The meeting began with introductions from Jennifer Gerbasi, Recovery Planner and presenter. Participants were asked to please sign in. We thanked our hosts the Office of Emergency Preparedness for, again, allowing us to use their state of the art facility for our meetings. The presenter then recognized that in response to requests from the Steering Committee, we would have this day presentations from Senator Reggie Dupre regarding the levee system and remaining vulnerabilities, and from Stuart Brown of CPRA discussing the Coastal Master Plan and ongoing or projected projects that are actually moving forward to protect the Barrier Islands and the coastlines affecting Terrebonne Parish.

As the first order of business, discussion of the Meeting Notes was invited, which was tabled until the next meeting.

By way of review for those that weren’t at the first meeting, the presenter discussed the process and the step in the process that was the subject of the meeting and recapped the events of the public meeting. There was a very brief discussion about the sediment transfer and the GIWW bypass (see Public Meeting 1 notes for full discussion).

The presenter then gave a brief account of the meeting held November 14th for the Repetitive Loss Area Analysis for the Bayou Black area. Approximately 20 people and 2 members of the Press were present. Mr. Carl Harding, aspiring to be the next Council Member, was present and provided feedback. A full report will be available within the period of drafting the HMPU.

At this time, the presenter turned the floor over to Stuart Brown, who provided a background on the CPRA and the Coastal Master Plan. The Plan itself is not a funding mechanism per se, but is a plan for how we might expend funds available through any source. The presentation itself is available on the HMPU TPCG website, and will not be summarized here. He invited the group to submit public comments on the plan.

S. Reggie Dupre then used a google earth projection of the Parish to discuss the MTTG footprint, and its funding through state and local means without the Federal government, and other projects that had been discussed. As the Levee Director, he sees it as his mission to make the Hazard Mitigation Plan unnecessary due to the reduction in risk. Smaller targets can have a big impact, and he proceeded to list some additional to the multiple lines of defense that could reduce residual risk. For an example, he stated that the J-2 levee was only feet, so it overtopped for the 9’ surge of Barry, but the 6’ levee behind it had no wave action hitting it and held. MTTG consists at this time of some height for 70 of the 90 miles
between Terrebonne and Lafourche. The marsh behind is freshening, and over 30,000 trees have been planted to take advantage of this and increase the habitat and wind break from these installations. We should focus on “betterment” of our current system. The lock system was provided as an example of this as current floodgates are transitioned into locks so that boat traffic can always get through without salt water intrusion.

**Level of Protection**

Reconvening, the presenter went over the preliminary damage results from HAZUS and indicated that the Parish was seeking new data for a more accurate run. The Committee would like to see runs for multiple events from 10 through 500 year.

**Project Discussion to respond to the problems, vulnerabilities**

The presenter quickly reminded the group of the goals and the objectives that were identified for the last plan and invited an update for those as circumstances have changed.

In general, it was agreed that with the levee system at its current level, specific critical facilities and targeted projects would best serve the Parish, particularly without the Flood Insurance Study or maps from the LAMP process to assess the current risk profile accurately. Oneil Marlborough requested that targets such as hospitals, the airport, and other critical facilities be modeled specifically to identify residual hazards. The Parish currently doesn't have the capacity or funding for small models of existing projects, or proposed.

Chris Pulaski suggested finding a way to provide additional flood insurance payments to help people be resilient through claims and meeting prerequisites for the mitigation programs. Oneil Marlborough asked about whether we had data on how much flood insurance has gone up for individuals, and we do not have that data.

Continuing the discussion on flood insurance, it is sometimes unaffordable, and people try to sell their homes to move outside the SFHA. People expressed concern with a lack of affordable housing, and a significant reduction in perceived value in the floodplain. The presenter discussed an initiative to support appraisers in recognizing the value in an elevated structure in the floodplain, v. assuming all structures in the floodplain are unsafe.

We wrapped up with a quick discussion of typical and the BRIC mitigation options, and each member of the committee was invited to bring in a list of 10 projects that they believe would provide risk reduction to the Parish. This could include anything from the adoption of a higher standard like that discussed as a potential additional goal, or aspirational achievements that we should shoot for. These would be reviewed for cost effectiveness and feasibility among other criterion.

The meeting was adjourned.