

Appendix K. Comments from 2019 Public Meeting

Comments from the August 22, 2019 Public Meeting

	Comment
Rev. Fields, UMC	Pearlington is an unincorporated town with 1 Quik Mart, a restaurant, a sno ball stand and an ATM machine. Whether it's work or basic necessities like food, residents must go elsewhere. This Hwy 90 is the only quick direct route to anywhere - Walmart, pharmacy, employment. If the bldg of the bridges disrupts the traffic flow forcing residents back to I-10 the town will suffer a huge hardship. There are no alternatives for them.
Robin & Lacy Volker	We like Option 1: Loop Road. We think it would bring traffic and possibly business opportunities to Pearlington - but not into the center of Pearlington. This option allows Pearlington to keep the small town feel.
Rick Boyet	We in Pearlington are asking that you take very careful consideration in regards to taking LA US 90 back to Grade Level. Although the levees in New Orleans are killing us during Hurrican Flood surge, Hwy 90 (even Louisiana side of East Pearl River) HEPLS Pearlington (North of Hwy 90) during a Hurricane. Thanks in advance for your (Re-thinking)!!!!
Mae Bradley	Traffic from Orleans coming from New Orleans East will be in the way of the Pealington People getting out from storm on Hwy 90. We have proplems with Slidell Peoples comming over to Bay St Lousi to shopp Traffic something Bumber to Bumber Can you'll look at the traffic from Slidell to Bay St Louis concern citizen
Alvin Attenhofer	If I had my choice of the proposed options for the East Pearl River Bridge, I would like to see the high rise and not a bridge that opens.
Jessica Calinda Crowe Aucoin	My main concernes: What happens if my home starts sinking, settleing, moves or cracks walls ect....from pile driving pounding ect...will ya'll fix issues from the construction causes? Or buy us out pending Problems? + I have prime propery on the river and being under a bridge now is gonna bring my propery value down, becuase things happen under bridges like Bums, Homeless people, Drugs ect....Out of all, figure 4 would be best choice for all concerned...I belive! And most in town, I have talked with about in, We + I would rather see our Historic Bridge on East Pearl River be restored + raised, why wasn't that proposed?
Christina Spell	I am writing you in regards to the US 90 bridge in Pearlington, Ms. I am truly upset that we have to remove the original bridge. These bridges are landmarks and should not be removed but merely updated. But if a new bridge has to be done I would rather it be figure 4 option. This is the least detrimental to our small town. It's bad enough this whole bridge is going to be a severe inconvenience to many residents rerouting our daily commute. But option 4 is the least impactful to our homes. Thanks
Joe Spell	I am a resident of Belle Isle subdivision. The option I would most like to see would be a refurbish of the original bridge. There are not many historical bridges left that are this functional. No matter what you build, if you get rid of this bridge you change the whole community of Pearlington, forever. If keeping the bridge in not an option then the only acceptable option is in figure 4, as it is going to have the least effect on the community, and be the smallest footprint and eyesore fo the 3 proposals. B'rgds
Brian Hasselvander	I am a resident of Belle Isle subdivision. The option I would most like to see would be a refurbish of the original bridge. There are not many historical bridges left that are this functional. No matter what you build, if you get rid of this bridge you change the whole community of Pearlington, forever. If keeping the bridge in not an option then the only acceptable option is in figure 4, as it is going to have the least effect on the community, and be the smallest footprint and eyesore fo the 3 proposals. B'rgds

Virle Reid	Please consider the following comments: This is my second round of comments regarding the project: Stacie Palmer has those emails on file. In my heart, I would hope that the present bridge-eligible for the National Register of Historic Places-be restored, but raised to an elevation which meets with the criteria of LDOT's three year study, regarding the percentage of river traffic which requires a bridge to be opened if the height from mean tide to the underside of the bridge is 25 feet. If restoration of the bridge is deemed impossible for PHYSICAL reasons, I cast my vote for the bascule bridge. According to the drawing/schematics, and the input of the engineers at the second meeting, it would be the less intrusive of the new bridge options, yet achieve the desired ends. Construction would happen quickly; fewer residents and businesses (in particular, our local store) would be adversely affected by its construction impact (especially airborne debris, noise pollution, and traffic re-reouting); and it would meet with Stennis' desire to have a river passage without any height limits on watercraft. And it would also offer a more aesthetically pleasing option to the fixed bridge option. To this end, I has asked, at the meeting, what the cost would be to restore our beautiful bridge, and the answer was "embarrassingly expensive." When I asked to see the figures, I was told they exist, but were not at the meeting, and received the same answer when I inquired regarding figures for the other bridges too. When I asked why the figures were not there-in order for us to have a better grasp of the scope of the project-I was told "they" told us not to bring them. When I asked who "they" were, the answer was: LDOT. I am alarmed by what feels like a lack of transparency surrounding this project. After questioning those in charge of the project for over three years regarding NASA's/Stennis' role in the construction of the bridge, and receiving either no answer, or the answer that the aforementioned had no preference or impact on the project, we finally received, on Thursday afternoon, a verbal answer from one of the senior engineers of Neel Schaffer: NASA/Stennis, in lieu of the planned missions to the moon in 2022 and 2024, and the missions to Mars in the coming decade, would like to have a fixed bridge in place which would accommodate the size of the newest SLS system AND allow unhindered transport of liquid hydrogen to the test site. To that end, I would like to officially request that an Environmental Impact Study be done to address the potential dangers and impact of Liquid Hydrogen and other fuels to be transported upstream, unhindered, 24/7. With increased traffic/transport comes increased risk; and though the safety elements built into the new LH bunker transports are considered state-of-the-art, an accident/rupture/spill of this highly combustible fuel, when coming into contact with the atmosphere, can be extremely catastrophic to the surrounding flora and fauna. Since construction on the East and West Pearl River bridges is imminent, I would also like to request that the powers that be look into the feasibility of creating an elevated stretch of hwy 90 between the two. It would allow freer flow of the Pearl River system in times of flood, reducing physical impact/damage on surrounding structures and communities; allow fauna to travel freely through the corridor, thus reducing their present highway crossing mortality rates; and in the spirit of this project, reduce the chance of that stretch of highway being inundated during times of storm/flooding. I am grateful that Neel Schaffer, LDOT, and MDOT have come up an alternate re-route of highway 604 for the fixed bridge option. I feel that the revisit by the historical assessment team the Thrusday prior to the meeting allowed them to see the extreme proximity of the initial Hwy 604 re-route to the historic structure at 5098 Hwy 604, and the potential dangers/consequences it posed. But this new option still leaves my immediate neighbors in a lurch, and it pains me to see them stressed out by the situation. I have not yet spoken to my neighbor whose property would be required for the alternate re-route, so I have not been able to gauge their feelings. I hope that neither of these options for a re-route become necessary.
------------	---

Virle Reid (continued)	In closing, I would like to pull something from an email I had sent to Barry Brupbacher: "Barry, a thought came to me after I had received your last email: I believe that we differ greatly regarding our definition of negligible, at least when it comes to the re-route project. A few feet, even as an individual who feels comfortable in urban and rural environs, is a lot to me. And a few more vehicles traveling down the road, to me, constitutes a significant amount of noise and visual pollution, especially if both are happening with earshot and line of sight. What might seem like a small increment in distance to the engineering crew translates into a violation of space for many out here in such a rural area. Most here covet their space and privacy, and a loss of even a few feet can mean a huge impact of their lives, and their psyches. Personally, I feel as if the engineering crew on this endeavor must strive for a greater sense of, well, sensitivity, in how this project is approached. You are dealing with a community that essentially became a refuge for people who were displaced by the Stennis Space Project back in the 1960's. And you are dealing with a community that was all but forgotten in the days shortly after Katrina. People here are very sensitive to the feeling of possibly being steamrolled. This project has the potential to rekindle those feelings." I look forward to serving on the Sec. 106 panel/committee.
Belle Isle Property Owner Associa	Following is our assessment of bridge construction least impact: 1, <u>East and West Pearl River Bridges</u> : We suggest "modification" of existing bridges. a) Less impact on right-of-way acquisitions. b) Less damage to property values. c) Less damage to property accesses. d) Less traffic interruption. e) Less costly. f) Better cost/benefit ration. 2, All Middle Pearl River Bridges: We suggest "fixed-span structures on offset alignments a) Less impact on boat and vehicular traffic. b) Likely most cost effective. c) Better cost benefit ration.
Debra Guthans	The public meeting was full of great information. My thoughts about the project. I am of the opinion that no bridge with any working parts to lift or lower bridge should be built. These parts will break and the people of Pearlinton are impacted the most when bridges break. A bridge high enough to allow all boat traffic 24 hours a day access. I live on the East Pearl and I see the traffic on the River. I feel all government facilities upriver from Pearlinton should have 24 hour access. Also, an elevated roadway would be nice between the West Pearl & East Pearl Rivers.
Janyne C. Evans	16463 Hwy 90 Pearlinton, MS, Comercial Building 2-story Concrete + slab Bussiness, 18 yrs this Sept. Bar + Resturant. I don't won't long span bridge, because of the pile driving it will destroy my building structure. What will be the finacial impact on my business + for how long. what is the projected finacial decress of property value for Pearlinton, MS. I have had my business up for sale since April 2019, what is the projected time of starting + ending the construction. Would appreciate some answers.
John Pavlovich	I have the most property on Hwy. 90 with 3 business's. The high rise bridge would put me out of business. The draw bridge would be better and cheaper. Several other business' would like to come, but will not because of the high rise bridge.
Robert Bastian	Ranked as to my preference: #1 - End vertical lift bridge #2 - End Bascule bridge #3- Long span bridge: Gooseneck option (Fig 3) #4 - Long span bridge: Loop option (Fig 2) Thank you
Joseph Pansano	After living in Pearlinton for over 20 yrs and seeing the now East Pearl River bridge break down it's time for something to be done. I vote for Fig.#4 movable bridge.