



USACE Partnered Studies Local Lead Example - Hunting Bayou

SWG Stakeholder Partnering Forum
Galveston, Texas
March 3, 2016

Steve Fitzgerald, P.E.
Chief Engineer

Active Federal Flood Damage Reduction Projects GREENS WHITE DAK HALLS BUFFALO LEGEND PERMANENT WATER BRAYS 1% (100 YEAR) FLOODPLAIN LIMITS (LOWR FEMA FLOODPLAINS) CHANNEL NETWORK CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WATERSHED BOUNDARY EXISTING CORPS LEAD PROJECT WATERSHEDS EXISTING SECTION 211(f) PROJECT WATERSHEDS CLEAR CREEK March 2015 | Washington, D.C.

Hunting Bayou Section 211(f) Federal Flood Damage Reduction Project





Hunting Bayou Study

- Local lead WRDA 1996, Section 211
- Began study in 1998; Completed in 2014 (Corps lead Clear Creek study 1998-2010)
- 16 years! Multiple reasons. HCFCD chose to begin implementation in 2006
- Structures in 1% floodplain 5,100 to 650
- Cost \$165M. BCR 2.02(3.375%) & 1.01(7.0%)
- Economically disadvantaged & vulnerable population



What We Like

- Fundamental planning process is good
- Most analytical tools are technically sound and useful
- Documentation & scientific thoroughness
- Without project condition data and information useful for other purposes
- Building relationships with Corps



What Do We Want

Identify a recommended Corps plan that is -

- effective in flood risk reduction
- compatible with land and natural resources
- compatible with regional watershed plans
- acceptable to local communities
- fiscally responsible
- in less than four years

Corps plan most likely a part of regional plan



People

- Local sponsors don't understand Corps process, complexity, or time it takes
- Some Corps staff lack expertise, knowledge of process, resources, or motivation
- Sometimes, the District, Division, and HQ not on the same page



Categories

Four Primary Problem Areas

- Process Itself
- Written Guidance
- People
- Funding

Leads to increase in time, cost, and frustration



Process Itself

- Learn, use, and trust planning fundamentals
- Simplify process and reduce number of steps
- Include local sponsor as much as possible in process including performing some of the work
- Set hard deadlines



Written Guidance

- Insist on updated guidance documents that are clear, concise, and complete
- Find and share examples and sample reports
- Insist that new guidance not delay studies underway or nearing completion
- Do not hesitate to amend authorities or refine policies, if necessary



People

- All team members be realistic and honest throughout study
- Include non-Federal sponsor in decision making at all levels
- Insist on a knowledgeable, experienced, and enthusiastic study leader
- Establish and commit to SMART Planning at all levels



Funding

- Provide sufficient federal funds when it's needed
- Provide additional funding to enable Corps
 Headquarters and SWD staff to actively
 support SWG and non-Federal sponsor
 during all phases of the study
- Complete study in less than four years



SMART Planning

- Feb. 8, 2012 Memo "Civil Works Feasibility Study Program Execution and Delivery" – Absolutely incredible!
- Directly addresses two problem areas –
 "Process Itself" and "People"
- Indirectly addresses "Funding"
- Does not address "Written Guidance"

It Takes A Lot Of Teamwork









Non-Federal Sponsors

