

LMVPD-E (27 Dec 82)

SUBJECT: Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, and Vicinity Hurricane Protection
Project - Reevaluation Study

TO C/Plng Div FROM C/Econ & Soc Anal Br DATE 21 Jan 83 CMT 2
JOHNSON/jst/5848
NET

1. We have reviewed subject document and submit the following comments.

2. Volume 1.

a. Table 1 and 6 should list their source. In Table 2, the numbers aren't defined.

b. Page 52, Second Paragraph. Recommend the main report give additional emphasis to the catastrophic flooding potential of the area. Figures on the numbers of human lives endangered, potential depths of flooding, the magnitude of social and business disruption, etc., can aid in relating the urgency of the problem in other than pure economic terms.

c. Page 54, Last Paragraph. The report should note the economic benefits resulting from prior project construction were also excluded from the plan formulation process.

d. Page 55, First Paragraph. Our understanding regarding the analysis is (1) existing conditions for economic analysis purposes are defined as 1 October 1979 conditions, and (2) the base year of the project for economic analysis purposes is 1988 for the High Level Plan and 1993 for the Barrier Plan. Recommend the paragraph be revised to reflect these points.

e. Page 98, First and Second Paragraphs. The numbers in these paragraphs do not agree with numbers presented in Tables B-35 and B-38 of Appendix B.

f. Page 103, Second Paragraph. The annual excess benefits over costs number does not agree with Table B-38 of Appendix B.

g. Recommend statements be added to this section to further amplify the NED Plan. For example, discussion of the primary planning constraint of providing SPH protection, and reference to the Appendix B section on Maximization of Net Benefits seem worthy of inclusion.

3. Volume 2, Appendix A. No comment.

4. Volume 2, Appendix B.

a. Paragraph B.5. Recommend the term "common base year" in the last sentence be changed to "common point in time".

b. Paragraph B.12, Table B-1.

(1) The base year given in the table should be 1993.

(2) A more detailed explanation must be presented to explain how the \$742,822 total expenditure grows to the gross investment cost figure. Appendix B is the technical appendix and more than a one-sentence footnote is required.

LMVPD-E (27 Dec 82)

SUBJECT: Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, and Vicinity Hurricane Protection Project - Reevaluation Study

c. Paragraph B.12, Table B-2.

(1) The gross investment figure should be \$653,958.

(2) Same comment as 4. b. (2) above regarding derivation of the gross investment figure.

d. Paragraph B.12, Table B-3. Same comment regarding derivation of the gross investment figure.

e. Paragraph B.54, Table B-26. The 100-Year Protection data for Chalmette is missing from the table; yet, the total figures are used later in the report as if no residual damages occur in Chalmette with 100-year protection. Request further explanation of this point to include possible footnoting of the later tables.

f. Paragraph B.56, Table B-29. The values in the table are apparently already discounted to base year 1988, but their relation to Table B-35 and the Barrier Plan isn't clear. Recommend additional summation data so the reader can go from Table B-29 to the future development benefit figures on Table B-35.

g. Paragraph B.57. The relative magnitude of the damages produced by such storms should be stated.

h. Paragraph B.67. The paragraph states the examples are at 1979 price levels, while Tables B-30 and B-31 are footnoted as being October 1981 price levels.

i. Paragraph B.69, Table B-37. Recommend revising the paragraph and table to make clear the Barrier benefit time stream begins in 1993 for 100 years and these values were discounted to 1988 for comparison with the High Level Plan.

j. Paragraph B.71. The relatively low level of residual losses referred to in the last sentence refers to average annual losses.

k. Paragraph B.74, Table B-39. Recommend revising the table to remove the base year 1988 connotation from the Barrier Plan.

l. Recommend the report include a description of the 500-year frequency flood, with and without the recommended plan, as required by Appendix A (NED Manual of Procedures) of ER 1105-2-40.

5. Volume 2, Appendix C. No comment.

1 Incl
wd



HOMER R. GARDNER

DISPOSITION FORM


For use of this form, see AR 340-15; the proponent agency is TAGO.

S: 12 Jan 83

REFERENCE OR OFFICE SYMBOL LMVPD-P	SUBJECT Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, and Vicinity Hurricane Protection Project - Reevaluation Study
---------------------------------------	--

TO C/Eng Div (5 cy) C/Con-Ops Div C/Real Est Div C/PDO Counsel	FROM C/Plng Div	DATE 27 Dec 82	CMT 1 ROBBINS/df/5835 <i>AR</i>
--	-----------------	----------------	---------------------------------------

1. Reference is made to LMVPD-P DF, 23 Dec 82, above subject.
2. Volume 2 of the report furnished by referenced DF is inclosed for review. The suspense date for comments pertaining to both volumes of the subject report is extended to 12 Jan 83.


FRED H. BAYLEY, III

1 Incl
as

CF w incl (for review):

- C/Econ & Soc Anal Br
- C/Env Anal Br
- C/Plan Form Br
- C/Urb St Br
- C/FPMS
- C/Pol & LR Plng Br
- Asst C/Plng Div