



After Action Review

What Went Right?

- Widespread support due to extensive and continuous **collaboration** with agencies and stakeholders
- Use of new technologies in public involvement
- **Sponsor support** for the program
- Congressional commitment to study (all funds up front)
- **Vertical team involvement**
- Use of experts throughout the Corps
- ERDC support; use of ADCIRC and other modeling tools
- Team dedicated to support MsCIP
- **Federal and state agency participation** in drafting plans
- Federal and Regional Principals meetings
- Participation of HUD & FHWA in development of HARP
- Coordination with FEMA on State boundary water level issues



After Action Review

What were the challenges?

- Development of **Risk** based planning **methodology**
- Use of the Risk Informed Decision Framework / Multicriteria Decision Analysis
- Justification of “**Cost Effective**” projects in lieu of NED benefits
- **Regional effects** (cross state boundaries) of Corps recommendations
- **Managing change** during the study process



SAD Lessons Learned

- *There is Real Value in Agency Partnering;*
- *Risk-Based Planning can Lead to Better Outcomes;*
- *Expanded Public Involvement Led to:*
 - *Realistic Expectations*
 - *Better Educated Public and Agency Staff*
 - *Better Plans Formulated and Recommended*