

RESTORE LOUISIANA TASK FORCE
December 16, 2016
West Monroe Convention Center
901 Ridge Avenue
West Monroe, LA 71291

Approved

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jimmy Durbin called the meeting to order at 9:36 AM. We come together here in this wonderful city as one of our bi-monthly meetings, so welcome to everyone in the audience today. I want to give a special thanks to our Mayor, someone who I have come to know, I didn't know before, I was a mayor for 3 terms in Denham Springs, LA, but this fellow, our friend Dave Norris. I saw him earlier this morning and I told him, Mayor I rarely ever get to West Monroe but I have come to really like what I see, all the growth. I give you a special thanks for hosting us today in your lovely city. We hope to continue to work with you for many months forward with this Task Force. Let's go ahead and do roll call, Lori will poll the task force. The roll was then called.

II. ROLL CALL

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Jimmy Durbin
Mr. Adam Knapp
Mayor Dave Norris
Mr. Michael Olivier
Dr. James Richardson
Representative Robert Shadoin
Commissioner Mike Strain
Mayor Ollie Tyler

TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Johnny Bradberry
Mr. Randy Cloutre (non-voting, ex-officio)
Mr. Roland Dartez
Mr. Michael Faulk
Mr. John Gallagher
Representative Edward "Ted" James
Mr. Raymond Jetson
Senator Dan "Blade" Morrish
Mr. Don Pierson
Representative J. Rogers Pope
Mr. Sean Reilly
Mayor-President Robideaux
Dr. Shawn Wilson
Ms. Jacqui Vines Wyatt

SUPPORTING STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Forbes, Executive Director, Office of Community Development
Jeff Haley, Office of Community Development
Lori Dupont, Office of Community Development
Kayla Westmoreland, Office of Community Development

Ms. Dupont: Sir Chair, 8 members are present, we do not have a quorum.

III. CHAIRPERSON OPENING REMARKS

~Jimmy Durbin, Restore Louisiana Task Force Co-Chair

Mr. Durbin: Thank you Ms. Dupont. Since we do not have a quorum we will not adopt the minutes from the previous meeting, we will take that up at the next meeting. As a reminder, your mics are hot, they will not be turned off when you conclude your questions/comments. At this time I am going to defer to Mayor Dave Norris and he will introduce our guests at this point.

IV. OUACHITA PARISH OFFICIALS

~ Mayor Dave Norris, West Monroe

~ Mayor Jamie Mayo, Monroe

Mayor Norris: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since we are talking about floods today, the great Mississippi flood that occurred in 1927, if you had been here then this is about where the water would have stopped, the City of West Monroe, use to be the old fairgrounds. You could have gotten in a boat outside this building, had it been here, and paddled your way to Vicksburg. There were a few little things that stuck up out of the water, but not much. So, we have a history of dealing with floods in our part of the state. The Ouachita River, for those of you that don't come up here very often, the Ouachita River bisects Ouachita Parish. About 2/3 of the land mass is on the west side of the river, about a 1/3 is on the east side. Population is kind of flipped, 60% on east side, 40% on west side. So, when we talk about the flooding that occurred here in March, you can see how it sort of falls out with more housing flooding on the east side than on the west side. We had just about finished cleaning up from a tornado that came through Ouachita Parish, hit the area that was the heaviest flood area of West Monroe, very hard, same thing on the north side of Monroe, some of those were just beautiful homes and the old oak trees, it took us forever to clean that up, but we got it cleaned up in time to have a flood, where we could start cleaning up over again. Today, to speak on how Ouachita Parish was impacted by the flood, we have two people, Mayor Jamie Mayo, long time mayor of the city of Monroe will speak somewhat on the impact on the city of Monroe specifically. Mayor Mayo is a very successful mayor, is this your 4th term?

Mayor Mayo: I've lost track.

Mayor Norris: 3rd term. He's a very smart mayor and I take great credit for that. He was one of my students when I was on the faculty at ULM, which at time was Northeast Louisiana State College, and he was one of my students and a very good student, but a much better basketball player. He was a point guard for the ULM Indians. He was a great basketball player and he's a great mayor. To speak on behalf of the whole parish is Walt Caldwell. Walt is an attorney and a longtime member of the police jury. Walt and Jamie, both, are boots on the ground mayors when it comes to disasters. When there is a flood, you can see Walt Caldwell wading around in his rubber boots and you can see Mayor Mayo doing the same. I take credit in doing that. We all get involved with floods, we have gotten involved with tornadoes. So, Walt Caldwell has some very specific information about the flooding that occurred in Ouachita Parish. I'm going to ask Mayor Mayo to make his comments and then Walt Caldwell will follow him.

Mayor Mayo: Thank you very much Mayor Norris and good morning to each of you. Mayor Norris I appreciate those kind words. I'm glad you didn't mention what grade I made in your class.

Mayor Norris: It was a B.

Mayor Mayo: Well in that case, tell everybody. When I came in I saw the folks next door and I saw all the folks and I thought, wow, a lot of people are concerned about the flood recovery effort, and rightfully so, and I looked through the window and I saw a sign that said 'How to save your marriage'. So, maybe I need to go in there too as an elected official. It's good to be here and I appreciate Mayor Norris hosting this here in West Monroe. We are twin cities and we work very well together. I appreciate all of you who are here, my colleagues Mayor Durbin, Mayor Tyler, Commissioner, and Representative, also, it's just good to see all of my friends here that I've worked with over the years. It goes without saying that when you look at the FEMA map that Ouachita Parish was one of the hardest hit parishes. When I talk about Ouachita Parish, I mean Monroe, West Monroe, Sterlington and Ridgewood, that's on the FEMA map. Also when you look at it you will see the most adversely impacted city that was hit was the city of Monroe, so in addition to up here talking about the city of Monroe, obviously we talk about the entire parish because those are the things that happened. There is no question that a lot of folks work very well together, Mayor Norris eluded to that. Being on the ground, trying to do what we can because when we have catastrophes happen like that, our citizens expect us to step out and lead, and that is what we attempted to do. We don't always know everything that we need to do but we do know that we need to pull people out of their homes and we need to do everything we can to give them hope and those are the types of things that we did. In addition to us stepping out, we also had folks from throughout the state come in to help us as well because these flood waters had no boundaries, they were everywhere, the water was going everywhere, but those boundaries were also looked up on by folks that came in to help us, so we certainly appreciate that and I want to say that. I have some notes here and I'll be very brief because I have to step out, I apologize for that, to go give some bicycles

away to some kids and I don't want them to be mad at me so, I'll be as quick as I possibly can. Our ability to access any recovery dollars and mitigation dollars depends on having matching funds. We understand the proposed flood recovery plan addresses needs of homeowners, renters and also small businesses, these programs will help our citizens in Monroe, as well as throughout the parish, and we support the program, however, the flood recovery plan proposed specifically excludes an infrastructure allocation of this first appropriation of CDBG disaster funds from Congress. It also excludes using the funds as match for mitigation or public assistance grants to our local governments. Although the plan states it will address infrastructure with future amendments, as the mayor of Monroe I think it is important for you as a task force to know our infrastructure needs are immediate needs. It does not make sense in our opinion to rebuild homes in areas that are not fully protected from future events because the storm damages are not yet repaired. It does not make sense in our opinion to rebuild homes and businesses in unprotected areas without also providing access dollars for mitigation. The plan states it is giving priority to the housing programs because the infrastructure needs exceed all available funds. However, we do ask you to remember that is the case only when both disasters are combined and the infrastructure needs of all 51 parishes considered in total. Remember, 80% of the appropriation of these \$500M CDBG disaster funds specifies for the 6 most impacted parishes, one of which is Ouachita Parish. The totals on page 57 of the report do not give these consideration, they appear to be totals for all of the affected parishes, not just the 6. Similarly, the decision not to allocate funds to match the mitigation public assistance dollars may have been based upon that total being over \$92M when considering both disasters, ours and the one in the southern part of our state, but if you consider the March event separately the match for those mitigation funds would be \$8M which is less than 1/10th of the total. The impact of access to those matching funds for Monroe and Ouachita Parish would be significant. Working together we could solve our drainage issues which have limited growth and adversely impacted our residents with repetitive losses for years. Lastly, it is important to remember that our communities were not found eligible for the 90/10 match by FEMA, so we are bearing the full weight of the 25% match of our permanent repairs. An allocation for matching funds would help us move more quickly through recovery and back to a fully restored condition. Please think about this as you finalize the plan and consider allocation for infrastructure and matching funds. In closing, I would like to say again that I want to reiterate the fact we do appreciate that all of you here, that FEMA is here and with my conversations with the Governor I know he is working extremely hard, he's been dedicated and committed, as all of our elected officials, both congressional delegation and state leaders, everybody is working together, and that is what happens when we have these disasters but at the same time we want to emphasize here in Ouachita Parish some of the concerns that we have and some of the things that will help us as we move forward. Again, thank you very much and again I apologize for having to leave but I thank you again for being here.

Mr. Durbin opened the floor for questions.

Commissioner Strain: In the CR that was passed about a week ago, \$85M was placed into the NRCS, National Conservation Services, from which of that part of those monies are going towards what is called the Emergency Watershed Protection Plan, the EWP, and government entities can participate in that as a cost share. The NRCS will bear up to 75% of the cost and specifically what it is there for is to remove debris from streams, channels, roads, culverts and around bridges to reshape and protect eroded banks, correct damaged facilities, putting covers on eroded land and prepare levees and structures and repair conservation services and practices. So, in this \$85M is both public & private but there is a public component and especially when you are looking at the Emergency Watershed Protection Plan, so those monies are allocated and coming through there so if there is anything that you would like to participate in or anyone in the government in the affected areas, the contact would be Mr. Kevin Norton, who is head of the NRCS. If you don't remember that, just call me.

Mayor Mayo: I have staff here and I'm sure they have written that down.

Commissioner Strain: And that has recently been done, about a week ago. I had a specific call from Congressman Scalise and he made sure that that was in the CR.

Mayor Mayo: Thank you very much Commissioner.

Mr. Durbin closed the floor for questions.

Mr. Walt Caldwell with Ouachita Parish Police Jury and Mr. Kevin Crosby approached the witness table.

Mr. Caldwell: Good morning. I think that Mayor Mayo has done a very good job of concisely stating the position that the parish has for overall. I think that at a core level the floods that were experienced in both March and August of this year, and sometimes there are several parishes that overlap, Northeast Louisiana, in particular Ouachita Parish, what we experienced is very different than what was experienced in South Louisiana. First of all, the event, 4263, caused widespread flooding in the parish. We had 5,357 privately owned homes and 5,230 rental units, for a total of 10,587 residential structures that were ultimately reported to FEMA. Additionally there was approximately 640 commercial structures that were flooded during the event. While some of the areas experienced flash flooding and they were only flooded for a matter of days, others were flooded for weeks. I want to talk for just a moment about the distinction between north and south Louisiana. We had a flash flood event that occurred with the initial rains, that flash flood event subsided and then we had all of our basins full of water and collecting water from these flash floods that rose and we had to combat that. As Mayor Norris talked about a few moments ago, historically we are a parish that has dealt with floods and we have had a number of drainage structures and different control devices put in place in the parish over a number of years. In most cases, after the initial period of the flash flooding when we were in rescue mode, we moved very quickly to a mode of trying to maintain the existing structures and move the water within the boundaries of the parish into basins and places that we could control it and keep it from doing additional flooding. As I appreciate what happened to south Louisiana, there were no drainage control structures, there were no mass of different flood type structures to deal with the flooding that occurred there, and to a certain extent, rescue mode was what was maintained through that period of time and large areas were flooded and were flooded for a period of time, but the resulting differences of what occurred in Ouachita Parish and what occurred in south Louisiana have created a different set of needs. I'm not saying there isn't housing needs in Ouachita Parish and I'm not saying that we don't need some housing dollars through these programs, that would be remiss of me. We have a number of people in this parish that still have no place to go. Kayla, can we pull up the map please? It's in tab 4 of your binders. To give an example of what I'm talking about a moment ago the difference between the flash flooding and the basin flooding that we had, in one place in Ouachita Parish that had both, and that was Treasure Island, and that is not to say that other areas weren't but Treasure Island is within my district and it's the subject of discussion. Could we zoom out on that, Kayla? That's much better. That's fine. This is the northeast quadrant of the parish that we have here. Treasure Island is located on Bayou DeSiard, it has a structure called Hannah's Run that comes out of Black Bayou. Treasure Island was initially flooded with Bayou DeSiard, the history of Ouachita Parish no one has record of Bayou DeSiard coming out of its banks, but it did. Bayou DeSiard initially flooded parts of Treasure Island in that event and certain houses were flooded, as were certain houses in different neighborhoods that had never flooded got water from Bayou DeSiard. That was the flash flood that subsided. But what ultimately caused great problems for Treasure Island, particularly the Stevenson and some of the other streets near the back of the island was that Black Bayou, which is a basin, collected a large amount of water from Bayou DeSiard and from other sources and as it filled and it tried to flow through Hannah's Run back into Bayou DeSiard it began to flood the backend of the island. Homes on Stevenson, there were some of them that had water in them for five weeks. That street is now virtually deserted, many of the houses are not occupied. Some of the homeowners were unable to wait for funding, which I appreciate may be available through these programs now, and sold their houses for pennies on a dollar to persons who have acquired them for rental properties. That is an example of the differences of the two. If you look at these maps, what you can see is that there is virtually no area of Ouachita Parish that didn't receive some level of flooding, likewise when you look at these maps you don't see any type of territorial boundaries. You don't see the municipalities, parish lines, this event didn't decide it was only going to occur within one area, it crosses over into different basins, and these basins in many cases cross over territorial lines in the parish in the cities. During the storm, the officials from Monroe, City of West Monroe, Homeland Security, National Guard, police, fire departments and the Ouachita Parish Police Jury worked very closely throughout the event to minimize damage to property and effectively use resources. Open communication and team efforts between the various governmental entities were key in moving the flood waters and bringing comfort to the residents. I'll say that in this particular event we got more right than wrong. There is always room for improvement in how we respond and we have had meetings about that and what we can do in the future, but cooperation has increased between the municipalities and between the parishes over the last several years. Beginning with some of our transportation

projects through our MPO, what we have seen is a high level cooperation between all the governmental entities to basically produce, coordinate and place in the queue for the Urban Systems funding that we need. That level of cooperation between our engineering and our governmental entities in that critical federal funding has brought about a high level of cooperation between the municipalities and the parish, and that was reflected in the storm. We had a very good cooperation, we had good communication and we were able to do a lot of things in the storm, that had we not had that cooperation and communication it would have caused some problems. This event was different from many other events. During a hurricane disaster there is typically several days and sometimes weeks to prepare and plan, unfortunately the March 2016 flood event came with minimal time on the front end for preparation. As with most of the flood events that I have been involved with since I have been on the police jury, the weather forecasts have always been lacking. No prediction of the magnitude that we experienced existed. While steps were taken in the municipalities in the parish for 9-10 inch rain, no one was expecting the amount of rain we received. So, response was not as quickly as we would have liked but then again no one was prepared based on the forecast that we had, what we were facing at that time, standing up our emergency operations and getting the communication lines set-up was not as quickly as we would have for a hurricane, where we have 72 hours or so outlook. I think that the experience was very similar in south Louisiana that we had here. The east side of the parish and the west side parish have separate drainage basins but both sides drain to the Ouachita River. On the west side, most of the more densely populated areas of the parish gravity flow directly to the Ouachita River, that is until the river rises to a level that we have close the flood gates. When we close those flood gates we greatly diminish our ability to move water. We can pump and we have several pumps. Over the years we have created a number of flood gates and pump stations to move water out of the municipalities and out of the parish and these basins into the river in the event that we have to close the flood gates. The problem is the gravity flow is about 10 times what we can pump, so once those gates are closed we are fighting an issue of moving the water as fast as we possibly can. During this particular event we had to get pumps to augment what we already had to do some additional pumping. Pumping is costly and it's not as effective as gravity flow. In the city of West Monroe, on the west side of the river, Black Bayou Canal runs through the heart of the city. It is a concrete lined channel. Prior to reaching the outfall pump station, Black Bayou Canal runs through a portion of the parish as a natural channel with a relatively flat slope. The portion of this critical conveyance within the parish must be improved and widened in order to get the flow to the outfall at a rate that minimizes the potential for flooding upstream. On the east side, the most eastern portion of the northeast quadrant of the parish, the southeast portion of the City of Monroe and the southeast quadrant of the parish gravity flow to the east through multiple tributaries to Bayou Lafourche, which flows south and eventually into the Ouachita River. These areas rely totally on gravity flow through canals that need improvement and widening. Young's Bayou, the primary drainage canal for the City of Monroe, needs improvement, widening and alignment corrections. The western portion of the northeast quadrant of the parish gravity flows to the west to the Ouachita River. Similar to the west side of the Parish, gravity structures are utilized until the level in the Ouachita River requires flood gates to be closed. At that point, the floodwaters must be pumped by two separate pump stations. The discharge pipe at the largest pump station, River Styx, must be replaced immediately due to a design flaw when constructed in the early 1990's. Various improvements are needed along Bayou DeSiard to direct the flow during flood events. These include L11, Midway Dam, the Duck Wheat Structure, several structures that we have on Bayou DeSiard. Additionally, channel improvements need to be made to the tributaries leading to these pump stations. Some experts have classified the March, 2016 Flood Event as a 1000-year event which is well outside normal design parameters for drainage structures. Approximately 16.58" of rainfall fell over Ouachita Parish in a 48-hour period. The Parish received 26.96" over the first 6-day period. I've actually talked to some people whose rain gauges had 29 and 30" so it just depends on where you were. Luckily, the area had not experienced heavy rainfall prior to the March, 2016 Flood Event and most of the basins were relatively low compared to the 1991 Flood Event. The 1991 flood event is the event that this is most often compared. That flood was different because we had long periods of rains beforehand and basically you had back water flooding because the rivers filled and the basins filled and the water started coming up and then you had a significant rain and nowhere for that water to go, so this was a different event altogether. Even with the amount of rainfall we experienced in a compressed timeframe, there are flood control projects that have been identified that would have greatly reduced the footprint of flooding, and in some instances prevented the flooding completely. A list of potential projects for flood control improvements is included along with the estimated costs. Kayla, could we pull up that list please? This is also in your binders

under tab 4. This is a potential list of projects that we feel are necessary and many in which we think would eliminate a great deal of flooding. If you will notice at the bottom, the total is \$91M. Now, this doesn't solve every drainage problem in the parish, this is not a wish list to get water out of Uncle Buck's yard and Aunt Sally's backyard, this is a flood list. An entire drainage plan would cost around \$200M, right Kevin?

Mr. Crosby: Around \$400M.

Mr. Caldwell: Around \$400M, so this is directly related to flooding and how to deal with flooding. In regards to Hannah's Run structure, the \$500K there, we fortunately have an allocation from Capital Outlay to repair that structure. So, that is taken care of, but we have to repair the River Styx Pump Station, looking at widening of Black Bayou and its tributaries in West Monroe, widening Young's Bayou and its tributaries in Monroe, looking at repairs and modifications to L11, the Duckweed Structure, Bayou DeSiard Pipe, and the list goes on. The existing structures did an excellent job but for the most part we were overwhelmed by the flood waters in this particular instance. In many cases it showed deficiencies and issues within the existing structures that need to be addressed. Such as widening some of these ditches and some of these outfalls and their tributaries. Kevin, I'd like for you to discuss this list a bit more. Is he in the camera and I can just hand him the microphone?

Ms. Dupont: He's in the camera, just hand him the microphone.

Mr. Crosby: I'm Kevin Crosby, I'm the parish engineer for Ouachita Parish Police Jury. Mayor Mayo did a very good job explaining about the housing and if you put all the money in housing instead of mixing some in with projects basically what we are going to be doing is putting people back in the same spot they were in when they flooded. Just to give you an example and because Walt brought it up, the Hannah's Run is a \$500K project, you probably had 15 houses in that area that flooded, so you are either going to buy them out, remove them, elevate them, that project will elevate the flooding in that area. That project prevents Bayou DeSiard from backing up into Treasure Island. So, I think it would be good to look and put a mix, even with this first set of funding because there are projects that won't necessarily break the bank and they will actually prevent flooding in those areas. We aren't talking about a 25 year storm, 50 year storm, some of these projects will prevent a 1,000 year storm, which is what we saw in this event. One thing we tried to look at with this, when you get a flood of our magnitude, it doesn't see municipal lines, or poor neighborhood, or rich neighborhood, it shows no mercy on anybody. These projects and any project that we put together or both cities put together will be a comprehensive project that will look at what areas it will benefit, what is the total benefit and what are the effects downstream. There is a lot of projects that you can fix in an area but you are fixing to push that water somewhere. Like Mr. Caldwell said, it is never went outside the banks of Bayou DeSiard, I've had a lot of people tell me it's never done that. Well there is a natural ridge along the entire channel for Bayou DeSiard, and that tells you over time, maybe before our lifetime, but it's come out of the banks and back in it, back out of the banks and back in it and built that natural bank up outside. So, another thing the municipalities and the parishes is going to discuss going forward is to not allow development to keep squeezing this drainage basin. I mean, you can only hold so much water and it doesn't make sense to keep adding pumps and keep making everything bigger, at some point we have to pump the brakes and say this particular area you can't build in, it has to be left natural and there are areas on both sides of the river for that, natural slump flood basins where when you have a flood like this the flood waters can actually go into and everything take a breath instead of the water keep rising. Walt mentioned the drainage basins, Ouachita Parish has a very complicated drainage system. The west side drains to specific areas and then have to pump it out, so it's not like we can do one project and then do this one over here and this one over here, if you widen and increase the capacity of Black Bayou, which comes through the heart, yes there is going to be some drainage issues outside of that, that is the bulk of it. So, if you correct that, you have the parish that comes through that channel and you have the city, it's basically solved. The east side you have the east half of the northeast quadrant, a lot of the heart of the city of Monroe, and the southeast part of the parish is the natural drainage canals. As development has occurred those drainage canals have got to be dredged, widened, deepened, and there simply has not been funding for that, on a local level, state level. We have bits and pieces of projects, with the amount of money that is coming back into the state, we have to make sure we make a difference with this money and not just piece, we have to make a difference with the money for long-term. Some of these projects, especially the larger ones that will solve drainage for many years to come. It's extremely important. I'm not saying housing is not important but if you do the infrastructure and the drainage correctly, it will solve a lot of the housing. The projects, we have some of those projects in for potential funding in other areas. One thing that would really help our area, and Mayor Mayo touched on this, if the CDBG money would be allowed, not only be matched for hazard mitigation but also for

public assistance. I know for a fact in the parish we have damage that occurred in March, levees around subdivisions that have hundreds of homes, some of those levees are almost breached. There simply is no money there to fund the match for it. So, the parish is going to have to try and pick and choose of where they put their money to try and spend for public assistance through FEMA. I mean, it's a real problem. We have River Styx that had damage during a January flood that was a disaster, a declared disaster, we were in the process of doing a \$1M emergency repair on River Styx, this flood occurred and one of the pumps couldn't even pump during the flood. We had two pumps. It's so much larger than the other pump station, you have to make sure that the basins are at a certain level or it will capitate the pumps and they are several miles apart, I mean it pulls that much water through. The damage to that was not out of neglect or not maintenance, its discharged pipe that is basically eaten up with electrolysis. There wasn't any type of metallic protection on this pipe when it was put in because it was built in the 1990s and there is just holes in it. I've never heard of anyone digging pipe up to see if it has holes in it. I mean, when you see there is an issue with it you dig it up, you don't know how bad the problem is until you dig it up and that is what we were in the middle of, we got two of the pumps back going, the other one was leaking at the toe of the levee and we didn't want to turn a flood event into a search and rescue so we didn't run that pump. As far as going forward, all three entities have started talking about looking at high water marks, looking at setting requirements higher, right now FEMA requires that you be above the base flood level, right now, all three entities, I'm positive, have ordinances in effect now that you have to be 1' above, so we already have a more stringent requirement but if people continue to want to build in low places I think you have to have stricter requirements to say you have to be 3' above or whatever the group comes up with that will be some of the things that's brought. The retention requirements, in the parish we say you can't impact anyone upstream or downstream, it's just simply state law. Both of the municipalities have retention requirements. Well if the parishes water is coming through both cities to get to the river and we are not detaining and they are, it doesn't work together very well, so that is some of the things, some of the development requirements and looking at this flood hazard area is developing those not allowing that going forward. We have Century Link here, a fortune 500 company, they are trying to bring people in, looking for housing. We have got to get the funding to do the flood control and drainage projects. We appreciate you all coming. I've got the larger maps with me, the ones that are so small on the screen, if anyone has any questions after.

Mr. Durbin opened the floor for questions.

Representative Shadoin: Thank you fellows. In terms of the potential projects for flood control funding, are these in any kind of preference or priority order?

Mr. Caldwell: No, sir they are not.

Representative Shadoin: Have we done any preference or priority depending on how much we get, where we can get the biggest bang for our buck?

Mr. Caldwell: That's the problem. In having discussions, Kevin and I have had discussions with the city of West Monroe, with the city of Monroe, not knowing what dollar amount is coming makes it difficult to prioritize, based on what you can do on the wish list. This wish list composed, Kevin and I worked on it, and he met with his corresponding engineers for the municipalities and came up with this list and supplemented it. This list knows no jurisdiction. It is for the entire parish and it addresses a number of issues. The problem is, in many ways, if you address some of these but you don't address all of these you can run into some problems. For example, you can fix Young's Bayou but you don't fix River Styx Pump Station you won't be able to pump Chauvin out like it should.

Representative Shadoin: Water is going to go somewhere. I understand that.

Mr. Crosby: Like with the city of West Monroe, if they clean out their portion or widen their portion of Black Bayou, but the portion that goes through the parish is downstream, if we don't have the funds to do it, you really haven't done anything.

Representative Shadoin: Okay.

Mr. Caldwell: Does that answer your question Representative Shadoin?

Representative Shadoin: Yes, as best we can right now, with the information that we have or don't have.

Mr. Caldwell: You know, from one lawyer to another, to be vague and ambiguous is our nature but I'm not trying to be. Quite frankly that is the situation. It's hard for us to say this is our number one, this is our number two, and

this is our number three based on because we don't know what our available funds are. I can tell you for the Mayor of West Monroe, clearly the Black Bayou project is one of his major projects that he would like to see. Mayor you have told me and your engineer has told me that 80% of the flooding in West Monroe could be alleviated probably by working on that canal, is that correct?

Mayor Norris: Yes, it certainly could when we don't have the flood gates closed, when the flood gates are closed everyone is in a lot different situation but when we are in a gravity flow position, probably with \$10M we could eliminate, and we got some match money so everyone remember that, we are always ready to match anything we can get our hands on.

Mr. Knapp: My name is Adam Knapp, I am the CEO of the Baton Rouge Area Chamber and working on the economic recovery I'd be interested to hear about the effects in your community to business recovery. You mentioned 640 commercial structures flooded, what is the status of that? Second questions is really after listening to the presentation I'm curious, if you had most of the funds allocated towards homeowners needs in the first \$437M would you fund, in your parish, infrastructure instead of homeowners in a program design?

Mr. Caldwell: Let me say this and make this very clear, housing is important and housing is needed, we have some housing needs in Ouachita Parish and those need to be addressed, but if we can't protect the structures that we build or that we remodel then we haven't done a whole lot, that's the bottom line. As to business entities, I've had some conversations with the Monroe Chamber and the West Monroe Chamber but I do not have a good gauge on where that is at this point. My perception is that most of the businesses are back up and running but I'll give you an example, coming here today you may have passed the Central American Insurance Agency on 7th St. by Kilpatrick Funeral Home, both the funeral home and the insurance agency flooded and they are still rebuilding the building at this point here in West Monroe. So there are a number of structures that are up and running, the businesses themselves I think remain viable but they are facing some issues in regards to the reconstruction and operations of their business still from the flood at this point.

Mr. Crosby: Some are using this, I guess, downtime as a let's go ahead and expand or let's go ahead and do this while we are totally shut down and they are doing additional work other than rehabbing from the storm.

Dr. Richardson: Following up on the Representative's question about, let's take it another way, if you had the entire \$91M, which one would you do first?

Mr. Caldwell: I'm sorry?

Dr. Richardson: If you had all \$91M available, which one would you do first? What order would you put them in?

Mr. Crosby: Some of these are basically to the point where they have the plans ready, some of them are going to take a significant time for permitting, some of them are large projects, and some of them are small projects that you can get out fairly quickly. I would think that all of them could be moved at the same time if you, I mean, had \$91M today.

Dr. Richardson: As an engineer, how long would it take to do those projects?

Mr. Crosby: Some of them, within 60 days you would have them out for bid, and some of them less than that, because like the Black Bayou and I'll take this one, go about mid-way down, the Repair & Improve J1E Canal, the downstream end of J1E Canal was done with Gustav/Ike funds, we just couldn't come upstream as far as we would like to, some of it is already surveyed, property surveys have already been done in hopes that there would be funding be tagged on to the end of the Gustav/Ike, naturally it wasn't but some of these could be moved quickly.

Dr. Richardson: Also, to follow up on, you talked about Hannah's Run, if you did that and that would help some people, would it hurt some people to potentially?

Mr. Crosby: There is another project on this that we recognize as if you aren't allowing water to go in through that structure anymore that would mean water is going somewhere downstream. During this flood event Midway Dam on Adment (sp?) Blvd. was topped by about 3', which allowed that water to just keep coming into the city of Monroe and had to be pumped out. If that structure was raised it would push it out L11 and out Bayou Lafourche. I mean you still would have damage, but it's not in populated areas where the waters were and if they get this much higher, that basin spreads out a lot once you get out to Bayou Lafourche.

Mr. Caldwell: You are speaking in generalities but in specifics, Hannah's Run is already a drainage structure we were replacing, and there are two drainage structures in concurrence there, one operated by the parish and one operated by the city, and in the past by certain adjustments we were able to prevent catastrophic effects to either party by balancing those two structures, but I understand that your question was more in general about are you moving water to hurt someone else.

Representative Shadoin: I had another question a while ago and that is, back in March when we had this flood, I can remember, I couldn't get home, we were in Baton Rouge in between sessions, couldn't get here. Next day the Governor invited me to fly over it and what use to be farmland and timberland and pastureland, looked like one big body of water. Now, we have spring coming, nothing happens, have we taken any remedial steps from last year's flood to now to help mitigate or lessen possible flood waters in the spring, because we have Ouachita River, Mississippi River, Bayou Lafourche, Bayou DeSiard, we have lots of water surrounding us.

Mr. Caldwell: Frankly Representative Shadoin, we are in a state right now, and this is sort of the comments that we got about our current conditions, we are nine months removed from the beginning of the 2016 floods –

Representative Shadoin: That's what I want, thank you.

Mr. Caldwell: And I'm going to answer your response.

Representative Shadoin: Come on.

Mr. Caldwell: There are a number of residents who aren't able to return to their homes, rental properties cost is at a premium and that goes directly to the housing component that we talked about earlier, drainage structures, pump stations, levees and roadways are still in need of repair. While progress is being made, and has been made the parish remains vulnerable to any type of spring flooding.

Representative Shadoin: Okay.

Mr. Caldwell: Funding for repairs and flood control projects is desperately needed at a state and federal level. We are a regional hub here in Ouachita Parish, with the population of this parish in the commercial base. If another flood event occurs prior to the repairs being made and projects being built, the results would be catastrophic for our entire region. Frankly gentlemen, we just do not have the funding at this point with our local tax bases to repair what we have and need to repair and make the alternations that we feel we need to make. And that is where we are.

Mr. Crosby: All of these are improvements or potential projects, that's what this list is. The flip side of that is, we haven't gotten all of the damage prepared yet, I mean it's a significant amount. I only looked at 5 or 6 areas that I submitted in November to FEMA, I think it was \$6M. City of Monroe just submitted another \$6-7M, that's not included in any of these reports, I mean you are looking at \$12 to \$14M in public assistance that's not included in any GOHSEP report as of yet.

Representative Shadoin: So, has there been any funding from other sources since March to help us address these repairs?

Mr. Crosby: (Turned and asked someone in the audience) Have we gotten any money at all from FEMA yet? (Answered) Oh I'm sorry, we got \$15,000 from FEMA so far.

Representative Shadoin: Well, I hope that didn't break the bank. \$15,000 and there was 9 months' post flooding in North Louisiana.

Mr. Crosby: That's what the Ouachita Parish Police Jury has received from FEMA to date, yes sir.

Representative Shadoin: And do we have all of the applications in?

Mr. Crosby: The City of Monroe, this is Kim Golden the city engineer.

Ms. Kim Golden approached the witness table.

Representative Shadoin: How you doing?

Mr. Crosby: Apparently, we got \$15,000 more than they have. They haven't received anything.

Representative Shadoin: Why?

Mr. Crosby: And they had a tax base where they had actual money that they could go ahead and move forward. The projects with the parish, we are at a standstill until we receive some funding.

Mr. Olivier: I think that was a good segway, he's basically gotten onto my question but one of the things that our federal agencies are focusing on right now is resiliency and contain ability, and so out of this entire list, because this is before the flood, right?

Mr. Crosby: Yes, sir.

Mr. Olivier: But if you had a flood of this magnitude, we have never experienced anything like this, so back to that prioritization issue, obviously we would love to have \$91M, obviously we are not going to get \$91M, what could be those things that could be done, going back to Dr. Richardson's question, that might mitigate or stop, help, the situation if another flood of that magnitude occurred, which may not maybe in another 100 years but I guess that is what we are looking for.

Mr. Crosby: It's tough to just rank a bunch of projects without knowing.

Mr. Olivier: I know, but what if you don't get that \$91M, what if you get \$20M, what would you do?

Mr. Crosby: We could provide you a list if we knew we were going to get \$20M because I can't sit here and tell you that we are going to widen Black Bayou and widen Young's Bayou because that's \$21M if we get \$10M. Do you see what I'm saying? But if I knew we are going to get \$50M, we can generate a list.

Mr. Olivier: Which also means you don't have match for any of them.

Mr. Caldwell: No, and Mr. Olivier, you have hit on a point, and I hate to but I think it's the time to talk about it, our experience in Ouachita Parish is distinct and different than what was experienced in South Louisiana. Not better, not worse, different. The handcuffing of these funds is based on different events could potentially cause some great problems because of what we are discussing and in need for that. The flood action plan as it currently sits does not adequately address Ouachita Parish and it's needs. It may adequately be addressing the needs of East Baton Rouge and Tangipahoa, St. Tammany and all those parishes but it's not addressing the needs of Ouachita Parish. We are not saying we do not need housing dollars, we do, but we also need to be able to protect the structures and we are asking that you consider changing the flood action plan to allow us to use some CDBG funds for matches, as you pointed out we need those matches. I would point out that within the flood action plan itself, Ouachita Parish based on the numbers compiled in that report by the National Flood Insurance Program, we rank number three in the state, both events combined on damages. Reported damages through the National Flood Insurance Program, I believe it's approximately page 65, or 67. He's going to find it real quick, it's in the 60s. Ouachita Parish ranks 3rd with both events combined, with claims through the National Flood Insurance Program. We have identified that our needs are distinct and different and we ask that this body recognize that and allow some funds to be put that way. To try and answer your question directly, we need to repair River Styx Pump Station, or we won't be able to pump Chauvin Basin. If we can't pump Chauvin Basin, I can tell you three neighborhoods that will flood, and when I say neighborhoods we are talking probably several thousand homes.

Mr. Crosby: It's probably more than that. I mean Century Link is in the basin also near River Styx.

Mr. Caldwell: River Styx is the major basin in that particular area. If we don't get Black Bayou in West Monroe widened and it improved, West Monroe will flood again. If we are unable to deal with Young's Bayou and its tributaries in the City of Monroe it will continue to have flooding. If we do not have modifications to L11 at the Duck Wheat Structure, the Bayou DeSiard Pipe, if we are not able to clean out L11 and if we can't raise Midway Dam, if we can't do some maintenance to the Chauvin Pump Stations, we have some concerns. The Chauvin Pump Station, Hannah's Run and the Styx Pump Station, Kevin alluded to earlier there was a design flaw, all three of those were constructed in the same time frame by the same entity, not any of the local entities by the way, a federal entity, and two of those structures we have rusted out pipes, we are concerned that Chauvin may be as well. Ms. Golden is with the city and she has the distinction of being a former police juror, so she has a very broad view of the needs of the city, as well as the parish.

Ms. Golden: Good morning. I'm Kim Golden, city engineer for the City of Monroe and to supplement what my colleagues are saying, and perhaps to address the question of Mr. Olivier, each one of these projects standing alone would mitigate and impact. The ability to do them in combination leverages that, so it's a multiplying effect, rather than an additive effect. So, each one of them as a standalone project will have a mitigating impact and as Mayor Norris said, the City of Monroe does have some match funds but the impact of what our projects can do would be multiplied by the ability of the other parish to also do projects and the fact that they are limited in what they can do with some of the outfall, we don't get as much bang for our buck. So, that is why we are going at this, and I think my colleagues have done a good job of presenting to you why we are a little bit different and infrastructure might be something to put in this front money.

Mr. Olivier: Yeah.

Ms. Golden: But it does, the City of Monroe did have the most residences impacted and did have the most commercial structures impacted, so the plan as it stands is going to be helpful to many of our residences, so I don't want that to get lost, we just want to be sure that you all in your work are understanding.

Mr. Olivier: That's why we are holding these meetings on site because you may not come to Baton Rouge, but thanks, that's very good.

Ms. Golden: We do want you to understand that we don't need the whole \$91M, that's what you all are looking at, that X amount of dollars, making sure it's going to where it's going to have the most impact, so it doesn't have to be all of it for us to be able to do something effective.

Mr. Olivier: Thank you, that's what we want to hear.

Dr. Richardson: Just a question.

Mr. Crosby: I think \$87M would be just fine.

Mr. Caldwell: Way to go Kevin.

Representative Shadoin: What can you do with \$15,000?

(Unsure of source): Come to this meeting.

Dr. Richardson: I have a question. The mayor talked about infrastructure and we talked about flood protection items entirely, are there any other infrastructure needs that require some help that because of the flooding got, for example school districts?

Mr. Caldwell: Yes, the school districts have provided some damages. Candy, do you know off the top of your head what they had?

Mr. Caldwell addressed 'Candy', a lady in the audience, on the above question. Let the record show that she did not approach the witness table and that her answers were not picked up by any microphones, therefore, will not be included in the official minutes.

Mr. Caldwell: Building damages.

Dr. Richardson: How about the parishes, did they any road damages?

Mr. Caldwell: Oh yes. We have tons of road damage, bridge damage.

Mr. Crosby: Public works had 200, how many worksheets? (addressing Candy in the audience)

Mr. Caldwell: 170 roads. School boards together had approximately \$1M.

Dr. Richardson: Okay.

Mr. Crosby: But there was like 200 and something worksheets that was done with public works, with the parish public works, and you can have up to like 10 projects. Now some of them were cross drains washed out, some of them were small projects but each one required attention and those projects actually have been repaired and the rest of them are right at the end of being done.

Dr. Richardson: Okay.

Mr. Caldwell: We do have some transportation needs, I know Ms. Golden has dealt with that bridge in Debra that has caused some consternation, basically it sat on top of the structure and was basically rendered entirely unsafe by the flood, and that's just one example that she has to deal with the City of Monroe, but I mean there's certainly some transportation and infrastructure needs outside of flood control structures that we have.

Mr. Crosby: In the flood action plan, we had mentioned a while ago about the flood insurance program claims, on page 62 it shows Ouachita Parish right at \$85M is what the claims were. On two pages over it shows the 4277 disaster, East Baton Rouge had \$138.5M, so \$138.5M, Livingston had \$94.8M, then the next one was Ascension at \$50M, so that was back to the comment that Mr. Caldwell made, Ouachita Parish is sitting at \$85M on claims.

Dr. Richardson: Okay.

Mr. Durbin: Mr. Caldwell, I do have a comment to make and a question. This is a terrific presentation and in the two-page document preceding the list, I'm looking at the bottom where you conclude conclusions and requests, and I see two numbers, one allow CDBG funds to be used to match federal funding and the second is to dedicate adequate funding to flood control infrastructure to improve drainage, which is where you have your list. Which one would you take first, or are you requesting this task force for both?

Mr. Caldwell: I want as much as I can get.

Mr. Durbin: Well, I think that is two things that we can focus on.

Mr. Caldwell: I think we need both.

Mr. Durbin: I'm not saying take either or, I'm just saying –

Mr. Caldwell: The cities both have some additional funding, their tax base is better than the parish, and I want to say this, when we talk about this we are not drawing up lines and saying we are going to X and we are going to do Y, there is a great level of cooperation with the City of West Monroe, we have talked about this Black Bayou, parts of it lay in the city, parts of it lay in the parish and that project is to be done and we understand that it is going to be a cooperative and collaborative partnership, but they have money and we don't. The City of Monroe, when you are looking at Young's Bayou, it actually travels through Monroe, Ridgewood and the parish, there is going to have to be collaboration in those areas, things that we recognize that we are going to do, we are just the poor cousin of the relationship here and we don't have the funding. With that said, the City of West Monroe at some point is going to run out funding and the City of Monroe is going to run out of funding before we can get the number of projects that we need done. So, CDBG grants for all of the major entities in the parish are very important and are desperately needed. As far as dedicating adequate funding to the infrastructure, that is something that we need to look at because of the distinctive differences in this event we need a significant portion of these funds dedicated to not only housing but to infrastructure, and again, we are not saying that housing is not important, we are not saying that we don't have housing needs, but in looking over the flood action plan what we see as the biggest deficiency is where Ouachita Parish and the municipalities within it sit is a lack of component to address that infrastructure needs. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Durbin: Yes, sir. Again, I think we all compliment you three and Mayor Norris with your presentation.

Mr. Caldwell: I want to tell you that Kevin prepared the presentation because I was getting ready for a hearing and he was kind enough to stay up really late and put this together, so I have to give full credit to Kevin for putting this together, with Kim's help and Robby George I'm sure put some information in there as well so.

Mr. Durbin: Compliments go to Mr. Crosby. Thank you all.

Mayor Norris: Let me just say one thing that they kind of brushed over, we had a lot of damage in Ouachita Parish, as I'm sure all of the parishes did, that didn't flood. When you have wash-outs all over the parish, the state had some big wash-outs on Highway 80, the state had a lot of expense associated with infrastructure damage that didn't flood but the parish particularly had a lot of wash-outs on streets and they had to spend a lot of their money repairing so people could get back to their homes, so when we talk about maybe we don't have enough money to match this or enough money to match that, part of the reason for that is we have depleted the road funds and depleted a lot of other funds because we were trying to get the roads back up and other structures and they never flooded at all.

Mr. Crosby: A mention to that, that's a very good point, River Styx, I mentioned earlier, we were in the middle of an emergency contract at that time for \$980K that had to be done at that instant, well the parish, year after year, they would try to squirrel a little \$50K into the drainage, \$60K into the drainage, well after 25 years I think they had right at a million dollars –

Mr. Caldwell: That we were going to use as match for statewide flood control projects, it's gone.

Mr. Crosby: It was used on River Styx.

Commissioner Strain: When you are looking at projects of this magnitude, have you presented this to the Corps of Engineers for their feedback as to the impact to the Ouachita River downstream? Have you talked to them?

Mr. Crosby: What on the Ouachita River now?

Commissioner Strain: Well, if you are looking at where all this water has got to go, downstream, Ouachita towards the Red, and when you are looking at projects to this magnitude, this many projects, have you talked to the Corps and have a preliminary discussion and said okay if we move down this pathway are you going to have an objection? I guess because the question is can the Ouachita handle the lower Ouachita to the Red the increased flow of water and whether or not they would say yes or no, that you are going to have to get environmental impact or one of these things, which would remarkably slow down these projects?

Mr. Caldwell: Commissioner Strain, we have not had direct contact with the Corps of Engineers, but in all of our conversations and all of our planning and all of our discussions, the Tensas Levee Basin has been involved.

Commissioner Strain: Okay.

Mr. Caldwell: And they do have a repore with the Corps and I feel certain that if they felt there was some issue that the Corps would have they would have represented that to us at this point, they have not, but many of these projects, River Styx, that's a repair, widening of Black Bayou and its tributaries, those are extensions of existing, I appreciate that we would be moving more water into the Ouachita River but it's one of those things that it's not how the water will get there ultimately but that it would get there more quickly.

Commissioner Strain: Oh, I know, right.

Mr. Caldwell: To answer your question, no, we have not had direct contact with the Corps of Engineers but we believe that Tensas Levee Basin is sort of our conduit with the Corps because they are constantly in contact with the Corps, and they have been involved in all of our engineering discussions that we have had.

Commissioner Strain: Because this gets to the Atchafalaya, the Atchafalaya Basin and when you start looking at all of these different river systems, the Corps manages the water and to manage the water they have a plan, a written plan, in place and it's very specific and so the only thing that is that I would hope that someone is talking to them so we don't get six months out and there is an allocation of money and they say we can't move forward because we don't understand the effect on the basin or the effect on these river systems if there is a pulse of water.

Mr. Caldwell: Ms. Golden just reminded me, many of these projects were Corps projects, River Styx is a Corps project.

Commissioner Strain: I understand.

Mr. Caldwell: Anyway, we will take that into cognizance and we will check with the Tensas Levee Basin and have them try to open that line of communication to see if there is something we should do.

Commissioner Strain: Okay because we may end up getting more money to dredge parts of the Ouachita to get the water to the levee, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

Mr. Caldwell: The Corps is well aware of our issues with River Styx Pump Station, they have come out and looked at it, I mean they are well aware of the situation. They came during the flood, we had some issues with potential breaches at different points that they looked at to make sure that they were, so the Corps is aware of all of these situations, there is no question, as to an ongoing dialogue, no we don't have that with them at this point.

Commissioner Strain: I just wanted to suggest it.

Mr. Crosby: We appreciate you all taking the time to listen to us today. Again, I've got the larger maps if any of you all after the meeting want to look at any of it, I will stick around to answer any questions.

Mr. Durbin closed the flood for questions.

Mr. Durbin reverted back to his opening comments (item III. on the agenda)

Mr. Durbin: In tab 3 of your binders we have the Stafford Act update and we have Mr. Casey Tingle with us sitting here on the front row if anyone has any questions on that. Anybody on the task force have any questions? Okay. Upon the adjournment of this meeting, the Ouachita Parish Public Meeting on the March and August flooding will immediately begin but we will take a 5-minute recess upon conclusion of this task force meeting before the public meeting starts. That will be conducted by Mr. Pat Forbes. We are going to bring her up in a few moments, not yet, I'm concluding this. Moving forward, we are going to the Governor's Office update and we have here with us Ms. Julie Baxter Payer, she is the Deputy Chief of Staff, Communications/Legal/Special Projects. Thanks for coming.

V. GOVERNOR'S OFFICE UPDATE

~ Julie Baxter Payer, Deputy Chief of Staff, Communications/Legal/Special Projects

~ Casey Tingle, GOHSEP

Mr. Durbin: Mr. Casey Tingle sitting to your right. Bring that microphone closer, I'm having trouble listening to the comments from that table. Thank you.

Ms. Payer: Good morning. I bring greetings from the Governor to everyone here in Ouachita Parish and the surrounding areas in North Louisiana. I know he was here earlier this week for lunch with the Monroe Chamber and here in West Monroe and thank you very much for hosting him and he sends his greetings and his prayers and thoughts from he and Donna at this Christmas season. I want to first just reiterate that the Governor hears the pleas that we have heard today about the match money and about the concern for the infrastructure. The Governor has consistently said, since both events, March, and August, that he believes Louisiana's best force forward is to focus on resiliency and building our state back stronger on an overall regional, parish wide, crossing parish lines, basin wide basis so that we are making sure that we are building back smarter, not only on an individual home level but on a regional level. So, we hear you, the Governor is concerned about that and probably the biggest piece of news that we bring to you as a task force since the last time we met in Amite is the additional \$1.2B that was secured after much work by the Governor, 5 trips to Washington DC and bringing home this \$1.2B. It's not here in Louisiana yet, it has to go through the same sort of federal guidelines that this first \$438M was and please know, I want to be very clear for the people who are here in North Louisiana, that the initial appropriation, which came at unprecedented speed by the way, just two months after the August flooding, of \$438M and that is the tranche of money in which you are hearing the action plan details today, that is the tranche of money that you all as a task force have made some recommendations about, and then the \$1.2B that is coming in addition to that is all money that goes to both responses, to March and August. All of that money is going to be used for both of those responses, and I want to be very clear about that while we are here in North Louisiana as a task force. Now, the \$438M you recommended that \$406M go to homeowner assistance programs, \$20M to rental assistance programs, and \$12M to small businesses. So, that is what the public here in Ouachita Parish will be able to hear today in some of the details on the recommendations and that's what is in the action plan you can link onto at restore.la.gov. That is what I spoke to some of the folks in the crowd here today that are not just from Ouachita Parish, some of the surrounding areas have come in, thank you for being here and that is what we are taking questions on today. So, that is what we have repeatedly talked about and as Pat Forbes will give you more information on from the Office of Community Development, who is working on writing the plan. We expect to build a strong plan that we will be able to expand out to be able to use that \$1.2B, but I want to stress also that, and Pat can give more details on this, that the \$1.2B we expect we may bring to you recommendations that you would look at using some of that to help parishes with match, and so we know that there is a need there and we are doing our best to spread the money around but I also want to reiterate we are in the same quandary I heard Ouachita Parish talk about in such a heartfelt manner, how do you pick and choose what projects that you want to do with the limited amount of money that is available is not enough to stretch all the way around the need. The Governor believes that we need from the federal government \$3.7B and that is what he is asking for, so we will be back in the spring. We have the \$438M, we have the \$1.2B, we got some additional money, you heard Commissioner Strain talking about the NRCS money, the \$85M, we have \$114M for some infrastructure projects, \$34M for federal highway backlog funds that we can clear some backlog, so there are a few additional pots of money outside of the \$1.2B that were approved in the latest CR but again we are working to bring those home and again, we need much more than that. So, we are working with you, as parishes and municipalities, we understand that it is very difficult choice to decide on what to spend it on. I just want to leave you with a couple other pieces of news from the Governor's office and then introduce you to Casey Tingle who you heard introduced earlier to talk about the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, that is also a big piece of news that has come down in the last week. First of all, the Community Disaster Loan Program, since this task force met, at the request of the Governor, the Community Disaster Loan Program was approved for the areas that were affected between March 8th and April 8th, this is very, very important for local governmental entities, like school districts, fire departments, sheriff's departments, local municipalities, who have lost revenue. This is not for capital improvements or infrastructure, this is to help to literally keep the organizations afloat. I've been in meetings with fire departments who are struggling looking at a loss of budget revenue and this is the kind of program, a loan program, up to \$5M if you can show more than 5% of your revenue was lost as a result of the disaster, you can make these applications. I know Wayne Rickard is here and there are other people in FEMA who have already met with these entities, you can get in touch with GOHSEP and with FEMA to meet personally with them to find out how to apply if you are a local governmental entity that hasn't applied for that yet, but that is very important funding for just the operating budget of some of these local governmental entities. Just recently in the last week or so the proof of loss period for those who had flood insurance in the August flooding was extended an additional 60 days at the request of the Governor, so for

a total of 180 days from the date of loss that those homeowners now have to submit their signed, sworn proof of loss to insurers, so that was extended. Also, we just recently heard in the case of the August flooding that the TSA, Transitional Shelter Assistance, which is basically FEMA funded short-term hotel rooms has been extended through January 17th. I don't know if all of you know this but we have more than 1600 families who are still in FEMA funded hotels, and I did do a little checking to see if some are staying up here, originally, we had some staying in other states, we are now basically back to mostly Louisiana. We have about 10 families we are actually up in hotel rooms in the north and central regions of Louisiana, in Avoyelles, Rapides and Franklin Parish, so thank you for hosting those families, and we are working every day, these are very difficult cases in many cases to try to find permanent solutions, so that is something we will be dealing with in the 2017 new year that is quickly coming upon us. I want to just mention and then hand it over to Casey, the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program speaks directly to what I'm hearing talked about today, which is we've got to build back our infrastructure and our protections for our communities on a community wide, regional basis better than they were before the flood. The announcement about the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program went out from the Governor's Office today, this is federal money and this is money that can be used to help build back better and more resilient in terms of state and parish projects to help reduce losses from future disasters and that is what we want to do in Louisiana, is be smarter and stronger going forward. So, at this point I would like to hand it over to Casey Tingle with the Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness in the Housing.

Mr. Tingle: Good morning, Casey Tingle with Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness. As Julie mentioned earlier this week it was announced the allocation that the Governor would make relative to Hazard Mitigation Grant Program dollars for the March event, and so those allocations are published and pushed out to the parishes that were declared and interested in those funding's relative to the March event. Certainly, a couple of points, what has been a common theme so far today which is, it's not enough money. It's not enough money to meet the needs, it's not enough funding to make significant differences in all of the areas that need to be addressed. One of the challenges we have, particularly with the March event, were the wide geographic area that the flooding impacted within the state. So, we had 37 parishes that were declared in either IA or PA declarations by the President in the March event and \$26M in Hazard Mitigation Grant Program dollars to share. So, that is just a challenge. If you go back to something like Hurricane Isaac, which was a more recent significant funding for hazard mitigation, we had about 3x the dollars and a third of the parishes to allocate them between. So, that's not going to make anything better or make anything easier but it certainly is a recognition that that amount of funding shared amongst that number of parishes just puts everybody in a difficult situation to try and figure out how to do that, there are no easy ways to proceed. As mentioned, the funding does require a 25% match, so the funding that was announced was only the federal share of the funding, so the 25% match would be added to that for the total amount of funding to allocate to the parishes. As we proceed forward, we are going to be working with and listening to the parishes as they provide us feedback in terms of what types of projects they are interested in doing, whether they are still interested in the dollar amount that was submitted to them. Some of them may have identified initially a project that they wanted to do but it was a \$1M project and the allocation that came out was only \$2 or \$300K and so they would be put in a position of saying if we can't do that is there anything else that we could do, so certainly we recognize that some of them will have to make some difficult decisions there, and it may turn out that some of the parishes would not be able to utilize the funding that they were allocated and so we would go back as we get that information and address that as we move forward. The other variable that we have to continue to take into account is that FEMA can revise the amount of funding that comes to the state at the twelve month anniversary, so they will establish the exact amount of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program dollars in March for the March event, and where that puts us is we reserve \$3M of the \$26M as sort of a buffer in case that final estimate is lower than \$26M, so that if at all possible we don't have to go back to parishes and say we are going to have to revise your allocation downward. We reserve \$3M that we will work within the state, but it provides a buffer so that we don't have to go back and reduce allocations at the twelve-month timeframe. One of the challenges that we have had so far is that the estimate that we got at 30 days was \$32M and at six months it had dropped to \$26M, so that certainly left us in a different position as we began to address, we got that information in August, and in July and August is when we were preparing the initial allocation to go out to the parishes, so one of the questions is that you might have is, why now, why this late in the game are we pushing this information out. Well, we were working it in July and August, then the August flooding happened and then we got notified that we had lost \$6M of the funding amount, so we had to go back to the drawing board

and reassess at that point in time. So, those are some of the parameters that got us to where we are now, it is certainly our intent to work with parishes on a multi-jurisdictional level, just as we heard earlier, which is the absolute right approach because as all of us have heard time and time again, these needs don't stop where lines have been drawn by somebody else. So, as municipalities and parishes work together to identify where their needs are and what their strategies are to address those needs, we will be happy to work with them to do that. That gets back to the way that this funding works is that it all starts with a plan, so each parish has received funding or contracting support from GOHSEP to develop a multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation plan, so this process, from our perspective, really goes back to that plan and as all of those jurisdictions sit around the table and say where are our risks and then develop strategies related to those risks that again, from our perspective, we are really pushing hard to make sure that people are working together and we are not coming up with solutions that fix a problem in one area but creates a problem somewhere else. So, certainly from our perspective, is some of the things that we have worked on and some of the processes that goes into this. The kinds of projects that this funding can be utilized for are a lot of what you have already heard, so drainage protection, drainage improvement, the elevation or acquisition of flood prone residential properties are all eligible for utilization of the funding. The one thing about this funding that I want everyone to be aware of is that the projects themselves have to solve a problem, and they have to be cost effective. So, there has to be a cost benefit analysis that goes in to say for the dollars that goes into the project, are we avoiding an equal amount of greater losses through the life of the project, and so that is an area that sometimes we get bogged down in a little bit and it makes this funding more difficult because the idea can make perfect common sense but if we can't pull together the flood loss damages through NFIP or some other sort of modeling to show that the project is cost effective, that causes some problems in being able to utilize the funding quickly. The other thing about the funding is that certain types of projects take longer than other types of projects and so this is somewhat familiar to you as you've heard about the environmental reviews required of HUD CDBG funding, the FEMA funding requires similar types of work and so whenever you are working in water and doing drainage and flood protection type projects, you are going to be usually involving Corps of Engineer permitting or Corps of Engineers reviews, wetlands delineation and things like that, as well as from the FEMA side, the review of potential historical impacts, tribal perspectives, and so there is a process to go through that and so in some cases what makes perfect sense in one location, that location may have some other things going on that make the funding take a little bit longer in terms of executing. The good news is that post the Sandy Reform Act is that the federal government is required to work together in a unified way that relates to environmental work so that if there were other funding sources going into a project, that environmental review should be streamlined from the perspective of the federal government, not duplicating the same work multiple times just because the agency is different. So, we have seen some examples of how that has worked and the Corps has permitted and FEMA is able to utilize the data from that permit in terms of expediting their own review and so forth. So, we will certainly be looking to leverage all of those things as we move forward to try to expedite that type of review because it can be somewhat time consuming for these types of projects.

Mr. Durbin: For the committee, I'm looking at tab 7 of your binders, if you will go there with me, and I'm going to pose this one comment, before I get to you Representative Shadoin. At the bottom of that page, I don't know if you have that page with you Casey but since we are here in Ouachita Parish, it shows that under Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Ouachita Parish is allocated \$5,938,616, but right above that it gives some timelines. Can you go over those timelines?

Mr. Tingle: Sure.

Mr. Durbin: And that basically two sentence piece is very important for you to comment on.

Mr. Tingle: Okay. I'm not looking at specifically what you have but I can reference the timelines.

Mr. Durbin: Let me read it to you. The parishes will have until January 13, 2017 to confirm the projects scope and cost estimates to the state with project applications due on February 13, 2017. By March 13, 2017 the state will submit applications to FEMA. That's the point I want you to make.

Mr. Tingle: Sure, that's terrific. So, the first deadline there in January is really an internal process that GOHSEP put in place to be able to evaluate how likely or unlikely an entity is to utilize the funding. So, the better idea that we have of not specific, very deep detailed scope of exactly where and what is going to happen, but the more information we have about what the scope is and about what the initial cost estimate is, the better we are going to be able to expedite the process from that point forward. It will also allow us sort of an interim check for pretty quickly to say who is not going to be able to utilize the funding or who has some issues to utilize the funding wo

that we can begin to take stock of those parishes and potentially do something else with that funding if they are not able to utilize it. So, that's really the thought process behind the first timeline deadline, it's not intended to require parishes or municipalities to be working with their parishes to develop complete scope and complete locations and all of the engineering and that sort of thing, it's really just an interim check to make sure that we all are on the same page and understand the eligibility of the potential project, the area of the potential project, and about how much it is going to cost. The second deadline of February 13th is really where we are looking at more of the details, and I'll say this for everybody's benefit, we certainly anticipate some of the potential projects of needing longer than these deadlines to get this work done, so we would certainly anticipate at some point requesting an extension from FEMA for the March application deadline that we have to submit, but the more information that we have and the more applications that we get and the more that we can justify the fact that we are not just waiting on everything, but we are in fact progressing on some applications while others may take longer will better position the state to be able to request that extension from FEMA. We have not had issues in the past in working with our FEMA counter parts in terms of what that extension may look like. So, what this is really saying is that in a perfect system we will be able to identify the relatively strong, straight-forward projects that we could move along quickly and then isolate the ones that are little bit more complicated that may require an extension.

Mr. Durbin opened the floor for questions.

Representative Shadoin: I know that the most recent decision of FEMA is that the North Louisiana, or the parishes affected in the March 2016 flood, is still on the 75/25 split. I know that was appealed by the Governor, I know that he has tried to get all of Louisiana the 90/10. Is that issue dead for us, or do we still have any life on an appeal to get the 90/10?

Ms. Payer: Our appeal was denied.

Representative Shadoin: I knew that, but was that the final word?

Ms. Payer: At this point I don't know what further can be done to change that result, but anything that the Governor can do, he would. I mean we have appealed all the way to Fugate (sp?), head of FEMA in Washington and that's where we are. We have had several rounds of discussions, the Governor has personally met with him in Washington, DC and at this point we got the denial letter, I believe in the last week we received an additional letter confirming that it remains 75/25.

Representative Shadoin: Well, I knew he had gone to bat for all of Louisiana, but I didn't know that if in the appeal process if we had, one more.

Ms. Payer: I will check, and if we do, I can guarantee you we will try.

Representative Shadoin: I know he will.

Commissioner Strain: In reference to Representative Shadoin's question, sometimes these numbers are put in place and you have to meet specific targets and goals, now as with other things from FEMA, the final route is to have language put into a CR that overrides that, whether or not dealing with the loan forgiveness due or dealing with whatever the match is, and so if FEMA, under their rules or whichever entity cannot make that work, then the next is the CR. The next CR is in April, right, and that is the time that we can work to change that, because that language would be in the continuing resolution, and then also as we talk about the dire need for more money, many things have not been funded, the ag sector has not been funded, \$85M is through NCRS which requires matching money from those farmers who don't have any money to do this with, so that is why we have to go back and get additional dollars and also any of these issues that we need to specifically address, I think that is one mechanism to try to deal with them is in the next continuing resolution, which will probably be the method rather than a separate bill.

Ms. Payer: I think you are right Commissioner and the Governor is already working on that, that additional CR and we meet weekly and sometimes two or three times weekly with our congressional delegation. I would urge you when folks are talking to their congressman and congresswoman that that is also a very important source to express the need, because that is going to be where, we are roughly \$2B, I believe, short in what we think we need and so we are continuing to work, we work on that daily in the Governor's office, but I would make note of that to the public that we really need that additional funding to be approved by the congressional delegation.

Commissioner Strain: And on that CR, when they did the last CR they wanted it relatively quote clean, well, they did that and now we need a CR that is going to deal with all the issues. So, when they say well we want to have a clean CR, that's unacceptable. We cannot just kick this can down the road, hopefully that it is going to, because it's not going away. We have to deal with it.

Mr. Durbin closed the floor for questions.

VI. OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT UPDATE
~ Patrick Forbes, Executive Director, Office of Community Development

Mr. Forbes: Pat Forbes, I'm the Executive Director of the Louisiana Office of Community Development. I will say that you all should be thankful this morning because my presentation is uncharacteristically short. In fact, it comprises of slides that you have seen already I believe. This is the timeline as defined for our action plan for the appropriation we received in September, \$438M, this is the timeline as prescribed by HUD, and so this constitutes a maximum timeline, it says the most amount of time we have to develop and submit an action plan, the maximum amount of time that HUD has to review, respond or approve, and we put it in here just for context. This is the timeline that we are working on, right now you can see mid-December we did publish the action plan in English last Thursday, on the 8th. We published it Wednesday in its translated form and consequently that is the official publication date. HUD required a 14-day minimum comment period, so that we can get comments from folks, that's basically their only requirement. You, the task force, asked us to make sure that everybody got ample opportunity to make comments on the plan, consequently because our comment period fell right across the holidays we extended it a little bit and the end of that comment period will be January 3rd, almost an extra week added to the comment period because of the holidays. In addition to that, we have been doing what we call the Road Show around the state all this week and the first half of next week to give folks an opportunity, if they don't have internet access, if they don't read the paper, you name it, if they don't have access to the traditional sorts of resources that we generally think of, we wanted people to have an opportunity to come out and tell us in person and we were, as you can see, in Livingston Parish Monday night, Lafayette Tuesday night, Alexandria Wednesday night, actually Pineville I'm sorry, Shreveport last night, lovely facility mayor, and here today after this meeting we will hold another public comment period where we will go through the action plan and then next Monday and Tuesday in Baton Rouge and Ascension parishes. Those meetings have been going great, we have gotten some really great comments so far. Many of which I'm sure will be incorporated into the plan. Along those lines I want to go back to the timeline a little bit. The one thing that we leave in here on its regular time period is the two months allowed for HUD to review the action plan, because it is out of our control, but I want everyone to know that it's not completely out of our control, as we have said before we are working with HUD. We provided a draft of the action plan to HUD three weeks ago, they were actually in our offices on Wednesday reviewing the action plan with their checklist with us, so that when we submit it, we are already making some tweaks to the plan based on that meeting, when we submit it, we have every expectation that it will have every detail that HUD requires because we don't want to waste any time in having it come back for some technicality that we missed something. We fully expect to drive this two months to a shorter time but we obviously have little control over it once it goes up there. So, that puts us out into April having funds available if we stay on this timeline. The timeline that you don't see here is our process of putting a contractor in place to run the homeowner rehabilitation program for us and to run the other programs. The others will be a little bit shorter and easier but we are, as we speak, have staff working on the request for proposals that will do that and we have every intention of having that coincide with this timeline so that we can be ready to help folks whenever the money comes available.

Mr. Durbin opened the floor for questions.

Mr. Knapp: Pat, if you could, just explain the work that you have been doing with HUD to accelerate their review of it already and how that timeline will then match up with the contractor RFP. I think two meetings ago it looked like the timeline for a release of an RFP for the homeowner program management was going to be an early January, I think that was the discussion, then that was going to be the release of the RFP, kind of around the

timeline of how the action plan will be responding to public comment, and then going to HUD. How do you see those two timelines lining up? Do you think HUD, if they approve sooner you would have a contractor in place and program designs line up?

Mr. Forbes: It's entirely possible that we could do too good of a job of accelerating the action plan and not have the contractor in place.

Mr. Knapp: That's kind of the question I was asking.

Mr. Forbes: That's completely possible. Our only approach is to make each go as fast as we possibly can because one is going to wind up being the critical path and so quicker we can get both of them done, the better, so it is possible. I mean if we have done such a good job of educating HUD on the action plan that they turn around and approve it in two days, and I joked about this with them on Wednesday, then we are going to be sitting in the hot seat not having our contractor ready to go potentially. But, it doesn't matter, we are going to do each one as fast as we can because we have to get both done. The one thing we are considering is setting up some of the applicant's intake prior to having a contractor on board so that we can at least have that process going so that when the contractor gets on board some of the work that they would be doing is already done. It would not include setting up the housing assistance centers all over the state and that kind of thing but we could at least start the process of online, if you will, access beginning to express interest in the program.

Mayor Norris: We have gotten approved a plan for the first \$400M+, at the time that we had talked about that plan we were anticipating having somewhere between \$3 and \$4B. If we had known that we were not going to get approval for that amount, do you think we would have done that a little differently? In other words, would we have designed that program a little differently?

Mr. Forbes: I think that all along we have never really had an assumption that we would get \$3.7B and I also want to reiterate what Ms. Baxter Payer said is that we are not giving up on getting the \$3.7B yet either. We need it for a full recovery. Will the homeowner program look different if we have a total of \$1.7B, instead of \$3.7B? Absolutely. Would I recommend a change in this initial \$438M? I don't think that I would. I think that the priorities are right for that batch of funding and I think that now that we know we have an additional \$1.2B, and some portion of that you will discuss and decide to commit to a homeowner program, I think that will look a lot different. I would at least expect it to look a lot different than what we have in this first tranche of funds.

Dr. Richardson: Pat, in talking about the applicants and we talked about being online, do we know how many have access to online and are familiar with it and work with it well?

Mr. Forbes: I want to clarify that the only thing that I'm talking about for that is if we start as a state before we have a contractor in place, if we start an opportunity for people to express interest in the program, that will absolutely not be the only way that people can access the program. When we have the contractor in place, we will be doing call-outs, mail-outs, email-outs, to everyone on the individual assistance database. We will be going through churches, we will have volunteers walking through neighborhoods, we will be doing public service announcements, all of those things to tell people if you were impacted by these floods as a homeowner, please call us, write us, get online, what have you and tell us about your situation so we can determine if you are eligible. I only mean as, if in fact it looks like we are going to have the funds available before we can get the contractor in place, we may take some steps to at least start some initial intake and that would probably just be online, yes sir.

Dr. Richardson: Tell me, how successful the FEMA applications, those have been mostly online, correct?

Mr. Forbes: That's correct.

Dr. Richardson: And have they been successful, in terms of the large groups of people or not?

Mr. Forbes: It's getting, by disaster, it's getting more and more weighted by people registering online. I'd have to ask Mr. Tingle to confirm for them, but I know with the Shelter at Home program I know they had all those opportunities, all those different methods of expressing an interest in the program and the vast, vast majority of the applications that they got were online.

Dr. Richardson: Okay, well that's a very useful tool if everybody has access to it.

Mr. Forbes: It is, that's right, but we recognize that some of the most vulnerable communities in the state don't, by in large, have access to the internet and that's how we know we have to reach out in different ways to touch them.

Dr. Richardson: And can you compare what we get to what FEMA already has gotten? For example, our applications for assistance here, can they be tied in or connected to what the applications to what FEMA has already gotten for assistance programs?

Mr. Forbes: They are tied together in a couple of different ways, actually a few different ways. One is we are using FEMA's individual assistance database, just the aggregate data, to present to you everything practically that we have presented to you, in terms of understanding where the damages are, who had them, all that kind of information. We will use their database as an outreach tool because we know everybody that signed up for FEMA individual assistance may very well be an eligible applicant for our programs. So, those are the primary ways, the other way sort of gets in the weeds on duplication of benefits, when we start figuring out how much money we can give towards each homeowner's rehabilitation, we have to take FEMA's grants into account as duplications of benefits. So, we will definitely be accessing that database and have been for some time.

Mr. Forbes: Okay, I'm going to cover a couple of other topics. One, we had a resiliency symposium in Lafayette at the LITE Center last week and it was a fantastic success. We had over 200 people attend. The Governor came and spoke. I will say that the best represented parish in the state was Ouachita Parish. I really want to thank Mayor Norris and his team came up, as well as some other folks. We had a lot of good lessons learned and best practices presented there. We have heard nothing but positive comments about the value of the symposium and we are looking at the potential of having some of those in other places around the state now. This has been a great partnership between the state and the feds, through the National Disaster Recovery Framework. We have a lot of great working relationships with them now and this was an off sheet of that. Another product of that work, of the NDRF, is some modeling. Clearly the floods in March and August, these rain events pointed out for us very clearly that we have not only troubled watersheds across the state with respect to drainage and development but also probably not very well understood watersheds across the state, and so what we have been working on with the Corps, USDA, FEMA, several federal agencies, as well as DOTD, CPRA within the state, is beginning to look at some modeling for all of the watersheds across the state, including the Ouachita. I think this will be very valuable. I am going to use the list that we saw this morning and the conversation from Ouachita Parish to talk about that a little bit, clearly they understand their watershed better than anybody else, what they may not be able to determine is how all of those projects are going to affect each other. Which ones will have the most value for lowering the 100 year floodplain and that sort of thing, which is where we want to come in and produce the modeling which will allow every single watershed, across jurisdictional lines, to assess the projects they have been considering and assess some project types they may not have been considered before. So, we have some planning funds available to us. We're already starting that process through several different contracts that exist within the state to start some of that modeling now. The first basin that's rolling right now is the Amite River Basin because there has been so much work done on it in the past that we know of. What we also know is that every one of these other basins has had a great deal of study done that we may not be aware of. So one of the first pieces of this project will be what we'll call a gap analysis which is to figure out what the local folks know, pull all that together, start figuring out what we don't know, and then start to work on modeling the basins. We're also going to put some pieces together that help us all understand the value of different sorts of features that we might put in a watershed, whether it is reservoirs, levees or storage. Rain barrels on houses from top to bottom, large scale to small scale, so that we can start to model those things and then that will be a tool for folks at the watershed level to start making decisions about what's the best thing on that list to do because we're always going to be dealing with limited funds. I want to say how exciting it was to hear about the cooperation among all the entities in Ouachita Parish. That's going to be critical as we go forward on these watershed discussions. Not just within a parish of course but in entire watershed, so we're all going to be working on larger scales than some of us are used to and I am really excited about it. The one thing that has become perfectly clear to us from the Katrina/Rita storm surge modeling, CPRA storm surge modeling process is that we have to get the local folks involved at the point where we are now, when we're starting the modeling, so that when the product of the modeling comes out it will be understood, it will be acknowledged as valuable, and it will be a tool then for folks to use as we try to make those value decisions. I think that that is the end of my presentation, with one exception, I do want to say we will be doing a public meeting after this meeting to go over the action plan for folks who are here. Help make sure that everybody understands clearly what it is we are proposing. The big thing is the \$1.2B obviously. My team is hard at work again getting ready to come provide some information and data to you about where we go with the

next step, to your question Mayor Norris, and so at the next meeting we will begin to lay some preliminary things out for you, certainly do not expect to have recommendations but at least help you start to understand what some of those, for instance, what the match requirements are around the state, what sorts of infrastructure investments at least in terms of planning and modeling and that kind of thing might be required, so that you can at least start to have a feel for what that looks like. Certainly some of those infrastructure things, the long term resilience infrastructure investments, are going to be longer term and may be a little bit behind in the timeline but we will start to bring you some alternative approaches to investing the next tranche of funds, with an eye toward getting more money but understanding again this just like we did with the \$438M, this may be all we get.

Mr. Durbin opened the floor for questions.

Mr. Knapp: Pat, just thinking about the timeline for the first tranche of funding and the timeline for publishing an action plan for the second tranche of funding, it was about five weeks between when the appropriation was made and the Federal Register notice was published for the first tranche, assuming that is around the same, obviously this would be a crunch, the fastest you would be able to even publish an action plan amendment, presuming you can do so, around the \$1.2B would be mid to late January, if you are on the very fast cycle. That would be while HUD is still considering the first one. I'm trying to think through the timeline and I'm curious, if you or staff have been able to do so, whether the program opening for homeowners to participate can have both funds available by the time the contractor's launch a program, HUD has gone through this? It seems like it would be possible to imagine that it's not just the first \$438M of homeowner assistance but potentially an additional amount and so as we consider this work in the next two to four weeks a lot of that is going to be about how do you get both out at the same time.

Mr. Forbes: That's our goal.

Mr. Knapp: Please, could you speak a little bit to what that would look like in terms of when our task force needs to take action on the next advice on to the design of the action plan?

Mr. Forbes: Actually I am going to ask if I can give you that sort of timeline, I'm hesitant to take a guess at that timeline right now but at the next meeting we will be able to describe that for you but our goal is by the time we are spending the first \$400M on the housing program, we are going to have the other money either available or very close to available and that's the important thing to remember, we don't have to have it in the line of credit before we can be doing the intake and all that for the second tranche of funds. So, there are pieces that are really important and time consuming frankly, pieces in the front of the process that we can do without having money when we get the contractor in place, so I would expect that it's not because the funding followed by three months between those two appropriations. I wouldn't expect that the availability of funds for the housing program is going to be a three month gap, we are trying to make it a zero month gap. It may be a little bit of difference but as long we know the population we're working with through the action plan we will be able to start the important work of identifying people, establishing eligibility, and all that.

Mr. Knapp: And, just a couple of follow-up questions. One is a concern that we may need to know, in order to hit that fastest possible time and actually being making some decisions at our next meeting, in addition to talking about it, in order to move as quickly as we can for the second, so wanting to know that timeline is also are we expected that we really might even have to do that as soon as the next meeting to begin making some allocations. The second part of that is, we've talked now at a few of our meetings about the request for a change in the LMI requirement if there was a second appropriation, now that there is, can you speak to how that consideration is on the table and whether you think the homeowner assistance program is going to extent to more middle income families than the first 70/30 split could?

Mr. Forbes: Yes, it's certainly our expectation that this \$1.2B is going to provide us the opportunity to reach a lot of different types of families. We have had conversations, certainly you have all seen those data slices that we showed you before and some 10,000 low to moderate income that fit all those criteria. I'm not saying that would be the same set of criteria that we would come back to and just say that that just gets bigger. There are some interesting proposals out and we're talking with HUD right now about some alternative approaches that might allow us to reach even more people. We're going to bring you information that helps you guys look at populations besides low to moderate income.

Representative Shadoin: Thank you, Mr. Forbes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Pat, you mentioned earlier in your remarks about the request for proposals. Can you give us an update on where we are with those and where we stand?

Mr. Forbes: Certainly. We are continuing to work on the RFP language and we are doing something that we can't find an example of, so it might be the first time that this is done but we think it's going to provide us opportunity to save a lot of money on program delivery. We are working through the language of how to do that, and we are hoping to publish sometime early mid-January or before. At the request of Mr. Bradberry, we will be presenting information on that to the task force before we do that.

Representative Shadoin: Good. One other question, concerning the watershed model, is that going to be associated with a master plan for the watershed? If I have learned anything today, it's that everything is connected.

Mr. Forbes: its whole purpose will be to provide the jurisdictions in that watershed to do a masterplan that is informed by the model. All the model does is give us a tool to be able to make good decisions, but then the plan that the folks in that watershed will come up with can be plugged into the tool to see what the impacts are and then make sure your plan is the most cost effective. So, yes sir, it would be just a tool to allow folks in the watershed to then develop their plan.

Mr. Durbin closed the floor for questions.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Police Juror Pat Moore
Ouachita Parish Police Jury, District F
Commented on the flooding event and the impacts in District F.
- Larry J. Head
NELA Long Term Recovery Group
Commented on the recovery group and the services offered during and still now after the flooding disaster.
- Earl Davis
ICNA Relief USA
Commented on the organization, services offered and volunteer group's needs.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Durbin: Moving on to other business on the agenda. The next Restore Louisiana Task Force meeting will be held on Friday, January 6, 2017. I just received confirmation from Livingston Parish President Ricks that Livingston Parish will host the meeting in their council chambers. Also, members please remember to leave your binders so they can be updated for our next meeting. A quick reminder that the public meeting will begin upon the adjournment of this task force meeting after a quick 5-10 minute recess.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Durbin: To adjourn is in order.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:52 A.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jimmy Durbin
Co-Chair of the Restore Louisiana Task Force

Date Approved: January 20, 2017

LD