemented within
11	existing authorities.
12	It's imperative that you know that
13	it's important that we dovetail this work,
14	whatever that work looks like, with all
15	the other things that are going on in
16	Jackson, most notably the water and sewage
17	work. That work is absolutely vital. We
18	recognize that. And everything we do here
19	ultimately will help build a better and
20	newer Jackson by investing together.
21	We look forward to today's input.
22	Thank you for your time.
23	MR. SHAW: Okay. The next thing that
24	we have up is we mentioned the meeting
25	schedule, and so, there are multiple ways

1	that you can do the public input. We just
2	ask that's the important thing. We do
3	want to hear your opinions, your views,
4	and your questions to help craft ways
5	forward. Okay. Mr. Eric Bush will talk
6	about our review process.
7	MR. BUSH: Thank you, Tom. Good
8	evening, everybody. Thank you all for
9	coming out and taking your time to share
10	your views and comments and also to learn
11	more about the alternatives that have been
12	developed for this project. My name is
13	Eric Bush. I'm the Chief of Planning at
14	Corps Headquarters in Washington, DC, and
15	my job is to provide technical and policy
16	advice to the Chief of Engineers,
17	Lieutenant General Scott Spellmon. Also
18	to Ms. Colosimo and Mr. Conner in the
19	Secretary's office.
20	As has been stated by Tom, we are in a
21	decisionmaking process, in a very public
22	phase of that decisionmaking process. And
23	so, this is one of several opportunities
24	to provide comments. And Tom will go over
25	again, I think, the different ways to

1	provide your comments into the Corps of
2	Engineers and Army Civil Works.
3	But what I want to say about that is,
4	this is the most to me, this is the
5	most important step in our process, where
6	we put out a draft plan, a draft set of
7	alternatives, and solicit your feedback on
8	that. So that process is currently
9	underway, that public process.
10	It continues the public comment
11	process continues through August 6th. And
12	what I want to add here is that all of
13	your comments will be considered and
14	documented in the final Environmental
15	Impact Statement, including additional
16	work or analysis we undertake in response
17	to comments we receive this evening. So
18	if you could go to the next slide, please,
19	Tom. Thank you.
20	You all know this project is about
21	flood protection, and we use words like
22	"flood damage reduction" and "flood risk
23	management," but this is really about, in
24	part, human misery, right? Associated
25	with flooding incidents. And so, that's

1	what we're seeking to ameliorate here and
2	to alleviate is human suffering associated
3	with flooding and environmental impacts
4	associated with flooding events.
5	Through our process, we evaluate a
6	range of alternatives, and you're going to
7	see those tonight, in order to identify
8	the best plan. And some of those
9	evaluations that we undertake will be
10	explained here by Brandon later in the
11	presentation.
12	I also think it's important to
13	highlight that we do this in partnership
14	with a local partner, and that's the
15	Rankin-Hinds Flood Control District,
16	represented tonight by Mr. Turner to my
17	left. And they've already done, as you
18	all know, much better than me, a great
19	deal of work developing plans for flood
20	risk reduction, flood damage reduction
21	here in Greater Jackson, Mississippi.
22	I think it's worth pointing out that
23	this project is already authorized by
24	Congress. That's an important decision
25	point that has already been reached in our

1	project implementation process.
2	And I also want to point out that the
3	Administration and Congress have already
4	set aside federal funds to initiate design
5	and construction after the required
6	evaluations are completed and a decision
7	has been made about which alternative to
8	implement.
9	So, as Tom pointed out, per direction
10	we received from Mr. Conner himself, we
11	are preparing a draft we have prepared
12	a Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
13	So we're going to talk about what's in
14	that tonight. That's to inform you, also
15	agencies who have a role in implementing
16	the project, and also Mr. Connor and his
17	staff.
18	And so, I'll wrap up by saying again
19	that we are in the middle of our 60-day
20	public comment period, which concludes the
21	6th of August. 6th of August. And we're
22	happy to hear your comments and take
23	questions later. So I'll turn the
24	presentation over now to Mr. Turner with
25	Rankin-Hinds. Thank you.

1	MR. SHAW: We're going to slightly
2	interrupt. We are fortunate that Mayor
3	Lumumba with the City of Jackson is here
4	with us. Sir, I know you have
5	restrictions on your time. If you'd like
6	to make a statement, sir, please come to
7	the mic, if you would, or come up front.
8	Yes, sir. Either place.
9	MAYOR LUMUMBA: I can face people
10	this way. Good evening. First and
11	foremost, make sure I don't stand too
12	close to any of the speakers. Feedback.
13	First, I would like to thank all of
14	our guests for being here to deal with
15	this issue. I ask that you give them a
16	round of applause. Appreciate it.
17	It is important and it is reassuring
18	that we have people showing up to address
19	the issues that we are seeing in our
20	community. I think that we have to
21	reflect on the thing that brings us here
22	today is not only '79, '83, but 2020 and
23	2022.
24	I will share with you that my
25	perspective at the beginning of hearing

1	about the One Lake project was a
2	perspective of, you know, I didn't think
3	that people were so motivated by dealing
4	with flood mitigation that some of that
5	motivation was based on economic benefits.
6	Right? Or economic development.
7	And my perspective was that I need to
8	be assured that there is no downstream
9	impact. And if there is no downstream
10	impact, then we want to make sure Jackson
11	gets its fair share of that process.
12	Having now dealt with the floods of
13	2020 and 2022, having now not only met
14	Congressman Thompson, Senator Wicker,
15	Supervisor Graham on Westbrook Road in
16	2020 and in 2022 where I was faced with
17	residents, faced with residents who were
18	being displaced out of their homes and
19	demanding that we find a solution to this,
20	I think that now brings us to a place
21	where doing nothing is not an option.
22	Right?
23	Not doing anything is no longer an
24	option because what has been proven is,
25	for whatever reason, whatever fits your

1	profile as to why we're receiving more
2	rain on an annual basis, the facts are
3	that we're receiving more rain on an
4	annual basis, and our infrastructure, as
5	it is situated today, is ill-prepared to
6	protect people. Right?
7	So that's why I think that we have to
8	do something. And so, now we go forth
9	with what the options are on the table.
10	And I want to be clear that not only some
11	of the people that I see here, but the
12	members of the Rankin-Hinds Levee Board,
13	we've gone to Washington several times in
14	order to seek solutions for this. Right?
15	You not only have a bipartisan group,
16	you have a group that stretches from all
17	of the cities within or all of the
18	elected officials within the Greater
19	Jackson area. And we've had deep
20	discussions with the Corps. We've had
21	deep discussions with a number of agencies
22	trying to figure out what is the best
23	solution. And the attorney for the Board
24	and their team has been working alongside
25	the Corps in order to identify what is the

1	best solution.
2	I think that I owe you and I'm a
3	collective genius person. And so, I want
4	to hear unfortunately, I'll be leaving,
5	but I'll be listening out for the comments
6	that come from residents.
7	I want to hear what your perspectives
8	are and move from that, but I want to make
9	certain that you're armed with all of the
10	information as you go forward or you
11	identify what is the best choice.
12	One of the options on the table that I
13	understand that a number of our community
14	members have been in support of is option
15	A, which is a nonstructural solution. And
16	what that ultimately means is some
17	residents will ultimately have their home
18	paid to have their homes lifted.
19	Right? So that they are now taken out of
20	the flood zone or their homes are
21	protected from the flooding.
22	And then some residents will be
23	looking at buyouts because their homes are
24	too lifting them would not be a
25	sufficient solution. And so, those are

1	buyouts.
2	So given a greater deal of
3	understanding of how that process works,
4	option A actually concerns me. Let me
5	tell you why option A concerns me. It
6	concerns me because if you have the
7	details, it somewhat is presented as a
8	privileged position. That's not to be
9	disparaging of anyone who supports that
10	option. But there are other there's
11	other information that they don't have.
12	Right? Or that you're not being told.
13	One of those things is that if you own
14	your home and you're one of the homes that
15	needs to be lifted, that that is a
16	reimbursable expenditure that you have to
17	foot the bill on the front end. And to
18	lift your home, that you know, in some
19	regards, that can cost up to \$200,000 that
20	you have to have available to you in order
21	to lift your home up, which will later be
22	reimbursed to you once you do. That's for
23	those individuals that own their homes.
24	The other piece of information that I
25	have is that our planning and development

1	department did the research, and what we
2	found out, which is unfortunate, is that
3	the majority of our residents in Jackson
4	today are renters, not owners. And
5	there's a good number of people who live
6	on Westbrook Road who live in that area
7	who don't actually own their homes.
8	And so, if they are provided the
9	answer of a buyout, then it doesn't
10	support them. What it ultimately supports
11	is the person who owns that home. Right?
12	Who may or may not live in the area, who
13	reaps the benefit of the buyout. And then
14	I have to be concerned for those people
15	who are renters who are now moved from one
16	state of misery to the next, where you're
17	being displaced right now because of
18	flooding, and you can ultimately if you
19	fall in that category that I mentioned,
20	you could ultimately be displaced because
21	you don't own your home. And maybe you've
22	lived there for 20, 30 years, and now you
23	have to figure out where you're going.
24	So I'm not objectionable to people who
25	are looking at the least-environmentally

1	invasive solution. I don't fault you
2	there, and, you know, given the absence of
3	other circumstances, I might be aligned.
4	But I think we need to answer people's
5	questions, given that information. What
6	happens if I don't have \$200,000 to lift
7	my home? What happens if I'm a renter and
8	I lived in this community and my children
9	were raised in this community and this is
10	the neighborhood that I made my I
11	raised my family in and I don't get the
12	benefit of what a buyout looks like
13	because I am a renter? Right?
14	And when we talk about kind of the
15	more progressive lens of being
16	environmentally-resilient and
17	environmental justice, that's not
18	environmental justice. You can't simply
19	talk about not interfering with the
20	environment and not tell people the
21	impacts to them and their pocketbooks and
22	how it will affect them because
23	environmental justice is not only looking
24	at the environment; it's looking at the
25	economic impacts and how it impacts

1	people, how people and the environment
2	coincide together.
3	And so, I thought that that was an
4	important thing to add to the discussion.
5	I will also tell you why now Alternative D
6	is one that I've been looking at, not only
7	because it avoids the issues that I just
8	spoke about, but also we have another
9	issue that was mentioned in the
10	introduction, and that is dealing with the
11	water insecurity that we have in the City
12	of Jackson.
13	The reason that we have water
14	insecurity in the City of Jackson is not
15	only because we have 50 percent loss in
16	our pipes. Right? But in addition to
17	that, we have an inefficient water
18	treatment facility.
19	We have the only water treatment
20	facility in the country that depends on a
21	combination of both conventional methods
22	of treating water and membrane methods of
23	treating water. And that has proven not
24	to be the most effective way of treating
25	water. We all know this.

1	And so, Congressman Thompson was able
2	to get a BRIC grant, which is a
3	multi-million dollar grant, in order to do
4	the engineering assessment for a new water
5	treatment facility. The problem with
6	where our water treatment facility is
7	currently housed is that there is not
8	enough space where JH not Fewell
9	O.B. Curtis is presently, or J.H. Fewell,
10	right, in order to create a new water
11	treatment facility.
12	And so, one of the places that was
13	being observed for a new water treatment
14	facility is where the police the
15	Jackson Police Department shooting range
16	is, which has access and connection to the
17	river. But in order to use that as a
18	new a place for a new water treatment
19	facility, there would have to be a
20	consistent flow of water that they an
21	intake valve could take the water from in
22	order to produce in order to have the
23	water come in to be treated.
24	You know, I'm just trying to introduce
25	into the conversation some elements of the

1	discussion that have not been included in
2	the conversation thus far. I'm not here
3	to be objectionable or speak negatively of
4	someone who agrees with option A. Right?
5	But I am saying that if we're going to
6	talk about option A, we got to talk about
7	the other elements that go along with
8	option A: You needing to foot the bill on
9	the front end; people who don't own their
10	homes and will be displaced; the
11	erosion the further erosion of a tax
12	space. In either one of those scenarios,
13	if people simply move out of those homes,
14	where do they go?
15	So I just wanted to include that in
16	the conversation. Unfortunately, I'm
17	double-booked today. I'm going to sit
18	around as long as I can, but I will have
19	to leave before the conclusion of this
20	community meeting. Thank you.
21	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. All
22	right. So next on the agenda would be
23	Keith Turner.
24	MR. TURNER: Thank you, Tom. So
25	we're going to give a little history.

1	Many of you in this room probably are very
2	familiar with the past floods, as the
3	Mayor mentioned. But Jackson has been
4	flooding from the origination when it was
5	first placed here because the Pearl River
6	is a very is a very flooding, flashy
7	river. Can y'all hear me okay? All
8	right. How about this? I'll hold this
9	one. Is this better?
10	Okay. So Jackson has had flooding
11	from the origination when it was first
12	placed in this area. And finally in
13	the through the '50s and '60s, they had
14	enough of it, and they convinced the Corps
15	of Engineers to come in and construct the
16	levees after the '61 flood. So we in
17	the mid-'60s, we had the levees
18	constructed, which are still there, pump
19	stations, and the river was channelized.
20	Many of you may not be aware of that,
21	but most of that river as it passes right
22	by the downtown sections from Lakeland
23	south is a channelized river. It's been
24	straightened, and it's not the natural
25	river course.

1	So even with that construction of the
2	levees in the '60s, as the Mayor
3	mentioned, the 1979 flood was a flood of
4	record. It was the worst flood we've had
5	thus far. This is a photograph of 1979,
6	and you can see at the top here, the
7	levees have been overtopped. This is
8	Herrin-Gear Chevrolet under water. And
9	the room you're in right now the room
10	you're in right now would be under water.
11	You'd have many feet of water in this room
12	as we sit today.
13	Then, again, in '83, you had another
14	event. It wasn't quite as bad, but almost
15	as bad. And I forgot to mention, you
16	can't tell from this photograph in '79,
17	I-55 was under water, just north of here
18	at Fortification, and Lakeland Drive was
19	under water. Significant paralyzation of
20	our community.
21	Again, in '83, we had almost as bad a
22	flood, and then, of course, we mentioned
23	2020. 2020 needs to be noted, also. At
24	the time, the Ross Barnett Reservoir,
25	which is not a flood control structure,

1	was extremely low at its water level.
2	They had lowered it down abnormally low to
3	try to kill off an invasive plant species
4	at the time. Fortunately, that was
5	happening at the same time because it gave
6	them flood storage capacity.
7	And so, the flood of 2020, although it
8	was the third flood of record, almost as
9	bad as '83 and '79, it would have been
10	much, much worse if it wasn't for that
11	fact that the Ross Barnett was lowered
12	down.
13	So, as I mentioned, in 1960s, the
14	levees were constructed, the flood of '79;
15	and since '79, the community leaders in
16	Jackson have been trying to find a
17	solution. They have tried all different
18	alternatives. Some of you may recall the
19	term "Shoccoe dry dam," which is a dam
20	that was proposed north of the Ross
21	Barnett Reservoir. That was shot down
22	because of the community. Folks up there
23	did not want to get their property flooded
24	during at the time, it was a
25	60,000-acre dry dam structure.

1	And then, of course, they looked at
2	levees again. Levees from South Jackson
3	all the way up to the reservoir were
4	considered in the '90s, and that was shot
5	down by folks south of Jackson because
6	they were concerned about the impacts that
7	the levees would cause south.
8	At one point, the groups that were
9	involved kind of passed the baton over to
10	Rankin-Hinds Flood Control District, and
11	we picked up and started trying to find a
12	solution as well.
13	In the 2027 report, which was the
14	Lefleur's lakes plan, was really not a
15	feasible concept for various reasons,
16	although it performed very well. There
17	was other obstacles. That in 2012,
18	Rankin-Hinds entered into an agreement
19	with the Corps to prepare our own
20	Environmental Impact Statement and look at
21	all the different alternatives under a
22	feasibility study.
23	That was completed finally in 2018 as
24	a draft. Some of you may have been to
25	those meetings we held in the Jackson

1	area, down on the coast, and so forth.
2	Ultimately, a final version of that was
3	modified and submitted to the Corps in
4	2022. And that brings us to this current
5	effort where the Corps has been involved,
6	taking our study and conducting their own
7	analysis and engineering work, as well as
8	environmental efforts.
9	One of the things that has come up in
10	this meeting this afternoon and the prior
11	meetings during last year was folks are
12	concerned about the tributary flooding.
13	Tributary flooding is obviously a concern
14	in Jackson. We have some very flashy
15	creeks, and that meaning that a little bit
16	of rain event can create a quick flood, a
17	flash flood in a neighborhood unrelated to
18	Pearl River flooding. And that's
19	something that folks need to understand;
20	it's unrelated to that.
21	And there is a fair amount of money
22	being spent right now. As you can see,
23	Hinds County has six projects spending \$8
24	million. Those are various projects
25	within the tributaries in the Jackson

1	area, different sections that they're
2	cleaning out, widening, whatever
3	structures that they need to improve.
4	Rankin County has numerous projects,
5	almost \$70 million worth of work. And all
6	of these tributaries we're talking about
7	here drain into the Jackson area of the
8	Pearl River. Madison County has some, and
9	that, of course, drains down, but not all
10	of Madison County comes down this far.
11	But you can see that the one shown here
12	does drain into the Pearl.
13	And then the City of Jackson is also
14	in an effort that the Mayor is working on
15	to bring additional millions of dollars
16	together to conduct their own tributary
17	work over the next several years. And
18	we'll have more of that information in the
19	coming weeks on exactly what specific
20	projects will be associated with that
21	work.
22	So the goal, of course, is to get
23	benefits for the community. WRDA, which
24	is the Water Resources Development Act of
25	2007, 3104, is what's given us our

1	authority to do all this work. As I
2	mentioned, that allows the Flood Control
3	District to proceed, and it also enables
4	the Corps to do their work.
5	The problems we deal with, of course,
6	is that the flooding of Jackson really
7	occurs from the rainfall that's north of
8	the reservoir. It comes into the
9	reservoir, the reservoir has to then open
10	up, and it's limited on what it can do as
11	flood control, as I mentioned.
12	And if you look on a map, you'll see
13	that we have a wide floodplain north of
14	downtown Jackson. It pinches in tight,
15	and then it widens back up again, and that
16	pinched-in part is what's causing our
17	flooding. It doesn't have the ability to
18	flow through the area.
19	So we had to look at a lot of
20	different alternatives. We actually went
21	back. When we conducted our preliminary
22	work, we looked at over 60 different
23	alternatives.
24	But the other problem we have, of
25	course, is that this flooding threatens

1	our infrastructure. As I mentioned
2	already, the '79 flood put I-55 and
3	Lakeland Drive under water. It surrounded
4	the hospitals in Flowood. It flooded out
5	the wastewater treatment plant on Savannah
6	Street, which, as you can imagine, raw
7	sewage was flowing into the Pearl River
8	back then for over nine months, going down
9	to the south. And, of course, the
10	transportation, as I've already mentioned.
11	The other important part as part of
12	this study to look at is we have a lot of
13	environmental justice communities that are
14	impacted first. The ones in north and
15	south of downtown, those are the ones that
16	flood first.
17	In 2020 and 2022, those folks are the
18	ones that took on water first, and those
19	are, you know, low income, minority
20	neighborhoods that don't have the ability
21	to just pack up and move away easily. So
22	those folks have to be part of the
23	equation as we go through this process.
24	I'm going to turn this over back to the
25	Corps.

1	MR. SHAW: All right. I may do a
2	better job having y'all hear me if I hold
3	the mic instead of having it on the stand.
4	So, as we mentioned earlier,
5	Section 3104 is the driving force, if you
6	will, for us. And what we were tasked by
7	Mr. Connor, by the Assistant Secretary of
8	the Army, that he was authorized to
9	construct the National Economic
10	Development Plan, the Locally-Preferred
11	Plan, the LPP, or some combination
12	thereof.
13	The reason I mentioned the "some
14	combination thereof," that's what we
15	commonly call the CTO, the combination
16	thereof. So you'll hear that term
17	throughout the evening.
18	As was mentioned earlier, we have been
19	working in very close collaboration with
20	the Rankin-Hinds team looking at not only
21	their Locally-Preferred Plan, Alternate C,
22	but looking and investigating those areas
23	where we could possibly gain some
24	reductions in impacts that are associated
25	with the project. And so, that led us to

1	look at certain things.
2	And so, we mentioned the NED plan. We
3	were to compare the level of flood risk
4	protection of the various alternates and
5	then assess the environmental
6	acceptability and the technical
7	constructability or feasibility.
8	Okay. This is kind of important in
9	that it talks about a project study area,
10	and we've really got three geometric
11	shapes, if you will, three shapes on here
12	that represent three different things.
13	There is a yellow circle that runs in
14	this area that we commonly call the study
15	area, and that was what was defined in the
16	authorization, which includes Rankin and
17	Hinds Counties, the municipalities of
18	Jackson, Flowood, Pearl, and Richland, and
19	it includes the tributaries that
20	several of the tributaries mentioned;
21	Caney, Eubanks, Hanging Moss, Hog Lynch,
22	Prairie Branch, Purple, Richland, and Town
23	Creek.
24	The large oval that is right there, it
25	constitutes our project area. That's the

1	area where the focus is, in trying to
2	obtain some flood benefits, if you will.
3	And that basically occurs from just south
4	of Byram all the way up to the reservoir.
5	And then, so the last area is, if you
6	will, that green rectangle that kind of
7	does this. That is what we call the
8	project influence area, and that's the
9	area we were tasked to also look and see
10	if there were any downstream impacts.
11	And so, that, it comes about because
12	of any changes in hydrology, if you will,
13	in how the water flows. Okay. And so,
14	one of the things that we talk about are
15	alternatives. The Rankin-Hinds team put
16	together three alternatives.
17	Alternate A was the original
18	nonstructural plan, Alternate B was the
19	levee's plan from the 2007 Corps report,
20	and then Alternate C is the
21	Locally-Preferred plan that we mentioned
22	earlier. I would note that Alternates A
23	and B were removed from further
24	consideration.
25	One of the reasons we did so is

1	because Alternative Al was crafted. It's
2	a modified nonstructural plan. We'll talk
3	about that shortly. And then we mentioned
4	the combination thereof. We generated two
5	combination thereof plans. Alternate D,
6	which looks to be the likely National
7	Economic Development Plan, and then
8	which includes a new weir, and then
9	Alternate E is that combination thereof
10	without the weir.
11	And so, we talked about Alternate A1,
12	which is the modified nonstructural plan,
13	if you will. So it's evaluated at the
14	25-year flood event. And of that, once
15	that area is determined, any structures
16	that fall within that, if they're
17	residential, then one of the choices is to
18	raise them to the 100-year event.
19	If it's nonresidential, floodproofing
20	is an option there. And On the study
21	boards, there's different types of
22	floodproofing so you can get an idea of
23	what that would constitute. And then
24	there's a possibility of voluntary
25	property acquisition. One caveat there is

1	that any properties that would be acquired
2	would then basically become green space.
3	That's one of the requirements.
4	And so, Alternate Al identified 143
5	structures that would be impacted; and of
6	those 81 were residential, with the 62
7	being nonresidential.
8	Okay. And I did want to mention one
9	last thing. With respect to the modeling
10	that's done for what we call H&H,
11	hydrology and hydraulic modeling, that the
12	water that comes down the tribs is in the
13	models. We did consider it. It is in
14	there. And so, that study area does
15	include the tribs.
16	Alternate C was the Locally-Preferred
17	Plan. That's the plan that was in the
18	draft EIS submitted by the Rankin-Hinds
19	folks and includes the items that you can
20	see there. One of the things that was
21	done is a gain in the efficiency of moving
22	water, and that's done by excavation and
23	basically cleaning that hydraulic
24	conveyance, in other words, how it moves
25	water. And that was done through some

1	excavation of the overbank areas.
2	It also included demolition of the
3	existing weir and levee around the
4	Fewell excuse me, around the Savannah
5	Street water treatment plant. So that was
6	an upgrade of a nonfederal levee, and then
7	there was some interior drainage
8	requirements that had to be met because of
9	the permanent pool that would be there
10	because of Alternate C.
11	Okay. So the CTO, the combination
12	thereof, Alternate D, includes the weir;
13	and then Alternate E is without a weir.
14	So that's basically what it looks like
15	there. The location of the weir is just
16	downstream of I-20, I believe. I will
17	show that in just a minute.
18	Okay. So one of the features that
19	comes with that Alternate D is this
20	addition of a levee around the Canton Club
21	area. We had some pretty good suggestions
22	from one of the earlier meetings is that
23	we do need to look further into what other
24	EJ communities may have a need for a levee
25	as well. So that's something I'm sure

1	we'll take back and will feed the process.
2	An important thing that the CTO does
3	is, because we move that weir upstream a
4	significant amount is that we actually
5	reduce the amount of excavation that
6	actually has to be undertaken. So that
7	saves money. It reduces mitigation costs
8	because it reduces the impacts there.
9	And the other thing is that there's an
10	avoidance, if you will, of known HCRW
11	areas, which is a good thing. And so, the
12	constructed weir would also be 2 feet
13	lower than that that was shown in the
14	Locally-Preferred Plan. So that would be
15	at elevation 256.
16	And it would include a low-flow gate
17	as well as a fish ladder for environmental
18	purposes, and it would include several
19	features of that A1 structural
20	nonstructural plan.
21	Okay. As I mentioned, Alternate E is
22	basically the same. It just does not
23	include that new weir.
24	So an important thing from the graph
25	that's over here on the right-hand side of

1	the page, it's describing water surface
2	elevations. And what you're seeing is
3	this is the upstream area, and you go
4	downstream to the left.
5	And one of the key features here is
6	that this is flood damage reduction of
7	about 5 feet between this is fairly
8	close to the Ross Barnett Dam, and you
9	come downstream, and right there is our
10	weir right there.
11	And just down below that, there's a
12	crossover line where we were talking about
13	of avoiding an HTR a known HCRW site.
14	There's a Gallatin Street landfill there.
15	And so, this area is all flood damage
16	benefits, if you will. And we do go over,
17	and there's a slight bit of inducement
18	that occurs downstream. But that's
19	totally resolved about 5 miles north of
20	Monticello.
21	And it's a max of 6 inches from the
22	100-year event as compared to the
23	no-project or no-action scenario. I would
24	mention here that we recognize that some
25	sedimentation modeling needs to be done,

1	and that will happen in subsequent phases.
2	And so, everything is pretty much
3	resolved down close to Byram here. Okay.
4	Now it's Brandon's turn to do the
5	mitigation.
6	MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Tom. I speak
7	pretty loudly, so I think I can put this
8	back on here. See if that'll hold.
9	Well, good afternoon. I'm Brandon
10	Davis. I'm your planning lead for the
11	Vicksburg District and very honored to be
12	here tonight with you guys. A great
13	crowd. There's a lot of places you could
14	be. So taking time out of your schedule
15	to be with us, we really appreciate that.
16	A couple of things I want to set on
17	the table before we get started is that I
18	don't have the answers to everything. I'm
19	just going to be upfront and honest with
20	you on that. But I do have an outstanding
21	group of subject matter experts in the
22	back of the room that have boards that can
23	answer your questions.
24	So I strongly encourage you tonight,
25	before you leave, if you have a question

1	about a technical side of technical
2	side of this, talk with someone. I'm
3	going to be standing off to the side. My
4	Chief's around here. We'll be glad to
5	talk with you to answer any questions that
6	you have.
7	One of the great things and these
8	next few slides will be talking about the
9	National Environmental Policy Act. Going
10	forward, you're going to hear me calling
11	that NEPA.
12	One of the great things about NEPA is
13	what it requires us to do as a federal
14	agency is that we have to be open and
15	transparent with you on what we are doing.
16	If we're spending federal dollars, we have
17	to write environmental documents, and we
18	have to have an opportunity for the public
19	to comment and understand what's going on.
20	That's what we're doing here tonight.
21	That's what we're doing with this CIS.
22	A couple things I want to lay out
23	about the CIS. Again, I'm open just to
24	set the table for that. A lot of people
25	are concerned that the tributaries and

1	those areas hadn't been included in that
2	document. Well, the reason they're not is
3	because that work is already being taken
4	care of by another group, NRCS. I believe
5	it's NRCS. If I said that wrong, Keith,
6	we'll get that corrected.
7	But I do know there is involvement.
8	Keith talked about the money that's being
9	spent. I also know that these groups are
10	going through the regulatory process at
11	the Vicksburg District to get the permits
12	required to start working on that.
13	So just want to set the table to let
14	you know that hasn't been forgotten, and
15	we have had not, from our scoping
16	meetings, we haven't ignored anyone. So
17	that might be a lot of concerns that you
18	may have, but that's not in the document.
19	So just want to set the table on that
20	again.
21	But one of the great things about this
22	is that we are able to go over in the CIS
23	and share with you our understandings of
24	the impacts and also the benefits of the
25	various resources and discussion and

1	discuss the mitigation plan.
2	Too many times on the EIS's we talk
3	about all just the bad stuff. There's
4	a lot of benefits with these various
5	projects that we can talk about as well.
6	You know, if we got to talk about
7	mitigation, we can talk about mitigation.
8	Now, obviously, the preferred method
9	is to avoid and minimize, but there are
10	cases where we have to mitigate. And when
11	we do that, we go through the proper steps
12	to do that.
13	What I want you to notice on this
14	slide here, on this first slide, is that
15	you see this table here, you have
16	Alternative C, Alternative CTO, the D and
17	E. Right now, we're just going to talk
18	about the first two here, and it's the
19	acres impacted.
20	And you're not going to notice the A1,
21	the nonstructural, because we don't expect
22	to have any impacts to the environment for
23	that alternative. So you're not going to
24	see that in this discussion here.
25	What I want you to notice is on

1	Alternative C, if you look at the various
2	types of habitats here, you have open
3	water, bottomland hardwood. You see the
4	impacts that you have. You see an
5	Alternative C.
6	Just for example, let's look at the
7	open water one here, 200 acres with
8	Alternative C. If you look at the
9	combined thereof, the CTO that we're going
10	to talk a lot about tonight, you see
11	how you see the reductions there, and
12	you see how that goes throughout the
13	various habitat types.
14	Also, you're going to see over here
15	what we call an AAHU. That is I'm
16	going to make sure that I have my notes
17	that I don't because I always mess that
18	up. That is an average annual habitat
19	unit. And what that represents is the
20	function and the values of a particular
21	habitat.
22	So, for example, the habitat of open
23	water is going to be different than what
24	the habitat of swamper forested uplands
25	would be. Where we mitigate for these

1	lost functions, this is not a one 1-to-1
2	as far as acres-to-acres. There's more
3	value to maybe a bottomland hardwood or a
4	Tupelo swamp than what you would see with
5	open water. So that's something I wanted
6	to point out to you.
7	Our terrestrial impacts, they were
8	determined by running a certified habitat
9	evaluation process model. Some of you may
10	know that as HEP, H-E-P. This was
11	completed by our nonfederal sponsor,
12	Rankin-Hinds, and their contractor did a
13	great job on that, and that was presented
14	in the EIS.
15	Something I want to point out to you
16	guys is that we are currently wrapping up
17	the mitigation plan, and we would have
18	that completed prior to construction
19	activities. The reason being is there's
20	still some uncertainty on what alternative
21	would be selected.
22	So you can't wrap up and sign any type
23	of record of decision without knowing
24	where are we going and is there going to
25	be any additional analysis that we need to

1	do on that. So just wanted to set the
2	table on that if you had any questions.
3	All right. Got it right. Next slide
4	is the threatened and endangered species.
5	So in this table here, there are eight
6	species of concern in the study era.
7	Again, it should be noted that the
8	nonstructural A1, you're not going to see
9	that up there. We're not expecting any
10	type of impacts to our any listed
11	species here.
12	Our team did a great job of
13	collaborating with U.S. Fish and Wildlife
14	when they were coming up with
15	determinations. The determinations are
16	what you're going to see here, the LAA and
17	the NLAA. We'll talk about that just in a
18	second. But I want you to know, this just
19	wasn't something we as lead agencies
20	decided, hey, this is the determination.
21	We were in close collaboration with our
22	other federal partners on that. Also
23	working with our other stakeholders to
24	come up with those determinations.
25	The LAA is likely to adversely affect

1	but not likely to jeopardize and continua
2	the existence of. So what does that mean?
3	Temporary impact. We're not going to
4	there could be some effects on the front
5	end, but we expect after a temporary
6	impacts we get back to more of a natural
7	state.
8	And then NLAA is not likely to
9	adversely affect. So an example on that,
10	the tricolored bat, we weren't expecting
11	that to be affected by any of the
12	alternatives that you have up there. And
13	also the northern long-eared bat, we're
14	not expecting to be impacting any type of
15	habitat that would be involved with them.
16	Now, for some reason, if we go out and
17	we do our surveys and we find that they
18	are roosting in there, you can wait and
19	mitigate for that by harvesting at various
20	times when they are not roosting in those
21	trees. So there are methods to working
22	past that if they were to if that was
23	to become a problem.
24	What I want you to notice on the
25	Alternative C and D, the CTO with weir,

1	they have the same impacts. Okay? And
2	the reason being is that there is the
3	likeliness or the possibility of
4	eliminating some riverine habitat and some
5	of the channelization that would be done
6	with that.
7	But one thing we need to do, we need
8	to do a velocity analysis. We did one for
9	Alternative C. But we need to do a
10	velocity analysis on the CTO to understand
11	the impacts of the riverine system.
12	And that's very important for, like,
13	the Gulf sturgeon, the ringed sawback
14	turtle, you know, the Pearl mat turtle,
15	because we need to understand a better
16	understanding of what's going on with that
17	riverine system from a temporary basis.
18	Alternative E, the CTO without weir,
19	you do see some slightly different impacts
20	to that river channel, but you would still
21	see some. For example, if we look over
22	here, the ring sawback turtle, you know,
23	we're still showing some of the LAA,
24	likely to adversely impact.
25	Even though we don't have a weir

1	there, there's going to be some work to
2	the bank and the turtles like using the
3	bank. So there could be some temporary
4	effects to those turtles, but we expect it
5	to return back to a normal habitat at some
6	point.
7	Our team did a great job with
8	preparing a biological assessment. Again,
9	we've been working very closely with Fish
10	and Wildlife on this effort. That's been
11	submitted to Fish and Wildlife with the
12	determinations that we have that's already
13	been submitted to them. And we're
14	continuing to do consultation. And all
15	the consultations are anticipated to be
16	completed by the release of the final EIS.
17	So cultural resources. Cultural
18	resources is very broad. There's a very
19	wide array of what the definition of that
20	is. But all of our alternatives have the
21	potential to affect cultural resources
22	because it's everything. You know, there
23	could be something buried under the ground
24	here that we don't know about, and, you
25	know, we're the highways, when they're

1	building highways, they find something and
2	various things like that.
3	So cultural resources could be from
4	Native American artifacts, historical
5	artifacts, or not dinosaurs. Not with
6	dinosaurs. I know we're on a volcano
7	right here, if y'all didn't know that.
8	But there's a lot of various cultural
9	resources that could be affected by this.
10	But we're doing a great job, and our
11	team is, of currently negotiating a
12	programmatic agreement with the State
13	Historic Preservation Office, tribal
14	nations, and also other stakeholders.
15	So what is a what is a PA? And
16	what it is, it's a plan that lays out what
17	we're going to do to address any impacts
18	once we know what the alternative is going
19	to be. Like I said, our team is having
20	regular consultation meetings. They
21	actually had one this morning. They're
22	working really close to an agreement, and
23	we're expected to have that PA signed and
24	ready to a plan of action by the time
25	the record of decision has been signed on

1	this EIS draft EIS. Excuse me.
2	Tribal resources. That is another
3	requirement under NEPA where we are we
4	have to be involved. It's a policy with
5	the federal government that consults with
6	all federally-recognized tribal nations
7	and governments. Currently, there are no
8	tribal lands or rights that are that
9	have been identified in this area, but
10	we're continuing to have consultation with
11	some tribes because there is potential to
12	identify some protected tribal resources.
13	So we continue to work with tribal nations
14	in that area.
15	So environmental justice, Mr. Mayor,
16	when he was here, he took a lot of my
17	thunder that I was going to talk about on
18	environmental justice, but a very good
19	overview of that. So trying to explain
20	what environmental justice is for folks
21	that may not know, and really what it is,
22	it means the just just treatment and
23	meaningful involvement of all people,
24	regardless of income, race, origin, and
25	disability.

1	Really want to make sure everyone's
2	involved. We don't want to go out here
3	and what you would think is, okay, this is
4	cheap land that we could acquire easily
5	and push someone out of the way. That's
6	not the way we want to operate and the way
7	we want to handle the problems that we are
8	trying to solve here with the flood
9	control issue. We want to make sure
10	everyone's involved and has a voice.
11	And that is the one thing that the
12	Obama administration started, and then, of
13	course, the Biden administration has been
14	very good at pushing this environmental
15	justice because it's a very important
16	issue.
17	For the no-action in the 100-year
18	floodplain, there were less than 800
19	structures in the EJ area of concern. You
20	can see it was 773, that number there. In
21	the nonstructural plan, Alternative A,
22	there were 143 structures in the EJ area
23	of concern.
24	Now, one thing that I do want to point
25	out that some people may say it's kind

1	of a maybe an elephant in the room
2	look down at this bullet right here;
3	structure inducement, flooding inducement.
4	I want to be really clear about that, and
5	I probably should have structured this
6	sentence a little bit differently.
7	You're seeing down there for
8	Alternative C, 83, and then for the CTO,
9	52. That's not 52 new structures that's
10	going to have inducements on it. That's
11	52 structures that are already getting wet
12	somehow, some way.
13	Now, Tommy talked about it a little
14	bit earlier. In the CTO alternative,
15	there's going to be nonstructural measures
16	that we would have to look at for this
17	issue if the CTO was selected. And that's
18	one thing, anytime that you know, and
19	there could be some errors in the model,
20	and tightening up the models that we'd
21	need to do.
22	And so, anytime that we saw any type
23	of inducements, we would have to go
24	through nonstructural measures to make
25	sure we're taking care of what we need to

1	take care of. But I wanted to point that
2	out. That's not 52 new structures.
3	That's 52 structures that are already
4	getting wet right now.
5	And something very important is, like
6	I said, we want to make sure that we are
7	working closely with our community on
8	this. So we're having more outreach, EJ
9	outreach meetings, two or three I believe
10	that are planned over the next couple of
11	months. We want to connect with you guys
12	and connect with the communities to make
13	sure that you have the opportunity to ask
14	the questions about this project.
15	All right. Next slide is
16	recreation not quite yet, Tom. I'm
17	almost done.
18	So the next slide on recreation, talk
19	about recreation. So obviously, for the
20	no-action, you see that there's no
21	benefits on the water base or the
22	shoreline, and there's no impacts to
23	Lefleur State Park. Same with A1, the
24	nonstructural plan, you don't see any type
25	of a benefit for Al for the nonstructural.

1	But you do see benefits, obviously,
2	for C, which was the lake project or the
3	river widening project, and then the CTO,
4	which you have with and without weir. But
5	the CTO, you see there are some benefits
6	there.
7	About \$5 million a year in
8	recreational benefits is what's been
9	estimated, and the analysis that we've
10	done we'll talk about that here
11	momentarily with when we get into our
12	economics. But, you know, you do see some
13	impacts that are going to be Lefleur State
14	Park. And I know that's an area of
15	concern for a lot of people. That's a
16	beautiful location. I actually had a
17	chance to take Mr. Bush and Ms. Colosimo
18	out there today to show them around. It's
19	a beautiful area.
20	Some of the areas that currently
21	that we would see if alternative CTO was
22	selected, some of the areas where there
23	are impacts or areas that are currently
24	flooding and I know I'm trying to sound
25	caustic when I say that, but these are

1	areas that really aren't accessible. And
2	what we would try to do, if there was any
3	damages from a CTO, we'd have to have some
4	type of mitigation in play. What does
5	that look like? It could be additional
6	walkways, paths, something that we would
7	have to do to try to mitigate for that
8	land that was lost because of the project.
9	And like I said, any the key
10	takeaway from here is that any potential
11	impacts identified in Lefleur, we'd have
12	to coordinate with the State Park Service
13	to make sure that we're doing what we need
14	to do. The goal, obviously, we want to
15	avoid and minimize that, but we will
16	mitigate if we have to if that alternative
17	was selected.
18	So the economics and this is one I
19	wanted to go over with you guys, not in
20	too much detail. I know I've been up here
21	a while. So the economics, I want to make
22	it really clear and kind of lay the table
23	on this one. We were directed by the
24	ASA's office and our guidance, we were to
25	analyze an array of alternatives and

1	determine an NED plan. We'll talk a
2	little bit about what that is.
3	But we're not here tonight to make a
4	decision. I'm not here to tell you that
5	this is the preferred alternative, this is
6	NED. I'm here to show what was determined
7	for Secretary Connor to look at to
8	determine what he wants to do. We feel
9	like with the information that we have, is
10	it perfect? No. There's more that can be
11	added to it, and it will be as we get it.
12	But the information that we do have,
13	we feel really good about it. We're
14	vertically aligned with our team and
15	stakeholders on that, and we'll continue
16	to add to it as more comes in. But we
17	feel really good about where we are. We
18	want to help the Secretary make an
19	informed decision with the information
20	that he has.
21	So what is an NED plan? I think Tom
22	had talked about that for a second.
23	National Economic Development. Okay?
24	Well, that's just another buzzword as
25	well. But what it is, is that we're

1	looking for a project that provides the
2	most net benefits. Okay?
3	And then we're also looking at what we
4	call a BC ratio. Some of you have heard
5	that, a benefit-to-cost ratio that is
6	above unity or one. So how do I get this
7	benefit-to-cost ratio, and what do these
8	numbers up here mean?
9	Well, the first thing I want to point
10	out on these numbers you see up here:
11	Let's look at Alternative D, for example,
12	CTO with weir. Project first cost ranges
13	from 487 million to 655 million. That's a
14	range. Why do we have that?
15	Well, there's risk involved in the
16	numbers that we have because there's some
17	uncertainty on some of the on what
18	maybe some of the features are. The Corps
19	of Engineers, we do risk-informed
20	decisionmaking, and we take the
21	information that's readily available, and
22	we try to make a decision and move
23	forward. And if we have to mitigate for
24	risk or revisit that, that's what we do.
25	It's kind of what we're doing here.

1	One of the things we're doing right now is
2	that this information is in agency
3	technical review. Our reviewer is from
4	The Cost Center of Expertise out of Walla
5	Walla, so a very qualified individual
6	that I've worked with this guy numerous
7	times. He does a great job, and he's very
8	particular in the cost analysis.
9	So we do have checks and balances
10	making sure that these costs are within
11	the reasonable. So what this slide
12	gives you, it also talks about the
13	benefit-to-cost ratio and the net
14	benefits. So I just want to go really
15	quickly over what a benefit-to-cost ratio
16	is.
17	So I'm going to have my benefits as
18	derived from my economic models. My
19	economists are going to figure that out.
20	I'm going to have my costs provided to me
21	by my engineers. I'm going to divide that
22	number, my benefits by my costs, and we'll
23	come up with a number.
24	So the example here, you see 1.4. So
25	what does that really mean? So for every

1	\$1 that's invested by the federal
2	government, in theory, you're getting back
3	\$1.40 to the community. And so, you can
4	see how that goes down through here, and I
5	have a table that I'm going to show you.
6	And it's a lot of numbers on this
7	table, but I think the big takeaway is, is
8	that we were asked to identify the NED
9	plan. There are multiple NED plans that
10	are identified here based on the
11	information that we have.
12	If we're looking at net benefits, you
13	look at 8.2 on the net benefits because
14	you want the one that has the most net
15	benefits and also the BCR above unity.
16	Right now I'm looking at that, there's two
17	or three on there that could be selected
18	from, and it all depends on what the cost
19	ends up being for this alternative.
20	So I really wanted to stress that,
21	that this is not a meeting telling you,
22	hey, we have something picked. This is a
23	meeting to tell you, based on the
24	information we have, we have multiple
25	alternatives for the Secretary's office to

1	look at to make his informed decision.
2	So the last thing is hazardous, toxic,
3	and radiological waste. This is something
4	that's very important. Rankin-Hinds has
5	done a fantastic job of doing analysis on
6	that. There's still more analysis that
7	needs to be done.
8	Really, once we know what the
9	alternative is going to be, we'll get with
10	them to make sure that we have an area
11	that is free of HCRW (Health-Care Risk
12	Waste) concerns. As Corps of Engineers,
13	with our regulations, we can't start
14	construction on a site if we're going to
15	be impacting some type of HCRW site.
16	So that's the information that I have.
17	Like I said, we have our subject matter
18	experts in the back of the room. Really
19	glad that you're here. I'm going to be
20	standing around. I really want to hear
21	from you. I don't want you leaving here
22	tonight without, if you have some key
23	concern, because I'm going to be open and
24	transparent with you. But thank you for
25	your time.

1	MR. SHAW: All right. Thank you,
2	Brandon. So what's next? Here's what our
3	timeline actually looks like. So we
4	released the draft EIS was released on
5	the 7th of June. It's out for public
6	review. That public review will
7	terminate, if you will, on the 6th of
8	August.
9	The time period after that will be
10	we've already started looking into the
11	public comments, but we will be addressing
12	those public comments in the
13	August-to-September timeframe with a
14	notice of availability of a final EIS, if
15	everything goes as planned, in October.
16	That's our schedule.
17	And then in December would be the
18	submission of the final EIS to Mr. Connor,
19	and then, you know, it's in his hands
20	then. If he chooses to make a
21	determination and a record of decision, it
22	will be available and ready to go.
23	So that concludes the first part of
24	our that concludes the presentation
25	part, if you will. Next we're going to

1	move into the question period. And so,
2	what I would ask if you recall when we
3	first came in, there's a microphone up
4	here.
5	If you would like to ask a question, I
6	would just ask, please allow me to
7	recognize you. Try to hold your question
8	to within about three minutes.
9	I mentioned earlier a couple of things
10	are going to happen. The recording of
11	this public meeting, the transcripts, the
12	questions that come in, the responses, all
13	of this will be put out on our project
14	website. It will all be available for
15	everybody to see.
16	It won't happen immediately. Some
17	things will come earlier, such as the
18	video will go up fairly quick. The
19	transcript will come probably within a
20	week or so, and then hopefully within a
21	week, we will be able to have comments,
22	responses to the questions.
23	So at this time, we are programmed for
24	basically two hours, which means we've got
25	about another hour left. If you want to

1	ask some detailed, technical-type
2	questions, please remember we have our
3	study boards with our subject matter
4	experts in the back. And with that, I'll
5	open it up to questions.
6	Please come to the mic, and I would
7	ask, please, if you would just say who you
8	are and then pose your question there.
9	MS. WALKER: Hello. Good afternoon.
10	My name is Theo Walker. I live on Deer
11	Trail
12	MR. SHAW: Ma'am, could you get a
13	little closer? Sorry.
14	MS. WALKER: Hello. My name is Theo
15	Walker. I live in the Canton Club
16	community, and I was just needing some
17	clarification. Did you all say that the
18	voluntary buyouts was off the table, or it
19	was no longer up for reconsideration?
20	Someone said that. No? Okay. It's still
21	on the table?
22	SPEAKER: Any thoughts you have, we
23	are open to.
24	MS. WALKER: Okay. Okay. Well, let
25	me

1	MR. SHAW: Any thoughts that she has
2	with respect to the voluntary buyouts, we
3	want to hear it.
4	MS. WALKER: Okay. So, yes. I live
5	on Deer Trail. I'm interested in the
6	voluntary buyout. Every time it rains
7	hard, the street floods, my backyard
8	floods. And I heard the Mayor and the
9	information that he shared today.
10	However, I'm still in favor of that
11	option.
12	I own my home over there. I have a
13	mortgage. I've been paying for it for a
14	while. I don't think I should be
15	penalized because some people maybe in the
16	neighborhood, you know, rent or whatever.
17	That doesn't concern me.
18	And usually when you rent, you're
19	paying more than somebody with a mortgage
20	anyway. So I'm pretty sure those folks
21	will be able to go and find places to live
22	elsewhere.
23	Flood insurance is astronomical, you
24	know, and you have to pay for it up front
25	in the beginning of the year. I am not

1	interested in dealing with that any longer
2	than I have to.
3	I can't get comfortable in my own
4	home. I might have said it at a previous
5	meeting, but I will keep reiterating it.
6	I can't get comfortable in my own home if
7	it keeps flooding and keep having to be
8	uprooting and keep having to lose stuff
9	that you don't necessarily have insurance
10	to cover because of the flood insurance
11	costs.
12	What else do I want to say? That's
13	pretty much it. I just wanted to get
14	clarification to see if the voluntary
15	buyouts was on the table because that's
16	what I'm in favor of. Thank you.
17	MR. SHAW: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.
18	Next, please.
19	MS. WILKERSON: Good evening,
20	everyone. My name is Doris Wilkerson
21	MR. SHAW: Could you get just a
22	little closer? I'm so sorry.
23	MS. WILKERSON: Good evening,
24	everyone. Is that better? My name is
25	Doris Wilkerson, and my husband and I, we

1	live in South Jackson. And we're like, in
2	my opinion, I'm not an expert, but we're
3	right in the middle of the flood zone.
4	So my question and concern is, this
5	project that you all are talking about, is
6	it an economic thing for, I guess, the
7	city, state, or whatever? Is this like an
8	economic thing just so somebody else can
9	get enriched as a result of us as
10	homeowners down there?
11	And number 2 is, how would this plan
12	help the flooding in our area? Because we
13	live right there in the flood near a
14	creek, and there's been instances where we
15	actually had to, you know, move, or my
16	husband and I sit you know, getting
17	turns trying to see how far the water
18	level is.
19	And so, I'm trying to see how would
20	this project, if it will help us and
21	alleviate some of the flooding problems
22	that we're having, or is it just not going
23	to help us?
24	MR. SHAW: Yes, ma'am. If you don't
25	mind, what creek are you speaking of?

1	MS. WILKERSON: Caney Creek, I
2	believe. It's a I know Caney Creek is
3	there, and then it's also we're like
4	close to down and not too further, Pearl
5	River is there, and there's also another
6	little creek that runs directly beside our
7	property. I don't know the name of the
8	street.
9	But when it rains, it really
10	overflows, and it really floods really
11	bad. So our concern is, you know, how is
12	this project going to help us and the
13	other residents that live in the area in
14	which we live in? Got an answer?
15	Anybody?
16	MR. SHAW: Troy, you want to address
17	that? Want to just come up here?
18	MR. CONSTANCE: Sorry. There was a
19	time when I could jump up here, but that
20	ain't happening tonight. So you have a
21	couple of questions in there.
22	So the federal government, when we
23	look at a project, we look at the damages
24	that are occurring, and then we look at
25	methods of reducing those damages. Those

1	are the benefits.
2	So all of the projects are designed to
3	be directly beneficial to those that are
4	flooding. It's not about development in
5	the future or anything else. So we're
6	looking at individual houses, businesses,
7	and things like that, and the difference
8	when the water goes down. Does that help
9	with where you are? So
10	MS. WILKERSON: No.
11	MR. CONSTANCE: Okay. What else you
12	need to know?
13	MS. WILKERSON: I'm trying to
14	understand, I guess, the project itself,
15	because obviously we are very concerned
16	about the flooding and the damage and
17	stress, and the because it's an
18	economic problem for us as well, not just
19	for the city or the state or county or
20	whoever you are.
21	So my concern is, how or if this
22	particular project will help us with the
23	flooding and damage to our property,
24	because it's also the flooding has also
25	caused damage to our property as well.

1	MR. CONSTANCE: Understood.
2	MS. WILKERSON: Because of the
3	erosion and all of the other things that
4	happens during a flood. So I'm just
5	trying to understand how is this going to
6	help us or help me, help me and my husband
7	and people that live in our community.
8	MR. CONSTANCE: Understood. And the
9	graph that you saw, you saw the water
10	levels come down. And it's a slope line,
11	so a lot of it depends on exactly where
12	you are. So I would I would ask you to
13	go back. We have a a lady that
14	actually did the modeling can help you.
15	UNIDENTIFIED: Brandon is going to
16	talk to her.
17	MS. WILKERSON: But also okay.
18	Wait, wait. One other thing I wanted to
19	ask, and I'm going to go.
20	UNIDENTIFIED: Brandon is going to
21	come figure out where you are.
22	MR. SHAW: All right. Next. You,
23	sir.
24	MR. VAUGHN: Hello, I'm William
25	Ashley Vaughn. I'm in Ridgeland now, but

1	I'm a native-born Jacksonian, and I lived
2	here most of my life. This is still my
3	hometown.
4	So Mayor Lumumba was very eloquent
5	about people who'd be displaced by the
6	buyout program. But one thing that's not
7	clear from anything that's been said is,
8	if you go with the other plans, which are
9	basically two of them at least are
10	basically the One Lake plan, how do you do
11	that without having to displace people
12	from their homes anyway?
13	And if it's going to be necessary to
14	do buyouts for that, how many homes would
15	be bought out or how many elevated?
16	MR. SHAW: Yeah. I hate to ask,
17	would you repeat? We're having a little
18	bit of problems hearing now. Sorry.
19	MR. VAUGHN: Well, we heard from you
20	and from Mayor Lumumba about how many
21	homes that have to be bought out or
22	elevated for A1, which does seem to be the
23	most workable of the projects.
24	But the other two projects, plans, two
25	out of the four plans, which are basically

1	the One Lake plan by any other name,
2	wouldn't it be necessary to move people
3	and buy people out in order to build a
4	dam? And if so, how many? And elevate
5	also.
6	MR. SHAW: So if I understood your
7	question correctly, when we looked at the
8	flood levels, there were no homes that
9	were going to be impacted, if you will, by
10	the lake portion. There were some homes
11	that would see some inducement, and I
12	think those are the ones that would fit
13	under the nonstructural portion of, like,
14	the CTO, Alternate D or E.
15	MR. VAUGHN: So you're saying about
16	the same number as A1 or less or more?
17	MR. SHAW: Yeah. Troy.
18	MR. CONSTANCE: So when we looked at
19	the lake plan, Alt D, we didn't find any
20	structures that required removing in order
21	to create that new channel. There are
22	some nonstructural components in that plan
23	because there were some residual damages
24	that were not being relieved by the lake.
25	And so, there are some nonstructural plans

1	there.
2	And then below the weir, we saw some
3	potential for some inducements. Although
4	they're very small, it's like 6 inches,
5	and that's within the within the model
6	era, but we believe that it was important
7	to include those in there. In those
8	areas, we would do nonstructural to bring
9	them back up out of the floodway. Does
10	that answer your question?
11	MR. VAUGHN: Yes. Thank you.
12	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Ma'am.
13	MS. YATES: Good evening. I'm
14	Representative Shanda Yates, and I
15	represent a portion of northeast Jackson.
16	I also live in northeast Jackson. And I'm
17	just here to voice my general support for
18	doing something.
19	This has been going on for decades at
20	this point. Many of my constituents have
21	had ongoing flooding issues for longer
22	than their children have been alive,
23	longer than I have been alive. So the
24	time to do something is beyond time at
25	this point.

1	In looking at the options that have
2	been presented to us at this point,
3	Alternative D seems to be the most
4	reasonable alternative in that it
5	incorporates most of what needs to be done
6	to accomplish the end results that are
7	needed for Jackson.
8	And it also includes building an area
9	around Canton Club neighborhood in
10	northeast Jackson that would prevent
11	additional flooding in that area, which is
12	in my district. And that would be a huge
13	additional added benefit, as I see it, for
14	Alternative D.
15	I did also want to take a moment to
16	mention that the nonstructural plan that
17	is listed as Alternative A that would
18	require houses to be built up, I think,
19	some 13 feet is honestly impractical. You
20	have elderly people. You have disabled
21	people.
22	I don't know logistically how they
23	would be able to get up 13 additional feet
24	to their homes on a day-to-day basis, what
25	that would look like, how that would play

1	out. Just from a logistical standpoint,
2	it seems very impractical and like
3	something that would not play out very
4	well.
5	So I voice opposition to Alternative A
6	for that very specific reason and would
7	like to, again, make my support heard for
8	my constituents in northeast Jackson,
9	specifically for Alternative D. Thank
10	you.
11	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Yes, sir.
12	MR. FERNANDEZ: Hello. My name is
13	Juan Fernandez. I've been organizing with
14	several residents from a number of
15	flood-prone communities over the last few
16	years to understand this project. I'm
17	here to ask a question that might not
18	be you guys might not be able to answer
19	in person, but at least should be in the
20	final EIS.
21	Before I do that question, though, I
22	want to follow up on a statement that I
23	made at the last meeting. I think it's a
24	shame that the public that the only
25	public officials who are part of this

1	planning process maybe made an appearance,
2	but left. The people who we elect to
3	oversee this project cannot be bothered to
4	stay around to listen to our comments. It
5	was the same thing this morning. I think
6	that's a severe problem, but that's not
7	what I want to cover here.
8	I have a question that I think
9	pertains to a central thing in this
10	project, national economic development
11	benefits and flood reduction benefits. In
12	December of last year, we saw a document,
13	an internal planning presentation from the
14	Corps of Engineers, which presented
15	Alternative 1 that looked a little
16	different from the current one.
17	This old Alternative 1 expanded into
18	West Jackson, deep into West Jackson, up
19	to Jane Avenue near the zoo, proposing to
20	elevate and floodproof structures there.
21	It covered 600 structures overall, had a
22	cost of about \$200 million and had a
23	benefit-to-cost ratio, which I believe the
24	gentlemen somewhere said that for every
25	dollar we put into it, the public would

1	receive \$2.70 in benefits. This was an
2	Alternative 1 that we saw last year.
3	This year, when the DEIS came out, we
4	saw a different Alternate Al. It only
5	covered 143 structures for about \$50
6	million and had a lower benefit-to-cost
7	ratio of about 2.2. This was this
8	could have been a massive \$150 million
9	investment to West Jackson for a very
10	effective plan, and yet it was trimmed
11	down.
12	And so, I think that the EIS, or maybe
13	even here, I need to better understand the
14	legal reasoning for trimming, for
15	diminishing or destroying a
16	highly-effective alternative that could
17	have been the basis for even a broader
18	alternative for what we have now. So
19	why was West Jackson removed from A1 if it
20	was such a good deal?
21	And in addition to that question, I
22	know that there's talk of how there's
23	already other programs out there for
24	creeks. And so, I want to make sure
25	that if you guys do choose that route

1	to say that somebody else is handling the
2	problem, we need to be honest about the
3	differences in prices.
4	This old Alternative A1 committed
5	upwards of \$150 million, and what I saw up
6	there on that screen and, excuse me,
7	\$150 million to West Jackson flooding.
8	What I saw on the screen was all these
9	creek projects that are going on. They
10	don't amount to much more than 20. That's
11	a huge deficit.
12	So in terms of commitment to
13	environmental justice, that is the one
14	question I would love to see answered.
15	Thank you.
16	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Ma'am.
17	MS. HARRISON: Hello. My name is
18	Audrey Harrison, and I'm a citizen of
19	Hinds County, and I have lots of
20	questions. So if I need to go to the back
21	of the line after I begin, I'll be happy
22	to do so.
23	Okay. I'm going to start by reading
24	from a section of the Draft Environmental
25	Impact Statement, specifically page 8 of

1	the Executive Summary. "Alternative CTO,
2	with weir, Alternative D, does not provide
3	any flood control benefits, and
4	construction of the weir necessitates
5	additional pumping needs at existing
6	levees as well as seepage protection in
7	the form of berms and slurry walls on
8	existing levee features upstream of the
9	weir."
10	So just to reiterate, that statement
11	reads, "Alternative CTO with weir,
12	Alternative D, does not provide any flood
13	control benefits, and construction of the
14	weir necessitates additional pumping needs
15	at existing levees as well as seepage
16	protection in the form of berms and slurry
17	walls on the existing levee features
18	upstream of the weir."
19	Okay. So that is a little bit
20	contradictory to some of the things that
21	I've seen tonight and read elsewhere. So
22	maybe that would just be a point of
23	clarification after I address my other
24	questions.
25	I would like to know, is Alternative

1	A1, plus the Canton Club Levee, because I
2	understand that other alternatives can be
3	added into a revised CTO, the most
4	cost-effective and least
5	environmentally-damaging option, as well
6	as providing a higher level of flood
7	mitigation. That's my first question.
8	And I can repeat that.
9	MR. CONSTANCE: So when we look
10	there's two things that you asked there.
11	The least environmentally-impacted plan,
12	if you look at it by itself, just the
13	environmental impact, Al. You pointed out
14	that.
15	If you look at the human impact, we
16	can pull into that all the economic
17	return. We're saying, based on the range
18	of cost, Brandon pointed out, it could be
19	any of the structural alternatives. And
20	so, what we're looking at is that
21	Alternative D has if you get the low
22	cost, is very high net returns, and that
23	would indicate that that would be the NED
24	plan.
25	MS. HARRISON: Okay. I'm sorry, I

1	just want to pause you right there because
2	the range for that is, if I remember
3	correctly from the slide, 1.4 to 1 1.4
4	to 1.1 as a ratio, compared to 2.2 to 2.1?
5	MR. CONSTANCE: And then when you
6	there's other components of
7	implementability. So there's other
8	criteria we have to use when we do our
9	selection.
10	You heard today that there are some
11	concerns about people participating. So
12	when we look at the participation rate,
13	and we look at participation rates from
14	other projects just like this across the
15	country, we see that participation rates
16	sometimes fall down to, like, 50 percent
17	of the population.
18	So when you're looking at 143
19	structures, Maybe only half of those
20	people can actually decide to participate
21	in that for various reasons, you heard the
22	representative. So when you look at it
23	with that, the next question is, how
24	effective is that plan?
25	So we have damages that are occurring

1	across a very broad area, and then we're
2	saying that the participation rate may be
3	relatively small, so it's less effective.
4	So when you start looking at those kinds
5	of considerations, you start leaning
6	towards the structural plans because those
7	are more effective across a broader area.
8	MS. HARRISON: It seems like one of
9	the structural options, which is to
10	construct a levee around the Canton Club
11	area, would prevent flooding to over 300
12	structures. Is that true?
13	MR. CONSTANCE: That's correct.
14	MS. HARRISON: Okay. And that's just
15	that \$10 million obligation alone?
16	MR. CONSTANCE: Right. And that was
17	part of Alt D. We added it
18	MS. HARRISON: Right. But it also
19	could be done independently in conjunction
20	with another nonstructural alternative,
21	correct?
22	MR. CONSTANCE: It could be. It
23	could be.
24	MS. HARRISON: All right. I can move
25	on to another question to save time, if

1	that's okay. Does congressional funding
2	to the USACE for flood mitigation have to
3	be used to mitigate flooding?
4	MR. CONSTANCE: Can you can you
5	repeat your question, please?
6	MS. HARRISON: Sure. Does
7	congressional funding, such as that of the
8	infrastructure bill to the USACE for flood
9	mitigation, have to be used to mitigate
10	flooding?
11	MS. COLOSIMO: So I'm just going to
12	help out here. So, yes. But why is that?
13	Because it's consistent with our
14	authorities and missions. Right? So we
15	aren't in the recreation business, as an
16	example. We can only do recreation if
17	it's an additional feature for flood
18	mitigation. So, yes, this is a flood risk
19	management authority, so we are driven by
20	that.
21	MS. HARRISON: Okay. Thank you.
22	That just brings me back to the statement
23	from the Draft Environmental Impact
24	Statement
25	MR. CONSTANCE: Yes, ma'am.

1	MS. HARRISON: which was
2	Alternative D does not provide
3	MR. CONSTANCE: The first statement
4	that you made with respect, it almost
5	sounded like when you were describing
6	you said Alt CTO, but it really described
7	like we might have a typo there, because I
8	think the description was Alt C, what you
9	described early on.
10	MS. HARRISON: Well, I don't think so
11	because of another because it also
12	mentions the weir.
13	MR. CONSTANCE: Okay.
14	MS. HARRISON: It mentions the option
15	with weir, and then it provides Alt D.
16	Alternative CTO with weir, Alternative D
17	in parentheses, which is the descriptor of
18	that particular does not provide any
19	flood control benefits, and construction
20	of the weir necessitates additional
21	pumping, on and on and on.
22	MS. COLOSIMO: I think it's missing
23	the word "any," "any additional." That
24	statement's about the weir.
25	MS. HARRISON: Okay. I can go

1	MS. COLOSIMO: But we can check.
2	MS. HARRISON: Okay. All right. So
3	do Alternatives D and E provide flood risk
4	mitigation?
5	MR. CONSTANCE: Yes. And I think the
6	point that you're driving is where we say
7	the difference between D and E, the flood
8	risk reduction are the same. They're
9	very, very close to the same.
10	What you gain when you put the weir in
11	there is additional recreational benefits,
12	and those come in the form of activities
13	that would occur around the lake. We have
14	good analog of that from other projects
15	that we've done.
16	So when you add that additional
17	benefit to the flood risk, plus the
18	recreational benefits, that's how it
19	becomes higher net benefits than E.
20	MS. HARRISON: Okay. Do
21	Alternatives D and E increase in any way
22	downstream flooding?
23	MR. CONSTANCE: What we're seeing in
24	the downstream flooding is about 6 inches
25	right at the face of the weir, and it

1	begins to play out. The model will
2	MS. HARRISON: Is that 6 inches in
3	increased flooding?
4	MR. CONSTANCE: Increased, yes, below
5	the weir. And then the model will
6	calculate out those differences for some
7	time, ma'am.
8	What we're seeing is that the 6 inches
9	is within the model era, and that's plus
10	or minus. Right? So if you have plus or
11	minus, we take it seriously and say, okay,
12	we're going to address that induced
13	damages. What we also see is that it
14	starts to alleviate itself very, very
15	quickly.
16	And so, what we saw is that we could
17	not identify any differences when we got
18	just north of Monticello.
19	MS. HARRISON: Will those updated
20	models be provided to the public during
21	the public comment period?
22	MR. CONSTANCE: I'd have to ask, if
23	you mind, we step back there, and we'll
24	talk about what is releasable. Sometimes
25	it's proprietary stuff, and sometimes

1	it's
2	MS. HARRISON: Well, no, no, no. I
3	was just wondering. You said y'all are
4	continuing to update the models, so would
5	the updated models or the results of the
6	models or summaries of the models be
7	available to the public?
8	MR. CONSTANCE: Yeah. Every time we
9	update, we're going to come back out to
10	the public, and that is a continuous
11	process that we do all the way through to
12	construction and beyond.
13	MS. HARRISON: Okay. Thank you. I'm
14	going to go to the back of the line so
15	that I don't hog the mic.
16	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Sir.
17	MR. NOONE: Good evening. My name is
18	David Noone. I'm a second generation
19	business owner here in Jackson. Been
20	around since the late '70s. Our business
21	flooded in the flood of '79 our
22	business flooded in the flood of '79.
23	We had relocated several years ago
24	onto Lakeland. We could have moved out of
25	the City of Jackson. We had many people

1	wanting us to, but we wanted to stay in
2	Jackson and support Jackson. We moved to
3	Lakeland, still in the flood zone.
4	And I think this is a long time
5	coming. We should have probably done this
6	years and years and years ago, and I just
7	want to voice my support for Alt D.
8	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Sir.
9	MR. THOMPSON: Good evening once
10	again. My name is Dion Thompson. I live
11	in the Canton Club neighborhood. And
12	we're talking about the possibility of a
13	levee there for Canton Club, but also
14	there's Parkway and McCloud. We don't
15	want to exclude them.
16	And my question is, with the DEIS that
17	has been dropped on us, can we just have
18	simplicity out of this so we can just, you
19	know, stick to this comprehensive plan
20	that we talked about earlier?
21	And also, how long are we going to
22	have to wait? I know you say in December
23	the final draft is going to come out, but
24	when that draft, when it's released, are
25	we going to have to wait again for another

1	year or so?
2	And the reason I'm asking is simply
3	because as of now, we are still on a
4	timetable, those of us that live in that
5	community, because within the last couple
6	of months, we was threatened to flood at
7	least three times, you know. And we never
8	know when potential rains are going to
9	come. And being in the hurricane season
10	that we're in now, you know, we don't know
11	what's going to happen.
12	But we're still like sitting ducks,
13	and we're just sitting here. And I
14	suggest that we all do what the young lady
15	did that just stepped from up here, get a
16	copy of the environmental statement and
17	read it for yourself.
18	You may say, well, I can't understand
19	all this and that that's in there, the
20	acronyms and all that. But if you read it
21	and listen to what you just discussed and
22	get with people that understand the
23	dynamics of it, it's going to help us.
24	It's going to help us all to, you know, to
25	come to some kind of comprehensive plan.

1	And you say, we all are going to be
2	invited to the table because, first and
3	foremost, it starts at our neighborhood.
4	It starts in our backyard at Canton Club.
5	When the waters come from the upper river
6	that comes from the (indiscernible), those
7	three rivers that verge into the river
8	bend, that lake is filled with those
9	waters coming from that upper Pearl River,
10	and then the reservoir has to release this
11	water on us.
12	And let's just get rid of the politics
13	and stop playing politics. Can we do
14	that? Because this is what has kept us in
15	abeyance for all these years, just playing
16	these political games. And at the same
17	time, our homes are being flooded, our
18	neighborhoods are just being dislodged,
19	and we don't need that.
20	When people come home, they want to
21	come home to a neighborhood. They want to
22	come home to their families. They want to
23	come home, if we want to sit out and
24	lollygag and do whatever we want to do in
25	our community, that's what we want to be

1	able to do.
2	We don't want to have to worry about
3	the risk of our homes being flooded, and
4	we don't have to worry about the fact that
5	we have to move all of our belongings out,
6	and we never know when we're coming back
7	or what have you and how long it's going
8	to take.
9	So, once again, the simplicity of it
10	is all we're asking, making something
11	simple because this flood mitigation and
12	all this other stuff that's involved in
13	it, I mean, give us a plain and a natural,
14	comprehensive plan. And if you do that, I
15	think we'll be all right. And remove all
16	the politics.
17	And I'm just asking the Levee Board to
18	work with the Army Corps of Engineers and
19	work together to come up with this plan.
20	And if you do that, then this thing can be
21	rectified and can be resolved, and we can
22	get on with our business. Please do that
23	for us, if you will.
24	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Next.
25	MR. JEROME: Hello. My name is

1	Patrick Jerome. I said a few things in
2	the earlier meeting, but I have some
3	questions for this one. I do want to
4	point out with what the Mayor said about
5	these costs for being relocated or having
6	your home raised are pretty significant;
7	but being flooded every year is not free.
8	Neither is flood insurance.
9	But I do have a question about, we've
10	talked about 2020 and 2022 floods, but
11	what about 2023? What about low water?
12	You could walk across the Pearl River most
13	summers. The Savannah Street water
14	treatment plant is already under EPA
15	decrees to not to get more water from
16	the reservoir than it is now. Will
17	building a weir above it reduce the amount
18	of water that it gets, and will the
19	increased evaporation from the lake make
20	that plant harder to operate?
21	MR. CONSTANCE: Part of that is
22	pretty highly technical, so I'm going to
23	point you back to Dana on those questions.
24	MR. JEROME: All right. Why was the
25	levee plan rejected?

1	MR. CONSTANCE: It was a
2	cost-and-benefit analysis that could
3	demonstrate that we had better options at
4	the time.
5	MR. JEROME: So more expensive than
6	the lake. Okay. Another question I've
7	got is, I did see the endangered species
8	and threatened species list there. I did
9	not notice any invertebrates on there. I
10	know that there's quite a few species of
11	mussels that are on the river that people
12	have concerns about. Were they examined,
13	or should I talk to somebody in the back?
14	MR. CONSTANCE: Again, that's pretty
15	technical, and you can talk to Tammy.
16	She's got her hand up right back there,
17	and she's very thorough.
18	MR. JEROME: The last one is, we've
19	talked about people being bought out or
20	the voluntary buyouts for people in the
21	flood zones now, but people own the lands
22	along the river. Are they going to be
23	reimbursed when their property is turned
24	into a lake?
25	MR. CONSTANCE: If you are using or

1	if you need land for a project, that
2	becomes an acquisition component.
3	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir.
4	MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon.
5	MR. CONSTANCE: Hello.
6	MS. WILLIAMS: I am Ramona Williams,
7	the president of the McCloud Neighborhood
8	Association. Thank you, gentlemen,
9	earlier for referring to our neighborhood,
10	McCloud Neighborhood Association.
11	My question relates to the timeline
12	that the report will be submitted in
13	December. And we know that we have a
14	national presidential election in
15	November. My question is, this plan, with
16	all of our energy and efforts being put
17	into it, where does our plan stand should
18	there be a change of leadership come
19	January 1?
20	MS. COLOSIMO: Thank you for that
21	thoughtful question. So technically the
22	plan continues to move forward. It's just
23	a question of who is the Assistant
24	Secretary of the Army for Civil Works at
25	that time.

1	So there could be a change in
2	administration, and if that happens and my
3	current boss vacates that position,
4	there's usually an acting civilian in that
5	position. The question is whether they
6	actually have the authority to make a
7	decision if he does not make one.
8	But, overall, the work still
9	continues. It's not affected by the
10	person in the job. It could affect the
11	timing and who approves it.
12	MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. That's my
13	concern. We've been dealing with this
14	issue for a number of years. Will it now
15	be put again on the back burner, and will
16	we still have to deal with the flooding of
17	our homes here in Jackson?
18	MS. COLOSIMO: Yeah. So I
19	wouldn't I completely appreciate your
20	concern because it's actually my job to
21	worry about this. And so, that subtlety
22	is really important. Right? Our goal is
23	to avoid that situation.
24	I can't pre-position my boss to make a
25	decision. Right? So the question is, is

1	he able to sign a record of decision,
2	which obviously there's a lot of work we
3	have to get done collaboratively, meaning
4	all the compliance laws and those things.
5	Can he make a decision based on that,
6	that positions us to be able to move
7	forward in some way? That is the ultimate
8	goal here, and that is my job to make sure
9	it happens.
10	MS. WILLIAMS: So we do have your
11	assurance that
12	MS. COLOSIMO: I have your assurance
13	that I will do everything I can to advance
14	in whole or in part that project.
15	MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. We got it on
16	record, right?
17	MS. COLOSIMO: Okay. You heard "in
18	whole or in part." I can't control all
19	the politics that go with that.
20	MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
21	MR. SHAW: Thank you, ma'am. Next,
22	sir.
23	MR. FARR: Hey. I'm David Farr.
24	MR. SHAW: David, could you get
25	there you go. Thank you.

1	MR. FARR: My name is David Farr.
2	I'm a lifelong resident of Jackson, and
3	I've been following this project or the
4	efforts to control flooding on the Pearl
5	since I was 9 years old when my family
6	lost our downtown business and many of our
7	friends lost their homes in the Easter
8	flood.
9	I really just want to say I'm
10	profoundly grateful to the Rankin-Hinds
11	Flood Control District, the Corps, all the
12	federal agencies that have worked on this
13	for as long as they have, our elected
14	officials in Washington, and primarily the
15	selfless community heroes that have driven
16	this effort since 1979 and refused to give
17	up on finding a solution for the people of
18	Jackson, Mississippi.
19	After reviewing the DEIS, I'm
20	convinced that Alternative D is the best
21	way, is the best answer for us. I really
22	appreciate the emerging clarity from these
23	meetings. You know, it was a little tough
24	to suss out some of the hot button issues,
25	like the fact that downstream water

1	quantity is only going to have
2	negligible Alternative D would only
3	have a negligible impact on downstream
4	water quantity; the issue with the
5	nonstructural solutions initially having a
6	higher cost benefit benefit-to-cost
7	ratio but that being based on 100 percent
8	participation, so when you bring that into
9	the realm of reality, it really just falls
10	off the radar; and this issue of induced
11	flooding showing up in the model within
12	the margin of error so that's not
13	So many of the comments today and this
14	afternoon and this evening have just been
15	driven by ideology and just dogmatic
16	adherence to, you know, some principle in
17	a field of study. But when you start
18	looking at the practicalities, it becomes
19	really clear that we have the opportunity
20	to address our flooding and get the
21	recreational benefits of the weir, and
22	we'll never get this chance again. For a
23	city like Jackson to get this opportunity,
24	it's just not something that we can take
25	lightly.

1	And so, I just felt like I had to come
2	and voice my support for Alternative D,
3	and thank you so much for the work you've
4	done. I'll work on written comments with
5	a little more specificity, but thanks
6	again.
7	MR. SHAW: Sounds good. Thank you.
8	So I would just make one observation, sir.
9	You mentioned about the any
10	inducements. That the inducements that
11	identified, these areas are already
12	getting flooded without project
13	conditioning. And so, yes, there are
14	inducements, but they are relatively
15	small, and they do quickly run out as you
16	get farther downstream. So thank you.
17	Ma'am.
18	MS. HARRISON: Hey, I'm Audrey
19	Harrison, again, a citizen of Hinds
20	County. Just to clarify, there are no new
21	inducements of flooding that would come
22	from Alternative D with weir? Is that
23	what you just said? It's only existing
24	flooding areas; there's no new
25	inducements.

1	MR. SHAW: I'll let
2	MR. CONSTANCE: So we need to be very
3	clear on this. So we rely on the computer
4	models that are generated, and we make our
5	decisions on that. That model is showing
6	a 6-inch increase in water surface
7	elevation just below the weir.
8	We don't ignore that. We say that is
9	a real problem, and we add the
10	nonstructural components to address that
11	to the plan. What we're telling you is
12	that as we advance and we move through the
13	project, and we'll continue to do modeling
14	all the way through it, it may be an
15	artifact of a model, but we can't say that
16	now. So we treat it as though it's
17	absolutely real.
18	In the future, it may be something
19	different. That's all we're trying to
20	point out.
21	MS. HARRISON: Right. But that's new
22	flooding. That's new that's
23	inducements.
24	MR. CONSTANCE: It's an increase in
25	water. For example, that house may be

1	flooding; it gets a foot of water in. And
2	we're saying, well, with this plan, it
3	might get 18 inches. That's the
4	inducement, the change in water surface
5	elevation.
6	MS. HARRISON: Thank you. How do you
7	plan to mitigate the point source
8	wastewater discharge and sewage into the
9	Pearl above the weir in Alternative D?
10	So within the new little lake, or big
11	lake I mean, I think is but how is
12	the point source pollution in terms of
13	wastewater discharge and sewage that we
14	know we have a problem with within this
15	watershed, when that's trapped behind a
16	weir, how is that going to be mitigated?
17	And then I'll go ahead and answer
18	ask my second, and then you can answer
19	both parts.
20	Will the will drinking water be
21	sourced from above the weir in
22	Alternative D?
23	MS. COLOSIMO: I'll let you do the
24	latter part. I think, as far as I know
25	first of all, just as a fundamental point,

1	and then I'm going to have Troy answer
2	broadly here.
3	In any situation where we have sewage
4	coming into a river that is beyond our
5	authority to implement, we're going to
6	work with the local government and our
7	federal sister agencies to make sure that
8	we're trying to uphold government wherever
9	we can, and that's important here. And
10	now I'm going to tell Troy to tell me what
11	he said in the report.
12	MR. CONSTANCE: Well, what we talked
13	about in the report is that there are a
14	lot of actions going on right now. EPA is
15	working with, I think, the City of
16	Jackson. We are, the Corps of Engineers
17	has a couple projects that are going on to
18	address those issues.
19	So if we have something going on,
20	sometimes we consider it as resolved while
21	we're going along. If it's not, it is
22	something that we would note. And as you
23	said, when you build a project, you have
24	to consider all those considerations, all
25	those things that are going on. And as

1	Robyn said, some of them are not ours to
2	fix. They
3	MS. HARRISON: Right. But when we
4	trap the water so now, at present, it
5	goes downstream and is diluted. Right?
6	My concern is when it is held as standing
7	water in the type of temperatures that we
8	have in central Mississippi that that may
9	cause some issues with the water chemistry
10	and with the smell and safety of the water
11	that's held behind the weir. So I was
12	just wondering how the inputs to that
13	would be mitigated.
14	And my second question is, where will
15	the will the drinking water be pulled
16	from the water behind the weir, or will it
17	be in a downstream downstream of the
18	weir or where?
19	MR. CONSTANCE: So I'll let Keith,
20	can you answer the question about the
21	location of the intake?
22	MR. TURNER: Yeah. So the proposed
23	intake would be above the weir because you
24	need to have a standing pool. But let me
25	point out a few things. You mentioned

1	point sources above the weir. There are
2	no actual point sources. There's actually
3	one intermittent point source at the
4	wastewater I mean, at the drinking
5	water plant at O.B. Curtis that can
6	discharge. There are no point sources
7	within the project area of wastewater.
8	Point source implies a point of
9	discharge, which would have to be a
10	treated, permitted discharge, so it
11	wouldn't be raw sewage anyway. North of
12	the Ross Barnett Reservoir, you have
13	multiple point sources that discharge
14	treated wastewater that flows down into
15	the reservoir. We drink that water
16	because it's treated before it's used, but
17	it's not raw sewage.
18	MS. HARRISON: Oh, I'm sorry. I
19	probably said that wrong. So the sewage,
20	like when you're watching the evening news
21	and people have sewage boiling out of the
22	manholes in their street that then is
23	going into a newly dammed river, and then
24	the drinking water is being pulled from
25	that, I'm sorry, it would be a non-point

1	source pollutant.
2	MR. TURNER: Exactly, yes
3	MS. HARRISON: So how would that's
4	my question.
5	MR. TURNER: And that's a good
6	question. A non-point source is a
7	concern, obviously, because you do have
8	situations like that occurring right now.
9	But as the Corps has already mentioned
10	and certainly can expand upon, there is
11	multiple projects underway right now to
12	address all of that. EPA has a consent
13	order with the Jackson folks, and they're
14	having to fix it.
15	Jackson water, the new entity that was
16	created that took over the sewer, they're
17	in the process; they've already got
18	projects underway. They've fixed numerous
19	bypasses and other raw wastewater that is
20	discharged in the river right now.
21	By the time anything like this,
22	whatever project is decided, you're
23	talking years from now, and their plan is
24	to have those wastewater non-point source
25	problems fixed.

1	MS. HARRISON: So all of the
2	non-point source pollutants, and sewage
3	specifically, would be completely fixed
4	before any construction happened and
5	before anybody gets their drinking water
6	from a standing collection of that
7	wastewater?
8	MR. TURNER: I didn't say that in
9	sequence. There's a lot of things
10	associated when the Corps has to pick a
11	project. The City of Jackson would have
12	to determine if they wanted to locate a
13	plant at that location and have a
14	withdrawal as well.
15	And, of course, I don't know what the
16	time sequence is of the wastewater
17	repairs. We know they're underway, and
18	it's a published schedule we have, and
19	that's over the next, I think, five to ten
20	years. So there's a lot of variables that
21	you're asking for, and there's a lot of
22	parties. Not all of them are in the room.
23	MS. HARRISON: Yeah. So we're just
24	not sure when what sequence and when
25	that'll happen. Okay. Thank you.

1	Do you have plans to relocate the
2	proposed threatened and endangered mussels
3	in the area of planned excavation in
4	Alternatives D and E?
5	I did want to say one more thing.
6	Jackson and the Pearl River itself,
7	Jackson was settled because of the Pearl
8	River; and the Pearl River is named
9	because of the freshwater pearly mussels
10	that inhabit this reach of the river.
11	So are those going to be are the
12	threatened and endangered species going to
13	be removed and relocated?
14	MR. CONSTANCE: The individuals that
15	actually do the dives and determine, you
16	know, their existence and then working
17	with them every day actually work in my
18	office. So we can get some information
19	and tell you how that actually occurs in
20	any project.
21	You can talk to Tammy in the back.
22	Tammy's got her hand up. She's our she
23	can tell you specifically how we handle
24	all of the species in the area.
25	MS. HARRISON: Okay. So they are

1	going to be moved. Right?
2	MR. CONSTANCE: Well, I don't know
3	I don't know what the plan is. That's why
4	I'm going to send you back there and
5	then
6	MS. HARRISON: They're gonna be
7	moved, Tammy? Thank you. All right.
8	Okay.
9	MR. SHAW: Ma'am, we've got
10	MS. HARRISON: Okay. I'll get behind
11	her.
12	MR. CONSTANCE: Before you go,
13	though, the guy in the purple shirt,
14	David, he's our HCRW guy. If you've got
15	any additional questions, he can handle
16	them.
17	MS. HARRISON: Thank you so much.
18	I'll catch up with you.
19	MR. SHAW: Yes, ma'am.
20	MS. HILLIGUS: Hello. I'm Jan
21	Hilligus from West Jackson. We're talking
22	here about water that too often goes to
23	places that people don't want it to be.
24	Right?
25	Often on the same newscasts, we hear

1	about places in the west and other places
2	where the water table is going down and
3	gets to be much too low. Has anyone with
4	the Vicksburg Corps talked with each other
5	or with anyone from other Corps areas
6	about the fact that when people want to
7	pay for it, they move oil all over the
8	country, all over the world in pipelines?
9	And whether it does not make sense to
10	consider moving water the same way, from
11	where it is not wanted to where it is
12	wanted, and making a plan for that?
13	MS. COLOSIMO: I mean, that's a
14	pretty broad ideological discussion. I
15	will tell you this issue comes up in DC
16	all the time. Right? Is there a
17	simplicity of a network of pipes to meet
18	these increasing demands.
19	And in the climate-change world, it's
20	actually casually come up in the last few
21	years. Again, I don't know of anything
22	here specifically. But certainly, you
23	know, if there's good ideas out there,
24	we're always going to want to make sure
25	the broader agencies are considering. I

1	don't know of anything active in this area
2	unless you do, Troy? No.
3	MS. HILLIGUS: Does it make sense to
4	you, or is there something so flawed about
5	that idea that you won't even think about
6	it?
7	MS. COLOSIMO: I mean, I'm happy to
8	talk to you more about it afterwards.
9	It's not that it's flawed. It's actually
10	just a lot more complex than it sounds.
11	It seems easy to put pipelines down. They
12	all need permits. There's all kinds of
13	things that go with them. And who takes
14	it, what's the timing, how do you decide,
15	those are operational issues that in many
16	cases, environmental permitting agencies
17	would have issues with. So it depends on
18	where you sit on the issue more than it is
19	about the technical ability to do it.
20	MS. HILLIGUS: Why would you be
21	opposed to it?
22	MS. COLOSIMO: I'm sorry?
23	MS. HILLIGUS: Why would you why
24	would you position me to oppose it?
25	MS. COLOSIMO: I couldn't tell you.

1	It depends on where people sit. We're not
2	opposing it. I'm just telling you it's
3	not generally a practical option. It's
4	pretty costly. But let's talk let's
5	talk some more after. I'll talk to you
6	more about it and see if I can better
7	understand what I'm missing here.
8	MS. HILLIGUS: It's very simple. I'm
9	not a scientist. It just makes common
10	sense to me that when you have the
11	technology already to send to send a
12	dangerous fossil fuel thousands of miles
13	away that you could also send water and
14	solve the problem for everybody.
15	MR. SHAW: Thank you, ma'am. Sir.
16	MR. HENDERSON: Thank you. I think I
17	may have been the tallest guy this
18	evening. Good evening. My name is Tim
19	Henderson. Just a quick question
20	concerning analysis.
21	There are some challenges currently
22	with some of the storm water drainage
23	within the city, and we're seeing it in
24	creeks. We're seeing it at different
25	parts. Was there analysis done or how in

1	depth was the analysis with respect to any
2	impact, unintended consequences per se, on
3	Jackson's stormwater drainage. Right? So
4	just in the modeling that was used, how
5	deep, how far did it go, how wide?
6	MR. SHAW: My recommendation, if you
7	would, go back and see Dana Mori. She's
8	in
9	MR. HENDERSON: Dana Lorre, raise
10	your hand.
11	MR. SHAW: Dana Mori. Are you back
12	there, Dana? I'm not seeing her just this
13	minute. David, the gentleman in the
14	purple shirt going right there can help
15	you with her. There she is.
16	MR. HENDERSON: Thank you.
17	MR. SHAW: There's Dana right in the
18	back. Thank you, sir. Yes, ma'am.
19	MS. HARRISON: Okay. I just have a
20	few more. Has there been a design of the
21	weir for Alternative D released? I didn't
22	see it in the draft EIS. I apologize if I
23	missed it. And will that be released
24	during the public comment period?
25	MR. SHAW: Well, we do not have the

	1	design in the draft. There will be some
	2	basic design features that will be
	3	included in the when everything is said
	4	and done. Yes.
	5	MS. HARRISON: Okay. Thank you.
	6	Along those lines you mentioned or I
	7	think the person who talked about
	8	mitigation mentioned a fish passage
	9	structure. Could you tell a little bit
1	.0	about what that looks like and what types
1	.1	of fish can pass?
1	.2	I'm worried about the large-bodied,
1	.3	bottom-dwelling fish that is threatened,
1	.4	the gulf sturgeon, and wondering if it'll
1	.5	be able to pass over that type of
1	.6	structure.
1	.7	MR. SHAW: Yes. And that is a little
1	.8	bit of a detailed question, and Tammy
1	.9	Gilmore in the back back there, Tammy
2	10	MS. HARRISON: I'll catch up with
2	:1	Tammy about a couple of these.
2	2	MR. SHAW: She will be glad to help
2	13	you. That is her right up her alley.
2	:4	MS. HARRISON: Okay. I saw that
2	:5	there was a listing decision for the Pearl

1	River map turtle. That's a turtle that
2	only occurs here in the Pearl River. It
3	occurs in the project area. Now it's
4	federally listed as threatened.
5	Will that will there be another
6	consultation for in response to that
7	decision, and will that happen before the
8	deadline of the project?
9	MR. SHAW: Yeah. That's a Tammy
10	question as well. Now, we're currently in
11	consultation.
12	MS. HARRISON: Okay. And then, part
13	of the mitigation rule, the 2008
14	mitigation rule that's used to mitigate
15	for any losses to waters of the U.S.,
16	which was discussed, is that mitigation is
17	to be in kind, meaning the same type of
18	mitigation, and the little boxes in the
19	little table show the different kinds.
20	But also within the watershed, is
21	there an assurance, or has there been an
22	investigation to see if there is the
23	amount of mitigation property available
24	within the Pearl River watershed for a
25	project of this size?

1	And also, how will those financial
2	assurances be made ahead of time? Because
3	that cost I mean, the costs that were
4	listed in the draft EIS are astronomical
5	for mitigation. I just would wonder I
6	would not like, as a citizen, with this
7	resource being partly mine and my dollars
8	being used to fund it, for this to happen
9	or impacts be made, and then money runs
10	short or not being insured for the proper
11	mitigation.
12	MR. SHAW: Yes, ma'am. I hate to
13	sound like a broken record, but Tammy is
14	your person for that. Oh, here we go.
15	Troy's got it.
16	MR. CONSTANCE: So we do believe that
17	there is enough land available to create
18	mitigation or restore the mitigation
19	requirements. Right? In the basin. And
20	that's what we're working towards.
21	Typically, we'll identify two or three
22	or four of them and then present those
23	because competition drives us to make sure
24	that there's availability of that
25	throughout.

1	The question about setting funds
2	aside, mitigation is a project feature.
3	It is not different than, say, the weir.
4	In addition, that law indicates that you
5	should do mitigation before or concurrent.
6	So those actions would go together.
7	So when we get authorized for a
8	project, the cost of mitigation is
9	included. We've identified local sources.
10	It's almost always in the basin. If it's
11	not in the basin, we have to go up almost
12	mostly to the Secretary to get out of the
13	basin.
14	So we don't believe that's going to
15	happen, and we tell you that it will be
16	part of the plan.
17	MS. HARRISON: Okay. That's good to
18	know. And then there was mention of
19	monitoring an adaptive management plan for
20	the mitigation. Is that going to be
21	present to the public as well?
22	MR. CONSTANCE: Yes. As part of the
23	mitigation plan, we develop
24	pre-monitoring, post-monitoring, and we
25	monitor to success. And at the point of

1	success, we turn it over to the sponsor to
2	maintain in perpetuity.
3	MS. HARRISON: Is there a date of the
4	release of that plan?
5	MR. CONSTANCE: We hope to have that
6	plan in the final. We're working towards
7	that. Hopefully we can get to that, but
8	we'll keep you up on it, whether it'll be
9	in the final or subsequently developed.
10	MS. HARRISON: Okay. Thank you. And
11	my final question is about the PA for the
12	cultural resources, that agreement. Will
13	the cultural resource impacts of
14	Alternatives D and E be released to the
15	public?
16	MR. CONSTANCE: That's a there's
17	little nuances to what you release to the
18	public, and I think Jason is here. So
19	Jason is our is our expert in that, and
20	he can kind of walk you through how a PA
21	works, what's releasable and what's not.
22	As you could imagine, some cultural
23	resources you want to protect from
24	MS. HARRISON: Yeah. But maybe just
25	the types and numbers and, you know,

1	general information. You don't want to
2	cause any digging or anything.
3	MR. CONSTANCE: Jason can walk you
4	through the plan.
5	MS. HARRISON: But that mitigation
6	and the cost for that would be included as
7	well?
8	MR. CONSTANCE: Absolutely.
9	MS. HARRISON: And that'll be
10	provided?
11	MR. CONSTANCE: Yes. That'll be
12	provided by
13	MS. HARRISON: Because I think they
14	were provided for Alternative C, but
15	not and for B that was dropped, but
16	maybe not for D and E.
17	MR. CONSTANCE: We also have Jeremiah
18	here, too. He's also
19	MS. HARRISON: I have a lot of people
20	to catch up with. Thank you so much for
21	your time.
22	MR. CONSTANCE: You do. But they're
23	great questions, and thank you.
24	MR. SHAW: Thank you, ma'am. Yes,
25	ma'am.

1	MS. HUTCHINSON: Good evening. I am
2	Kathleen Hutchinson. I can't tell if you
3	can hear me.
4	MR. SHAW: Ma'am, could you stand a
5	little closer and maybe repeat your name?
6	MS. HUTCHINSON: Okay. Kathleen
7	Hutchinson. Can you hear me now?
8	As a property owner along the Pearl
9	River, I share concerns with other
10	property owners about the DEIS that has
11	been released, a document that says very
12	little about downstream, and I am a
13	property owner downstream.
14	The Corps states that One Lake is not
15	feasible in this document, but then
16	suggests a slightly smaller lake in the
17	CTO, Alternative D, with the same problems
18	and issues I think that you would have
19	found with the One Lake. This, to me,
20	seems contradictory and also confusing.
21	I am not an engineer. I am not a
22	hydrologist. I do not understand a lot of
23	this. So if these questions are dumb, I
24	apologize in advance. I do not want your
25	answers. I just I'm going to email

1	these into you, but I do want to say them
2	out loud to you. Okay?
3	Why consider another lake when the
4	current reservoir operations are already
5	causing property loss and damage
6	downstream while operating under
7	regulations that are very outdated? We
8	should I don't know why Corps doesn't
9	ask Congress for authorization to update
10	these regulations to help those of us
11	downstream.
12	In the CTO, Alternative D,
13	construction involved reveals the possible
14	impact of toxic hazardous waste sites
15	locally and downstream. If done on the
16	cheap, toxic waste could leach into the
17	river during dredging.
18	We've already dealt with tons of
19	sewage that has come down to us from
20	Jackson. We certainly do not want to deal
21	with toxic, radioactive waste coming down
22	as well.
23	Shouldn't flood control start upstream
24	by moderating input flow, rather than
25	downstream? The study area in the DEIS

1	document is too small and ignores both
2	upstream and downstream impacts.
3	Alternative D doesn't address the
4	increased water velocity, meaning
5	downstream areas. My property is about 30
6	miles down, and I'm expecting this huge
7	amount of water that's going to be coming
8	at a great velocity should we have a flood
9	event.
10	The CTO, Alternative D is intended for
11	both recreation and flood control, which I
12	am told are incompatible purposes. I have
13	an engineer friend who says that
14	engineering principles suggest that
15	combining these two functions can
16	undermine the effectiveness or enjoyment
17	of either. So why would the DEIS
18	statement suggest a plan with
19	contradictory purposes?
20	I want to say that I have great
21	sympathy for the flooding issues here in
22	Jackson. The good that can come from all
23	of this is that we are given an
24	opportunity to address these issues
25	correctly. Effective flood relief can

1	follow Alternative A's plan with home
2	elevations and floodproofing buildings.
3	We should expand this plan while
4	seeking congressional approval for what we
5	really need, which is a comprehensive,
6	basin-wide study. People have advised me
7	to avoid taking these things personally,
8	but it's hard not to when you're
9	considering the situation.
10	The idea of Jackson land developers
11	collaborating on a land development
12	project that threatens to destroy our
13	generational family property, let me
14	assure you, is very personal.
15	Did you know that there are over 630
16	properties along the Pearl River from just
17	south of Jackson to the
18	Mississippi-Louisiana state line? Please
19	don't ignore us. I urge you not to forget
20	about us downstream.
21	I know that a lot of this is about
22	I know that this is really about Jackson,
23	but the decision that you make may affect
24	us greatly downstream. Thank you so much
25	for your time. I really appreciate this

1	opportunity.
2	MR. SHAW: Thank you, ma'am. Yes,
3	sir.
4	MR. RICKY: Dennis Ricky. I'm a
5	resident of Rankin County. Where I live
6	is not subject to flooding from the Pearl,
7	but I think those whose properties are
8	subject to flooding would be very
9	interested in the answer that you give to
10	the question I'm about to ask.
11	So let's say the plan goes to the
12	plan is going to go to the Assistant
13	Secretary of the Army. He or she, whoever
14	that is, is going to say, yay/nay. Let's
15	assume they say, yes, we're going to do
16	the project, and this is the project that
17	I choose.
18	And so, let's say the cost of the
19	project is \$500 million, and let's say the
20	current appropriation does not cover \$500
21	million, but Congress acts, and you have
22	the full \$500 million.
23	Based on your experience of other
24	projects, once full funding and the
25	decision of the Assistant Secretary of the

1	Army is made, how long will it be before
2	the first shovel of dirt is turned to
3	start construction? An estimate, rough
4	estimate.
5	MS. COLOSIMO: So it's a really
6	difficult question to answer. I will say
7	one thing as an opening matter on this
8	that a bunch of us have talked about over
9	the last day in these two sessions is, it
10	depends upon what we pick and the
11	sequencing. Right?
12	So let's say there was a plan approved
13	that had Alternative A in addition to one
14	of the other alternatives. Alternative A
15	might be easier to begin the work, right,
16	because it's got a bit of a simpler
17	approach; but it's also complicated
18	because it depends upon each homeowner and
19	what they want to do and whether they want
20	to be bought out and elevated.
21	So bottom line is, things that can
22	happen simpler are the ones that are more
23	obvious. The ones that require permits
24	and additional studies take time.
25	So it could be a while, but having

1	fully appropriated upfront, sometimes
2	projects take 10, 15, 20 years; but that's
3	because they're fighting for funding.
4	Here, what we can advance quickly, we
5	would be able to start immediately, and
6	immediately is probably on the low side.
7	With permits, I'd say in the two-to-five
8	year range. That's just an educated
9	guess. It really depends.
10	MR. RICKY: What if he selects the
11	National Economic Development Plan or the
12	NED?
13	MS. COLOSIMO: By itself?
14	MR. RICKY: Yeah.
15	MS. COLOSIMO: I mean, it's largely
16	the same answer because there's work that
17	has already begun; and because we already
18	have the money, we would be advancing
19	quickly. So it's in that two-to-five year
20	zone of beginning that work. That's with
21	unknown other things that can come up in
22	the next few years.
23	MR. RICKY: Thank you.
24	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Yes, sir.
25	MR. CAMPBELL: Good evening. Good

1	evening, sir. I just have mostly some
2	comments. No doubt Jackson needs flood
3	control, flood relief. I'm Monty
4	Campbell.
5	We live on the Pearl River down south
6	of here, down around Hopewell,
7	Mississippi. And Jackson definitely needs
8	flood relief. We need flood relief as
9	well. And I just don't believe an
10	1800-acre lake is going to provide any
11	significant flood control for Jackson or
12	for us downstream.
13	When those floodgates were opened up
14	there on that reservoir and they were
15	flowing I don't know how many thousand
16	cubic feet per second, an 1800-acre lake's
17	going to fill up in nothing flat.
18	Probably won't last a half a day. So it
19	just doesn't really make too much sense to
20	me.
21	And downstream, we need bank
22	stabilization. And we checked into that,
23	and the Corps said that they do not have
24	authorization or funding for any work on
25	the Pearl River.

1	The Pearl runs all the way, of course,
2	to the Gulf of Mexico, about 250 miles of
3	river. And when you figure that you got
4	both sides of the river, so that gives us
5	about 500 miles' worth of frontage. It
6	seems like we ought to have a little pull,
7	having that many landowners involved in
8	what's going on.
9	But, anyway, we need bank
10	stabilization in the worst kind of way.
11	We're suffering severe bank erosion from
12	these heavy rains and flooding that's
13	going on. Seems like to me we would need
14	more than an 1800-acre lake that people
15	are talking about here. Seems like we
16	might would need a big, huge, dry, lake
17	that could hold this flood water
18	temporarily and then let it ease out over
19	time.
20	But we've had since back when the
21	reservoir was built in '63 or '64, we've
22	suffered. They'll open up those
23	floodgates when they feel need be, and the
24	water will they'll drain it down to
25	where it suits them, and then they'll

1	close the gates pretty suddenly. They
2	used to do it worse than they do now. But
3	they will shut the gates down, the banks
4	are saturated, and when they close those
5	gates suddenly, the banks erode. I mean,
6	they slough off, and the trees slough off
7	and that sort of thing. So that's the
8	same thing that's going on now that's been
9	going on since about '63 or '64, '65,
10	along in there. About 60 years' worth of
11	it's been going on.
12	And we live down there and have a lake
13	that we irrigate out of, and the bank
14	erosion is about to erode into that lake.
15	So it's a top concern of ours to try to do
16	something about bank stabilization.
17	And the other thing that Ms. Kathleen
18	mentioned, I think, we I understand
19	that the reservoir is working off a 1995
20	plan, and here we are in 2024. And it
21	seems like we need an updated plan for the
22	Corps of Engineers to work with the
23	reservoir and regulate the gates, do a
24	better job of that. We would very much
25	appreciate that.

1	And before any kind of lake or
2	anything would be built, it seems
3	sensible, the only thing would make sense
4	to me would be to have a basin-wide study
5	of the whole Pearl River before they jump
6	the gun and put in some sort of lake.
7	And the one question I'd like somebody
8	to answer would be, all the development
9	that's going on in Hinds, Rankin, and
10	Madison Counties, all the pavement, all
11	the buildings, and all of that, that
12	increases the runoff that we're having to
13	deal with downstream.
14	I'm wondering if there are any laws in
15	effect that make it mandatory for people
16	to have retention ponds to hold
17	significant amounts of water, runoff water
18	where all this construction is going on,
19	so it can be let out slowly and not have
20	quite as much impact on the flooding that
21	we're seeing. Thank you very much.
22	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir.
23	MR. CAMPBELL: Does anybody happen to
24	know that? About the retention ponds,
25	possibly in Hinds, Rankin, and Madison

1	Counties where the development is going
2	on, you know, and we're getting all this
3	runoff.
4	MR. CONSTANCE: Well, typically those
5	kinds of measures are managed by the
6	state, county, or municipalities. They
7	will pass ordinances restricting
8	development and methods of managing
9	runoff.
10	MR. CAMPBELL: Be dictated by the
11	State?
12	MR. CONSTANCE: Well, it's going to
13	be one of those, depending on the scale.
14	MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.
15	MR. CONSTANCE: Either state, county,
16	or the municipality.
17	MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.
18	MS. SEABROOK: I'm Sarah Seabrook,
19	and I have kind of the unique perspective
20	of being born and raised being in
21	Jackson and living through the floods and
22	being a property owner downtown down
23	river.
24	And I just kind of want to piggyback
25	off what they say. Kathleen and I

1	actually own the properties that we have
2	together. And when y'all sit up here and
3	say it takes this long for the water to
4	come down, we sit and we go we're very
5	scientific. We stick a stick in. I can
6	watch overnight the water go up 3 feet,
7	and I can watch it drop 3 or 4 feet in
8	less than 24 hours.
9	Whatever is happening up here is
10	having huge, huge impacts downstream. We
11	used to get as a child, I got in the
12	river and caught mussels. We won't even
13	get in the river anymore. It's
14	disgusting. It's turned from a beautiful
15	river into a muddy river.
16	And I hope that when y'all are making
17	your decisions, because I know this is all
18	about Jackson, but those of us who have
19	land downstream, the impact on us is
20	different, but it should be equally
21	important.
22	I hate anybody's house to get flooded.
23	I think that's terrible and horrible and
24	things in Jackson need to be done and need
25	to be fixed. But what's happening I

1	mean, my property we have is third
2	generation. We have pictures of people
3	swimming in springs right off the river
4	from the 1800s, and it's getting ruined.
5	And we're very passionate about,
6	what's happening to us is as important as
7	people up here, too, and there just aren't
8	as many of us. But we want our
9	perspectives to be considered equally
10	because just because we fix the problems
11	up here, it's not going to fix them
12	downstream.
13	So what's happening downstream and
14	I know we're just in that big purple, or
15	the big box we're not in the major
16	consideration for this, and we need to be.
17	MS. COLOSIMO: Thank you.
18	MR. SHAW: Thank you, ma'am. Yes,
19	sir.
20	MR. RUPAL: Hello. My name is David
21	Rupal. I'm a I live in Hinds County.
22	So I have a question. A, I'm opposed to
23	Alternative D, but I do have a question
24	about Alternative D.
25	If you put in the weir, is there going

1	to be any kind of flood control structure
2	associated with that weir, like some sort
3	of gate that releases water or any of
4	that, or is it just going to be a standard
5	weir?
6	MR. CONSTANCE: So it's an overflow.
7	Okay. It'll go completely over the top.
8	Under a flood, it's almost as if it's not
9	there.
10	The whole concept is to widen the
11	stream. And then when you widen the
12	stream, you get better flow through the
13	city. As Mr. Turner was talking about,
14	you have some areas that are choked out.
15	So under a flood, the weir has really no
16	effect. You heard us saying that. There
17	will be low-flow gates
18	MR. RUPAL: So you're saying that
19	when there's a flood and all that water
20	gets released from Ross Burnett, you're
21	not going to see any increased run or,
22	like, elevation change in whatever that
23	lake is going to be?
24	MR. CONSTANCE: You'll have some
25	changes when there's a flood occurring.

1	MR. RUPAL: So there's still going to
2	be flooding that is going to occur even
3	though we put the weir in?
4	MR. CONSTANCE: No. Okay. Why don't
5	we I can take this, and we can go to
6	the back and work through it.
7	But, essentially, the way you manage
8	water surface elevations in a stream is in
9	the cross-sectional area, how big it is,
10	and then the roughness of it.
11	MR. RUPAL: Correct.
12	MR. CONSTANCE: So you take this
13	stream that's rather narrow, full of
14	trees, grass, and stuff like that, has a
15	very high roughness. And so, when the
16	water tries to go through, that friction
17	causes the water surface to go up.
18	So in this case, you widen the stream.
19	You get the benefit of a longer
20	cross-section, but at the same time, it's
21	relatively smooth because you don't have
22	all the trees and stuff like that. So
23	those two things allow the water to move
24	quickly through the system.
25	Yes. You will get a rise in water

1	surface elevation, but much less, so
2	you're 5 feet at the 100-year less than
3	what you would see under the current
4	condition.
5	MR. RUPAL: Okay. And that's what
6	your models showing?
7	MR. CONSTANCE: Pardon me?
8	MR. RUPAL: That's what your models
9	showing?
10	MR. CONSTANCE: Yes.
11	MR. RUPAL: Okay. Thank you.
12	MR. PYRON: Good evening. I'm Craig
13	Pyron from Crystal Springs. I'm a
14	landowner that is south of Jackson in
15	Copiah and Simpson Counties; and we're
16	losing tremendous amount of land every
17	year from bank erosion. We're losing
18	timber, and I'm in the timber business.
19	And Mr. John Siegmund met with us in
20	Georgetown a year ago, who was over the
21	reservoir at that time, and said that he
22	is operating the reservoir on a plan
23	that's about 30 years old. And to me, I
24	don't know of a business today that can
25	operate on a 30-year-old plan. We all

1	know things have changed.
2	And he mentioned that there was only
3	two gauges. There's one at the Highway 80
4	bridge, a river gauge, and one at
5	Rockport, and they're reading the river
6	levels at that, those two gauges. We need
7	more gauges on the Pearl River south of
8	Jackson so the operators of the Pearl
9	River will know how much water is there.
10	There's been tremendous development in
11	Rankin and Hinds County; and with the
12	buildings, the residences, the asphalt,
13	and the concrete, the water is not soaking
14	in like it did 30 years ago. It's coming
15	down. It's coming through Richland Creek,
16	and then you got the Strong River, and the
17	gauges at Jackson and one at Rockport. So
18	we need some more additional gauges.
19	And to me, I know there's been a lot
20	of money spent and a lot of research done,
21	but how could you build a magnitude of a
22	project like this without a basin-wide
23	study from the beginning of the Pearl
24	River to the mouth? How could you do
25	that? Thank you.

1	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Anyone
2	else? We still have opportunities with
3	our subject matter experts in the back.
4	We would just like to tell you thank you
5	so much for attending, thank you for your
6	questions, your feedback, and we just wish
7	you a very safe travel home. And we will
8	do this again in the morning in Slidell.
9	Thank you all. Good night.
10	(END OF PROCEEDING.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
                CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
 2
         I, Ella J. Hardwick, CVR-M, #1749, Court
 3
     Reporter and Notary Public, in and for the State of
 4
     Mississippi, hereby certify that the foregoing
 5
     contains a true and correct transcript, to the best
     of my ability, as taken by me in the aforementioned
 6
    matter at the time and place heretofore stated.
         I certify that I am not in the employ of or
 8
 9
     related to any counsel or party in this matter and
    have no interest, monetary or otherwise, in the
10
     final outcome of this matter.
11
12
         Witness my signature and seal this the 21st day
13
     of July, 2024.
14
15
16
     My Commission Expires:
17
     February 8, 2025
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```