

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COASTAL PROTECTION
AND RESTORATION AUTHORITY

The above-entitled Public Meeting was held at the State Capitol Building, House Committee Room 6, Baton Rouge, Louisiana on Thursday, April 12, 2007, commencing at 9:12 a.m.

Reported by:
R. Aaron Palmer
Certified Court Reporter

1

APPEARANCES:

cpr

2 SIDNEY COFFEE
Chair, Governor's Office of Coastal Activities

3
4 SCOTT ANGELLE
Secretary, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources

5 JOHNNY BRADBERRY
Secretary, Louisiana Department of Transportation and
6 Development

7 BRYANT HAMMETT
Secretary, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and
8 Fisheries

9 KAREN GAUTREAUX
Deputy Secretary, Department of Environmental Quality
10 (Designee of Secretary)

11 BRAD SPICER
Assistant Commissioner, Louisiana Department of
12 Agriculture & Forestry (Designee of the Commissioner)

13 JERRY LUKE LeBLANC
Commissioner, Louisiana Division of Administration

14 KING MILLING
Chair, Governor's Advisory Commission on Coastal
15 Protection, Restoration and Conservation

16 SUSAN SEVERANCE
Executive Counsel, Governor's Office for Homeland
17 Security & Emergency Preparedness

18 BEN MOSS
Louisiana Department of Insurance

19 THOMAS L. JACKSON
President, Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection
20 Authority East, Levee Region 1 Representative

21 STEVE WILSON
President, Pontchartrain Levee District, Levee Region 3
22 Representative

23 WINDELL CUROLE
General Manager, South Lafourche Levee District, Levee
24 Region 4 Representative

25

3

1 BENNY ROUSSELLE
Intergovernmental Affairs Coordinator, Office of the
2 Secretary, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources

3
4 EDMOND J. PREAU, JR.
Assistant Secretary, Public Works, Hurricane Flood
Protection & Intermodal Transportation

cpr

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RENEECA JAMES
Office Manager, Governor's Office of Coastal Activities

ENGER KINCHEN
Governor's Office of Coastal Activities

4

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

CAPTION	1
APPEARANCES	2, 3
SPEAKERS:	
Ms. Durham-Aguilera	13, 127
Mr. Porthouse	93, 151, 260
Mr. Twilley	136
Mr. Fruge	177
Ms. Slaughter	223
Mr. Wingate	224
Mr. Frey and Mr. Bahr	245
PUBLI C COMMENTS:	
Mr. Dai g l e	264

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

cpr

Mr. Ford	265
Mr. Moertle	267
REPORTER' S PAGE	275
REPORTER' S CERTI FI CATE.	276

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

MS. COFFEE:

Okay, I'd like to call the meeting to order. Somebody gave me this gavel; I've never used this before.

All right. I'd like to welcome everyone and I'd like to especially thank the House of Representatives for allowing us, once again, to use their committee room. It's very helpful. It seems to be the perfect setup for us because we have a lot of members and we usually have a lot of

11 audience. ^{cpr} So thank you again to that body.

12 We have a very busy agenda today and I'd like
13 to go ahead and get started; we have a lot to
14 cover. This is a very important meeting. This is
15 truly - and several of us have said this before
16 - it's truly the end of the beginning of a new
17 phase of our history where we go forward as a
18 state with, for the first time, a comprehensive
19 plan that addresses the needs of our coast both
20 through hurricane protection and coastal
21 restoration to help us not only make our coastal
22 community safer but to ultimately have a
23 sustainable ecosystem that serves not just
24 Louisiana but the entire nation.

25 So I would like to at this time to welcome -

6

1 We've got some housekeeping duties to take care of
2 right here at the beginning. But first I would
3 like to welcome and recognize our new members: Mr.
4 Mark Morgan and Livingston Parish President Mike
5 Grimmer. I think Mr. Grimmer is not here yet, but
6 he is supposedly on his way. Mr. Morgan was
7 appointed to represent the Southeast Louisiana
8 Flood Protection Authority West, and we welcome
9 you, Mark, to our authority. Mr. Grimmer was
10 selected by the Louisiana Police Jury Association
11 to represent a coastal parish with no levee
12 district that is west of the Atchafalaya River.
13 He represents Livingston Parish.

14 I would ^{cpr} also like to recognize and thank our
15 returning members who have been reappointed for
16 another one year term: Mr. Steve Wilson, Mr.
17 Windell Curole, and Ms. Tina Horn. Steve is on
18 his way. Tina called and said she could not make
19 this meeting. Her husband had an accident, and
20 he's okay, but she needs to be there with him.
21 Steve represents the Pontchartrain Levee District,
22 the Atchafalaya Basin Levee District, and the
23 Lafourche Basin Levee District and North Lafourche
24 Levee District. Windell represents the Terrebonne
25 Levee District, South Lafourche Levee District,

7

1 the Grand Isle Independent Levee Districts, and
2 the Plaquemines Parish Government. Tina was
3 appointed by the Police Jury Association of
4 Louisiana to represent a coastal parish with no
5 levee district that is west of the Atchafalaya
6 River. She represents Cameron Parish.

7 At this time, for our cleanup activities, I
8 would like ask Denise Fitzgerald from the Attorney
9 General's Office - Denise is the counsel assigned
10 to the CPRA, and she's going to hand out some
11 forms that we all need to sign today to make sure
12 that our records are all in order.

13 Denise.

14 MS. FITZGERALD:

15 Hi. For those of you who don't know me, I'm
16 the attorney assigned to the CPRA, as Sidney said,

17 and there are four of us in our office, Tonya
18 Ozene is another one of them, and available to
19 assist the CPRA with any legal requirements it
20 has. And so today we are going to swear in the
21 new members and the newly appointed members, and
22 I'm going to pass out copies of the oaths of
23 office to everyone for you to sign and fill in any
24 information that's included there. There's a
25 space on this form that says you received a copy

8

1 of the Code of Ethics as required by statute. If
2 you look, I put them in your chair. I know ya'll
3 probably have four or five copies of these, but
4 we'll do it again. So I'm going to pass these out
5 as Tonya administers the oath.

6 MS. OZENE:

7 Would the newly appointed members and
8 reappointed members please stand to take the oath
9 of office.

10 I, state your name, do solemnly swear or
11 affirm that I will support the constitution and
12 laws of the United States and the constitution and
13 laws of this state, and that I will faithfully and
14 impartially discharge and perform all the duties
15 incumbent upon me as a member of the Coastal
16 Protection and Restoration Authority according to
17 the best of my ability and understanding, so help
18 me God.

19

cpr

23 Here.
24 MS. KINCHEN:
25 Secretary Bryant Hammett?

10

1 Deputy Secretary Karen Gautreaux?
2 MS. GAUTREAU:
3 Here.
4 MS. KINCHEN:
5 Secretary Michael Olivier is absent.
6 Assistant Commissioner Brad Spicer?
7 MR. SPICER:
8 Here.
9 MS. KINCHEN:
10 Mr. King Milling?
11 MR. MILLING:
12 Here.
13 MS. KINCHEN:
14 Susan Severance?
15 MS. SEVERANCE:
16 Here.
17 MS. KINCHEN:
18 Mr. Ben Moss?
19 MR. MOSS:
20 Here.
21 MS. KINCHEN:
22 Mr. Thomas L. Jackson?
23 MR. JACKSON:
24 Here.
25 MS. KINCHEN:

1 Mr. Mark L. Morgan?

2 MR. MORGAN:

3 Here.

4 MS. KINCHEN:

5 Mr. Steve Wilson?

6 Mr. Windell Curole?

7 MR. CUROLE:

8 Here.

9 MS. KINCHEN:

10 Mr. Mike Grimmer?

11 MS. COFFEE:

12 Thank you, appreciate it.

13 At this time I'd also like to recognize two
14 of our legislators: Representative Carla Dartez
15 and Representative St. Germain. Oh, and
16 Representative Wilfred Pierre. Excuse me, I
17 didn't see you back there. And Mr. Odinet is in
18 the office. Well, we've got a lot - would all of
19 our rep - I mean, have I missed anyone else? Any
20 other legislators? Thank you very much for
21 attending this and being here with us today.

22 At this point, I'd like to ask for a change
23 in the schedule, in the agenda in order to
24 accommodate the Corps of Engineers. And I know
25 ya'll have a very busy day today because you've

cpr

1 got a field hearing down in New Orleans. I would
2 like to ask Ms. Karen Durham-Aguilera - Well,
3 first, I need somebody to make the motion, if it's
4 okay?

5

6

7

MS. COFFEE:

8

Thank you.

9

10 Oh, okay. Representative Dartez, first, did
11 you - would you like to - Did you want to
12 address the group?

13

MS. DARTEZ:

14

I'm here to hear - get information -

15

MS. COFFEE:

16

Okay.

17

MS. DARTEZ:

18

- (inaudible).

19

MS. COFFEE:

20

Okay, that's fine. Okay. All right, good.

21

22

I would like to ask you then, Karen, to
23 please come forward. This is - You know, Dan
24 Hitchings retired from the Corps back in December,
25 and I'd like to welcome for the first time Karen
Durham-Aguilera who has replaced Dan. But I think
your duties may even have been a bit expanded.

26

Motion seconded

1

You might want to explain first.

2

MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

cpr

3 And good morning, Sidney, thank you for
4 inviting me. Secretary Angelle, Secretary
5 Bradbury, members of the CPRA, the state
6 representatives, and the various attenders that we
7 have, I'm really glad to be here today.

8 As Sidney said, I am the new Director of Task
9 Force Hope. So a couple things that I - You
10 know, what does that mean? You know, first, I'm a
11 member of the Army senior executive service.
12 Ordinarily, I would be in Washington, D.C., right
13 now or still at my past job in the northwest. But
14 because of the enormity of this mission, you know,
15 the Corps took one of our senior executives, first
16 Dan and now myself, and put us on the ground. And
17 I've actually moved to New Orleans.

18 So I have two roles. You know, the first
19 role is that long term planning role, you know,
20 for coastal restoration and increased hurricane
21 protection, and we're going to talk about that a
22 little more today when John Porthouse and I give a
23 joint presentation on how that study is working.
24 But then my other role is on the near term role.
25 You know, and that's the director to oversee an

14

1 entire system program of the hurricane protection
2 system to bring it up to hundred year level
3 protection. And the way that we do that, we have
4 a huge extended team to include using our national
5 assets across the Corps, our research labs,

cpr

6 contractors, and various other members of the
7 community, industry, and so on, to help us do
8 this.

9 Locally on the ground in New Orleans, we
10 have, basically, two organizations that are there
11 responsible for the program management part of the
12 execution to actually get the projects in place.
13 That's a combination of the New Orleans District
14 led by Colonel Rich Wagenaar, and the other
15 organization, the Hurricane Protection Office, led
16 by Colonel Jeff Bedey. This mission is so
17 important and so enormous, you know, that we
18 brought an extended team to bear with two military
19 commanders on the ground to help make it happen.

20 You know, I was asked to be brief today and I
21 should have asked what the definition of brief is.
22 But I'm going to try to do this in about ten
23 minutes to allow time for questions that I hope to
24 be able to answer. And if there's anything that I
25 can't answer, I'll go back with the team and I'll

15

1 get you the answer later.

2 MS. COFFEE:

3 And, Karen, please take the time you need. I
4 mean, this is an important report because this is
5 the last time this body will probably meet before
6 the beginning of hurricane season, and that's why
7 we wanted to make sure, even with your schedule
8 today, that we got this report in.

cpr

9 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

10 Okay, well, thank you, Sidney, for the
11 commission's indulgence.

12 We're all familiar with the enormous
13 catastrophe that hit this area, Hurricanes Katrina
14 and Rita across Louisiana and Mississippi in
15 August and September of 2005. We found out that
16 Katrina was nearly a four hundred year storm and
17 that part of damage resulted due to the surge -
18 I'm sorry, I need more light than that to see my
19 notes. Thank you.

20 Part of the damage, of course, resulted in a
21 surge from Lake Pontchartrain, Lake Borgne, and
22 Plaquemines Parish. The New Orleans and
23 surrounding area were flooded for up to fifteen or
24 seventeen feet of water. Over thirteen hundred
25 people lost their lives and hundreds of thousands

16

1 were displaced.

2 There was an external forensic group stood
3 up; this was the Interagency Performance
4 Evaluation Task Force made up of over a 150 people
5 from across industry, academia across the nation,
6 state, federal agencies, industry, including
7 members from the United Kingdom. The forensics
8 report found that two-thirds of the catastrophic
9 flooding and over one-half of the economic damage
10 was caused by four different breaches, that was
11 basically failed I-walls along the outfall canals.

cpr

12 So what I'm going to let you know today is: what
13 improvements have we made, what have we done
14 today, are we ready for the start of this year's
15 hurricane season, and how we're applying lessons
16 learned in the way ahead.

17 This doesn't show everything, but one of the
18 things that we've learned, you know, that the
19 nation has learned, is that a true protection
20 system is made up of components. So we can't just
21 look at those individual components such as
22 levees, floodwalls, or gates, or pumping by
23 themselves. We have to look at the entire system.
24 This is a depiction of part of the system. You
25 know, you can see the Inner Harbor Navigation

17

1 Canal, the different levee system, the outfall
2 canals, and so forth. So when I talk today, I'm
3 talking about the system as in components of the
4 system that make up the hurricane protection
5 system.

6 This is an optimal system schedule. This is
7 a master schedule of the entire system of listed
8 components of that system, such as perimeter
9 protection, the permanent pumping, the interior
10 drainage, storm proofing, Plaquemines and LaRose
11 to Golden Meadow, Grande Isle, those levee
12 systems. And, of course, everything we do has to
13 be integrated with the long-term planning effort.
14 There are numerous projects that make up the

cpr

15 components of those systems, and, of course, when
16 we're doing our basic project and construction
17 management, you know, we're constantly planning
18 how to get those construction projects in place.

19 If you look at the stars on the top, those
20 are all milestones that we have to hit to try to
21 deliver this hundred year level protection, you
22 know, prior to hurricane season of 2011. Most are
23 familiar with the request for re-appropriation and
24 an emergency spending bill that's being
25 contemplated by Congress and the Administration at

18

1 this time. We are driving to complete a cost
2 estimate of the hundred year level protection by
3 mid July, you know, because we need to inform the
4 Administration or Congress how much additional
5 funds are needed to complete this system.

6 To do that, because of the way the original
7 appropriations were set up, we need what we call
8 flexibility. In other words, the ability to move
9 money around between the different features of
10 work, receive the additional funding to complete
11 the system by October of '08. And this is all to
12 deliver the system prior to hurricane season. So
13 far as - If you're looking at this, you're going
14 to say, "Okay, it's already almost April 30th and
15 Congress and the Administration have not yet
16 passed that emergency spending bill. So what does
17 that mean?"

cpr

18 We are running what-if drills right now to
19 determine the effects on delivering this hundred
20 year level protection, you know, if we fail to get
21 that re-appropriation flexibility by the end of
22 April or by the first of June, by the first of
23 July, or what could happen if you don't get it
24 until October. So we're going through that right
25 now. And two things: You know, first, in the

19

1 short term, just this summer, it won't have much
2 of an effect on delivering the system protection,
3 you know, by hurricane season 2011. As we get
4 closer towards October, it will have an effect,
5 and we're running the schedule now to see what
6 those stakes could be.

7 But there's another effect and that's the
8 effect on the market. And if we try to stack up
9 the way we award construction contracts, well then
10 we have a problem with availability and supply,
11 the builders, the borrow, you know, that whole
12 orchestrated plan to make this work. So, you
13 know, we can't just run the schedule exercise, we
14 have to look at the market, the resources, the
15 materials, and the builders and their availability
16 to make this happen. So we're going through those
17 scenarios right now, but the bottom line is we
18 really do need that flexibility to be able to
19 deliver this system, you know, by the 2011 date.

20 So where are we right now? We've had - We
Page 17

cpr

21 are contemplating roughly 248 separate contracts.
22 That number could change as we continue to
23 complete our designs. We have 77 already awarded.
24 We are planning to award another 52 within the
25 next six months. And that is assuming the

20

1 flexibility and the re-appropriation at least -
2 at least by October of this year. And I've listed
3 some of the components that make up this system.

4 My Chief of Engineers, Lieutenant General
5 Strock is testifying this afternoon in New Orleans
6 in a congressional field hearing regarding small
7 business. You know, as we've gone through time
8 after Katrina and Rita hit, an enormous amount of
9 work was done both in the initial response, the
10 repair and to date. So one of our goals, of
11 course, is to make sure we are giving as much work
12 as we can to small business and it's the
13 appropriate amount of work.

14 So the Chief, along with other federal
15 agencies and then some locals, will be testifying
16 as to our plans to date, how well we've done on
17 those plans, and what we plan to do in the future
18 regarding small businesses. Just kind of an off-
19 the-cuff statistic, as we look at the amount of
20 work that has happened, both as to prime
21 contractors and to sub-contractors, a lot of the
22 work for small business has gone to sub-
23 contractors. Roughly 90 percent of those small

cpr

24 contractors were from the state of Louisiana.
25 So what system improvements have we made

21

1 leading up to 2007? You know, one of the things
2 that my folks hear me say every day is the drive
3 to June 1st. And that's the drive to make sure
4 we're as ready as we can be to protect and reduce
5 the risk for the community for this hurricane
6 season.

7 You're looking at some before and after
8 pictures. Before, of course, was the damage that
9 occurred after Katrina hit. The after picture,
10 though, is what it looks like after some of the
11 initial repairs were made and what it looks like
12 today.

13 We have repaired all the damages that
14 resulted at that time, but we also learned a lot
15 of lessons in that. You know, we not only learned
16 the lessons of the system components, but we
17 learned a lot of lessons regarding the initial
18 design, you know, of those floodwalls. And so we
19 have come - corrected to the floodwalls that we
20 found, made them more stable going from I-walls to
21 the T-wall sections. Where we have floodwalls to
22 be vulnerable, we have armored them. We have also
23 strengthened the transitions, and the transitions
24 are when you go from a floodwall, a flood control
25 structure - in other words, going from concrete

1 to the earthen levees. We found those to be
2 vulnerable points and we've gone in and
3 strengthened them.

4 We put in 25 miles of new levees and restored
5 them to the design height. By that, I mean the
6 authorized heights that existed pre-Katrina. So
7 today the system is stronger than it - better
8 than it was before Katrina. But we are driving to
9 make the entire system, bring it - bringing that
10 up to a hundred year level protection.

11 This is a snapshot of a map with some of the
12 other things we're doing regarding levees,
13 floodwalls, and armoring. We are raising specific
14 IHNC levees above the stillwater elevation. The
15 reason we are doing that is to improve the
16 stability in those areas.

17 Another important component is the pumps and
18 the gates. We have been in the news quite often
19 lately over what we're doing with the interim
20 pumping capacity at the outfall canals. This is
21 not a new story. This has been going on since
22 June of last year. But I want to bring you up to
23 date on where are we today. One of things that we
24 did is we took a look at what capacity we had that
25 existed. And I listed pre-Rita because during

1 Rita the ^{cpr} flooding did not occur. So during Rita
2 the outfall - the pumping capacity of these
3 outfall canals were those top numbers that you
4 see, 2700 cfs at the 17th Street Canal, for
5 example.

6 As of today, we have 18 pumps fully installed
7 and tested at the 17th Street Canal. We're putting
8 in about four pumps a week, and that includes
9 installation and testing at the other two canals.
10 We are on track to have all 40 hydraulic pumps
11 installed by the first of June.

12 Now, the second part of that is the
13 additional capacity that we want to get in place
14 by the peak of hurricane season or right around
15 mid-August. So we have additional pumps that
16 we're planning to install. These are a
17 combination of direct drive and portable pumps.
18 So that way, we have additional capacity, you
19 know, by mid-August to provide as much protection
20 as we can should we have to close those gates and
21 be able to pump.

22 Another component is the interior drainage.
23 New Orleans and the community has always had a
24 challenge, even during a normal rainfall event.
25 One of the things that we've done since the storm

24

1 is go in and repair a lot of the existing pump
2 stations. We've awarded 21 out of 26 contracts.
3 We've already completed 15 of them, and we expect

4 to have these repairs complete by this summer.

5 You know, I can talk about the system
6 components and the improvements that we've made
7 and the work where we're striving put in place,
8 but another huge lesson of being ready for
9 hurricane season is the way that we respond to an
10 emergency. Our New Orleans district with the
11 Corps of Engineers, you know, has the lead to make
12 that emergency response.

13 But they do that through a combination of
14 teams, not just from across the Corps, you know,
15 but with FEMA, with local emergency management
16 offices, with the State Office, and a whole host
17 of people. We learned a lot since Katrina, and we
18 are better prepared to respond to an emergency
19 today than we were then. I can define that as
20 people, increased communications and redundant
21 communications, having supplies on hand,
22 equipment, and pre-positioning our response
23 contract. We are already drilling in preparation.

24 Another thing that we've learned is something
25 we never did before. And that's if an event

25

1 happens, we used to just talk, you know, to the
2 parishes' emergency operation center, but we
3 didn't have people actually in the center. So you
4 have a problem with communications, we had a
5 problem talking to each other; when I say "we," I
6 mean both FEMA and the Corps of Engineers. So,

7 now, we have ^{cpr} people - these are our local folks
8 that live here and work with the parishes every
9 day - where we will put them in the parishes'
10 emergency operation center during events so they
11 will be right there with the rest of the response
12 team.

13 Another thing we're doing is an operational
14 test in May for the interim control structures in
15 the outfall canals. And then in addition to the
16 drills that are already ongoing, we have a - what
17 we call a table top hurricane exercise on 31st of
18 May. That, basically, is a drill to act as if the
19 event actually occurred, and it's a combination of
20 the Corps, FEMA, you know, the State, the Homeland
21 Security emergency office, the local responders in
22 the parishes, the local responders in the city
23 office, and so forth. This is something that we
24 do periodically across the country, but we're
25 going to do it locally, you know, to just try to

26

1 increase the way that we're right. If we have to
2 respond to an event, we want to be as ready as we
3 can.

4 Some of the challenges, I've talked about the
5 forensics and the - this external huge group of
6 the IPET, Interagency Performance Evaluation Task
7 Force. The wake up call to the nation after
8 Katrina was that you have to have an integrated,
9 comprehensive protection system, and that means

10 all the components have to work together. The
11 ongoing challenge, of course, is always to match
12 those commitments with the authorities and
13 available funding. And that relates to my
14 comments earlier about the schedule.

15 And then there's communication. We've also
16 learned we have to do a much better job of
17 communicating risk, risk awareness, and the
18 planning efforts across the community so that
19 people understand the risk, they're aware of
20 what's going on, and they can make their personal
21 decisions, as well.

22 I mentioned, too, the upcoming projects with
23 the permanent pump stations and the IHNC. One of
24 the things that we're doing to try to meet these
25 challenges that's new within the Corps of

27

1 Engineers, and that's to use design build
2 construction contracts for these projects. We are
3 used to doing that with our military construction
4 program. We don't normally do that in the civil
5 works. And I frequently get industry asking me,
6 "Are you serious about that?" We are serious
7 about it. It is our plan, and I haven't heard
8 anybody telling me to stop.

9 So to make this successful, we have a very
10 wide stakeholder engagement. I call it a new kind
11 of partnering because I spent a good part of my
12 career managing construction projects, and in that

13 type of partnering we award a construction
14 contract and then we sit down with the builder and
15 the end user and we decide we're going to work
16 together. Well, in this case, we have our levee
17 authorities, parishes, environmental groups, the
18 city, industry. A lot of different people are
19 coming together right now to help us form the
20 solution on how we're going go about a design
21 build for the IHNC and for the permanent pump
22 stations.

23 We'll take the requirements that we're
24 hearing in these stakeholder's groups and actually
25 put them in our request for proposal, which is the

28

1 solicitation for the design build contract. We'll
2 make this part of the technical evaluation, use it
3 during design reviews, and actually get our
4 stakeholders to participate during acceptance
5 testing. We're getting a lot of positive feedback
6 on doing this because it is different. But, you
7 know, one thing we learned from Katrina, the
8 entire community are the stakeholders, and we need
9 a lot of help in making sure we're going about
10 this the right way.

11 Another recent success when we talk about
12 partnership is after month's of trying we have
13 achieved success with our project cooperation
14 agreements with the state, the Corps, and the
15 levee authorities. We have the West Bank and

19 almost ^{cpr} daily with the city, with the Gulf Coast
20 Reconstruction Office, with the Administration,
21 and with FEMA, as well as others within the
22 community to have a synchronized message that we
23 can give to the public so that they know what the
24 risks are, but even more important, how they use
25 it to make personal decisions both for their homes

30

1 and for their businesses.

2 So within the next two months, you know,
3 you're going to see those - the maps that are
4 produced by all this risk planning, and it will be
5 integrated with the things the city's doing with
6 their targeted zones for redevelopment, as well as
7 FEMA and their effort to come up with the
8 annualized flood maps.

9 Okay, well, that concludes my briefing and
10 I'll be glad to answer questions. And, again,
11 Sidney, as I said, any questions that I can't
12 answer today, I'll get back with the team and then
13 we'll come back later to you and give you an
14 answer.

15 MS. COFFEE:

16 Okay, thank you. And I'd like to note that
17 two more members of the authority came in. I'd
18 like to welcome Commissioner of Administration
19 Jerry Luke LeBlanc and Mr. Steve Wilson, and I'd
20 like to note that on the roll call.

21 All right, I'd like to open it up now to

22 questions ^{cpr} from the Authority. And for the new
23 members who aren't familiar with it, you need to
24 just push your button so that I'll know that you
25 have - that you'd like to speak. Okay.

31

1 Secretary Bradberry.

2 MR. BRADBERRY:

3 Ms. Aguilera, I've written down a few
4 questions I want to ask around floodgates and
5 several other areas. One - So I'll read some of
6 these, bear with me.

7 What's the protocol for closing the gates on
8 the pump station outfall canals? I mean, who
9 makes the call? What triggers the call? Will
10 there be a consultation with local entities before
11 that call is made, and which entities will that
12 be? It will be an important area, I believe, that
13 they're all in coordination.

14 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

15 Secretary Bradberry, thank you for that
16 question. That's one of the things that we're
17 working on every day. Because, you know, first,
18 the pumping capacity has to integrate with
19 interior drainage, and that's the pumping capacity
20 of the New Orleans Sewer and Water Board. You
21 know, the pumps that I'm speaking of would only
22 operate when the gates are closed, and that's
23 during a hurricane-like event. The question is,
24 "Well, how do we know when to close the gates?"

25

One of the ^{cpr} things that we're doing daily is

32

1 working with Marcia St. Martin and her folks to
2 determine exactly when we would have to close
3 those gates, when we would have to pump.

4 So I can't define it in terms of how much
5 rain do you get before you know, because there's
6 the rainfall event and there's the hurricane
7 event. Now - But we're working with New Orleans
8 Sewer and Water Board further to determine what
9 that protocol would be.

10 MR. BRADBERRY:

11 Well, at the end of the day, who you believe
12 makes the final call on closing the gate?

13 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

14 We do. But we don't do it by ourselves. We
15 do it in combination with the community that we're
16 working with, but we have the responsibility to be
17 able to close those gates and to start pumping.

18 MR. BRADBERRY:

19 What, in your opinion, is the maximum safe
20 water elevation for the London Avenue Canal, and
21 how does that affect the pumping capacity of that
22 location?

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

24 Okay. Right now the safe water elevation is
25 defined at four feet. We have a site-specific low

33

cpr

1 test that we're going to run early this summer,
2 and we hope to even start running that before the
3 end of May, because we believe that that may be
4 too conservative. And with it set at four feet,
5 that limits the pumping capacity.

6 So we want to go back in and find out is that
7 truly conservative with the design assumptions we
8 made, or can we raise it. So we're going to do a
9 site-specific low test along the part of the canal
10 that we feel would be vulnerable, and we're
11 working out the details of how to do that, John,
12 you know, right now with the people that live
13 there, with the Sewer and Water Board, and the
14 others that were involved.

15 If we find first by looking at the short
16 stretch that that is a conservative safe water
17 elevation and we can raise it, then we'll go to
18 the next step in determining if we're able to do a
19 full low test. If we do it, though, we have to do
20 it well before the peak of hurricane season or we
21 would have to wait. So right now it's defined at
22 four feet, but if we find a way to validate that
23 it is conservative so we're not overloading our
24 pumping capacity, then that's what we'll do.

25 MR. BRADBERRY:

34

1 But when are going - You're going to do this
2 test before hurricane season?

cpr

3 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

4 We're doing it somewhere around the end of
5 May. It's a pretty short test. It goes on for 24
6 hours a day and we have people out there for 24
7 hours a day that - you know, monitoring the
8 instrumentation. So we'll have the results within
9 - in about two weeks after that. But what
10 happens after that, of course, will depend on how
11 successful this test is.

12 MR. BRADBERRY:

13 All right. Okay. With the outfall canals
14 closed, what, in your opinion, would be the
15 rainfall amounts, intensity, and duration, if you
16 can, that - will the temporary pumping system be
17 able to actually accommodate? And which areas
18 will be subject to flooding when the rainfall
19 amounts exceed the pumping capacity? And if you
20 recall - Well, you may not recall. Dan is in the
21 audience, he may recall. But last season, the
22 Corps provided maps showing areas subject to
23 inundation. Are these maps going to be available
24 this year for this season?

25 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

35

1 Secretary, I'll have to check on when - if
2 we - if and when we were going to put out maps
3 again this year, you know, if those maps if those
4 maps are still valid or if we need to update them.

5 I'm going to have to get back to you on
Page 31

cpr

6 saying can we actually categorize that in terms of
7 rainfall amounts. What we've been doing is trying
8 to provide as much capacity as possible and have
9 the capacities of both what we are able to pump
10 out a canal and the interior pumping capacity be
11 about the same. As you can see earlier, it is a
12 dramatic increase from what we had, you know,
13 prior to Katrina.

14 MR. BRADBERRY:

15 I guess my suggestion to you is that if you
16 do indeed try to publish those maps, update them.
17 Last year, I think they were very helpful.

18 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

19 Okay.

20 MR. BRADBERRY:

21 And I think it would be a point of interest,
22 really a point of interest for the citizens in the
23 areas if you can do that.

24 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

25 I'll take that back. Thank you.

36

1 MR. BRADBERRY:

2 On one of your slides, I want to talk a
3 little bit more about the pump capacity. We
4 talked about having 5200 cfs by the June 1st and
5 7600 by mid-August. Is the Corps confident that
6 you'll make that capacity increase by that time?

7 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

8 Yes, we are.

cpr

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. BRADBERRY:

How confident are you?

MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

We're confident. You know, and the reason that we're confident is because, you know, everything that we've planned as far as how many pumps we need to draw that capacity is coming into place. You know, we have the hydraulic pumps, which is just part of the capacity, and then we have the additional capacity provided by additional pumps: the temporary pumps, you know, direct drive pumps, and portable pumps.

We actually had some of those portable pumps in place last year, as well, to try to add to the capacity of the hydraulic pumps as we are installing them. But, you know, we are confident that we are on track, and we're confident in the

37

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

capacity that we're calculating. The other thing that we're doing is making sure we're keeping everybody up to date: how many pumps get into place, when they're in place, when they're tested, successfully tested. We have a lot of people coming out and watching it.

And if we should deviate from that at all for any reason, you know, we'll let people know right away. But the numbers that I've shown is - I flip back to the slide, though it's - most probably can't see it now. That combined capacity

cpr

12 of 7600 cfs, the 17th Street Canal, by mid-August
13 and so forth, the other canals, we are confident.

14 MR. BRADBERRY:

15 Well, how does the 7600 cfs compare to - at
16 17th Street Canal compare to what the Sewerage and
17 Water Board can pump?

18 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

19 You know, that's one discussion that we have
20 often. Because if you look at the nameplate
21 capacity, and I say nameplate by - if you add up
22 the numbers that would be on a pump for a motor,
23 that capacity would be ten thousand. But whether
24 that system can actually operate at that
25 efficiency is another question. So we're working

38

1 daily with the Sewer and Water Board, you know, to
2 make sure that, first, we can both deliver the
3 capacities that we envision. You know, and
4 second, that the systems are working together, you
5 know, to be able to deliver with that capacity.

6 MR. BRADBERRY:

7 Yeah, because you have a - Really, if you
8 have different pump capacities your, I guess, your
9 weakest link is going to be where you have the
10 smallest capacity, i.e., when you close those
11 gates and you're pumping out of the city into the
12 17th Street Canal and the Sewerage and Water Board
13 can deliver twelve thousand cfs or ten thousand,
14 whatever that number is, and you can only deliver

cpr

15 7500 or 5200, then, you know, that's the weak link
16 in the system, or the smaller link in the system,
17 I might add.

18 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

19 Well, you know, both entities have to work
20 together to be able to ensure they can deliver as
21 much capacity as possible. You know, what we're
22 driving for by the end of August, by mid-August,
23 is 7600 hundred cfs. Whether their number is
24 eight thousand or nine thousand or ten thousand,
25 we're not sure of, you know. But the point is to

39

1 get as much as we can get into place as quickly as
2 possible to deliver that capacity.

3 You know, one thing I want to point out is
4 the perspective. We had an enormous amount of
5 effort that we had happen in a matter of months
6 where the normal practices would have taken three
7 to five years to design, manufacture, and install
8 these pumps, and we did it in a month - in
9 months. You know, so we're driving just as fast
10 and as hard as we can, but anything we put in has
11 to work. So when I say we're confident of that,
12 what I'm confident of is that we can deliver, you
13 know, that planned capacity with the system we're
14 putting in by mid-August.

15 MR. BRADBERRY:

16 You can rationalize my interest in all of
17 this. And that is, you know, it's quite likely -

cpr

18 And, hopefully, we won't get a hurricane, but we
19 could get a heck of a lot of rain and the city has
20 to be in a position to be able to pump itself out
21 in all areas. And so we have to understand and
22 clearly work together with Sewerage and Water
23 Board, the Corps, and everyone else to make sure
24 that that pumping coordination and that the
25 evacuation of that water is done properly.

40

1 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

2 Absolutely. You know, but New Orleans has
3 the challenge they had before and the challenge we
4 have now to be sure they can handle a rainfall
5 event. You know, and that's before we would even
6 get to the point, you know, where we would close
7 those gates, you know, and have to pump out the
8 canal. But I certainly understand. I mean, I
9 live there, too, you know, so I certainly
10 understand, you know, how important it is to make
11 the system work as best we can.

12 MR. BRADBERRY:

13 Okay. Just a couple more pump questions.
14 The ten pumps and twelve pumps you have at Orleans
15 Avenue and London Avenue, respectively, you're
16 saying that right now, if I understand this right,
17 you have ongoing testing. Are you seeing any of
18 the problems that you saw - that you experienced
19 at the 17th Street Canal with respect to these
20 pumps? Are you - Is it the same pumping type

cpr

21 system, are they the same manufacturers, and are
22 you getting any of the - similar problems?

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

24 Secretary, what we've done since last year is
25 we identified the different components, problems

41

1 we were having with the pumps, such as some
2 problems with the motors and some problems with
3 the tube end (phonetic), and everything that I'm
4 talking about with the new pumps reflect those
5 corrections.

6 So these totals of forty pumps, the eighteen,
7 the ten, and the twelve, are the same
8 manufacturer, but they're the pumps that have been
9 corrected. So the pumps that we're reinstalling
10 are the ones that we corrected based on the in-
11 place (phonetic) problems that we found last year,
12 and then we test them to make sure that they're
13 working. We run - Depending on how much water we
14 have in the canal, we run ten pumps, twelve pumps,
15 et cetera, simultaneously to make sure that it's
16 working as planned.

17 MR. BRADBERRY:

18 Are they going to be on-line before the
19 season?

20 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

21 Yes, they will. All forty will be in place
22 before 1 June.

23 MR. BRADBERRY:

cpr

24 All forty?

25 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

42

1 All forty hydraulic pumps. And then after
2 that, we'll continue to bring on the additional
3 pumps, portable pumps, and direct-drive pumps so
4 we can further increase the capacity by mid-
5 August.

6 MR. BRADBERRY:

7 And the cfs capacity that we'll see at
8 Orleans and London, is that going to be compatible
9 with what Sewerage and Water Board can pump in the
10 system?

11 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

12 As far as we know, yes. Now, that 7600 at
13 17th Street Canal is really the diving factor. You
14 know, you try to get the capacities to match as
15 close as possible during an event.

16 MR. BRADBERRY:

17 Again, you understand the reason for the line
18 of questioning here.

19 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

20 I certainly do, Secretary, I live in New
21 Orleans, you know.

22 MR. BRADBERRY:

23 People want to have a confidence level -

24 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

25 Absolutely.

1 MR. BRADBERRY:

2 - (inaudible) hard rain during hurricane
3 season of ten, twelve inches in an hour, that they
4 won't flood again, and we have to give them that
5 confidence by assuring that the a pumping system
6 we have in place can do that.

7 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

8 Yes, sir.

9 MR BRADBERRY:

10 Let me read - Hold on. (Inaudible)
11 question. If I could we get the lights back, I
12 can't read my question.

13 Levees, gates, and floodwalls on IHNC and
14 GIWW from its intersection with MRGO have not been
15 brought up to the authorized grade because they
16 will be inside the area to be protected by the
17 proposed floodgates on those channels. I
18 understand that these proposed floodgates are not
19 due to be installed until 2010. I also understand
20 that the present budget does not provide enough
21 funds to complete the proposed project.

22 If these deficient levees, gates, and
23 floodwalls are not repaired, then New Orleans and
24 - New Orleans East and St. Bernard Parish from
25 Parish Road west are unprotected. Do you have a

4 of work we can do right now, you know, during this
5 year and further.

6 That raises another question about, "Well,
7 what about other areas of vulnerability, other
8 holes in the system that you think will be
9 vulnerable this year?" And we're still looking at
10 that and we have found some areas that we want to
11 beef up this year, and so we're using funds that
12 we had to make that happen.

13 MR. BRADBERRY:

14 Do you believe that by May 15th you can report
15 back to us either as a whole body or a
16 subcommittee on the interim measures and the
17 interim rationalization that's taken place around
18 the risked areas.

19 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

20 We can report back on our status.

21 MR. BRADBERRY:

22 I'd like -

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

24 (Inaudible.) I'd be more than happy to, you
25 know, provide information to you about where we

46

1 are, what we found out, and what we can do this
2 year.

3 MR. BRADBERRY:

4 I'd like you to put that in your schedule.

5 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

6 Will do.

7 MR. BRADBERRY:^{cpr}
8 One more question about contractors; find my
9 slide. The - On your contractor slide, the
10 permanent pump station is one contract. You
11 haven't awarded that one contract and it won't be
12 awarded in the next six months. What is that
13 contract?
14 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:
15 That is a design build contract for the IHNC
16 gates that I spoke of.
17 MR. BRADBERRY:
18 Okay.
19 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:
20 So our plans - and, again, it will take
21 flexibility and, of course, supplemental to fully
22 award that design build contract - are to award
23 it this fall.
24 MR. BRADBERRY:
25 Is that for the - That's for I -

47

1 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:
2 That's for the IHNC navigable gates.
3 MR. BRADBERRY:
4 Yeah, well, but you have a permanent pump
5 station. So that's the -
6 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:
7 That's the - That's a different contract.
8 MR. BRADBERRY:
9 That's the one I'm talking about.

10 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:^{cpr}
11 I'm not sure if we can award that this year.
12 MR. BRADBERRY:
13 What's it for? What permanent pump station?
14 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:
15 We have the - what we call the temporary
16 pump stations, and that's the slide that you're
17 looking at right now. That's the pumps and the
18 housing and everything else we're putting in place
19 to be able to provide that pumping capacity for
20 the next few years. But to provide a permanent
21 solution, you know, some of the features that
22 we're installing now will be part of the permanent
23 solution.
24 MR. BRADBERRY:
25 Is it a money issue or is it a design issue?

48

1 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:
2 It's both. It would be a money issue, it's a
3 design issue. A very restricted space out there,
4 so we have to design how we would actually
5 increase the capacity and make these facilities
6 permanent.
7 MR. BRADBERRY:
8 So how long have you been working on the
9 design and how long will - how much longer will
10 the design take?
11 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:
12 This is going to be a design build contract

13 so we're working on the concept right now. You
14 know, in the meantime, we're getting the - what
15 we call the temporary system in place. But when I
16 say "temporary," a lot of the features we're
17 putting in, we're looking to make part of the
18 permanent system.

19 MR. BRADBERRY:

20 But knowing a little bit about design build
21 from the transportation perspective, I would think
22 right now - rationalize that this is a money
23 problem, not a problem with awarding of the design
24 build contract, because, essentially, design build
25 - design will take place indeed when you award

49

1 the contract. So are we having problems with
2 getting the money for this particular pump
3 station?

4 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

5 Well, first, as I mentioned earlier, you
6 know, we have to complete the baseline estimate
7 for the hundred year level protection by mid-July,
8 and we're working on that right now and driving to
9 make that date. You know, second, all of our
10 design and installation efforts to date have been
11 to get these pumps into place as quickly as
12 possible. Instead of taking three to five years
13 to do it, we've done it in a matter of months.

14 As far as a design build contract, I also
15 have years of experience in using design build

16 cpr
contracts on vertical construction. We do have to
17 have enough of the requirements known to put that
18 concept in before you can even go out with the
19 design build. Because if we don't - If we don't,
20 then it becomes an R & D effort, you know, with an
21 unending cost.

22 MR. BRADBERRY:

23 Again, when -

24 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

25 So we are informing those requirements right

50

1 now.

2 MR. BRADBERRY:

3 So when is that - when are those - When is
4 that concept going to be finalized? I mean, here
5 we are almost two years after the storm, so when
6 is that - when is that concept going to be
7 finished so we can award this contract?

8 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

9 You know, well, first, the concept is in play
10 right now in the temporary pumps we're putting in
11 place. To make those permanent and to increase
12 that solution, we are working on that now. That's
13 part of the stakeholder engagement, the industry
14 workshops, et cetera, that I was referring to. We
15 wanted to have that finished by this fall.

16 But, then, that goes to your second point.
17 At that point, it is a money issue. You know, to
18 further expand what we're doing out there and get

19 to the permanent solution will be a money issue.
20 Just as to complete that whole hundred year level
21 protection, additional funds will be required, and
22 we are determining and estimating that amount
23 right now and hope to have - are planning to have
24 that by mid-July.
25 MR. BRADBERRY:

51

1 Here's where I'm going with this line of
2 questioning, money versus design. You have a lot
3 more leverage once you get the design done and you
4 ask for money, as opposed to waiting on money now
5 with no design leverage. So if we can get that
6 done, then we have leverage to ask for the money
7 to complete this thing. The quicker we can get
8 the concept squared away, the parameters squared
9 away, and how we want to do this, the quicker we
10 have more leverage to get that money that we need.

11 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

12 Correct, but I have to look at the entire
13 system, as well. It's not just the additional
14 funds for the permanent pump station, it's the
15 additional funds for all the rest of the
16 components. You know, we determined that the
17 quickest strategy and the strategy to come up with
18 the best product is to use the design build, you
19 know, for both the permanent pump and the IHNC.

20 So we're doing our workshops right now to
21 determine the requirements right now that would go

22 into those ^{cpr} solicitations. You know, we would like
23 to have the solicitation out for the IHNC, you
24 know, by early summer - I mean, late summer,
25 early fall, and same time frame, mid-fall, for the

52

1 permanent pump stations.

2 But as far as the funding aspect, if we have
3 flexibility in the fourth supplemental, our plans
4 are to fully award the design build contract for
5 the IHNC. The permanent pump stations, though,
6 will - would require that additional funding.
7 You know, and we, the Corps, would have to first
8 provide an estimate on and provide it to the
9 Administration and Congress.

10 MR. BRADBERRY:

11 Well, I guess my final comment on this
12 subject is that I would really like you to hurry
13 with the concept.

14 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

15 I understand. I mean, I live in New Orleans;
16 I moved back to New Orleans. We are hurrying as
17 fast as we can.

18 MR. BRADBERRY:

19 We're going - At the next meeting that we
20 have, the next update we have, I'm going to
21 probably ask again about this one, so, hopefully,
22 we'll have a little bit more progress.

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

24 You know, and at that next update, we will be

25

very happy^{cpr} to give you the latest information and

53

1 the status and how far we've gotten with these
2 efforts.

3 MR. BRADBERRY:

4 One last question around Louisiana
5 contractors. Can you state - can you state again
6 - I think, Karen, you stated it previously. Of
7 all the contracts that have been awarded, how many
8 went to Louisiana companies, and how are you
9 incorporating Louisiana companies in this work?

10 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

11 Okay. Well, I was trying to flip back to
12 that slide, but in any event, you know, we have a
13 small business acquisition plan. We have small
14 business goals that we have to meet both with the
15 Department of the Army and with the Department of
16 Defense. And both the Army and Defense are -
17 they're pretty rigid at trying to hold us to those
18 goals and make sure we're doing it as much as
19 possible.

20 And to be honest, in the Army, the Corps of
21 Engineers are the reason that the Army makes those
22 small business goals, and that's because of the
23 nature of the work and the numerous projects that
24 we do across the nation. You know, up until now,
25 and I don't have the numbers in front of me, but

cpr

1 we have about 34 percent of the contracts awarded
2 today that actually went to small business as
3 prime contractors. But then we have numerous sub-
4 contractors, because we also have small business
5 goals for the sub-contracts that we hold the prime
6 contractors to.

7 MR. BRADBERRY:

8 Is that small Louisiana companies?

9 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

10 What we found - What we found is that, of
11 those small business sub-contractors, roughly 90
12 percent of them are from the state of Louisiana.

13 MR. BRADBERRY:

14 Are you finding the company resource you need
15 in Louisiana to do the work that you need to do?

16 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

17 Yes, we are.

18 MR. BRADBERRY:

19 Okay. Thank you, Karen.

20 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

21 Thank you.

22 MS. COFFEE:

23 Mr. Jackson.

24 MR. JACKSON:

25 Thank you, Madame Chair. Sidney, I'd first

55

1 I like to say that I understand the Corps is working
2 as hard and as fast as they possibly can; however,
Page 49

cpr

3 they're still many problems, and I appreciate the
4 opportunity that I have had and my board members
5 have had to work with the Corps on many critical
6 projects.

7 And I appreciate Secretary Bradberry's
8 concern over pumping; however, I do have a concern
9 of something that I figure that I have invest -
10 my investigation and that of the Corps has turned
11 up which makes the pump station issue pale in
12 comparison, and that's the IHNC protection.

13 We have - We've spent three days in
14 partnering meetings and three and half days in
15 partnering meetings with the district and a number
16 of other stakeholders. At, I think, insistence of
17 myself and my board members that were there for
18 the first two days, the Corps elected and agreed
19 to look at interim protection.

20 And for the audience's information, the Inner
21 Harbor Navigation Canal has been identified by the
22 IPET Risk Analysis as by far the riskiest
23 situation coming into the next hurricane season.
24 What bothers me and the other holders that
25 participated in this was that by the Corps'

56

1 schedule the closure of the IHNC and the MRGO and
2 Seabrook is post-hurricane season 2010. That
3 means we have four hurricane seasons to go
4 through.

5 I know it's very difficult to predict whether
Page 50

cpr

6 you're going to make schedule, but when you don't
7 even have the money for the project and you're
8 projecting to start in the fall of next year
9 without the money, and no money was requested in
10 this fiscal year to Congress for this and other
11 vital projects including the pumping projects, I
12 fail to see how this dangerous situation is going
13 to be cured in four hurricane seasons or five or
14 six or seven or eight.

15 I think that it is imperative that the Corps
16 share the risk assessment maps that they have
17 prepared, that are now in internal peer review at
18 the district, with the public. I think the public
19 has a right to know both for their consideration
20 on reconstruction of their homes and their
21 businesses, but more importantly, the right to
22 know what the dangers are from any given storm
23 that may come into the New Orleans area over the
24 next four or five, six, seven, or eight hurricane
25 seasons. And so would you please share with this

57

1 group the plans for releasing of the IPET Risk
2 Assessment Maps and what that time schedule is?

3 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

4 Well, thanks, Mr. Jackson, for the question.
5 Within the next two months I anticipate that we're
6 going to be releasing risk and reliability results
7 from IPET. And, you know, IPET is not a Corps
8 product. You know, IPET is an external - It's

cpr

9 this huge group that stood up to both the
10 forensics, you know, and the risk evaluation based
11 on over 150 storms.

12 The maps that IPET had produced that - then
13 we can use, you know, both in our planning and
14 then to continue our modeling not just for this
15 year, but for the long term study. Those are
16 under review right now. They have to go not by
17 the Corps, but they do have to be reviewed by the
18 Department of Justice before, you know, we're able
19 to take them and release them.

20 What we are doing, though, is looking at the
21 products that they could come up with, working
22 with the city and with FEMA to make sure that
23 we're not just provided an in-store (phonetic)
24 product but also tie it in to the annualized flood
25 mapping that FEMA has to do. But back to your

58

1 question, within the next two months, I think
2 those maps are going to be able to be rolled out.
3 MR. JACKSON:

4 I think that's good news because I certainly
5 - I understand as well as anyone that the huge
6 gates that need to be built to protect the Inner
7 Harbor Navigation Canal from failure are not going
8 to be built overnight, and there's nothing we can
9 do about that. That's the facts. Now, is the
10 Corps continuing to pursue the thirty some odd
11 interim measures that we put together in our

cpr

12 meetings?

13 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

14 We are pursuing numerous interim measures
15 this year. You know, one of the ways we have to
16 do that is to be able to use the funding at hand,
17 and as we can, move it into place to provide
18 additional measures. And that includes transition
19 points, beefing up some of the sections we found
20 recently with that. For example, at the 17th
21 Street Canal we found some sheet pile tips that
22 were less than five feet from the top of the sand
23 stratum. Our new design requirements require
24 that, so we're beefing up those earthen measures
25 - those earthen sections. We have other interim

59

1 measures that we plan to do this hurricane season,
2 and that work's ongoing there.

3 MR. JACKSON:

4 Well, we discussed a lot of things. Some of
5 them were a little bit out in left field, I must
6 admit even to - from my own perspective. But the
7 tidal surge that we've experienced during
8 Hurricane Betsy and then again during Hurricane
9 Katrina, which was an exacerbated or amplified
10 tidal surge as a result of the geometry of the
11 MRGO levee and the New Orleans East levee coming
12 to a point, or a focal point, at the Industrial
13 Canal and Intracoastal Canals.

14 Magnifies - That geometry magnifies the
Page 53

cpr

15 tidal surge, and I think the Corps' mapping and
16 their own computer modeling have shown that to be
17 a fact. As a matter of fact, Colonel Bedey has
18 referred to this situation as the Achilles heel of
19 the entire New Orleans area Hurricane Protection
20 System on the East Bank, and I think the West Bank
21 has one, as well.

22 I'm concerned about the fact that you've
23 built 23-foot levees along the MRGO, and I take my
24 hat off to you for doing that; however, that levee
25 - that same strength in levee during Katrina

60

1 would have magnified even further the surge into
2 the Industrial Canal corridor. Failure of the
3 Industrial Canal corridor on the east and west
4 sides as occurred during Katrina would re-flood
5 the entire city including Orleans Parish, portions
6 of Jefferson Parish, and all of St. Bernard
7 Parish. This is an extremely critical thing.

8 I'm not sure exactly, and we wrestled with
9 this for days, and I'm not sure exactly what can
10 be done now for this hurricane season, but I lie
11 awake at night concerned. Number one, I don't
12 think we can stop this from happening if Mother
13 Nature decides to send us another bad storm;
14 however, we have to notify public of the dangers
15 that lay with that particular situation, and we
16 can't continue to beat our chests and say
17 everything is better than it was pre-Katrina.

cpr

18 Because I don't believe that in this particular
19 situation, and I think it's time we were honest,
20 totally honest, with the public with regard to
21 this.

22 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

23 Well, we share that. And - But the fact is,
24 the system is better than it was pre-Katrina. You
25 know, it's better in terms of the increased

61

1 interim capacity for pumping. It's better in
2 terms of the weak points we found in transitions
3 between floodwalls and floodgates and earthen
4 levees. It's better in the terms of the armoring
5 that we put in. You know, it's better - You
6 know, even more so it's the realization that you
7 have to have an integrated system.

8 But do we have interim measures in place, you
9 know, for the ITC before those gates are
10 completed, you know, at the earliest by the end of
11 2010 as you know? No, we don't. Are we looking
12 at what we could do? Yes, we are. As I just told
13 Secretary Bradberry, you know, we will come back.
14 I think he gave me a date of 15 May to give an
15 update on what can we do, what is possible.

16 And as you work closely, you know, with
17 Colonel Bedey and his folks and the other folks
18 who are under Colonel Rich Wagenaar, you know that
19 we're looking at those internal measures. But as
20 of today, no, we don't have an answer. But our

cpr

21 engineers, you know, and team in combination with
22 you and the others, you know, are looking at what
23 we can do given the limit of funding, given the
24 limit of time, what can you do to make it better.

25 You know, Katrina was nearly a four hundred

62

1 year storm. You know, we are all praying that we
2 don't experience that again. But, in the
3 meantime, what we are mandated to do is to provide
4 at least a hundred year level of protection. We
5 have a personal commitment, you know, with our
6 chief of engineers in his "12 Actions for Change"
7 to always inform, you know, the community of the
8 risk.

9 But I have to say that no matter what, we can
10 never totally, totally prevent anything from
11 happening. We can reduce the risk, but there will
12 always be risk. And back to your point, that was
13 right on target. That's why the emergency
14 preparedness, the evacuation plan, the informing
15 of the public - what can you do to mitigate it?
16 You know, whether it's elevating your house or
17 doing land swaps or some of the other things that
18 the city's identified, that all has to be part of
19 it. We can never totally eliminate the risk, you
20 know, but we need to do everything we can to
21 mitigate it as much as possible.

22 MR. JACKSON:

23 Will the risk assessment map that was shown
Page 56

cpr

24 to our group studying or looking at interim
25 measures - which I think was shown by mistake,

63

1 but, nevertheless, it was show -

2 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

3 Well, it was - It was notional.

4 MR. JACKSON:

5 It was shown. It showed a twenty percent
6 risk on the Industrial Canal. In conversations
7 I've had with people that are involved in this,
8 that it is by far the highest risk in the City of
9 New Orleans. And it's - At this point, I'm not
10 saying that the Corps is not doing everything that
11 they can do. If I thought you weren't, I would
12 really get nasty.

13 However, I think it's a situation where all
14 of us - I think all of us that are involved in
15 this - I can absolutely assure you of my reason
16 for participating here is to try to help the
17 people of New Orleans. And if I can't keep them
18 from flooding, I want them to know that ahead of
19 time so they get out so that we don't lose another
20 1300 people in a future event.

21 And there's a very, very short fuse for
22 people to make those decisions and for the public
23 emergency preparedness people to understand that
24 they've got to get people out. We all -
25 Everybody in the room, we all owe the public that.

1 Because we're the ones that are involved in this
2 and we know what we can and what we can't do.

3 Along those same lines, the deauthorization
4 of the MRGO as a navigable channel is absolutely
5 vital to the closing up of this Industrial Canal
6 problem. Short of having that deauthorization
7 done by Congress prior to your designing and
8 letting design build contracts, you would have to
9 build a deep draft gate on the MRGO.

10 If the Congress would decide to deauthorize
11 from a deep draft channel to a shallow draft
12 channel, then you would have to build a shallow
13 draft gate, which is much less expensive and can
14 be built much quicker. If it is deauthorized as a
15 navigable channel, then we can use earth plug and
16 a more standard - a lot cheaper, and lot quicker.

17 I have already met with Senator Vitter's
18 office to urge Congress to deal with this as
19 quickly as possible. And as I appreciate, this
20 decision is still in the Corps hands in terms of
21 final recommendation to Congress. What can be
22 done to accelerate that process?

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

24 Well, Mr. Jackson, thank you for the
25 question. We have accelerated the process. We

1 have a draft^{cpr} report. We do have to seek public
2 comment, then we'll be coming out here within the
3 next couple of months. We have moved up our
4 schedule dramatically to complete that
5 recommendation to include the public comment so
6 that we have that done by - the whole process
7 done by around October this year.

8 The report will be included in a chapter of
9 the LaCPR study, technical report, that's due to
10 Congress in December. We also have for the work
11 that we can do - We can't do anything that
12 precludes what type of deauthorization that could
13 occur. But we also have backline restoration
14 among other restoration projects that we can do.
15 After we met with Senator Vitter, we also moved
16 those up.

17 But, as you just stated, the decision on how
18 - on if to deauthorize MRGO and how to
19 deauthorize it works with Congress. But we have
20 accelerated our schedule to do the technical parts
21 of it, the concepts for closure, and the public
22 input. We moved that up several months from what
23 we had.

24 MR. JACKSON:

25 I think it's important that everybody know,

66

1 just based on my question, that that decision is
2 an extremely important decision on our ability to
3 be able to get this Industrial Canal situation

4 tucked away ^{cpr} and put to bed and for safety.

5 I have a couple of other questions, if the
6 Chairman doesn't mind.

7 You have in your possession now the hundred
8 year protection heights, flood water levee
9 heights, in your shop for internal peer review, as
10 I appreciate. When are those elevations going to
11 be released?

12 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

13 Well, we are using the modeling that was
14 performed by IPET to calculate those elevations.
15 It's still a work in progress. We have a lot of
16 them done already, and they are going through
17 internal review on (inaudible) right now. I
18 believe that that internal review or that -
19 actually, it's more than an internal review -
20 that the peer review of those elevations will be
21 done by the end of April.

22 MR. JACKSON:

23 Great.

24 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

25 So sometime after that is when we will be

67

1 able to share further. But we're using that
2 modeling and conforming those design heights for
3 the new elevations right now because we have to to
4 be able to determine what cross sections to build,
5 what types of real estate acquisition could be
6 necessary, and so forth. And it's a whole effort.

13 had several ^{cpr} of their older stations completely
14 destroyed by Katrina. And those stations, if you
15 go out there today, they'll look much as though
16 Katrina just passed two days ago except for the
17 rust and corrosion and other deterioration of the
18 building and the interior equipment.

19 The Congress gave money to the Corps for
20 reconstruction of pumping stations; however, there
21 seems to be a lot of disagreement as to whether
22 that was for Orleans and Jefferson only. The
23 congressional aides say that it included St.
24 Bernard Parish, but it is a moot point because
25 that money's gone. We have gotten commitments,

70

1 verbal commitments, from the district, from the
2 Corps, that temporary pumps and some
3 reconstruction of these stations will take place.
4 Can you give me a progress schedule on what we can
5 expect in that regard?

6 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

7 Well, Mr. Jackson, I have to get back to you
8 on that schedule, but, you know, this is a bigger
9 issue than just what the Corps can do. FEMA is
10 also a part of this. You know, so FEMA and the
11 Corps and the parishes, in all honesty, have been
12 trying to work this out. So one of the things
13 that I need to get back to you on is the schedule
14 to what we can do, whether it's providing
15 temporary pumps or additional construction on

16 those pump ^{cpr} stations or just whatever solution we
17 can come up with.

18 MR. JACKSON:

19 As you probably know, I'm from East Jefferson
20 and my house was not flooded, so I could have
21 lived on my life without getting involved in this,
22 but I just absolutely couldn't do that. My
23 friends in St. Bernard Parish were absolutely
24 devastated by this storm. And for them to go for
25 eighteen months with almost no help, and for

71

1 someone from the government to make a statement
2 that their particular agency could not help unless
3 they could satisfy a benefit to cost ratio and
4 couldn't find benefits for cleaning out the canals
5 because they couldn't find benefits because all of
6 the houses were destroyed, that really bothers me.

7 And it was so bad and so sad that the person
8 that was making the statement was very embarrassed
9 and has worked very hard, and I'd like to
10 compliment that individual that's worked very hard
11 and almost counted house by house of people
12 returning to St. Bernard Parish so that they could
13 make this work.

14 We not have a contract for cleaning the sea
15 grass. This is stuff is a big thick mat, for
16 those of you that are not familiar. Anybody
17 that's from St. Bernard certainly understands,
18 because when they got back to their house, what

19 was left of it, it was full of mud and it was also
20 full of this sea grass that floated out of the
21 marsh and landed in the houses. But it also
22 landed in the canal system, and I would like for
23 the Corps to do anything and everything they can
24 to get the St. Bernard pump stations up and
25 operating, to get protection for the operators so

72

1 that they can stay in those stations during the
2 next storm so that they will have the same
3 protection as do Orleans and Jefferson Parishes.

4 Thank you. Madame Chairman, that's all I
5 have.

6 MS. COFFEE:

7 Thank you, Mr. Jackson.

8 Mr. Morgan.

9 MR. MORGAN:

10 Thank you. First, I want to just commend the
11 Corps for listening in a good faith effort to
12 technical comments and review that the Westbank
13 Authority has made over the last month or so. I
14 don't think it's changed anything yet, but we're
15 working on it, and in the near future, will.

16 I had a short question, but as you talked and
17 Mr. Jackson made some comments, it may get a
18 little longer. How long have you known what the
19 hundred year flood elevation is?

20 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

21 About a month.

22

MR. MORGAN: ^{cpr}

23

About a month?

24

MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

25

If - and I - Let me go back and qualify

1

that. We received the modeling that we could use to calculate the hundred year flood elevations a little less than a month ago. We are not finished yet. You know, one thing, too, is, as we go across and look at the system, we found a couple of things, you know.

7

First, we found that the - I don't want to go into - you know, sound like the nerd engineer that I can be, but our design, case one elevations that we had assumed when we were trying to put together the initial estimate, in some cases were near the same or even more than the hundred year elevations. So as we look across the system and say, "What exists today? What do you need as you calculate this hundred year level of elevation?", we found three things.

17

We found in some areas what exists today and even what was at the pre-Katrina authorized levels were above that hundred year elevation. We found other areas and what exists today in that preauthorized level were below that hundred year elevations, and Mr. Jackson mentioned a few of those cases. And we found other areas where they're about the same. So if I look across the

25

system, we ^{cpr} have some areas that are deficient,

74

1 some areas that are okay per the new modeling
2 data, and then some that need more work.

3 So we have to put all of that together and
4 then run the actual cross sections, you know, on
5 the ground, section by section, to then, you know,
6 determine physically what exactly we do - we need
7 to do. How wide does the levee have be, for
8 example. What real estate acquisition is
9 affected? You know, because if people are
10 surrounding the areas, we all know people are
11 affected.

12 So - And we haven't finished that yet. But
13 the modeling that we needed to be able to do that,
14 we got just a little under a month ago. So it's
15 an inordinate design effort to complete all those
16 runs and we are still in engaged in that effort.

17 MR. MORGAN:

18 Okay, that leads to the ultimate question.
19 You're going to Congress with the cost to provide
20 a hundred year flood protection in August. If I
21 heard you correctly, you're going to go public
22 with the hundred year flood elevation in July.
23 Katrina was a four hundred year event, and I think
24 most people understand that hundred year is going
25 to be less than four hundred years. Are you

75

cpr

1 concerned that the rhetoric may create some
2 concerns in Congress and delay the funding?

3 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

4 Well, I can't speak to rhetoric in Congress,
5 but what I can speak to is that our - the system
6 that we're authorized to deliver is a hundred year
7 level of protection. You know, the LaCPR that
8 we're going to talk about here shortly will go
9 beyond that. You know, will from a hundred year
10 to a category four or five. At least, that's the
11 initial thinking in all the different alternatives
12 that we're looking at.

13 The modeling that we just received from IPET
14 we will use and expand, you know, as we continue
15 that study. But, you know, one reality is there
16 is a risk, there will always be a risk, and we
17 cannot permanently eliminate the risk. You know,
18 what we are charged to deliver, you know, is that
19 hundred year level of protection. And if I did
20 not just firmly believe that we should be doing
21 that and that we can do it, I would not have moved
22 back to New Orleans, you know, to be the system
23 program manager for this effort.

24 MR. MORGAN:

25 Thank you.

76

1 MS. COFFEE:

2 Thank you, Mr. Morgan.
Page 68

cpr

3 Mr. Milling.

4 MR. MILLING:

5 Thank you, Sidney.

6 Karen, thank you very much. I appreciated
7 your discussion this morning. I just want to make
8 a comment that I think this entire discussion
9 brings out -- And I hope I'm not preaching to the
10 choir, but I may - well may be.

11 I was pleased that we're now talking about a
12 sense of urgency, we are folding in issues such as
13 design build, and we're doing things which could
14 hopefully move these things much quicker than
15 we've ever moved them in the past. All of which,
16 of course, requires that ultimate sense of focus
17 that's got to be intense at almost every level,
18 and I think that we have had it now.

19 Betsy taught us one lesson, that the focus
20 gets diffused. It gets diffused here. Clearly,
21 it gets diffused in Washington a whole lot faster.
22 And my point to all of this is that clearly with
23 regard to this Authority and the commission, and
24 with regard to everyone in this room who has a
25 strong and almost insistent belief that we have to

77

1 move forward, it is our job from this point on to
2 make sure that that sense of urgency and that
3 focus is always on the table, not just as it
4 relates to New Orleans, but, quite frankly, as it
5 relates to all of south Louisiana. That's what

cpr

6 we're here for and I am delighted that we are, in
7 fact, beginning to achieve that focus. Thank you.

8 MS. COFFEE:

9 Thank you.

10 Mr. Currole.

11 MR. CUROLE:

12 Thank you.

13 You talked about the modeling going on. Is
14 the same modeling that will apply to all the
15 projects in Louisiana? I mean, right now you have
16 in Morganza waiting on modeling to talk about its
17 elevation for a hundred year storm. We're waiting
18 to see if it stays the same in our area. Or is
19 this modeling just for the New Orleans area you're
20 talking about?

21 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

22 We're going to be using this modeling in all
23 the work that we're doing, you know, across
24 southeast Louisiana.

25 MR. CUROLE:

78

1 So we should be getting the same numbers? In
2 other words, you'll be giving numbers for the
3 other authorized projects in south Louisiana along
4 with the New Orleans area?

5 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

6 You know, I'm not sure about that.

7 MR. CUROLE:

8 Okay.

cpr

9 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

10 I'll have to check and get back to you.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. CUROLE:

13 All right. The other thing is, we know about
14 the four hundred year storm. The critical path of
15 that storm really just affected the southern part
16 of Plaquemines Parish and then New Orleans and
17 Mississippi. When we talk about the four hundred
18 year event, not all of New Orleans or the New
19 Orleans area experienced that; is that correct?

20 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

21 That's correct.

22 MR. CUROLE:

23 And I think we - I think it's very important
24 when we talk about education, people knowing their
25 risk, that we talk about exactly what - the event

79

1 that affected that area. As an example, when
2 Andrew hit in '92 in Morgan City, people who had
3 95 or had maybe 65 mile an hour winds, said, well,
4 they were hit by a category three storm, not
5 realizing or not knowing that unless you get in
6 the critical part of that storm you do not get
7 that category of hurricane.

8 So I think it's important that we - when we
9 talk about the event, that - what event really
10 took place in the particular areas, we need to
11 clear up. Because we certainly had a four hundred

cpr

12 year event in southern Plaquemine and as it hit
13 Waveland, Mississippi, but it was a lesser event
14 in some of the flooding issues that we had in New
15 Orleans. I think we need to talk about that so
16 that people don't get the wrong impression, which
17 it's a complicated issue. But I think we need to
18 really explain that and talk about it from that
19 perspective.

20 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

21 You know, I would add to that, though, that
22 the damage that occurred, you know, aside from the
23 forensics about some breached areas, it was also a
24 function of which way the wind turned. And so
25 I'll give you an example. And the Mayor of New

80

1 Orleans had this conversation with myself and
2 Brigadier General Crear, who's the Mississippi
3 River Commission President as well as the
4 Mississippi Valley Division Commander, which
5 includes New Orleans as well as numerous other
6 districts.

7 The conversation we had with the Mayor last
8 week, he said that, "I hope that you're not -
9 you'll retain a sense of urgency for the
10 Westbank." And we said, "Well, of course, we
11 are." He said, "People don't realize how
12 vulnerable that they are." I said, "They don't,
13 and they were lucky." They were lucky. Because
14 it depends on which way the wind turned, you know,

cpr

15 when the effects of Katrina hit.

16 So to be sure that we have the system level
17 protection we can deliver, and, of course, I'm
18 talking about the hundred years that's authorized,
19 we have to look across the system and be sure that
20 we're not just trying to improve one part of the
21 system at the expense of another, that (inaudible)
22 suffer the damage is a vulnerable part of the
23 system.

24 And that goes right back into, I think, Mr.
25 Jackson's comments about getting the risk and

81

1 reliability maps out so that everyone can look
2 around to see what is the risk under various
3 scenarios, what can they do about it, what can the
4 City do, you know, as well as what the Federal
5 Government can do.

6 But, you know, one of the biggest lessons
7 that I think we've experienced from all of that is
8 that it is a system, you have to look at all the
9 components, you can't ignore one part of the
10 system and leave the rest vulnerable. But for the
11 people that, you know, thankfully, weren't
12 affected by Katrina, next time during a Katrina
13 or, you know, or some other type event, they could
14 be. You know, depending on which way the wind is
15 turning as it hits land.

16 MR. CUROLE:

17 Yeah, and that's the point. It just -

cpr

18 Because we classified what happened to New Orleans
19 a four hundred year event, I don't - you know,
20 people have learned or accepted that's what it is,
21 and really most portions of New Orleans did not
22 have a four hundred year event. And we need to
23 really be succinct so that people learn from these
24 experiences and know that it could be much, much
25 worse.

82

1 You look at Waveland, now you're talking
2 about thirty foot storm surges, you're talking
3 about that maximum event - and southern
4 Plaquemine, also. So I'm just saying when we talk
5 about these, I don't think we need to - we
6 shouldn't throw out numbers that aren't absolutely
7 accurate so - because people may misinterpret
8 what they experienced. Again, I - It's part of
9 the education, and so individuals can understand
10 their own risk in what they went through knowing
11 that it could be much worse. That's the only
12 point. Thank you.

13 MS. DURHAM-AGUILERA:

14 I appreciate that. Thank you.

15 MS. COFFEE:

16 Thank you, Windell.

17 Ms. Severance.

18 MS. SEVERANCE:

19 Good morning. I was intrigued by your
20 comment that the IPET maps have to be reviewed by

cpr

21 the United States Department of Justice prior to
22 their review; is that correct?

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

24 That's correct.

25 MS. SEVERANCE:

83

1 Is that the normal practice?

2 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

3 No, it is not, but one of the realities of
4 what we're dealing with is a huge amount of
5 litigation.

6 MS. SEVERANCE:

7 You're talking about present litigation based
8 on Hurricane Katrina?

9 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

10 There is numerous litigation, and I - you
11 can understand I can't go into details about it.
12 But it's been published in the newspapers that,
13 you know, we have experienced numerous claims that
14 the Department of Justice is going through for all
15 kinds of aspects: MRGO, claims due to damage in
16 - from Katrina, and so forth.

17 MS. SEVERANCE:

18 Okay, well, litigation aside, the IPET maps
19 were produced by a team that was put together by
20 the Army Corps of Engineers, weren't they?

21 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

22 Well, the Corps helped stand it up, but the
23 IPET team is not a Corps team.

cpr

24 MS. SEVERANCE:
25 But the Corps was part of the IPET team,

84

1 weren't they?

2 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

3 That's correct.

4 MS. SEVERANCE:

5 And the Corps participated in the forensic
6 investigation?

7 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

8 Yes, we did.

9 MS. SEVERANCE:

10 And the Corps reached some factual
11 conclusions?

12 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

13 The IPET team reached conclusions.

14 MS. SEVERANCE:

15 Okay.

16 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

17 That's the forensics.

18 MS. SEVERANCE:

19 All right. The IPET team reached factual
20 conclusions which they then reduced onto maps?

21 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

22 They haven't done that yet. They're still
23 trying to come up with the risk products, but what
24 the IPET team has done, is they have released
25 numerous volumes. There's another volume that is

1 coming out this summer. It gives the results of
2 everything that they found.

3 MS. SEVERANCE:

4 I thought you indicated that the Army Corps
5 of Engineers is reviewing the IPET maps?

6 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

7 No, we are taking the modeling results that
8 IPET came up with to determine hundred year
9 elevations. We are working with IPET to see what
10 type of risk and reliability maps that they're
11 going to produce. That - Then, we can translate
12 into the usual part for the product - for the
13 public. If we took the maps, you know, such as
14 they existed, they're so complicated - there's
15 152 storms - that it would be hard as a homeowner
16 to realize what they mean.

17 MS. SEVERANCE:

18 Are you -

19 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

20 So what we're doing is, you know, using the
21 information that they're giving us and working
22 with FEMA to come up with maps that everybody can
23 use to be able to assess risk.

24 MS. SEVERANCE:

25 Okay, but IPET was an independent group?

1 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA: ^{cpr}

2 Yes, it was. There are over 152 different
3 people from universities across the nation, from
4 industry, from other state and federal agencies,
5 from the United Kingdom, and so forth. It was
6 quite an extensive external group.

7 MS. SEVERANCE:

8 And this external group produced some maps?

9 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

10 They modeled 152 storms. They have not
11 produced maps, per se. They have modeling runs of
12 152 storms in different scenarios. We're going to
13 use that information, working with FEMA to produce
14 maps that we can use that would show the risk, you
15 know, depending on what area that you live in.

16 MS. SEVERANCE:

17 Okay. I guess my, you know, my bottom
18 question is: If this is an independent agency
19 that was stood up after Hurricane Katrina to
20 conduct a forensic analysis, what authority or
21 what jurisdiction does the United States
22 Department of Justice have to hold the findings of
23 the IPET team?

24 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

25 Well, you know, ma'am, I can't speak for the

1 Department of Justice, and I also wouldn't want to
2 give the idea that they're holding the findings.
3 What I know is that anything that ends up getting

4 relieved ^{cpr} - I won't say anything. I just know the
5 Department of Justice is reviewing the products
6 that we're coming up with before we release them.

7 And I'm not talking about the IPET findings
8 so much as when we are able to put the maps
9 together to show the risk. You know, and one of
10 the processes we have to follow, due to the
11 unfortunate climate of litigation, is to work with
12 Department of Justice.

13 MS. SEVERANCE:

14 Have you produced products that are now in
15 the possession of the United States Department of
16 Justice?

17 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

18 The IPET had public volumes they've already
19 -

20 MS. SEVERANCE:

21 No, no, no, ma'am, I ask about the Army Corps
22 of Engineers -

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

24 No, we have not. We are still working with
25 that modeling to determine the best usable maps

88

1 that we can cast out to the public. And that's
2 the effort we're engaged in right now. Our
3 timetable is to be able to do that within the next
4 two months. Well, we're doing that and working in
5 partnership with FEMA, who is also part of IPET,
6 with the City of New Orleans and the Mayor's

7 Office and the Reconstruction Development Office,
8 as well as the other groups that we're working
9 with.

10 MS. SEVERANCE:

11 I join in Mr. Jackson and Mr. Curole - well,
12 in all the members of this body's concern that the
13 public be provided information as soon as
14 possible. I'm very concerned that there appears
15 to be some delay in the release of this
16 information.

17 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

18 Well, I apologize if I gave you that
19 impression. There's not a delay in the release.
20 It's not the modeling, it's what you - how you
21 take the modeling and translate it into a risk and
22 reliability map that's applicable to this area,
23 that is in concert with the FEMA annualized maps.
24 And, to be honest, we haven't finished it.

25 We just got the results of that modeling,

89

1 which we had to - I don't want to sound like an
2 engineer nerd again, but we had to go through -
3 have these single computers at different
4 universities, you know, had have numerous runs,
5 and we just got that modeling in our hands just a
6 few weeks ago.

7 Now, to take all those models, thousands and
8 thousands of runs and translate that into a map
9 that even me as a homeowner can use, it is quite

10 an effort. ^{cpr} So it's not a delay, it's just - it
11 just takes time to come up this.

12 MS. SEVERANCE:

13 What work product are y'all are viewing right
14 now, the Army Corps of Engineers?

15 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

16 It's the modeling data from the IPET. I do
17 not have a map in my hands right now here today.

18 MS. SEVERANCE:

19 I don't want to confuse you - confuse the
20 issue. I'm not asking about a map, I'm asking
21 about work product. That's two different things;
22 one's broader than the other.

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

24 Well, I'm sorry, if I'm misunderstanding your
25 question, because what we have are the results of

90

1 the modeling that IPET has just completed.

2 MS. SEVERANCE:

3 And do you - Have you reached some
4 conclusions as a result of looking at that
5 modeling that's been reduced to writing?

6 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

7 No, we have not.

8 MS. SEVERANCE:

9 At what point do you anticipate that your
10 findings will be reduced to writing?

11 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

12 If you're talking about the risk and

13 reliability ^{cpr} rollout, within the next couple of
14 months. If you're talking about using that
15 information to come up with the hundred year
16 design elevations, that's the discussion we had
17 earlier with Mr. Jackson. That would be available
18 by sometime this summer, because we need that to
19 inform - complete our baseline cost estimate.

20 MS. SEVERANCE:

21 Is the risk and reliability work product
22 going to be subject to review by the United States
23 Department of Justice prior to its release?

24 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

25 I'm not sure of that.

91

1 MS. SEVERANCE:

2 Can you find out for us?

3 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

4 I can, but - And you can understand there's
5 only so much I can say about the workings of the
6 Department of Justice.

7 MS. SEVERANCE:

8 I understand that.

9 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

10 I can get back to you with the schedule.

11 MS. SEVERANCE:

12 Okay, thank you.

13 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

14 Thank you.

15 MS. COFFEE:

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Thank you. ^{cpr}

(Whereupon a short break was taken. After the break:)

MS. COFFEE:

Okay, we're going to go ahead and get started. At this time, I'm asking Jon Porthouse to please present the Master Plan. And I just want to give my congratulations to Jon and the

93

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

entire team. This represents months and months and months of extremely incredibly hard work, and they were working all the way up to late yesterday to get this ready. Right now, I think we've got - we need to pass these copies out, please, to the members of the plan itself.

As that is happening, Jon, go ahead. You can get started. Thank you.

MR. PORTHOUSE:

First of all, I would also like to thank the members of the stakeholder community, scientific and technical community, governments, local citizens, everybody who participated in this plan. But, especially, I don't think the members of the Steering Committee for the CPRA get enough credit for this either. Sidney Coffee, Johnny Bradberry, Scott Angelle, Windell Curole, and Mr. King Milling have all put an enormous amount of time into this effort, providing us with the guidance we need and the support we need to get this thing done. So I would like to recognize them for their

22 efforts, as well.^{cpr}

23 Just by way of introduction, I am not going
24 to go back and do the August 2005 all the way
25 through now presentation. I think every time we

94

1 come to this Authority, we usually just start with
2 what's been going on since the last Authority
3 meeting, and I think we're going to keep going
4 with that. I do have the timeline available. If
5 anybody wants to go back and revisit any of the
6 process that has gone on before February 5th and
7 since February 5th, we'd be happy to do that.

8 But I do only want to emphasize again how
9 collaborative this entire effort has been, how
10 much participation we've had from the Corps of
11 Engineers and our CWPRA partners, from local
12 governments, from levee districts, levee boards,
13 from the scientific and technical community, and
14 the general public. All of this partnering has
15 produced what I think is - I think I promised
16 Secretary Angelle a world class plan, and I think
17 we're on the verge of delivering it to you.

18 So I'm going to go in two parts here. One is
19 the - what has been going on since the last CPRA
20 meeting on the 6th of February and really hit most
21 of the major issues that had required us to
22 respond in some way in the Master Plan. There are
23 some major issues that we've addressed in the
24 Master Plan such as the Mississippi River Gulf

25

Outlet, which, ^{cpr} the way we treated it in the plan,

95

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

we have not received any negative comments on that. So, in essence, I'm interpreting that, probably prematurely, as a passing grade on how we decided to deal with the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet. I'm sure we'll find out if there is any problems lingering there. So you will not see every issue out there that's in the coastal zone, but you will see the ones that we heard in the public and technical review that we have responded to in this plan.

So what have we been doing? First of all, we have been continuing to collaborate with other planning efforts, not only in Louisiana but around the world, particularly the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I can't stress enough that the partnership we've been having at the technical level - sharing data, sharing information, discussing our common processes and interest - has continued since the last meeting and will continue into the future. We have also presented to the Louisiana Recovery Authority Board of Directors and continued our staff-level interactions to improve the "Louisiana Speaks" regional planning effort. We did meet with the Unified New Orleans planners to discuss mutual

1 areas of concern and had a meeting piggy-backing
2 on the Corps of Engineers relationship with Dutch
3 Rijkswaterstaat. We did participate in that
4 meeting with those folks and the Province of
5 Zeeland, and we'll have more on that later in the
6 program today.

7 We also had - Again, once we released the
8 public - the Draft Master Plan on February 6th, we
9 had four very well attended public meetings and
10 hearings. You can see - Specifically, I want to
11 call your attention to Lake Charles, where the
12 local media challenged the community to show up at
13 Lake Charles and really let us know what they
14 thought of the draft plan. Very, very good
15 communication, and it's resulted in substantial
16 improvements in how we present things in the
17 Master Plan. It also resulted in the next week
18 going back to Cameron Parish for a public meeting
19 just to make sure we hit everybody out there and
20 got everybody's concerns on the table and revised
21 the draft plan appropriately.

22 But between the four public meetings, we've
23 also had 113 written comments received in some
24 way: through the internet, through the mail, or
25 so on. And over 7,700 visits to the web site

1 trying to download information for this plan just
2 between February 6th and April 2nd, which was the
Page 87

cpr

3 end of the public comment period. So a
4 significant amount of activity; people accessing
5 the plan, reviewing it, and providing comments.

6 We have continued our discussions with other
7 governmental agencies. This does not include the
8 comprehensive list previous to February 6th. But
9 since February 6th, we have met with the Cameron
10 Parish Police Jury in a public meeting. We have
11 talked to the Joint Legislative Coastal
12 communities, the Parishes Against Coastal Erosion,
13 both flood protection authorities.

14 We've met with Mayor Randy Roach in Lake
15 Charles. We sat down with Plaquemines Parish
16 President Billy Nungesser. We went to the town of
17 Jean Lafitte. We've also gone to Washington and
18 talked to the Senate Energy Committee Staff, who
19 were very interested in how this planning effort
20 is coming together and what we see as the federal
21 involvement in implementing this plan. And also
22 with the staff of the Office of the Federal
23 Coordinator for Gulf Coast Rebuilding; this is
24 Chairman Powell's office.

25 We have continued our reviews with the

98

1 scientific and technical community. We had a
2 joint meeting on March 14, with the Louisiana
3 Coastal Area Science Board and our Science and
4 Engineering Review Team. They have both submitted
5 comments that have been incorporated to the extent

cpr

6 that we can into the draft which you see before
7 you. And we also did sit down with the Louisiana
8 Hypoxia Working Group.

9 If you recall, at the last meeting, Mr. Doug
10 Daigle came before the Authority and made a
11 comment that the hypoxia issue is one major
12 national issue which was not adequately treated in
13 the draft plan. We have made significant
14 revisions to this final version of the plan to
15 better talk about the hypoxia issues and the
16 linkage to the rest of the nation.

17 We've also met with several stakeholders and
18 citizens groups: a couple of engineering groups,
19 Citizens for a Safer Jefferson, Huddled Masses
20 Pleasure Aid Social Club, and the Flood Plain
21 Manager's Association. So we continue to be out
22 there talking about the plan, receiving comments,
23 and putting us in a better position to move
24 quickly through the implementation process.

25 So the major comments we've heard and how

99

1 we've responded. I always like to start out with
2 a positive. And some of the major comments we've
3 received is that the Draft Master Plan was a
4 significant improvement over the Preliminary Draft
5 Master Plan. We have shown that we have been very
6 responsive to review and comment, that the content
7 was an appropriate level of detail for what we had
8 to work with. We have been acknowledged by many

cpr

9 reviewers about the extensive effort to engage the
10 public in the planning process, and also the
11 efforts for scientific and technical review. And
12 there's - And I'll come back to that point in a
13 moment.

14 But just as a quote, this kind of information
15 doesn't typically make it out into the world, but
16 I thought it was important to bring it before the
17 Authority today. One of our scientific and
18 technical review panels, the Louisiana Coastal
19 Area Science Board, has this quote. It's a
20 summary of their review of our draft plan. But,
21 basically, they emphasize that the Master Plan is
22 about right in terms of its presentation of
23 objectives, its vision, and the uncertainties
24 that must be resolved, and the process for
25 refining and implementing the plan in the future.

100

1 They realize that this is a serious problem;
2 it's got a serious sense of urgency in terms of
3 time. The processes that are ongoing down here
4 had to have a plan put together quickly. And that
5 we've done a commendable job in developing a quick
6 plan, seeking extensive public comment, and
7 articulating the scientific and technical
8 challenges. So I view this as a passing grade
9 from the national scientific community.

10 However, we do have some major comments that
11 we not only need to address - that we have

cpr

12 addressed in this final draft of the Master Plan,
13 but also into the future. And there's a
14 distinction between getting people involved in the
15 planning process itself, putting - making
16 decisions verses the review and comment period
17 process. Up until this point, the scientific and
18 engineering community, we had extensive
19 involvement in the planning process from the
20 scientific and technical community. But the big
21 picture, the national scientific and technical
22 perspective really was brought in in a review
23 capacity.

24 We received several comments that as we move
25 forward into implementation, we need to broaden

101

1 our involvement of scientists, engineers, and
2 other technical experts in the actual planning
3 efforts. And, specifically, there are also some
4 other - some other stakeholders that we did not
5 do an adequate job pulling in, but will be
6 incredibly important as we move forward. Chief
7 among those are the navigation interests.

8 These comments were offered by several
9 people. We agree with them. We know that as we
10 move forward to more detailed planning and design,
11 we obviously need to be talking to more people,
12 keeping the dialogue going so that whatever we
13 actually end up building as quickly as possible,
14 it also represents the best available science and

cpr

15 engineering and the views of the stakeholders.
16 Just a while ago, you spent a lot of time
17 talking about maps, and if I could point to one
18 area of this entire effort that has caused more
19 miscommunication has been maps. When you try to
20 convey this much information on simple maps in two
21 dimensions with so many different types of
22 projects and alignments and you only have three or
23 four really bright colors to work with, it's
24 nearly impossible to convey all the information on
25 a map. You really do have to rely on people going

102

1 and reading the text that's associated with the
2 map.

3 But, however, we have gone back and revised
4 our maps. We're still in the process,
5 unfortunately, of finalizing those maps to show
6 that some of these hurricane protection strategies
7 do have alternatives, and some of the legends and
8 measurements have to be updated. So for - as an
9 example, this is a map straight out of the draft
10 plan, and I just want to call your attention - I
11 don't know which one you're going to look for.
12 But the Barataria Basin here, we have the Gulf
13 Intracoastal Waterway highlighted as an alignment
14 for the Donaldsonville to the Gulf Hurricane
15 Protection System.

16 We have that highlighted because it is the
17 northernmost alignment that we were considering

cpr

18 which achieved all of our objectives in terms of
19 increasing protection to the Westbank and also to
20 the central basin communities such as Lafitte,
21 Crown Point, and Lafourche Parish corridor.
22 People have looked at this map and they saw a
23 single dotted orange line and looked at that as
24 we're going to build an earthen levee straight
25 across that basin. That's a bit of a

103

1 misinterpretation of what we're saying.

2 The other bit of miscommunication we've had
3 with this map, if you notice this blue hair -
4 this blue area above the levee alignment, which
5 was a note to us to stimulate the discussion that,
6 as we finalize the design of the hurricane
7 protection system, emphasize that the area, the
8 wetland areas north of these hurricane protection
9 systems, must remain sustainable and undeveloped.
10 We highlighted that area in blue to call
11 everybody's attention to that to make sure people
12 knew we were aware of those issues.

13 Unfortunately, we used the term "water
14 management," which gave people the impression that
15 we're doing marsh management projects. It was a
16 completely - It was an unfortunate
17 miscommunication. We think we've clarified that.
18 So you will not see another map in the final plan
19 that looks like this, with the levee system
20 stretching from the Pearl River to the Atchafalaya

cpr

21 River.

22 Instead, what you will see in the final plan
23 is really focusing in on focus areas. Again, this
24 is just an example. These maps have not,
25 unfortunately, been finalized either. But

104

1 focusing in again on that Donaldsonville to the
2 Gulf alignment, the map in the lower portion of
3 this presentation is the GIWW alignment for
4 Donaldsonville to the Gulf. What you also see,
5 however, in these upper two maps are the other
6 alternatives that the Corps of Engineers are
7 considering.

8 And these are representative; there are
9 issues in terms of exactly where those lines fall,
10 but these are representative concepts. Either
11 going all the way up and around Bayou Lafourche
12 and down the Mississippi River building rain
13 levees for the central basin communities and
14 increasing the height for the Westbank and
15 Vicinity Project, or going up Bayou Lafourche to
16 Highway 90 back around increasing the height of
17 the Westbank levee system and providing rain
18 levees in the Lafitte area, or the original
19 alignment that we proposed, and was the GIWW
20 alignment.

21 Again, all of these accomplish the same
22 things in terms of providing the level of
23 protection we're looking for in these communities,

cpr

24 and they all are intended to work with sustainable
25 and functional levees throughout the system. But

105

1 to adequately communicate all these concepts, we
2 had to go to sort of this map series to discuss
3 these things.

4 The legends were another issue. We had, if
5 you recall, in the draft plan just a long list of
6 what looked like project names and a disconnected
7 map icon series, and that was hard for people to
8 understand where these list of projects, what they
9 were, and what they looked like on the map.

10 So, as a working draft here, what you see is
11 whenever we have a river diversion, for example,
12 which would be this blue arrow, we would list the
13 river diversions next to it so at least people
14 know what they're looking at. We're looking at
15 river diversions in these general areas and so on
16 and so forth. So these are all working products
17 right now, and we are intending to finalize that
18 graphic layout again - not again, but by next
19 Wednesday, and I'll get to that in a moment.

20 We have also had some major comments, and,
21 again, I think this stretches back to how we
22 presented things in the maps. But there was a
23 perceived over-emphasis of structural solutions in
24 the plan. And there is particular concern about
25 these hurricane protection alignments that will

1 traverse the wetland basins. So, again, we did go
2 back, we discussed the alternative alignments. We
3 did clarify in the maps and the text that anything
4 we do out there has to have sustainable and
5 undeveloped wetlands if they are, in fact,
6 enclosed or landward of these levee systems.

7 We also added more text to emphasize the need
8 for innovations in hurricane protection project
9 designs. Some - We cannot necessarily rely on
10 traditional earthen levee technology in all
11 environments where we may need to put a hurricane
12 protection system. And we added specific
13 recommendations so that people understood that the
14 comprehensive risk reduction issues out there, the
15 protection schemes, if you will, do actually rely
16 on a lot of people making a lot of smart decisions
17 in terms of how high the elevations of their homes
18 and businesses are, adequate evacuation planning,
19 and so forth. So we clarified the text to show
20 that our hurricane protection strategy was not
21 just focused on new structures out - in the
22 coastal zone.

23 Another major comment is - we've had is that
24 the placement of our large land-building
25 diversions is extremely critical. If you recall,

1 in the preliminary draft that we introduced in
2 November, we had large land-building diversions
3 fairly high up in Plaquemines Parish in the
4 vicinity of Myrtle Grove on the East - on the
5 Westbank and the White Ditch area, I believe, on
6 the Eastbank.

7 However, in discussion, the public
8 conversation period following the preliminary
9 draft, the stakeholders suggested that those
10 diversions would probably be better to balance our
11 objectives if they were lower in the system. So
12 the next version in February showed those land-
13 building diversions lower down in the system.

14 However, since it is an issue of balancing
15 the objectives, there are tradeoffs here. The
16 higher up in the system you put these diversions,
17 the greater the sediment retention and wetland
18 benefits you'll have, the greater potential for
19 nutrient removal you'll have. However, in terms
20 of balancing objectives, it's likely that that
21 would be - involve some fairly significant shifts
22 in the fisheries communities. Lower down in the
23 system, it's sort of reversed. You will have less
24 of an impact on salinity regimes, but you also
25 reduce your sediment retention and nutrient

108

1 assimilation.

2 So we did - we are now including both maps,
3 and I'll show you on the next slide. But most

4 importantly,^{cpr} I have to emphasize both of those
5 scenarios are highly conceptual. No locations
6 have been selected. It may not be just two
7 diversions; we may have to find other ways to do
8 this. But as we move forward, it will be a
9 collaborative effort with communities, Plaquemines
10 Parish, the navigation industry, and others as we
11 make these decisions.

12 But when you see the actual draft plan, we
13 are going to include the original proposal on June
14 1st from the "Envisioning the Future of the Gulf
15 Coast" scientists, which had these sort of higher
16 up land-building diversions, and we're also going
17 to include this one, which is more of a
18 stakeholder driven perspective. And we rounded
19 out the discussion to discuss the tradeoffs
20 between those two scenarios.

21 As far as another major comment where there
22 continues to be concern in Lower Lafourche and
23 Terrebonne Parishes that we will not - that
24 they're being left in terms of rapid restoration
25 and sustainable restoration. Much of this is

109

1 centered around the issue of what are we going to
2 do to address the objectives contained by - in
3 the third delta concept. There has been a lot of
4 ongoing work with stakeholders in technical
5 analysis on the third delta concept and other
6 possible alternatives to achieving those

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

objectives.^{cpr}

The Master Plan very clearly - And I'll go back just to show you. If you look in Lower Terrebonne Parish specifically - I don't know which map you folks are looking at, but over on the right, up on the screen here, all of this green area - which it's unfortunate there's no red in the projection. But this green area represents marsh creation with dedicated dredging and pipeline conveyance of sediment.

What you also see are these arrows. The yellow one in particular here or these areas over here, which represent optimizing river influence through navigation channels to sustain those newly created wetland areas. In the Barataria Basin it's the same thing. We have a lot of marsh creation with dredge material, but we have larger river diversions which will be able to influence those areas and maintain sustainability. So

110

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

although, again, as I mentioned last time I presented this to the Authority, you do not see the third delta channel. You do see aggressive, rapid land building in Lower Lafourche and Terrebonne Parishes supported by river diversions for sustainability.

We had a lot of discussion about the Chandeleur Islands. If you recall, in the draft plan we articulated that this was a national

10 wildlife refuge, and in the past we've had
11 difficulties doing traditional barrier shoreline
12 restoration in terms of beach, dune, back dune,
13 and in marsh creation areas.

14 But the Department of Interior is currently
15 working on defining habitat restoration plans for
16 these areas. And what we are saying, we clarified
17 our text here, the Federal Government owns these
18 islands, and we will work with them to define an
19 appropriate habitat restoration plan which
20 includes all of the habitats due to - especially
21 which are important to storm surge reduction and
22 so on. And we will work with them at that point
23 to figure out how we can participate in those
24 restoration plans. But the Chandeleur Islands,
25 they are important for habitat, they are fairly

111

1 important especially to coastal Mississippi in
2 terms of storm surge. But they're not the same
3 kinds of barrier islands as we have in Terrebonne
4 and Barataria Basins.

5 As far as Plaquemines Parish levees, again,
6 what you heard from Mr. Andrew MacInnes last
7 meeting was that a perceived hole in our plan; we
8 did not adequately articulate that the hurricane
9 protection system in Plaquemines Parish needs to
10 be a continuous levee system and it needs to -
11 the entire levee system needs to be part of the
12 federal system.

19 we would have to take too much property for people
20 to live there.

21 We did clarify in the text that we are not
22 necessarily looking to raise the entirety of these
23 highways. We are not looking to raise these
24 highways ten feet. But what we're trying to do
25 is, if you look at the landscape, meaning the

114

1 cheniers in combination with the roadways out
2 there, the controlling elevation for storm surge
3 should be ten feet. In most cases, these roadways
4 will not have to be elevated. Especially on the
5 cheniers where people live, the roadway may not
6 even be on top of the chenier, so it doesn't make
7 sense to raise the roadway.

8 So we did clarify that this is not going to
9 be a global raise every roadway ten feet, and I
10 think we've got the language about right. Also,
11 it will include the notion - the added
12 realization that if these roadways are overtopped
13 into freshwater ecosystems, we've got to find a
14 way to improve the capacity to drain that
15 saltwater out to facilitate the recovery.

16 We did receive some reservations about our
17 proposed expansion of quick-take authority, mainly
18 from landowners. We did revise our texts further
19 to show again that this is a last resort effort.
20 There are situations where multiple landowners or
21 multiple parcels of land are needed for big

22 projects, and unless we're willing to live with
23 the fact that a single landowner can kill a major
24 project that involves hundreds of landowners,
25 we've got to find a way to have quick-take

115

1 authority as the last resort in the toolbox.

2 We did add text to the main report that
3 clarifies that this would be an option after good
4 faith negotiations and only if the delay in
5 acquiring land rights would delay construction of
6 the project. So I think we got it kind of hemmed
7 in as far as we can, but the fact is if we are
8 going to be serious about building projects, we
9 have to have this last resort even if we recognize
10 it as a last resort that we would rather not use.

11 Land-use planning effort needs to be more
12 inclusive. Again, this is a landowner issue. If
13 we intend to make comment about wise use and wise
14 development of low lying areas, it does make sense
15 that the working group we proposed to look at the
16 land-use planning tools and any changes in
17 legislation and regulations that are out there
18 should include landowners for - just to round out
19 the perspective so we weren't just imposing
20 something on landowners. So we made that change.
21 We still do recommend land-use planning, we still
22 do recommend a State perspective, but the
23 clarification is the landowner should be a part of
24 that discussion.

25

cpr
Last few major comments. These are going to

116

1 be chronic issues. These are not things that we
2 can or should resolve in this Master Plan, but
3 they are things we have tried to address now, we
4 will be addressing in the near future and probably
5 for the life of the program. For instance,
6 prioritization, decision-making, and program
7 management processes must be more explicit.
8 People want to know who's going to make the
9 decision, when they're going to make the decision,
10 when they're going to get projects, and why
11 certain projects are more important than others.

12 We've made some strides in the annual
13 planning document, which we'll go over in a few
14 moments to show which projects we thought were
15 higher priority. We have not gone the extra
16 distance to define every constructible element,
17 put a schedule on it, put a cost estimate on it,
18 but, as we mention in the annual plan, that is an
19 activity that we intend to undertake next year.

20 We hear everywhere we go that we need to
21 maintain and even increase the sense of urgency.
22 People want these projects built quickly. We
23 obviously agree with that. Most of the Master
24 Plan is intended to highlight the issues that need
25 to be resolved quickly so we can deal with them in

cpr

1 an up-front and honest and expeditious manner to
2 get these projects built quickly. Everything we
3 can do to keep the pressure on to increase
4 funding, to speed the design process to get
5 projects on the ground, this is going to be an
6 ongoing issue.

7 And another comment that we frequently get
8 is, although we come here before you as the CPRA
9 Integrated Planning Team and the Corps comes
10 before you to talk about the LaCPR effort and how
11 we're partnering and sharing data and sharing
12 people, somehow we have not been able to
13 articulate in our documents the true level of
14 partnership that's going on here. So people have
15 been concerned and continue to be concerned that
16 in December they will be forced to choose between
17 the State Plan and the Corps Plan.

18 We have had extensive discussions over the
19 last couple of weeks with the Corps of Engineers
20 on how these efforts really do build on each
21 other. They are not separate efforts; they build
22 on each other. Obviously, the Federal Government
23 has a few extra requirements they need to satisfy
24 for their decision makers, but this is, in
25 essence, a single planning effort, and Ms. Durham-

118

1 Aguilera will be back up here in a few moments to
2 comment further on that.

cpr

3 As for what's next, the first on here is
4 finalizing the graphic design. It was our intent
5 to be able to be here today with a first cut
6 version fully laid out with all the figures and
7 maps and legends so you could look at the entire
8 content of the report. As I mentioned, though,
9 getting those maps right, it's critically
10 important to us and it turned out to be a slightly
11 bigger job than we had envisioned, so we will not
12 be able to finalize the graphic design until April
13 18th, although the text you have before you right
14 now is final as we have it, pending discussion and
15 recommendations for change by the Authority this
16 morning.

17 We do have technical appendices out there
18 that we have to finalize our technical edits, and
19 that will be done by the end of the month, prior
20 to submission to the Legislature. And other
21 technical documents that are not part of the
22 report package that we need to have as part of the
23 record to hand off to implementation teams. All
24 of those efforts will be completed by the end of
25 the month so that when we hand it off to the

119

1 Legislature on April 30th, the master planning
2 effort, as far as producing this first iteration,
3 will be complete and ready to go into
4 implementation.

5 Implementation meaning, recognizing again, as
 Page 107

cpr

6 I mentioned a few times, many of the concepts, if
7 not most of the concepts in the Master Plan, do
8 require additional planning, environmental
9 analysis and or design we can get to construction.
10 We do have a significant amount of engineering and
11 technical reviews going on out there. The IPET
12 was mentioned, but there's Team Louisiana, there
13 independent ASCU reviews. All of these things
14 have to be incorporated when we get into detailed
15 design processes.

16 And we have to continue to build on the
17 success we've had in this planning effort to
18 engage the scientific and technical community, the
19 public, and stakeholders, and, obviously, continue
20 to enhance the dialogue with the public. I think
21 the one thing that we, as the Integrated Planning
22 Team, are most proud of is the level of
23 conversation we have stimulated out there, good
24 people having an honest conversation about the
25 issues in public, in the press. It's good to see

120

1 this. It keeps the pressure on. It keeps the
2 pressure on to resolve the issues, and we
3 certainly view that as a positive development that
4 we would like to continue to enhance into the
5 future.

6 Lastly, we have our web site up here. This
7 is where all of our information is. As soon as
8 these technical documents are finalized and laid

cpr

9 out, they will be available on the internet by
10 April 30th, if not before. And I believe that's
11 the end of the presentation.

12 MS. COFFEE:

13 Okay, thank you, Jon. Now, I have a question
14 of the Authority right now. The others who are
15 coming up are going to be Karen Durham-Aguilera to
16 show us how this planning process is interfacing
17 with the Corps, Dr. Robert Twilley to speak to
18 some of the scientific concerns and the science
19 review. We also have Dave Fruge, he's going to
20 give us the final version of CIAP.

21 And then my question to the Authority is, do
22 you want to question each individual, or do you
23 want to hear this first and then ask questions?

24 You want to hear everybody? Okay.

25 All right, then at this time - Thank you,

121

1 Jon. At this time, I -

2 MR. ANGELLE:

3 I've got one question.

4 MS. COFFEE:

5 Go ahead, go ahead.

6 MR. ANGELLE:

7 Jon, great job. I appreciate your ability to
8 communicate so effectively. Relative to the
9 comment that you made on the Larose to Golden
10 Meadow and the Morganza to the Gulf, one of the
11 things I just wanted to comment on real quickly is

cpr

12 that, of course, last week I was with Secretary
13 Bradberry, former Congressman Tauzin, the
14 executive director of the Port of Fourchon, and
15 some of the folks from the Louisiana Offshore Oil
16 Port about the dedication of Highway 1.

17 And one of the things that I have, the role
18 that I do, is a little unique from a lot of other
19 folks in that not - in addition to working on the
20 Coastal Master Plan, I also regulate the oil and
21 gas industry in the state. And we have decided in
22 this state, perhaps over the last 25 years or so,
23 to link our ability to restore the coast and, more
24 recently, our ability to provide hurricane
25 protection - I'm talking about paying for it -

122

1 through the mining of our nation's offshore
2 mineral assets. And certainly the halls of
3 Congress have been filled with folks from
4 Louisiana who have from time to time, you know,
5 testified on those issues on why it's so important
6 and it's a logical link.

7 And, obviously, this past year we were very
8 successful moving it from a concept to a reality
9 and hope that here before too long we will be able
10 to do more. I say that because I want to just
11 make sure - I know you made the comment, and I
12 appreciated your comment, but I want to make sure
13 we get on record here that I don't have any
14 misunderstanding.

cpr

15 That we obviously need - When you take a
16 look at the importance of Port Fourchon, we
17 obviously need to protect that route. We need to
18 make sure that the folks who work offshore to
19 produce the revenue that we are going to come to
20 count on, for the most part, live in a protected
21 area, probably in that Larose to Golden Meadow
22 program - project as well as perhaps in the
23 Morganza to the Gulf. Not to take away that other
24 folks live in other areas, as well; they all are
25 very, very important. But, obviously, being able

123

1 to keep Highway 1 open and on and so forth to
2 bring the fuel to America.

3 Having said all of that, it is very, very
4 important from my standpoint, that we are in a
5 position to make sure that if some of the models
6 that you talked about show that those areas would
7 be better served by a level of protection that is
8 higher than a hundred years, that we would be able
9 to provide that, that the Master Plan could be
10 adjusted. And, again, I heard your comments to
11 that. I don't want to talk about whether it's two
12 hundred or three hundred or five hundred, because,
13 quite frankly, I'm not so sure that I can
14 articulate that.

15 But I think you understand my concern because
16 we have to make sure that that product can, you
17 know, continue to serve all of America. And that

cpr

18 way, America will continue to invest in what we're
19 trying to do here.

20 MR. PORTHOUSE:

21 Right. Yeah, and, Scott, I don't want to
22 give the impression that every - As you
23 mentioned, everything is important out there. And
24 I don't want to give the impression that we're
25 treating the Larose to Golden Meadow, Lafourche,

124

1 or Terrebonne in any sort of a unique, external to
2 the technical analysis sort of way. And what
3 we've identified right now is what we need to do
4 quickly, which is get that hundred year level of
5 protection established.

6 And as we wait and we see that the rest of
7 the analysis and we can provide more protection to
8 any of these areas, not just the Lafourche
9 corridor but anywhere else, if we can provide more
10 protection, we would. That's sort of an universal
11 part of the Master Plan. But this represents what
12 we know now and what we know needs to happen now.
13 And as we move forward, the entire plan is subject
14 to change as we learn more. So that's sort of a
15 universal comment for the rest of the plan, as
16 well.

17 MR. BRADBERRY:

18 Thank you, Madam Chairman.

19 I want to reiterate Secretary Angelle's
20 comments. In fact, I think it's appropriate that

cpr

21 if we look in the Master Plan, the Master Plan
22 basically states this: An analysis of the areas
23 and assets - Not working?

24 The Master Plan states this: An analysis of
25 the areas and assets and greatest risks has led

125

1 the State to target as a baseline - the word
2 "baseline" is very important - coast-wide level
3 of protection that would withstand a storm surge
4 with a one percent chance in any given year.

5 Then it goes on to say a few more things.
6 But then it says, in the last part of this
7 paragraph, it says: In all cases, the State's aim
8 is to tailor the measures adopted to the specific
9 needs of individual communities while basing all
10 of our innovations on sound engineering and
11 science. And so what that says is, is that one
12 hundred years is the baseline and that we will be
13 - the Master Plan will give consideration to
14 higher levels of protection, should they be
15 needed, consistent with the economic value of
16 those assets and the safety of those communities.

17 MR. PORTHOUSE:

18 Yeah. And I would just clarify, though, that
19 not all of that hundred year of protection is
20 provided by levees and floodwalls and those kinds
21 of issues. Some of it, especially in our more
22 coastal communities that are outside in these
23 really high-risk areas, we do have to rely on

cpr

24 nonstructural means, as well. So the hundred year
25 level of protection is not just levees.

126

1 MR. BRADBERRY:

2 Right. Okay.

3 MS. COFFEE:

4 Thank you, Jon.

5 All right, at this time I'd ask Karen Durham-
6 Aguilera to please come back up and explain the
7 interface between the two teams, the two efforts.

8 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

9 Well, you're not supposed to hide the brief
10 from the briefer, but as soon as I find my flash
11 drive, I'll get it back up there.

12 MS. COFFEE:

13 Well, can you - Do you feel you can do it
14 without the PowerPoint?

15 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

16 Yes, Sidney, I can, if I don't find it in a
17 second. Thank you for your indulgence. Does
18 everybody have a hard copy?

19 MS. COFFEE:

20 Yes.

21 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

22 Okay. Well, if you would, we'll just -
23 Everybody should have a hard copy. It should say
24 "Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration."

25 MR. MORGAN:

1 This is it?

2 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

3 That's it.

4 MR. PORTHOUSE:

5 The one Secretary Bradberry has.

6 MS. COFFEE:

7 Okay.

8 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

9 You know what, I'm just going to use that, if
10 that's okay.

11 MS. COFFEE:

12 Okay. That's fine.

13 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

14 All right. Well, first, I thank Jon for his
15 excellent presentation. But it also allowed me to
16 just take it further talking about the joint
17 efforts and the partnerships between the Corps of
18 Engineers and to the State. So if you go to your
19 next slide, please, you should be looking at a
20 slide that is titled, "Existing Coastal Protection
21 and Restoration Authorities."

22 What I tried to do was to show the vision
23 that this is an integrated system. The State
24 Master Plan is the overarching vision that Jon
25 just described quite well. Within that vision,

4 Federal ^{cpr} initiatives, you know, we have a ways to
5 actually turn that vision into action.

6 Next slide, please. Slide four. So what do
7 we have? We do have a joint team, you know, with
8 the State and the LaCPR/Corps team. Last week,
9 Randy Hanchey and senior executives from the
10 Corps, myself, Mike Rogers, and Tom Waters, as
11 well as members of our teams met to renew our
12 commitment on specific activities that the teams
13 have to take to make sure that we're working
14 together. We will continue and increase that
15 collaboration, as we talked about recently with
16 General Riley and members of the LaCPR steering
17 committee.

18 But we also want to make sure that the LaCPR
19 report is consistent. You know, we do have
20 federal reporting requirements so that we can get
21 - deliver a report that will get through the
22 Administration and be passed by Congress. But we
23 will use the State's Master Plan as a basis, as a
24 start, and springboard from there regarding the
25 formulation efforts.

130

1 Sitting together, we'll refine the State's
2 Master Plan through a greater level of analysis.
3 And to do that, we have numerous data, you know,
4 that the Corps has available to them, and that
5 includes the recent modeling, and we talked about
6 earlier (inaudible). It includes this plan

10 between it.^{cpr} Okay. I just talked about how the
11 LaCPR will use the State's Master Plan as a
12 springboard and how we'll work together to further
13 refine the measures.

14 We do have a plan formulation atlas; it's in
15 draft form and it should be published here soon.
16 But the reason that was developed is to inventory
17 all the measures that are available that we can
18 use to help further refine the concept envisioned
19 by the State's Master Plan. So we will catalog
20 those measures together based on the partner and
21 the stakeholder collaborations.

22 As Jon talked about, we do have to seek local
23 preferences. And as part of the Corps of
24 Engineers, you know, we look for the greatest
25 level of partnership that we can find so we can

132

1 actually make projects happen. So together with
2 the stakeholders, non-governmental organizations,
3 resource agencies, and then the scientific and
4 technical community, the joint team will screen
5 the options identified, will identify an array of
6 approaches that we can evaluate. And Jon talked
7 about making tradeoffs, and we'll continue that
8 tradeoff process, but also do that using a risk-
9 informed planning process.

10 Idea of the timeline, you know, Jon's already
11 talked about the schedule for the State Master
12 Plan. Our goal is to have the draft of the LaCPR

16 Well, you're welcome. And, you know, I'm
17 pretty excited that we've gotten to that point.
18 But I think part of it was the realization we were
19 doing it already but we needed to ramp up our
20 efforts. And so, you know, that's why myself and
21 my other colleagues, you know, senior executives,
22 and yourself, and Randy Hanchey, and, you know,
23 the LaCPR Steering Committee, and others, you
24 know, have really jumped into this to make sure
25 that we are working together, we're not starting

134

1 from scratch, or even worse, even giving the
2 perception that we're starting all over again.
3 You know, so thank you.

4 MS. COFFEE:

5 Very important. Thank you.

6 King.

7 MR. MILLING:

8 Sidney just asked me to reiterate the
9 significance of this. I think that this effort,
10 if we can work it together, really brings together
11 an unbelievable amount of initiative that should
12 provide a motivation to get this thing done in a
13 quick and timely manner. The coordination between
14 the Corps and the State has been, from day one,
15 critical.

16 We both know that if we go to Washington with
17 two separate plans, we are dead on arrival, and
18 none of us can afford that, and clearly the State

19 of Louisiana^{cpr} cannot. In that context, I want to
20 emphasize just one issue that I think is just
21 critical, and that is it's not what we know that's
22 important, it's what we don't know and have to
23 learn that's really important. There's an awful
24 lot that we don't have our hands totally around at
25 this junction, and that's why we're dealing with a

135

1 conceptual base.

2 Anew concepts of science and technology and
3 engineering over the years will hopefully be
4 developed and will be infused into this process on
5 a full time basis. And if we can corral all our
6 assets together, which I think today is clearly
7 the beginning of a vision for, and take that
8 meaningful educational process and put it in
9 place, we probably can be able to do what we've
10 set out to do. And, Karen, I really appreciate
11 your comments. Thank you.

12 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

13 Thank you.

14 MS. COFFEE:

15 Any other comments? Okay.

16 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

17 Excuse me, Sidney, just as a reminder, I'm
18 sorry, but I do have to leave, so -

19 MS. COFFEE:

20 I know. That's fine. And I appreciate you
21 staying for as long as you have and enduring. So

22 we'll see you next time.

23 MS. DURHAM-AGUI LERA:

24 Yes, you will. Thank you.

25 MS. COFFEE:

136

1 Thank you.

2 And at this time, before we go into the
3 Master Plan, I think it - I mean, into the Annual
4 Plan and the CIAP as an extension of that, I think
5 it's - actually it makes more sense if I ask
6 Robert Twilley to come up now and comment, because
7 his comments mainly relate, I think, to the Master
8 Plan more than anything.

9 MR. PORTHOUSE:

10 Should I stay or should I go?

11 MS. COFFEE:

12 You can stay.

13 MR. TWILLEY:

14 Jon should stay.

15 MS. COFFEE:

16 Dr. Robert Twilley.

17 MR. TWILLEY:

18 Thanks, Madam Chair. Given the significance
19 of the meeting today, I actually have some
20 comments that I've prepared. I don't have
21 PowerPoint; I'm going to spare you with PowerPoint
22 slides. And I will say that most of my comments,
23 that Jon has covered quite a bit of those related
24 to our response, but I do have couple points that

25

I really ^{cpr} feel is necessary that's made. And so if

137

1

you'll give me a couple of minutes, I do have some statements that I'd like to make.

2

3

One of the most important is, is that, you know, we have to keep in mind as we move through this Master Plan and what we're trying to accomplish that we've known for a long time that this is a landscape of rich natural resources, and it's become more and more the last hundred years the landscape of human settlements. And that we've tried to manage the risk associated with those combination of natural resources and human settlements.

10

11

12

13

And the stakes always get high right after catastrophes, historically. We've responded to those catastrophes, and each time we've responded to those catastrophes to protect human settlements, whether they're floods or whether they're storm surges, we've also tried to keep in mind that we want to protect our natural resources. If, historically, you go back and look, and I have quote at the end of my comments, to document that - If, historically, you go back and look at every public document this State has generated after every catastrophe, there was the intent by which we protect human settlement but

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 also protect natural resources.

2 So what's going to be different this time?

3 What is CPRA going to be doing different this time
4 in the challenge that you have before you to
5 protect human settlement, economic activity, our
6 culture, and at the same time have as a priority
7 the sustainability of this coastal natural
8 landscape? Because, historically, if you go back
9 and look over the last one hundred years, even
10 though we have stated in our intent to protect the
11 natural resources, we have lost over one hundred
12 million acres.

13 If you look at the performance of the system
14 of this landscape related to our intent through -
15 to develop economic activity, I'm not quite sure
16 if we have that strong a performance record
17 related to our natural resources. So this
18 challenge is to find these engineering solutions,
19 to risk insustainability, that consider this goods
20 and services of both economic and natural
21 resources to this coastal region. And I guess
22 that's the content of my statement. Is that over
23 the last eight decades, as we try to define this
24 resolution between natural resources and economic
25 activity, what you have found is that we are

1 moving our human settlements and we're moving our
2 risk closer to the coast, and at the same time,

cpr

3 because of the wetland loss and the degradation of
4 our landscape, we're moving the Gulf closer to our
5 risk.

6 You're faced right now something very
7 different than did past 1927. In 1927, or since
8 that time, we've lost, depending on what you want
9 to calculate, six hundred thousand acres of
10 wetlands. So the juxtaposition of what you're
11 trying to do today related to embrace the
12 protection to the economic infrastructure and the
13 people of this coast, you're doing it when, in
14 fact, you have less of a landscape and an ecotone,
15 if you will, by which the Gulf and the storm
16 surges associated with every hurricane that's
17 going to follow, and they will, you're faced with
18 a great challenge of engineering and science in
19 which we try to accomplish both a sustainable
20 economic activity and a sustainable natural
21 resources.

22 So the message that I want to establish here
23 today is that - And I want to take up, as I
24 normally do, because he's always one step ahead of
25 me, is follow in King Milling's comment that he

140

1 just made. It's not what we know, it's what we
2 don't know. And the issue is, is that the
3 challenge as we move forward today and take these
4 bold steps is that we have to keep in mind that,
5 even with the scientific uncertainties and given

cpr

6 what we don't know about the science and
7 engineering, is that we both want to move forward.

8 The science and engineering community, and
9 you hear a lot about our review and what we've
10 done and what we've said, I want it emphatically
11 stated today that I think there's one thing we all
12 have in common, and that is that we want to move
13 forward. The difference is, is that the balance
14 between moving forward - Because let me say this:
15 If you're balance between natural resources
16 sustainability and economic sustainability, if we
17 don't move forward, there's one thing that's
18 guaranteed, we both lose.

19 The no increase action of nothing happening
20 and committed relative to the State Master Plan,
21 the ecosystem restoration, means that we will
22 lose, what, five hundred square miles, right, over
23 the next fifty to one hundred years. So we both
24 lose if we don't move forward with some action on
25 moving from planning to projects.

141

1 Now, the issue is is the relative balance
2 that we establish related to protecting the
3 coastal processes that we need to sustain the
4 natural resources, and at the same time provide a
5 certain degree of protection related to the
6 economic activity and the coastal communities that
7 live across the state.

8 And I'm - I just, you know, am going to read
Page 127

cpr

9 - I've been out of context here ever since I
10 started, so why start now. But the point I want
11 to make is that, I tell you, the one comment I
12 think that I've heard this morning that is so
13 critical is honesty, is having a real true value
14 of exactly what people will have at risk given
15 climate change, given engineering uncertainties,
16 given what we can and cannot do related to the
17 coast.

18 Jon has already - And given those
19 uncertainties, we did have concerns in the science
20 and engineering community. I represent the
21 science and engineering review team. Jon showed
22 you comments from the LCA Science Board. There
23 are other comments that the IPT received. I will
24 not go through those concerns specifically. I
25 will say that the general comment that Jon showed

142

1 you earlier is one that I have here in my text
2 that I was - reiterate. And that is that both
3 boards were very much impressed with how the IPT
4 responded and considered with a lot of thought, a
5 lot of deliberation, and a lot of frankness, and a
6 lot of clarity, answers to our concerns. And I
7 want to compliment the IPT and the team for doing
8 that.

9 There was a lot of incorporation from the
10 very preliminary draft plan. There's still some
11 concerns, one of which you hear quite a bit. And

cpr

12 we are - Our statement is that related to levees
13 encompassing wetlands, where we put our structural
14 features related to coastal processes that we will
15 need to sustain our coastal landscape is of real
16 concern. And that is the balance.

17 That's the balance between are we really
18 going to sustain the coastal landscape as we've
19 said we're going to do over last eight decades or
20 are we - with even more of a risk because our
21 Gulf is closer to our communities. Are we going
22 to continue to use structural features over that
23 balance of coastal processes? The Science Board
24 and the CERP (phonetic) recommend a precautionary
25 approach, wherein the burden of proof is on those

143

1 advocating such a potentially risky scheme to
2 demonstrate that it is unlikely to have negative
3 impacts on the sustainability of wetlands and
4 productivity of the resources rather than on those
5 who have raised reasoned concerns about such
6 negative impacts.

7 I think the burden of proof and where we
8 pursue these uncertainties and how we develop an
9 implementation system that has a transparency to
10 delve into those uncertainties is critical. We
11 don't the know the answers in the State Master
12 Plan. The assurances we have to establish right
13 now is the intent by which CPRA will require the
14 implementation to have a transparent process of

cpr

15 decisi on-making before any of these projects wi th
16 such hi gh uncertai nties go forward. And that is
17 my key message here today. It's not related to
18 what thi s Master Plan has in it. What - It's
19 what it doesn't have in it that is going to be
20 assured through the CPRA that a process during
21 i mplementation, we're sure that that is adequately
22 addressed.

23 We have to make sure we get the sediment
24 right. We have to make sure that science and
25 engi neering review does not stand the same as

144

1 engagement. Just because we review something
2 doesn't mean we've been engaged. And that is,
3 again, the point that I want to make related to
4 thi s i mplementation phase. It's not what's in the
5 plan that you see so much before you as an
6 assurance that the plan in the future and during
7 i mplementation will engage the science and
8 engi neering communi ty to delve into these
9 uncertai nties that have been stated.

10 It is very important that the CPRA implement
11 fundamental program principles as you move
12 forward. And I just have a couple of these that
13 I'd like to emphasize before I close my comments.

14 It is very important, again, parti cipation.
15 I think it had been a hall mark to a certain extent
16 related to the development of thi s plan. I cannot
17 overemphasize how important it is during an

cpr

18 implementation phase that a level of engagement be
19 included and structured so that decision-making is
20 appropriate as we delve into this balancing of the
21 natural resources and economic activity.

22 The selective plan during implementation has
23 to include an effective monitoring and evaluation
24 process that reduces the scientific uncertainty,
25 assesses the effectiveness of the plan, and

145

1 supports adaptive management of planned
2 implementation. This implementation must follow
3 an integrated standardized procedure and scoring
4 system that will allow reasonable and informed
5 decisions within and among planning units.

6 For example, there's a lot that you're going
7 to hear in a second about the planning document,
8 this annual plan that you've required to look at
9 projects. What I haven't heard too much about and
10 what I would really like to see more discussion of
11 by CPRA is what the Everglades has, which they
12 refer to as the Everglades Consolidated Report.
13 It is legislated, it's required for the agencies
14 to produce, and if I could, I'd like to read just
15 the first two sentences of the 2004 Everglades
16 Consolidated Report that was published. I
17 downloaded it, actually, last night so that I
18 could give you a perspective of what this report
19 would include.

20 "The 2004 Everglades Consolidated Report is
Page 131

cpr

21 the sixth comprehensive report authored jointly by
22 the South Florida Water Management District and
23 the Florida Department of Environmental
24 Protection. This report brings together a year of
25 scientific engineering, planning, financial, and

146

1 management efforts by dozens of outstanding
2 professionals. It is prepared to satisfy various
3 annual reporting requirements by the Everglades
4 Forever Act and other state and federal laws." In
5 other words, this is required and mandated by the
6 authorities in Florida related to the performance
7 of the restoration plan.

8 "The diverse information presented in this
9 2004 Everglades Consolidated Report continues to
10 document the scientific soundness and strong
11 performance of programs leading to Everglades
12 restoration." An annual report that only lists
13 products or only lists projects without an annual
14 report - this is what are your scientific
15 soundness of what you are doing, and what is the
16 performance of the system that you are
17 constructing - is - it is critical that that be
18 a part of your implementation phase.

19 So when you move forward in this decision-
20 making and looking at the evaluation and
21 performance, we ask a couple of key questions.
22 Number one, how will you secure that system level
23 analysis using state of the art techniques and

cpr

24 models of natural science, social science,
25 economics, and engineering will be used to inform

147

1 tradeoffs and support qualified decision support
2 process?

3 We're there yet? I don't think exists a
4 document by which that is identified. That is a
5 critical piece as we move forward. Where are the
6 ideas generated? Who's ensuring that the
7 principles are adhered to? How will we build the
8 science and engineering capacity to implement one
9 of the largest public work projects in the world?

10 Mr. Bradberry answered - asked a very
11 important question this morning earlier. Do we
12 have the workforce to accomplish what the tasks
13 are that the Corps are trying to accomplish? Do
14 we have the workforce to accomplish what is in the
15 State Master Plan? Where will we generate the
16 science and engineering capacity by which we
17 implement such a large program? And how will we
18 decided when the vision needs to be revised? When
19 will we make decisions that, in fact, as we learn
20 through this process, that the vision and the
21 state document that you may accept needs to be
22 revised and edited?

23 Now, I'll finish with four comments that
24 were published by the National Research Council in
25 their review of the LCA Near-Term Plan. Because I

1 think these four comments of the several that they
2 made resonate as much today as the votes that you
3 take related to implementing this Master Plan, as
4 it were when we were dealing with the LCA Near-
5 Term Plan.

6 Number one, social services and ecological
7 processes need to be linked in evaluating the most
8 appropriate planning for coastal restoration. You
9 know, as an old social scientist told me a long
10 time ago, "You know, it's not managing natural
11 resources, it's managing people." And so we have
12 to make sure we incorporate with all the science
13 and engineering how we're dealing with the social
14 aspects of what we're trying to achieve.

15 One of the most important comments the NRC
16 made is we have to make sure that we strive to
17 achieve the synergistic effects of large scale
18 projects. Number One, remember my earlier
19 comment. For eighty years we've been saying that
20 we're going to sustain this coast and at the same
21 time we're going to protect the people. We failed
22 at that; we haven't done it yet. And so what will
23 be - And the reason we have not is because the
24 commitment we have to make to natural and coastal
25 processes to maintain the eighth largest delta in

1 the world is going to require a tremendous
2 commitment of political will. And it's going to
3 require us to build the synergies of these large
4 scale projects.

5 Number three, we have to have the appropriate
6 criteria to decision-making that is transparent.
7 But this is another very important point.
8 Generating precision - Generating criteria for
9 decision-making is not enough. You have to apply
10 it. You can generate a document; this is what
11 we're using for decision-making and these are our
12 criteria. If you don't apply it and document it
13 through transparency and how that is being
14 applied, then it really doesn't accomplish
15 anything in the minds of building trust of
16 stakeholders in the science and engineering
17 community.

18 And, finally, adaptive management. You have
19 to move forward with these bold projects with
20 strong science and management programs that
21 support adaptive environmental management. I go
22 back to your annual report that you need on system
23 performance. That is a critical part of the
24 language that has to be authorized in order to
25 guarantee that you really have the intent of doing

150

1 both protection and ecosystem restoration.

2 You know, system performance is the final
3 end-of-the-day criteria by which we must be

4 evaluated. ^{cpr} It doesn't matter if Federal Express
5 buys a hundred new airplanes; if that package
6 doesn't get there by ten o'clock tomorrow, you
7 still haven't done your job. Building stuff isn't
8 what it's all about. It's not projects. It's
9 performance of the system, and that system
10 performance over the next several decades is going
11 to be critical.

12 So I'll finish with a quote. This quote was
13 published in Ecology, the journal Ecology, which
14 is the journal of the Ecological Society of
15 America, presently nine thousand professionals
16 that represent the ecological community. The
17 author is Percy Viosca in a publication titled,
18 Louisiana Wetland and the Value of Their Wild Life
19 and Fishery Resource.

20 And I quote, "Man-made modifications in
21 Louisiana wetlands are the result of flood
22 protection, deforestation, deepening channels and
23 the cutting of navigation and drainage canals.
24 Reclamation and flood control have been more or
25 less a failure, destroying valuable resources.

151

1 Reclamation experts and real estate promoters have
2 been killing the goose that laid the golden egg.
3 Our future conservation policy should be a
4 restoration of the natural conditions best suited
5 to an abundant marsh, swamp, and aquatic fauna."

6 That article was published in 1928. Eighty

7 years we've^{cpr} been talking about this. How are we
8 going to make a difference?

9 Thank you very much.

10 MS. COFFEE:

11 Thank you, Robert. Appreciate those
12 comments.

13 Jon.

14 MR. PORTHOUSE:

15 Yes.

16 MS. COFFEE:

17 Yeah, and at the end of all the
18 presentations, then we're going - I'm going to
19 open it up to comments and questions by the
20 Authority.

21 Jon, now, you're going to present for us the
22 annual plan.

23 MR. PORTHOUSE:

24 With that introduction, yes, I am.

25 Okay. In keeping with the comments that Ms.

152

1 Coffee made starting off this meeting this morning
2 about this being sort of the end of the beginning,
3 we said this last year when we presented the
4 annual plan, and this year we really mean it, that
5 this is the last time you will see an annual plan
6 that looks like this one does.

7 We understand that there are requirements in
8 Act Eight (phonetic) for reporting on progress and
9 performance. There are requirements for all sorts

10 of other reporting for annual plans that we have
11 not necessarily done in the annual planning
12 setting.

13 For example, we have the annual project
14 reviews that DNR puts out every year for the
15 protection - for the restoration program. Those
16 kinds of issues, we need to start looking at
17 incorporating into the annual plan to move more
18 towards the consolidated reporting that Dr.
19 Twilley mentions.

20 But for this year, what this annual plan
21 really does deal with is what are we asking for in
22 terms of new spending authority for projects to
23 put on the ground, and how are we moving towards
24 implementation of the Master Plan. Again, we have
25 not got a completed implementation plan yet for

153

1 the Master Plan. I'll get into that a little bit
2 towards the end of the presentation. But we do
3 want to deal with the FY '08 funding authority and
4 the Master Plan priority groupings.

5 Again, this is what I ended the last
6 presentation with; it's what I start this
7 presentation with because it's all about
8 implementation. How are we going to complete the
9 planning, the environmental analysis and design to
10 put these projects onto the ground in a balanced
11 manner, balancing the ecosystem needs with the
12 flood protection needs of the coastal zone?

13 cpr
14 We do have a number of programs available to
15 us right now via the Coastal Impact Assistance
16 Program; the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection
17 and Restoration Act; Louisiana Coastal Area. We
18 also do have ongoing non-structural flood risk
19 reduction programs and evacuation planning and
20 ongoing hurricane protection projects, many of
21 which you've heard about already this morning.

22 But the challenge for this annual plan is to
23 pull all these programs - and potentially some
24 new programs that don't currently exist - pull
25 them together so that all the programs work
 together to implement the one comprehensive vision

154

1 of the Master Plan.

2 For the - As far as the FY '08 budget
3 authority we're asking for, there are these six
4 phases that the presentation is broken down into
5 that does correspond with the Annual Plan document
6 you have in front of you: the planning,
7 engineering and design, construction, O&M, science
8 and technology, and other initiatives.

9 One difference you see in this year's plan
10 versus last year's plan is previously all these
11 efforts were kind of program specific. We would
12 discuss everything going on in CWPPRA, then we'd
13 discuss everything that was going on in LCA, and
14 so forth. But that didn't really give the
15 impression that we were going for, that all of

16 these activities - doesn't matter which program
17 we're using - it's all leading towards planning,
18 design, construction, and O&M of one comprehensive
19 vision.

20 So one big difference you see in this annual
21 plan is it all is done with - by these phases to
22 give that integrated approach to how these
23 programs and projects work together.
24 Specifically, planning, engineering, design,
25 construction, O&M, we are further breaking down in

155

1 the Annual Plan by hurricane protection and
2 coastal restoration so everyone's got a better
3 handle on exactly what we're starting in this
4 program, what we're building, and what we're
5 operating and maintaining.

6 For planning, the - I don't know how to
7 define this exactly for you, but, basically, from
8 the point of time when you identify that you have
9 a problem to the point of time where you've
10 identified your potential solution is called
11 planning. Hashing through all the alternatives,
12 doing your environmental analyses, and selecting
13 that plan that actually is the one you're going
14 for is planning.

15 The big planning programs we have out there
16 are obviously from the restoration standpoint,
17 Louisiana Coastal Area. These are all feasibility
18 studies in partnership with Corps of Engineers.

19 But, also, ^{cpr} hurricane protection, the two big
20 ongoing - the one ongoing one, Donaldsonville to
21 the Gulf, that we're involved with, but also
22 starting a new planning effort to begin looking at
23 the Lake Pontchartrain barrier that is part of the
24 Master Plan. Total for planning in this year's
25 Annual Plan is 16.5 million dollars.

156

1 As far as engineering and design, which is we
2 have identified the project we want to build. We
3 just need to go out and collect the engineering
4 data and do the actual design of the project so we
5 know exactly where the project is so we can let
6 contractors to go build it.

7 Ecosystem restoration, we have these five
8 projects through the CWPPRA program: Alligator
9 Bend Marsh Restoration, Southwest Louisiana Gulf
10 Shoreline Nourishment and Protection, Madison Bay,
11 West Belle Pass, the demonstration project on
12 enhancement of Barrier Island vegetation.

13 These dollars are cost-sharing with the
14 federal government through the CWPPRA program.
15 The 1.4 million dollars you see here is the state
16 portion of that. That is fifteen percent of the
17 total project cost. In your document, you see
18 what the total project cost associated with these
19 are.

20 For the Coastal Impact Assistance Program,
21 which was authorized in the Energy Policy Act of

22 2005 that Mr. Fruge, I believe, will be up here
23 presenting in moments, these are the projects that
24 are anticipated to go to engineering and design
25 this fiscal year for a total cost of 21 million -

157

1 just over 21 million. These are one hundred
2 percent funds dedicated through the Energy Policy
3 Act to the State.

4 Ecosystem restoration, there are other
5 miscellaneous items out there like the Bayou
6 Lafourche Diversion project, which is - at this
7 point, the State is committing five million
8 dollars to complete that design on that project,
9 or to progress the design on that project, but
10 also anything new that we would have to do
11 regarding closing the MRGO and associated
12 ecosystem restoration effort. So design on these
13 efforts totaling eight million dollars. At this
14 point, we anticipate these are a hundred percent
15 State dollars. But if we can find funding
16 partnership opportunities, especially with the
17 Corps on the MRGO, we would do that.

18 Hurricane protection, engineering and design,
19 continuing the design of the Morganza to the Gulf
20 project with capital outlay funding totaling three
21 million dollars. There are ongoing studies right
22 now. Southwest Coastal Louisiana is completing
23 the reconnaissance phase with the Corps of
24 Engineers. DOTD is signing up to be the local

25

cost-share ^{cpr} sponsor as that moves in to - as that

158

1

further - as that moves forward.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

At this time, that and the west shore of Lake Pontchartrain, we are not asking for funds from the Coastal Protection and Restoration Fund or capital outlay. Those are - If funding is required for those as the fiscal year moves on, the intent is to ask for an amendment to the Annual Plan.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As far as what's going to construction this next fiscal year, in the CWPPRA Program is the Baratari Landbridge project and Goose Point/Point Platte in the Pontchartrain Basin. Total State cost there is just over five million dollars. Again, that's fifteen percent of the total cost. The rest of the federal cost is included in the document you have before you.

Coastal Impact Assistance Program, not to again preempt Mr. Fruge's presentation, but the projects we anticipate moving to construction next year, total cost to complete the construction of those projects right now is estimated at nearly 105 million dollars. And other construction items in the ecosystem restoration portion, there's bank stabilization along Bush Canal and Bayou Terrebonne. And that one is - That one, the

159

1 beneficial use of dredged material, Small Dredge
2 Program are ongoing efforts that we have every
3 year to send a small dredge out.

4 The beneficial use is something we set aside
5 every year to match federal O&M dredging, to use
6 that material beneficially. This year it's 1.5
7 million dollars. The Small Dredge Program is
8 something the State does. You know, going out and
9 sending a small dredge to create marsh in smaller
10 areas.

11 And this new one at the bottom, Bayou
12 Lafourche Salt Water Barrier, deals with -
13 There's a sort of a chronic problem with salt
14 water moving north of Gulf Intracoastal Waterway
15 and Bayou Lafourche. As we continue to design the
16 Bayou Lafourche Freshwater Introduction Project,
17 which is the ultimate solution of this project, we
18 can't wait several years to keep the salt out of
19 people's drinking water. So this is a sort of a
20 hold-the-line project for right now. Total cost
21 on this category is eleven million dollars.

22 For construction, the top three, Morganza to
23 the Gulf, Grand Isle and Vicinity, West Bank and
24 Vicinity, all requested by DOTD capital outlay
25 funding totaling nearly 21 million dollars to move

160

1 those projects through construction. The rest -
2 The next four, Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity,

cpr

3 Larose to Golden Meadow, New Orleans to Venice,
4 Southeast Louisiana, you heard Ms. Durham-Aguilera
5 this morning giving you the rundown of what
6 activities are ongoing in those projects, all at a
7 hundred percent federal cost.

8 Operations and maintenance. We build these
9 projects, we need to maintain them. We have
10 significant requirements and various cost-share
11 ratios between CWPRA, Caernarvon, Davis Pond, our
12 state-only projects, the Barrier Island
13 Maintenance Fund. Two projects that either - had
14 sustained damage from the storms in 2005 are just
15 reaching the point where they need to be
16 rehabilitated, Rycade Canal in the Chenier Plain
17 - I believe that's in the Chenier Plain; Gerry
18 can correct me later - and North Prong Schooner
19 Bayou to prevent saltwater from entering the
20 freshwater reservoir in Vermilion Parish.

21 And, also, hurricane protection, operations
22 and maintenance. The State has established a
23 Levee Inspection Program; it is the responsibility
24 of the local levee boards and levee districts to
25 perform those levee inspections. DOTD does

161

1 oversee that program to make sure they're being
2 done in accordance with the laws and regulations.
3 The total costs this year for operation and
4 maintenance, State cost anyway, is nine and a half
5 million dollars.

cpr

6 As was mentioned, we do have to make some
7 serious advances in science and technology to
8 implement the Master Plan through not only sort of
9 an umbrella coastal and Applied Coastal
10 Engineering & Science Program, but we do have
11 other things out there like Louisiana Coastal Area
12 Science and Technology Program, which can be used
13 to help implement the overall science and
14 technology efforts.

15 All of our restoration programs from CIAP and
16 CWPPRA do have some monitoring and performance
17 evaluation requirements. We have ongoing data
18 collection initiatives such as GPS benchmarks to
19 know the elevation in the coastal zone, wave
20 monitoring and database management to manage all
21 the information that's coming in, make it
22 accessible to researchers and planners. The total
23 cost there is 9.6 million dollars in this year's
24 Annual Plan.

25 There are other initiatives that can't be so

162

1 easily categorized into planning, O&M,
2 construction and so on. And those are these sort
3 of programmatic issues like emergency response to
4 hurricanes and other emergencies, public outreach,
5 expanding the information flow not only to the
6 public but back into the system.

7 Protection and restoration support
8 activities. We have time to time needs for legal

cpr

9 support. Last year we had an Annual Plan with a
10 million dollars or so for support of OCS
11 litigation. That kind of support activity is
12 here.

13 We have very explicitly implementation of
14 non-structural recommendations of the Master Plan
15 and the ongoing requirements of the Coastal
16 Wetlands Conservation Plan and the America's
17 Wetland Conservation Corps support. We have a
18 total of nearly thirteen million dollars from the
19 State Plan.

20 Before I move to Prioritization and
21 Sequencing, one thing that is included in the
22 Annual Plan Draft that you have before you but I
23 neglected to prepare a slide for, is a discussion
24 that anticipates to a degree receiving in the
25 vicinity of 200 million dollars from the State

163

1 budget surplus.

2 We have not identified those projects that
3 would be involved in that - to expend that 200
4 million dollars, but we have a draft of the
5 criteria that would be used to help identify those
6 projects. The ones you have in front of you, item
7 numbers one through six, remain the same, but we
8 did have two late additions that did not make it
9 into your packet. So I'll just read all eight for
10 the benefit of the Authority and the audience if
11 they don't have a copy in front of them.

cpr

12 But the projects we would look to advance
13 with the 200 million dollars in the budget surplus
14 if it is appropriated to us would be, number one,
15 they'd be consistent with the Master Plan and the
16 urgent, early actions that I will discuss in just
17 a moment. They should require no what's
18 traditionally called study; we should know what
19 they are and they should either be close to
20 complete with their engineering and design or
21 require not so much effort that we can't start
22 construction in a very quick period of time. We
23 have in here either immediately or within 18 to 24
24 months.

25 We need to make sure that we are balancing

164

1 the hurricane protection and coastal restoration
2 needs. Again, in keeping with the stated desire
3 of the Master Plan to keep these things in
4 balance, to not let hurricane protection get out
5 in front of the restoration or the other way
6 around.

7 Projects that really span the coast. We
8 have, as I'll get into in a moment, we have three
9 major regions of the coast. We want to make sure
10 that we're dealing with high-priority actions in
11 each of those three areas. Obviously, we know
12 that there may be some emergency project repairs
13 or other emergency needs that may need to be
14 satisfied, that's another criteria.

cpr

15 A portion of the fund should be used to
16 develop the science and technology - the
17 scientific and technical capacity that Dr. Twilley
18 spoke of. And the last one being, due to
19 limitations on non-recurring revenues, personnel,
20 personnel-related expenditures and administrative
21 costs are not going to be part of that 200
22 million.

23 So those are the criteria that are in the
24 Annual Plan. The last one, in particular, about
25 the administrative and personnel costs is not in

165

1 the Authority's draft, but it is in the draft that
2 will need to be approved.

3 As far as prioritization and sequencing, to a
4 large extent, the activities that I just went over
5 in terms of planning and operations and
6 maintenance and instruction have been a
7 continuation of ongoing projects and programs. We
8 have worked over the last year to make sure that
9 whatever we were starting new was consistent with
10 the intent of the Master Plan. But without an
11 approved Master Plan, it's hard to develop that
12 final implementation process.

13 But Chapter 3 in your Annual Plan this year
14 does deal with the beginnings of developing that
15 implementation plan. It deals with how we
16 identified urgent, early actions in the Master
17 Plan. Again, the discussion you see in Chapter 3

cpr

18 of the Annual Plan is the same discussion you see
19 in the last chapter of the Master Plan to provide
20 that linkage from one document to the next.

21 And how we would identify those urgent
22 actions of the Master Plan are those things that
23 would reduce key uncertainties in what the plan
24 looks like. Delta Management that we talked about
25 this morning, those land-building diversions where

166

1 we really don't have a handle on what that looks
2 like, we've got to get moving on that and define
3 what those things are because that really affects
4 the rest of the plan. We have to figure out what
5 those are. Even if we can't build it in the next
6 three or four years, we've got to get going on
7 that planning to move that project forward
8 because, I mean, it's so critical to the entire
9 plan.

10 Things like operational modifications to
11 existing projects, Caernarvon and Davis Pond are
12 critical examples of this, where they exist, they
13 have a given capacity, they are rarely - they're
14 rarely run to the capacity. But we can, with
15 operational modifications, get more ecosystem
16 restoration benefits out of those projects rather
17 than just operating them to maintain the salinity
18 regime. Those kinds of issues, relatively low
19 cost, relatively high benefits.

20 We also identified area - project types that
Page 150

cpr

21 deliver what we call highest priority outcomes,
22 and these are hurricane protection projects for
23 our areas of highest risk, metro New Orleans,
24 Houma, Lake Charles, Lafayette. Landscape
25 features that sustain or restore hydrologic

167

1 regime. We're talking Barrier Islands, closing
2 the MRGO, Bayou LaLoutre, that kind of project.

3 Restoring natural processes to areas of high
4 projected land loss. Natural processes can be
5 read river diversions and better hydrology,
6 sediment introduction, getting the sediment right,
7 as was mentioned. And sustaining or improving
8 processes critical to the socioeconomic viability
9 of an existing community. The biggest one we can
10 point to there for - just for an example of what
11 that might be is the Bayou Lafourche Diversion,
12 not only for a very - not only an effective
13 wetlands project during certain environmental
14 circumstances, but also keeps the salt out of the
15 drinking water. So that kind of a good multi-
16 purpose project is a high-priority issue.

17 We do know that we need to sequence these
18 urgent actions, again, to make sure that the
19 objectives, as we achieve them, are balanced, that
20 we are not building all the hurricane protection
21 up front and then having - being stuck in a
22 position of playing catchup with the restoration.
23 But the actual time scales of total Master Plan

cpr

24 implementation are dependent upon resource
25 availability.

168

1 So these groupings, they have several
2 different sort of categories. We have non-
3 structural and evacuation planning. These are
4 things that we take care of, and they're not large
5 projects construction. We have large scale
6 measures, as I mentioned, such as Delta
7 Management. We have programmatic measures like
8 the education and outreach.

9 And we have divided the coast into these
10 three major functional areas: areas east of the
11 Mississippi River; between the Mississippi River
12 and the Atchafalaya River - the Barataria and
13 Terrebonne estuary, essentially; and everything
14 west of the Atchafalaya River. And we have
15 identified within each of those three regions the
16 highest priority protection activities and the
17 highest priority restoration activities, and
18 that's what I'm going to go through right now.

19 But, again, the first grouping would be
20 raising and maintaining evacuation routes to make
21 sure that people can get out in advance of a
22 storm, that they can return safely after storms,
23 and that in certain instances some of these
24 evacuation routes can serve as an ecosystem
25 restoration or a hurricane protection project.

1 Large-scale planning, specifically out of the
2 Master Plan, the concepts we're talking about,
3 there is the Mississippi River delta management,
4 the large-scale land-building diversions,
5 optimizing the flow distribution at the Old River
6 control structure, and getting a good handle on
7 how the freshwater and sediment moves around in
8 the Chenier Plain and what we can do to increase
9 the sustainability of not only the wetlands but
10 also the economic activity out there, the
11 agricultural and crawfish farming.

12 Programmatic measures that we have identified
13 as urgent early actions are getting a handle on
14 how much sediment we have out there between the
15 navigation channels that we can use beneficially,
16 and also areas like rivers and offshore, and how
17 renewable is that sediment. But a basic inventory
18 of what's out there, and what we can use, and
19 where could it best be used.

20 Science & Technology Program is an ongoing
21 thing that we know we need to have - make a
22 serious investment in for the life of the program.
23 Coordination with non-structural measures, again,
24 how do we support elevating houses and those kinds
25 of issues, including evacuation planning, and

1 building the capacity we need in Science and
2 Engineering within the State.

3 East of the Mississippi River for hurricane
4 protection, all of the projects associated with
5 providing that increased protection to the
6 metropolitan area of New Orleans, upper St.
7 Bernard, Plaquemines Parish. These are the
8 projects that are - the concepts or the measures
9 that are included in the Master Plan related to
10 that, which we've grouped together as a high-
11 priority grouping: Lake Pontchartrain Barrier
12 Plan, the St. Bernard 40 Arpent Levee, the Lake
13 Pontchartrain and Vicinity Project, and anything
14 we would do on the north shore of Lake
15 Pontchartrain that is currently unprotected.

16 Closing the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet and
17 Ecosystem Restoration, this group of projects
18 we've identified here is what needs to move very
19 quickly. It starts with closing the Mississippi
20 River Gulf Outlet, restoring the central wetlands.
21 And between the Mississippi - the diversion at
22 Violet, the LaLoutre Ridge, and maintaining the
23 MRGO-Lake Borgne Landbridge, that collection of
24 projects, we'll close the MRGO to deep draft
25 navigation and use the remainder of the channel to

171

1 restore and maintain the Biloxi marshes.

2 The rest of the diversions we know we need to
3 size and operate the rest of the diversions we

4 have east of the Mississippi River as a system
5 with Hope Canal, Convent/Blind River, Violet,
6 Bayou Lamoque, and Caernarvon. Again, build as
7 many of these as we can as quickly as we can, but
8 operate them as a system to maintain and achieve
9 our objectives.

10 East of the Mississippi River we have
11 critical landforms out there such as the Maurepas
12 Landbridge which separates Lake Maurepas from Lake
13 Pontchartrain. We have the East Orleans
14 Landbridge which separates Lake Pontchartrain from
15 Lake Borgne, and then we have the Biloxi marshes
16 and reefs out there which separates Lake Borgne
17 from the Gulf. Those are critical landforms and
18 we need to find ways to restore with dedicated
19 dredging or shoreline stabilization as needed in
20 critical areas.

21 Between the Mississippi River and the
22 Atchafalaya River, hurricane protection,
23 Donaldsonville to the Gulf, completing that
24 project - that feasibility study and moving into
25 construction with the preferred alternative,

172

1 whatever that may be; improving the Larose to
2 Golden Meadow Project; the West Bank and Vicinity
3 Project, completing that and upgrading it as
4 necessary; Morganza to the Gulf including Houma
5 Navigation Canal Lock.

6 And these last two bullets really refer to in

7 the Master ^{cpr} Plan sort of that supplemental interior
8 barrier. Morganza comes first; it's what we need
9 to build first to establish the baseline level of
10 protection to the Houma area. But, beyond that,
11 evaluating what else needs to be done to increase
12 the protection of the Houma area.

13 As far as we do have other river diversions
14 to operate and maintain as a system: Bayou
15 Lafourche, Davis Pond, Myrtle Grove, and west
16 Point a la Hache. This - And we do have critical
17 landforms again. All the marsh creation I pointed
18 to, all those green areas in the Master Plan, west
19 barrier shoreline, are high-priority items. We
20 also have some issues to stabilize. Marshes and -
21 not stabilize, but restore marshes in Terrebonne
22 Parish and optimize the influence of the
23 Atchafalaya River in these areas for
24 sustainability.

25 Westward from the Atchafalaya River, actually

173

1 getting a better handle on the true level of risk
2 that Lafayette and Vicinity and Lake Charles and
3 Vicinity are subject to, and moving forward with
4 whatever hurricane protection projects we need to
5 do to provide that level of protection.

6 Restoring critical landforms, again, there -
7 most of these are dedicated dredging for marsh
8 creation because there is no river to put back
9 into these systems to build land. But the

10 highways, the barrier shoreline restoration and
11 select spoil banks to maintain the integrity of
12 the freshwater reservoir that's out there.

13 We do have some true watershed management;
14 basically, work falls in the upland basin of the
15 Mermentau area. As rainfall is ushered out to the
16 Gulf as quickly as possible in times of high
17 rainfall, it is not retained within the system and
18 we have significant portions of the year where
19 there is a freshwater deficit. Finding ways to
20 manage that rainfall so it's retained for a
21 greater portion of the year and remains available
22 for agricultural and ecosystem purposes is
23 extremely critical now, but especially in the
24 future, with projections of climate change, will
25 become more critical.

174

1 Maintaining the Atchafalaya River water
2 influence in coastal wetlands. Again, we know
3 what comes down past Morgan City. If you couple
4 that with whatever the optimized flow distribution
5 is at Old River, getting it through the
6 Atchafalaya Basin, which we still articulate as
7 needing to be wet and wild. But whatever gets to
8 the coastal zone, how can we get through the
9 wetlands so that the sediment and nutrients are
10 retained within the wetlands?

11 So that was a long list of concepts with the
12 Master Plan. It is not by any means an

16 When am I going to see some activity?".

17 Critically, though, the projections into the
18 future will not be the entire plan. Still, it
19 doesn't make sense to project detailed activities
20 out fifteen, twenty years, because the level of
21 certainty you have with those projections just
22 doesn't make sense. Currently, in the Annual
23 Plan, we're looking at the current year plus two
24 more. If the Authority thinks two isn't enough
25 and they want to go to five, that's fine, we can

176

1 do that. But the critical thing is turning the
2 concepts I just discussed in that last part of the
3 presentation into constructible projects,
4 scheduling and budgeting those out in the future
5 so people know what to expect.

6 I apologize for the length and the dryness of
7 that presentation, but that's what the Annual Plan
8 is.

9 MS. COFFEE:

10 And we appreciate it, Jon. Thank you.

11 All right, now, I'd like for Dave Fruge to
12 join the group to give us - and Greg Grandy -
13 and give us some more detail on the CIAP program,
14 which, actually, you know, this group does not
15 have to officially approve. But I think it makes
16 sense that we're showing how the CIAP Plan is
17 working to actually begin the first implementation
18 of the Master Plan.

19 So, Dave,^{cpr} you can go ahead.

20 MR. FRUGE:

21 Pull this slide presentation.

22 MS. COFFEE:

23 I'd like to make note for the - for Enger or
24 the Court Reporter that another member of the
25 Authority has come, Bryant Hammett - Secretary

177

1 Hammett, Wildlife and Fisheries.

2 MR. FRUGE:

3 Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

4 Yeah, I'd like to also recognize Greg Grandy
5 here with me. Greg has done a tremendous job in
6 helping to put our plans together and a tremendous
7 job of outreach with the parishes in that process.

8 What I want to do today is, basically, tell
9 you where we are in our efforts to put together a
10 Coastal Impact Assistance Plan that we can move
11 forward and get money for.

12 A little bit of background for the newer
13 members or those who may not have been here last
14 time, the program, the Coastal Impact Assistance
15 Program was authorized by Congress in the summer
16 of 2005. Louisiana and the coastal parishes will
17 receive an estimated 523 million dollars over a
18 four year period. That's the figure we've been
19 working with up to now.

20 The State is going to receive 65 percent of
21 that money or about 340 million, and the parishes

22 will receive^{cpr} the remaining 35 percent. The
23 funding begins this federal fiscal year, FY 2007,
24 and MMS is actually going to announce the actual
25 FY 2007 and 2008 allocations next Monday here in

178

1 Baton Rouge. To get at this money Louisiana has
2 to submit this Coastal Impact Assistance Plan to
3 the Minerals Management Service, and MMS has to
4 approve that plan before they can disburse the
5 money to the State and to the coastal parishes.

6 What we've done so far in terms of the Draft
7 Plan, we released the Draft Plan February 6th in
8 conjunction with the release of the Draft Coastal
9 Master Plan, and we've made presentations to this
10 body. We also made presentations to the Joint
11 Select Legislative Committee on the Coastal
12 Restoration and Flood Control.

13 We summarized the plan to the Governor's
14 Coastal Advisory Committee on March 30th, and we
15 also participated at the public meetings held for
16 the Master Plan and the Annual Plan and the CIAP
17 Plan on February 26th through March 1st. We also
18 posted that Draft Plan on our DNR website, and the
19 comment period ended April 12th - April 2nd, just
20 like for the Master Plan.

21 What was in the Draft Plan? We had ten
22 State-only projects at a cost of about 102 million
23 dollars. There were 97 Parish-only CIAP projects
24 with a total cost of 131 million. And then there

1 Mississippi River Long Distance Sediment Pipeline
2 that will take Mississippi sediment across the
3 Barataria Basin for wetland creation. And I'd
4 mention there with that project, we have three
5 different parishes cost-sharing in it: Jefferson
6 and Plaquemines and Lafourche Parish each
7 contributing a million dollars.

8 Next project is a Blind River siphon to
9 divert Mississippi River water into the Maurepas
10 Swamp. The next one is removal of the Bayou
11 Lamoque Floodgate to increase the flow through
12 that existing structure, that is really not
13 functioning now, to about twelve thousand cubic
14 feet per second. And then, finally, a Delta
15 Management Strategic Plan development effort that
16 will help us to frame up the subsequent
17 feasibility study of large-scale sediment
18 diversion in the Lower Mississippi River.

19 The next category is Barrier Shoreline
20 Restoration and Protection. We have two projects
21 there. One is the East Grand Terre Island
22 Restoration Project in the Lower Barataria Basin,
23 and the other one is the Rockefeller Refuge
24 Shoreline Demonstration Project. For the East
25 Grand Terre Project, the parish - Plaquemines

1 Parish is putting in six million dollars into the
2 project.

cpr

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Next.

The next category is the Protection and Restoration of Critical Land Bridges. Two projects there, one is the Orleans Land Bridge Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project. Orleans Parish is putting in 15 million dollars of their CIAP money. And the next project is the Barataria Land Bridge Dedicated Dredging Project.

Next.

We have four interior shoreline protection projects. The first two involve federal navigation channels; one being Freshwater Bayou Shoreline Protection and the other one being a section of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in Terrebonne Parish where there is very rapid erosion of the sensitive freshwater marshes.

The last two projects include the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection Project in the western part of the state. The State putting in 10.6 million, and then the CWWPRA Task Force has agreed to put in another nine million dollars to finish up the remaining 15 percent of the project and to actually operate and maintain the project. The

182

1
2
3
4
5

Last project is a cost-share project between the State and St. Charles Parish for the third and final phase of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Project.

Next.

cpr

6 Then, we have Marsh Creation with Dredged
7 Material. Two projects and programs under that;
8 the first being a beneficial use program to use
9 dredged sediment for federal navigation channels
10 to build more marsh. It's really a wasted
11 resource at this point. And then we have a fringe
12 marsh repair project being done by Plaquemines
13 Parish, and the State is going to put in 2.3
14 million dollars into that. And that's to create
15 marsh next to the back protection levees to
16 actually reduce erosion of those levees.

17 The next category is Coastal Forest
18 Conservation Initiative, 18 million dollars, and
19 it's primarily focused on acquiring conservation
20 easements from willing sellers so that we can
21 preserve forest that are important biologically
22 and that provide storm surge reduction. We'll
23 also use some of that money for some small-scale
24 restoration projects and to support, perhaps, some
25 wetland assimilation projects to enhance coastal

183

1 forest restoration.

2 The final two restoration projects; one being
3 the Central Wetlands Assimilation Project in
4 Orleans and St. Bernard Parish, Phase 1 of that
5 project. It's actually a project that will
6 retrain - that will force treated and disinfected
7 sewerage discharge, run that through the wetlands
8 and help them to become more productive and help

cpr

9 to restore those wetlands that have been grossly
10 degraded by human activities. And then, finally,
11 there's a performance management and science
12 monitoring effort to see how well our projects do,
13 and how we can build them better and operate them
14 better in the future.

15 The next category that the State plans to put
16 it's CIAP funding into is onshore infrastructure
17 projects to mitigate OCS impacts. The first one
18 is to invest in the Houma Navigation Canal Lock.
19 To help expedite the construction of that feature,
20 the State would put in 33 million dollars into
21 that and the parish is putting up 10 million
22 dollars.

23 The second one is the LA 1 Improvement
24 Project that we've heard about many times already.
25 The State putting up 33 million dollars to

184

1 supplement existing funding sources, and the
2 parish of Lafourche putting in over 2 million
3 dollars.

4 The last three projects for infrastructure
5 involve really resurfacing roads that have been
6 damaged by OCS traffic, and those are in the New
7 Iberia area and Morgan City and also in Lower
8 Cameron Parish.

9 The projects that are going to be supported
10 with the parishes' CIAP Funds of about a 183
11 million dollars in all, 86 percent of that funding

cpr

12 is going to go into restoration and conservation
13 projects and programs, and the remaining 14
14 percent is going to go into infrastructure, public
15 service needs, and planning and administrative
16 costs. I'd also note that the parishes are
17 putting up 52 million dollars for joint
18 state/parish projects.

19 Next.

20 In terms of the Final Plan Development, we're
21 well into that process now of putting together
22 that final plan. We've gotten many supportive -
23 We're guided by the fact that we've gotten many
24 supportive comments back on the Draft CIAP Plan
25 and really very few negative comments, so we're

185

1 moving forward. We're working closely with the
2 Minerals Management Service and the parishes to
3 address some of MMS's review, concerns, and
4 questions on projects in the Draft Plan. And, by
5 and large, those concerns relate to some of the
6 parish projects.

7 Keep in mind, now, we're the first ones out
8 of the chute nationally and so MMS is - knows
9 that they may be setting precedence on the
10 decisions they make. So they're requiring a lot
11 of detail, but they're very cooperative in working
12 with us to get through those issues that they
13 have. Really, we expect no significant
14 differences between what we have in the Draft CIAP

cpr

15 Plan and what we have now in what is coming
16 together as the final plan for those projects that
17 are going to be supported with the State's share
18 of the CIAP dollars.

19 Next.

20 The timeline really - We want to get the
21 Final Plan submitted to MMS next month. We are
22 also planning to implement some - as Jon
23 mentioned earlier, Jon Porthouse - some selected
24 CIAP projects with State funds even before the
25 CIAP dollars get here. We hope to obtain approval

186

1 of the Final Plan from MMS sometime in August, and
2 MMS has said that they will accept CIAP grant
3 applications. Once you get your plan approved,
4 you still have to apply for grants to access the
5 dollars. They'll start accepting those grant
6 applications sometime, we think, in the early
7 fall.

8 Next.

9 Jon also mentioned we're moving forward
10 before the funding gets here with several
11 projects. We're preparing for construction. This
12 is with State funds that we're moving this
13 activity up quicker. East Grand Terre Island,
14 Barataria Land Bridge and Grand Lake Shoreline
15 Protection Project, we plan to move forward with
16 some of our acquisition planning, and, hopefully,
17 some acquisition under the Coastal Forest

cpr

18 Initiative. And we have engineering and design
19 planned for several projects here: Violet
20 Diversion, Freshwater Bayou, the Long distance
21 sediment pipeline in the Barataria Basin, the
22 Bayou Lamoque Diversion Project, and the Orleans
23 Land Bridge Project.

24 As I said, we have a May target date to
25 submit this final plan, and so we would recommend

187

1 for discussion later on that the Authority
2 authorize, as one option here, authorize the
3 Steering Committee to review and approve the final
4 CIAP Plan and then - provided there's no
5 substantive change in the State-funded projects,
6 CIAP projects, that we showed you in the Draft
7 Plan.

8 That concludes our comments, Madam Chair.

9 MS. COFFEE:

10 Thank you, Dave.

11 All right. At this time, I'd like to ask for
12 comments and questions from the Authority on
13 anything that you've heard from the Annual Plan to
14 the Master Plan to Robert Twilley's comments to
15 the CIAP Plan.

16 Mr. Curole.

17 MR. CUROLE:

18 Dave, so you ask that a resolution giving the
19 Steering authority - Steering Committee authority
20 to approve the plan?

cpr

21
22
23
24
25

MR. FRUGE:

Yes.

MR. CUROLE:

I would make that Motion.

Motion made.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

MR. ANGELLE:

First of all, to Mr. Fruge, congratulations on a good presentation. Again, I know I asked this question last time, and I have a question for you and one for Mr. Porthouse before I read it.

Did not seem to be a big emphasis on the use of this money for studies; is that correct?

MR. FRUGE:

That's correct. We wanted to put projects on the ground.

MR. ANGELLE:

Right. And did I hear you say, Mr. Porthouse, that relative to the 200 million dollars that we've been working with Governor Blanco and the Administration, and we'll be working with the Legislature trying to establish those projects, there's some criteria that the staff has put together working with DOTD and DNR and the Governor's Office of Coastal Activities, and one of those criteria is that - of this 200 million dollars, we couldn't use it for personnel,

23 administrative cost, and we couldn't use a single
24 penny for studies; is that correct?
25 MR. PORTHOUSE:

Motion Seconded.

1 That's is correct.

2 MR. ANGELLE:

3 It's a great day. Okay.

4 Whereas the Coastal Impact Assistance Program
5 authorized by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 will
6 provide an estimated 523 million in federal
7 funding to Louisiana in its coastal parishes over
8 a four year period, and

9 Whereas, Louisiana must submit a CIAP plan to
10 the Minerals Management Service, and MMS must
11 approve that plan before Louisiana's coastal
12 parishes can obtain those CIAP funds, and

13 Whereas, the Department of Natural Resources
14 presented Louisiana's Draft CIAP Plan to the
15 Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority on
16 February 6, '07, and

17 Whereas, full public review of the Draft CIAP
18 Plan occurred from February 6th through April 2nd,
19 2007, and was facilitated by a variety of
20 meetings, including several public hearings, and
21 making the Plan available for review on the
22 Internet, and

23 Whereas, the State has received numerous
24 supportive public comments and very little
25 negative feedback on the projects included in the

1 Draft CIAP Plan, and

2 Whereas, the State does not anticipate that
3 the Final CIAP Plan will involve substantive
4 changes in the State-funded CIAP projects listed
5 in the Draft CIAP Plan, and

6 Whereas, the State intends to complete and
7 submit the Final CIAP Plan to MMS in May 2007,

8 Therefore, be it resolved, that the CPRA
9 authorizes its Steering Committee to review and
10 approve the State's Final CIAP Plan provided there
11 is no substantive difference between the State-
12 funded CIAP projects included in that Final CIAP
13 Plan and those presented in the Draft Plan.

14 I read well?

15 MS. COFFEE:

16 That's very good.

17 All right, all those in favor? Or do I have
18 a motion to pass the - We've already done that.
19 Okay. All those in favor?

20

21 MS. COFFEE:

22 Any opposed?

23

24 MS. COFFEE:

25 All right. The CIAP Plan is approved.

cpr

None opposed.

1 Mr. Curol e.

2 MR. CUROLE:

3 Okay. Well, one thing, Dr. Twilley, your
4 comments were well taken, but one issue, you know,
5 that kind of - you know, in a place that lost
6 three hundred thousand people to a flood in 1970,
7 lost a hundred twenty-five thousand people to a
8 flood in 1991, a guy from Bangladesh once told me,
9 "Don't let a dry-footed researcher do your flood
10 protection."

11 And, you know, not meant to be too humorous,
12 but the issue is that motivation in what we do.
13 You know, Richard Feynman - I read this book,
14 Genius by Richard Feynman, and there was something
15 that he did after the Challenger accident. You
16 know, here they were doing a big investigation,
17 were going to go solve the problem. After reading
18 a couple of reports, he realized that there - the
19 guy - the company that constructed the O-ring
20 said, "Do not launch when it's cold." And in
21 front of all the cameras he took that O-ring and
22 dipped it in a glass of water, and then he raised
23 it up and said, "It's not as flexible."

24 Okay, the point being, there were millions of
25 dollars that people were going to use to research

192

1 what caused the problem. Many people became angry
2 because the engineers and scientists were going to

cpr

3 reap some benefits from doing all the research.
4 Yet, he cut that. And that - What I'm looking
5 for is a Richard Feynman in this area.

6 You know, we talk about moving forward,
7 finding money to do some work, but - and people
8 talk about wrapping up. From our perspective,
9 people have been living on the coast and in these
10 communities that you talk about the water getting
11 to. You know, we feel we've been in a lot of
12 studies and a lot of wrapping up to this point.
13 And that's, you know, the issue that we need to
14 get to.

15 The transparency on the other side, also, is
16 that - again, agreeing with everything you said
17 about transparency. You know, we had an issue
18 just this past week where Morganza to the Gulf,
19 which has been very transparent - I mean, I work
20 with Jerome. Jerome has a biology degree, that's
21 his background; he cares about doing things right.
22 And, yet, it almost looks like sabotage with some
23 of the questioning from the scientific community.

24 These are the types of issues if we're going
25 to do things right and really do what's right for

193

1 the people - You know, and you ask, "Why? What
2 can we do different?" Well, years ago I saw this.
3 We would do projects for the flood protection or
4 restoration and we'd come to loggerheads and one
5 side would win and one side would lose, but it was

cpr

6 never a good - a pretty sight.

7 The point and the thing into the future is
8 one, I think, people know we need to do these
9 things, and that's why doing these things together
10 gives us a better chance of putting on the table
11 or in the ballgame, setting up some procedures
12 that you talked about. But I think for us to move
13 forward, these need to take place, and I don't
14 think we've done flood protection well, either,
15 not just restoration. And we could have - We
16 could always do both of those things well, but
17 lack of focus, everyday things come into being.

18 But I just wanted to mention these things. I
19 agree with you, but on the other side, we need to
20 look at the whole picture. And, you know, we
21 always talk about the best engineering and the
22 best science, no one disagrees with that. But,
23 you know, when you're getting attacked, you can't
24 wait until you get the best weapon in your hand;
25 you got to survive. And then you fight, and as

194

1 time goes on, maybe you can develop the best
2 weapons.

3 We have been attacked for the past eighty
4 years, as you described, and, yet, we basically
5 sat on our hands. But one thing we cannot let
6 science do - and the question - because it in
7 that same book, Dr. Feynman defines science.

8 There is - Science helps us know what we know, to

cpr

9 what degree we know it, because we don't know
10 everythi ng -

11 MR. TWILLEY:

12 Never will.

13 MR. CUROLE:

14 - about anything. Okay. So we can always
15 throw in another question. We can always do
16 another paper. These - This is the fine line
17 that we need to get to so we can have confidence
18 in the work that we do and the money that's spent
19 on science rather than to a contractor. The
20 feeling in coastal Louisiana is that, you know,
21 we're giving all the money to the lookers and none
22 of that - and not enough of that money goes to
23 the people who actually make the difference with a
24 physical problem and taking care of the attack.

25 So, again - I'll say again I agree with what

195

1 you said, transparency, doing it the right way,
2 but we need to be able to do all these things the
3 right way for the betterment of all the people.
4 And caring for the marsh, we have some people that
5 live in some of these coastal communities you
6 described, there's no one in this room that has
7 more emotion, more feeling, and more connectivity
8 to that marsh than those people. And they have
9 been ignored in these battles and this tug-of-war
10 that's going on.

11 So, again, I'll mention again, we agree, but
Page 176

cpr

12 we need to do everything better.

13 MR. TWILLEY:

14 It wasn't a question, but can I respond real
15 quick to two points?

16 You know, one of the most important messages
17 - because when you - when I speak, I guess I
18 represent number one, the academic community;
19 number two, to a general degree the science and
20 engineering community, and I just want to get two
21 really important messages in my comments and
22 respond to yours, Mr. Curolle.

23 One is we have to move forward. And the
24 community that I work with wants to move forward
25 as much as you do. All right, that's very

196

1 important. And, second, is that when we speak,
2 we're not saying we want more studies and more
3 research, per se. What - And which a lot of
4 people interpret it stalling. We've got to find a
5 way by which what we want to accomplish in this
6 process is the same that you're looking for, and
7 that is performance. And so it's not, you know,
8 sequencing science and then projects, but, in
9 fact, their tandem.

10 The way I describe that is sort of like
11 clinical trials. When you look at the medical
12 community or pharmaceutical community - I mean,
13 if you really want to know how well science is
14 performing and doing something, you do clinical

cpr

15 trials. We need to get out there and build
16 projects. But we can't build projects without the
17 science monitoring and understanding performance
18 so that we know when we've made a mistake, and we
19 correct it.

20 So we're not saying you can't do anything
21 until we have the nth degree of science. But what
22 we are saying is we need to institutionalize
23 science as part of the process so that we know
24 what the performance is as we're moving forward.

25 I can even - You know, Don Davis wrote this

197

1 great chapter in a book that Craig Colton edited.
2 And I haven't gone back to the original document,
3 and maybe some people in this room know it. But
4 there was an engineer back - I think, wrote a
5 report in 1852 by the name of Elliott to the State
6 that talked about having openings in the levee
7 system. I mean, you know - I mean, we - And
8 Humphreys overruled him on what he was doing.

9 So, you know, there's a lot of this - things
10 that we know, and so I guess our point is we need
11 to, you know, have a process by which we implement
12 some of these really good ideas.

13 MR. CUROLE:

14 But, again, I go back to trust. I mean,
15 that's the thing, you know. I want to be able to
16 trust when a scientist tells me he needs more
17 information or an engineer tells me he needs more.

cpr

18 But I need some trust. Because, again, it's
19 motivation. If you live in the community, if
20 you're going to suffer the consequences by just
21 looking at not dealing with the problem, I've got
22 less, you know, less concerns that you're really
23 not interested in - yeah, that you are really
24 interested in solving the problem.

25 But so many times I've dealt with a number of

198

1 people with a Corps project we have, engineers
2 coming from another place. We spend - They spend
3 fifty thousand dollars trying to - finding what
4 an intelligent high school senior can tell about
5 the place.

6 And, I mean, this is just part of the - This
7 is the frustration: When we look at all the
8 projects that we have up there, knowing that we
9 don't have the dollars to do all of those things,
10 that we're going to make some very hard decisions.
11 And, again, being truthful to people, we will not
12 -I do not believe we can do all these things.

13 But that's why pinching every penny to make
14 sure it gets - it's solving the problem. And I
15 agree with you, a dollar to science and
16 engineering that provides thousands of dollars of
17 benefits is well spent. But a dollar for science
18 that may provide some good information that
19 doesn't help solve the problem, we're not in that
20 situation in this arena.

cpr

21 So, again, trust is the big thing on both
22 sides of that discussion. And I can tell you,
23 there's tremendous frustration in the Terrebonne
24 area and in the upper parts of Lafourche on what
25 the - The way it took place, the timing, almost

199

1 looked like a plan. Some residents between
2 Washington said down here "Let's get back and
3 forth and let's sabotage to this project."

4 MR. TWILLEY:

5 Can - And I meant to add one more. Be very
6 - Also, be very careful of how institutions will
7 use in science community for their own benefit of
8 decision making. I'll just lay it at that, okay?

9 MR. CUROLE:

10 And you're absolutely right. Yeah, I mean,
11 people - you -

12 MR. TWILLEY:

13 We are - and so the - You can go into a lot
14 of different arenas.

15 MR. CUROLE:

16 Exactly.

17 MR. TWILLEY:

18 And if you want to stop something and you
19 don't want to give the exact reason, you can use
20 science as an argument. So we're caught in that,
21 but we need to build a system by which we -

22 MS. COFFEE:

23 At the very highest levels of our United
Page 180

cpr

24 States Government, they will use science when -
25 MR. TWILLEY:

200

1 You bet, at the very highest levels.

2 MR. CUROLE:

3 I don't want to give these people ammunition
4 to do something they want to do using another
5 reason. Exactly right.

6 Back - One of the key issues we talk about,
7 crossing the basins, the middle of the basins,
8 okay. You know, I - You know, these concerns, we
9 understand the concern. But one of my big
10 problems is right now you have so much
11 disassociation between the barrier islands and our
12 marsh fringe that the wave action in between is
13 causing problems for that marsh.

14 I also look, you know, at, again, science's
15 observations for the years we've had our levee
16 system. I have less problems along the base of
17 the levee where I have fresher water than where I
18 have salt water. Again, this is part of just -
19 freshwater has more species that can grow and at
20 probably a greater rate. But we need to look -
21 You know, it's not like Herke's (phonetic) study
22 or empowerments (phonetic) and the problems with
23 empowerments (phonetic) is that talking to some
24 mid-level biologist, people that are in the area
25 and are in the water a lot. If we can, and I

1 understand the lack of trust from the scientific
2 community that if you build a levee, people are
3 going to - they're going to develop behind it,
4 they're going to drain it, those types of things.
5 That's understandable and that's legitimate.

6 But, also, if in talking about these cross
7 basin levees, designed properly, and with enough
8 fresh water induced on the north end, that they in
9 some instances could actually improve the
10 situation. But the fact of the matter is if our
11 society says we need those things, why I look at
12 science is to come in and say, "How can we best
13 minimize the problems and maybe maximize some
14 benefits from the environmental side."

15 And I think this is the discussion. I don't
16 believe R&D ought to be directing what society's
17 doing. I believe R&D should be able to minimize
18 problems and offer suggestions. And this is where
19 we need to be better as a state entity.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. TWILLEY:

22 And if I can respond to that. I mean, the -
23 Where I think the role there is, and my concern
24 over the entire discussion of restoration that
25 I've been heavily involved in the last three

1 years, and you've heard me say before, is that
2 where I think the R&D and the science and
3 engineering community has to calibrate the
4 expectation of the public. And I just - And I
5 think it's our responsibility, knowing how the
6 system works, that if you have an unrealistic
7 expectation of what you're going to get, because
8 the processes and the way the system works does
9 not support it, it is our responsibility to
10 challenge that.

11 And that's exactly the - I think that's
12 where the - you know, and I think it's all about
13 the - I keep thinking, you know, we keep using
14 this term "unintended consequences." You know,
15 we've known how this system works for almost a
16 hundred years, if not longer. And so it's not
17 really just knowing how the system works, it's
18 also calibrating the political will of the
19 projects we need to stabilize the system. And so
20 that's our job, is in knowing exactly what those
21 increments are.

22 MR. CUROLE:

23 And, you know, we go back again to the truth
24 that we talked about earlier to the public. You
25 know, we cannot - Well, I don't believe we should

203

1 mislead the public to think marsh grass can do
2 more than it can do. But we should always talk
3 about how - what it can do and the importance it

4 can do. cpr
5 I mean, I see this thing, this politicizing
6 science as a very negative thing. We need to put
7 the facts on the table as well as we can, as
8 honest as we can, and keep improving those facts
9 as we go. These are real problems on both sides
10 of the table in this discussion. Because I feel
11 frustrated for both of them. A lack of
12 restoration that we've been needing for 30 years,
13 the lack of will to do those things is not there.
14 And on the other side, a loss of focus and a need
15 for flood protection. You know, we've not done a
16 real good job, but the -

17 MS. COFFEE:

18 All right.

19 MR. CUROLE:

20 - but the only encouragement is we've had
21 these events and we have that opportunity and
22 we're having this discussion now to move to some
23 positive things.

24 MS. COFFEE:

25 Thank you. And I know that this is a

204

1 discussion that could probably go on for quite
2 some time, but - Mr. Wilson.

3 MR. WILSON:

4 Yes, ma'am, thank you.

5 I'm going to try to remember the comments. I
6 guess this was the right way to do it so bear with

7 me. I guess, ^{cpr} to Dr. Twilley, I don't want to beat
8 a dead horse here. But what I want to make sure
9 gets put across is, science - I'm about sick of
10 hearing science and engineering as a statement.
11 It's about putting stuff on the ground. That's
12 why I like what, Dave, you had to say about your
13 projects. You're putting money on the ground, no
14 studying.

15 In my experience, science and engineering,
16 nothing personal to any engineers or scientists,
17 but they don't always include common sense.
18 Science and engineering, for example, told us, an
19 area I represent, that we could build a levee and
20 retain the water and let the water flow through
21 drain - flow through structures, and then we've
22 flooded four times since it's been complete. So,
23 now, science and engineering tells us differently.
24 And I appreciate the fact it's evolving, and I've
25 always listened to you, Dr. Twilley, and I think you

205

1 bring some reason to it. I appreciate you very
2 much.

3 I want to say that I appreciate - Since this
4 is all in one, I'm going to get it over with.
5 Secretary Angelle and your folks, we got 46
6 million dollars worth of potential projects in the
7 PLB jurisdiction area, and I appreciate that.
8 What I want to do is let you know publicly that
9 I'm going to be working with the appropriate

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. ANGELLE:^{cpr}

I think - I may be wrong, but I believe that the ones that Mr. Porthouse listed were ones that were specifically made by DOTD to that.

MR. PORTHOUSE:

That's correct.

MR. ANGELLE:

209

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

That doesn't mean that those obviously can't happen, but, I think that's why it was limited to that.

MR. WILSON:

Okay.

MR. ANGELLE:

I think Mr. Curole has the same issue; is that correct?

MR. CUROLE:

Yeah, exactly.

MR. ANGELLE:

Right.

MR. WILSON:

The last thing I want to say here is, you know, I got the big report here, Jon, the old draft, February 2007, and I - what I did is sent it to the four levee districts that I'm supposed to represent up here and asked for feedback. And I got positive feedback from all of those levee districts.

However, because we represent the whole, and

22 we better be^{cpr} representing the State as a whole, I
23 want to encourage the Steering Team to please come
24 back and realize that we all understand that this
25 is a joint effort between coastal restoration and

210

1 integrating our levees. And Secretary Angelle, I
2 know, can vouch for the fact that I'm very
3 passionate about that.

4 What I'm not passionate about is getting -
5 having to get three-quarters of the way through
6 the big plan before we really get into talking
7 about levees, because they're a fact. They're
8 going to have to occur or we're going to have to
9 move people.

10 So some of the levee districts or some of the
11 levee concerns, primarily on the Westbank, I think
12 need - I don't want to get into the maps; this is
13 not about the maps, but some real concerns: the
14 Harvey Canal, places like that, where people were
15 within inches, I think, just a few inches of
16 flooding.

17 We can't wait four more hurricane seasons,
18 and if the State can take the lead through - I
19 look through all this other funding, why can't we
20 find some money to go out and do some interim
21 measures there? You know, I don't know whether it
22 will fit in your arena, or maybe we can find a way
23 to use some of the coastal money to do it. We
24 can't wait four more seasons. There are

25

businesses^{cpr} there that will flood, and I just want

211

1

to get that feedback to you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I apologize for using this means to do it, but please go back and look at some interim measures. That, to me, is the thing that we can use the State funds on, try to find some innovative ways to use them so we can get some people a comfort level while we're waiting on the Corps to finish studying and getting Justice Department reviews and whatever else they got to do to actually get down to putting dirt on the ground.

MR. PORTHOUSE:

Yes, if I can just respond to that for a moment.

Again, the Master Plan, the big one, you do have to wait a good deal until you see the mention of the actual structural hurricane protection. That is not by any stretch of the imagination to mean that it is not important.

The way we have - The way we communicated throughout this entire plan is that a sustainable landscape is needed for sustainable flood protection. And the Master Plan, the big document, as you called it, really lays out the vision. Where - The second part of your point

212

cpr

1 really gets into the Annual Plan. We've
2 identified protecting metropolitan New Orleans,
3 including the Westbank, as one of the very high-
4 priority items.

5 And we also recognize that turning that big
6 item, protect the Westbank, into constructible
7 elements is an ongoing thing that we start
8 essentially now. So if there are innovative
9 ideas, anything that you know needs to be in
10 there, sort of a constructible item to implement
11 that vision, now is the time. We'll get it on the
12 table as we start putting that implementation plan
13 together.

14 MR. WILSON:

15 Just so I'm clear - And I've been asked this
16 question; I think I know it. Who's the Steering
17 Team?

18 MR. PORTHOUSE:

19 The Steering Committee for the Master Plan
20 effort is Ms. Coffee, Mr. Angelle, Mr. Bradberry,
21 Mr. Curole, and Mr. Miller.

22 MR. WILSON:

23 Okay, I'm clear on that. I want to - I'll
24 get that information to you folks, because I've
25 gotten a lot of feedback. And, again, I apologize

213

1 for having to wait.

2 One more thing, Jon, is in the plan - Let's
Page 192

cpr

3 see, Chapter 3, all right, we talk smart growth
4 policies and encouraging parishes and
5 municipalities to adopt smart growth policies that
6 preserve wetlands, and I speak from experience
7 there as a former planning commissioner. I want
8 to give you the data that those policies get
9 enacted - And I'm saying this because maybe we
10 need some legislative help.

11 St. Charles Parish, for example, has a W1
12 zoning delineation, and that's what they've gone
13 through in their Master Plan and I think they did
14 a pretty good job of that when they implemented
15 it. They mapped it out and it's supposed to be
16 non-developable wetlands. And then what happens
17 is we get these things - not to be - probably a
18 different realm with the Corps, but you get a 404
19 permit request and none of those get turned down;
20 they get modified, they get withdrawn. You know,
21 Dr. Twilley, I know you've got to grin at that
22 one. They all get approved, ultimately, in some
23 way, shape, or form.

24 So what happens is the parish who has tried
25 to implement smart growth and tried to preserve

214

1 wetlands has a landowner come back and throw on
2 them that, "The Corps gave me a permit. The Corps
3 is going to allow me to mitigate these wetlands,
4 so you can't consider them wetlands. And if you
5 don't let me do what I want, you know, you're

cpr

6 taking" - it amounts to a taking. And what
7 usually occurs is, after that, if they get through
8 all that, they sue a municipality anyway, and
9 that's happened to me personally.

10 So I just want you to take that info, and if
11 there's any ideas that you have or anybody else
12 has that I can go get with a legislator or
13 somebody to help us change that, I mean, put some
14 more teeth into it. Because I think the parishes,
15 for the most part, are trying, but it's
16 counterproductive.

17 MR. PORTHOUSE:

18 Right. And as you mentioned, there are a lot
19 of good things going on out there and some things
20 that we wish we could be doing better. In the
21 Master Plan, we do recognize that we've got to get
22 better about being smart in the coastal zone. We
23 are awaiting what we think is a pretty critical
24 document that actually was initiated not by us but
25 by other people from the Coalition to Restore

215

1 Coastal Louisiana and Louisiana Sea Grant to
2 review all these land use planning tools, what
3 each individual parish or other government
4 organization has to help guide smart growth. It's
5 not uniform across the coast, everybody does it
6 differently, and there are some glaring holes; one
7 of which you just mentioned being the permit
8 process, not necessarily just state but also

cpr

9 federal .
10 What's in the Master Plan right now is once
11 we get that inventory and the sort of
12 recommendations from these professional land use
13 planners, one of the things we recommend is
14 getting a working group together to include the
15 Legislature, the CPRA, landowners, parish
16 governments to work through that inventory and
17 figure out what we need to be doing to make this
18 smart growth really happen.

19 So we do very much understand your concern
20 there, and we know there's a lot of work left to
21 do. But we, at least, are waiting for that final
22 inventory which is due in the next couple of
23 months to get really - to pick that thing up and
24 start running with it.

25 MS. COFFEE:

216

1 Thank you.
2 Any other comments or questions by Authority
3 members?

4 Mr. Morgan.

5 MR. MORGAN:

6 Thank you.
7 After reading the plan several times, and
8 several drafts, the only real question I had was
9 - had to do with the overall management of how
10 this is going to happen. It says in there in two
11 paragraphs the DNR is going to manage wetland

cpr

12 restoration projects and DOTD is going to manage
13 flood protection, which are two separate entities
14 al together under our government, the way it's set
15 up. And I'm sure sometime in the future, if there
16 hasn't already been, a conflict between those two
17 groups.

18 MR. BRADBERRY:

19 (I naudi ble.)

20 MR. MORGAN:

21 Will it come back - Oh, well, never mind, no
22 questi ons.

23 But is there some way, or do we have some
24 envisi on of how we can resolve those conflicts and
25 make the projects move forward quicker wi thout

217

1 internal di scussi ons extendi ng - And that's my
2 only questi on.

3 MS. COFFEE:

4 Yeah, and we're, actual ly, going to be
5 addressi ng that ri ght after thi s di scussi on, so.

6 Any other comments or questi ons?

7 All ri ght. Well, what is the wi sh of the
8 Authori ty?

9 MR. MILLING:

10 I'd like to move -

11 MS. COFFEE:

12 Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, one second.

13 MR. MILLING:

14 No, I - That's fi ne.

cpr

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. COFFEE:

Oh, is that - Okay, is that good?

Mr. Milling.

MR. MILLING:

I'd like to move that we adopt the plan.

And, as always, Mr. Tanner comes up with a suggested resolution. Am I supposed to read this?

MR. TANNER:

You can read it or I'll pass it out.

MR. MILLING:

Motion made.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

All right. Unless, Ms. -

MR. ANGELLE:

We have copies. We don't need to hear you read.

MR. MILLING:

Okay. Then once you have a copy, would you please read it, and then may I hear a second to the motion?

Whereas, the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana is mandated to Develop, coordinate, make reports on, and provide oversight for a comprehensive coastal protection Master Plan and Annual Coastal Protection Plans, working in conjunction with state agencies, political subdivisions, including flood protection authorities, levee districts, and federal

cpr

sic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. MORGAN:

I have a question. What if they make an amendment? Does our resolution - Do we have to come back and make another resolution?

MS. COFFEE:

They can't.

All right. All those in favor?

Any opposed?

All right. We've now approved the Annual Plan, as well.

Thank you very much. And thank you very much for all the presentations. I appreciate that. That was a lot to get through.

Now, I'd like to ask Ms. Christel Slaughter - Dr. Christel Slaughter, to come before us if she would.

There have been questions and there have been references to where do we go from here? How do we implement? What are we looking at? And there is an ongoing dialogue taking place right now between my office and the two secretaries of DNR and DOTD, and I'd for Christel, if you would, to kind of brief us on - brief the Authority on where we're going with that.

cpr

The Committee responds "Aye."

1 MS. SLAUGHTER:

2 Thank you very much. I'm very happy to do
3 so. Thank you for your interest, and Mr. Morgan,
4 your last question about moving forward.

5 We have - Our firm, SSA Consultants, has
6 been engaged to conduct a study and come up with
7 recommendations. It'll be a brief study. And -

8 MR. ANGELLE:

9 A planning document.

10 MS. SLAUGHTER:

11 A planning document. That sounds much
12 better. Thank you Secretary Angelle.

13 We are in the process right now of conducting
14 research on other models, the Everglades was
15 mentioned earlier, Chesapeake Bay Authority, as
16 well as some large civil and public works projects
17 like the Big Dig in Massachusetts. We have
18 several criteria that we're looking for. What
19 kind of capacity do they have? What's their
20 structure? Their authority? Reporting
21 relationships? Budget? What have been their
22 successes and failures? And some of them have
23 very interesting stories to tell that we can learn
24 from. And if they were starting over, how would
25 they do things differently?

224

1 So we'll go out and we'll look at that.

2 We'll have ^{cpr} that research ready for you. And then
3 we're also looking internally, interviewing
4 stakeholders, people from around the state who
5 have been interested and working with flood
6 protection and coastal issues for many, many
7 years, as well as people within DNR and DOTD and
8 GOCA to try and come up with some recommendations
9 to help you move forward.

10 We are on a fairly short timeline, so I'm
11 hoping to have information back to you quite soon.

12 MS. COFFEE:

13 Any - Thank you. Any questions or comments
14 about how we're moving forward?

15 Okay. Thank you, Christel.

16 Okay, we're very near the end of our agenda,
17 and so at this time I would like for Mr. Mark
18 Wingate to come forward with the Corps of
19 Engineers and to give us an update on Southwest
20 Coastal Louisiana Hurricane Protection.

21 Mr. Wingate.

22 MR. WINGATE:

23 Okay. Well, I appreciate being here in front
24 of the Authority this afternoon. My name is Mark
25 Wingate. I'm a Senior Project Manager with the

225

1 Corps of Engineers out of New Orleans. I work in
2 the Project Management Division.

3 If we can turn the lights down just a little
4 bit so I can see those slides there. Okay, thank

8 certainly ^{cpr} reduced risk, sustained ecosystem, fish
9 and wildlife habitat, and certainly celebrate and
10 appreciate our culture.

11 I don't want to bore you with all the
12 details, but certainly during recon we don't have
13 an extensive amount of time or funding to look at
14 a whole slew of alternatives, but we did consider
15 quite a few. We call them "S" for structural.
16 One is certainly what Congress authorized us to
17 look at, was a twelve-foot armored levee along the
18 GIWW. We looked at it along the south bank, and
19 certainly it has a number of large control
20 structures to allow flow in and out.

21 We took another look at that, also, and we
22 said, "Well, let's go to a hundred year level."
23 We also took some ideas and said, "Well, what if
24 we ran varying alignments of levees south of the
25 IWW, along cheniers, et cetera, maybe in

227

1 combination with a levee along the GIWW. S-4 also
2 talks about that. Again, just some other ideas,
3 multiple lines of defense.

4 We also looked at - looking at the CPR
5 Alignment Category 5 at the ten-foot Contour and
6 others. We broke up the levee alignment along the
7 entire IWW, as authorized by Congress, to see if
8 that may be justified. We called it "Reach 2" and
9 "Reach 5." And we have had a number of meetings
10 that also - within the communities that said

11 possibly ^{cpr} some work on Highway 82, coastal levees,
12 breakwaters, et cetera.

13 Again, I couldn't look at all of these in
14 detail on recon, but certainly we wanted to
15 consider them during a recon study at a minimum at
16 a qualitative fashion.

17 Now, in addition to structural solutions, we
18 also wanted to take a look at coastal restoration
19 that would certainly be complimented by that
20 structural solution, multiple lines of defense
21 within the marsh, marsh creation, re-forestation
22 of cheniers, create barrier islands, et cetera.
23 And then, certainly, even when you do all of that
24 you're still going to have residual damages out
25 there, so the report does address non-structural

228

1 solutions such as ring levees, structural raising,
2 buyouts, new building codes, et cetera.

3 Now, after looking at all that, again, in a
4 fairly quick fashion during reconnaissance, we did
5 carry several alternatives forward. Again, the
6 whole intent of this study is to determine if
7 economic justification can be proven, and that
8 would then determine that a federal interest
9 exists. So the test there, very simply, at this
10 phase is a benefit to cost ratio equal to or
11 greater than one. And we did come up with several
12 plans that have BC's equal to or greater than one,
13 and I'll hit those in just a moment.

17 view to take ^{cpr} advantage of the environmental
18 restoration activities we could enjoy.

19 And very similar, we also said, "Let's take a
20 look at Vermilion Parish area." I believe this
21 protects the areas of Erath, Kaplan, and
22 Abbeville. And similar to Reach 2, we came up
23 with a cost of about six hundred million, 1.21
24 B/C. Again, a twelve-foot levee and armored.

25 This is just a quick matrix, if you will, of

230

1 the four plans that we primarily carried forward
2 into recon to take a look at with some detail.
3 The only other plan that I didn't show the graphic
4 there for was taking the entire levee along the
5 IWW through the three parishes at a hundred year
6 level of protection in lieu of a twelve foot level
7 of protection.

8 The hundred year actually came out with a B/C
9 pretty close to one; it's .86. You can see the
10 cost on it's about four billion dollars. The
11 elevations varied along the Reach, but you are
12 somewhere around a 19-foot levee for a hundred
13 year level of protection in this area. Again,
14 that was based upon some early ADCIRC data, Case
15 One Study.

16 So where do we stand? We've completed the
17 study. We received the authorization and money.
18 And I guess it's now in early '06, we nearly
19 completed that reconnaissance. It shows that we

20 do have several ^{cpr} plans that aren't economically
21 justified which gives us now the ability to go
22 into feasibility, okay. Again, the whole intent
23 of recon was to determine if, in fact, we have a
24 plan and can move forward. The answer is, yes, we
25 do have a number of justified plans.

231

1 What would we study during - in feasibility?
2 Well, certainly we can consider, certainly, the
3 ones that were justified in recon, but the slate
4 is really clean at this point. That's going to be
5 negotiated between the Corps and a non-federal
6 sponsor as to what plans will actually be included
7 in our project management plan.

8 But, certainly, they would include the
9 structural component, the hurricane protection.
10 It would also include a large component, the
11 ecosystem restoration, and try to reduce that
12 surge, as well as provide ecosystem restoration
13 benefits. And then you're still going to have
14 residual damages out there that the non-structural
15 component would take advantage of. So the number
16 of plans would certainly take care of those
17 interests during feasibility.

18 In terms of plan selection, how would we
19 ultimately select a plan? We would not just be
20 limited to our traditional NED benefit category,
21 but we would be looking at the NED, which is the
22 economic development; the NER, which is the

23 ecosystem ^{cpr} restoration; and certainly we would want
24 to lay out the risk and reliability based upon any
25 plan that we would recommend.

232

1 During reconnaissance study, we did get out
2 into the field. We had numerous meetings. We met
3 with Calcasieu Parish, Vermilion, and Cameron, and
4 some of ideas went into this particular study. We
5 certainly have worked with our folks within the
6 Corps and the CPRA and LCA throughout the study.
7 We have met with your Integrated Planning Team,
8 and we have had several meetings with DOTD, as
9 well.

10 Certainly, this type of coordination will be
11 ramped up and continue during feasibility. I
12 certainly would envision an extensive public
13 improvement program. I would even envision some
14 type of committee formed. Again, that would be
15 determined ultimately what that would look like
16 between the non-federal sponsor and the Corps.
17 But, certainly, that committee, I could certainly
18 see consisting of parish representatives,
19 academia, state and federal agencies that we
20 always work with on these types of feasibility
21 studies, as ya'll are aware of.

22 Certainly, on all our feasibility studies, we
23 work with state agencies: DNR, DEQ, Wildlife &
24 Fisheries. The same thing on the federal side -
25 USGS, U.S. Fish, et cetera - all throughout the

1 project process. Certainly, key stakeholders,
2 industry, recreation, special interest groups,
3 user groups would also be part of this involvement
4 program, and may find themselves on the advisory
5 committee, as well. Again, that would be
6 ultimately formed and formulated between the Corps
7 and the non-federal sponsor as to how that may
8 look.

9 In terms of the feasibility study, we have
10 put a ballpark cost on it. Now, again, this up
11 for negotiation and discussion with the non-
12 federal sponsor, but we did want to put a cost
13 estimate to it. You're probably somewhere in the
14 range of about a ten to a fifteen million dollar
15 study on this. Now, again, you're talking about a
16 120 miles of levee, you're talking about extensive
17 analysis that's going to go into this,
18 coordination, data collection, and plan
19 formulation. The cost of that is shared
20 fifty/fifty as you can see there.

21 In terms of the non-federal sponsor's
22 contribution, it could be in cash, it could be
23 through in-kind services, or a combination of the
24 two. The role of that non-federal sponsor
25 certainly would support ultimately all the plans

cpr

1 that we would be looking at. So they would
2 certainly participate in outlining the scope of
3 study and ultimately the final cost of the study.
4 That would include the array of all the
5 alternatives that we would consider.

6 Certainly, we'd have to negotiate a
7 feasibility cost-share agreement with that non-
8 federal sponsor. We would establish an executive
9 committee meeting with the non-federal sponsor and
10 the Corps, and certainly participate throughout
11 the whole study process, certainly helping us form
12 the ultimate solution during feasibility as well
13 as bringing new ideas and concepts to the table.

14 Okay, so where do we go to next? Again, I've
15 got a reconnaissance report right now. It's
16 probably about 95 percent drafted. It has several
17 plans that are economically justified, and we're
18 positioned to move forward with greater detail to
19 ultimately come up with a recommended plan. What
20 I need now is a local sponsor, a non-federal
21 sponsor, that is willing to provide the fifty
22 percent funding and/or in-kind services.

23 So I'm looking for a letter of intent from
24 that appropriate entity. Once I would get that
25 letter of intent, I could then go ahead and

235

1 finalize my reconnaissance study, get it up to our
2 division office, get it certified, and then I can
3 go ahead and begin the feasibility study. The

cpr

4 feasibility study, if all that were to occur, I
5 could actually be initiating that probably around
6 the July, August time frame of this year. And I
7 do have some seed money in federal dollars to
8 begin that project.

9 In terms of time on the feasibility study,
10 you're probably talking about a three to four year
11 study. After that study would be complete, you're
12 probably talking about, probably, a year to two
13 years to get your plans and specs together, but I
14 would certainly imagine that the first contract
15 package could be done prior to the end of the two
16 years and we would go to construction as our PNS
17 were to continue.

18 So, again, I've got several plans ready to go
19 into the feasibility phase. I'm looking for a
20 non-federal sponsor. Again, this project would be
21 put together between that non-federal sponsor and
22 the Corps and certainly a host of all other types
23 of stakeholders, academia, et cetera. And, again,
24 we're prepared to move forward.

25 That concludes my presentation. I certainly

236

1 open it up to any questions or comments.

2 MS. COFFEE:

3 Thank you. Any comments or questions?

4 Secretary Bradberry.

5 MR. BRADBERRY:

6 Thank you, Mr. Wingate. One more time, can
Page 213

cpr

7 you briefly talk about the duties and the
8 responsibilities specifically for a non-federal
9 sponsor.

10 MR. WINGATE:

11 Well, certainly, the duties begin with
12 negotiating what the scope is going to be in the
13 feasibility. So we're going to cooperate prior to
14 the initiation of the feasibility study, determine
15 what that study really is, make sure both parties
16 are comfortable with the cost and the time line.
17 And then, certainly, the local sponsor, or the
18 non-federal sponsor, is an active member of what
19 we call our Project Delivery Team. He's certainly
20 going to be embedded in with us, coming up with
21 the solutions.

22 The non-federal sponsor does have the option
23 of bringing in-kind credits to the project, as
24 well. So an integral part of the project;
25 obviously can't do it without the sponsor. And

237

1 you're there from the end - from the beginning to
2 the end of this particular study.

3 MR. BRADBERRY:

4 Again, so I heard it correctly, we can do in-
5 kind work?

6 MR. WINGATE:

7 Yes, sir.

8 MR. BRADBERRY:

9 Great. You know, you went through this

cpr

10 presentation and you mentioned a number of
11 alternatives that are going to be investigated.
12 Are those the only alternatives that are going to
13 be considered? And if you're going to involve the
14 public any more than what you already have, will
15 the public be able to recommend additional
16 alternatives?

17 MR. WINGATE:

18 Well, again, certainly - You know, the idea
19 behind recon was to determine that we do have a
20 justified plan and move forward to step two. We
21 would look at that plan during feasibility, but
22 the slate is clean. We'll come up with a number
23 of alternatives. I have drafted up a scope of
24 work for a number of alternatives, but, certainly,
25 that's up for discussion and support approval from

238

1 our non-federal sponsor.

2 So, yes, I would certainly envision a whole
3 host of alternatives being put together, and
4 certainly the local sponsor will bring to the
5 table ideas from other interests, et cetera. And,
6 you know, as the project proceeds, if some other
7 ideas come up, we can always get back to the table
8 and amend the scope and the agreement.

9 MR. BRADBERRY:

10 Thank you.

11 MR. WINGATE:

12 M-hm (affirmative).

cpr

13 MR. BRADBERRY:

14 Madam Chairman, recall that, I guess, a
15 couple of weeks ago, I wrote a letter to you and
16 CPRA fundamentally deciding that DOTD would be
17 willing to act as a non-federal sponsor. On this
18 project, we're willing to do that. We're willing
19 to sign the letter of intent to move forward with
20 this, so I guess we need a motion for us to do
21 that if everyone is willing.

22 MS. COFFEE:

23 Do I have a motion?

24

25 Okay, Mark Morgan makes the motion.

Motion made.

1

2 Seconded by Steve Wilson. All those in
3 favor?

4

5 Go ahead, please. Wait.

6 MS. SEVERANCE:

7 I just have a question. How does your
8 proposal tie in with Mr. Porthouse's presentation?

9 MR. WINGATE:

10 You know, from the very beginning, certainly,
11 it's going to be consistent with CPRA as well as
12 our CPR. We'll certainly work with CPRA and
13 others throughout the whole study, so, certainly,
14 I think they are consistent and complimentary to

15 each other.^{cpr}

16 MS. SEVERANCE:

17 Jon?

18 MR. BRADBERRY:

19 I want to comment on that, as well.

20 Obviously, DOTD is a CPRA member. We're
21 going to assure - One of our focuses is going to
22 be that we assure we have a tight alignment with
23 the Master Plan and the Annual Plan. So I feel
24 fairly confident that we'll be able to, quote,
25 "influence the process" to some degree, being, in

The Committee responds "Aye."

1 fact, a fifty/fifty cost-sharing partner.

2 MR. WINGATE:

3 Certainly.

4 MR. PORTHOUSE:

5 Yeah, there has been a lot of communication
6 between the State and the Corps, and the Corps
7 internally on that project. But the - without
8 knowing which presentation you're talking about,
9 there was that asterisk in the FY '08 Annual Plan
10 presentation which said we're not asking for money
11 yet in the document you have before you, but
12 should we need it sometime in FY '08, we would
13 have to come back for an amendment to the Annual
14 Plan.

15 So based on the - I guess this is a
16 discussion for the Authority. Based on the
17 schedule you heard presented, it looks like

cpr

18 they're able to expend federal funds in FY '08
19 which would require a state match. So the
20 discussion is, does the Authority want to handle
21 putting money into the Annual Plan now, or wait
22 into the future. So that's the only part that
23 kind of is a little bit not matching up just yet.

24 MS. SEVERANCE:

25 Thank you very much. I just wanted to make

241

1 sure we were consistent and coordinated. Thank
2 you, and Secretary Bradberry.

3 MS. COFFEE:

4 Benny Rousselle is filling in for Scott
5 Angelle.

6 MR. ROUSSELLE:

7 Mr. Wingate, what period of time did the
8 reconnaissance study cover?

9 MR. WINGATE:

10 You know, I don't recall exactly when the
11 third supplemental funds came about, but I'm going
12 to tell you it was probably around March or April
13 of '06. Feasa - or recon - I'm sorry?

14 MS. COFFEE:

15 April 5th.

16 MS. WINGATE:

17 April 5th, the funds came. A recon, by the
18 books, is supposed to take twelve to eighteen
19 months, and we've been in this position now for
20 about three months. So it took us about nine

cpr

21 months.

22 MR. ROUSSELLE:

23 So all of the numbers that you're using are
24 post-Katrina?

25 MR. WINGATE:

242

1 That's correct. That's correct.

2 MS. COFFEE:

3 Ms. Gautreaux.

4 MS. GAUTREAUX:

5 I just wanted to mention since the
6 representative of the levee districts that a lot
7 of that area encompasses is not here today, and if
8 you haven't done so already - I'm sure you've had
9 conversations with Tina Horn, but I think it will
10 be very important to get that presentation to her
11 and giving her an opportunity to review it with
12 you so she can share that information with the
13 others in her area.

14 MR. WINGATE:

15 Thank you.

16 MR. MILLING:

17 I just want to emphasize that when Karen was
18 up here this morning she made it very clear that
19 we wouldn't try to align, we would, in fact, align
20 and then deal with the modifications thereafter.
21 And I assume that you are prepared to deal with
22 this matter in the same way.

23 MR. WINGATE:

cpr

24 Certainly.
25 MR. MILLING:

243

1 All right.

2 MS. COFFEE:

3 We have a vote before us - a motion before
4 us that simply gives the cost-share action to
5 DOTD. That's all this vote is. Do I have - It's
6 a letter of intent, but I mean, it's - Is
7 everyone clear on what we're voting on? Okay,
8 good.

9 All right, all those in favor?

10
11 Any opposed?

12 All right, thank you. And thank you, Mr.
13 Wingate.

14 MR. WINGATE:

15 Thank you.

16 MS. COFFEE:

17 All right, next I'd like to invite up Mr.
18 Paul Frey and Dr. Len Bahr.

19 I'm going to - While ya'll are getting
20 settled, I'm going to give the Court Reporter a
21 little break.

22 (Whereupon a short break was taken. After the break:)

23 MS. COFFEE:

24 Okay, we're going to get started again.

25 We're almost through.

The Committee responds "Aye."

1 Before Len and Paul get into their brief
2 presentation, I'd like to - You each have a
3 letter from the Governor before you regarding this
4 issue, and I'd like to just read it. It's a very
5 brief letter; I'd like to read it for the purposes
6 of the Court Reporter and audience.

7 "Dear Authority Members: Thank you for your
8 continued hard work and dedication to the critical
9 work of restoring and protecting our coast. Your
10 work is the embodiment of the comprehensive and
11 integrated approach to coastal issues this state
12 has needed for a long time.

13 One of the most important challenges facing
14 Louisiana and our coast is the responsible
15 management of our bountiful resources. An
16 integrated approach to coastal restoration and
17 protection must acknowledge the conservation of
18 our resources, especially our coastal forest.

19 A look at establishing expanded Louisiana
20 Policy on coastal forestry has been a
21 collaborative and thorough process. It has
22 culminated in the formulation of recommendations
23 to me by the Governor's Coastal Wetland Forest
24 Conservation and Use Advisory Panel. I have
25 accepted their recommendations as presented to me

cpr

1 and hereby transmit them to the Coastal Protection
2 and Restoration Authority for your review and
3 consideration.

4 Again, thank you for your hard work. I look
5 forward to learning of your work on these
6 recommendations. Kathleen Babi neaux Blanco,
7 Governor. "

8 And I would like now to ask you to sort of,
9 if you will, tell us a little bit about the
10 working group itself. And I can tell you that
11 they've been at it a long time and it has not been
12 easy.

13 MR. FREY:

14 Well, we weren't going to mention that.

15 MS. COFFEE:

16 That's okay. That's all right. Go ahead.

17 MR. FREY:

18 We're worse than a group of scientists. I
19 thought you could appreciate that one.

20 Madam Chairperson and Members of the
21 Authority, it's a privilege to be here. I - Len
22 probably has a little more background than I do in
23 terms of the formation of this panel. I just want
24 to say that it did represent a diverse group of
25 interest. Several of you here on this Authority

246

1 were represented by personnel. The four state
2 agencies were Ag and Forestry, Natural Resources,
3 Environmental Quality and Wildlife and Fisheries.

cpr

4 So those four state agencies were all members. A
5 number of NGO's that you're all familiar with,
6 Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana, Lake
7 Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, Mississippi River
8 Basin Alliance - I'll leave out some folks, but
9 -

10 MR. BAHR:

11 The Gulf Restoration Network, I guess.

12 MR. FREY:

13 Yeah, Gulf Restoration Network, Nature
14 Conservancy, Terrebonne - Barataria-Terrebonne
15 Natural Estuary Program, and then we had a large
16 group of landowner interests: Louisiana Landowner
17 Association, Louisiana Forestry Association, and
18 various landowners that actually owned coastal
19 wetland forest.

20 So it was a diverse group and, of course, we
21 had - we had a difference of opinion on a lot of
22 matters, as you might well appreciate. So,
23 consequently, it did take us quite a while to
24 resolve some of our issues. But yet, here,
25 approximately two years later, we have the

247

1 recommendations from the panel and I'll go through
2 them very briefly. I'll let my co-chair here, Mr.
3 Bahr, express any comments.

4 MR. BAHR:

5 The only thing I would add to what Paul said
6 is that, as Sidney mentioned, this has been a long

cpr

7 process and it preceded - it began before
8 Katrina. And in terms of the interest of the
9 CPRA, one of the most dramatic things from my
10 standpoint that came out from the science report
11 and from our trying to - our advisory committee's
12 trying to grapple with issues of the bad shape
13 that some of coastal forests are in is how
14 effective those forests are for storm surge
15 protection.

16 And that was a new wrinkle that hadn't been
17 really emphasized in the early discussions, but it
18 really did come out later, and I think it's
19 timely. So the recommendations, as Paul said,
20 these are the ones that we got total consensus on.
21 The other issues that were - that we couldn't
22 agree on completely, we - were tabled. We
23 resolved - We're not officially a body anymore,
24 but we could be reconstituted, and I think we
25 would all be happy to, if it were appropriate to

248

1 go back, and to spend more time on some of the
2 issues that, again, we couldn't resolve. But what
3 you're going to hear are the recommendations that
4 everyone agreed on. So go ahead, Paul.

5 MR. FREY:

6 And I think all of you have copies of those,
7 so what I'll do is just really highlight for the
8 sake of time and brevity.

9 We broke out our recommendations into options
Page 224

cpr

10 for immediate implementation and then more long-
11 term implementation. And under those broad
12 categories for immediate implementation, we had
13 restoration and conservation programs. And that
14 basically focused on the issue of sustainability
15 and trying to have programs in place to encourage
16 sustainable management of these coastal wetland
17 forests.

18 Touched a little bit on the previous
19 Governor's science working group findings relative
20 to how we identified those coastal forests in
21 terms of the - delineating those in terms of how
22 vulnerable they were and - or if, in fact, they
23 were sustainable and could be managed. And that's
24 one of the things that we wrestled with as an
25 Advisory Panel.

249

1 So that will be something that not only needs
2 to be done, but needs to be - Well, it's
3 currently ongoing. There are a couple of
4 projects. I think I - I'm not sure if it was
5 CPRA who funded the LSU work in the Barataria -
6 I'm sorry, Lake Verret Basin, but there's a
7 mapping program in place there. We need that
8 across the coast so we can specifically identify
9 those where we need some restoration work and
10 those that are sustainably being managed
11 currently, and we can develop incentives for
12 landowners to continue to manage those

cpr

13 sustainably.

14 Moving on to the next major issue - major
15 breakout is funding and incentives. And the CIAP
16 Plan you approved earlier I think has a specific
17 - Mr. Fruge addressed in regard to conservation
18 easements of some of these coastal wetland
19 forests.

20 As far as governmental issues, the fact that
21 we had four agencies involved in this panel and
22 some of the discussion, we realized, as the
23 various agencies, that we need to work closer
24 together. As far as the communication, I heard
25 some of your discussions on some of all these plan

250

1 presentations, but it's imperative that we all
2 work closer together.

3 We talked about the need for additional
4 science. Secretary Angelle is not here to hear
5 that. Good. But we do need some additional
6 science to clarify that some of what we're
7 implementing is, in fact, the right thing. Part
8 of that additional science would be this
9 continuing mapping of the various condition
10 classes.

11 And then we got into a very thorough
12 discussion of federal and state regulation and
13 private property rights. Eighty-five percent of
14 these coastal forests we're talking about are
15 privately owned, and so we have to make sure we

cpr

16 recognize that very strongly in anything we
17 recommend, and we need to develop incentives to
18 encourage private landowners to manage
19 sustainably. And in those cases where we've got
20 some critical need, that may be where your
21 conservation easements would take place.

22 Of course, education and outreach, that goes
23 without saying. We've got to continue to do that.

24 In terms of long-term planning, really the
25 same broad categories: restoration and

251

1 conservation, funding and incentives, science and
2 governmental issues. And I just would like to
3 point out a couple of direct mentions of the
4 Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority
5 within the recommendations.

6 One is that you consider the formation of a
7 standing committee, steering committee, task
8 force, whatever you might name it, to continue to
9 monitor the coastal wetland forest situation and
10 then address issues as they arise, and that would
11 be a sounding board for you as the Authority.

12 And another, in terms of - under the long-
13 term planning for sustainability, was for the CPRA
14 to address the avoidance, minimization, and
15 mitigation of secondary impact from roads, levees,
16 spoil banks, navigation channels, and other
17 development. And I think with the Comprehensive
18 Coastal Plan that has to be taken into effect.

cpr

19 Some of these coastal forests are, in fact,
20 in what would be - we might call an unsustainable
21 condition because of hydrologic alteration. It
22 may have been due to a number of reasons, but
23 generally it's manmade. In some cases it's
24 natural, but if those forests are impounded,
25 they're continually underwater, then they will not

252

1 sustain themselves over the long-term. So you've
2 got to make sure that water moves through those
3 systems and out in order to be able to manage
4 them, to regenerate those systems. So that's, you
5 know, that's a critical part of the long-term
6 issue at hand.

7 MR. BAHR:

8 Yeah, the principle culprit, if you will, of
9 why many of our coastal forests are in such bad
10 shape is because of hydrologic changes and
11 subsidence, the deltaic processes that have caused
12 the marsh loss that we've been talking about all
13 day. And they're subject to the same problems,
14 and mitigating those hydro - those - the damage
15 is going to require large-scale river diversion
16 projects, for example, and other kinds of
17 hydrologic changes.

18 But it's really important for you-all to
19 realize that the money, the CIAP money, for
20 example, that would compensate land owners for
21 easements to allow coastal forests that are in bad

cpr

22 shape to be - to remain intact until we can make
23 the hydrologic changes is really a good step
24 forward. And we'll need a lot more than that in
25 the long run, but that's a very positive step.

253

1 MR. FREY:

2 Well, if there is any questions, that's - We
3 ran through it very hurriedly, but for the sake of
4 time.

5 MS. COFFEE:

6 Okay, are there any questions or comments by
7 the Authority members?

8 MR. MILLING:

9 Do we need a motion to accept these
10 recommendations?

11 MS. COFFEE:

12 We could have one.

13

14

15 Okay, all in favor?

16

17 Any opposed?

18 Then we do accept them, and I want to thank
19 you very much.

20 And what I think might be in order, and I'll
21 leave this to the discretion of the Authority, but
22 I think it might be a very good idea for the
23 Governor's Coastal Commission to work closely with
24 the CPRA in establishing an ongoing group that

cpr

25 will include some of the most pertinent agencies

The Committee responded "Aye."

1 that are involved in this issue. And we'll
2 include people from the outside as well as maybe
3 some Commission Members.

4 And I would like to - I would like to ask
5 that - I know, King, the Commission is going to
6 have another meeting in May. I would ask that you
7 put that on your agenda and take that up, and -
8 because I would like a very quick turnaround.
9 What I'd like to see is this working group
10 immediately take up these recommendations and
11 let's see where - and what actions we can take
12 quickly, and what are most feasible to start
13 implementing right away.

14 And if that's agreeable with the Authority,
15 I'd like to move forward with that and ask the
16 Commission to address that.

17 MR. MILLING:

18 (Inaudible).

19 MS. COFFEE:

20 Okay, great, thank you very much.

21 And I just want to make a comment about
22 science. As Chair of this Authority, I understand
23 the frustrations, I do, but at the same time, I
24 want to make sure that we all understand there is
25 going to be a balance. And we cannot get from

1 here to the end of the road without sound science
2 and engineering. We have to have it; it's going
3 to be a part of this. It has to be a part of
4 this.

5 Are we going to move quickly on the things
6 that we have the answers to? Of course, we are.
7 Are there plenty of things we don't have answers
8 to? Yes, indeed, there are. And that is where
9 the best minds are going to have to come in and
10 help us solve those and reconcile those. Thank
11 you for that.

12 Thank you, gentlemen.

13 We are reaching the end of this, and, as you
14 can see, we did not break for lunch. I was afraid
15 of a mutiny. Who's blinking? I'm sorry.

16 Steve Wilson? Oh, Windell, you too? Both of
17 you? I have you both blinking. Who wants to talk
18 first?

19 MR. CUROLE:

20 Okay, I just want to mention -

21 MS. COFFEE:

22 Go ahead.

23 MR. CUROLE:

24 The one big point I forgot in the discussion,
25 but navigation, to me, the biggest hurdle you'll

cpr

2 greatest part of the coast is water and sediments
3 coming from the river, basically. And the
4 navigation issue, I think, it has to be at the top
5 of the list. It's our biggest hurdle. I meant to
6 ask Randy a couple of times, you know, "How are we
7 doing?"

8 And all of these plans, but especially the
9 restoration aspect, you know, we can do the
10 defensive things, throwing up the levees and
11 cheniers and those things, but to do the real
12 systemic stuff. So I would just suggest y'all
13 look at planning in the future we get a long-term
14 discussion and try to flush out those positions.

15 Because what I find is, when you go to build
16 something, a lot of times the guy holding the
17 trump card will never show his hand. He doesn't
18 have to a bad guy until you really get down to
19 building it, then the money's there and you've
20 wasted time and money. So I would just
21 (inaudible) think of something to develop.

22 One other thing. There's been so much work
23 accomplished today, and you've got to go back
24 after the storms allow this thing to take place.
25 There are two people, I think, that I was involved

257

1 with that took some big steps, and - once the
2 Governor said we're going to move forward, we need
3 to make some type of changes for these two issues
4 and marry restoration and flood protection.

cpr

5 And I know Scott was in there in a big way
6 and was tasked to do this, change some things that
7 had been happening for a hundred years, and made a
8 major shift in how some of the levees - and was
9 not real popular in doing some of these things and
10 in bringing restoration. And at the same time,
11 again, Scott was kind of tasked by the Governor to
12 do this.

13 And then if he was the guy with the shotgun
14 to make this wedding happen, I guess Reggie Dupre
15 was the priest, okay, because he sat there, got
16 the legislation going that was able to get us here
17 today. And, hopefully, it is the jumpstart we
18 need to start dealing these issues. But I just
19 want to mention again that these two guys, I
20 think, played some key roles in getting us where
21 we are today.

22 MS. COFFEE:

23 Thank you.

24 And, also, I want jump down to the very next
25 issue and just take it up right here that, you

258

1 know, we've just considered this other work group,
2 the work group on coastal forestry, I think there
3 a lot of work groups that we're going to have to
4 convene. And I think one of those, absolutely,
5 Windell, I agree with you is - has to do with
6 navigation. I think navigation is key in all of
7 this.

cpr

8 I think in - certainly on some of our more
9 long-term and more profound looks at what happens
10 with that little river, we're going to have to get
11 some very, very strong, powerful work groups
12 together very, very quickly and start going there
13 in those places.

14 And I would like - I would just like to pose
15 to the Authority at our next meeting to please
16 come back and let's be prepared, please, to have a
17 very substantive conversation and discussion about
18 what those work groups might - what issues those
19 work groups may take up, and I would like to do
20 that at the next meeting.

21 Okay, any more discussion or announcements?
22 Do we have announcements that need to be made?

23 Yes, go ahead, Ed.

24 MR. PREAU:

25 I'd just like to let everybody know that DOTD

259

1 in conjunction with the Association of Levee
2 Boards of Louisiana will be conducting a workshop
3 on May 3rd and 4th here at the Radisson. At the
4 Radisson? No, Holiday Inn Select. It used to be
5 the Radisson. I'm still living in the old ages.

6 If anybody's interested, I have a couple
7 announcements set up on the back table back there,
8 I'd ask you pick them up. If you want to more
9 about it, give us a call. If you'd like to
10 register, give us a call, please.

cpr

11 MS. COFFEE:

12 Any other announcements? I'd like to make
13 one quick one. Okay, Steve, just one second.

14 Before we close this meeting, I'd like to say
15 - to state for the Record that the Louisiana
16 Department of Economic Development was unable to
17 be present today, but they did send along a letter
18 of support for the plans and Tanner's going to
19 pass those out to you right now. And I would like
20 to ask that - ask consent that the letter be
21 included in the transcript. Is that okay? I'm
22 sorry.

23 Oh, my goodness, we left off part of our
24 agenda, and I think - Is Jon still here? Yes, he
25 is.

260

1 MR. PORTHOUSE:

2 I've been waiting for you.

3 MS. COFFEE:

4 I am so sorry, Jon. I have completely
5 skipped a part of our agenda. Let's go back to
6 the memorandum of understanding with the
7 Netherlands, the Providence of Zeeland.

8 Jon, fill us in on that.

9 MR. PORTHOUSE:

10 I actually had three slides, believe it or
11 not, and they're all pictures. So, unfortunately,
12 you don't get to see them because the computer
13 went to sleep. But, basically, one of the by-

cpr

14 products of this whole planning effort between us
15 and the Corps of Engineers was, predating the
16 storms, the Corps had a memorandum of
17 understanding with the Dutch Rijkswaterstaat -
18 it's their sister agency in the Netherlands - and
19 we were able to sort of partner on some of those
20 early conversations with them. But, by and large,
21 the Corps and their sister agency are focused on
22 technical issues with structural hurricane
23 protection, storm protection.

24 Through the course of those discussions, we
25 did find that the province level, the equivalent

261

1 to the State of Louisiana, has a very similar
2 relationship to the national government, to the
3 water agency, to the water boards or levee boards,
4 and to the municipalities as we do.

5 They are also kicking off their planning
6 efforts to really incorporate more of an
7 environmental perspective to their protection
8 schemes, more evacuation planning, spatial
9 planning, all these issues that we're talking
10 about now ramping up and getting moving for a
11 comprehensive protection and restoration scenario.

12 So rather than have the province and the
13 State of Louisiana be sort of a third and fourth
14 party to the Corps' MOU with the Rijkswaterstaat,
15 the interest has been expressed by the Province of
16 Zeeland, one of the major provinces in the Delta

cpr

17 Works at the Eastern Scheldt Barrier, one you're
18 all very familiar with. They're interested in
19 signing a memorandum of understanding with the
20 state of Louisiana, the CPRA to memorialize this
21 intent to communicate and collaborate and share
22 our experiences so that both of us can move
23 forward expeditiously.

24 So I do have - Well, there are four or five
25 -

262

1 MR. MILLING:

2 And it would be a costs sharing (inaudible)?

3 MR. PORTHOUSE:

4 There should be no real costs associated with
5 it except for an occasional trip maybe to the
6 Netherlands and then vice versa.

7 And, essentially, this is just an agreement
8 to communicate, collaborate, share experiences,
9 and share knowledge back and forth so we're not,
10 you know, hanging on other people's coattails.

11 MS. COFFEE:

12 Windell wants to know if we can get an
13 agreement at the same time with France? So long
14 as it includes many trips, right?

15 Okay, did you want to show those slides, or
16 do you need to? I mean, do -

17 MR. PORTHOUSE:

18 I don't think we need to, but I guess what
19 we're asking for is they're interested in signing

cpr

20 an MOU with the CPRA, and I guess we're asking for
21 is permission and delegation to you, Sidney, to
22 continue discussing that and sign it should we
23 come to any substantive agreement.

24 MS. COFFEE:

25 Okay.

263

1

2

King Milling moves it.

3

Does anyone second?

4

5

Okay. All those in favor?

6

7

Any opposed?

8

Thank you. Thank you, Jon.

9

10 And although I've obliterated Robert's Rules
11 of Order, I think we - Steve did you still have
12 something that you wanted to announce?

12

MR. WILSON:

13

Yes, ma'am.

14

MS. COFFEE:

15

You do? Okay, before we go to public

16

comment, Steve.

17

MR. WILSON:

18

19

Just I wanted to clarify, Sidney and for the
20 scientists and engineers in the audience, I want
21 to make sure that everybody understands what I was
22 proposing was not - I've got a bad habit of

22

saying - I just read so much in the paper and all
Page 238

cpr

23 in the media over the past few weeks about science
24 and engineering. When I say I'm sick of hearing
25 about it, what I want is them to be involved, but

The Committee responds "Aye."

1 I want them to be involved on the front end. I
2 don't want it to be at the final product. So I
3 hope y'all understand. I think I'm saying the
4 same thing as you, but I'm not quite as eloquent
5 as King or yourself in expressing my views.

6 MS. COFFEE:

7 I they're well taken, thank you.

8 All right, I'd like to open it to public
9 comment, if there's anyone from the public who has
10 - would like to address the Authority.

11 Doug Daigle.

12 And, please, as you come up give your name
13 and who you're affiliated with, if anyone.

14 MR. DAIGLE:

15 Okay. Doug Daigle, I'm the coordinator for
16 the Lower Mississippi River Sub-Basin Committee on
17 Hypoxia, and just wanted to mention that the
18 report does - has expanded it's reference to that
19 issue and I hope it's the beginning of, you know,
20 moving forward and coordinating on that.

21 And the National Hypoxia Task Force is going
22 to be in New Orleans June 11th to the 13th. They
23 haven't selected a location yet, but it's going to
24 be at a hotel and you're all welcome to come to

25 that. We'll ^{cpr} forward the information to you and

265

1 the agenda when that becomes available.

2 The second question I have is just as a
3 member of the Advisory Panel on Coastal Forests.
4 Just to get it clear in my mind, the report refers
5 to the recommendations that you-all received today
6 as being put in an appendix and it also references
7 the science working group report which came out
8 the previous year. And I just wanted to
9 understand - The science working report,
10 obviously, is too big to put in an appendix, but
11 that will, as well, be part of what the State is
12 utilizing for its policy development?

13 MS. COFFEE:

14 Absolutely.

15 MR. DAIGLE:

16 Okay.

17 MS. COFFEE:

18 Yes.

19 MR. DAIGLE:

20 All right.

21 MS. COFFEE:

22 Thank you.

23 Mark.

24 MR. FORD:

25 Hi, I'm Mark Ford with the Coalition to

1 Restore Coastal Louisiana. And on the State Plan,
2 I want to make a comment that we feel, along with
3 the science community, that they need to be more
4 involved up front in the planning process, not
5 simply commenting on that.

6 Obviously, this is a large task before us.
7 The people who put together the plan - Jon and
8 Randy and the whole group - have done a great job
9 to this point, but there's obviously a lot more
10 work to do, there's a lot of nuts and bolts and a
11 lots of hands-on that needs to be done there.

12 And if there's anything the NGO's can do to
13 help facilitate this process to get it out to the
14 community, we're more than willing to step up and
15 help out with that.

16 One of the needs we see when we talk about
17 risk and storm protection is the community in
18 general, the public, don't seem to understand the
19 difference between one hundred year and five
20 hundred year or one percent risk or .2 percent
21 risk, and we need to do something to help educate
22 the public. Because they are having a hard time
23 determining whether or not they should move their
24 homes, leave the area, keep their business there,
25 and so on.

1 And another point I want to make, it was
2 brought up about land use planning. The Coalition
Page 241

cpr

3 has been working on putting together a document
4 with Sea Grant and some other people, and that is
5 just about done, Jon, and we'll be able to talk to
6 you just about any day now to add that to the
7 Plan.

8 That's all I have.

9 MR. MOERTLE:

10 My name is Randy Moertle. I am with Biloxi
11 Marshlands Corporation and Lake Eugenie Land
12 Development Company. We're the biggest land owner
13 in St. Bernard Parish; we own a hundred and fifty
14 thousand acres.

15 We've been involved in this process from the
16 very beginning. You know, we've had private
17 meetings with Secretary Angelle, we've met with
18 the inner agency planning team. It's been very,
19 very successful. I will say - and I've been
20 involved in this stuff a long time - this has
21 been the best effort yet to engage the
22 stakeholders, especially the landowners.

23 We've heard this repeatedly that the
24 landowners own eighty percent of the forest,
25 eighty percent of the marshlands. They own the

268

1 land; they need to be engaged as much as possible.
2 Jon had made the statement that landowners should
3 be included in the working groups for this land
4 use planning from the very beginning. Thank God,
5 I'm finally listening and hearing what we've been

cpr

6 touting and screaming about for so long. We need
7 to be on the front end, as major landowners, and
8 be a part of that land use planning effort.

9 Because what's been happening in the past is
10 we're always reactionary. We come out, they tell
11 us what the plan is, and then we're supposed to
12 buy into it. You know, we have our own management
13 programs. We have surface management schemes that
14 we do for our property and we want that to be
15 integrated into any planning efforts that are
16 done, especially in this coastal restoration
17 stuff.

18 The one other item, I've got to say I'm
19 really - I'm - so help me, this has been a great
20 job. And for the first time, they actually heard
21 the comments after the draft came out. They
22 actually put in changes - Because a lot of times
23 these things are rubber stamped. We get the draft
24 and it's a done deal. We can go to all these
25 public meetings, we can speak all we want to, but

269

1 nothing's ever done about it. The draft is
2 exactly like the final product. In this
3 particular case, the final product reflects -
4 because I went to several of these meetings -
5 reflects the comments of the people that were
6 there.

7 Cameron Parish is another good example. They
8 felt like they were disenfranchised in this

cpr

9 process because the meetings are in Lake Charles
10 and they're still trying to get lives back
11 together. The team went down to Cameron Parish,
12 they heard what was said, and then Jon and them
13 have integrated it into the plan.

14 I appreciate what I have seen and what has
15 been done, and the effort that has been done, and
16 the open door policy that has been going on
17 throughout this entire process.

18 Now, I have one final item to speak about and
19 that's quick-take. I thought that was a major
20 landowner issue until I went to Cameron Parish
21 meeting. You know, that is the man that owns an
22 acre of land, as well. Quick-take is going to be
23 something that - You know, I don't envy anybody
24 that's going to try and institute quick-take on a
25 private landowner.

270

1 If - And I'm speaking from my client and for
2 major landowners in general, if there is a quick-
3 take that is legislated, or however it's done, to
4 get this thing done, we need to separate the
5 minerals. We need to keep - The landowner,
6 whoever the landowner is, needs to retain his
7 minerals, and quick-take is not allowed - should
8 not be able to take his minerals in any way,
9 shape, or form.

10 There is one other incident that I know of in
11 which, under the threat of expropriation or under

cpr

12 the - There was a levee board that said, "We're
13 going to build a levee here." The landowner said,
14 "Okay, if you're going to build a levee here, I
15 will sell you the land." The levee board did not
16 building the levee there, but they didn't offer
17 the land back to the landowner, either. What they
18 ended up doing was leasing the land to duck
19 hunters who were - also were in conflict with the
20 landowner that originally held it, if that makes
21 any sense.

22 So if - There should be a timeline on any of
23 these quick-takes. If the thing is not done, then
24 the landowner, it needs to revert back to him as
25 first option for purchase. And that's just a

271

1 suggestion, because I know this is going to be a
2 huge issue, especially for people with levee
3 boards and stuff like that.

4 I thank you for letting me speak my mind, and
5 it's been a very, very good thing today. I've
6 heard a lot of good stuff. The changes that we've
7 asked for in written comment and oral comment have
8 been instituted in the program. Thank you.

9 MS. COFFEE:

10 Thank you.

11 Do we have any other comments from the
12 public?

13 Windell.

14 MR. CUROLE:

cpr

15 Yeah, just to answer that - part of that
16 question. In fact, I'll cite y'all some
17 legislation passed to take care of that problem,
18 because that's incorrect. If the public's going
19 to take property from a private landowner, need to
20 respect that ownership and only use it for that
21 purpose.

22 And there's some policies you can do. I
23 mean, the objective is not to take mineral rights;
24 if we surface, we should go for surface. And,
25 again, only as a last resort. We've talked about

272

1 it a lot, but as bad as it is, you cannot build a
2 big project if you don't have that power. Because
3 it just takes one person to do a basin-wide job
4 and not have it work.

5 And one of the problems with restoration is
6 we have to be as serious about it as we have been
7 serious with flood protection. There's a reason
8 that restoration is behind; it's because it hasn't
9 had the will or the guts to go out and do the hard
10 things, like take property sometimes, when it's
11 politically a difficult thing to do.

12 So all - But it's well-taken. Any board
13 that respects private property will always use it
14 as a last resort and will always look at the
15 landowner's benefit to do it properly, because
16 that is a taking.

17 MS. COFFEE:

cpr

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

King.

MR. MILLING:

The one thing I want to say about quick-take is, is there have been a number of suggestions today that I hope we're taking account of. They all bear upon mitigating the issue. Clearly, as a result of what we have seen in litigation in the past, there is no doubt that the State has got to

273

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

take the posture today that redoing this coastline is an issue of primary public trust, and to some degree we've got to be able to proceed.

I think the comments you've made have been very good. There have been some others earlier that have been made, and I hope that a legislator who is taking note of these things will try to incorporate those concepts into a bill which might be presented.

MS. COFFEE:

Thank you, King.

And in closing, I just want, once again - and, I mean, I - Because I think that there are people in state governments who work very hard, and I think there are a few who work just - who do way beyond what is expected and go way beyond, you know, the call of duty.

And I just want - once again, want to thank this planning team for the months and months and months of work and all the holidays and all the

cpr

21 weekends that they've spent working on this. It
22 has been an effort that I don't think has ever
23 really been undertaken in this state in this short
24 of time period and required the kind of work and
25 the kind of strife that they've had to go through

274

1 to get us to this day.

2 And Randy Hanchey couldn't be here today, but
3 I want to thank Randy and Jon Porthouse and Jean
4 Cowan and Andrew Beall, Michele Deshotel, Larry
5 Ardoin, David Miller, all of those that I'm sure I
6 may have accidentally left - Oh, my God, and I'm
7 looking at Norwyn Williams. I just want to thank
8 y'all again publicly for all you've done, and I
9 hope everyone realizes the hard work that's gone
10 into this.

11 Thank you.

12 Is there a motion to adjourn?

13

14 Is there a second?

15

16 We're adjourned.

17

18

19 (The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24
25

Motion seconded.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

R E P O R T E R ' S P A G E

I, R. Aaron Palmer, Certified Court Reporter, in and for the State of Louisiana, the officer, as defined in Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or Article 1434 (b) of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure, before whom this sworn testimony was taken, do hereby state on the Record:

That due to the interaction in the spontaneous discourse of this proceeding, dashes (--) have been used to indicate pauses, changes in thought, and/or talkovers; that same is the proper method for a Court Reporter's transcription of proceeding, and that the dashes (--) do not indicate that words or phrases have been left out of this transcript;

That any words and/or names which could not be verified through reference material have been denoted with the phrase "(Phonetic)."

R. Aaron Palmer, CCR
Certified Court Reporter
Louisiana License #25021

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

cpr

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, R. Aaron Palmer, Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the voice-writing method of the proceedings herein, reported by me at the time and place hereinabove stated and thereafter transcribed under my supervision to the best of my ability and understanding.

R. Aaron Palmer, CCR
Certified Court Reporter
Louisiana License #25021