# MINUTES OF SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY-EAST OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 21, 2019

PRESENT: Herbert I. Miller, Chair

Clay A. Cosse, Committee Member Mark L. Morgan, Committee Member

Herbert T. Weysham, III, Committee Member

The Operations Committee of the Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority-East (Authority or FPA) met on February 21, 2019, in the Franklin Avenue Administrative Complex, Meeting Room 201, 6920 Franklin Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana. Mr. Miller called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**Opening Comments:** None.

**Adoption of Agenda:** The agenda was adopted by the Committee.

<u>Approval of Minutes</u>: The minutes of the January 17, 2019, Operations Committee meeting were approved.

### **Public Comments:**

Ray Landeche, a resident of Lakeshore Subdivision, asked the status of Phases 3 and 4 of the Seawall Project. He expressed concern about how Lake Terrace Park may be redeveloped and asked whether Phase 4 incorporates the bike path that the City is expanding to Lake Terrace Park.

Derek Boese, Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), advised that there have been issues involving the borrow pits; however, he anticipated the issues being resolved and Phase 3 of the Seawall Project being completed in about four months. The design of Phase 4 has almost been finalized; however, Phase 4 will not be advertised for bid until Phase 3 is completed. Ryan Foster, Engineer, explained that Phase 4 includes a pile supported plaza behind the seawall steps, replacement of the roadway (the exact alignment and size of the roadway is under discussion), drainage and lighting improvements in the park area, and two pavilions for use by the public. He stated that he was not aware of the City's expansion of its bike path. A bike path is not currently included in Phase 4.

#### **New Business:**

# A. Discussion of permit fees.

Mr. Miller advised that the summary of permits issued in 2017 and 2018 indicates that the breakeven point for the FPA is \$150 for residential permits and \$300 for commercial permits. Blanket permit fees would remain at \$3,000. He requested that staff prepare a draft resolution with the stated rates for the Board's consideration at its March meeting.

### B. Discussion of levee survey plan.

Stevan Spencer, Regional Chief Engineer, explained that staff was requested to investigate potential methodologies for annual surveys. A proposal was received from one of the FPA's Indefinite Delivery-Indefinite Quantity (ID-IQ) Contracted Consultants, Linfield, Hunter and Junius (LHJ), to perform RTK surveys along the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) earthen levees and Non-Federal interior levees (63.5 miles total) for an estimated cost of \$45,000.

Mr. Morgan asked would the consultant prepare a report that compares the RTK survey to the design that can be updated annually in order to address settlement issues. Mr. Spencer responded that the consultant should be able to do the comparison.

Mr. Spencer advised that the East Jefferson lakefront levee raising projects were completed about a year and a half ago. Sections of levees in New Orleans East are currently being raised as part of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) armoring projects (ARM-04 and ARM 09). He suggested that an RTK survey of the Mississippi River Levee (MRL) could be done as a second phase.

Mr. Morgan asked would an RTK survey be acceptable for the HSDRRS recertification process. Mr. Boese responded that the purpose of the RTK survey is to look for major issues. At this time, based on CPRA's discussions with the USACE, RTK surveys would not be sufficient for the HSDRRS recertification process.

Mr. Spencer explained that LSU C4G's RTK survey was compared to a traditional survey performed by LHJ, and the results were close. There are two ways for doing an RTK survey. The methodology in the LHJ proposal is the more precise of the two.

Mr. Morgan recommended that the RTK survey be performed for one year and that the data be reviewed for level of accuracy. Mr. Luettich suggested that the FPA have a variety of methods that can be implemented over the course of time to ensure that the system has not in any way degraded and a strategy or plan that can be executed on a routine basis. Mr. Boese suggested that an RTK survey is a reasonable approach at this time for going forward; however, staff must continue to evaluate this methodology and potential options that may result in a greater level of confidence. Mr. Luettich commented that in the past the FPA has collected data, but has not necessarily converted the data into actionable information. The FPA should ensure that whatever methodology is used, data is not only collected, but is used to produce an actual product,

Mr. Morgan recommended that staff move forward with the RTK survey and that the data be reviewed. Mr. Boese suggested that the RTK survey be performed, the data plotted in GIS against the most recent elevations, and that the results be reviewed for any differences. Any major differences discovered would be further investigated through traditional surveys.

Mr. Boese informed the Committee that the Mississippi River stage has been in the range of 13.5-ft to 14.5-ft and is predicted to rise above 15-ft. within the next two weeks

and potentially reach 16.5-ft. by mid-March. The River stage has been consistently high since about November. Daily inspections are required when the stage rises above 15-ft. and permitted activities within 1,500-ft. of the river, including waivers, are halted.

C. Discussion of a proposed Change Order to the contract with Kostmayer Construction, LLC for the IHNC and Michoud Floodgate Painting Project to increase the contract amount from \$2,364,518.55 to \$2,510,285.89 (an increase in the amount of \$145,767.34) in order to pay for additional work items and additional work to prepare for tropical events.

Mr. Miller noted that the change order represents about a six percent increase to the contract amount. Mr. Foster explained that the contractor is currently painting the last two floodgates, which are located inside of Port of New Orleans property, in place. All final quantities have been received and no additional change orders are anticipated. The change order includes approximately \$50,000 for extra work (includes replacement of corroded parts discovered on some of the floodgates after the paint was blasted off, and extra security fencing required in a Port owned secured area), and \$95,000 for work necessitated by three tropical events (Alberto, Gordon and Michael). The contractor was required to reinstall six floodgates during each tropical event (total of 18 reinstallations). The mobilization required weekend and overtime work. It was noted that the engineer's estimate for the project was slightly above the bid amount.

A motion was offered, seconded and unanimously adopted, to recommend that the Board approve the change order to the contract with Kostmayer Construction, LLC.

D. Discussion of a proposed Change Order to the contract with Cycle Construction Company, LLC, in the amount of \$198,165.29 (increasing the contract amount from \$2,176,690.00 to \$2,374,855.29) for the Violet Canal North Realignment Project (Phase II).

Mr. Miller noted that the change order represents about a nine percent increase in the contract amount. Mr. Foster advised that the field work is anticipated to be completed in mid-March or early April. The change order being considered addresses the first part of the extra work and delays which were evaluated and undisputed (agreed upon by Cycle, Tetra Tech and the FPA). The project engineer is Tetra Tech. Much of the construction administration is being performed by Ardaman, which is owned by Tetra Tech and is being used as its subcontractor.

Mr. Foster explained that as built drawings on utilities were received from St. Bernard Parish. Since the construction site is located in a very old section along the Violet Canal, utilities drawings and information were almost non-existent. The project was initially designed by Tetra Tech and was bid in March, 2018. Construction commenced in April, 2018. Unknown and unforeseen utilities were discovered as the contractor proceeded with the project. The contractor experienced on-going delays due to the utility relocations. The extra work and delays were not quantifiable until late in the project. An additional change order of the same dollar magnitude will be forthcoming for extra work currently being evaluated and negotiated. The FPA will be able to provide as built drawings to St. Bernard Parish upon completion of the project. The project is being

funded through a grant. Grant funding is available for the cost of the change order under review by the Committee and for the forthcoming change order.

A motion was offered, seconded and unanimously adopted, for the Committee to recommend that the Board approve the change order to the contract with Cycle Construction Company, LLC.

## E. <u>Update on USACE issues.</u>

Mr. Spencer updated the Committee on three outstanding issues with the USACE:

• 17<sup>th</sup> Street Canal (Bellaire Drive) seepage issue – The FPA proposed that a French drain (3-ft. wide and 6-ft. below the ground) be installed parallel to the floodwall to alleviate the seepage problem. Instead, the USACE, in its proposal received yesterday, agreed to install drains on each end of the site to prevent water from draining onto adjacent residential properties and a drain along Bellaire Drive to prevent water from ponding along the roadway. The City of New Orleans is planning to pave Bellaire Drive; therefore, the USACE's work will be coordinated with the City. The USACE will also place a small section of berm on the floodside of the floodwall. The existing fill grade to the street will not be changed. The USACE's proposal must be reviewed by the FPA's consultants and evaluated by staff. Mr. Miller stressed that the USACE and the FPA's consultants determined that the seepage does not in any way present a danger to the levee/floodwall. The FPA's concern relates to water ponding on the site.

Roy Arrigo commented that he received a number of calls from residents who live adjacent to the site about water draining onto and ponding on their properties. He advised that he would convey this information to the residents.

- ARM-04 The USACE is currently armoring LPV 108 and installed articulated concrete blocks (ACB), which are about 9-inches square with open cells filled with sand and clay, along the crown of the levee. Two minor slides occurred near the Paris Road end of the project. The USACE took grab samples, which are currently being analyzed for moisture content, about 3-1/2 to 4 feet deep every 500 feet and east of Southpoint every 1,000 feet, along with cross sections. The USACE is investigating whether the ACBs are allowing water to seep in and pond along the crown. Mr. Miller advised that the FPA is not concerned about a levee failure, but wants to determine the cause of the two slides and determine whether there are any other areas of concern.
- ARM-09 The FPA provided funding to the USACE to raise LPV 111 from the Pump Station to the IHNC Surge Barrier. The USACE's contractor performed surveys in the vicinity of the CSX tracks and discovered that the subsidence had been greater than anticipated. Additional funding (estimated at \$5 million) will be needed from the FPA in order to raise the levee to the original design grade. Payment of the Local Sponsor's share of the HSDRRS is set to begin in June, 2020; however, the additional work may delay the target date. The USACE and CPRA are in on-going discussions about whether the USACE should expedite the armoring project to meet its current work schedule, possibly doubling the cost, or exclude the project from the pay back schedule. Additional information is

expected from the USACE on the settlement issue. Mr. Boese pointed out that he informed the CPRA and USACE that it is not reasonable for the FPA to pay the cost of accelerating a project based on the USACE's self-imposed schedule. He pointed out that the USACE took control of the levee two years ago for the armoring project.

There was no further business; therefore, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.