C/POL + LR RR Gen. Read

TELEPHONE OR VERBAL CONVERSATION RECORD

For use of this form, see AR 340-15; the proponent agency is The Adjutant General's Office.

DATE: 23 Feb 83

23

SUBJECT OF CONVERSATION: Lake Pontchartrain Hurricane Project

Mr Robbins

INCOMING CALL		
PERSON CALLING: Ed Nutter	ADDRESS: DAEN-CWP-G	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION: 0154
PERSON CALLED: Arnold V. Robbins	OFFICE: LMVPD-P	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION: 5835

OUTGOING CALL		
PERSON CALLING	OFFICE	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION
PERSON CALLED	ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION

SUMMARY OF CONVERSATION:

1. Mr. Nutter called at approximately 0900 hours and informed me that he was just visited by Mr. Earl Stockdale, OCE Office of Counsel. Mr. Stockdale is scheduled to meet with Mr. Edelman, Chief Counsel, later today to discuss the use of the Chief's discretionary authority to adopt the high level plan in lieu of the barrier plan, and wants answers to the following questions by noon today.

a. Would the level of protection change in going from the barrier plan to the high level plan?

b. Back during the hearing held in 1978, part of the testimony given by Colonel Rush (page 19) gave a list of reasons why the high level plan was inferior to the barrier plan. One of the reasons was "More rights-of-way would result in displacement of more residences, businesses, et cetera . . ." How much would rights-of-way change? How much would displacements increase?

c. Also, on page 19 of the testimony - "High level levees would take years longer to construct because of subsidence problems . . ." Do we still have subsidence problems? If not, how has the problem been solved?

d. Also, on page 19 of the testimony - "Lakefront levees would have to be 6 to 9 feet higher than the present design grade . . ." Comparison data from the reevaluation study show a difference in the range of 2 to 5 feet. Is this difference comparable to the difference cited earlier? If so, why?

e. Who would support or oppose the high level plan?

2. I advised Mr. Nutter that the answer to his first question is no, and that I would provide answers to the remaining questions as soon as I could obtain input from NOD and develop a coordinated District/Division response.

LMVPD-P 23 February 1983
SUBJECT: Lake Hurricane Protection Project

3. I relayed the questions to Mr. John Weber, NOD, and asked him to provide answers coordinated with NOD Engineering Division. Mr. Weber said he would do so and call back the answers before noon.

Arnold V. Robbins

ARNOLD V. ROBBINS

CF:
Mr. Bayley
Mr. Resta
~~MG~~ Read

TELEPHONE OR VERBAL CONVERSATION RECORD

For use of this form, see AR 340-15; the proponent agency is The Adjutant General's Office.

DATE: 23 Feb 83

SUBJECT OF CONVERSATION: Lake Pontchartrain Hurricane Project

INCOMING CALL		
PERSON CALLING	ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION
PERSON CALLED	OFFICE	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION

OUTGOING CALL		
PERSON CALLING	OFFICE	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION
Arnold Robbins	LMVPD-P	5835
PERSON CALLED	ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER AND EXTENSION
Mr. Earl Stockdale	DAEN-CCK	0028

SUMMARY OF CONVERSATION:

1. Information following was furnished verbally by Messrs. Weber and Dykes, NOD, and relayed to Mr. Stockdale as interim response to questions posed earlier by Mr. Nutter.

2. Testimony by COL Rush at the 1978 hearing was given before any detailed design study was done on the high level plan. The statement made about more rights-of-way resulting in displacement of more residences, businesses, etc., pertained to the Citrus lakefront levee, which was thought at the time to require relocation to accommodate the high level plan. However, the conclusion of current studies is that the Citrus lakefront levee can be raised-in-place for the high level plan. Consequently, the statement is no longer valid because there are no significant differences between the barrier plan and high level plan rights-of-way and displacements in the Citrus lakefront area. Subsidence problems perceived for the high level plan at the time of the 1978 hearing are being addressed through improved levee design incorporating the use of wave berms. The improved design also accounts for the difference in levee heights between the barrier plan and high level plan being less in the current reevaluation than was indicated in the 1978 testimony. The Louisiana Office of Coastal Zone Management has expressed some concern about borrow areas proposed for the Jefferson Parish lakefront feature of the high level plan, but there is no known opposition to the high level plan. Statements made by public officials and others at the public meeting held in New Orleans in November 1981 were generally in favor of the high level plan.

Arnold Robbins

ARNOLD ROBBINS

CF:
Mr. Bayley
Mr. Resta
MG Read
LMNPD-F/Mr. Weber