

# **USACE Perspective on Mississippi River Sediment Diversions**

#### **BG Duke DeLuca**

Commander, Mississippi Valley Division President-designee, Mississippi River **Commission** 

January, 2014



**US Army Corps of Engineers BUILDING STRONG** 



# **Presentation Outline**

- **The Value of the Mississippi River to the United States**
- **The Causes of Wetland Loss in Louisiana**
- **How Well Will Sediment Diversions Work?**
- **Can We Quantify and Mitigate for the Unintended Consequences of Diversions?**
- **How Should a Full Array of Alternatives Best Be Applied?**





### **U.S. Ports: Vital to Trade …and to Our National Economy**



### **1927 vs. 2011 Mississippi River Record Flood: From "Levees Only" to "Room for the River"**

- **1927 Flood = 16.8 million acres**
- **2011 Flood = 6.4 million acres**
- **\$14 billion Investment since 1928**
- **\$234 billion damages prevented (2011) 84% of the damages prevented were in Louisiana** 
	- **\$612 billion since 1928**

U.S.ARM' **ARMY STRONG.** 

- **44 to 1 return on investment**
- **Over 4 million people protected**
- **\$3 billion annual transportation rate savings**
- **Untold economic productivity enabled: Farms, towns, factories**



### **Value to the Nation** *Coastal Louisiana Fisheries and Wetland Values*

- USFWS: "Louisiana is the most productive fishery in North America"
	- 25% of continental US commercial fisheries
	- More than 1 billion pounds caught annually with a dockside value \$291 million
	- Recreation value \$900 million to \$1.2 billion
- Louisiana has 40% of the coastal marshlands in the continental United States which support:
	- Five million waterfowl
	- 25 million songbirds

**ARMY STRONG:** 

70 rare, threatened or endangered species



# **Causes of Land Loss in Coastal Louisiana**





# **Major Causes of Wetland Loss**



![](_page_6_Picture_2.jpeg)

"Land Area Change in Coastal Louisiana from 1932 to 2010" USGS, 2011.

### **Land Loss in Coastal Louisiana by Basin, 1932 – 2010**

**MISSISSIPPI RIVER INFLUENCE OUTSIDE OF MISS RIVER INFLUENCE** 

• **Atchafalaya: 16 mi2** • **Barataria: - 456 mi2** • **Breton Sound: -174 mi2** • **Miss. Delta: -124 mi2** • **Pontchartrain: -194 mi2 TOTAL: - 932 mi2**

- **Calcasieu-Sabine: - 214 mi2**
- **Mermentau: - 154 mi2**
- **Teche-Vermillion: 77 mi2**
- Terrebone: -506 mi<sup>2</sup>
	- **TOTAL: - 951 mi2**

![](_page_7_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_10.jpeg)

Couvillion, B.R., Barras, J.A., Steyer, G.D., Sleavin, W., Fischer, M., Beck, H., Trahan, N., Griffin, B., and Heckman, D. 2011. Land area change in coastal Louisiana from 1932 to 2010: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Map 3164, scale 1:265,000, 12 p. pamphlet. 9

### **Oil and Gas Extraction**

#### • **Impacts:**

- 8,000 10,000 miles of canals
- Salt water intrusion
- Hydrologic alteration
- Subsidence due to fluid withdrawal

•Recent article puts value of oil and gas mediated losses are as high as 36%

#### **Oil and Gas Exploration:**

- First Coastal Oil Well  $\rightarrow$  1901
- First Offshore Well  $\rightarrow$  1934
- By 1950's, 92 Offshore Platforms to Depths of 100 Feet
- End of 1960's, 500 Platforms to  $\frac{1200}{1000}$ Depths up to 350 feet
- End of 1970's, over 12,500 Offshore Rigs Producing Hydrocarbons

(Louisiana DNR, http://dnr.louisiana.govassets/TAD/education/BG BB/6/la\_oil.html)

1947. First bottom supported platform in 18 feet of water, 12 miles offshore.

![](_page_8_Figure_15.jpeg)

<http://thes.wordpress.com/2010/06/10/gulf-of-mexico-oil-rigs/> from M Figure 6. Annual hydrocarbon and water production from

. Modeled Total Landloss /10 o Direct Landloss  $1400<sub>1</sub>$ **v** Permitted (Direct Landloss) 800 600 400 200 1940 1960 1980 2000 Year

■ Total Landloss/10

Turner, R.E. 1997. Wetland loss in the Northern Gulf of Mexico: Multiple Working Hypotheses. Estuarine Research Federation,

![](_page_8_Picture_20.jpeg)

Vol.20, No. 1, p.1-13. **Canal construction near Golden Meadow, <u>I</u> ouisiana.** 

### **Wetland Loss Due to Hurricane Damage**

#### •**Direct impacts of selected storms:**

• Audrey (Max. Wind 100 mph) •Beach Erosion: 200-300 ft • Increased Water Area: Not Measured •Hilda (Max. Wind 134) •Beach Erosion: Not Measured • Increased Water Area: Not Measured • Andrew (Max. Wind 121) •Beach Erosion: 200-330 ft • Increased Water Area: Not Measured • Katrina (Max. Wind 125) •Beach Erosion: 180 ft • Increased Water Area: 89 mi2 • Rita (Max. Wind 125) •Beach Erosion: 130-260 ft • Increased Water Area: 114 mi2 • Gustav (Max. Wind 106) •Beach Erosion: 150-525 ft • Increased Water Area: 48 mi2 • Ike (Max. Wind 87) •Beach Erosion: 30-150 ft • Increased Water Area: 77 mi2

#### • **Indirect impacts:**

• Salt water intrusion

•Impact unknown

#### •**Summary:**

•**Open water area has increased by 328 mi2 just from the four measured storms that have occurred since 2005** 

• USGS estimates that 25% to 35% of wetland loss since the 1940's is due to direct and indirect storm-induced losses.

Morton, R.A. and J.A. Barras. 2011. Hurricane Impacts on Coastal Wetlands: A Half-Century Record of Storm-Generated Features from Southern Louisiana. Journal of Coastal Research, Vol. 27, pp 27-43.

![](_page_9_Picture_10.jpeg)

Hurricane tracks that modified the southern Louisiana coastal wetlands between 1957 and 2008. Source: NOAA 2010 .

![](_page_9_Picture_12.jpeg)

Breton Sound damage after Hurricane Katrina (2005).

![](_page_9_Picture_14.jpeg)

Remnants of march vegetation stripped to the sediment surface by Hurricane Rita (2005).

![](_page_9_Picture_16.jpeg)

Boudreaux Lake (A) Before and (B) After Hurricane Audrey 1957.

### **Sea-Level Rise global rise = 0.07 inches/year**

### **Relative Sea-Level Rise**

#### **global rise + local sinking**

#### Grand Isle, LA (0.4 inches/year)

![](_page_10_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Pensacola, FL (0.08 inches/year)

 $-2.0 + 1900$  $-1.5$ -1.0 -0.5 0.0 1900 1920 1940 1960 1980 2000 Mean sea level trend is  $0.08 + 0.01$ 

inches/year or 0.69 feet in 100 years.

0.5

**Feet**

1.5 1.0

2.0

Data with the average seasona

-, -..<br>-ligher 95% confidence interval

ower 95% confidence interval

inear mean sea level trend

cycle removed

The mean sea level trend is 0.4 inches/year or 3.0 feet in 100 years.

**High subsidence rate + sea-level rise makes wetlands more vulnerable to submergence and erosion.**

**NOTE: Grand Isle is an official NOAA gage with records back to the 1950's. Other gages in the Mississippi River Delta show much higher rates of RSLR, up to 1.0 inches per year.**  13

### **Additional Estimates of Subsidence Rates**

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

Shinkle & Dokka (2004). NOAA Technical Report – 50 Rates over 24mm (1 inch) per year.

LA State Master Plan, 2012. Maximum rates in the Bird's Foot between 15-35 mm per year.

#### **Variation in Subsidence Rates**

![](_page_11_Figure_5.jpeg)

Subsidence Advisory Panel Members: Louis Britsch, PhD, PG, USACE-MVN; Roy Dokka, PhD, LSU; Joseph Dunbar, PG, USACE-ERDC; Mark Kulp, PhD, UNO; Michael Stephen, PhD, PG, CEC; Kyle Straub, PhD, Tulane; Torbjorn Tornqvist, PhD, Tulane

![](_page_11_Picture_7.jpeg)

### **How Well Will Sediment Diversions Work? (What Have We Learned in the Last Few Years?)**

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Water and Sediment Budgets**

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_3.jpeg)

Allison, et. al. 2012. A water and sediment budget for the lower Mississippi-Atchafalaya River in flood years 2008-2010: J. of Hydrology.

#### **Reach Assessment 1970s to 2000s**

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

**ARMY STRONG.** 

**U.S.ARMY** 

Little, C. and Biedenharn, D. 2014. Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study – Geomorphic Assessment. In press.

## **Sustainability of Diversions**

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

Dean, R. G., J.T. Wells, J. Fernando, P. Goodwin. 2012. River Diversions: Principles, Processes, Challenges and Opportunities A Guidance Document. LCA S&T Program.

![](_page_15_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_4.jpeg)

**Wax Lake Outlet** has built about 1 km2 per (250 acres) year between 1983- 2010, utilizing about 10% of the flow of the MS River. The overall land loss in Coastal Louisiana is about 10,600 acres per year over the same time period.

Allen, et al., 2011. Using Multitemporal Remote Sensing Imagery and Inundation Measures to Improve Land Change Estimates in Coastal Wetlands. Estuaries and Coasts. DOI 10.1007/s12237-011- 9437-z

### **Atchafalaya Basin Land Building**

![](_page_16_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **U.S.ARMY ARMY STRONG.**

# **Fort St. Philips**

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

**U.S.ARMY ARMY STRONG.** 

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

**Table 3. Summary of Fort St. Philip study area acreages, and percentages of area change, for select time periods - from high resolution analyses. The color-ramp illustrates the type and magnitude of land change – the darkest red represents loss maxima and darkest green represent gain maxima.**

![](_page_19_Picture_151.jpeg)

† Land change percentage is based on initial land area of the period analysis. ‡ Land change percentage is based on the 1956 land area.

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

Suir , G. and Jones, W., Garber, A. and Barras. J. 2014. Pictorial Account and Landscape Evolution of the Crevasses near Fort Saint Philip, Louisiana. In press. MS River Geomorphology and Potamology Program.

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

**®** The fresh and brackish portions of the estuary experienced more than 24 25.7% failure versus 2 -4% in the more saline regions. (Kulp, et.al., 2009.)

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER FRESHWATER DIVERSIONS IN **SOUTHERN LOUISIANA:** EFFECTS ON WETLAND VEGETATION. **SOILS, AND ELEVATION**

A Position Paper by the Technical Panel from the

Workshop on Response of **Louisiana Marsh Soils and Vegetation to Diversions** 

![](_page_21_Picture_3.jpeg)

Coastal marsh near Leeville, Louisiana. Photo Credit: Dennis Demcheck (USG)

**Final Report to the** 

**State of Louisiana and** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers through the Louisiana Coastal Area Science and Technology Program

**Coordinated by the** National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration

December 5, 2012

"A general conclusion on the expected short-term and long-term responses of marsh belowground production to Freshwater Diversions in Louisiana could not be drawn from the available evidence."

"With regard to Freshwater Diversions, data are particularly needed on how changes in water chemistry or plant community composition may influence plant production-decomposition processes and resultant effects on soil volume and elevation change."

![](_page_21_Picture_11.jpeg)

# Energy Budget of a Sediment Diversion

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Drawdown Induced by Flow Reduction

- When a diversion is open, the river flow downstream of the diversion is reduced by the amount of flow diverted.
- · This produces a corresponding reduction in river stage (which may be estimated from a rating curve at a downstream gage).
- The stage reduction propagates upstream
	- (and may be computed using standard methods for determining the shape of the backwater curve)
- The larger the diversion, the greater the reduction in river stage associated with the diversion.

![](_page_23_Figure_6.jpeg)

## Energy Loss at the Diversion Structure

- Energy losses at the diversion structure are typically associated with drag, flow separation ,flow contraction, and flow expansion as water passes through the structure
- These losses can be minimized with design specifications that limit their magnitude and number.

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Energy Loss in the Diversion Channel

- The diversion channel must be designed with sufficient "stream power" (essentially, velocity) to transport the diverted sand.
- Therefore, diversions with higher concentrations of sand require a higher velocity diversion channel than do diversions with lower concentrations of sand.
- This results in more energy loss, or a "steeper" water surface slope in the channel.
- This results in a **constraint**.
- *For a given total available head (H<sub>TOTAI</sub>), a diversion carrying a higher sand concentration must be steeper and shorter than a diversion carrying a lower sand concentration. Hence, a diversion with a higher sand concentration cannot transport sediment as far as a diversion with a lower sand concentration.*

![](_page_25_Figure_6.jpeg)

# Energy Loss in the Channel Receiving Basin

- As water exits the diversion, it forms a jet of water into the receiving basin*.*
- If the receiving basin is relatively shallow , this exiting water tends to pile up, forming a "dome" of water with a maximum elevation at the channel outfall.
- This "backwater" effect is more pronounced for larger discharges than it is for smaller discharges.
- This results in a **constraint**
- For a given total available head (H<sub>TOTAI</sub>), a diversion carrying a larger discharge will result in a larger backwater effect *in the receiving basin than a diversion carrying a smaller discharge. This means that there is less head available for use in transporting the sediment load for a diversion carrying a larger discharge than there is for a diversion carrying a smaller discharge.*

![](_page_26_Figure_6.jpeg)

### **Summary of Energy Budget Constraints on Diversion Design**

- The application of basic hydraulic and geomorphic principles to a sediment diversion has shown that, for a given total available head, the greater the sand load one diverts, the shorter the distance one can transport it.
- As time progresses, deposition in the diversion outfall will become emergent land and begin to obstruct flow. This will induce an increase in the water surface elevation at the downstream end, and an upstream extension of the of the zone of deposition.
- When the water surface elevation increases to the point where the diversion can no longer pass the design flow, the diversion can no longer be operated at full capacity.
- If the diversion channel is too short to be truncated or redirected, and if there is no mechanical redistribution of the deposited sediment, then the life-cycle of the diversion is effectively complete.
- Hence, this results in the following general statement of the consequences of the energy constraint on sediment diversion design:
- *In the absence of any mechanical redistribution of the deposited sediment, the greater the sand load diverted, the shorter the life-span of the diversion.*
- Note that this conclusion is essentially **qualitative** and **simplified**. To determine whether or not this principle has a measureable and quantifiable impact on any specific diversion, it is necessary to do a more sophisticated analysis, including modeling.
- Preliminary attempts at this type of analysis have indicated that the energy budget *is*likely to be a significant and measureable constraint on diversion design.

![](_page_27_Figure_9.jpeg)

# **Preliminary Outfall Channel Analysis**

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

# **Can We Quantify and Mitigate for the Unintended Consequences of Diversions?**

![](_page_30_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### **ACCCUMULATED DEPOSITION 2020 - 2079**

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

**ARMY STRONG.** 

Thomas, M. T.and Trawle, M. 2014. One-Dimensional Modeling of the lower 35 Mississippi River. In press.

Alternative 18 allows for the "free flow" of Davis Pond, subject to river head, and assumes a 15,000 cfs diversion at Myrtle Grove

![](_page_32_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Alternative 18 Brown Shrimp Effects (May)

![](_page_32_Figure_3.jpeg)

DRAFT

![](_page_32_Picture_4.jpeg)

# **Should a Full Array of Alternatives be Applied?**

![](_page_33_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Louisiana Coast Beneficial Use Placement**

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **Myrtle Grove Vicinity**

August 23, 2012 ADCP 175,000 cfs

**o** CTD/turbidity/LISST casts

![](_page_35_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_5.jpeg)

Figure from Mead Allison, 2013

![](_page_36_Figure_0.jpeg)

## **Summary: LMR Diversion Principles**

- Consider All Coastal Loss Mechanisms
- Balance Competing Uses of the River and River Resources
- Apply Sound Science
- Reasonable Use of River Resources
- **Evaluate State's Diversion Portfolio as a System**
- **Utilize Controlled Diversions**
- Employ Diversion Adaptive Management
- Consider Mississippi River Commission Recommendations

![](_page_37_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_10.jpeg)