

**MINUTES OF  
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY-EAST  
COASTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON FEBRUARY 19, 2015**

PRESENT: G. Paul Kemp, Chair  
Rick Luettich, Committee Member  
John Lopez, Committee Member  
Albert Gaude, Committee Member  
Stephen Estopinal, SLFPA-E President

---

The Coastal Advisory Committee (CAC) of the Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority-East (SLFPA-E or Authority) met on February 19, 2015, in Meeting Room 201, Orleans Levee District Franklin Administrative Complex, 6920 Franklin Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana. Mr. Kemp called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

**Opening Comments:** None.

**Adoption of Agenda:** The agenda was adopted as presented.

**Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the November 21, 2014 Coastal Advisory Committee meeting were approved.

**Public Comments:** None. Mr. Kemp encouraged participation by the public during the meeting.

**New Business:**

**A. Discussion of Hurricane Surge Analysis path forward.**

Mr. Kemp explained that the CAC has been working to educate itself on the factors that have gone into the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDDRS) design. Monitoring the factors that affect the HSDDRS and efforts to go beyond the 100-year level of protection will be on-going responsibilities. A draft scope of work for the "Hurricane Surge and Wave Analysis Update Phase I – Planning" was prepared by Robert Turner, SLFPA-E Regional Director, and distributed. Mr. Kemp explained that this is not an effort to displace what others are doing on hurricane surge and wave analyses and levee design issues. The CAC's goal is to go beyond National Flood Insurance Program (NIFP) requirements and address the broader issues regarding future protection and ways to achieve a higher level of protection.

Mr. Luettich commented that the HSDDRS designs were confirmed in or before 2007. This process, largely led by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), was an incredible process in advancing the state of the practice of design and the analysis of risk and surge. The state of the science and data sets have significantly grown since the 2007 analysis. The SLFPA-E engaged a consultant, Bob Jacobsen, to perform an

assessment of the HSDRRS design and the state of the science and provide an opinion. The Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) has also led an effort to look at similar issues and is in the latter stages of issuing a report. Technical knowledge and capabilities have advanced, the system has changed due to settlement, additional storms have occurred, better data has been collected and there has been some effort to assess what has been done thus far. The HSDRRS must be recertified in 2023. He recommended that the SLFPA-E systematically approach this problem and work towards the ultimate recertification. The first step would be the development of a plan for a reanalysis of the HSDRRS and its components, which would include the length of time for implementation, costs and information regarding data collection.

Mr. Turner explained that the scope of work is basically for the planning phase. Information is needed on the current state of the science. An estimate of the length of time for the effort can be determined based on today's available technology in order to begin the process in time to meet the 2023 deadline. He pointed out that sufficient time must be incorporated into the process in order to mediate any issues that may be discovered. The surge analysis will be a major component in the recertification effort. Interior drainage may also have to be addressed; however, the responsible entity for this component will need to be identified. He recommended that a working group be formed that would include the SLFPA-E, SLFPA-W, CPRA, other entities that deal with the levee system and parish governmental entities that deal with the drainage component. A lead must be identified to coordinate the effort and ensure that all entities are carrying out their responsibilities. No structure has been put in place as of this time to coordinate the effort. Beginning the process with the scope of work could be the impetus for getting other entities on board. He commented that several weeks ago he asked the USACE to host a meeting with the SLFPA-E, SLFPA-W, CPRA and other appropriate entities to begin a discussion on roles and responsibilities for future efforts. The USACE is very non-committal because it does not have authorization or funding for the effort at the present time.

Dr. Lopez agreed with the previous comments regarding the need to coordinate this type of analysis. He asked about whether the work would meet future requirements for recertification. Mr. Turner responded that the USACE should be brought into the effort since it has a significant amount of institutional knowledge on this type of analysis. Legislation may be required in order provide the USACE with the appropriate authorization to participate. He pointed out that the CPRA, the non-Federal sponsor, must be a key player since the surge analysis is a regional effort. Mr. Luettich noted that the surge analysis must also reasonably address areas outside of the levees. While the SLFPA-E may do the planning, it would not make sense for the SLFPA-E alone to do the analysis.

Dr. Lopez asked would there be a public solicitation issued for the plan. Mr. Turner responded that the scope of work was written with a public solicitation in mind; however, it is the Board's decision. Dr. Lopez asked would Bob Jacobsen's report be available to use as a resource. Mr. Turner indicated that Bob Jacobsen's report on the surge analysis is on the SLFPA-E website. Mr. Luettich pointed out that scope of work

includes a review of the methodology that has been used for the current system and recent evaluations of this methodology by the SLFPA-E and CPRA. Mr. Turner clarified that typically the SLFPA-E would solicit qualification statements for this type of work. Based on the qualification statements the SLFPA-E could either pick a firm or establish a short list of firms for interviews or to provide proposals.

Mr. Kemp pointed out that it may be helpful to begin collecting certain information and data. Much of the effort will be getting the necessary data collection programs coordinated and started. Mr. Turner added that a user friendly database system should be developed.

Rickie Brouillette commented that the necessary questions need to be developed at this point of time. One question concerns the goal—is the goal recertification (an insurance driven issue) or further risk reduction. He agreed that a solid comprehensive coordinated effort is needed. Some of the CPRA's on-going efforts may be the start of the effort; particularly, if the flood protection authorities participate in the funding. The State will be doing a Lidar flyover of the region that will result in updated information. He commented on the issue of relative sea level rise, which drives wave overtopping. He pointed out that the issues and constraints (e.g. funding) must first be identified. Mr. Kemp commented that the logistics could be worked out and the collaboration solidified within the discipline of a contract.

Bob Jacobsen questioned whether the onus for a new hazard analysis is on the recertification applicant. Flood maps are prepared through a joint agreement between the parishes and FEMA. Features included on the map must be accredited. Mr. Turner explained that FEMA's guidance on levee certification for the NFIP outlines what must be done in order for a levee to be accredited. The certification effort is the responsibility of the levee owner. Some of the finer points of the requirements need further investigation since the SLFPA-E only has jurisdiction over the levee system (the exception is the Lake Borgne Levee District). There have been instances in the past where FEMA did the hydrologic analysis; however, this is not typical. Mr. Kemp clarified that the SLFPA-E is interested in reducing residual risks and wants to understand the capabilities and deficits of the system before even going into the recertification effort. He added that a good group of knowledgeable people have focused on this effort in an informal way and that he wanted the momentum to continue. Mr. Turner suggested that the SLFPA-E Board adopt a resolution recommending a collaboration with the CPRA and other appropriate entities.

Mr. Luettich questioned the level of return frequency to be used and suggested that an attempt should be made to assess residual risks to the 1,000-year level. Mr. Turner commented that the USACE used the 750-year event in the armoring program. He pointed out that for the larger events there comes a point where there is no additional benefit of resiliency because the entire system completely fills due to overtopping even though there is no levee failure. He commented on the uncertainty issues beyond the 500-year level. Mr. Jacobsen pointed out that there are independent exposures within

the regional system. An area could have multiple independent exposures. He commented on wind surge analyses, lake tilt and uncertainties.

Alan Dupont with CH2M Hill cautioned about the development of information that may not meet potential new standards.

Mr. Kemp stated that additional work will be done to the scope of work over the next several weeks. He asked for written comments from the public on the scope of work. Mr. Turner stated that Board approval would be required in order to issue a Request for Qualifications.

Dr. Lopez advised that the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation (LPBF) is kicking off a project for working with entities around Lake Pontchartrain and Lake Maurepas interested in hurricane surge management. The kick off meeting will be held tomorrow. The LPBF has attempted to reach out to levee boards, parish governments, major municipalities and other entities. The LPBF hopes through a sequence of meetings that a resource can be created for the levee boards, parish governments and municipalities. He stressed the importance of thinking regionally. He pointed out that the jurisdictions of all of the entities are limited and that no one entity covers the total geography being considered. He noted that this effort is similar to the LPBF's effort relative to the Lake Pontchartrain water quality issue.

Mr. Kemp commented that he anticipated that a resolution may be presented to the Board in order to move forward.

There was no further business; therefore, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.