



**LOUISIANA STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETINGS – ROUND ONE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ENHANCEMENT
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**

*March 20, 2013 • 9:00AM to 12:00PM
LA DOTD, Baton Rouge, LA*

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
Advisory Council Members		
Amdal	Jim	UNO Transportation Institute
Elam	Ed	Burk-Kleinpeter, Inc.
Horton	Val	LA DOTD
Lavigne	Donna	LA DOTD
Marousek	Kim	St. Charles Parish Planning Department
McPherson	Nancy	AARP
Mitchell	Mike	Lafayette Consolidated Government
Parsons	Brian	LA DOTD
Reneau	Lori	Monroe Chamber of Commerce
Rogers (Chair)	Kent	Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments
Strohschein	Lacy	Center for Planning Excellence
Wills	Ann	LA DOTD
Other Attendees		
Kalivoda	Eric	LA DOTD
Romeo	Robin	LA DOTD
Decker	Dennis	LA DOTD
Sholmire	Dawn	LA DOTD
Horne	Michelle	LA DOTD
Stringfellow	Mary	FHWA
Buckner	Brandon	FHWA
Goodin (Facilitator)	Krista	Fenstermaker
Babineaux	Butch	CDM Smith
Bucklew	Keith	CDM Smith
Nagura	Mikeila	Fenstermaker

PURPOSE

The purpose of the First Round of Advisory Council meetings was to give the Advisory Councils a briefing on the status of the Plan update and to allow each Council to discuss issues regarding their mode. Attendees also received the Draft Vision, Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures to review and provide feedback, as well as the previous Policy Recommendations to consider for the next round of meetings.

Note: This meeting summary is a compilation of the input received from the advisory council members and accurately reflects the views expressed.

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Opening PowerPoint Presentation
- Community Development and Enhancement Advisory Council PowerPoint Presentation
- Initial Community Development and Enhancement Issues
- Draft Vision, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures
- Surface Passenger and Bicycle/Pedestrian Recommendations from 2008 Review and Status Report

MEETING SUMMARY

Opening Session

In the opening session, the Aviation Advisory Council and the Community Development and Enhancement Advisory Council members heard information about the status of the plan and an initial overview of conditions and issues, presented by Don Vary of CDM Smith. Highlights included:

- Plan Status
 - Draft vision, goals, objectives, and performance measures based on input from DOTD leadership interviews, state legislator questionnaire, public telephone survey, and a visioning workshop as well as initial technical analyses of conditions
 - Round One Advisory Council meetings are focusing on issues and a review of the vision, goals, objectives, and performance measures
 - Plan completion scheduled for mid-2014
- Initial Overview of Issues
 - Overall Issues, regardless of mode include:
 - Asset Management: maintaining what exists in good condition
 - Mobility: to support and encourage economic growth and quality of life
 - Governance: more cooperation and collaboration, especially relative to land use and transportation
 - Safety: developing programs and practices that deal with changing times – more elderly, more trucks, etc.
 - Revenue: developing sustainable funding options
 - The individual Advisory Councils will be discussing issues related to their particular mode/topic area

Community Development and Enhancement Advisory Council Meeting

The agenda for the breakout Community Development and Enhancement Advisory Council meeting included:

- Introductions/Opening Remarks
- Community Development and Enhancement Issue Discussion
- Review of Vision, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures
- Handout of Previous Plan Policy Recommendations

A copy of all materials will be posted on the web along with these meeting notes.

Introductions/Opening Remarks

Krista Goodin, Fenstermaker, introduced the Chair, Kent Rogers, and then there were self-introductions by all attendees.

Issues Discussion

An initial list of community development and enhancement issues was developed to guide discussion by the group on key issues that should be addressed. This initial list included:

- Aging Population and Other Issues
- Land Use/Community Character
- Planning Tools/Functions
- Transit Investments

The following are key points noted during the group discussion.

- Aging Population
 - Aging population numbers are important nationally, not just in Louisiana; we're a part of a larger system and need to address aging in place for overall quality in the state and in the nation.
 - We should be concerned with mobility for persons with disabilities as well as the aging population.
 - Retirement communities in northern Louisiana are located on the periphery of cities and not included in the transit system.
 - There is a need for infrastructure for non-motorized transportation, including sidewalks and bike facilities.
 - There is a funding issue
 - Goals and performance measures need to be built out more specifically.
 - Human services transportation coordination is essential for accommodating aging and disabled populations. A work group has been tackling this issue and is creating a business plan to improve coordination and funding across multiple entities that provide these services.
- Communication/Education
 - Communication/Education of public needs to improve: a high percentage of the public wants to widen roads – we are not thinking in the same terms and the public is not recognizing their own future needs.
 - Better education for policy makers (state, regional and local) regarding impact of transportation decisions on the quality of life, which will help them educate their constituents, which will create a base of advocates.
 - This is a social issue. The younger generation is demanding better infrastructure and options, particularly in New Orleans.

- Better education for long term impact – residents become advocates who put pressure on elected officials and developers.
- Coordination and education regarding Map-21 funding
- Land Use/Community Character
 - The public survey identified that a high percentage of Louisianans want to maintain the rural feel/special character of the state.
 - There is a disconnect in communication between land use and transportation, land development, and economic development, especially at the state level (DOTD + LHC + LED).
 - We have access management issues particularly regarding retrofitting for sidewalks and bike lanes.
 - Capacity for municipalities to accommodate future growth, funding, and addressing permits. Municipalities don't have adequate funding and development impact fees could be a consideration to improve/complete infrastructure.
- Planning Tools/Functions
 - There is a shortage of staff capacity at the local level. Specifically coordination of engineering and planning, as well as coordination with other jurisdictions and the state. Rural parishes and municipalities are most impacted by lack of staff capacity. How do we help municipalities get capacity?
 - Impact of bike/ped enhancements to transportation connectivity, Access Management
 - Terminology is an important tool – i.e. change “template” to “standards” or “toolkits”. Consider improving the Comprehensive Plan legislation by developing standards instead of creating a template.
 - Dedicated funding is an important tool to plan, implement, and manage comprehensive plans otherwise other priorities will take precedence.
 - Toolkits are a positive resource – pictorial tool with elements that get positive community response.
 - Legislation is a good tool. Consider revisions to Revised Statute 33: specifications, require public outreach, linking components instead of breaking out/separating land use and transportation, terminology updated from master to comprehensive plan, standards checklist for small communities with little to no capacity
 - Public/private partnerships can be a way to fund bike/ped/transit improvements.
 - CPEX and AARP have existing materials for educating the public on transportation and planning and are good tools/resources for communities and public agencies.
 - Need to focus on completing transportation networks that cross boundaries. Create mechanisms for connecting across SILOs and disparate funding streams utilizing performance measures, accountability, and/or holding funding. Need to centralize funding resources into a central database. We are great at collaborating after a crisis. We need to make coordination and collaboration a matter of business prior to crisis mode.

- Transit Investments
 - Local Buses, Bus Rapid Transit, Intercity Passenger Rail, Local Rail, and Human Services Transportation Coordination all need to be integrated with transportation decision making.
 - Dedicated Funding is important for transit investments. But transit agencies need to be able to gain public confidence.
 - Funding sources require local matches which can be difficult to get the match.
 - LA Swift is successful but there is difficulty in finding matching funds every year. Would like to see the service expanded to other areas of the state. Has LA Swift considered teaming up with Megabus?
 - Incorporating technology Apps for real time service encourages ridership.
 - Education is important in transit usage. AARP has a resource: “How to Ride the Bus”
 - E-documents and Apps for public resources (less funding for printing)
 - Keep Complete Streets in mind when planning for connections and funding
 - Consider partnerships with private companies. The Arts Council has paid for bicycle amenities.

Additional notes during Issues discussion:

- The Statewide Transportation Plan Update should address Livable Communities. HUD, EPA and USDOT are partnering at the federal level to address livable communities. Is our plan doing the same? How does Housing and the Environment fit into the DOTD Statewide Plan?
- Would like to see the addition of policy language in the Plan that encourages coordination among state agencies to work together.
- Need a mechanism to compel agencies at each level to work together. What are the incentives for that? We need more direct performance measures and accountability.

Megaprojects

- New Orleans – Baton Rouge Rail
- New Orleans CBD – New Orleans Airport Rail
- Shreveport – Dallas Rail
- Shreveport – Baton Rouge Rail
- State continuing funding to LA Swift to increase routes
- Funding of a Statewide Mobility Manager

Draft Vision, Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The attendees briefly discussed the Draft Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures. Suggestions for revisions or additions follow:

- Goal: Safety
 - Question: Data availability/access
 - Addition: Data by MPOs, local jurisdictions under Indirect Measures
 - Revision: change language from “accidents” to “crashes”
 - Revision: change language from “number” to “rate”

- Goal: Economic Competitiveness
 - Addition: Number of communities/job centers served by transit under Direct Measures
- Goal: Community Development/Enhancement Goal
 - Revision: use explicit language regarding increase/support services so agencies “get” how it impacts future services/population
 - Revision: explicit Direct Measures language – these are qualitative measures, for example Miles of Bike Lanes, Miles of Complete Streets
 - Direct Measure Addition: % of State System that meets ADA Requirements
 - Direct Measure Addition: % of State System that meets Complete Streets goals
 - Indirect Measure Addition: % of local systems that meet ADA requirements (depends on data availability)
 - Indirect Measure Addition: % of local systems that meet Complete Streets goals (depends on data availability)
- Goal: Environmental Stewardship
 - No amendments discussed

Note: Direct Measures are items that DOTD has oversight and data is available, Indirect Measures are items that DOTD is a partner but does not provide oversight.

Previous Plan Policy Recommendations

The group was provided with a handout of the recommendations from the previous statewide plan effort and asked to familiarize themselves with it and talk to colleagues about changes that would be needed to address the issues discussed on March 20. This will be the subject of the next round of Advisory Council meetings in the summer of 2013.

COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER MEETING

The following comments were received after the Advisory Council Meeting through April 22, 2013:

- Vision: The word “passenger” is used twice – is it a reference to transit and rail? Goal should be to move people and freight in and between cities and rural areas. Does balanced equate to multi-modal?
- Safety Performance Measures: Add “Crashes/fatalities for pedestrians and bicyclists (data to be collected from various sources)” and “Evacuation routes”
- Economic Competitiveness Objectives: Add “Improve access to job centers” and “Improve modal options associated with supporting the economic competitiveness and quality of life”
- Economic Competitiveness Direct Measures: Edit second bullet to “Reduce Annual hours of delay from incidents and congestion on freeways” and add “Fiscal impact studies”
- CD&C Objectives: Add “Walking and biking accessibility”
- CD&C Direct Measures: Add “Shorter commuting hours and distance” and “Options for multiple modes”
- What are the tools and data needed for locals to better understand the costs of expanding transportation infrastructure? Is it possible to suggest infrastructure audits for

communities so they can understand the cost of maintaining transportation infrastructure? (Livingston Parish conducted one of these.)

- CD&C Indirect Measures: Add “Outreach to communities and public outreach” and “Increase in property values near transportation investments”
- Environmental Stewardship Objectives: Add “air and water quality”
- Under preservation and maintenance: is the DOTD responsible for any sidewalks? If so, it would be good to include them. In an ideal world we would be able to measure the sidewalk miles in good or excellent condition and strive for a reduction in falls, especially among older adults. But the world is probably not ideal. A first step may be to inventory sidewalks under DOTD jurisdiction and grade them. State DOTs are using technology to track the conditions of roads, I wonder if evaluation of parallel sidewalks could somehow be integrated into this tracking. Louisiana could make a name for itself if it does. I have heard of segways equipped with devices that measure ADA compliance. Nothing is impossible.
- I strongly suggest adding a goal entitled “access” and come up with some measures that get at the percent of residents with access to public transportation services (I can’t remember, is there a state transit division within the DOTD?).
- Under environmental stewardship I would add objectives and measures for shifting the mode share away from Single Occupancy Vehicles and toward walk, bike, transit, carpool. Also, it is important to couple decreased bike and ped fatalities with increased mode share as you can decrease your fatalities if everyone stops biking and walking and that is not desired.
- Under Community Development & Enhancement Goal/Performance Measures:
 - Move “number of parishes with elderly and handicapped transit service” from Indirect Measures to the Direct Measures
 - Add “number of parishes with public transit services” as a Direct Measure
- Vision, 2nd paragraph: The intent of this paragraph is confusing to me. I think it dances around working toward improving the integration of transportation and land use planning no matter the size of a jurisdiction or density of development, without stating it directly. I am not sure it is helpful to call out New Orleans (it is not monolithically compact) when Baton Rouge and potentially other cities are working toward retrofitting downtowns or specific areas toward more intense development. It also includes a cautionary imperative for regions and local jurisdictions by stating... “requires more local decision-making on and responsibility for transportation investments, local land use planning, ” but it is unclear if the second half of the sentence is meant for DOTD or not. Since it is the DOTD Statewide Vision (policy) and thus about how they wish to grow/change it would be helpful to clarify that the ideal DOTD direction requires them to support improving quality of life and travel choice for all, regardless of age, disability and income.

Recommendations:

Line 3: Insert “or” after “dense,” Delete “such as New Orleans” and replace it with “within some communities”

Line 4: Insert “and”/ Delete the comma between “investments, local”

Line 5: Replace “an” with “DOTD”

Now reads: Louisiana recognizes that while a good portion of the state's residents prefer to live and work in small and medium-sized communities, there is also a desire for living and working in higher-growth, dense or compact urban areas within some communities. This future requires more local decision-making on and responsibility for transportation investments and local land use planning, and DOTD emphasis on quality of life and passenger travel choice.

- CD&E Objectives: I believe this is the place to bring more specificity about who is included in "populations" using fairly standard language.
Bullet Five, Change to: Improve modal options associated with supporting the economy and enhancing quality of life regardless of age, disability or income
- CD&E Performance Measures: Bullet 2: I believe this fits better under INDIRECT MEASURES
New Bullets under DIRECT MEASURES: Add "Number of trips provided by 5310 and 5311 funding". Add "Number of state agencies providing information into DOTD facilitated data base of public transit assets"

The second new bullet reflects an easy measure on the level of coordination and efficiency among State agencies providing transportation services. The collection of asset data into a central data base was a first priority arising from two rounds of legislative work group investigations (HCR 131 and HCR 181) for better Coordinated Transportation Human Services Planning.

New Bullet under INDIRECT MEASURES: Add "Number of Louisiana communities passing Complete Streets policies." This can help account for modal considerations of developing land use plans.

- I reviewed the materials distributed and note that under the performance measures for Safety, crashes / collisions for cyclists and pedestrians was omitted from the Direct Measures. This is becoming a growing issue given the emphasis now placed on alternative transportation modes, especially here in New Orleans. I was also surprised that "complete streets" as adopted by LDOTD and the City Council in New Orleans was not included. This is an important issue statewide and should be addressed.

Comments on Previous Recommendations Document:

- Who is the responsible party within
- SP-4 progress: Feasibility study underway by CRPC and NORPC
- SP-7: What does this mean? Is this funding not available? LA Swift could receive some of this funding?
- SP-8: What existing DOTD programs support this?
- SP-10: By HST Workgroup?
- SP-11: Is this being replaced with something else?
- SP-14: Name has changed to Southern Rail Commission
- SP-16: Is NORPC still studying this?

- SP-19: How is LA Swift supported?
- SP-23: What is current %?
- SP-24: Is there any progress with the Shreveport to Dallas rail line?
- SP-25: What program does this fall under?
- BP-1: Is this the Complete Streets Policy?
- BP-3: If these are completed, is there an accompanying effort to encourage bike plans at the local level?
- BP-5: Is this the Complete Streets Policy?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED

The following comments were received between April 23, 2013 and April 30th:

- Vision: Would generally agree that the vision needs to be neutral in terms of specific cities/parishes as examples of the type of development we would want (or not want) in our state. However, I am thinking that with the edits suggested to this point, the term “higher-growth” is not really necessary (Paragraph 2, line 3). I would suggest striking it from the paragraph as amended with the deletion of the term “such as New Orleans”. I would also suggest that we imbed the need for education in this statement, through the addition of the term “informed” in the next sentence (Paragraph 2, line 4), to replace the word “more”, along with the word “coordinated” and strike the term “passenger travel choices” as this repeats indirectly at the close of the statement: *This future requires informed local decision-making on the responsibility for coordinated transportation investments, local land use planning and DOTD emphasis on quality of life.*
- Economic Competitiveness Goal: I would not assign reduction in incidents and congestion delay to just freeways – I would also include *“major federal and state highway network connecting across parishes or sub regions of the state”* or *“primary federal and state highways”* to this measure to reflect the contribution of roads such as US 90, US 61, US 84, US 167, LA 1, US 190, US 171, etc. Other additions to direct measures would include: *“Average Reported Commute Time by Workers, 16 years and Older”*; *“Number of Households or Workers without Access to automobiles”*.
- Community Development and Enhancement Goal:
 - Under Performance Measures, I would add *“Miles of identified Complete Street projects implemented in MPO urbanized areas”* and *“Miles of identified Complete Street projects implemented in rural communities, parishes and other areas”*
 - Under Performance Measures, Direct Measures category, I would suggest a slight modification to *“number of parishes with public transit services”* to *“number of parishes with accessible transit or transportation services”* – a slight nuance, but important none the less as it might capture a broader coalition of providers.
 - Also, given that the federal programs change over time, I would suggest not being too title specific in the listing of direct measures – rather than # of trips funded under 5310 and 5311, why not the “number of trips funded through combination of federal, state, local funds”?

- I would also add a couple of indirect measures to this category: *“# of Reduced Fare or Partial Fare transit trips consumed within a particular Parish or City”* and move *“Anecdotal improvements to system accessibility”* down from direct to indirect.
- Environmental Stewardship Goal:
 - I would suggest expanding the term *“Air and Water Quality”* to be something like *“Maintain existing standards for air and water quality”*
- Infrastructure Preservation and Maintenance Goal:
 - I would suggest adding *“Condition of at-grade rail crossings”* as a Direct Measure.