In Re: USACE Pearl River Flood Risk Management (Monticello, MS)

Transcript of Meeting

July 11, 2024

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

MONTICELLO, MISSISSIPPI

DATE: July 11, 2024 at 6:00 P.M.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - Vicksburg District public meeting for the Pearl River Flood Risk Management Project was held at Lawrence County Civic Center, 125 E Broad Street, Monticello, Mississippi beginning at 6:00 p.m.

REPORTED BY: Dawn Dillard, CCR 1763

1	APPEARANCES:
2	Army Corps of Engineers:
3	Thomas R. Shaw
	Robyn Colosimo
4	Colonel Jeremiah Gipson Brandon Davis
5	Eric Bush
6	Keith Turner Troy Constance
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
1	MR. SHAW: Okay. Good afternoon,
2	everybody. My name is Tom Shaw. I'm the
3	project manager for the Vicksburg District
4	Corps of Engineers. Thank you for your
5	attendance and for coming out for this public
6	meeting. This is the fourth public meeting
7	for the Pearl River Flood Risk Management
8	Draft EIS presentation. We're very pleased
9	that you could be here, and we will get
10	going. I have a remote here, and it works,
11	which is a wonderful thing. So I hope
12	everybody can see. I hope everybody can
13	hear. If I'm not speaking loud enough,
14	please let me know and I'll talk up.
15	So this is the fourth in a series of
16	four meetings. We started out yesterday in
17	Jackson, Mississippi, with two different
18	meetings there, two different locales. We
19	had a meeting this morning at 11:00 a.m. In
20	Slidell. And this will be our finale, if you
21	will, for this round of public meetings.
22	So I would like to make some
23	introductions. Over here at the head table,
24	we have Robyn Colosimo. She is the Deputy
25	Assistant Secretary for the Army for Project

1	Planning and Policy Review.
2	We have Mr. Eric Bush, who is the
3	Director of Planning and Policy at
4	headquarters, United States Army Corps of
5	Engineers.
6	We have Colonel Jeremiah Gipson, who's
7	the Vicksburg District Commander for the
8	Vicksburg District Corps of Engineers.
9	We have Keith Turner, who is with the
10	Rankin Hinds Pearl River Flood Control and
11	Drainage District as our representative for
12	them.
13	We have Troy Constance, which is right
14	here behind me. I apologize. Troy is the
15	Chief of the Regional Planning Environmental
16	Division South.
17	And Brandon Davis is in the back.
18	Brandon is the planning liaison and commonly
19	known as RPEDS. That's Mr. Constance's
20	organization.
21	So, at this time, I would like to
22	recognize any government officials that we
23	might have here with us tonight. I think
24	Anna was here a few minutes ago. I'm not
25	sure. There she is. I'm sorry. So we have

1	Anna Timms who is with Senator Hyde Smith's
2	office. And I'm not sure if Brad made it in.
3	We expect Brad Ferguson with Senator Wicker's
4	office as well. I want to express our
5	appreciation to Mayor Martha Watts for her
6	participation in making all this happen here.
7	I'm not sure where the mayor is right this
8	moment. Oh, there she is. I'm sorry. I
9	think I saw you come in. I apologize.
10	And so, at this time, one of the things
11	that if you followed these meetings any
12	much in the way at all, about a little over a
13	year ago, in May of 2023, we had, if you
14	will, a scoping meeting where we did a series
15	of public meetings. And the current
16	commander at that time was Colonel Chris
17	Klein. Colonel Klein has basically moved on
18	with a different mission, and we have our new
19	commander, Colonel Gipson, and we've got a
20	video that we would like to show everybody
21	that basically talks about that transition.
22	COLONEL KLEIN: I'm Christopher Klein.
23	On the 7th of June 2024, the Vicksburg
24	District published a Draft Environmental
25	Impact Study, a pivotal step in our journey

towards mitigating the flood risks plaguing 1 2 the Pearl River Basin. Publishing the Pearl River Basin DEIS marks a significant 3 4 milestone in our collaborative efforts with 5 the community and local leaders to deliver a flood risk management strategy tailored to 6 7 the unique needs of the City of Jackson and its surrounding areas. We are committed to 8 9 providing a solution that manages flood risk 10 and at the same time enables a wide range of additional benefits. 11

12 It was an honor to lead the team through 13 the publication of this important document. 14 My time at the Vicksburg district, however, 15 has come to an end as the Army's transitioned 16 me to another role in a district serving our 17 warfighters, allies and partners in the 18 Middle East.

19The good news, though, is that the Army20chose a very capable leader to continue the21good work in the district. I'd like to22introduce Colonel Jeremiah Gipson. Colonel23Gipson most recently served as deputy at the24Mississippi Valley Division in Vicksburg and25has been following the development of this

plan for months. Colonel Gipson Jeremiah,
welcome.

COLONEL GIPSON: Thank you, Chris Klein, and for your dedication and leadership.

5 To our partners, I assure you that the mission entrusted to us will continue with 6 7 the same vigor and resolve. Together, we will navigate the complexities of the Pearl 8 9 River Basin with diligence and foresight. 10 For decades, flooding along the Pearl River has disrupted lives and livelihoods. Various 11 12 proposals have been presented, yet none 13 garnered definitive support. In July 2022, the Rankin Hinds Pearl River Flood and 14 15 Drainage Control District presented a locally 16 preferred plan to the Assistant Secretary of 17 the Army for Civil Works, the Honorable 18 Michael Conner. This set the stage for the Corps involvement. Secretary Connor tasked 19 us with bridging data gaps, identifying the 20 21 National Economic Development Plan, and 22 evaluating the merits of that plan. Through 23 extensive public engagement, we've gained 24 valuable insights, ranging from the need for 25 recreational areas, concerns about water

3

4

1	volume, and existing concerns in the lower
2	Pearl River. As we move forward, your
3	engagement is critical. We invite you to
4	attend our scheduled public meetings or
5	submit your thoughts via e-mail or mail.
6	Your voices will shape the future of flood
7	risk management in our region.
8	In closing, I urge each of you to
9	participate. Together, we can forge a
10	resilient future for those who are affected
11	by the Pearl River Basin and those who rely
12	on its many benefits. Thank you.
13	MR. SHAW: Okay. Get our presentation
14	right back up and be ready to go. Okay.
15	Thank you, Madam Mayor. We've got a few more
16	government officials we'd like to recognize.
17	Senator Jason Barrett. Thank you, sir.
18	Representative Becky Curry. Thank you,
19	ma'am. Representative Ken Morgan. Thank
20	you, sir. And Senator Andy Berry. Thank
21	you. All right. Anyone else?
22	Okay. All right. So we've got a
23	presentation that we're going to provide for
24	everybody. When we finish with that
25	presentation, one of the things we have is

1 we've got a microphone set up. We most 2 definitely want to hear from you, the public, 3 any questions or concerns that you might 4 have. When we finish the presentation, we'll 5 just ask that if you would come up to the microphone, state your name please, and then 6 7 express your concern. And so to make things kind of go in an orderly fashion, we've got a 8 9 few rules of engagement which you can see 10 here. I would ask you please wait to be 11 recognized. Speaking time so that everybody 12 can have an opportunity to speak, we would 13 like to have no more than three minutes if you will, per question. And then please use 14 15 respectful language. 16 And so if for some reason we can't get 17 to all the questions or if there's something

18 that you'd be more comfortable putting in writing, there's multiple ways that can 19 happen. You can do it as a -- there's an 20 21 e-mail address right there. There are 22 comment cards when you first came in 23 downstairs that those comment cards, you can 24 fill those out and then you can also use the 25 US Postal Service and send in your concern

1	that way as well.
2	So why is this important? Well,
3	everything that we're doing here is to
4	satisfy the National Environmental Policy
5	Act. NEPA is what you'll hear us talk about
6	it, but it's to satisfy that, we have to
7	document the process by which we go through
8	and the public input is very important. It's
9	something that we need, and we want to
10	capture.
11	All right. And with that I'm going to
12	turn it over to Ms. Colosimo to talk about
13	our purpose. Just pick it up and hold it to
14	your mouth. There's switch, go ahead.
15	MS. COLOSIMO: Hello. Oh, look at that.
16	Thank you for the guidance.
17	As said, I'm Robyn Colosimo and I'm the
18	Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for
19	Civil Works in the Assistant Secretary of the
20	Army for Civil Projects Office. Now, what's
21	that mean? It's a mouthful, but essentially
22	it's a small office where the policy
23	oversight of my boss, Mr. Connor, of the
24	Corps Civil Works Program occurs. Right. So
25	Mr. Conner is one of six assistant

1	secretaries of the Army and he is a Biden
2	policy official. I am career, and my job is
3	to help in that oversight and I do that with
4	my partner, Eric Bush, who's in the Corps of
5	Engineers, and you'll hear more about that.
6	It's really important that we're here
7	today to hear from you. I want to thank all
8	of you in advance for your time and your
9	passion and sharing with us your thoughts on
10	where we are in this important process. Hear
11	from everybody, want to make sure we get all
12	those comments in both verbally and written.
13	So please know we value that.
14	This process has been guided by the
15	scoping meetings we had in May, work that's
16	been done prior times and under with Rankin
17	Hinds and even by the Corps, but it's
18	particularly guided by direction my boss gave
19	to the core and how to move forward to try
20	and come to a solution that we can address
21	with implementing authorities that already
22	exist. That's really important, right?
23	There's a variety of authorities that we can
24	leverage to resolve flooding, but it was also
25	important to know that money was set aside to

1	implement a project, if we can find an
2	implementable project, to resolve these
3	problems that start in Jackson with
4	bipartisan infrastructure money that was set
5	aside for Jackson to implement this project.
6	What the work has happened to date since we
7	did our scoping sessions, it encompasses
8	really important updated modeling. It builds
9	on these prior studies, including peer
10	reviews that were completed by the Corps,
11	Rank Hinds and others.
12	And what you're going to hear today a
13	bit more about is the outlining of
14	alternatives that can be implemented within
15	those current authorities. In all cases,
16	it's imperative that any project we seek to
17	implement dovetails with current investments
18	going on with Jackson, but is responsive to
19	legislation, including legislation that talks
20	about any potential downstream impacts.
21	Right. I know those are front and center of
22	mind here. It's equally important to know
23	that we're aware of your concerns. I want to
24	understand them better. But about water
25	supply, reliable water supply, both for your

1	businesses and your community. It's also
2	true that I know that we're concerned about
3	bank sloughing and those kinds of things. We
4	want to talk about what this project might
5	mean for Jackson and how it may or may not
6	implicate any concerns in your community. So
7	with that said, I'm looking forward to this
8	conversation.
9	MR. SHAW: Mr. Bush?
10	MR. BUSH: Thank you, Tom.
11	First of all, thank you all for coming
12	out tonight to take your time to share with
13	us your views, your comments, your questions.
14	That's a very important part of our
15	processes, as Tom has already stated.
16	I'll introduce myself again. My name is
17	Eric Bush. I'm the chief of planning and
18	policy for the Corps of Engineers at our
19	headquarters. And one of my responsibilities
20	is to provide technical and policy advice to
21	my boss, the Chief of Engineers, Lieutenant
22	General Scott Spellmon; and also to the
23	Secretary himself, Mr. Connor, through
24	Ms. Colosimo.
25	So, as you all know that we're part of a

1	public process right now, but I do want to
2	make a few points here to explain the
3	importance of your participation in this
4	process. From my perspective, this is the
5	most important part of our decision process.
6	We put a draft report out there now, and we
7	need to hear your views and comments, and
8	we'll take all of those comments into
9	consideration as we move ahead to finalizing
10	our Environmental Impact Statement. And that
11	will include additional evaluations that we
12	decide to undertake as a result of comments
13	we've received in these public meetings.
14	Next slide, please.
15	All right. So I'll just start with a

16 very important point. And this project, 17 although we're very aware of the concerns downstream of Jackson, this project is about 18 19 flood protection in the Jackson area. That's what it was authorized for. And so when we 20 21 talk about flood protection in the Corps of Engineers, we use terms like flood damage 22 reduction and flood risk reduction. But what 23 24 it really is about is reducing human suffering, because if you think about the 25

1	impacts of floods on people's jobs,
2	livelihoods, properties, their homes, you
3	know, those are devastating events that we
4	have a mission in the Corps of Engineers to
5	try to help with and ameliorate those
6	conditions. Through our process we evaluate
7	a range of alternative plans, which you're
8	going to hear about the alternatives that
9	we've evaluated tonight and get an
10	opportunity to ask questions and make
11	comments. It's also important for me to
12	point out we do this in partnership. We have
13	a nonfederal partner for this project, the
14	Rankin Hinds Flood Control District
15	represented here tonight by Mr. Turner.
16	And I'll also add that they've already
17	done a great amount of technical work, some
18	of which we are still utilizing in our
19	decision process.
20	Another important point is that the
21	project is already authorized by Congress.
22	Now, that's a very important action that has
23	already occurred in our process here. And so
24	that implementing the project that was
25	authorized by Congress is subject to

1	determinations that Mr. Connor is going to
2	make as a result of completing this
3	environmental impact statement.
4	I'll also add here that the
5	administration and Congress have set aside
6	funds to initiate design and construction
7	activities for flood protection project in
8	Jackson after our required evaluations have
9	been completed.
10	And finally, you know, as Robyn pointed
11	out, her very explicit direction we received
12	from Mr. Connor himself, we are preparing an
13	Environmental Impact Statement to inform you,
14	the public, and also the agencies that have a
15	role in implementing the civil works process
16	project. And we are in the middle of that
17	public process right now, that public comment
18	period. That initiated in June, it completes
19	on August 6. So we're right in the middle of
20	that comment period right now.
21	And so I want to thank you all again for
22	allowing me to be here and for you all coming
23	out tonight to share your comments and
24	questions. And we'll be happy to take your
25	questions and try to answer those questions

	at the conclusion of the briefing.
	Now, I'll turn the presentation over to
	3 Mr. Turner.
4	4 MR. TURNER: Thank you, Mr. Bush.
	5 I'm going to give a little background.
	5 Some of you are probably familiar with as far
	as what we're dealing with in Jackson and
8	what the Pearl River is about. As many of
9	you are aware, of course, Jackson has had
1() flooding since its origination, and as
11	Jackson grew the flooding became more and
12	2 more difficult to the point of where in the
13	3 1960s the Corps came in and constructed
14	4 levees, which I'll mention a little bit
1	5 later, but it's flooded regularly.
16	5 In 1979, I believe you all had a
17	7 significant flood here as well in '79. We
18	had our flood of record where Interstate 55
19	was under water, downtown was under water,
20) the wastewater treatment plant went under
2	water and put raw sewage coming down to y'all
22	and communities below you for almost a year.
23	3 Since that time, of course, there's been
24	4 other floods, '82 and '83. And then more
25	recently as 2020 and 2022, we had floods.

1	The 2020 flood was actually the third flood
2	of record and would have been dramatically
3	worse, but for the fact that the Ross Barnett
4	Reservoir was extremely low. It was lowered
5	to a purpose of trying to kill invasive plant
6	species, so it had some flood storage
7	capacity that it wouldn't normally hold. And
8	that ended up helping a lot, even though it
9	was still a record flood at the time.
10	So we've been dealing with flooding, as
11	everyone has, and we've been trying to find
12	solutions for many years. As I mentioned, in
13	the '60s the Corps came in and constructed
14	levees. They also channelized the river.
15	They took the area right across from downtown
16	and built about a three mile straight
17	channel, and then they also dredged out above
18	and below that. Unfortunately, as I
19	mentioned, in '79 we still had a significant
20	flood, and that was over top. As you can see
21	from this picture, that is north. The top of
22	that picture is the levee beam over top,
23	that's right there and that's Herrin Gear
24	Chevrolet, some of you all know that area.
25	And that bottom is Interstate 55. Just north

of that is where it went under water. Next slide, please.

3 So since that time, since '79, other 4 state agencies were trying to find solutions. 5 Ultimately, in the early 2000s, Rankin Hinds Flood Control got involved to help find 6 7 solutions because prior efforts, some of you may be familiar with what was called Shoccoe 8 9 Dry Dam, which is a dam, a dry dam north of 10 the reservoir, 60,000 plus acre design, but it was shot down by locals who were concerned 11 12 that they were going to flood. And then 13 later, a levee plan was proposed that went from the reservoir south below downtown, 14 which was also shot down by folks downstream 15 16 through the legislative process. So there 17 hasn't been a solution in all these years. 18 We're still trying to find one.

19Ultimately, a project evolved over the20years to this, what you folks call One Lake.21And the Rankin Hinds folks entered into a22what they call Section 211 Agreement with the23Corps of Engineers to allow us to prepare the24Environmental Impact Statement and look at25alternatives and a feasibility study. We

Jackson Gulfport

1

2

1	began that in '12-'13, finished a draft EIS
2	in 2018, which we conducted a public
3	commenting process for that. Some of you may
4	have even attended those meetings. And then
5	we submitted it to the Corps of Engineers in
6	2022. That is where they took off and
7	started their work. And as you'll hear
8	tonight, what the results of their efforts
9	have been in collaboration with Rankin Hinds.
10	Next slide, please.
11	One of the things that we also deal with
12	in Jackson is we have a lot of tributaries
13	that have flash flooding, particularly on the
14	Jackson side of the river with the slope of
15	these creeks that flash regularly. And so
16	we're also working on projects locally within
17	the County and the City that they're trying
18	to work out tributary issues. I know that's
19	less of a concern to y'all, but it's part of
20	the issue that folks have to look at when
21	we're talking about flooding in the Jackson
22	area.
23	So there's several projects throughout
24	the metropolitan area that are being worked
25	on, millions of dollars trying to fix the

flash flooding projects as well. Next slide,
please.

3 So the purpose of this project is 4 outlined in Water Resources Development Act 5 2007 Order 3104 and prior authorizations, which basically, as we stated here, finding 6 7 flood control, flood risk management for the metropolitan Jackson area. That is the 8 9 focus. Rankin Hinds authority also 10 (unintelligible) within that range.

11 And, of course, as you hear coming up, 12 that goes beyond just the metropolitan area 13 when you're looking at alternatives, but that is the purpose of need. And it comes from 14 the fact that north of the Ross Barnett 15 16 Reservoir, that water basin, of course, when 17 it floods, comes down through the reservoir 18 and it comes into the metropolitan Jackson area, is not a flood control reservoir. They 19 have to let water out and it comes into an 20 21 area that is confined, more constrained 22 because of development and other reasons, and 23 it causes flooding throughout the Jackson 24 area. The floodplain is not as wide as it would otherwise be. 25

As I mentioned, you know, we have both 1 2 interstates, we have Lakeland Drive, which 3 can flood. We have four hospitals in 4 Flowood, which are threatened by these 5 floods. We have thousands of homes and businesses. Downtown Jackson, south of 6 7 Jackson, are all vulnerable to flooding. And a lot of these homes and businesses, on an 8 9 annual basis, have to pack up their stuff and 10 get ready to move at a regular because of the 11 frequent flooding. 12 In addition, these homes in the north 13 and south of downtown Jackson side, many of those are environmental justice communities, 14 15 meaning they're minority or low income, and 16 they flood first. They're the first ones to 17 flood. And these homes, you know, get water 18 creeping up the street, they have to decide when they see those rain coming, whether or 19 not they have to pack up and leave, whether 20 21 it's going to actually flood their homes or 22 not. And that becomes a real challenge. 23 In addition, a lot of these communities 24 have over 50 percent rental properties. So 25 it's not easy to find solutions that can work

1	that also account for those dynamics
2	associated with that. Next slide.
3	MR. SHAW: All right, thank you, sir.
4	So, at this time, I'm going to talk about the
5	USACE activities, things that are ongoing
6	right now.
7	It was mentioned that the Corps of
8	Engineers works under authorization, and
9	Section 3104 is the actual authorization for
10	us. And it basically stated that the
11	secretary is authorized to construct the NED,
12	which is the National Economic Development
13	plan; the LPP, which is the Locally Preferred
14	Plan, or some combination thereof. Some
15	combination thereof is an important concept,
16	because as we go through the presentation,
17	you will hear it mentioned as CTO. And what
18	that really means is that we look at
19	different features between those alternates,
20	and we are able to pick those that either
21	have reduced impacts or lower cost or greater
22	benefits.
23	So the challenge there that the
24	secretary put on the Corps of Engineers was,
25	number one, to identify that National

1	Economic Development Plan, to compare the
2	levels of flood protection for the various
3	alternates, and then assess the environmental
4	acceptability and technical feasibility of
5	those alternates.
6	So one of the things that we would like
7	to communicate to you is the study area is
8	the area that Congress authorized us to look
9	at. And so that constitutes Rankin and Hinds
10	Counties; the cities of Jackson, Flowood,
11	Pearl, and Richland. You can see there's
12	numerous tributaries that are included in
13	that area. And so that's represented by
14	there is a yellow circle that is shown
15	graphically here, and that represents the
16	study area. That's what I just described.
17	The other area is what's known as the
18	project area. And the project area is the
19	area that we're actually going to be working,
20	if you will, work in the project. And that
21	begins at the Ross Barnett reservoir and goes
22	just south of Byram. And so this would be
23	limited to the area where the proposed
24	actions would be implemented.
25	And the last thing I would mention is

1	there is this trapezoid or this kind of a
2	green rectangle there that that is
3	representing an area by which, when the
4	project, if implemented, would be effective
5	from a hydrological standpoint.
6	I failed to mention one other thing. As
7	Mr. Turner mentioned earlier, there was a
8	slide that showed local work that was being
9	done by others with respect to the
10	tributaries. From the hydrology and
11	hydraulics standpoint, our modelers utilized
12	the actual rain on the grid that would fall
13	within those tributaries. That has to be
14	considered when you're performing the models
15	for the study area. And so we've been
16	working with those folks that are undertaking
17	the work in the tribs, and we're trying to
18	account for that in every way.
19	So the alternatives that are actually
20	under evaluation is broken into two parts
21	here. One is the work that was done by the
22	nonfederal interest, Rankin Hinds is a part
23	of that '22, that 2022 report. And that
24	includes three alternates. Alternate A,
25	which was a nonstructural selection;

1	Alternate B, which was the levees plan that
2	was proposed back in 2007. 'And then the
3	Alternate C, which was the locally preferred
4	plan.
5	So the first two were basically removed
6	from consideration for a number of reasons.
7	The last one, the locally preferred
8	plan, includes a significant amount of
9	channel improvement and then a weir, a new
10	weir for the purposes of water supply and to
11	create the lake, if you will. And then it
12	also had a levee plan where some levees were
13	added, and I'll show you those in just a
14	minute.
15	And then so, since the secretary's
16	direction, we worked closely and collaborated
17	with the Rankin Hinds team, and we've
18	basically come up with a modified,
19	nonstructured plan, which we call A1. We've
20	got I mentioned the combination thereof
21	plans earlier. That's an Alternate D, which
22	is the combination that we'll speak of in
23	just a minute, but it includes a weir. And
24	then Alternate E, which is basically the same
25	as Alternate D., but there is no weir

1 included.

2 Okay. And so the details with respect 3 to Alternate A1, the evaluation is done in 4 the 25 year floodplain, and any structures 5 identified within that 25 year floodplain, actions would need to be taken there as a 6 part of that alternate. And so if the 7 structures -- if the properties themselves 8 9 are residential, the thing that would happen 10 is that they would have to elevated. Τf they're within that identified area of that 11 12 25 year floodplain, they would have to be 13 elevated. And to ensure that they're taken out of the floodplain, they're actually 14 15 elevated to the hundred year level. So 16 that's the level of protection they would 17 actually receive. If they're nonstructural, 18 then they would undergo dry flood proofing to 19 protect them.

20 One other possibility there is voluntary 21 property acquisition. And the thing that's 22 pretty important about that is if there is 23 that acquisition, then any places that are 24 acquired then become green spaces. They are 25 no longer allowed to have residents there or

1	whatever.
2	And so the results of that, that 25 year
3	floodplain identified 143 structures total
4	that are within that floodplain. Of those,
5	you can see that 81 were residences and then
6	the balance was nonresidential. So the H and
7	H model, as I mentioned earlier, did include
8	the rainfall on the tribs as well as on the
9	Pearl River.
10	The Locally Preferred Plant, that was
11	one of the alternates considered. That's the
12	one that was originally developed by the
13	Rankin Hinds team. A couple of important
14	things there would include a nonstructural
15	plan. It includes I mentioned the
16	clearing and the lowering of the overbanks,
17	the channel overbanks, to improve conveyance.
18	When you get that 100 year event. We're not
19	doing anything in the channel itself. It's
20	in the overbanks. And so with the idea being
21	that helps you at the 100 year flood because
22	basically we've improved the ability of water
23	to move downstream.
24	It also included the demolition of the
25	existing water supply weir at the fuel water

1	treatment plant and included construction of
2	a brand new weir. This weir would have been
3	constructed at elevation 258 and then would
4	include the upgrading of existing federal
5	levee at the Savannah Street Wastewater
6	Treatment Plant. And then it would have also
7	required, because of the permanent pool that
8	would have been created there, would have
9	required some updates to interior drainage
10	systems.
11	All right, back to the CTO. Okay, so
12	the combination thereof, I mentioned we had
13	two options. If you or two alternates, if
14	you have D and E, and so both have common
15	features and we'll go into those next.
16	Okay. So they both have improved
17	conveyances through that overbank, the
18	removal of some of the overbank materials,
19	very similar to Alternate C. One of the key
20	features that is different between it and C,
21	Alternate B and Alternate C is the
22	addition of the relocation of that weir.
23	That weir is now moved upstream to just south
24	of the I20 bridge, I believe. It's
25	because we're moving that weir up, then it

1	has a reduced amount of excavation in
2	comparison to Alternate C. And it also
3	moved or moving that weir upstream, if you
4	will, we avoid some known HTRW sites. And we
5	ultimately should reduce the amount of
6	mitigation required significantly.
7	The weir elevation that we in
8	comparison to Alternate C, the weir is now at
9	256 instead of elevation 258. So that's two
10	feet lower.
11	The other thing that is similar to
12	Alternate C is that this weir contains a low
13	flow gate, which in periods of drought, they
14	can open that gate up to ensure that water
15	can continue to flow downstream. And it also
16	includes a fish ladder so that species such
17	as the sturgeon or whatever have the ability
18	to move up and down that weir. They would
19	not be prohibited.
20	I failed to mention one thing there.
21	Alternate D, based on the current information
22	we've got, is the likely potential National
23	Economic Development Plan.
24	Alternate E is basically the same as D,
25	except it does not have that weir and

1	therefore would not require, I mean, it's no
2	different than the run of the river now,
3	other than it would still have the excavation
4	of the overbanks, but it wouldn't change the
5	way the channel runs in terms of low flow and
6	for the aquatic species.
7	So this is one of the things that I
8	would really like to focus in on for a
9	moment. So what you're actually looking at,
10	this is a it's a water surface elevation.
11	And these lines represent the water surface
12	elevation. On this side it represents the
13	upstream, if you will. This side over here
14	represents downstream with respect to the
15	river. So we always compare any of our
16	alternates against the without project. In
17	other words, the condition as it currently
18	is. The without project is this kind of blue
19	line that runs right here. The with project
20	is this line right here. I point this out
21	for one reason here in particular, that five
22	feet is five feet of reduction between the
23	without project or current condition and with
24	the project in place, that is basically the
25	location of the weir with respect to upstream

1	going downstream is about that point right
2	there. A point of reference there was the
3	Gallatin Street landfill. Richland Creek is
4	here.
5	And then you'll notice there is a slight
6	bit of what we would call inducement there.
7	And the inducement there is about six inches
8	with, I think, plus or minus three inches
9	with respect to the accuracy of the model.
10	And so the hydrological impacts, if you will
11	resolve about five miles north of Monticello
12	here. Our H and H modeling, that's what they
13	show that there really will not be any
14	discernible impacts once you get south of
15	that point or downriver.
16	We also recognize that there's something
17	that needs to happen that we will not, you
18	know, we haven't done yet and that's the
19	sedimentation model and that will occur in
20	the next phase.
21	Okay. At this time, I'm going to ask
22	Brandon to come up. He's going to start
23	talking to the environmental side.
24	MR. DAVIS: Well, good afternoon, Madam
25	Mayor. Thank you for the hospitality and

1	giving me a tour around this place a little
2	earlier, a beautiful place you have here.
3	And to our public officials and first
4	responders, thank you for your service for
5	being here tonight. It's after 6:00 on a
6	Thursday, supper time, so we appreciate you
7	being here and your commitment helping us
8	make this a better project.
9	I'm Brandon Davis. I'm your planning
10	lead out of the Vicksburg District. Tonight,
11	these next few slides, we're going to talk
12	about the National Environmental Policy Act.
13	NEPA is what I'll call it. I'm going to go
14	through that, but I want to set the table on
15	a couple of things.
16	We as the Corps of Engineers, we are a
17	risk informed decision making organization.
18	That's the type of planning we do. What that
19	means is we're going to take the best
20	information that we have available at the
21	time. We're going to tag and put risk on
22	that and we're going to continue to come back
23	and visit to see are we doing what we need to
24	be doing? Do we need to do something more
25	along those lines? And that's really what

1	it's about, taking the best information we
2	have at the time, identifying and putting a
3	risk with it and then moving forward. That's
4	what we've done so far with the CIS. This is
5	a draft. This is not a final. There are
6	still some areas that need some improvement,
7	and that's the reason we're here tonight,
8	because we're relying on you guys to help us
9	make this a better product.
10	Another commitment I have to you is that
11	I'm doing my best to answer your questions.
12	I'm going to be honest with you, I'm not the
13	best person to answer all these technical
14	questions. I'm not that smart. But I do
15	have subject matter experts in the room and
16	downstairs that can help you with anything
17	that you may have on the environmental side,
18	economics, HTRW. So that's my commitment to
19	you. I don't want you leaving here with
20	questions. Things may come up as you move
21	along and, you know, that's why we have this
22	open comment period for you to get with us to
23	help us. Again, we're relying on you in this
24	process to help make it better again.
25	Again, one of the good things about the

1	NEPA process is that it's a method of holding
2	the federal government accountable, checks
3	and balances. And one of the requirements
4	that we do with the NEPA process is allowing
5	the public to comment and being involved in
6	these type of in these type of exercises,
7	which, again, is a benefit to us all because,
8	you know, we're relying on you to help us
9	make it better, and that's why we're here
10	tonight.
11	So I want to go into the habitat
12	mitigation, and then we're going to roll into
13	a few more things. First thing on the
14	habitat mitigation here is that what you're
15	going to see is that we are not we have
16	Alternative C and the CTO with Alternative D
17	and E. You're not going to see the
18	nonstructural Alternative A1 up there because
19	we are assuming there's not going to be
20	any not expected to have any reasonably
21	foreseeable environmental impacts with those
22	alternatives. So you're not going to see
23	that on this slide here. But what you are
24	seeing here for the Alternative C and the
25	CTO, we're going to look at the acres that

1	are impacted here, and then we're going to
2	talk about the AAHUs, and we'll go into a
3	little detail what that is.
4	So if we look at Alternative C, the
5	river widening project, the Locally Preferred
6	Plan, you can see the various types of
7	habitats here, open water, bottomland,
8	hardwood swamp, and you can see what the
9	acres impacted are. You compare that to
10	the what we're calling the CTO,
11	Alternative D and Alternative E, you can see
12	the reduction through each of the different
13	habitat types.
14	I'm trying to make sure I've got my
15	notes correct on this. So also, the second
16	thing here that we're looking at here, we're
17	looking at the AAHUs. AAHU is an Average
18	Annual Habitat Unit, and that represents the
19	function and the values of a particular
20	habitat. So when we mitigate for land and
21	projects in the Corps of Engineers, it's not
22	going to be we're going to look at the
23	functions that are lost, and it's not going
24	to be a one to one acres that we look at.
25	For an example, you know, Tupelo swamp, the

1	value of Tupelo swamp being, you know,
2	damaged or taken away, probably more than
3	likely is going to hold more value than open
4	land. So we have to look at that and we have
5	to figure what the impacts are, and that's
6	one of the ways that we go through the
7	mitigation process.
8	Our terrestrial impacts were determined
9	by running a certified Habitat Evaluation
10	Process model HEP. This is completed by our
11	nonfederal interest contractor who did a
12	great job on that, and it's been presented in
13	the EIS.
14	And also, I wanted to point out to you
15	that our team is currently working on a
16	mitigation plan, and that will be completed
17	prior to the construction activities. The
18	reason that's not completed is, again, it's
19	part of the process. This is a draft. We
20	need input for you. We also need direction
21	from the secretary's office on what route are
22	we going to go so we can make the final
23	adjustments to that.
24	So this next slide here, threatened
25	endangered species slide. In the table

1	you're going to see there are eight species
2	of concern in the study area. It should be
3	noted again, like we talked about on the
4	mitigation slide, Alternative A1 is not
5	present here. We're not expecting any
6	reasonable, foreseeable impacts to a
7	threatened endangered species with this
8	alternative. Our team has worked really
9	close and collaborated with our sister
10	agency, US Fish and Wildlife Services, to
11	making the determinations that we have here.
12	We're going to talk about those
13	determinations right now. But I wanted to
14	point that out. This wasn't something that
15	our people just decided what the
16	determination is going to be. We have had
17	collaboration with other federal agencies
18	while we're doing this.
19	So, for example, here we'll look at the
20	Gulf sturgeon in Alternative C. You see LAA,
21	and then you come down on the Northern
22	Long-eared Bat and you see NLAA. So what
23	does that mean? The LAA is likely to
24	adversely affect, but not likely to
25	jeopardize the continuing existence of. And

Page 38

1	whereas, the NLA is not likely to adversely
2	affect. Now, what you're going to know is,
3	is that the impacts for Alternative C and the
4	alternative of the CTO are the same. And the
5	reason behind that is, is like it's
6	assumed that, like Alternative C and the
7	construction of the CTO and weir could likely
8	eliminate some riverine habitat. We are very
9	familiar with that and we understand that.
10	A velocity analysis like has been
11	conducted for Alternative C, is being
12	conducted to better understand the potential
13	impact of the CTO on the riverine system.
14	Very important that we understand how would
15	that impact Gulf Sturgeon and other type of
16	species that could be impacted.
17	Alternative E, the CTO without the weir,
18	the impacts are slightly different. But you
19	can see there are some impacts that we need
20	to talk about. One I want to point out here
21	would be for the Ringed Sawback Turtle and
22	for the Pearl Map Turtle, we're showing LAA
23	on those, potential for an impact. And the
24	reason being is that even though there is not
25	a weir there, they're still going to require

1	some excavation to the banks. And those
2	turtles have been known to rely on those
3	banks, so there could be a potential impact
4	to those species.
5	A biological assessment was prepared and
6	has been submitted to the US Fish and
7	Wildlife Service to read the determinations
8	on that. So that consultation is ongoing and
9	anticipated to be completed by the release of
10	the final EIS. But again, also it goes back
11	to understanding the path forward with this
12	exercise.
13	So cultural resources, you're going to
14	notice that all the alternatives have some
15	type of potential impact to cultural
16	resources. Cultural resources are everywhere
17	around you, and it's a very broad array of
18	things. Like this building that we're
19	setting in tonight, beautiful building, is a
20	cultural resource. So there's a lot that we
21	have to look at. It could be graves, it
22	could be potential historical findings, you
23	know, buildings like this. There's a lot
24	that we have to look at on cultural
25	resources. Our team has done a fantastic

1	job. Our subject matter experts are some of
2	the best in the Corps of Engineers. We're
3	currently negotiating a programmatic
4	agreement with the state historic
5	preservation office, tribal nations, and
6	other stakeholders we have as well.
7	So what is a PA? Excuse me. What is a
8	PA? Periodic agreement programmatic
9	agreement, I'm sorry, thinking of something
10	else. But a programmatic agreement is a plan
11	that we lay out the steps needed to take to
12	address any type of impact. So kind of
13	the if we know that we're going to be
14	working in an area that has a lot of cultural
15	resources, what are the steps that we have to
16	take to either avoid or mitigate for that.
17	Again, our team is having regular
18	consultation meetings. They actually had one
19	yesterday. They're close to reaching an
20	agreement and that PA is expected to be
21	signed before the record of decision is
22	signed on the development draft EIS.
23	So the next slide we're going to talk
24	about tribal nations. The same falls
25	underneath the NEPA umbrella. This is part

1	of the Section 106 requirements that we have
2	with cultural resources. It's a policy of
3	the federal government to consult with our
4	federally recognized tribal nations and
5	governments. And that is what we've done.
6	Currently, there are no tribal lands or
7	rights that have been identified, but we're
8	continuing to have consultation with these
9	groups in case there's some type of
10	identified protected travel resource that we
11	need to work through the process on.
12	So environmental justice, this is a very
13	important topic form that the Obama and Biden
14	administration has done a fantastic job of
15	making sure is being identified and that
16	these groups of individuals aren't forgotten
17	about. So what is environmental justice?
18	For those that don't know, it's really the
19	means of just treatment and meaningful
20	involvement of all people, regardless of
21	their income, backgrounds, race, origins,
22	disabilities, things of that nature.
23	Everyone needs to be involved. It's not that
24	we as the Corps or our nonfederal interest,
25	we find cheap land where low income housing

1	may be and we go and we take that and then we
2	develop projects on that. That's not how
3	things are operated. Everyone's involved to
4	make sure that everyone has a voice.
5	As you can see for the no action
6	alternative here on the slide, in the 100
7	year floodplain there are less than 800
8	structures that are in EJ areas of concern.
9	The actual number is 773. In the
10	nonstructural Alt A1 plan, there are 143
11	structures that make up EJ concerns.
12	And then one thing I want to point out
13	that I've told all the other groups that I
14	feel like is an elephant in the room is this
15	bullet right here about structure inducements
16	occurring from the Alt C and the CTO. As you
17	can see on the CTO, it's showing 52
18	structures. That's not 52 new structures
19	that are getting wet. These are 52
20	structures that are already getting wet as a
21	result of the existing conditions right now.
22	So what does that mean? It means that
23	depending on the alternative that is
24	selected, either way those 52 structures are
25	going to have to have some type of a

1 nonstructural measure, either being raised 2 with elevation or flood proofing of some 3 things of that nature. So just want to point 4 that out. I probably should have reworded 5 that and made that a little clearer. Just want to let you know that is not 52 new 6 7 structures. It's 52 that already exists. But again, we'll have to follow the proper 8 9 procedures on nonstructural means, depending 10 on whatever alternative is selected by the 11 secretary's office. 12 And the final thing I want to relay on 13 the environmental justice slide is that our comment period -- I'm sorry about that -- our 14 15 comment period stops or ends for this, I

believe, 6 August for the NEPA side, but the 16 17 environmental justice and outreach will 18 continue. We have two or three meetings that are set throughout the next coming months to 19 meet with environmental communities and 20 21 individuals that may be affected by this. We 22 want to be able to grant them the 23 opportunity, beyond just these meetings here, 24 to ask any questions that they may have about 25 the project.

1	So the next slide here is on recreation.
2	I want to point out that this is not a
3	recreation project. The Corps of Engineers
4	does not have the authority to justify a
5	project off of recreation. The way our
6	regulations read is that 50 percent or more
7	of the benefits of a project has to come from
8	a mission, in this case being flood risk
9	management. So once you have 50 percent or
10	more of your benefits from that mission, then
11	you can tack on any recreational side. For
12	this project, and we'll see in a moment,
13	there's roughly \$5 million worth of
14	recreational benefits associated with this
15	project that come from boating, fishing,
16	sightseeing. The team used unit date values
17	and updated that to come up with those
18	numbers. But I thought it's important to lay
19	that out.
20	But also it's important to talk about
21	some of the so-whats behind this as well. So
22	you notice that what has benefits. No action
23	and Alternative A. Obviously the no action

one we've talked about being the

Jackson Gulfport

24

25

had no added benefits. Alternative A, the

nonstructural plan wouldn't expect to see any
type of benefits on recreation, but you
obviously would have on Alternative C and
then the CTO. But, you know, that's water
based recreation, shoreline based recreation,
things of that nature.

7 But what you also see on -- the truth of the matter is for C and the CTO, you are 8 9 seeing potential impacts at LeFleur's State 10 Park. Now, the area that is of question of 11 potential impacts are areas that are already flooding and inaccessible. And I don't mean 12 13 to sound caustic when I say that, but it's just a point out of where the land is. 14 It's nothing that what we can tell is affected by, 15 16 you know, walking trails or anything of that 17 nature. It's more of a swamp land. But 18 still, though, with that being said, we've continued to work with, depending on the 19 alternative selected, we will continue to 20 21 work with the park service if we were to see 22 any damages on that and mitigate the way we 23 needed to mitigate that. Mitigation could be 24 additional walking trails, things of that 25 nature. I don't quite know what that would

1	be, but the bottom line is if something
2	that's being some type of an impact on the
3	recreation of LeFleur's Bluff, because I know
4	that's very important to a lot of our
5	citizens up in the Jackson area, and maybe
6	you as well, if you travel up there; but, you
7	know, it's not just something that we're just
8	going to let it flood and walk away, that
9	there's going to be something done about
10	that.
11	So, you know, the goal obviously is
12	regardless of what alternative we have with
13	recreation, with environmental, you want to
14	avoid, you want to minimize any impacts, but
15	we'll obviously have to mitigate if
16	absolutely necessary on that.
17	So the economics is one that that's a
18	lot of numbers up here, and I don't well,
19	this slide is a summary. The next slide is a
20	lot of numbers, and I want to be as clear as
21	I can so to avoid any confusion on this. So
22	I'm going to go through this for a second and
23	try to make this as elementary as possible.
24	I'm not talking down to you. I'm just trying
25	to lay it out in a way that's easier to

understand because it's not obvious most of the time.

3 So what you're going to notice on the 4 cost here, and we're just going to focus on 5 Alternative D with the weir, it's the first 6 one that I'm looking at. You see the project 7 cost ranges from 487 million to \$655 million. You may be asking yourself, well, why is 8 9 there such a gap there. Well, we had to add 10 something risk to that. And because, again, risk informed decision making, and that's 11 12 what we did. Our engineers work together to 13 come up with what they thought the numbers might be and what the values might be. One 14 way that we also are checking ourselves 15 16 through checks and balances is these numbers 17 are currently going through an agency 18 technical review process. Independent eyes are looking at that. The individual that 19 actually is reviewing that is from the Corps 20 of Engineers Economic Cost Center of 21 22 expertise out of Walla Walla, Washington. 23 That is their job. That is their expertise, 24 is handling cost engineering. And he's a 25 very tough reviewer that's worked for me in

1

2

1	the past on some projects. Like I said, he's
2	independent, but they're looking at these
3	numbers to see if anything needs to be added,
4	taken away, et cetera.
5	So our charge from the secretary's
6	office was to analyze an array of
7	alternatives and to determine an NED plan and
8	help the secretary make an informed decision
9	with the information that we have. Do we
10	have all the information that we need? Well,
11	we think we do, but we do know that what we
12	have we're vertically aligned with, but if
13	there's more that we need to add or more that
14	we need to look at, well, then again, that's
15	what we're going to do. So we just wanted to
16	point that out.
17	But when you're trying to determine what
18	an NED plan is, there are a couple of things
19	that you look at up on the front side. One
20	is you're trying to determine what's going to
21	give you the most benefits, the most bang for
22	your buck, and then you're also going to look
23	at what the benefit to cost ratio is. You
24	want that to be above NET or above one.
25	So, an example right here, we want to

1	maximize our net benefits. It's going to be
2	a little more obvious in the next slide what
3	I mean by maximizing your benefits, but the
4	benefit to cost ratio, breaking this down for
5	you, what that 1.4 right there, that 1.1
6	means is that so I'm going to take what my
7	benefits are, that's derived by my economists
8	and engineers. I'm going to divide that by
9	the cost of the project was given to us by
10	the engineers and we're going to come up with
11	a number, simple arithmetic, but it comes up
12	in this case here at 1.4. So what that means
13	in simplified terms, is for every \$1 that's
14	invested by the federal government, in
15	theory, \$1.40 should be returned to the
16	public. And you can see how it breaks out,
17	1.1, 2.1. So you kind of get the idea of
18	what that means.
19	So again, a lot of numbers here, so I
20	wanted to break that down to make sure that I
21	was clear with what all this means. So you
22	have your alternatives here. You have
23	Alternative D, you have Alternative E, and
24	your nonstructural alternatives. And you're

going to notice we still have the low and the

Jackson Gulfport

25

1	high cost. Again, that's going through
2	review right now to see where we're at, if we
3	need to make any adjustments on that. Again,
4	the big difference on Alternative D and
5	Alternative E are going to be if you look at
6	the benefits here. So, for example, on
7	Alternative D, you're looking at 27.7 in
8	benefits versus compared to 22.4. That's
9	the \$5 million in the recreation benefits
10	that I was talking about by having the weir
11	in place of adding for various boating and
12	camping and things of that nature as well.
13	So that's one of the differences you see
14	there.
15	But getting back to the NED plan, in
16	addition to let me go ahead and say this
17	first. So I'm looking at my annualized net
18	benefits here, and I see 8.2, 6.8. I believe
19	that's what that number is, but you get what
20	I'm talking about. So when you compare the
21	1.4 to that, you actually have multiple
22	projects that could be considered an NED plan
23	based on determination of the cost. So in
24	this case here, Alternative D could be the
25	NED plan, Alternative E, CTO without weir

1	could be an NED plan if you look at that
2	number. Then also your nonstructural plan
3	could also be part of your NED plan. So
4	again, following the guidance that was given
5	to us from the secretary's office providing
6	an array of alternatives to be looked at and
7	determined what is going to be selected. But
8	you also have to look at in addition to the
9	NED, you look at the implementability
10	ability to implement, sorry for the big word,
11	tongue tied. So are you able to, with this
12	project, either one of these projects, even
13	though it might could be considered an NED
14	plan, are you able to implement, plus other
15	things have to be taken into the factor.
16	Also the nonstructural, are you going to
17	have a participation rate to for the
18	nonstructural to take place. In some places
19	in what you're seeing you're seeing about a
20	50 percent participation rate on the
21	nonstrustural Come noonle theules not

17have a participation rate to -- for the18nonstructural to take place. In some places19in what you're seeing you're seeing about a2050 percent participation rate on the21nonstructural. Some people, they're not22going to want to be involved. So that's23factors. And we don't know what that actual24number would be for this project, but that25just gives you an idea, other things have to

be considered when you're trying to determine
that.

3 So, finally, the last slide here, and I 4 know this is something that is near and dear 5 to some of you in the room, and I appreciate that as well, is the hazardous, toxic and 6 7 radiological waste as part of this project. The nonfederal sponsor's done a great job of 8 9 going through various phases of tests, but 10 once we know what the alternative select is 11 going to be, then there's possibility that 12 more analysis will have to be done.

13 Part of our regulation is, is the Corps of Engineers cannot build on a site that has 14 15 some type of an HCRW concern. It'd have to 16 be either excavated out, cleaned or avoid and 17 minimized. So you can't have an issue where 18 you're going to have some type of sewer seepage of creosote, or something along those 19 lines that's going to impact the water or 20 21 water supply. So that's something that has 22 to be taken into account and will be once we know the path forward, if we need to do more 23 24 analysis.

25

David Day is in the back of the room,

1	he's a subject matter expert on the board for
2	HCRW, so if you have additional questions on
3	that, he'll be glad to talk with you about
4	that.
5	Again, though, I appreciate your time.
6	On behalf of me and my chief Troy Constance.
7	We thank you for allowing us to be here
8	tonight to present this information to you.
9	And again, the questions, we're looking
10	forward to that, but our subject matter
11	experts are downstairs with the boards. So
12	as you walk out, if you have something that's
13	really on your mind, we hope that you'll stop
14	and visit with us. So, thank you again.
15	MR. SHAW: Okay. Thank you, Brandon.
16	So that concludes the presentation
17	portion of our meeting tonight. So we're now
18	going to enter in a time where the public, we
19	want your feedback. You've heard us say
20	that. If you would please come up to the
21	microphone, I would remind you of a couple
22	things. Please limit your questions to about
23	three minutes to allow anybody else and
24	everybody to make a comment. If some of your
25	questions are of a very technical nature,
1	

1	very detailed, as Brandon mentioned earlier,
2	we do have subject matter experts that are
3	here. When you came in, there were a bunch
4	of study boards down there, those boards are
5	where the subject matter experts will
6	actually be. So if you have some very
7	technical questions, there are opportunities
8	to talk with those subject matter experts.
9	We're video recording the public meeting. We
10	have a transcriptionist who is actually doing
11	court transcription, making transcripts, if
12	you will. We want your comments either
13	through the comment card, the project website
14	with the e-mail address, or my physical mail.
15	So at this time, I want to go over where
16	we're at with respect to the review period in
17	our timeline today. So as you heard, the
18	document, the draft EIS, the Environmental
19	Impact Statement, went out for public review
20	on 7 June. We will conclude the comment
21	review period on the 6th of August. Next in
22	line would be the addressing of those
23	comments. So that's time for August and
24	September, and scheduled for a notice of
25	availability will be in October with a target

1	for a final EIS in December. And then the
2	secretary can take the action of his
3	determination and a record of decision.
4	So at this time, I would just ask if you
5	would like to offer your questions and
6	comments, please do so. I would ask, keep in
7	mind the three minutes, because we want to
8	see if everybody can have an opportunity to
9	speak. Okay, and I failed to mention one
10	thing. You can go ahead and come to the mic.
11	There's a QR code down in the lower
12	right hand corner, which will take you to the
13	project website where you will see the videos
14	from our public meetings. There will be
15	project updates, the draft EIS, multiple
16	things will be out there on that project
17	website. So that's your easiest way to stay
18	up to date on what's going on with the
19	project. Yes, ma'am.
20	MS. CYNTHIA STEWART: Hi, thank you all
21	for coming. My name is Cynthia Stewart. Our
22	family has been in the area and farmed the
23	same farm since the 1800s. Just a question,
24	and y'all's slides are great, but I couldn't
25	read some of them, so if I'm asking a

1	question that was on one of the slides, I
2	apologize. So how long is construction on C
3	and CTO expected to take? And will during
4	construction or after, raise or lower the
5	Pearl River levels? Or is that a technical
6	question?
7	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: So that's going to
8	vary depending on (unintelligible), but
9	normally we need just a little bit of period
10	of about five years for implementation.
11	To answer your question, is it going to
12	raise and lower, it's designed not to change
13	the water surface elevations or any other
14	effect downstream. It's lowering the water
15	surface elevations above the weir in the area
16	of Jackson.
17	MS. CYNTHIA STEWART: During
18	construction too?
19	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: During
20	construction, we intend to have no impacts.
21	And so we have methods in which we manage
22	that. Part of the contract requirements have
23	those in place, it's rather complicated. We
24	have to put some of the construction guides
25	in there, but we consider flood events during

1	construction and part of the contracts that
2	we like, they have to have measures to
3	address that.
4	MS. CYNTHIA STEWART: Thank you.
5	MR. SHAW: Thank you, ma'am. Yes, sir.
6	MR. KEN MORGAN: Thank you, sir. I'm
7	Ken Morgan, state representative going on 19
8	years in the House of Representatives and I
9	served on the Committee Conservation and
10	Water Resource and Chairman of the Forestry
11	Committee. I've lived in Marion County,
12	Mississippi all my life. I'm going on 73
13	years old. All these settlements except down
14	the river, they ain't coming down on mule and
15	wagon, they come up the river. The John Ford
16	home down in South Marion County; Columbia,
17	Mississippi; Monticello, Mississippi, all the
18	way to Jackson they had paddle wheelers
19	coming up and down the river because they
20	could. Me saying I was going on 73, I can
21	remember back about 62 years ago, I was
22	standing on the bluff of the river and looked
23	down in October when I was squirrel hunting
24	and I'd see the fish swimming. Them days is
25	gone, been gone.

1	Along with some of the problems of what
2	happening in Hinds County, Hinds County has a
3	failing system as far as their sewage system.
4	And they know it's failing, but they hadn't
5	made any attempt to treat re-energize it
6	or build a new facility. And then they've
7	had the water problems. We all know that
8	because it was on the news.
9	Well, we kind of got shuffled in the mix
10	that the people down south in Hinds County
11	getting the brunt of the storm. And, you
12	know, when they built the state capitol, the
13	old capitol and the state capitol now today,
14	which is built on the property where the old
15	first penitentiary was, was all up the hill
16	from the high school. They didn't go down in
17	the floodplain and build facilities down
18	there. Why? Because they knew it flooded.
19	But when you get population moving in and on,
20	you get realtors involved and they say, well,
21	you can buy that man's property for a unique
22	price because that was cotton and cornfields
23	all around Ross Barnett Reservoir when it was
24	built. The property owners that owned the

Jackson Gulfport property at that time couldn't go down and

1	put any kind of structure down there or
2	couldn't build a little boat ramp or anything
3	to fish because the Reservoir Board had
4	authority saying they couldn't do it. But
5	then once the real estate people got involved
6	in it, that \$300 acre land and everything
7	else went up immensely. And it's pretty much
8	controlled because I've asked several times,
9	do y'all have a day operating procedure
10	manual for the Ross Barnett Reservoir. They
11	didn't know what I was talking about. The
12	way that thing operates and been operating is
13	over the telephone. What y'all done to the
14	water this morning? Went down there and my
15	boat's three foot below the mark from where I
16	pull in and that kind of thing, but what we
17	really wound up hurting is the people down in
18	south Mississippi. From Hinds County our
19	river has just went to pot. We can't
20	straighten it out. I promise you. I know
21	from my heart that it's probably 50 to 75
22	yards wider than what it used to be. And you
23	can't come from the Gulf Coast, where this is
24	also going to affect some of the seafood
25	industry down there if this happens and water

1	gets pulled out, evaporation every day,
2	nobody don't know how much that's going to
3	take. But what was going on last year for
4	the drought situation, we should have learned
5	something from it.
6	But with that said, if we don't do
7	something to right now to start trying to
8	correct some of the problems we've had,
9	because you can't get a 14 foot boat with a
10	25 horse motor and leave down at Gulfport,
11	Mississippi, and come up the Pearl River and
12	make it to Jackson without getting out and
13	toting that boat because we've got so little
14	water to run through. You don't have a jet
15	boat or something on there you're not going
16	to make it.
17	I wasn't going to ask a bunch of
18	questions. I just want to give you a little
19	history of what was going on. And y'all can
20	chew on that when you want to. The thing
21	about it, it's happening, folks. It's not
22	all just what's going on in Jackson at the
23	reservoir. We got large timber companies
24	that's coming out in 3 and 400 acre tracts of
25	timber. And the timber industry has changed.

1	If you don't have a big skidder and all, wet
2	area and all to get the logs out, you're not
3	going to get them to the mill. That's common
4	sense. But if that skidder goes through a
5	bubbling spring that's been there since God
6	created dirt and packs it in about three or
7	four trips through there, it quits floating.
8	But when it rains, the sediment goes down to
9	the first head of the spring of the water.
10	Then it pushes it down to the creek, and then
11	it pushes it to the river. And they tried
12	some years and years ago down in the below
13	Marion County toward the Louisiana line,
14	picked all that stuff up and set it on the
15	bank. And guess what? River come up and
16	washed it all right back in.
17	So I don't know what the answer is, but
18	I'm not sitting here doing nothing taking the
19	blame for something that Hinds County and
20	Rankin County is wanting to make money off of
21	in a real estate venture because once you put
22	a levee up there first thing they're going to
23	cover, oh, you're protected by the levee now,

the price of that property just went up. And

that's just common sense tell you that.

25

24

Jackson

Gulfport

Brooks Court Reporting 1-800-245-3376

1 Because I got some property at Lake Chotard 2 in Warren County too, I deal with the levee 3 over there. But with all that said, the 4 headwater in Philadelphia, Mississippi where 5 the Pearl River starts hasn't changed. It stayed the same, bless its heart. Because if 6 7 you don't see what the Pearl River used to live like 62 years ago, you go up to 8 9 Philadelphia and put a boat in the river and 10 start down a little bit. Because those folks could paddle a six foot marsh down a public 11 river and run trotlines and all fishing 12 13 because the flow of the river was moving so slow it was like a little dead lake. 14 Now, you take a ten foot boat aluminum boat and 15 16 get in there and paddle half a mile you'd 17 want to borrow a life restraint before you 18 got through. Appreciate your time. If you got any questions (interruption in comments). 19 20 Thank you, sir. Yes, ma'am. MR. SHAW: 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I truly thank you 22 all for being here. I know you did US a 23 special favor. This was not on your normal 24 routine, and I thank you for giving us this 25 time. And as you can see, there is a lot of

7/11/2024
know that this
ago with the sole
ational housing

2	But those we all know that this
3	project began many years ago with the sole
4	purpose of being a recreational housing
5	development. After several tries and fails,
6	it went quiet for a while until the Rankin
7	Hinds County came together to call it a flood
8	control project, enabling them to tap into
9	federal funds. If this were truly a flood
10	control project for the good of Jackson
11	neighborhoods experiencing flooding from
12	their many tributaries, it would make sense
13	that this would be the first thing addressed
14	and corrected in their neighborhoods and then
15	work down to the lake area.
16	The idea of creating a lake and then
17	working up to neighborhoods to try to solve
18	their issues is completely backwards. The
19	entire idea of the One Lake Plan is nothing
20	but a scheme to get into the back door with
21	federal monies in order to fund their
22	development for the wealthy.
23	No river is exclusive to any one group,
24	city, or state. Rivers belong to everyone,

every community surrounding them. The only

Jackson Gulfport

25

1

interest.

1	one having ultimate purview over natural
2	lakes and rivers is the God that put them
3	there. For one selfish group to discount
4	every person, every community, everything
5	downstream is wrong on every level. For one
6	group to decide the fate of those in the 100
7	miles below the project is inconscionable.
8	Spending these years wasting your time,
9	energy, and money by trying to call this
10	development project this development a
11	flood control project, as a taxpayer is
12	infuriating. This time, money and effort
13	would have been better spent by actually
14	helping the neighborhoods in Jackson by
15	dredging their channels, reconfiguring their
16	drainage systems, and putting this money
17	spent into real drainage and flood control
18	issues.
19	Our communities downstream will not
20	survive without the quality of life that the
21	Pearl offers. We have to have water levels
22	acceptable for the 100 permitted users
23	downstream of the project area.
24	Downstreamers are completely against any
25	further alteration of our river and
1	

1	completely against any project upstream that
2	does not directly benefit downstream.
3	If you're going to approve this project,
4	what are you going to do for us? In the DEIS
5	it's stated that you will not have cost
6	estimates for mitigation and habitat loss
7	until the project design has been approved.
8	There is not a plan for the hazardous waste
9	sites, accepting what you just said, until
10	after it has been approved. How can you
11	possibly consider approval until you have the
12	plans that address those issues?
13	On page 11, Item D of the commander's
14	report, it speaks to public testimony and
15	comments from communities south of the
16	project area demonstrated in numerous
17	existing problems on the lower Pearl. Public
18	testimony included observations of extended
19	periods of flooding and extended periods of
20	low water, sandbars forming in the river
21	threatening tributary access, low water flows
22	impacting the Louisiana wildlife management
23	areas, and low water flows and saltwater
24	intrusion into fishing grounds and oyster
25	beds. Since the de-authorization of the

1	Pearl River as the Federal Navigation
2	Project, the maintenance of waterway losses
3	and funding available as authorized by the
4	caretaker status.
5	It goes on to say that we should have a
6	comprehensive watershed study of the Pearl to
7	fully understand the basins, hydrology,
8	hydrodynamics, and ecosystem. It also says
9	that we should have improved monitoring to
10	provide for additional information to better
11	understand how various sections of the Pearl
12	River perform during flood events.
13	Additional instrumentation is desired at
14	specific river miles.
15	So to you, Corps, do you recognize that
16	there is much you do recognize that
17	there's much to learn about potential effects
18	of the lower Pearl, regardless of which
19	alternative is selected. Doesn't it make
20	more sense to wait until we are able to
21	obtain authorization and funding for you to
22	have these studies completed prior to sealing
23	our faith?
24	As I said in the beginning, this is all
25	backwards. You're not putting first things

1	first. It's like asking forgiveness rather
2	than permission. There are too many unknowns
3	still outstanding, both for the flood victims
4	in Jackson and the downstream flood. Thank
5	you.
6	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.
7	MS. BECKY CURRY: Hello, I'm
8	Representative Becky Curry. I have District
9	92, which Copiah, Lawrence, and Lincoln. And
10	I just want to say that I represent 25,000
11	people, and I've not talked to one person
12	that is for this project. The A1, I believe
13	it is, where you go in, there's 81 houses
14	that could be put on stilts or made where
15	they could survive a flood. It worked on the
16	coast and it sure wouldn't cost what you're
17	asking to spend of taxpayer's money. And I
18	think you can double that \$600 million
19	because there's no way that you can finish
20	this project with that. I know that there's
21	a bridge in it that's going to be over \$250
22	million that I know of that can be added to
23	that.
24	It really ticked me off that you're
25	talking about recreation when I don't know

1	your name, I'm sorry, from the board. I
2	can't see that far without my glasses. But
3	you're working very hard with the Army Corps,
4	but you only are concerned about a couple of
5	counties, Rankin and Hinds. You're only
6	concern is their recreation. And, you know,
7	probably the worst thing the legislature ever
8	did was give you the ability to tax people up
9	there. I'd like to know how much money your
10	board has brought in by taxes. You have that
11	number. Well, could you give me a roundabout
12	number?
13	MR. TURNER: No, (unintelligible).
14	MS. BECKY CURRY: Well, could you give
15	me a round about number?
16	MR. TURNER: It's about a million
17	dollars a year.
18	MS. BECKY CURRY: About you make
19	so how many years has that gone on?
20	MR. TURNER: Since the '60s. And of
21	that (unintelligible) goes to our maintenance
22	and (unintelligible) stations.
23	MS. BECKY CURRY: So you spend a million
24	dollars a year?
25	MR. TURNER: It sure appears like that.

1	MS. BECKY CURRY: So my question is,
2	y'all are making money to tend to your
3	problems, but everybody's only concerned with
4	Rankin and Hinds, and I need to tell you, I
5	don't want anybody's house to flood. Don't
6	want anybody's house to flood. But we can't
7	worry about 143 buildings when you are
8	looking at destroying from Hinds County to
9	the Gulf Coast in Louisiana. So if you don't
10	have a viable product that you know is going
11	to work, you can tell us, you're going to be
12	fine; Jackson, you're not going to flood
13	anymore; everything is great, we can assure
14	you of this. But you don't have that.
15	So who loses their job? What's the
16	accountability for the Army Corps of
17	Engineers when it goes bust and it's the
18	wrong thing? Who loses their job? Because I
19	lose mine when something goes wrong. I get
20	voted out by these people. But nobody loses
21	their job. There's not any accountability.
22	And let me assure you that Louisiana and
23	Mississippi will sue you. We will be in
24	court fighting over you destroying our
25	recreation, our way of life, our wildlife,

1	our fishing and hunting and recreation. We
2	will be in court.
3	And I just want to say to you, please
4	think about more than Rankin and Hinds
5	County.
6	MR. SHAW: Yes, sir.
7	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening,
8	sir. I'm not a politician and I'm not going
9	to stand up here write you up a speech, but I
10	do have a couple of facts to point out. The
11	City of Jackson pumped over 4 million gallons
12	of raw sewage in the Pearl River last year.
13	Every bit of sewage from Magee, Mendenhall,
14	D'Lo, Georgetown, Pinola, Harrisville, comes
15	through Monticello either by the Strong River
16	or the Pearl River. Why would anybody want
17	to do anything to slow down the water rate
18	coming past our town.
19	And the last thing I got, the Pearl
20	River covers at a moderate level, 33,000
21	acres. If my figures are correct, and I'm
22	not an educated person, but if my figures are
23	correct, that's 1,000,400,000 square feet of
24	land. Have we given any thought to making
25	the reservoir two foot deeper? And how many

1	cubic feet of water would it hold if we did
2	that? That's just some thoughts. Thank you.
3	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Yes, sir.
4	MR. ANDY BERRY: I didn't know if you
5	were responding, I'm sorry.
6	My name is Andy Berry. I'm here in a
7	couple different capacities tonight. I'm
8	executive director of the Mississippi
9	Cattlemen's Association, which I want to talk
10	about first. I'm also state senator for
11	District 35, which is Copiah County,
12	Lawrence, Simpson, and Jeff Davis, which is
13	the Pearl River from the Hinds County line,
14	both sides south of here for a couple miles.
15	In my capacity in working for the
16	Cattlemen's Association, I deal with cattle
17	farmers and farmers and landowners across the
18	state, and that includes both sides of the
19	reservoir and the proposed recreation area
20	we're talking about here and up north along
21	the river. I never, not once have I heard
22	anyone north of Lakeland Drive talk about the
23	problems they have with the Pearl river.
24	Anywhere south of the Pearl River, it is very
25	routine to hear after a rain or some type of

1	water event, the quickness of how that river
2	rises and falls and the deterioration of
3	their lands and the loss of their land.
4	And I heard awhile ago, the last speaker
5	talk about possible mitigation of walking
6	trails at LeFleur's Bluff State Park, and we
7	have people losing acreage, not a damn trail,
8	acreage because of how this is managed.
9	In my capacity as a state senator, just
10	this past session, we authorized and funded
11	gauges for the local Pearl River. Why in
12	heaven's name will you not wait until we have
13	those gauges installed and more data to
14	study? I don't understand that. When has
15	the last comprehensive study been done for
16	the lower Pearl? When has the last study of
17	the Pearl been done?
18	MR. SHAW: I don't have that
19	information, sir.
20	MR. ANDY BERRY: And you're sitting here
21	talking about billions of dollars for another
22	structure, and you haven't studied the river?
23	And you're not going to wait until we get
24	these gauges in to see what's going to
25	happen? I have sympathy for these people up

1	in Hinds County. I don't want anyone
2	flooded. I don't want anyone going through
3	any type of disaster. I truly don't. But
4	this is people's livelihoods, their heritage,
5	and we're losing it. Thank you.
6	MR. SHAW: Yes, sir. And we will we
7	will get the information. Like I said, that
8	will be, you know, part of the public
9	records. So as you come back to the public
10	website, you'll start seeing the comments and
11	responses coming in on there, so.
12	MS. CARRIE SMITH: My name is Carrie
13	Smith. I'm from Louisiana, so I feel I have
14	a vested interest in Louisiana as far as the
15	Pearl River is concerned. We skied in that
16	river. Well, you can't do that now,
17	especially if y'all go through with this.
18	And I live here in Monticello. And in
19	response to your statement, my opinion, it's
20	all about money. Y'all are losing money, and
21	that's why you're rushing it. You haven't
22	done the studies that you needed to do, and
23	you can't give us the facts. So it comes
24	down to how much money has these contractors
25	and whoever else is in charge lost and will

1	lose. You know, people here will lose their
2	livelihood, and they'll lose their homes, and
3	that's just not right so that somebody can
4	have a walking trail.
5	MR. SHAW: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Yes,
6	sir.
7	MR. JASON BARRETT: Yes, sir, Jason
8	Barrett, senator for District 39. And I know
9	it was said multiple times throughout this
10	that this deals with a congressional study
11	that was authorized by Congress for the Hinds
12	County, Rankin County area. And to echo a
13	lot of sentiments that have been given here,
14	have any studies been done outside of what
15	you refer to as a trapezoid or the rectangle
16	that you put up on a slide?
17	MR. TURNER: So, the hydrologic model
18	that we did went way down river. What we're
19	showing you and I'll go through this
20	again. The study area is what's in the
21	authorization. The project area it varies
22	from alternative to alternative, but it's
23	where you physically work. And then the
24	influence area is where you could possibly,
25	potentially have influences. So we modeled

1	the river and tracked it through our model
2	until we saw no further impact. And that's
3	why you see the box kind of stopped right
4	there.
5	If you could pull up so, this is
6	this is what we look at, just one of the
7	pieces of element that we look at. So what
8	you're seeing is that point is where the weir
9	is, that's the lowerings within Jackson. And
10	then we know that we're transferring water
11	down. And so when you start transferring
12	water down, we start looking for those
13	influences. And if there's a problem, we put
14	that into our project. And what we were
15	seeing is about six inches change close to
16	the weir, and then it starts to tail off
17	pretty quick. Down here, it's inches. And
18	then when we get about five miles north of
19	here, it's imperceptible in the model.
20	So what you need to understand is that
21	those models are there's a relative
22	tolerance in which they can predict about six
23	inches. So when we see six inches, we say
24	that's real. And again, it's plus or minus,
25	so it could be six inches, it could be a

1	foot, it could be zero. Right. And so we
2	bring that into that and that's why you hear
3	us talking about that.
4	We also looked at the flow velocities
5	and things, so we're not seeing huge changes
6	very far away from the weir. Now, that said,
7	before we actually go into construction, we
8	continuously intensify our efforts to track
9	that. And if we find things do change, we
10	are required to report up that we have
11	changes. And in some cases, that will
12	require a change, sometimes directed by the
13	chief, other times directed by Congress.
14	MR. JASON BARRETT: Well, at that point,
15	wouldn't it be too late once you've began one
16	of the options that you've put forth today,
17	you spent millions of dollars, and if there's
18	changes, wouldn't it be too late to go back
19	and change the plan?
20	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Well, what I'm
21	talking about is if we see changes in design,
22	that we would have to report that out, and
23	that may stop construction at all
24	completely. We have really good models right
25	now. Some of the best models I've worked

1	with. I've been doing this for 39 years, and
2	they did a really good job on this and they
3	chased it for miles and miles and miles
4	beyond this point.
5	MR. JASON BARRETT: Yeah. Well, as a
6	senator that represents 56,000 people in
7	southwest Mississippi, and I can certainly
8	appreciate y'all being here, but if you're
9	here for comments, I think you need to know
10	that the overwhelming comment is that people
11	south of Rankin and Hinds County, they are
12	not wanting any changes to their river. And
13	the disconcerting thing is, it certainly
14	appears like, as someone who has a vested
15	interest on the Pearl River in Wanilla, it
16	certainly feels like someone's land in Hinds
17	County or Rankin County is worth more than
18	land that we have worked for or our families
19	have worked for. And to see year after year
20	after year, and this young lady,
21	Ms. Colosimo, mentioned sloughing earlier. I
22	didn't hear anything about that today. But
23	we are losing tens of acres every year based
24	upon the rising and lowering of a lake that
25	we have no control over. And now we're being

1	told that this is a project that the
2	secretary is going to decide on in December.
3	We're here for public comments, but we're not
4	going to wait until the studies are back that
5	Senator Barry was just referring to, because
6	we're going to make a decision in December.
7	I can tell you it's very frustrating as
8	citizens of southwest Mississippi. And I
9	think, since you guys are having a public
10	comment time, I'm glad you're here, and I'm
11	glad you know that at this point, we do not
12	support this.
13	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Y'all have a dam
15	up here that I don't know who's
16	controlling it, but they let that dam fill up
17	to the top before they ever do it. When they
18	open the gates, we get it. When we get it
19	we're on a river right now and you can't
20	hardly navigate it because of all the trees
21	and stuff. If you want to spend some money,
22	spend some money for the Gulf Coast, clearing
23	out Pearl River, and then you won't have to
24	worry about putting a lot of dams in it.
25	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've got a lot of 2 questions, but y'all don't have time to 3 answer them, so I'm just gonna make a 4 statement. There was an older man here 5 awhile ago but he had to leave out. He --I've listened to him and another old 6 7 gentleman from Rockport talk about the Pearl River. Before the reservoir that he's got 8 9 pictures. It was level. And the steamboat 10 coming up at Rockport. Well, then they said, oh, the reservoir's not going to change it 11 12 that much. Go to my place at Crock Fork 13 (phonetic) right now. You can't get to the river unless you're going to fall down a 40 14 foot bluff. I mean, it's like that man said, 15 16 every time -- the reservoir was supposed to 17 been good for Jackson, and it's been dang 18 good for Jackson. It's brought in a lot of 19 money. And I feel like one of those models 20 you was showing awhile ago is going to be the 21 One Lake Project that they've been trying to 22 push on us, but y'all calling it CTO or 23 whatever. Y'all calling it by a different 24 name. And we're not gonna have any kind 25 of -- I think we should have to vote on it,

1	because nobody's giving us a chance down
2	here. I mean, yeah, I feel sorry for people
3	who gets flooded, but I feel about as sorry
4	for them as they feel for us down here. I'm
5	sorry.
6	MAYOR JUSTIN MCKENZIE: Hello, I'm Mayor
7	Justin McKenzie, and I'm from Columbia,
8	Mississippi. I don't have a well-written
9	statement like Ms. Martha did. She was
10	prepared to go through that spiel. But I
11	want to say I echo everything she said, and
12	everything that I've heard these people say
13	so far has been in line with the same
14	sentiments that I have and that I've heard
15	from people in our community.
16	I represent about 6,800 people in the
17	City of Columbia.
18	And I think based on some of the folks
19	that I see here from Marion County, I can
20	kind of speak for some of them as well. I
21	grew up on the river. At four years old, I
22	was driving a boat up and down the river down
23	in Marion County, going with my grandfather,
24	fishing. We ran trotlines in the morning, we
25	ran them in the evening. I can talk about

1	all these mushy little things all day long,
2	but I can tell you that the experiences that
3	I had with him are memories that I have today
4	because of an opportunity I had then. He
5	died before I graduated high school. You
6	know, I don't have time to make memories with
7	him today, but those memories were made back
8	on that river way back when, and I hope to
9	never, ever forget that.
10	I understand that flooding is an issue
11	up there. In the slide earlier, we were less
12	than 200 homes would be elevated. I believe
13	it was 170 something could be potentially
14	impacted and elevated.
15	In the 2020 flood, our town received
16	significant damage. I'm still dealing with
17	MEMA and FEMA to obtain all of our
18	reimbursement for money that was spent then.
19	Why did we receive significant damage? Most
20	of the homes did not. I had very few very
21	minimal amount of homes that were damaged.
22	But I had Highway 98 working as a levee down
23	there. It was restricting the water flow.
24	The level was almost five foot higher on the
25	north side of Highway 98 than it was the

south side of 98.

1

2 I also, in this presentation today, and 3 I do want to say thank you to the Corps of 4 Engineers and staff members for being here 5 and coming to hear from us on a local level. But I do want to circle back to -- the 6 7 flooding that took place and what was stated earlier really rubbed me wrong. We were 8 9 lucky that the Ross Barnett was down to kill 10 some dadgum weeds. We were lucky the Ross 11 Barnett was down trying to kill weeds. The 12 damn thing ought to be dropped anyway. Ι 13 don't care about anybody's boat dock north of that levee. If they need to adjust it to a 14 15 floating dock, then they need to adjust to 16 that. But what I feel, and the sentiments 17 from every coffee shop you go to in Columbia, 18 Mississippi, is that when they get good and ready, they dump it on in. And when they 19 ready to shut it off, they don't mind killing 20 21 the faucet, and they will drop that water so 22 darn fast that the river sloughs in. We had 102 acres down here in southern 23 24 Lawrence County that my dad owned. My

25

uncle's back here. He owns some 2 to 300

1	acres right now on the Pearl River on River
2	Road. Convenient name isn't it, River Road
3	run along the Pearl River. It's a historic
4	roadway, has a historic landmark located on
5	it. It floods every time we deal with
6	massive rainfall in Jackson, Mississippi.
7	But every time that it's flooding, the gates
8	on the reservoir are wide open, dumping the
9	water down here. Now, if it was dropped to
10	restrict or to allow us more of the water
11	that's already flowing down the river and
12	should proceed on, we would have higher
13	levels down here. At the same time, they
14	would have a larger capacity to then obtain
15	and hold water until the rainfall stops
16	hopefully. I mean, we're not looking for a
17	40 day, 40 night flood as experienced back in
18	Noah's time. But in any normal event, we
19	would expect that the rainfall would stop
20	before the capacity would be reached and they
21	would have to start dumping. Therefore, the
22	initial flash flooding could drain off and
23	then the river could be turned loose from the
24	Barnett Reservoir to give them some relief.
25	I think that's reasonable management. I

1 don't know who manages it. I kind of got 2 humored awhile ago when it was said by 3 Representative Morgan, that it was managed by 4 the phone. You know, it doesn't matter to me 5 who's up there watching. I think the Army Corps of Engineers, one of your staff 6 7 members, should be managing that reservoir. That's what I think. And that's -- I say 8 9 that because then I think you'd take a biased 10 person out of the picture or a biased board of directors out of the picture, so that 11 12 you're not dealing with folks keeping it at the boathouse level. It's disappointing to 13 see that we would even entertain spending 14 some 600 and something million dollars to a 15 16 billion dollars to construct an area -- to 17 construct a 1,700 or more acre lake in an 18 area that's going to affect 170 something homes when why don't we look at going in just 19 like y'all said earlier, in the flood zone, 20 21 and the low lying areas of the river, when 22 the river jumps up and gets out of its banks, 23 why aren't we widening the bank maybe in that 24 area, dredging it and widening, that's a 25 solution to start helping that. Let's dredge

1	it and let's widen it a little bit. And then
2	we take the overspill area and let's remove
3	some of that dirt. Let's excavate it, let's
4	haul it off. Let's use it. Let's use it to
5	build up the area for the lagoon in Jackson
6	or the sewer site. I mean, I've got to
7	operate two lift station or two soil lagoons
8	in Columbia, Mississippi. I do not want them
9	to flood and spill over into the river,
10	because the folks in Bogalusa don't deserve
11	that, and I should be humiliated if it does.
12	I don't think the folks in Jackson that
13	operate the local sewer and water have the
14	same standards that I do. But I would be
15	humiliated if the folks south of us received
16	that off of us. I don't want to receive it
17	from Monticello. So I would encourage, if
18	Mayor Watts was having an issue with that and
19	it spilling over into her lagoon, her to find
20	a way to invest to ante up on her lagoon so
21	that it would be suitable to hold the
22	capacity and provide from water spilling over
23	in it, washing raw sewage down toward me.
24	I think that the money could be better
25	spent widening, removing some of the
1	

landscape next to the river along the lines. 1 2 If you don't want to dredge it, like 3 Representative Morgan said, I've heard my 4 granddaddy grew up on the river, my dad, all 5 them, I've heard the stories of when they dredged it and they set all the trees over 6 7 here, and then they dredged out some sand and stuff and just piled it up and immediately it 8 washed back into the river. We don't want to 9 10 experience that again. That'd be a waste of 11 money, time, and effort. But I do think that 12 there's some responsible ways to do it 13 without creating a weir or dam in Jackson to create an additional resort style place. 14 Ι 15 mean, 49 percent of that money, I guess, can 16 be spent on that recreation because we'll 17 exceed the 50 percent. I don't want any of 18 my tax revenue spent on recreation of a lake 19 in Jackson. That's just -- I'm trying to 20 speak for all of Columbia and Marion County, 21 and I think I'm in line with everything that 22 I would hear sitting around the coffee pot 23 today, what I heard six months ago, what I 24 heard four years ago when we signed a resolution. But the entire Board of Aldermen 25

1	for the City of Columbia unanimously voted in
2	a resolution to oppose the One Lake Project.
3	And we still stand by that. Thank you.
4	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Sir.
5	MR. MARK HERBERT: My name is Mark
6	Herbert. I'm a local resident here and a
7	fisherman on the river. I have more
8	technical questions than anything. We
9	started out with a One Lake Project and a
10	very big economic impact up there. And so
11	our question becomes weirs. What level is
12	the current weir in Jackson?
13	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 251.
14	MR. MARK HERBERT: 251. So were going
15	to have one project that says 256 and one
16	says 258.
17	MR. SHAW: 258 is the Locally Preferred
18	Plan.
19	MR. MARK HERBERT: So that's going to
20	put you a seven foot lake, is that correct?
21	It's going to put you water level seven foot
22	higher than what we are now.
23	MR. SHAW: For Alternate C, yes, sir.
24	MR. MARK HERBERT: So the only you
25	have one of these projects that doesn't have

1	a weir. So does that mean there's not going
2	to be a lake in that project?
3	MR. SHAW: There would be no difference.
4	MR. MARK HERBERT: What you mean there
5	would be no difference?
6	MR. SHAW: In the current project. In
7	other words, the conditions are there today.
8	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible).
9	MR. SHAW: That's right. Alternate E
10	would be the same as the current project in
11	terms of elevation of the river.
12	MR. MARK HERBERT: So we'll leave the
13	weir at 251.
14	MR. SHAW: Yeah.
15	MR. MARK HERBERT: Not do away with the
16	weir at all. It's just going to be at 251.
17	MR. SHAW: That weir that's there is for
18	water supply.
19	MR. MARK HERBERT: Right.
20	MR. SHAW: For the City of Jackson.
21	MR. MARK HERBERT: For the City of
22	Jackson.
23	MR. SHAW: Yes, sir.
24	MR. MARK HERBERT: So we dig a lake
25	without a weir.

1	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Look. All right,
2	so what you have going on is two major
3	components of the plant. So the way that you
4	can move water quicker, there's two things
5	that really slow the water down. You have
6	the roughness of the channel itself, which
7	could be anything in the channel, trees,
8	grass and all that stuff. And then there's
9	the sides of the channel. So you can widen
10	the channel and that helps convey water. You
11	can remove some of the roughness and that
12	helps convey water. In this case, they're
13	doing both. So they're widening the channel,
14	which gives you more capacity and removing
15	the material so it gets a little bit better
16	roughness. That's E.
17	D, as you said, the same project, but
18	they put a weir in there to contain water
19	MR. MARK HERBERT: And make an economic
20	development later.
21	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Well, the Corps of
22	Engineers are not in that business.
23	MR. MARK HERBERT: Well, it did an
24	economic development study, did it not?
25	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: No, that's not the

1	kind of economics we did. What we're looking
2	at is damage is reduced.
3	
	MR. MARK HERBERT: Okay.
4	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Because it's a
5	different it's its own different kind of
6	analysis. Ours is what kind of damages are
7	occurring in that area and then what is the
8	cost of removing those damages. Right. And
9	when you talk about NET, you want the number
10	of damages that you remove to be higher than
11	the investment that you put in. That's our
12	economic evaluation.
13	MR. MARK HERBERT: So explain to me the
14	difference between putting the weir
15	leaving the weir at 251 versus the 256 versus
16	258 makes a difference in flood control.
17	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: So what makes a
18	difference in flood control is widening of
19	the channel.
20	MR. MARK HERBERT: Okay. That has
21	nothing to do with the weir.
22	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: That's right. And
23	we point that out, there's no difference in
24	water conveyance between E and D. The
25	difference comes in when you put the weir in

1	place, then you start to accrue additional
2	benefits and those come in the form of
3	recreation. So we looked at all of the
4	economic benefit that is associated with any
5	plan we have.
6	MR. MARK HERBERT: So that E would keep
7	the river exactly the way we had it now,
8	would not bother us.
9	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Not quite exactly.
10	We perform pretty much the same under flood
11	conditions.
12	MR. MARK HERBERT: Whereas we put a weir
13	up there, then it changes some dynamics with
14	things of low flow, evaporation rates into
15	August, and that's why you have added a low
16	flow gate.
17	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: The low flow gate
18	is
19	MR. MARK HERBERT: Now, you've not gone
20	from the weir, now you've gone to a
21	discharge. Not a true weir, but a discharge.
22	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: So the weir is
23	designed to overflow. The low flow is to
24	manage conditions like, as you're saying, you
25	get too low in the river you need to continue

1	to take on water after.
2	MR. MARK HERBERT: So if we have an E,
3	we don't have very much change here, whereas
4	the other, we're depending on a local gate
5	and somebody in charge of it, not us.
6	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: We'll need to
7	manage the water.
8	MR. MARK HERBERT: Thank you.
9	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?
10	MR. STEVE ROLLINS: My name is Steve
11	Rollins. I own property behind Homer's
12	Grocery Store. Y'all can't control the dam
13	up there or weir you got up there now,
14	because water comes up so high so fast, and
15	it goes down so fast. What it does is when
16	you think them big shots up there is going to
17	lower your water by two inches, y'all will
18	close that dam up, and it jerks the banks
19	off. I've lost probably anywhere from 15 to
20	50 acres of land. And I lost trees that big
21	around in the river. And how y'all gonna
22	control that with another weir? That's
23	stupid. I disagree with you all the way.
24	You can't control the water now. How you
25	going to control two of them or three of

1	them? There ain't no way. And I don't want
2	to lose no more land. I lost enough. Y'all
3	don't try to control it. Don't worry about
4	them people up there in that lake losing the
5	water going down that far. Let it drop down.
6	Like the guy said, get float float piers,
7	help us down here. Thank you.
8	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir.
9	MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: My name is Alton
10	Letchworth. I'm a product of the MAC
11	(phonetic) second unit from Vicksburg and the
12	Corps of Engineers. I spent 30 years on the
13	MAC secondary. Colonel, I know you got a job
14	ahead of you. I dealt with flood control
15	dikes. And, you know, the (unintelligible)
16	operation is the largest hired labor unit
17	within the Corps Engineers. And I retired
18	from the Corps off of that second unit as
19	chief of the second unit when I retired. So
20	I know I'm well aware of weirs, dams,
21	locks, and what to do.
22	All the tributaries that flow into the
23	Pearl River, had they have been properly
24	managed over the last 40 years, they wouldn't
25	be flooded in some of those areas. They

1 don't keep them cleaned out. So when you	-l
	1
2 don't keep those tributaries cleaned out,	cne
3 water is not going to flow like it should.	
4 If they were opened up, those tributaries	
5 would flow into the Pearl River and some of	E
6 those back areas would not flood because of	E
7 that. That's simple math. It's not hard	20
8 figure out.	
9 And my question is, the dredging that	
10 you're going to do on the Pearl River, what	5
11 are you going to do with the discharge of	
12 that dredge?	
13 MR. TROY CONSTANCE: He pulled the mag	<u>p</u>
14 up there. The material they excavated from	n
15 the channel would be placed in the side of	
16 the channels.	
17 MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: That's hazardo	ıs
18 material.	
19 MR. TROY CONSTANCE: No, sir. We	
20 wouldn't the Corps of Engineers has the	ir
21 policy, but we won't take	
22 MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: Jackson has be	en
23 dumping sewage into the river up there for	
24 the last 40 years.	
25 MR. TROY CONSTANCE: I understand this	5,

1	sir, and we do the regular HTRW testing.
2	This gentleman right here is here today,
3	if you want to talk to him about how we'll
4	handle that, but I promise you, we don't
5	construct on sites that have HTRW. It has to
6	be a clean site before we go.
7	MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: That's your
8	opinion. Our opinion down here is they dump
9	raw sewage in the Pearl River every day.
10	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Yes, sir.
11	MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: That's not going
12	to none of this is going to solve that
13	problem. 81 homes that you had up there,
14	that's going to be done those 81 homes,
15	you could pay them \$250,000 for every one of
16	those homes, and you've spent less than \$40
17	million.
18	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: And I do agree that
19	(unintelligible).
20	MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: So you could buy
21	every home out that's in the flood area, and
22	you would use half the money that you're
23	going to spend on this.
24	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: So one of the
25	things that we look at is that we look at the
L	

1 damages reduced. So if you look at the 2 nonstructural plan, it only has 143 3 structures in it. And so one of the things 4 we do is how effective is the action. So 5 when you compare the damages that do exist, we showed that the 773 structures in the 100 6 7 year floodplain, all of them experiencing some sort of flooding. To justify raising, 8 9 because of the cost that you're talking 10 about, you can only get to about 143. But when you start looking at the structural 11 12 plans and the very structural plans, you 13 start incorporating a whole lot more structures for damages reduced, so those 14 become more effective in resolving the 15 16 problem. So we don't just look at the 17 benefit cost ratio and the net benefits. There are other criteria we need to look at. 18 And again, of course, we talked about that as 19 20 well. One of them is indeed acceptability. 21 And that is how well we would be accepted by 22 the communities, by our partners in it, how 23 well it is cast against existing policies 24 through laws and regulations. 25 MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: And the weir --

1	now you can put a boat in below the
2	reservoir. If you put that weir in there,
3	you won't be able to go over that weir and go
4	lower than the I20 bridge.
5	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: I'm sorry, I'm not
6	following. Say it again.
7	MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: If you put a boat
8	in the river below the reservoir, between the
9	reservoir and the I20 bridge, when you put
10	that weir in there, you're not going to be
11	able to come below the I20 bridge. You're
12	going to be confined to that one area.
13	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Yes, sir, I believe
14	that would be correct.
15	MR. ALTON LETCHWORTH: So if they
16	develop that area there and people put houses
17	and whatever else, one theory is they going
18	to cut channels in there and build houses
19	back up in there on those channels. Well,
20	the only boating area that they'd be able to
21	run in is from the I20 bridge up to behind
22	the reservoir. So and none of this
23	benefits Lawrence County. We get no good
24	benefit out of this.
25	And if the reservoir had never been

1	built, we wouldn't be standing here
2	addressing this area today. The reservoir
3	was built on the idea of flood control and
4	recreation, but they took the flood control
5	off of it after it got built. They used that
6	flood control statement for money to build.
7	That's what they used, how they used it. So
8	it was false pretense in the very beginning
9	of when they built it. And we've suffered
10	from that ever since it was built. You can
11	go up here just like you said earlier, you
12	can go up the Pearl River north of the
13	reservoir, and it's a beautiful sight. If
14	you fly a helicopter from there down here,
15	you'll see banks sloughed in. Up the river
16	here in the summertime, you have to get out
17	of your boat and pull it up the river. And
18	it's all because of the reservoir and flood
19	control.
20	So my 30 years with the Corps of
21	Engineers over the Mississippi River, I'm
22	well aware of weirs, underwater weirs.
23	Victoria Bend, the project that's up there,
24	what it does, it does what it's supposed to
25	do, it makes it keeps from having to

1	dredge, but when it leaves there, it divides
2	
	into somewhere else. So I'm well aware of
3	what how it works and what it does. And
4	in my opinion, in my 30 years from the Corps
5	of Engineers, this is a disaster for Lawrence
6	County. Thank you.
7	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: Yes, sir.
8	MR. SHAW: Yes, sir.
9	MR. SCOTT MCCLELLAN: I'm Scotty
10	McClellan and I've lived here my entire life.
11	I was raised up on the river. That man right
12	yonder, Mark Senter, me and him played in
13	that river. We fished in that river
14	together. That's beside the point on this
15	right here what I'm fixing to tell you. I've
16	worked in that paper mill right yonder 44 and
17	a half years. What's this gonna do to my
18	paper mill? Huh? Come on, I didn't tell
19	you. That mill I'm on a paper machine and
20	I use lots of water, reckon where that water
21	comes from.
22	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 75 million
23	gallons a day.
24	MR. SCOTT MCCLELLAN: Ho do you know,
25	Thurman? He knows. 75 million gallons. You

1	build this and we can't get the water, and
2	Thurman will tell you if I'm wrong, but it
3	has to be a certain temperature, correct?
4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It does.
5	MR. SCOTT MCCLELLAN: So here we are.
6	And let me tell you something, you shut that
7	paper mill down, Michael Sanford, you a
8	supervisor, you and Mr. Lynn Harland, what's
9	that paper mill do for our county?
10	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We couldn't
11	survive without it.
12	MR. SCOTT MCCLELLAN: Couldn't survive
13	without it. You talking about a lawsuit, you
14	talking about some mad folks. Yes, sir.
15	Think about it, people, think about it.
16	That's all I ask.
17	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Anyone else.
18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I ask one
19	question?
20	MR. SHAW: Yes, ma'am.
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you said that
22	a secretary somewhere is going to make the
23	decision.
24	MR. SHAW: Assistant Secretary for the
25	Army of Civil Works, Mr. Connor.

1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, so why
2	isn't he listening to all of this?
3	MS. COLOSIMO: My name is Robyn Colosimo
4	and he's my boss, and so I'm here
5	representing him directly as his highest
6	career civil servant. So he came for the
7	original listening sessions in 2023. We are
8	helping inform him through this process. And
9	so the reason he makes that decision is
10	because Congress directed that. That's when
11	we talk about Congress decided there was a
12	project here of work. We have to determine
13	through this process collectively to include
14	this public input if there's something that
15	is implementable with the authorities that
16	has support and that decision goes to him to
17	make that.
18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I hope you
19	let him know that he's talking about from
20	Jackson, Mississippi to the Mississippi Gulf
21	Coast to Louisiana. We're not talking about
22	two counties. I cannot say that enough that
23	we are desperate for him to have heard us.
24	And I sure wish he had taken the time to be
25	here to listen.

1	MS. COLOSIMO: I assure you, ma'am, that
2	he is listening. And I know Mayor Watts even
3	met with him not long ago, so he is very
4	aware of this issue and I will continue to
5	translate all the things I've heard here.
6	Thank you.
7	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Real short. In
8	1980 I was elected president of the Pearl
9	River Land Conservation Association, and we
10	did get the legislature back then to give us
11	a 24 inch fall in 24 hours. And it helped
12	the sloping of the bluffs, believe it or not,
13	but we've gotten away from that over the
14	years. One question I want to ask y'all, and
15	I appreciate y'all coming in, because I know
16	this is your job, you gotta do it, but have
17	y'all flown from Jackson down to the Coast to
18	see what the Pearl River looks like? You
19	need to be able to do that. That would be
20	money well spent.
21	MR. SHAW: Thank you.
22	MS. COLOSIMO: Here's my alibi, I was
23	not in the meeting that happened in the
24	Pentagon. It was actually with our second
25	political principal that being Mr. Pinkham.

1	I believe that's correct, Ms. Watts.
2	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Next.
3	MR. ANDREW WHITEHURST: I'M Andrew
4	Whitehurst. I asked questions at two
5	meetings so far, but when the I'm the
6	I'm the water. What am I? I'm so tired.
7	I'm the water program director at Healthy.
8	Gulf, the Gulf Restoration Network. And when
9	this document came out, I looked for an
10	economics appendix, and the next day I called
11	Eric Williams, the guy up there, was able to
12	talk to him, ask him where's the economics
13	appendix. There's a statement in the main
14	report that says, see Economics Section, and
15	there's not an Economic Section, and there's
16	not an economics appendix. And I've got an
17	economist who's going to charge me \$200 an
18	hour to review it if I could find the
19	economics appendix. So before the end of the
20	comment period, will there be any economics
21	appendix released on this? There was one of
22	these in the 2018 document that the drainage
23	district put out. It had charts and graphs,
24	and it had the assumptions that were used
25	to all of the things from your guidances

1	and your engineering notebooks was in there,
2	you could follow it and you could see the
3	work, and that's not there now. So will
4	there be a way to look at that or are you
5	going to try to prepare one?
6	MR. TROY CONSTANCE: So we have so we
7	have the information that underwrites the
8	economic evaluation that is in the report.
9	Our economist is here, and he's been tasked
10	to try to pull some of that together. It
11	wouldn't be the traditional economic benefit
12	that you're used to, but it would be the
13	foundation of all the economic analysis that
14	we've done. We're doing that right now
15	because we're having the same request from
16	the secretary's office and from headquarters.
17	And so as soon as we get that together, we'll
18	share that with you.
19	MR. ANDREW WHITEHURST: I have one more
20	question about your history slide. Would you
21	mind dialing back to the history slide? The
22	2007 USACE Preliminary Draft Report compared
23	an older levee plan to the Two Lake Project
24	and the Corps of Engineers, after they
25	compared it and looked at the relative cost

1	said, we're not going to build your lake and
2	we're not going to do any more studies.
3	Thank you very much. And they said, if you
4	want to go forward, Rankin Hinds Drainage
5	District, you can get permission from
6	Congress to do it. That's the story I know,
7	and that's not what that says, but it was
8	done with Corps oversight. So the Rankin
9	Hinds Drainage District developed their DEIS,
10	the Corps is watching over their shoulder,
11	checking that they're following NEPA. And I
12	wonder how we went from 2007 to 2008 when the
13	Corps said, we're not going to do this until
14	now, when we've got the Corps helping sell a
15	plan to build a lake, the kind of thing that
16	they said they weren't going to do? How'd
17	that happen?
18	And you know, I've got a there's an
19	imbalance of power here. You know, we small
20	environmental groups are like fleas on the
21	back of you all and the Drainage District,
22	but we've been to Washington twice for the
23	Pentagon, haven't gotten to meet with
24	Mr. Connor, but we've met with Mr. Pinkham
25	once and then Mr. Leach once. They've been

1	how many times a month? I don't know.
2	There's an imbalance of power here and
3	there's, you know, I don't know how to
4	explain it, but there's a story from one of
5	the early public meetings before 2015, I
6	guess. And it was when the late John McGowan
7	went to the meetings, and a couple who had a
8	swamp tour talked to him after the meeting.
9	He was a very charming man. And the swamp
10	tour couple, they were very attractive. And
11	they told him why the lower waterways were
12	going to be a problem for them. And he let
13	them say their piece and then smiled and
14	winked and leaned in and said, you know, I'm
15	going to win, I'm rich. And I think that
16	explains a lot about this process, about the
17	imbalance of power. And I wish there wasn't
18	a hurry to approve this thing because as I
19	said the other night, you can do it well or
20	you can do it by the same. Thank you.
21	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.
22	MS. CYNTHIA STEWART: Okay, no
23	questions. I'm just going to take a
24	statement. So I said before that I'm just
25	representing myself, my family. And I said,

1	we've been here since the 1800s, and I think
2	it was 18 in the 1850s, so a long time,
3	over 150 years. We have stories in our
4	family of the floodings, where it got to the
5	house. In the I think it was 1902 or 1906
6	that the flood got the highest point. In
7	2020, yes, we did have a flood, but I will
8	say in 1976, that was not a natural flood.
9	That was a man being flood by the reservoir.
10	They decided to let the water go as late as
11	they did, which impacted all of us
12	downstream.
13	My husband and I just inherited the
14	place with my brother and we had the land
15	surveyed and I know I've lost 18 acres on the
16	Pearl River and surrounding waterway. The
17	banks to the river and the surrounding
18	waterway are so high that in order to go
19	swimming now we have a rope, right, we go
20	down by a huge rope in order to get to the
21	bank, and the banks are keeping on eroding.
22	The Army Corps of Engineers built a second
23	bridge over our land and created a waterway
24	so that we wouldn't have so much flooding.
25	Well, guess what? The waterway has eroded so

1	much that it's almost a second egress of the
2	tributary. So I'm sorry, you're adding
3	another lake, another water more water
4	that you don't have control of that's going
5	to come down and yes, I know you said it
6	wasn't going to impact the water levels, but
7	during flooding times, the rich seem to get
8	the answers that they want and we suffer
9	downstream. And now you're talking about
10	more water coming. I don't like this plan.
11	I don't think anybody in this room likes
12	these plans. Thank you.
13	MR. SHAW: Thank you. Sir.
14	MR. THERMAN LAMBERT: Therman Lambert.
15	I've been a resident of Lawrence County all
16	my life. I worked at the paper mill 44
17	years.
18	MR. SHAW: Could you get a little closer
19	to the mic? Give your name again, please,
20	I'm sorry.
21	MR. THERMAN LAMBERT: Therman Lambert.
22	We own some property down around 587 right on
23	the river. I can see the river from my front
24	porch every morning. We had left in my
25	wife's family for four generations, since the

1	1800s. Ever since they built the reservoir,
2	I know in the early '80s my father-in-law
3	walked in one day and said, well, they took
4	300 acres off my tax roll, it's gone to the
5	river. It's on the other side of the river
6	now. And the Pearl River is the property
7	line. So it's the other man's river right
8	now. We inherited the place in 2004. We had
9	100 acres down there. Now we've got 775
10	acres down there. Talking about losing 50
11	acres, that ain't nothing. Lose 500 acres,
12	that's a lot of land and ain't nothing you
13	can do about it.
14	Like I said, and I haven't figured out
15	yet how a little lake is going to help. All
16	you're going to do is fill the floodplain up
17	up there. And when you fill the floodplain
18	up, that water ain't got but one place to go,
19	here. It's going to make our flooding worse
20	when we have a very high river. I remember
21	'79, we had 1,000 acres under water. We
22	had I've had 400 acres under water five
23	times this year. I know about the river
24	flooding. And all the banks, that river used
25	to be lined with willow trees. There's no

1	willow trees on that river anymore because
2	they've all sloped in the river because they
3	dropped them out so fast. I've seen that
4	river dropped 12 feet in less than 10 hours.
5	And you can't say that's at all natural. If
6	they got to maintain the only thing that
7	saved hurt us one year, they had raised
8	the level in the reservoir twelve inches
9	because they were going to have a bass
10	tournament. We had a heavy rain. Guess who
11	got all the extra water? We did. So, I
12	mean, another lake ain't going to help
13	because, like I said, you fill a tub up, you
14	ain't got nowhere for the water to go but
15	downhill. And that's all it's going to do is
16	make a bigger tub. Thank you.
17	MR. SHAW: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?
18	Okay. I just want to take this
19	opportunity to thank you all for coming.
20	Your voices have been heard. If you still
21	feel like you would like some additional
22	information, our subject matter experts, like
23	I said, are downstairs. We you still want
24	your comments. If you don't have the
25	opportunity to either access a website

1	through e-mail and you can still send things
2	by the postal service. So I would just thank
3	you for your participation here. Please have
4	a safe trip home. Thank you all.
5	(Hearing concluded at 8:15 p.m.)
6	
7	ORIGINAL: THOMAS SHAW, ESQ.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
Tagle	an Prooks Court Deporting Moridia

1	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
2	I, Dawn Dillard, Court Reporter and
3	Notary Public, in and for the State of
4	Mississippi, hereby certify that the foregoing
5	contains a true and correct transcript of the
6	public hearing of USACE Pearl River Flood Risk
7	Management Project, as taken by me in the
8	aforementioned matter at the time and place
9	heretofore stated, as taken by stenotype and later
10	reduced to typewritten form under my supervision
11	by means of computer-aided transcription.
12	I further certify that under the
13	authority vested in me by the State of Mississippi
14	that the witness was placed under oath by me to
15	truthfully answer all questions in the matter.
16	I further certify that, to the best of
17	my knowledge, I am not in the employ of or related
18	to any party in this matter and have no interest,
19	monetary or otherwise, in the final outcome of
20	this matter.
21	Witness my signature and seal this the
22	4th day of August, 2024.
23	- Lawn Allard
24	DAWN DILLARD, #1763 CCR
25	My Commission Expires: March 7, 2025