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6.12.4 Plan 16 222

Same As Plans 1-5

6.13 **Recreational Resources**

6.13.1 Plans 1-5

6.13.1.1 Summary Of The Total Annual Loses Of Hunting Days Plans 1-5 Would

Cause Due To Direct Construction Of Diversion Routes (Represented In Dollar Amounts)

6.13.1.2 Summary of Claimable Fishing And Hunting Benefits In the Barataria Basin And The Breton Sound Basin Projected For 2035 (Represented In Dollar Amounts)

6.13.1.3 How Fishing Benefits Are Determined

6.13.1.4 Man-days Of Individual Hunting Activities And Their Associated Values

6.13.1.5 Additional Impacts From The Implementation Of Any Freshwater Diversion 223

Plan

6.13.2 Plans 6-10

6..13.2.1 Summary Of The Total Annual Loses Of Hunting Days Plans 6-10 Would

Cause Due To Direct Construction Of Diversion Routes (Represented In Dollar Amounts)

6.13.2.2 Benefits To Habitat Quantity And Quality Would Be Greatest Under Plans 1-5 224

6.13.3 Plans 11-15

6.13.3.1 Summary Of The Total Annual Loses Of Hunting Days Plans 6-10 Would

Cause Due To Direct Construction Of Diversion Routes (Represented In Dollar Amounts)

6.13.3.2 Recreational Benefits Under Plans 11-15 Would Be Less Than With Plans 1-5 Or 6-10

6.13.4 Plan 16

6.13.4.1 Summary Of The Total Annual Loses Of Hunting Days Plans 6-10 Would

Cause Due To Direct Construction Of Diversion Routes (Represented In Dollar Amounts)

6.13.4.2 Recreational Benefits Under Plan 16 Would Be The Same As Under Plans 1-5

6.14 **State Wildlife Management Areas And National Parks**

6.14.1 Plans 1-5

Plans 1-5 Would Not Negatively Impact Any Wildlife Management Areas

Or National Parks Due To Direct Construction of Diversion Routes; Some

Areas And Parks Will Benefit

6.14.2 Plans 6-10 225

Plans 6-10 Would Not Negatively Impact Any Wildlife Management Areas

Or National Parks Due To Direct Construction of Diversion Routes; Some

Areas And Parks Will Benefit

6.14.3 Plans 11-15

Plans 11-15 Would Not Negatively Impact Any Wildlife Management Areas

Or National Parks Due To Direct Construction of Diversion Routes; Some

Areas And Parks Will Benefit

6.14.4 Plan 16

6.14.4.1 Impacts To State Wildlife Management Areas And National Parks Under Plan 16

Would Be Similar To The Results Under Plans 1-5

6.14.2.2 Impacts To The Salvador Wildlife Management Area Under Plan 16 and Current

Description Of That Area

6.15 **Minerals**  226

6.15.1 Plans 1-5 Impact On Oil And Gas Pipelines

6.15.2 Plans 6-10 Impact On Oil And Gas Pipelines

6.15.3 Plans 11-15 Impact On Oil And Gas Pipelines

6.15.4 Plan 16 Impact On Oil And Gas Pipelines 227

6.16 **Mississippi River**

6.16.1 Plans 1-5 Would Have Minimal Impacts On The Mississippi River

6.16.2 Plans 6-10 Would Have Minimal Impacts On The Mississippi River

6.16.3 Plans 11-15 Would Have Minimal Impacts On The Mississippi River 228

6.16.4 Plan 16 Would Have Minimal Impacts On The Mississippi River

6.17 **Water Quality**

6.17.1 Plans 1-5

6.17.1.1 Summary Of Suspended Particulates And Turbidity Due To Dredging And Disposal

Operations

6.17.1.2 Diversion Of Freshwater Around New Orleans And The Impacts Of The Surrounding

Mississippi River Water

6.17.1.3 Additional Impacts of Diverting Freshwater From The Mississippi River To The 229

Receiving Areas

6.17.1.4 When The Extent Of Water Quality Impact Is Project To Be The Greatest And The

Associated Water Quality Monitoring Program

6.17.2 Plans 6-10 230

6.17.2.1 The Acreage Of Water Bodies That Plans 6-10 Would Impact; Water Quality

Impacts Would Be the Same As Under Plans 1-5

6.17.2.2 Unable To Determine Site-Specific Differences In The Overall Water Quality

Of the River; Water Quality Impacts Would Essentially Be the Same As Under

Plans 1-5 Except For Thermal Shock Effects

6.17.3 Plans 11-15

6.17.3.1 The Acreage Of Water Bodies That Plans 11-15 Would Impact; Water Quality

Impacts Would Be the Same As Under Plans 1-5

6.17.3.2 Further Description Of Water Quality Impacts Under Plans 11-15

6.17.4 Plan 16 231

6.17.4.1 The Acreage of Water Bodies That Plan 16 Would Impact; The Amount of

Acreage That Would Be Converted To Marsh

6.17.4.2 The Davis Pond Overflow Area Summary

6.18 **Louisiana National And Scientific Streams System**  232

6.18.1 Plans 1-5

Diversion Of The Mississippi River Water Into Lac des Allemands

6.18.2 Plans 6-10

Diversion Of The Mississippi River Water Into Lac des Allemands

6.18.3 Plans 11-15

Diversion Of The Mississippi River Water into Lac des Allemands

6.18.4 Plan 16

Plan 16 Would Not Impact Any Natural Or Scientific Streams

6.19 **National Register Properties**  233

6.19.1 Plans 1-5

6.19.1.1 Plans 1-5 Would Not Impact Any Cultural Resources Currently Listed Or

Determined Eligible For, Or Pending Nomination to the National Register

Of Historic Places

6.19.1.2 Full Impacts Under Plans 1-5 Would Require A Survey Of All Alternate Impact Areas

6.19.2 Plans 6-10 Would Not Impact Any Cultural Resources Currently Listed Or

Determined Eligible For, Or Pending Nomination to the National Register

Of Historic Places

6.19.3 Plans 11-15 Would Not Impact Any Cultural Resources Currently Listed Or

Determined Eligible For, Or Pending Nomination to the National Register

Of Historic Places

6.19.4 Plan 16 Would Not Impact Any Cultural Resources Currently Listed Or 234

Determined Eligible For, Or Pending Nomination to the National Register

Of Historic Places

6.20 **Archeological Resources**

6.20.1 Plans 1-5

6.20.1.1 Site Specific Impacts On Cultural Remains And Archeological Resources

Under Plans 1-5

6.20.1.2 Potential Impacts On Cultural Remains Under Plans 1-4 As Opposed To Under

Plan 5

6.20.1.3 Beneficial Impacts Of Plans 1-5 On Archeological Resources

6.20.2 Plans 6-10 235

6.20.2.1 Site Specific Impacts On Cultural Remains And Archeological Resources

Under Plans 6-10

6.20.2.2 Site Specific Impacts On Cultural Remains And Archeological Resources

Under Plans 6-10

6.20.2.3 Beneficial Impacts Of Plans 6-10 Are The Same As For Plans 1-5

6.20.3 Plans 11-15

6.20.3.1 Site Specific Impacts On Cultural Remains And Archeological Resources

Under Plans 11-15

6.20.3.2 Site Specific Impacts On Cultural Remains And Archeological Resources

Under Plans 11-15

6.20.3.3 Beneficial Impacts Of Plans 11-15 Are The Same As For Plans 1-5 236

6.20.4 Plan 16.

6.20.4.1 Site Probabilities For Impacting Cultural Remains; Specifically

Big Mar Site and Davis Pond Site

6.20.4.2 The Potential For Impacting Archeological Resources Is High

6.20.4.3 Beneficial Impacts Are The Same As Under Plans 1-5
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And Major Concerns
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Table 9. Index 253

List Of Literature Cited 257

Tentative Recommendations 263

Letter From American Shrimp Canners And Processors Association 267

Letter From Louisiana Department Of Wildlife And Fisheries 269

Letter From Louisiana State Executive Department 273

Letter From The Department Of Transportation And Development 275

Map Of ***Can’t Read*** 277

Map. Diversion Site: Davis Pond 279

Map. Diversion Site: Near Caernarvon 281

Map. Alternate Plans  283

Map. Potential Freshwater Diversion Sites 285

Map. Proposed Max And Mean ***Can’t Read The Rest***  287

Map. Predicted 10 Percent Drought Condition And Average ***Can’t Read The Rest*** 289

Map. Land Change Rates 1955-1978 291

Map. State Constructed Freshwater Diversion Structures 293

Map. Study Area 295