ROUND 2 MEETINGS OVERVIEW

The second round of LA SAFE meetings focused on conversations at the community scale. The team held twenty-one meetings in nineteen towns and cities across the coast. Residents at the first round of meetings chose the round 2 meeting locations. In St. Tammany Parish, meetings were held in Covington, Mandeville, and Slidell. Meeting at this level allowed the team to present a more in-depth view of the trends in each community, and to gather input at the community level.

In this series of community meetings, residents pinpointed challenges, proposed solutions, and collectively described a future across different types of environments and different levels of risk. The project team combined the residents’ ideas and mapped their proposed strategies. The community recommendations will form the basis for the projects, programs, and policies that LA SAFE pursues going forward. The project team will review the ideas, and take into consideration current and future environmental risk, as well as best practices in planning.

Map of Meeting Locations
**ACTIVITY 1: MAPPING STRATEGIES**

The activity included a large table map of the community, which depicted the 2067 flood risk, and a set of related question cards. Residents chose one card from each color category (shown on the right), and discussed a set of questions on the back. A table host facilitated the conversation, and a table scribe recorded it.

Each card had questions that related to three time periods:

1. **Short Term (10 years)**: current needs and opportunities.
2. **Medium Term (20 years)**: ways the community can adapt over time to a changing environment, economy, and population.
3. **Long Term (50 years)**: the long-term vision for the parish.

Each card prompted residents to write and draw on their maps to show areas in need, or areas with potential for growth. The table hosts encouraged the residents to write, draw, and point out where potential projects and programs would be most successful.
The following pages show what residents added to the maps, and contain summaries of the discussions from each of the meetings in St. Tammany Parish. The map below includes the results from each meeting. A larger version of this is available at LASAFE.la.gov.

**WHAT WE HEARD AT MEETING 2**

ST. TAMMANY PARISH

Discussion Summaries

**SLIDELL**
- Minimize high-risk development
- Increase recreational access to water
- Elevate roads without creating a levee-like effect
- Insure new road construction doesn’t negatively affect stormwater management
- Protect and promote natural assets
- Increase connectivity between parks and trails
- Adapt and renovate existing structures

**MANDEVILLE**
- Prepare for population growth
- Increase public transit
- Expand walking and biking infrastructure
- Implement more restrictions on building practices
- Regulate impact studies for all future developments
- Increase inexpensive housing stock to attract younger people
- Address the full scope of flooding needs
- More connectivity between parks and trails
- Connect with environmental organizations to clean up pollution in waterways

**COVINGTON**
- Synchronize traffic lights for maximum efficiency
- Implement a public transit system (bus line)
- Improve and add more sidewalks
- Grow jobs within Covington to reduce city-wide daily commute
- Grow medical facilities and aides for the elderly
- Increase support for “green” jobs (solar panels, Tesla) and advanced manufacturing
- Develop less concrete and more greenspace/retention ponds
- Connect existing greenspaces for education and recreation

Each table group chose one card from each of the three categories. In St. Tammany Parish, residents chose Stormwater Management, Quality of Life, Property Value & Cost of Living, and Jobs & Job training the most frequently.
The residents at the Covington meeting said that traffic and inadequate infrastructure are the main issues affecting their quality of life. They proposed a public transit system for their community (there is currently no bus line), and more and improved sidewalks and bike lanes. One table suggested that if more workplaces were open to employees working remotely, they would not have to commute, which would help cut down on congestion. Participants further pointed out that there are not many jobs in Covington, so workers are forced to commute. They recommended adding more jobs to the area.

According to residents, the biggest employers in the community are the school district, hospital, and port. They suggested building more medical facilities, and providing skills training for aides for the elderly, as the community has a large aging population. The participants also recommended green jobs (solar panels, Tesla) and advanced manufacturing (robotics) as career options in the area.

As with the other meetings in the parish, residents at the Covington meeting called for more oversight on new development. They cited the increased growth and use of concrete as a major cause of the stormwater runoff and flooding that already exists. The participants proposed that developments include more green space and retention ponds to help offset the runoff.

Covington residents emphasized nature and greenspace as important assets in their community. They recommended connecting existing greenspaces and trails, and suggested that these spaces should be both recreational and educational. The participants further pointed out that students should be taught about coastal issues, so that they can become better engaged in the subject. One of the ideas for improved engagement included asking students to monitor the weather.
Mandeville Summary

Residents at the Mandeville meeting discussed the need to prepare for continued population growth. Their primary concern was infrastructure (streets, drainage, sewage) that cannot sustain the current population. They also emphasized the natural beauty of the parish. The transportation recommendations mirrored those from Covington, as the participants expressed the need for more public transit and an expansion of walking and biking infrastructure.

The residents recognized that continued irresponsible building and development has worsened the stormwater issues in their community. As Covington residents did, they called for more restrictions and enforcement of regulations over building practices. One participant suggested that developers should have to perform impact studies, and then use rain gardens throughout their developments to offset their stormwater runoff. While most people expressed concern over continued development, there was also a conversation about the need for smaller, inexpensive housing stock to address the needs of younger people, and those in the service and retail industries who cannot afford to live where they work. For many Mandeville residents at the meeting, infrastructure is key to their quality of life, and with a rapidly growing population, the infrastructure is stressed and services cannot keep up with the demand. Therefore, the participants recommended more highways, another Causeway bridge, and sewage infrastructure. They further expressed the need for a central water and sewage board that addresses the full scope of what is needed, rather than piecemeal solutions. Residents also asked for a solution for all slab-on-grade homes that have not been elevated.

The participants pointed out that nature and the shoreline are the biggest draws for ecotourism in Mandeville. As part of bolstering that industry, the residents recommended improving the connections between the existing parks and trails. They also suggested addressing pollution along the waterways, and connecting with existing environmental organizations to manage the effort. In addition to larger green spaces, the residents asked for more local, neighborhood parks.

For the future economy of their community, Mandeville residents recommended a way for people in the oil and gas industry to be able to transition into coastal restoration, using the skills they already have. They also see a future in renewable energy (solar, wind turbines) in their community, and they want job training to prepare people for work in that field.
Residents in Slidell envisioned minimal development along high-risk areas, and offered suggestions for ways the government could restrict unsafe and irresponsible development. They focused their conversations around water, including increasing recreational access to it and mitigating more frequent flooding. Residents still focused on water when the subject moved to transportation, commenting on flooded roads and limited access to amenities during flooding. Some suggested elevating the roads in a way that would not create a levee-like effect, blocking water flow. One table discussed locating highway development/improvement in high-ground areas, as a way to incentivize development and population growth in those areas.

Participants pointed out that water is both the biggest asset and biggest hindrance for quality of life. They suggested more access to the water for recreational activities, and recognized the need to control where and how the water drains. Residents recommended that the parish better promote the natural assets of Slidell, such as the bayous and streams. They further suggested more connectivity between existing parks and trails. Participants stated that despite being so close to the water, getting out to it with a boat is difficult.

Residents had split views on development. Several people noted that they don’t want Slidell to become “another Metairie,” speaking in terms of density. They also called for more requirements for responsible development, such as protecting natural assets that absorb water, and restricting development in the floodplain. Participants suggested that the government offer buyouts for properties within the floodplain to ensure that they do not get developed. Others said that existing structures should be adapted and renovated before new development is prioritized.
NEXT STEPS

After the second round of LA SAFE meetings, the project team reviewed all of the results and conducted outreach with key stakeholders. The team designed the activities and questions for the third round of meetings based on the projects, programs, and policy recommendations from this round.