

**MINUTES OF
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA FLOOD PROTECTION AUTHORITY-EAST
OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON JULY 19, 2018**

PRESENT: Herbert I. Miller, Chair
Mark L. Morgan, Committee Member
Herbert T. Weysham, III, Committee Member

The Operations Committee of the Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority-East (Authority or FPA) met on July 19, 2018, in the Franklin Avenue Administrative Complex, Meeting Room 201, 6920 Franklin Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana. Mr. Miller called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Opening Comments: Mr. Miller welcomed Mr. Weysham to the Operations Committee.

Adoption of Agenda: The agenda was adopted by the Committee.

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the June 14, 2018, Operations Committee meeting were approved.

Public Comments: None.

New Business:

A. Public Hearing: A presentation to the public of the recently completed *Web-Based Permitting Software Management System* by Vinformatix.

Roger Colwell, I.T. Geographic Project Supervisor, explained that after coordination with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding managers, the FPA successfully advertised for proposals, reviewed submittals, conducted interviews and selected Vinformatix for the development of the Web-Based Permitting Software Management System. The FPA has been very pleased with the professionalism demonstrated by Vinformatix and with the quality of the product. He introduced GG Mumfrey, Director of Accounts for Vinformatix, who served as the Project Manager.

Ms. Mumfrey proceeded with the presentation on the Web-Based Permitting Software Management System. She first walked through a high level flow or overview of the process. An Applicant or Agent must register for an account and indicate whether he/she is an Applicant or Agent. The Applicant or Agent is sent an email with login information and he/she can then login the system to complete and submit the permit application. Email notifications are sent throughout the process as actions are taken, including submittal of the application. The third party reviewers [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)] are the first users to review the application and take action. Once all third party reviewers are in

agreement as to the status of the application, the Permitting Office reviews and takes action on the application. The Applicant or Agent is then notified and must sign the final application. The Permitting Office then provides final approval and the permit, along with any attachments, are available within the system for the Applicant or Agent to download. The Applicant or Agent must notify the Permitting Office when the project has been completed. The permit is valid for one year after its approval. Permits are marked “completed” when notified by the Applicant or Agent.

Ms. Mumfrey reviewed the system’s user types (i.e., Applicant/Agent, USACE, CPRA and Permitting Office) and the detailed steps involved in the process.

- The Applicant or Agent can create an account/profile or login the system with a previously created account/profile. The individual must indicate whether he/she is an Applicant or Agent. Once registered, the Applicant or Agent is sent an email notification with a temporary password and link to login the site to begin the permitting process.
- The first step in the application process requires the Applicant or Agent to provide the coordinates of the project in order to determine whether or not a permit is needed. The system will inform the Applicant or Agent whether or not a permit is required based on the coordinates (latitude and longitude). If a permit is not required, the individual can exit the system. If a permit is required, the individual is taken to the actual application.
- A progress bar on the side of the screen walks the Applicant/Agent through each step of the process and provides instructions and the anticipated timeframe for the process. Should an individual log off the system, the information that is input into the system thus far is saved and he/she can login the system at a later time and continue. The Applicant/Agent can also cancel the application at any point before it is actually submitted. If the application is submitted by an Agent, he/she will be required along the process to provide the Applicant’s information, including email address, and at that point an email is sent to the Applicant and the Applicant is required to login the system to authorize the Agent to act on behalf of the Applicant. The Agent can then continue with the application process on behalf of the Applicant.
- Space is provided at the end of the application for an electronic signature and payment is collected at this point. Payment can be made by check or credit card. The fee is determined based on the type of Applicant selected (e.g., residential, commercial or non-profit). No fee is charged for governmental entities.
- The third party reviewers (CPRA and USACE) and the Permitting Office are notified of the application’s submission. Actions are available to third party reviewers by clicking on the “Take Action” button and include approve, deny, not needed, request more information from Applicant/Agent and comments. The Applicant is notified by email of actions taken. Third party reviewers are automatically emailed reminders if action has not been taken within a given period of time.

- After the third party reviewers have taken all required actions, the application goes to the Permitting Office for review and action. Available actions include deny (if no previous reviewer denied the application), not needed, request more information from Applicant/Agent, comments and change Applicant type.
- Once the Permitting Office takes all actions that are needed, the application goes back to the Applicant or Agent for final signature signifying agreement to abide by all stipulations and provisions of the permit, and options are made available for uploading documents and adding comments. Hold harmless agreements for all three levee districts are made available and the Applicant or Agent can download the appropriate hold harmless agreement, have the document signed by the contractor, upload the executed document into the system and attach it to the application.
- After the application is signed by the Applicant or Agent, it is returned to the Permitting Office for final approval and signature. The permit, along with all attachments, is then made available in the system for the Applicant or Agent to download. The permit expires one year after the final approval date. Applicants are required to inform the Permitting Office when a project is completed so that the permit can be marked "completed".

Ms. Mumfrey reviewed the system's available administrative actions:

1. View all applications in list or map view (based on coordinates)
2. Manage system users
3. View and refund credit card payments
4. Manage historic permits
5. View application analytics

Ms. Mumfrey reviewed potential future enhancements that have been discussed as part of a possible Phase Two of the software development:

1. Ability to assign applications to agencies and/or individuals
2. Email approved applications and attachments to agencies, in lieu of having the Agencies login the system to download
3. Add a final checklist for the Permitting Office to review before final approval
4. Ability for Applicants and Agents to request permit extensions
5. Ability for Applicants to authorize Agents for a period of time
6. Ability to export latitude / longitude coordinates for inspections
7. Ability for Applicants and Agents to pay by check *and* credit card (in the event the fee is split between the two different payment methods)
8. Ability for Contractors to login and sign the hold harmless (adds another User to the system)

9. Color code federal vs. other district lines on the map view
10. Merge historical permits with current permits.

Mr. Morgan asked about conditional approvals. Mr. Colwell responded that the approved permit lists any conditions or stipulations.

Mr. Weysham asked is an Applicant or Agent sent an email from the Permitting Office with the reason if a permit is denied. Derek Boese, Chief Administrative Officer, explained he did not recall a situation where a permit has been denied. Typically, there may be requests for additional information and eventually a permit is issued, possibly with very strict stipulations. Work may temporarily be stopped during a high river event, and the USACE may or may not grant a waiver to allow work to continue when the river level reaches a certain height.

Mr. Miller asked could an Agent submit a letter of authorization from the Applicant at the beginning of the process in lieu of the requirement for the Applicant's signature later in the process. Ms. Mumfrey explained that currently the software system requires a signature from the Applicant. A discussion would be needed before making any changes to the software to allow the submission of letter in order to ensure the appropriate safeguards and the accuracy of the document that is uploaded.

Mr. Miller asked would the approved permits be tied into the FPA's GIS. Mr. Colwell explained that this feature would be part of Phase Two, since it did not fit into the scope of work based on the CDBG funding limits.

Mr. Miller inquired about permit extensions. Ms. Mumfrey advised that extensions are not part of the system at this time; however, this feature is planned in Phase Two.

Mr. Miller inquired about the ability of the public to view permits. Ms. Mumfrey explained that only registered Applicants and Agents are able to login the permitting software system and view permit applications. Mr. Miller asked would permits be available for the public to review after they are tied into the FPA's GIS. Mr. Colwell responded that the permits could be made available in the FPA's GIS.

Mr. Miller asked about the funding and schedule for Phase Two of the software development. Mr. Colwell explained that a meeting will be held soon on Phase Two. The list of potential items will be prioritized. Mr. Boese advised that, in order to avoid the lag that would occur while attempting to locate and obtain grant funding, the FPA would self-fund the next phase of the software development. He pointed out that feedback from the Applicants' side should be solicited and considered prior to implementing Phase Two. The scoping process could start immediately; however, Phase Two would probably not be implemented for a month or two.

Mr. Miller asked whether any member of the public had a question or wished to comment. There was no one from the public with a question or who wished to provide a comment.

B. Discussion of a proposed a one-year extension of the ID-IQ Contracts expiring on August 31, 2018 for Professional Civil, Coastal, Geotechnical and Hydraulic Engineering Services, Inspection Services and Surveying Services, and authorization to advertise and issue Requests for Qualifications for Professional Construction Management/Inspection Services and Facility Management Services to be provided on an ID-IQ basis.

Mr. Boese explained that the series of Indefinite Delivery-Indefinite Quantity (ID-IQ) contracts initiated approximately two years ago will expire on August 31, 2018; however, the contracts have a one-year renewal option. The maximum contract value for a majority of the contracts, with the exception of contract management, have sufficient remaining capacity for a one-year extension. He recommended that the Board exercise the one-year renewal option for all of the current ID-IQ contracts for Civil, Coastal, Hydraulic and Geotechnical Engineering Services, and Inspection and Surveying. The extension would be for time only with no increase in the maximum contract value. He also requested that the Board approve the advertisement and issuance of Requests for Qualifications (RFQ) for Professional Construction Management/Inspection Services and Facility Management Services. The resulting ID-IQ contracts are anticipated to be in place by January 1, 2019, and have a maximum contract value of \$1 million. The advertisement and issuance of the two RFQs at this time allows the FPA to begin staggering future RFQs for professional services on an ID-IQ basis.

Mr. Boese further explained that the FPA requires a number of specialty services related to buildings and facilities (e.g., safety, fire inspection, electrical/HVAC) that are currently tasked under the ID-IQ contracts for Civil Engineering Services. ID-IQ contracts for Facility Management Services would allow the FPA to task projects directly to the firms providing the services instead of going through a civil engineering firm. The FPA's goal is to develop a pool of specialty consultants.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Board exercise the one-year renewal option for the current ID-IQ contracts and approve the advertisement and issuance of RFQs for Construction Management/Inspection Services and Facility Management Services.

C. Discussion of the proposed award and execution of a contract with Conhagen, Inc., in the amount of \$1,263,000.00, for the Pump Station 6 and Pump Station 7 Repair Project.

Gerry Gillen, Director of Operations, advised that four bids were received and opened on June 21st for the Lake Borgne Basin Levee District (LBBLD) Pump Station 6 and Pump Station 7 Repair Project. The proposed repairs are to be funded through a FEMA Katrina grant. He stated that he is working with FEMA to revise the documentation so that the repairs will be funded 100 percent by the grant.

Mr. Miller commented that the four bids range from \$1,263,000 to \$1,915,000. Mr. Gillen advised that the lowest bidder's documentation is in order and that the engineer's estimate is \$1.3 million.

Mr. Morgan inquired about the status of the repairs should the pump stations become the property of St. Bernard Parish. Mr. Gillen responded that the FPA would like to complete the repairs prior to the turnover of the pumping and drainage system on January 1st.

Mr. Boese advised that FEMA had questions about covering the entire cost of the repairs. If FEMA does not approve a revised version of the Project Worksheet (PW) for the project in order to cover the entire cost of the pump station repairs, then the contract will not be executed due to the current financial status of the LBBLD. FEMA has been pushing to move along and close out the PWs for work resulting from Hurricane Katrina; therefore, he anticipated a quick resolution of the FEMA issues.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Board approve the award of the contract for Pump Station 6 and Pump Station 7 Repairs to Conhagen, Inc.

There was no further business; therefore, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.