JEFFERSON PARISH
ROUND 2 MEETINGS SUMMARY
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 Jefferson, meetings were held in Metairie, Marrero, and Lafitte. 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.
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.
MEETING RESULTS

The following pages show what residents added to the maps, and contain summaries of the discussions from each of the meetings in Jefferson Parish. The map to the right shows the results from the three community meetings. A larger version of this is available at LASAFE.la.gov.

Discussion Summaries

METAIRIE
- Promote dense, mixed-use, walkable neighborhoods
- Develop local university satellites
- Improve bike connectivity
- Establish a cultural district
- Increase access to the lakefront
- Create an HOV lane and carpool incentives to reduce traffic
- Improve public transit
- Create a light rail and regional transit
- Create bike paths and transit along canals
- Establish a fishermen's market
- Promote green energy production
- Assist in elevating homes

MARRERO
- Create a community college
- Create a culturally-focused commercial and entertainment corridor for families
- Increase environmental science classes
- Build a second expressway
- Elevate evacuation routes
- Add a public light rail system
- Promote canal transportation
- Add more bike lanes
- Mandate minimum greenspace on future developments
- Incentivize permeable paving

LAFITTE/JEAN LAFITTE MEETING
- Subsidize home, flood and wind insurance costs
- Develop ecotourism attractions
- Promote swamp tours
- Build a new fish market
- Create a commercial fishing village
- Promote aquaculture development
- Support fishermen

Each table group chose one card from each of the three categories. Their choices reflect what issues are most important to them. In Jefferson Parish, residents chose Jobs & Job Training, Quality of Life, Youth & Education, and Stormwater Management the most frequently.
In Metairie residents most commonly expressed interest in denser, walkable, mixed-use development, and stated that the Parish does not have a strong cultural center. They mentioned that outsiders see the parish as lacking culture. The areas residents identified for this type of development included Veterans Boulevard, Fat City, and River Town. Some participants recommended establishing cultural districts; others recommended bus tours. Many residents voiced the need to attract younger people to the area. They emphasized amenities that younger people might enjoy, including university satellites and a more vibrant urban fabric to compete with New Orleans. In this way, Jefferson Parish could offer a similar lifestyle with a lower cost of living.

Residents emphasized transportation as a major area for improvement, citing frequent heavy traffic. Many participants expressed the desire for better bike connectivity and access to the lakefront. The residents listed ideas such as HOV lanes, carpooling incentives, park and rides, centralized parking, improved public transit, canal transit, regional transit, and regional light rail.

Participants also asked for increased access to parks, connected paths and trails, a fishermen’s market, green energy production, attention to flood issues, and mandated elevation of new homes.
Marrero meeting participants focused most on stormwater, transportation, local economic development, and youth and education. They pointed out that there are rifts between these sectors, and recommended that they coordinate better in the future.

The residents said that the school system lacks higher education pathways, and could benefit from more connection to job training, local business, and industry. Several participants suggested additional community colleges to transition students into the workforce. Residents also expressed the need for more education about the region’s environment and coastal issues. They said this could be accomplished by bringing kids on field trips to get more hands-on experiences and connecting principles in science class to the real world.

Most comments about local economic development either promoted strengthening the riverside industry, including transportation and manufacturing, or creating a culturally-focused commercial and entertainment corridor for families. One resident recommended that this corridor run along Highway 90.

Many participants expressed the desire to alleviate traffic and create an elevated evacuation route for the region. Residents recommended adding a second expressway, elevating evacuation routes, adding a light rail system, using canals for water transportation and bike paths, and increasing public transit.

The participants pointed out that most of the stormwater management issues are related to construction policies and practices. Many residents cited too much pavement and not enough stormwater retention areas as the main issue. They proposed incentivizing permeable paving materials, increasing rain barrel use, elevating homes, implementing protection measures, and mandating green space in developments.
The most important issues voiced by Lafitte and Jean Lafitte residents were the preservation of the water economy and the stabilization of home values and cost of living. Residents pointed out that flood insurance, or wind insurance if elevated, are driving factors in the quality of life decreasing and residents moving away. Participants said that large camp houses and second homes are replacing the traditional community. Some said fishermen are being priced out and retreating to Marrero. To combat this, participants recommended raising the entire community, adding floodwalls, rewriting insurance policies to reduce premiums, and supporting programs to elevate or protect homes prior to disasters, rather than waiting for the aftermath.

Economic and cultural issues centered on fishing, recreation, and eco-tourism. From education to new economic development, the recommendations focused on harnessing and further developing the natural resources of the area. Resident ideas included swamp tours, a curriculum focused on environmental education, a new fish market, a commercial fishing village, aquaculture development, water management and restoration jobs, other support for fishermen, and developing environmentally oriented attractions for visitors.
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.