File

February 23, 1983

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

Memorandum of Telephone Conversation

Person Calling: Arnold Robbins, LMVPD-P

Person Called: John Weber and Joey Dykes, LMNPD-F

The following are the questions posed by Mr. Robbins and answered by Messrs. Weber and Dykes:

Q-1. Would level of protection change if high level plan is adopted?

A-1. No. A SPH level of protection would be provided in the same south shore areas of Orleans, St. Bernard, Jefferson, and St. Charles with either the high level or barrier plans. The Slidell, Louisiana, area on the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain, which receives incidental protection with the barrier plan (due to lower lake levels), would receive no protection with the high level plan. (Difference in benefits in Slidell over between barrier and high level plans is approximately $4,000,000 annually.)

Q-2. During hearings in 1978, the New Orleans District Engineer listed the following reasons that the high level plan was inferior: (a) more rights-of-way would be required which would result in the displacements of residences, businesses, etc.; and (b) higher levees would be required which would take years longer to complete due to subsidence.

Q-2a. How much would rights-of-way change and how much would displacements increase?

A-2a. Rights-of-way requirements (in development areas) would not be significantly increased with the high level plan and no increase in displacements would occur. Changes in levee designs resulting from more detailed studies have determined that the Citrus lakefront area levee, where most of the anticipated increases would occur, can be constructed without additional land requirements. This levee which extends along the south shore of the lake is located between the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks (on the lakeside) and an extensively developed area on the landside. Previously, less detailed studies indicated that the levee would have to be relocated on the lakeside of the tracks in the lake, displacing numerous camp-type structures, or enlarged to the landside, displacing numerous residences and businesses. Subsequent studies have indicated that the existing levee can be enlarged in its present location.

Q-2b. Do we still have a subsidence problem? What is being done to solve the problem?

A-2b. More detailed design studies have determined that the high level lakefront levees can be constructed to lower elevations through the use of

wave berms. This has resulted in significantly lower levees which has significantly reduced subsidence. Beneficial completion of the project would be obtained much earlier with the high level plan than with the barrier plan.

Q-2c. In his 1978 testimony the New Orleans District Engineer stated that lakefront levees would have to be 6 to 9 feet higher than present design grade. The comparison table showed difference in height of levees ranging from 2 to 5 feet. Are differences comparable?

A-2c. See A-2b. above.

Q-3. Who would support or oppose the high level plan?

A-3. All statements received to date have been in favor of the high level plan. There is some potential opposition to the deep borrow areas along the Jefferson Parish lakefront for fish and wildlife interests; however, these interests favor the high level plan (with deep borrow areas) to the barrier plan. There may be opposition from environmental interests to levee features which are common to both plans. (NOTE: Jefferson Parish officials have not taken a position on the high level versus the barrier plan. Their share of the first cost would increase significantly with the high level plan.)

John C. Weber
for
JOSEPH L. DYKES