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I. Introduction

The South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22) project is located in the Mermentau Basin in Vermilion Parish, Louisiana. The project area encompasses the southern shore of White Lake from Will’s Point to the western shore of Bear Lake. The total area of the South White Lake Shoreline Protection project is approximately 5,222 acres and is primarily composed of fresh emergent marsh (2,314 acres) and open water (2,908 acres) habitats (USACE 2002). (See Appendix A)

The South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project was authorized by Section 303(a) of Title III Public Law 101-646, the Coastal Wetlands Planning Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) enacted on November 29, 1990 as amended and approved on the twelfth Priority Project List. The South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project has a twenty–year (20 year) economic life, which began in August 2006.

II. Inspection Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of the annual inspection of the South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project (ME-22) is to evaluate the constructed project features, identify any deficiencies and prepare a report detailing the condition of project features and recommended corrective actions needed. Should it be determined that corrective actions are needed, LDNR shall provide, in the report, a detailed cost estimate for engineering, design, supervision, inspection, and construction contingencies, and an assessment of the urgency of such repairs. The annual inspection report also contains a summary of maintenance projects, if any, which were completed since completion of constructed project features and an estimated projected budget for the upcoming three (3) years for operation, maintenance and rehabilitation. The three (3) year projected operation and maintenance budget is shown in Appendix C.

An inspection of the South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project (ME-22) was held on May 28, 2008 under sunny skies and warm temperatures. In attendance were Stan Aucoin and Darrell Pontiff from LDNR, along with Susie Hennington representing USACE. All parties met at the boat launch on the Old Intracoastal Waterway and traveled west to the project site. The annual inspection began at approximately 10:25 a.m. at Bear Lake on the west end the project.

The field inspection included a complete visual inspection of all project features. Staff gauge readings where available were used to determine approximate elevations of water, earthen embankments, rock dike and other project features. Photographs were taken at each project feature (see Appendix B) and Field Inspection notes were completed in the field to record measurements and any notable deficiencies (see Appendix D).
III. Project Description and History

The South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project (ME-22) was completed in August 2006 and involved the construction of 61,500 linear feet of foreshore rock dike, including fish dips at 1,000 foot intervals with a top width of 50 feet and the toe lined with a layer of rock. The principle project features of the South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project include the following:

A. Foreshore Rock Dike: Approximately 61,500 LF of rock dike built with 650 LB stone on geotextile fabric, 4 foot crown, 1V:1.5H side slopes, top elevation of +3.5 NAVD88 (+/- 0.5 foot). Foreshore dike includes fish dips every 1,000 feet, gaps at pipeline crossings and navigation crossings. Warning signs are located at all pipeline crossings, fish dips and navigation openings.

Coast 2050 identified wave erosion, high water levels, and altered hydrology as the major factors contributing to the rapid erosion of the southern shore of White Lake (Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force and the Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Authority [LCWCRTF & WCRA] 1999). Between 1932 and 1990 an estimated 6,525 acres of marsh south of White Lake were lost (LCWCRTF & WCRA 1999). Future land loss projections predicted an additional loss of 4,220 acres of fresh marsh by 2050 or nearly 14% of the remaining 30,270 acres of marsh.

The construction of the foreshore rock dike will effectively stop erosion along the southern White Lake shoreline by damping wind generated waves. By stabilizing the southern White Lake shoreline, the interior marsh will be maintained at or near current levels. Emergent marsh will be created through the beneficial use of dredged material from the digging of the flotation canal.

The Shoreline Protection Foundation Improvement Demonstration (LA-06) project, authorized on the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) 13th priority project list has been incorporated into the ME-22 construction project. The goal of this demonstration project is to determine the feasibility of shoreline protection structures where a relatively poor soil foundation exists. The strategy of the Shoreline Protection Foundation Improvements Demonstration is to use sand as a foundation beneath rock dike structures as a means to achieve increased bearing capacity and consolidation settlement design tolerances in a manner that lessens 20-year shoreline protection project costs.

The demonstration project experimental design will include two sub-reaches. Each sub-reach is divided into two 900-foot treatment sections and one 900-foot control section. Fish dips are built at approximately 900-foot intervals with a top width of 50 feet. Treatment A was built by placing sand directly on top of soil and then placing the rock material on top of the sand foundation. Treatment B was built by dredging out the soil foundation, filling the cavity with
sand, and then rock was placed on top of the sand foundation. Treatment C is the control or reference section and consists of the typical rock dike cross-section.

The specific goals of the project are:

1. Stop erosion along the South White Lake shoreline between Will’s Point and west of Bear Lake.
2. Build marsh substrate behind the rock breakwaters using dredge material from the project construction flotation channel.
3. Prevent a breach from occurring between White Lake and the management unit known as the Kaplan Tract.

IV. Summary of Past Operation and Maintenance Projects

**General Maintenance:** Below is a summary of completed maintenance projects and operation tasks performed since August 2006, the construction completion date of the South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project (ME-22).

There has been no maintenance on this project.

**Structure Operations:** There are no active operations associated with this project.

V. Inspection Results

**Foreshore Rock Dike**
The rock dike is in excellent post construction condition. A few low areas were noted along Bear Lake where there was some initial settling during construction. These areas will be monitored during future inspections. Signage along the entire project is also in good condition. The spoil bank material placed behind the rock dike generated from the flotation excavation has approximately 90 per cent vegetation cover. (Photos: Appendix B, Photos 1 & 2)

**Demonstration Project**
The six different demonstration areas are in good condition and do not appear to look any different than the rest of the project as far as crown width, dike elevation and side slopes. The various instrumentation devices at each demonstration section are intact. A request was made to get the monitoring data from these instruments from the USACE. (Photos: Appendix B, Photos 1 & 2)

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations
Overall, the South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project is in very good condition and functioning as designed. It is recommended that the warning signs be numbered from one end of the project to the other in order to determine where your physical location is along the twelve mile long shoreline during an inspection.
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Photo 1, west end of rock dike.

Photo 2, View of typical rock dike section, fish dip and signage.
Photo 3, low section of rock dike in Bear Lake

Photo 4, close up view of spoil bank behind rock dike showing vegetation.
Photo 5, view of instrumentation on one of the demonstration areas.

Photo 6, east end of the foreshore dike.
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## SOUTH WHITE LAKE SHORELINE PROTECTION/ ME-22 / PPL 12
### Three-Year Operations & Maintenance Budgets  07/01/2008 - 06/30/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Inspection</td>
<td>$5,570.00</td>
<td>$5,737.00</td>
<td>$5,909.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total - Maint. And Rehab.</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### O&M Budget (3 yr Total)
$17,216.00

### Unexpended O & M Budget
$23,277.31

### Remaining O & M Budget (Projected)
$6,061.31
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MAINTENANCE INSPECTION REPORT CHECK SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Physical Damage</th>
<th>Corrosion</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Observations and Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steel Bulkhead Caps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Grating</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Logs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Piles</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Wales</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galv. Pile Caps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cables</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage Supports</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recommend numbering of signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rip Rap Rock Dike</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 6</td>
<td>A few low areas in Bear Lake, 90% vegetation cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration Sections</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No difference in typical section from remainder of project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the conditions of the existing levees?
Are there any noticeable breaches?
Settlement of rock plugs and rock weirs?
Position of stoplogs at the time of the inspection?
Are there any signs of vandalism?
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