Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority – West (SLFPA-W)

Technical, Operations, and Maintenance Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 22, 2012

The Technical, Operations, and Maintenance Committee of the SLFPA-W met on February 22, 2012 with the following members present: Mr. Wilkinson, chairman, Mr. Morgan, and Mr. Viera. Also in attendance were: Mr. Spencer representing SLFPA-E, Mr. Miserendino, Mr. Roark, and representatives from OCPR and CPRA.

Mr. Wilkinson called the meeting to order at the SLFPA-W Office, 7001 River Road, Marrero, Louisiana, at approximately 8:30 am. The Committee immediately went to visit Project WBV 24. The Committee reconvened at the SLFPA-W Office at 9:55 am to discuss their findings and the rest of the agenda.

The Committee unanimously approved the agenda as presented.

There were no comments from the public.

**Issue #1: Durability of Scour Protection**

Mr. Miserendino began the discussion of the comments by requesting information on the first issue, Durability of Scour Protection. Mr. McMenis mentioned that the NFS would like to know how much vertical settlement in the scour protection would be allowed before the loss of embankment becomes detrimental to the stability of the floodwall and also requested reference to the study mentioned in the White Paper that allows ¼” cracks in a “monitor” remedial action. Mr. McMenis addressed the NFS’ concerns about the warranty period, requesting that the warranty period, typically one year, cover workmanship, materials, and repairs for unexpected cracking.

Under the issue of the durability of scour protection, the NFS also requested further clarification on what would be considered “excessive anticipated settlement” and asked that construction phrases used in the report match up with pre-turnover terminology.

Mr. Miserendino then asked the Committee for solutions on the problems of vertical and horizontal displacement. After some discussion, the Committee agreed that CPRA will provide a decision matrix on repairs and replacement of scour protection.

Mr. Miserendino moved on to the comment related to saw cutting, stating that the NFS believes that saw cutting should be used whenever crack repairs are made to a slab that has experienced a severe crack near the edge of the slab, with the smaller part being removed and replaced with new concrete.

Mr. Miserendino discussed the NFS comment related to the problems of vertical and horizontal cracks in slope pavement, asking for clarification on points such as whether the injection system would be used for both vertical and horizontal surfaces and an official definition of what constitutes “excessive cracking.” The NFS’ comment further states that, prior to remedial actions on these crack repairs, the Corps shall first document specific crack measures such as crack span, presence of differential settlement, crack spanning multiple panels, crack spanning contraction joints, etc. and formally identify the most likely cause of the concrete failure. If the cause is something that will persist over time and contribute to further deterioration, a full and complete replacement of the area is required.

**Issue #2: Vertical Cracks in Floodwalls**

Mr. Miserendino referred the Committee to the crack measurement methodology referenced in the White Paper and pointed out that the system of averaging cracks was potentially harmful. For example, a crack with a width of 0.016” two feet from the bottom, 0.012” four feet from the bottom, and 0.011” six feet from the bottom will average 0.013”, but this measurement does not take into account that the crack is widest at the point that will most likely experience water intrusion. This methodology also provides different deviation for walls of different heights. Mr. Miserendino requested that the Corps provide an ACI standard for crack measurements.

Mr. Roark moved on to the NFS comment on the White Paper related to the statement that it is not advisable to initiate repairs if there are only 5 cracks out of 5,000 LF of floodwall, stating that cracks in the floodwall presented a risk regardless of how many there are. Mr. Miserendino stated that he wants a signed Engineer’s Report stating that the area of concern is structurally sound and safe. The Committee decided to recommend implementing a testing method for through cracks. The NFS also requested a clear statement from the USACE on the likely source and consequences of the monolith cracks which extend continuously on both sides and over the tops of the monoliths. After further discussion, the Committee agreed that all visible cracks need to be sealed, with the method of sealing left open for discussion at a later date.

**Issue #3: Elevation Deficiencies in Pile Founded T-Walls**

There were no comments relating specifically to elevation deficiencies in pile founded t-walls. On the issue of the proposed repairs, the Committee requested that they be provided with a formal field report on any repairs performed.

**Issue #4: Deficient Elevations of Uncapped Sheet Pile I-Walls**

Mr. Roark began the discussion of the issue of uncapped sheet pile, stating that the NFS will send a letter requesting that all sheet pile height deficiencies be corrected. After some discussion, the Committee decided they would like more information than the White Paper provides on these issues, such as elevation on transition I-walls and overdriven sheet pile list, and stated that they would meet again to discuss these points at a later date.

**Issues #5: Vehicular Floodgate Seal Settings**

Mr. Roark moved on to the issue of the vehicular floodgate seal and expressed concern that gaps between the seal and seal plates would lead to expensive repairs and avoidable replacements of the floodgate seal.

**Issue #6: Vehicular Floodgate Paint Deficiencies**

Mr. Miserendino led a discussion on vehicular floodgate paint deficiencies and stated that rust concerns needed to be added to the list. He further stated that the NFS would like to be provided with the qualifications of the Coating Inspector who was responsible for these projects and requested more information on the unaided visual inspection of the finished coat, such as what time it will be performed and whether the NFS concerns would be considered during the inspection.

**Issue #7: Swing Gate Nuts/Bolts**

There were no comments on the issue of swing gate nuts and bolts in the White Paper.

**Issue #8: Start/Completion of Warranty Period & Overall Comments**

Overall additions to the comments on the White Paper include Mr. McMenis’ concerns about clarifying at what point the warranty on the walls goes into effect.

There were no other matters of discussion.

Mr. Wilkinson announced that the next regularly scheduled Committee meeting will be held on Monday, February 27, 2012 at 3:00 pm in the Commissioners’ meeting room at the SLFPA-W Office, 7001 River Road, Marrero, Louisiana.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 1:35 pm.