



Coastal Protection and
Restoration Authority of Louisiana

Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana

Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration

2007/2008 Annual Inspection Report

SWEET LAKE/ WILLOW LAKE HYDROLOGIC RESTORATION PROJECT (CS-11b)

State Project Number CS-11b
Priority Project List 5

May 1, 2008
Calcasieu Parish

Prepared by:

Mel Guidry, Engineering Tech.
CPRA/ Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration
Lafayette Field Office
635 Cajundome Blvd.
Lafayette, LA 70596

Table Of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Inspection Purpose and Procedures	1
III. Project Description and History.....	1
IV. Summary of Past Operation and Maintenance Projects.....	3
V. Inspection Results	3
VI Conclusions and Recommendations	4

Appendices

Appendix A	Project Features Map
Appendix B	Photographs
Appendix C	Three Year Budget Projections
Appendix D	Field Inspection Notes
Appendix E	Map showing areas to be monitored

I. Introduction

The Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project is composed of approximately 6000 ac of open water and freshwater wetlands surrounding Sweet Lake and Willow Lake in north eastern Cameron Parish. The project area is bounded on the south and west by the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), and on the north and east by Pleistocene prairie formations along LA Hwy. 384 and LA Hwy. 27. (See Appendix A)

The Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration 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 fifth Priority Project List. The Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Project has a twenty –year (20 year) economic life, which began on January 27, 2000.

II. Inspection Purposes and Procedures

The purpose of the annual inspection of the Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project (CS-11b) is to evaluate the constructed project features to 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 (O&M Plan, 2002). 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 Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project (CS-11b) was held on May 1, 2008. In attendance were Stan Aucoin and Mel Guidry from LDNR, and Dale Garber from NRCS. The annual inspection began at approximately 12:30 p.m. on the eastern boundary of the project area.

The field inspection included a complete visual inspection of the entire rock dikes from the GIWW. Staff gauge readings were not available to be used to determine approximate elevations of water and rock dikes. Photographs were taken (see Appendix B) and a Field Inspection form was completed in the field to record measurements and deficiencies (see Appendix D).

III. Project Description and History

Wetlands in their natural state are among the most productive areas on earth, and they are central to the culture and development of south Louisiana. The Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act provides a substantial federal commitment to help Louisiana save its coastal wetlands. The wetlands are a fragile environment, which is disappearing at a rate of over 25 square miles of marsh a year in Louisiana, which is 80 percent of the nation's annual coastal wetland loss. The wetlands provide many benefits including commercial and recreational value, wildlife habitat, wintering habitat for millions of the continent's migratory ducks and geese, nursery habitat for one of America's largest fish and shellfish harvests, erosion control, flood protection and acting as storm buffers. Additionally the wetlands help maintain water quality.

In the early 1990's, Sweet Lake and Willow Lake were essentially lank-locked lakes surrounded by coastal freshwater marsh on the northern edge of the Cameron-Creole estuary (USDA/NRCS 1997). The introduction of water and sediment into the project area was influenced mainly by precipitation, local drainage, and wind and tide generated water exchange extending across the Cameron-Creole estuary from Calcasieu Lake through overland flow and small, meandering bayou. Marsh elevation was maintained through vegetative biomass production which compensated for losses caused by subsidence and sea level rise (USDA/NRCS 1997).

When the GIWW was constructed in the early 1900's, its route lay just south of the southern shorelines of both lakes, but the high energy associated with the navigation channel has and continues to impact the lakes and surrounding marshes. Erosion of the banks of the GIWW, caused by the water level drawdown effect and wave wash from the wakes created by passing boats and barges along with the widening and deepening of the channel from its original dimensions of 40 ft. wide x 5 ft. deep, to 125 ft. wide x 12 ft. deep in the 1940's and subsequent erosion of its banks, has resulted in the breaching of the narrow strip of marsh and spoil bank between the canal and the southern shoreline of both lakes.

The principal project features include:

- 4,000 linear ft. of rock embankment along the north bank of the GIWW adjacent to Willow Lake
- 14,200 linear ft. of rock embankment along the north bank of the GIWW adjacent to Sweet Lake
- 24,300 linear ft. of vegetative planting along the north shore line of Sweet Lake
- 25,500 linear ft. of earthen terraces

IV. Summary of Past Operation and Maintenance Projects

General Maintenance: Below is a summary of completed maintenance projects and operation tasks performed since January 2000, the construction completion date of the Sweet/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project (CS-11b).

There have been no past maintenance projects and there are no active operations associated with this project.

V. Inspection Results

The dikes are in reasonably good condition. There are a few low places along the length of the rock dike with the most significant stretches along the open water areas adjacent to Sweet Lake along with an area approximately 50 feet wide along the very eastern end of the project area in which the dike appears to have been “pushed back” 10-12 feet apparently by a barge. There is another area approximately 4 feet wide in which the dike appears to have been removed by hunters or fishermen. Several settlement plates are either broken or leaning and are of no use. No gauges were available in the vicinity to determine water levels. The condition of the shallow water terraces feature of the project was unable to be determined due to high water conditions in Sweet Lake and Willow Lake. (Photos: Appendix B, Photos 1 & 2).

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

The foreshore rock dike feature of the Sweet Lake/Willow Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project is in good condition and functioning as designed. The areas along the foreshore rock dike identified as being below constructed height were noted in previous inspections and will continue to be monitored to determine the need for a maintenance event.

- Install a staff gauge adjacent to the project area in 2008/2009.

Appendix A
Project Features Map



Appendix B
Photographs



Photo No.1, Area of rock dike pushed back by barge.



Photo No.2, Typical rock dike section.

Appendix C
Three Year Budget Projection

SWEET LAKE/WILLOW LAKE SP/ CS-11B / PPL 5
Three-Year Operations & Maintenance Budgets 07/01/2008 - 06/30/11

<u>Project Manager</u> Pat Landry	<u>O & M Manager</u> Mel Guidry	<u>Federal Sponsor</u> NRCS	<u>Prepared By</u> Mel Guidry
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011
Maintenance Inspection	\$ 5,570.00	\$ 5,737.00	\$ 5,909.00
Structure Operation			
Administration		\$ -	\$ -
Maintenance/Rehabilitation			

08/09 Description: Add a staff gage.

E&D	\$7,500.00
Construction	
Construction Oversight	
<i>Sub Total - Maint. And Rehab.</i>	<u>\$ 7,500.00</u>

09/10 Description:

E&D	\$ -
Construction	\$ -
Construction Oversight	\$ -
<i>Sub Total - Maint. And Rehab.</i>	<u>\$ -</u>

10/11 Description:

E&D	\$ -
Construction	\$ -
Construction Oversight	\$ -
<i>Sub Total - Maint. And Rehab.</i>	<u>\$ -</u>

	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011
<u>Total O&M Budgets</u>	<u>\$ 13,070.00</u>	<u>\$ 5,737.00</u>	<u>\$ 5,909.00</u>

<u>O & M Budget (3 yr Total)</u>	<u>\$ 24,716.00</u>
<u>Unexpended O & M Budget</u>	<u>\$ 456,831.89</u>
<u>Remaining O & M Budget (Projected)</u>	<u>\$ 432,115.89</u>

Annual Inspection Report
 SWEET/WILLOW LAKE HR PROJECT
 State Project No. CS-11b

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET WORKSHEET
 SWEET LAKE/WILLOW LAKE HR PROJECT / PROJECT NO. CS-11b / PPL NO. 5

DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST. QTY.	UNIT PRICE	ESTIMATED TOTAL
O&M Inspection and Report	EACH	1	\$5,570.00	\$5,570.00
General Structure Maintenance	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
Engineering and Design	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
Operations Contract	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
Construction Oversight	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00

ADMINISTRATION

LDNR / CRD Admin.	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
FEDERAL SPONSOR Admin.	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
SURVEY Admin.	LUMP	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
OTHER				\$0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION COSTS:				\$0.00

MAINTENANCE / CONSTRUCTION

SURVEY

SURVEY DESCRIPTION:	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST. QTY.	UNIT PRICE	ESTIMATED TOTAL
	Add staff gage.				
	Secondary Monument	EACH	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Staff Gauge / Recorders	EACH	1	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00
	Marsh Elevation / Topography	LUMP	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	TBM Installation	EACH	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	OTHER				\$0.00
TOTAL SURVEY COSTS:					\$7,500.00

GEOTECHNICAL

GEOTECH DESCRIPTION:	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST. QTY.	UNIT PRICE	ESTIMATED TOTAL
	Borings	EACH	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	OTHER				\$0.00
TOTAL GEOTECHNICAL COSTS:					\$0.00

CONSTRUCTION

CONSTRUCTION DESCRIPTION:	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST. QTY.	UNIT PRICE	ESTIMATED TOTAL
	Rip Rap	LIN FT	TON / FT	TONS	UNIT PRICE
	Rock Rip rap	0	0.0	0	\$0.00
	Aggregate Surface Course	0	0.0	0	\$0.00
		0	0.0	0	\$0.00
	Filter Cloth / Geogrid Fabric	SQ YD	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Navigation Aid	EACH	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Signage	EACH	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	General Excavation / Fill	CU YD	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Dredging	CU YD	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Sheet Piles (Lin Ft or Sq Yds)		0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Timber Piles (each or lump sum)		0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Timber Members (each or lump sum)		0	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Hardware	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Materials	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Mob / Demob	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Contingency	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
	General Structure Maintenance	LUMP	1	\$0.00	\$0.00
	OTHER				\$0.00
	OTHER				\$0.00
	OTHER				\$0.00
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS:					\$0.00

TOTAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET: \$13,070.00

Appendix D
Field Inspection Form

Annual Inspection Report
 SWEET/WILLOW LAKE HR PROJECT
 State Project No. CS-11b

FIELD INSPECTION CHECK SHEET

Project No. / Name: Sweet Lake/Willow Lake HR CS-11B Date of Inspection: 5/1/2008 Time: 12:30 PM
 Structure No. _____ Inspector(s): Stan Aucoin, Mel Guidry, (LDNR)
 Structure Description: Rock Dike Dale Garber (NRCS)
 Water Level: Inside: N/A Outside: N/A
 Type of Inspection: Annual Weather Conditions: Clear and mild

Item	Condition	Physical Damage	Corrosion	Photo #	Observations and Remarks
Earthen Terraces	Fair				Unable to determine condition of terraces due to high water.
Steel Grating	N/A				
Stop Logs	N/A				
Hardware	N/A				
Timber Piles	N/A				
Timber Wales	N/A				
Galv. Pile Caps	N/A				
Cables	N/A				
Signage/Support	N/A				
Rip Rap(fill)	N/A				
Earthen Embankment	N/A				
Foreshore Dike	Good			1 & 2	300 Linear feet of dike on eastern edge of Willow is low, . Also, there is a 50 foot section of rock dike that has apparently been pushed back. Another 4 foot section is missing in another area.

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?

Appendix E
Locations to be Monitored