

LOUISIANA IMPACT POLICY MEETING SUMMARY

September 3, 9:00 AM – **Baton Rouge**, TTEC/Rm 275

September 14, 9:00 AM - **Alexandria**, PW Complex, Front Conference Room

September 14, 2:00 PM - **Shreveport**, Dist 04, Conference Room

September 15, 9:00 AM – **Monroe**, Fire Safety Center, Meeting Room

September 22, 9:00 AM – **Lake Charles**, Dist 07 District Lab Training Room

September 22, 2:00 PM – **Rayne**, Mural Room

September 29, 9:00 AM – **New Orleans** (Metairie), RTMC Bldg, Conference Room

September 29, 2:00 PM – **Hammond**, City Council Chamber

Several meetings were held statewide on the captioned dates to discuss the current Traffic Impact Rule. We are fully aware that the current traffic impact rule has many issues that need to be solved. Our goal was to gather information from all affected parties through out the state in order to develop a new and improved rule that will hopefully correct the existing problems and provide the necessary tool to promote the goals of the development community as well as protect the interest of the traveling public. The following is a summary of the comments we received from these meetings:

Current Traffic Impact Rule

- Current process has issues and needs improvements
- Mitigation requirements not known up front
- Complaints about last one in pays for mitigation
- Rule is too subjective and many terms are not clearly defined
- New Rule should have a definitions section
- Traffic Impact Study requirement is not consistent as some districts require them more than some. The rule does not clearly define when they are required and leaves it to the discretion of the DTOE.
- There is a lack of communication between LA DOTD and local entities including the development community and local city officials that creates issues.

- Local officials and the development community feels that as tax payers, they are the true owners of the roadway system and DOTD is only the manager of the system. Current rule gives too much control to DOTD.
- Control should shift to local entities with DOTD serving only in the reviewing process.
- Traffic Impact studies are too subjective
- Traffic Impact studies end up requiring turn lanes and other mitigation that ends up making new developments cost prohibitive.
- Some Districts lack the resources to effectively manage the traffic impact policy
- The traffic impact rule has issues, but they all can be traced to a lack of effective management of the policy
- The 0.25 mile threshold needs to be re-examined
- The 0.25 mile threshold is not consistently enforced throughout the state
- The 0.25 mile threshold does not serve both the development community and the department well. Access pts are placed outside of the threshold to avoid dealing with the department, and developments that place traffic on the system are not making necessary mitigation payments.
- Some areas have roadway networks that consist of primarily state owned roads and some of the requirements for traffic mit
- Permit Process takes too long
- The current process works against developers "where time is money"
- Traffic Mitigation projects are forced on developer when problems exist prior to new developments being established. The responsibility of mitigating traffic falls on the developer when at times should fall on the department or first developments in.
- Department resources are focused on major metro areas like New Orleans and Baton Rouge and does not do enough in other state regions
- Developers should be given credit for taking traffic off the system.
- Appeal process should be revised to be more objective and fair
- Traffic impact rule can require smaller developments to make improvements that they can't regenerate through profits
- Changes to rule should hold down cost for smaller developments
- Trip Generation should not be the only mitigation trigger
- Interconnectivity should be added as a mitigation technique along with other techniques or options.
- Mitigation requirements should apply to both new and existing requirements
- DOTD has to do a better job of educating stakeholders on the existing rule. This applies to the driveway permit application process, Traffic impact study requirements, and mitigation in order to avoid delays due to unexpected requirements developers face.
- New rule should be careful so that it's requirements do not slow down development.
- Public/Private partnerships should be investigated in the new rule.
- Access management techniques should be implemented as mitigation alternative options.

- Current rule does not address impact on the roadway system caused by the residential areas.

Traffic Mitigation Payment

- Reduces No. of Traffic Impact Studies Required
- Predictable Fee – Payment is up front
- Fee should be applicable statewide – but distinguishing between urban and rural should be looked at
- Only Developments with direct access to state route should pay
- Fee takes away control from developer and transfers it to government
- Mechanism is needed to ensure improvements that are needed when development opens, are in place and not in limbo because of fee
- Developments that change in use type may need to also pay impact fee
- Local chamber of commerce and the state economic development should be involved in order to avoid discouraging growth or economic development
- Monies generated from fee should only be spent where they are collected
- Accounting should be transparent to public
- Need to examine how to apply state impact fees in communities like EBR that already have impact fee
- Developers should get credit towards a fee for improvements made to corridor
- Smaller developments are responsible for traffic mitigation as well as larger developments. Everyone must pay
- Fee needs be based on some type of base rate with different categories per unit and/or per type.
- A bond could be an alternative to a traffic impact fee
- Payment system must be simple in order to avoid delays that penalize economic growth
- Fee should be the same statewide with credits for up-front improvements
- Fees could be divided by parish or possibly more divisions
- If development never fully develops, new rule should address – we need to avoid turn lanes to no-where.
- New rule should have provision for mitigation that grows with development so that it is not all required up front.
- Mitigation payments need to turn into improvements on the road without unnecessary delay.
- Since project development at DOTD takes time, a mechanism for turning mitigation to actual roadway improvements in a reasonable amount of time needs to be established.
- Mitigation payments relative to Government entities (i.e. Schools) should be examined
- Off-System roadways networks seek a mechanism to draw from funding pool.