

LOUISIANA RECOVERY AUTHORITY
Office of State Planning Task Force Meeting
State Office Building Auditorium
Baton Rouge, LA
Tuesday, December 18, 2007

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Krystle Beauchamp, Assistant Planning Director for the Louisiana Recovery Authority (LRA), called the Office of State Planning (OSP) Task Force meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. in the State Office Building Auditorium in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. *(Note: Notices to the public and news media of the time and place of the meeting were given in compliance with the Louisiana Open Meetings Law.)*

II. ROLL CALL

Ms. Fay Ayers called the role.

Board Members Present:

Mr. Kevin Belanger
Mr. Johnny Bradberry
Mr. Tanner Johnson (representing Ms. Sidney Coffee)
Ms. Donna Fraiche
Mr. Dan Garrett
Ms. Ternisia Hutchison
Ms. Kristy Jones
Mr. Mr. King Milling
Mr. Sean Reilly
Ms. Boo Thomas
Mr. Stephen Villavaso

Board Members Absent:

Representative Cheryl Gray

Staff Members Present:

Ms. Krystle Beauchamp
Ms. Lynn Bankston
Mr. Adam Knapp
Ms. Kristen Parnell
Ms. Christina Stephens
Ms. Fay Ayers

III. OSP TASK FORCE ACTIONS

Ms. Krystle Beauchamp welcomed the task force members and commented that the state is fortunate to have included the best and the brightest to help advise as to future decisions for Louisiana. She indicated that two questions need to be addressed: 1) how did we get to this point? and 2) what are the goals of the OSP Task Force?

Historically, House Concurrent Resolution No. 229 by Representative Cheryl Gray in the 2007 Regular Session created the OSP Task Force to study how the recommendations of the LA Speaks plan could become a reality. A diverse group of individuals representing a number of agencies are represented on the OSP Task Force, whose creation was a priority of the LRA and supported by the state legislature. This group is to examine the findings in the LA Speaks plan and create various mechanisms to make the OSP a reality. Recommendations will be fluid and set the stage for the future administration. The LA Speaks plan emphasized enhanced planning capacity in order to create predictable growth. Ms. Beauchamp expressed enthusiasm to begin the dialog.

Ms. Beauchamp reminded everyone that this is a public meeting and only appointed task force members can participate in the actions taken. Public Comment is on the agenda at every meeting at the end of the agenda.

The first item on the agenda was the election of a chairman. Ms. Boo Thomas nominated Ms. Donna Fraiche to be the chair, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Kevin Belanger. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of those present, 8 yeas and 0 nays. Those voting yeas were Mr. Kevin Belanger, Mr. Johnny Bradberry, Ms. Donna Fraiche, Mr. Dan Garrett, Ms. Ternisa Hutchinson, Ms. Kristy Jones, Ms. Boo Thomas, and Mr. Stephen Villavaso.

Ms. Donna Fraiche thanked everyone for their commitment to this effort. She commented that we will try to get as much accomplished as possible in the minimal timeframe to issue the report and recommendations to the legislature. Two additional members joined the meeting and she welcomed Mr. King Milling, who is renowned for coastal protection efforts, and Mr. Steve Villavaso, who is an expert in planning and zoning. A packet was sent in advance to all the members for review prior to the meeting.

Ms. Fraiche stated that implementation of the LA Speaks plan is critically important to Louisiana. This plan should not just sit on a shelf. She suggested that there be coordination among agencies to facilitate the LA Speaks action plans that address key infrastructure issues with a strategy that emphasizes historic facilities and streamlined recovery. She expressed a desire to move discussion thoroughly but not create duplicate meetings.

Ms. Fraiche introduced member Mr. Sean Reilly, who apologized for being late.

Ms. Fraiche reviewed the three primary goals of the LA Speaks effort: recover sustainably, grow smarter, and think regionally. Arising out of the hurricanes is the opportunity to rebuild safer, smarter and stronger. The LA Speaks regional plan was adopted in May, 2007, and implementation actions are already underway.

Ms. Fraiche introduced Ms. Boo Thomas, and thanked her for the efforts and that of the Baton Rouge Area Foundation (BRAAF) on identifying the top ten priorities of recovery.

Ms. Boo Thomas said they looked at the LA Speaks staff and its champions group in determining the top ten priorities. She wanted to make sure that efforts are coordinated with the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) of Louisiana; that local recovery plans are supported; and, that the plan is extended to North and Central Louisiana in Phase II. She said “upstate” Louisiana is open and anxious for the plan to come to them.

Ms. Thomas said the number one priority of the plan is to establish the Office of State Planning. Six meetings were held as well as several conference calls to discuss the creation of this office. The remaining priorities include funding and building of recovery-critical transportation infrastructure; the creation of a Louisiana Location Index; the creation of model development and zoning codes; the use of the LA Speaks regional plan to guide the Louisiana Land Trust; the use of public investments into developed areas and centers; the establishment of a state trust fund to revitalize communities; the establishment of a state trust fund to acquire high-risk or environmentally sensitive land; to locate and design schools and medical facilities to create better neighborhoods and spur community development; and to build greener.

Ms. Fraiche said if action items are added to the agenda, it must first be amended.

Secretary Johnny Bradberry asked what we would hope to have accomplished at the end of the day. He said the agenda looked to be more fundamental and addressed getting grounded and understanding the goals. He thought the “second steps” would be addressed in a subsequent meeting.

Ms Fraiche explained that there would probably be only one additional meeting before the findings and recommendations of the task force are presented to the legislature in February, 2008. She said she was hoping to accomplish a great deal in the meeting today, and discussions on best practices in other states will hopefully lead to a consensus on how Louisiana should proceed.

Mr. Kevin Belanger offered a motion to approve the agenda.

Mr. King Milling said the members had heard ten suggestions and asked if there were any other suggestions.

Ms. Thomas explained that the top ten came from the LA Speaks regional plan.

Mr. Milling commented that the resolution requires the Task Force to come up with recommendations, and he felt it would take more than one meeting.

Ms. Fraiche stated that we were trying to follow the legislation and would prepare a report of the Task Force’s findings. She said there could be as many or as few meetings as the members wanted.

Mr. Milling said he was not pushing for more meetings.

Ms. Fraiche pointed out that she was only trying to get the agenda approved.

Mr. Belanger said the goals and objectives are a footprint to begin with and not necessarily the model that will be used.

Ms. Fraiche stated that the LA Speaks plan was a compilation of recommendations of approximately 30,000 citizens of Louisiana. The plan is a blueprint but not necessarily what the task force will recommend in the end. We want to determine how to implement the LA Speaks plan.

The motion offered by Mr. Belanger to adopt the agenda was seconded by Ms. Kristy Jones. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 10 yeas and 0 nays. Those voting yea were Mr. Kevin Belanger, Mr. Johnny Bradberry, Ms. Donna Fraiche, Mr. Dan Garrett, Ms. Ternisa Hutchinson, Ms. Kristy Jones, Mr. King Milling, Mr. Sean Reilly, Ms. Boo Thomas, and Mr. Stephen Villavaso.

Ms. Boo Thomas introduced Mr. John Frece, representing the University of Maryland and the National Center for Smart Growth. He also served under Governor Glendening of Maryland as his Special Assistant for Smart Growth.

Mr. John Frece said he was happy to be in Louisiana and that he was here to help. He commented that he is not from Louisiana and does not know our culture or our authorities. His examples are only from his experience in Maryland; however, he has worked with many other states. He said he wanted to spark discussion and explained that the fundamentals should be discussed.

Mr. Frece said there is national interest in better planned growth, and people come at it for different reasons. Louisiana has an opportunity to rebuild and we need to think in advance about how best to use our land. The LA Speaks plan is a terrific resource and guide and with a new administration about take office, we have a rare window of opportunity. Coastal issues are paramount because 53% of the population lives on the coast. When you look at other states that have done coastal planning, there are five quality of life issues: the rising sea level and more dangerous storms; rising energy costs; population migration and growth; aging population; and, international competition. His advice is to know our parameters, know our political reality, and know how far we can go. We do not want to push anything so far that it fails and we do not want to scare people. We need to make a solid start with the Office of State Planning: start small to see if it works and then add to it over time. He commented that he used to be a reporter and he discovered that if you try to do something big you cannot get it accomplished all at once.

Mr. Frece said nothing is as important as the Governor's role – he has to be the leading voice. We have to insure the planning department is independent and financially sound. They have to coordinate and invest in state and federal funds and agencies have to work together. If the OSP is set up, it is important that the governor's staff include a point person to ensure state agencies work together in a means to reach the end.

Mr. Frece commented that in many states, the state planning function is passed down to the local level because they know best as to local planning needs, but the state has a justifiable interest. Only a handful of states have free-standing planning departments. Many such departments are buried within other state agencies, and some get moved from one agency to another depending on the administration.

Mr. Frece stated that the general role of the OSP is direct support to local agencies, coastal restoration, data repository coordinator of federal funds, historic preservation, and periodic reports on trends. The OSP makes sure the plans work together and oversee capital improvement programs, transportation, school building expenditures, hazard mitigation, and parish plans and zoning. Some responsibilities show preservation and some show growth. This is a long process of working with local governments to get local approvals. The only weakness is that this is only voluntary for the local governments.

Ms. Fraiche asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Bradberry asked if we knew for sure that the incoming administration is on board and if they are interested in the agenda. He said he would like to have a good feeling about this before investing a lot of time.

Mr. Sean Reilly said he had visited with the transition team on this and they are looking forward to receiving our report. The feedback that he received was that there was a great deal of interest depending on our conclusions. One issue is where the OSP will be housed. He said he thought it should be located within the Division of Administration (DOA), and he had spoken to Commissioner-elect Angelle Davis about her willingness to create the OSP and to fund it. The transition team is also looking into this. He said our job is to produce a report on what the OSP should look like, how it should be staffed, and the mandated resources needed.

Mr. Dan Garrett asked if transition people should be present at the meeting.

Mr. Bradberry commented that this may be his last meeting as he did not know if he would be reappointed as the Secretary of the Department of Transportation and Development.

Mr. Reilly stated that appointments to the OSP Task Force were based on different representation.

Mr. Garrett asked if Governor Blanco had consulted with Governor-elect Jindal on the appointments.

Ms. Fraiche said the appointments happened before the elections, and pointed out that we had invited Ms. Davis and people from the transition team to today's meeting.

Ms. Thomas said she testified on December 12, 2007, before the transition team and that her PowerPoint was well received. Mr. Paul Sawyer requested a copy of the minutes from today's meeting, and Ms. Davis is interested in what happens today. Everyone sees the need for the OSP because we need to know how we can improve the state after a disaster.

Mr. Milling commented that the mission of the task force is to determine the role of the OSP. If we create the OSP then we need to ensure it has “teeth”. If the administration decides they do not like the OSP, they can eliminate the teeth. We need to start with the largest issue which is whether the OSP can work. We need to see how this will work in Louisiana and what would be the best of all possible worlds. There is no political reality until the new administration takes office.

Mr. Reilly noted that we could take an educated guess. He said he thinks the true value of an OSP is in land use issues and capital projects, some of which have very long lead times and cross administrations. Sometimes projects do not get completed until the third or fourth administration. We need to look at what is the best practice and what is a successful approach for the next 30 to 40 years. He has often heard that the role of the OSP is that of providing technical assistance. He said if we use a “stick” approach we will not be successful; if we use a “carrot” approach we stand a chance of success.

Ms. Fraiche said there is some reservation about the political situation because we are in the midst of a transition. We need to define the issues. If we recommend an agency versus an office, what is the difference? What is the constitutional authority for an agency versus an office? How does the legislature work with the agencies to get things accomplished? How does it work in Louisiana versus other states?

Mr. Bradberry remarked that we have to understand fundamentals. He suggested that Mr. Frece describe what “overseer” means. Do they spend the budget or is it a coordinated effort? The role of overseer has many implications and we have to understand this first.

Mr. Frece explained that it varies from state to state and this study task force would recommend as to the definition in Louisiana. He thinks it is more of a coordinating effort and they do not spend other agencies’ budgets. There should; however, be cross-staffing in the agencies, which is the way it works in Maryland. They also have checkmarks for smart growth.

Mr. Bradberry asked if it is consistent with a statewide/local goal that is budgeted. He said we need some clarity.

Mr. Frece suggested we make a list of the questions that need to be resolved.

Ms. Fraiche thought that was a good suggestion. The first question to be addressed is: what does it mean to be an “overseer” in Louisiana.

Mr. Frece said he was unsure this would work because of the way the agenda was prepared.

Mr. Reilly suggested we move on to the next presentation.

Mr. Frece said he would go through the planning goals and then we could have a longer discussion.

Mr. Reilly introduced Mr. Michael DiResto, who was recently appointed to be the Director of Communications and Strategic Initiatives for the Division of Administration under Commissioner-elect Davis.

Ms. Fraiche commented it was important to have a representative of the Division of Administration with whom to communicate these concepts.

Mr. Frece stated that the state needs to get its house in order before asking the locals to do so. We need to be strategic with roads, sewer/water, schools, and transit lines, which affect patterns, resources and taxpayers expenses. The local planning capacity is most likely limited, but the state can help with local planning grants that will help those who actually do the planning. Budget recommendations can help to make this effort work. Another of the planning functions is data collection and map analysis. In Maryland, this department also deals with reapportionment and redistricting. There are various kinds of state planning departments around the country that fall into six categories: 1) within the governor's office, 2) a state planning office within the capital budget office (DOA), 3) an independent cabinet level department, 4) a cabinet coordinating committee, 5) an OSP within an existing department (he recommended against this option as it becomes subservient), and 6) a state planning commission - an outside group with an array of outside participants. Mr. Frece explained that they have numbers 1, 3, 4, and 6 in Maryland all at the same time, and all serve different functions.

Ms. Fraiche suggested the members discuss what functions currently exist within agencies.

Mr. Bradberry explained that Dr. Eric Kalivoda is the planner for the Department of Transportation and Development (DOTD), and he gives consideration to the priorities of the local governments. (Dr. Kalivoda was present at the table with Mr. Bradberry.) He said Dr. Kalivoda may be able to help with other agencies, but he was not sure if other agencies have planning departments.

Ms. Fraiche asked about the Louisiana Department of Economic Development.

Ms. Thomas interjected that the Office of Emergency Preparedness was about to appoint planners for each region of the state.

Mr. Bradberry pointed out that this is for emergency events.

Ms. Thomas said she had suggested a planning position to several agencies, and they were open to the idea.

Mr. Bradberry stated that we need someone to coordinate with the parishes and their planning agencies.

Mr. Milling commented that the CPRA planning process for coastal Louisiana will take on a massive effort that will cover several decades, and will last long into the future. He explained that the CPRA sits in the governor's office and has a staff which does not provide construction, but the OSP Task Force may want to be independent. We need to think about

the creation of a separate commission or body that could take on responsibilities. He said it is critical that someone from the OSP sit on the CPRA.

Mr. Bradberry said we need to define what we want to see as oversight before we create an organization. What will the organization be accountable for? Is it just a coordinating effort? We need to define oversight before we establish the roles.

Mr. Frece said that is the decision of the task force.

Mr. Bradberry asked what category the planning office falls in other states: accountability or coordinating.

Mr. Frece said Oregon has a Department of Land Conservation that oversees all the land, and they have a regional office in Portland that also oversees transportation. The organization will have to be consistent with the overall state goals. His view is that we start by getting what we can in authority, and then see if we need more later on. We need to start with the carrot and then we might have to pick up the stick.

Mr. Reilly commented that this is the reason we wanted to review the summary of best practices.

Ms. Fraiche said that there is a lot of detail including pros and cons in the summary of best practices presented by Mr. Frece. One reason for the task force is to address the lack of coordination between the legislature and the state agencies. She has seen many projects that may or may not have been prioritized that get funded without connection to a plan or strategy. There is a complete disconnect between those projects and the recovery plans. There needs to be coordination of capital projects between agencies.

Mr. Milling said that will happen only if the Governor directs it to. He said it comes down to authority. We need to have someone say we are going to get together to make it work.

Mr. Reilly explained that he preferred the option of having the state planning office within the capital budget office because they set the budget for the department and they have more persuasion.

Mr. Milling commented that there needs to be a dotted line connecting this function to the governor's office.

Mr. Reilly suggested we establish the OSP under the DOA and with a state planning commission made up of interested citizens who care about making this effort a reality. The citizens can provide support to the OSP in a way to give it political weight. They would be the keepers of the flame and the carriers of the torch.

Mr. Frece said we have to determine the mission of the OSP. He provided an overview of the Maryland Department of Planning, which includes communication and intergovernmental outreach, historic and cultural programs.

Mr. Reilly pointed out that historical and cultural programs are currently under the Office of Culture, Recreation and Tourism. He does not suggest changing this.

Mr. Milling stated that a secretary in Louisiana is tantamount to a cabinet position.

Ms. Fraiche said that is different from what Mr. Reilly was suggesting.

Mr. Frece said the Maryland Department of Planning was created in 1933 and lasted until 1956 in varying forms. The agency was demoted when it fell out of favor with the governor, and it was re-elevated in 2000. He explained that the cabinet coordinating committee is chaired by the state planning agency. Planning services provided include land use planning and analysis, planning assistance to the local governments, sewer and water systems, schools, and some transportation. The Resource Conservation Planning department has a budget of \$8 million from the general fund and the current staff is numbered at 120. There is also a Maryland state clearinghouse for intergovernmental assistance, a state data center, and socio-economic projections.

Mr. Bradberry explained that DOTD has only a mapping system and no one entity brings all the maps together. He recently went out to other agencies to coordinate land use and issues.

Ms. Fraiche exclaimed that it is mind boggling that agencies read from different maps.

Mr. Bradberry commented that people come to them and DOTD generates the maps.

Ms. Thomas stated that some parishes have geographic maps and GIS maps, but other parishes have nothing.

Mr. Belanger pointed out that right of way maps created the starting point of statewide mapping. This has been disenfranchised. The OSP could bring this function together under one umbrella through mandates and incentives.

Ms. Fraiche observed that she was hearing a consensus that Louisiana needs one place to house consistent mapping.

Mr. Milling mentioned that we do not have one place for the laws of the state as they relate to the individual towns.

Mr. Frece said that would be an appropriate function of the OSP. The first task would be to redraft or recodify some sections of law.

Mr. Milling remarked that there is a need for consolidation where it makes sense. There are different approaches in different states, and we are creating something without understanding what we are trying to do.

Mr. Stephen Villavaso stated that it is about the data. We have to populate the polygons with data in order to make good plans. Louisiana has a history of an OSP, which was housed in the Governor's office. The function of this organization was to publish a "state of the state". It was a valuable tool for grant writing because data is the heart and soul of grant writing. There needs to be a link to GIS data and maps and this link needs to be coordinated with regional and local levels. An integrated flow is very important.

Ms. Thomas asked Ms. TERNICIA HUTCHINSON to explain her office in the DOA to the task force members.

Ms. TERNICIA HUTCHINSON stated that she works in the Planning and Budget Department within the DOA and they deal with the strategic plans. They do not do any real planning or mapping because they do not have the staff or the capability.

Ms. Fraiche commented that this is important information. She asked if the department was that way when Ms. Hutchinson started there and if this was a carryover from previous administrations. She wondered if this office is driven by the governor.

Ms. Hutchinson said the Revised Statutes state that the Office of Planning and Budget (OPB) is responsible for the strategic plans. She pointed out that she has been there for seven years and the function does not go away with a new governor.

Mr. Belanger asked if they deal with the actuaries and do fiscal notes for the legislature.

Ms. Hutchinson explained that the Legislative Fiscal Office prepared the fiscal notes by contacting the various agencies.

Mr. Reilly remarked that their function is more strategic planning for the operational budget, and was created when strategic-based budgeting was all the rage. He said the OPB compares goals against the operations budget.

Mr. Dan Garrett commented that technical support and GIS make it easier for local governments, and then there is the policy side. These two things are divergent but having both together is a disconnect. The Maryland mission statement does not show that OSP controls anything. He said you can tell local government how their general fund should be spent, but asking them to find funds to do a comprehensive plan is most difficult. Parishes have difficulties now, and this will not work if there is a perception that they will eventually be ordered by the state to prepare plans.

Mr. Villavaso explained that RS 33:106 requires parishes to prepare a comprehensive plan, but it is not enforced. We can be the good guys who reward the local governments that do have a plan, but we do not want to be the bad guys.

Mr. Reilly suggested that the OSP offer good, helpful technical assistance but not mandate anything. We already have a head start with the model codes. He said the type of help that the OSP should provide is where we could pull a plan off the shelf and offer it as a guide for a parish to use for their own planning document.

Ms. Thomas asked the cost of plans.

Mr. Villavaso responded that it varies depending on the parish.

Ms. Thomas said this is the first step.

Mr. Reilly pointed out that the infrastructure is not being related to land use as stated earlier by Mr. Garrett.

Mr. Garrett said they are related but in making the policy decision versus being a technical resource. These are two different functions and two very distinct entities: one includes the state providing resources and the other decides who has authority and how far that authority extends. Now the OSP Task Force is saying the parishes must have a comprehensive plan. This is a significant change from what is required now.

Ms. Fraiche said that the LRA did that with respect to recovery plans for 22 parishes. The parishes must meet a 10-point plan to meet smart growth objectives or the parish does not get allocated funding. She said the LRA did this with carrots.

Mr. Garrett said this is new funding. The old funding requires hoops that must be jumped through and we are adding yet another level.

Mr. Belanger said the OPB almost does what the Legislative Auditor does in making sure the agencies spend their funds correctly.

Ms. Hutchinson said the OPB makes recommendations.

Mr. Belanger commented that he would like to see an independent cabinet level department mixed with a state planning commission appointed by the governor. This would be no different than the Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) that exist today, which are sustainable because they are under one head of the governor. If there are appointments, there is continuity. The OSP has to remain sustainable. He said he felt if the OSP was under the DOA it would give the impression that it is run by the governor.

Mr. Milling said we are at the table because of extraordinary circumstances that require extraordinary actions. The parishes would likely appreciate having something at the state level such as building permits. Now the state is working with the parishes to put best practice options on the table that allow the parishes to do things they would not have thought about. The storms woke up the state and now we need to look at things through a different lens. We need a different relationship between the state and the local governments.

Mr. Frece stated that he sees a connection between the two functions. The minimum core function should be a data center or a mapping center. The critical element is uniform timely data. What do we need to do to get this set up? GIS must be in Natural Resources, Transportation and OSP. He said they still have different maps in Maryland, and they need to have uniform data. The data center is the information that is used to make informed policy decisions. He added that Maryland identified certain areas known as smart sites and development areas so state resources could be focused in these areas. The same thing is done on the rural conservation side in order to help the rural areas. If an area undermines the state investment, then they do not receive funding again. This is an example of how to form policy.

Mr. Frece said there are different functions performed by the Maryland Department of Planning. They house a collection of data that includes 2,800 property maps that are linked to

a 2 million statewide tax database for use with off-the-shelf viewing. This information is used by several agencies. Maryland decided to charge for the information and therefore it is not accessible to many people. This also undermined the acceptance by the public, so Louisiana will have to decide how they will pay for the information.

Ms. Fraiche said she thought we can get this information from the Louisiana Department of Economic Development.

Ms. Thomas explained we want to create a Louisiana location index and we want to go to the next level, but how do we get there. Page 62 of the LA Speaks plan describes a New Jersey smart growth locator site. This served as a great tool for the state of New Jersey. In Louisiana, the Department of Economic Development assigned Ascension and West Feliciana parishes a pilot program to do this.

Mr. Milling observed that this is two agencies with the same function.

Mr. Bradberry stated that he sent a letter to the agencies asking about their desire for a common database.

Ms. Thomas said they love the idea of the database, but it must be housed and funded.

Mr. Belanger mentioned that all of the RPCs were contracted to investigate 20 sites that will go into the program. He suggested we get the local RPCs excited.

Mr. Milling asked if it was possible that data takes on a different posture depending on for what the data is used.

Ms. Fraiche said the Department of Natural Resources has maps for other reasons. She said each agency can have its own data, but the information and access could be compiled in one agency.

Mr. Reilly pointed out that Lamar does this. He added that the data should not be department by department, but should be in one place because there are other goals. Economic Development looks for development, but we have to look at hazard mitigation and score sites differently in the new world after the storms. We need a new lens for the data index to help us come to grips with smarter development.

Mr. Milling stated that it looked like the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) was going to be closed and a company was working on a site for a large terminal facility with the Louisiana Department of Economic Development (LDED). The LDED was promoting the site even though it was being discussed that MRGO would be closed. This is the type of decision that the OSP should make.

Mr. Frece said that Louisiana is looking at migrations and Maryland is looking at a growing population. Maryland has looked at data for land use modeling to simulate what may happen in the future and at future development patterns. This was presented as an example of what is done by the Maryland OSP. He showed slides on actual parcel development and a watershed map that is used as planning tools. These help when explaining to the public what is at stake. Additionally, he showed a slide on the Office of Smart Growth that illuminated the

importance of the Governor's involvement. The Office of Smart Growth also produces an annual report that is used to inform the public and the legislature of accomplishments.

Mr. Frece commented that the clearinghouse and the plan review is also part of the OSP. The trend in Maryland is that the state will have more approval authority and the local land use decision making and incentives may not be enough. They need to use the priority funding areas for comprehensive area growth including land use, transportation, mineral resources, community facilities, land development regulations, areas of critical concern, sensitive areas, and municipal growth. The only missing element is housing. Louisiana needs to look at housing, economic development, and agriculture.

Ms. Fraiche remarked that Louisiana uses regional planning efforts to extend parish boundaries.

Mr. Frece stated that he had not seen this in the United States. It makes sense, but if you are limited by boundaries, then it will be a mess unless you have a regional body.

Mr. Belanger asked if the RPC has been incentivized as part of the mission.

Mr. Milling explained that the Department of Natural Resources is looking for water resources and the DOTD is looking for levees and the CPRA is looking at environmental areas. The relationships need to be delineated between the agencies so they understand each other's essential responsibilities.

Mr. Frece pointed out that Maryland passed a state timing act in 1974 to come up with a statewide development plan; however, it has yet to be created. It has been pushed off from one administration to another. Presently, the current administration is going back to the 1974 plan. They are looking at how to change the state plan to meet the local needs. Many people are opposed to this plan, but some are starting to see the value of a statewide plan. One generalized zoning map was created by the state of Maryland, which limited where the state could spend its funding. The Smart Growth changed this by providing priority funding areas defined within every municipality. The overall plans had to be consistent with the Smart Growth plan. Some redevelopment in the older and rural legacy areas are the flip side to this issue. In Maryland, a citizens' advisory group decided who got to buy some of the properties in the older areas of town.

Ms. Fraiche asked is there were any further comments. She said she heard a consensus on the functional side of the OSP with core data including housing the data and legal codification. She added that this could end up looking like a model code and she referred to the John Costannis report.

Ms. Fraiche asked if there was anything else the members wanted to add.

Mr. Kristy Jones stated that we should not underestimate the need for technical assistance. They just formed a planning group to help some of the parishes and empower them by educating them with options.

Ms. Fraiche commented that technical assistance is a bridging tool that is used to get CDBG funding approval.

Mr. Reilly asked how everyone felt about a fund that could be tapped to influence redevelopment and growth and whether this should be something that could be advocated by the OSP.

Mr. Milling asked the definition of mitigation.

Mr. Reilly responded that we will create a report that will be given to the legislature that will include funding and incentives available to create conservation easements. He asked where this should be housed.

Mr. Milling commented that this is an example of conceptionally allowing marsh land owners to donate surface rights. The concept is to get private ownership into the government which can then be related to mitigation.

Mr. Frece explained that they go directly to the land owners, which requires certain requirements. This activity comes out of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) rather than from a planning agency. He advocates that the function be in the proper agency; however the agencies need to have representation on the planning commission.

Mr. Milling asked what should happen with regard to the property.

Ms. Fraiche asked if we were talking about hazard mitigation where property is landbanked due to repetitive flooding. She pointed out that this is a different issue than conserving property for future use.

Mr. Belanger stated that Maryland land preservation is basically mitigation. It is needed to protect the scenic beauty and to address environmental issues.

Mr. Reilly commented that you get to the same place in trying to set aside low-lying areas so housing is not built there. He said he is not sure where the trust fund should be housed.

Ms. Fraiche said acquisition of properties by NORA is because of hazard mitigation. The Land Bank would include abandoned properties for redevelopment or to ensure that the land is never developed again.

Ms. Thomas explained that she thought we were addressing two different issues. Both have been addressed in the plan. Community investment banked properties would adhere to correct future guidelines. She suggested that this responsibility be housed in the OSP to ensure that the properties are monitored.

Ms. Fraiche pointed out that this is presently performed on the local level; however, this is a topic that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Milling asked if the state can only deal with municipal properties when under emergency declaration. He said cities have specific rules and regulations.

Mr. Reilly stated that New Orleans properties acquired will be disposed of by the New Orleans Redevelopment Authority (NORA). There is a loose agreement between NORA and the LRA that properties will be disposed of in accordance with the LA Speaks plan.

Mr. Milling asked if this is a common agreement.

Mr. Reilly exclaimed that NORA has the final say.

Ms. Fraiche said she thought the New Orleans City Council had to agree with the NORA decision when the state took control of the land.

Mr. Milling commented that this is one of the “sticks”.

Ms. Fraiche said this does not necessarily have to be overseen by the OSP. They had envisioned that LA Speaks would be housed at the OSP once the LRA function was no longer needed.

Mr. Milling asked where the funding would come from.

Mr. Reilly explained that the legislature would have to create the trust fund. It could be done with tax inducements and outright purchases; however, the legislature would have to create the fund. He asked who should oversee this trust fund. He suggested that the head of the OSP sit on other agency boards.

Mr. Milling said the objectives between the various agencies would have to be coordinated.

Ms. Thomas agreed with Mr. Milling.

Mr. Reilly said we would have to do some wordsmithing on the issue of coordinating between agencies.

Mr. Milling asked what exists already that could be utilized.

Ms. Thomas interjected that one role of the OSP would be to position the state to get federal funding.

Ms. Fraiche suggested we list the roles of the OSP. There are many different avenues for federal investment and no single entity is coordinating these efforts.

Mr. Bradberry said this is a classic case of the DNR and DOTD talking about the same funding. A central location does not mean there is more federal funding available, and the OSP could play a role in identifying the federal funding.

Ms. Fraiche pointed out that \$7 billion would be coming into Louisiana for levees and coastal protection. She asked who is deciding how this funding is spent.

Mr. Milling explained that the CPRA is working with the DNR in accordance with the master plan.

Mr. Tanner Johnson commented that coordination of the state level funds is out of our hands. This funding is very specific and is targeted for the CPRA.

Mr. Milling explained that different funds are being generated and the CPRA is coordinating the pot. If the OSP is created, then they will need to sit on the CPRA.

Ms. Fraiche declared that the funds are jurisdictionally dedicated.

Mr. Bradberry asked what control we would have over the funds. We have to work up front to coordinate the spending of the funds, and we have the plan and the funds flow into the plan.

Ms. Thomas mentioned that she had spoken with Ms. Sidney Coffee on how the OSP could benefit the CPRA. There are other agencies that are not aware of the available funding, and Ms. Coffee expressed some of her concerns to Ms. Thomas.

Ms. Thomas said grant writing assistance is very important. We need to look at regional and local plans when considering the state goals as outlined by the LA Speaks plan. The local plans could be used to leverage a small amount of funding. We also need to continue to include North and Central Louisiana and develop a plan that includes them. We need to set standards for investments in state infrastructure that is consistent with the CPRA.

Mr. Bradberry added that we need to consider the future revenue stream.

Ms. Thomas said we need to look at all of the funding.

Ms. Fraiche explained that it is up to the sitting governor. A consensus can be easily reached with a governor's representative in the room.

Mr. Bradberry observed that all future offshore royalties are dedicated to the CPRA.

Mr. Milling added that this funding is constitutionally dedicated.

Mr. Bradberry asked if we were going to manage the priorities.

Mr. Milling pointed out that there are funds outside of the dedication and priorities are being coordinated in accordance with the CPRA.

Ms. Fraiche mentioned that there is money not allocated from last year's state budget. She said she thought Ms. Thomas was implying that expenditure of the surplus be coordinated with the overall state plan.

Mr. Milling stated that he thought it was a function of all the agency heads carving up the funds.

Mr. Garrett said people have the notion that Louisiana got where we are because we did it correctly. The criminal justice system funds itself; surplus funds must be spent on non-recurring projects. He wondered if this would create more pressure to underfund other projects.

Mr. Thomas interjected that she thought the opposite: the system has been streamlined.

Mr. Milling commented that the capital expenditure process is archaic. He understands that Governor-elect Jindal plans to reorganize the priority system. At the end of the day are we going to tell the administration how to spend this money?

Ms. Thomas explained that if the OSP was under the umbrella of the DOA then they would be connected and working in tandem with the administration.

Mr. Milling asked if anyone does that today.

Ms. Fraiche asked if anyone knew.

Mr. Reilly explained that the capital outlay process has five priorities. Presently, there is no scoring of a project against like projects. This allows the administration to make it fit the way they want. He said there will be a bill to reform the process and delete the two fictional priorities. Priority one is a project that is in the works; priority two is in the bonding process; and, priority three is waiting for funding. Then the projects will be scored against one another. This will be an opportunity for the OSP to weigh in. He added that the capital outlay reform would also look at the amount of state funding of local projects. The current thinking is that we will take a historical look at the percentage of funding going to locals, and cap it at its historical percentage of 20%.

Mr. Milling remarked that this would require each secretary to prioritize its projects and have groups come together to make decisions.

Mr. Bradberry explained that DOTD prioritizes its budget and they play a role in capital outlay in supporting entities around the state. This then goes through the priority process at the Office of Facility Planning.

Mr. Milling asked about the City of New Orleans.

Ms. Thomas said the transition recovery team wants one contact person for future recovery efforts. The LRA provided this after the storms and the OSP can provide this in the future. In the event of a future disaster, we will go to the Office of Emergency Planning, but it would be great if we had the OSP.

Mr. Milling pointed out that this would require a significant funding component.

Mr. Thomas stated that it is a clearinghouse rule.

Ms. Fraiche explained that the LRA was created by Executive Order for recovery advice, and since they are already in place why do we want to create another agency.

Mr. Reilly pointed out that the LRA will sunset, and then the natural point of contact will be the Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness (GOHSEP).

Mr. Bradberry noted that initial response to an emergency is provided by DOTD, the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, police and first responders. Recovery is a different story and has to address how to get people and commerce back.

Mr. Milling commented that this gets back to the fundamental issue of coordination. From an advisory standpoint, we want to make sure it is done consistent with the state plan.

Ms. Fraiche said the LRA had adopted the La Speaks as the state plan. There is a big difference between rescue organizations and a recovery plan. GOHSEP is only short term and not for major disasters.

Mr. Belanger agreed that the OSP needs to be a part of the overall plan, but it should not serve in the premier role. The aftermath plan should emanate to the OSP.

Mr. Milling apologized that he had to leave the meeting.

Mr. Belanger said GOHSEP should be the primary entity for disaster response.

Ms. Thomas said the first action of the LRA was to work with the groups that FEMA put on the ground. She suggested a review of the gap between FEMA's response and when the LRA was created. The OSP would not take on the first responder role.

Mr. Belanger asked where he could find maps of Mamou. DOTD may not have any and the OSP should have the maps.

Mr. Bradberry noted that the OSP could play a support role in the emergency response.

Mr. Reilly said that the OSP would initially be the repository of disaster planning and the institutional memory. We are still ten years from recovery.

Ms. Thomas said we have hazard mitigation plans in place now, but asked who is going to update them.

Mr. Reilly explained that this is a different from the first response. We need to be a coordinator for the post-disaster plan.

Mr. Belanger said he put together a list of what is pertinent for the OSP. The number one priority is a statewide GIS, along with a statewide comprehensive plan, a repository of demographics, historical preservation, and a planning commission. The American Planning Association has come a long way in mandating that planning commissioners be trained. We need a regional clearing house for the statewide plans. The Municipal Planning Organization is trying to expand a highway but the Corps does not work with the local entities. We have to create a law requiring that the federal agencies need to check with the local agencies. In statewide forecasting, we need to collaborate with the universities. There are studies and surveys and other avenues for state government to access the office for an efficiency analysis. The state employs its own leaders in industries and the state can save money.

Mr. Belanger stated that there are secondary items that could be the responsibility of the OSP. We need to involve local governments on a regional basis so the OSP will be successful. The

OSP should not be an authority; it should offer suggestions but it should not mandate. We need to let the electorate make the decisions. The Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) have worked this way since they were created in the early 1930s.

Ms. Fraiche said she will add this to the list provided by Ms. Thomas. She said we have two lists: one includes options for the model of the OSP and the other is where the entity will be housed and whether it is a cabinet level.

Mr. Reilly commented that whether the OSP is a separate state department or housed within another agency, there should still be a state planning commission.

Ms. Thomas remarked that this would require a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Belanger said he took a different viewpoint. The authority should be autonomous, helping the state go forward but not an agency of the state.

Ms. Fraiche asked for an example.

Mr. Belanger pointed out that the Center for Performing Excellence (CPEX) was not created out of the legislature, but its role could function as this entity and be responsive to any department with a request. CPEX has involvement but it does not have control.

Ms. Fraiche said this would be a policy body of some kind; however, LA Speaks envisions a place to house and implement the plans. They have to be housed in an office and report to the commission.

Mr. Belanger agreed with Ms. Fraiche. The legislature or governor would appoint people to the OSP, and the commission would be similar to the Legislative Auditor. The citizen's board should be the regulator and set policy as derived by law.

Mr. Frece asked how this fit with the list or responsibilities and what should be done by the commission.

Mr. Belanger said the commission should be authorized by the legislature and housed in the office of the governor.

Mr. Frece pointed out that you lose control by using an outside commission.

Mr. Belanger said appointments would come from the electorate and they can be replaced. This would involve the citizens.

Mr. Frece suggested that large citizen-based groups should be more of an advisory board offering suggestions, and the important functions should be with the OSP.

Ms. Thomas observed that the OSP should have a staff with a budget in addition to a public/private board that oversees the OSP. This would be the goal-setting group. Then there would be a citizen's oversight group that is the conscience.

Mr. Belanger pointed out that the ideas parallel each other, but he suggested we create an autonomous group that would be unbiased and independent. He said the legislature would have control.

Mr. Reilly explained that he was struggling with giving the OSP independence; how would they hold sway? If they were located in the DOA and the commission wants certain things accomplished, then the DOA would have the power. Then you have the ability to hold sway. It would worry him if the OSP was set up as a separate secretary as that would cause friction.

Mr. Belanger commented that it would be more of a planning and research office and only the legislature would make the rules. He said they should supply a point of reference and a means of advice.

Ms. Fraiche asked for a verb that might apply. Are we to work as a convener to bring everyone together in one place to work out the details, like a mediator?

Mr. Belanger agreed that this would be a good word for the OSP role. Every municipality around the state needs to be included in the decision making. There is distaste for decisions being mandated to the local governments. He said the OSP is needed and it will work.

Ms. Fraiche suggested we devise a function list for the OSP, and the relationships can be discussed later. She asked if there were any other issues not yet listed, defined or articulated at this point.

Mr. Frece explained that the “big ticket” issues would be discussed in the afternoon. He commented that the consensus is that this is a definite need for the OSP, but we need to decide the location, responsibilities, budget and staffing. He added that the task force also needs to decide if we need a commission and what its authority would be.

The meeting was recessed at 11:51 a.m. and reconvened at 12:35 p.m.

Ms. Fraiche said the CPRA is a model and we appreciate them being here.

Mr. Garrett noted that the OSP cannot take steps on its own, and suggested we talk about the charge of the entity. He said we need to know the responsibilities and the structure of the OSP.

Ms. Fraiche commented that we would be wasting our time if we did not think these functions need to be done. Data collection and GIS needs to be housed and implemented somewhere. We want to leave the meeting saying that there needs to be an OSP or not.

Mr. Garrett remarked that we need a state entity to assist local governments with zoning and planning.

Ms. Fraiche said that we need to add to the agenda to consider an action item that there is a need for a state entity.

Dr. Kalivoda asked when this will be discussed and asked that the motioner amend the motion to include planning actions. He suggested we vote at the end of the day after all the testimony has been received.

Mr. Villavosa asked if we were splitting hairs. He explained that the House Concurrent Resolution addresses the creation of the OSP and he is ready to take action.

Ms. Kristen Parnell, LRA Deputy General Counsel, notified the members that Dr. Kalivoda is not a member of the task force and is only present representing Mr. Bradberry, Secretary of DOTD.

Dr. Kalivoda asked for clarification as to whether he could vote or not.

Ms. Fraiche informed Dr. Kalivoda that he could not vote. She said there was a motion on the table offered by Mr. Garrett to add an action item to the agenda. Mr. Belanger seconded the motion, which was unanimously adopted by a vote of 9 yeas and 0 nays. Those voting yeas were Mr. Kevin Belanger, Ms. Sidney Coffee, Ms. Donna Fraiche, Mr. Dan Garrett, Ms. Ternisa Hutchinson, Ms. Kristy Jones, Mr. Sean Reilly, Ms. Boo Thomas, and Mr. Stephen Villavaso.

Mr. Frece asked if there was going to be another presentation.

Ms. Fraiche replied that there would be another presentation.

Mr. Belanger gave a brief overview of the RPCs. There are eight RPCs in Louisiana as set out in 1977 in Act 472. There was an Executive Order in 1973 for state agencies to flow their plans through the RPCs. Many took on the role of prioritizing projects in their areas. The agencies saw the benefit of this and supported the RPCs by entering into contracts with the Louisiana Department of Economic Development (LDED). Now, they have minimal roles with LDED, and the RPCs are recognized by the U.S. Department of Commerce. All public works funds must be identified through economic development strategies, as mandated by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The strategy avails municipalities to apply for funds for economic development projects, and derived a good relationship with the U.S. Department of Economic Development. They are the mapmakers for the LDED now. In the late 1980s, funding ceased and the RPCs morphed into other roles, such as the MPOs. This was a good fit and there is a federal distinction between the MPOs. The RPCs started working with the MPOs. All are manned with good people, and they are not funded by recurring revenues but through grants, and now they have recurring revenue.

Mr. Belanger explained that the MPOs area of expertise go through functions mandated by DOTD for highways and economic development activities with revolving loan funds. Ultimately, they write the comprehensive plan to being in millions to the areas. They also work with the Department of Environmental Quality on solid waste planning, the Highway Safety Commission, the Department of Justice, the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and others. The MPOs work with whoever wants to partner with them. They have been working on the fisheries infrastructure program and managing community development block grants (CDBG), and are presently working on eight projects. They also perform information technology and provide graphic design for the parishes. They

use it as an economy of scale. This is provided at a rate of \$16.50 per hour when the going rate is \$150 per hour.

Mr. Belanger noted that the MPOs are also helping locals to plan. They partner with the LAGIS group and provide advocacy for coastal restoration, crime labs and others. They were asked to solve problems determining baby powder from cocaine and they had to plea bargain. The MPOs also created a process where they can turn the information around in two weeks. They have helped with building codes and created a regionalized building enforcement division in the country. Building codes came as a shock, and there was a huge cost associated with them. A revenue neutral plan was devised that saved the consumers lots of money. The permitting process was done on an economy of scale through a third party that would cost \$3,600. They represent ten districts with one building official and a small staff.

The MPOs were also charged with helping the parishes with planning initiatives. There are many RPCs out there who are willing to take on new roles. Back in the 1980s when they were funded by the LDED, they received \$100,000 each, but today they receive \$4,000 from the LDED. Mr. Belanger said he wanted to serve on the OSP Task Force to bring the RPC issues to us and explain the conduits available to help with planning.

Ms. Fraiche thanked Mr. Belanger for his presentation. She noted we had re-characterized the carrot stick as a sugar cane stick. She said she thought that if we were incentivized that we could create change. She asked if this had ever been done on a statewide level.

Mr. Belanger said the U.S. Department of Commerce came from highway legislation, and there has never been an attempt to incentivize local offices. There is little they can do so they put forth good planning exercises to enlighten the parishes to their options. The RPCs can provide research and develop strategic plans for schools. They view themselves as a planning and research commission so locals can make responsible decisions. They answer to a 24-member board. They have a good cross section of representation on their RPC, and they seek out new opportunities and are proactive in the community. If the OSP is created, they will engage them to encompass some of the local data. There is a lot of potential for collaboration and you touch every parish in the state when dealing with eight RPCs.

Ms. Fraiche asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, she moved to Mr. Frece for a presentation on planning departments.

Mr. Frece explained that there are two parts to his PowerPoint: the relationship of planning departments with other entities and the principal partners involved, which include the legislature, some state agencies, general services with regard to state facilities, and transportation.

Ms. Fraiche asked about health care.

Mr. Frece replied that planners are encouraged to create more walkable communities but health care is not specifically addressed. He added that big, institutional entities have created some fights in Maryland. They did not “walk-the-walk” when considering a satellite campus. If privately owned, they do not always have sway.

Municipalities, counties, and councils of government, the Interior Department, the Environmental Protection Agency, the federal government, other smart growth communities and preservation groups. The Department of Agriculture has a land preservation board, and many other boards that help with coordination.

Mr. Frece informed the members that the Maryland Smart Growth sub-cabinet included many agencies. The first thing to do is to inventory what already exists; this helps with cost savings before the creation of the OSP. It may also require the consolidation of existing offices, some of which may be duplicative work. It may not be necessary to move offices, but information must be sent to the OSP. The MPOs may be a resource, as well as DOTD, for GIS capabilities. He suggested we look at various land use departments, and whether they have offices in other parts of the state. These facilities can be harnessed for use in outreach.

Most states have historic preservation, and he suggested we consider linking it to the OSP. He asked which entities have long-range planning, and whether other funds are available. He noted that the OSP needs a director who has the confidence of the governor. There are many different structures that could be used. A person has to understand planning, but also politics, if they want to get anything accomplished. This is a need for a communications and marketing staff. This is a product that is used for public support. The Governor's involvement is critical. The entity must be independent and have a funding source. It has to understand how budgets are spent, with an emphasis on helping local governments.

Mr. Frece suggested we look to other states for examples, such as North and South Carolina, and Alabama. The statewide commission should be used for input and support, but they should only be advisory. We need to set long range goals with benchmarks. He pointed out that the state of Oregon had established great benchmarks. He recommended that we stagger the appointments to establish continuity, and the members of the commission must be empowered or they will lose interest. Also, in addition to having a stakeholder commission, we should encourage an outside group, such as LA Speaks, as a citizen advocacy group to keep pushing for action. Lastly, a more balanced pattern of development means you can accommodate more growth with less land, and you can reuse land, and provide density and land mixes that are useful. This will improve the quality of life and spur economic competitiveness.

Ms. Thomas reminded the task force members that everything in the LA Speaks plan came from citizen's ballots, and this is what helped create the plan.

Ms. Fraiche said historic preservation is at CRT, and we do not need to duplicate this effort. She listed GIS planning capabilities, long-range funding, and allocations for the recovery efforts as the inventory of responsibilities for the OSP. She added that technical assistance is available through the MPOs; however, we need a statewide agency responsible for assistance. We need to determine what the OSP is responsible for, and address where we should go from here.

The meeting was recessed for a ten-minute recess at 1:30 p.m. to allow staff to capture the position of the task force, as discussed so far.

Ms. Fraiche reconvened the meeting at 1:40 p.m. She remarked that Mr. Frece had given the task force the major planning roles to use as a template. She stated that we had removed historic preservation from the duties of responsibilities.

Ms. Sidney Coffee suggested that we get someone from the Governor's office involved in the discussions.

Ms. Fraiche explained that she would meet with Ms. Coffee later to inform her of what was discussed in the morning session.

Ms. Fraiche stated that we need to discuss the roles, functions, activities and responsibilities of the OSP, as well as technical assistance and the repository of the GIS data portal.

Mr. Garrett suggested that we look at what is attainable. The census projections are available. He asked if we would get this information from Louisiana Tech University.

Ms. Fraiche noted that we were only looking at functions already being performed, and deciding how these functions could be consolidated.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that many people do not realize that information is available.

Mr. Reilly proposed that the OSP do population forecasting, and that they not be responsible for reapportionment.

Mr. Belanger commented that Louisiana Tech University had been slow in releasing data after the hurricanes.

Ms. Fraiche stated that we needed to determine where the centralized data is kept. She explained that there is a LA Speaks plan already available on disc, and that the OSP webmaster would need to check the disc for omissions.

Mr. Frece mentioned that the data would be needed by several sources. He recommended that we create the data center in conjunction with local governments to ensure compatibility and consistency.

Ms. Fraiche said we first needed to determine where the centralized data is kept. Then we need to check for omissions. Next would be an analysis of state laws pertaining to land use and the re-codification of laws. Then we would have to provide incentives through grant funding to local communities for planning functions. The creation of a community reinvestment trust fund would require coordination with government entities responsible for conservation and the mitigation trust fund.

Mr. Tanner Johnson explained that the DNR was responsible for the Conservation Trust Fund.

Ms. Fraiche continued that the OSP would be responsible for the coordination, communication, and centralization of the information exchange between state agencies and legislative committees involved in infrastructure recommendations and decisions. She suggested that a link to the legislature be established.

Mr. Tanner Johnson suggested an annual report.

Ms. Sidney Coffee pointed out that the CPRA did not have legislators as members of their board. They have the ability to approve or disapprove plans, and they want to keep politics out of the CPRA.

Ms. Fraiche said the legislators will ultimately make the decision so we need to communicate.

Mr. Frece suggested we change the wording to assure that infrastructure recommendations are decisions that are consistent with the state goals.

Dr. Kalivoda asked if the DOTD would have to go through the OSP for their mandated reports to the legislature and state agencies.

Mr. Garrett explained that the OSP is looking to ensure coordination between the agencies.

Ms. Fraiche said the OSP would coordinate the post-disaster recovery by functioning as a repository for mapping and demographic information. It would also provide information to officials so they could make informed decisions. There would be collaboration with the universities to provide education and resources to the local governments.

Mr. Frece commented that a planning course was given to the Maryland planning officials, which was taken around their state. Realtors needed continuing education credit so they took the course and paid to come to the classes. This is a cost effective way to get the education out to the citizens.

Ms. Fraiche stated that the OSP should not be given new regulatory powers related to environmental or other reviews. It should review local and regional plans to ensure consistency with statewide goals, such as delineated in LA Speaks.

Mr. Garrett asked how this can be ensured, and whether the OSP would be given veto authority.

Mr. Belanger explained that local governments could be required to be on notice that they have to check with the entity where the plans are on record. This would make them aware of potential contradictions.

Dr. Kalivoda observed that two philosophies seemed to be at work. He said some entities will not embrace smart growth.

Mr. Garrett informed the members that a legislative study committee on inclusionary zoning had advocated that there be an entity that could reverse bad decisions made by planning agencies. He said he thinks the word “ensure” creates an authority.

Ms. Thomas suggested we use the word “encourage”.

Dr. Kalivoda stated that many parishes and municipalities are brought on-line without seeing the big picture. He said they are like children; you can advise them for a while, but they are

going to make their own decisions eventually. He said it will be an issue of budgetary controls versus educating the users.

Mr. Frece interjected that “big brother” always has to come in and bail them out. He said there are issues in every state, and it comes down to what is the correct balance. He suggested one way would be to have the entity advise the other agencies, and then withhold funding.

Mr. Belanger remarked that he did not agree with everything in the LA Speaks plan, and suggested that the OSP not refer to this plan. He added that we have to be cautious when unveiling this entity.

Ms. Thomas referred back to the RPCs.

Ms. Fraiche suggested we move on and come back to this issue. She continued that the OSP should provide resources for the RPCs to act as coordinators between the municipal, parish, and regional plans, as well as the recovery plans. Also, the OSP would weigh in on the capital outlay process. She said she would like to have facilitation, timing and funding of the plans, but presently there is no one entity that is charged with the responsibility of implementing the plans.

Ms. Thomas asked about the implementation and updating of the Louisiana regional plan.

Ms. Fraiche stated that implementation applies to statewide, regional, and local plans.

Ms. Coffee asked where the implementation will come in.

Ms. Fraiche replied that the creation of the OSP will take care of that. She wants to ensure that the LA Speaks plan does not sit on a shelf somewhere.

Mr. Tanner Johnson said that DNR and DOTD create the plans and state budgeting requires oversight.

Mr. Villavosa commented that we were not building a bridge; it’s only facilitation.

Ms. Thomas stated that implementation and updating of the plans is already included in the responsibilities of the OSP as discussed. She suggested we include the entire state.

There was no objection.

Mr. Belanger did not want to make a motion, as he did not want to say that the LA Speaks plan is the state plan and thereby force it on everyone.

Ms. Thomas suggested using the word “validate”.

Ms. Fraiche pointed out that the LRA had already done that.

Mr. Belanger asked if there were contradictory comments.

Ms. Thomas observed that there are contradictory comments in everything and in every agency.

Mr. Belanger suggested a filtration of all the plans be coordinated.

Ms. Coffee stated that we do not want to limit ourselves to the LA Speaks plan. The master plan has already been approved by the legislature and it must be implemented.

Mr. Garrett asked for a recitation of the core roles and responsibilities of the entity.

Ms. Kristen Parnell explained that the House Concurrent Resolution states that the OSP is based on the LA Speaks plan.

Mr. Garrett commented that he felt the legislature wanted us to use the LA Speaks plan as a guide.

Mr. Villavosa said it is a guiding framework, and he suggested we use another name instead of the Office of State Planning.

Mr. Belanger offered a motion to adopt the core roles and responsibilities of the OSP. Mr. Reilly seconded the motion, which was unanimously adopted by a vote of 9 yeas and 0 nays. Members voting yea were Mr. Kevin Belanger, Ms. Sidney Coffee, Ms. Donna Fraiche, Mr. Dan Garrett, Ms. Ternisa Hutchinson, Ms. Kristy Jones, Mr. Sean Reilly, Ms. Boo Thomas, and Mr. Stephen Villavaso.

Mr. Reilly suggested we discuss where the OSP is housed.

Ms. Thomas asked about latitude in wordsmithing.

Ms. Fraiche said staff had heard the concepts and the discussion. This is a study commission.

Mr. Belanger said he would like to see overstriking and underscoring of the recommendations that could be ratified at the next meeting of the task force.

Mr. Villavosa asked if he could work with staff on the wordsmithing.

Ms. Fraiche explained that subcommittees are sometimes formed to address one issue. Everything has to be a public record. She asked about the name of the entity.

Ms. Thomas recommended the Office of Coordinated Planning.

Mr. Belanger offered the Office of State Planning and Research.

Ms. Fraiche asked if we could name the entity if we did not know where it would be located. What if the entity is under the DOA? She asked that we consider two options for the name of the entity.

Mr. Garrett suggested that we put the entity in the DOA. He pointed out that if you pass a constitutional amendment, there will be political implications.

Ms. Fraiche stated that all the ideas brought forward will be part of the report made to the legislature, and it may be an office within the DOA.

Dr. Kalivoda said that since the entity will have to have the Governor's buy-in, that it be located within the Governor's office.

Mr. Reilly asked about the function of the entity when considering where to place it. If the entity is under the DOA, they have a lot more power and the civil service function creates continuity. Then there is institutional memory.

Ms. Coffee said that DOA is the way to go if institutionalizing the entity. She did not think it wise to place the entity under the office of the Governor.

Mr. Belanger asked if the Governor had the authority to move the entity out of the DOA.

Ms. Coffee commented that this would not likely happen.

Mr. Garrett asked about the appointments by the Governor.

Mr. Frece observed that having the entity under the DOA is the way to go until the agency can prove itself. He reiterated that the Governor's office has to be involved, and they have to keep the Governor informed on the status of the entity.

Ms. Fraiche asked if a deputy commission could be the policy board for the entity. She asked who would be responsible for hiring the professionals. We do not want this from Civil Service because there are leadership issues.

Mr. Reilly stated that we need to determine where the entity would be housed.

Mr. Reilly offered a motion to house the entity in the DOA, and that the entity be named the Office of Coordinated Planning (OCP).

Dr. Kalivoda offered some comments on actions taken by the previous commissioners of administration.

Ms. Fraiche asked if we could address safeguards.

Mr. Belanger said that if the deputy is appointed, then he is subject to reappointment. He asked who will set the policy and goals and objectives for the OCP. If it is not within the framework of a group, then the entity becomes another boondoggle. He asked where we were headed.

Mr. Reilly suggested staggered appointments to the board that sets the policies.

Ms. Thomas called the question.

Mr. Reilly's motion to house the entity in the DOA and that the entity be named the Office of Coordinated Planning was seconded by Mr. Belanger. The motion was unanimously adopted

by a vote of 8 yeas and 0 nays. Members voting yea were Mr. Kevin Belanger, Ms. Sidney Coffee, Ms. Donna Fraiche, Ms. Ternisa Hutchinson, Ms. Kristy Jones, Mr. Sean Reilly, Ms. Boo Thomas, and Mr. Stephen Villavaso.

Ms. Fraiche stated that the OCP must be appropriately funded and staffed.

Mr. Frece said the report to the legislature should give a sense of the scale and the appropriate staff needed for the OCP. He added that we may want to even consider percentages assigned to particular budget areas, such as GIS and technical support to the local governments.

Ms. Fraiche asked if Mr. Frece had any examples.

He responded that he did not.

Mr. Belanger asked what agencies are already performing certain functions so we could consider pooling staff. We could determine where to go from there.

Ms. Fraiche recommended the Independent Commission on Oversight.

Mr. Frece said an internal coordinating cabinet with committee member representatives ensures agencies speak to one another. Another issue was whether there should be a broader, independent entity.

Ms. Fraiche suggested a commission of the legislative body created like the LRA in addition to an advisory body to set the policy and make recommendations for the hiring of the executive director.

Mr. Frece said the name of a commission usually describes the function.

Ms. Fraiche suggested the Louisiana State Planning and Coordinating Commission.

Ms. Coffee commented that the Governor's Advisory Commission on Coastal Protection does include legislators.

Mr. Garrett asked to include RPC members from the eight planning commissions, which would ensure local input.

Dr. Kalivoda stated again that the appointments should be staggered.

Ms. Thomas said we should discuss the mission before determining appointment possibilities.

Mr. Belanger asked if legislators should be included.

Ms. Coffee explained that it would depend on their role and whether they are chairmen. She said the CPRA includes national people on their committee, which helps to keep things in check. She remarked that it is helpful to have a good mix.

Ms. Fraiche asked if the House Concurrent Resolution addressed the mission of the commission. She asked staff to come up with some ideas for the policy body to direct the coordination, flow and dissemination of planning documents.

Mr. Frece suggested we establish goals. He explained that Maryland did not do this. Benchmarks are also a big task for the commission at the beginning.

Ms. Fraiche stated that the OCP is supposed to focus on the statewide goal to build stronger, smarter, and safer.

Mr. Frece asked that the criteria be listed.

Staff showed the following criteria:

1. The facilitation of implementing and funding local, regional, and state plans.
2. Support the Model Development Code as a tool to implement local planning goals.
3. Provide technical assistance and informational resources (including population forecasts and up to date data and maps), education, outreach to local parishes and municipalities.
4. Establish, in cooperation with LaGIC and other efforts, a GIS and data portal for use as a resource by municipal, parish, RPC, and state agency planning.
5. Analysis of state laws pertaining to land use, i.e., coastal, redevelopment issues, and recodification of laws on the books.
6. Provide incentives through grant funding to local communities for planning functions.
7. Create a Community Reinvestment Trust Fund and coordinate with government entities responsible for the Conservation and Mitigation Trust Fund.
8. Coordinate/communicate and centralize information exchange between state agencies and legislative committees to ensure that the infrastructure recommendations and decisions are consistent with state goals.
9. Annual report to the state legislature on activities.
10. Coordinate post disaster recovery by functioning as repository for local mapping and demographic information and updated local hazard mitigation plans.
11. Will provide information to officials to make the most informed decisions.
12. Collaborate with universities and others to provide education and resources to local governments.
13. The OCP should not be given new regulatory powers related to environmental or other reviews.
14. Use the LA Speaks Regional Plan as the initial guiding resource for activities of the OCP and expand it to include the entire state.
15. To evaluate local and regional plans for consistency with the LA Speaks Regional Plan and/or statewide goals.
16. Provide resources for RPCs to act as coordinators between municipal, parish, and regional plans.
17. The OCP would weigh in during the scoring process conducted by the DOA during the capital outlay process.

← - - - Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Ms. Parnell suggested that the paragraph of the resolution be included in the criteria.

Ms. Fraiche stated that “recovery sustainably” will be included. This will set the framework to be discussed at the next meeting. She asked if we wanted to tackle the composition of the entity. She said she had heard the policy jury, the Louisiana Municipal Association, the Homebuilders Association, the Urban Land Institute, and the Department of Agriculture, someone from the environmental community and DOTD.

Ms. Frece suggested we omit cabinet secretaries but include legislators. He said you do not want to catch legislators by surprise. They do not like it when they are not informed.

Ms. Fraiche asked if any jurisdictional people should be included.

Several suggestions were made by many members of the task force.

Ms. Fraiche said we did not have to decide everyone today, but suggested we establish a maximum number. She said she heard 22 agencies and suggested a maximum of 25 appointees.

Mr. Frece asked about representation from all eight RPCs.

Ms. Fraiche commented that we needed all of them.

Ms. Thomas asked about the universities.

Dr. Kalivoda asked about the natural environment.

Ms. Fraiche said we could add something to address natural conservancy. The task force is taking a good stab at identifying everyone.

Mr. Belanger suggested we elect a vice-chairman for the task force, in the event that Ms. Fraiche could not attend a future meeting.

Ms. Fraiche stated that this would require a vote to amend the agenda.

Ms. Parnell pointed out that this would require a 2/3 vote of the membership.

No action was taken on the election of a vice-chairman.

Ms. Fraiche asked that staff coordinate with her for the next meeting. In the meantime, staff will work on drafts.

Ms. Coffee asked if the director would serve on the advisory committee.

Ms. Thomas said they would want the director on there.

Ms. Coffee said the advisory group advises the OCP.

Ms. Fraiche commented that there is some confusion because there is an internal and an external advisory group. She said the internal coordinating cabinet committee is still under

consideration. She asked if there was anything else the members wanted to add. She asked if we needed to vote again.

Ms. Thomas offered a motion to adopt the criteria that had been presented to the task force for the roles and responsibilities of the OCP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Villavaso. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of 8 yeas and 0 nays. Those voting yeas were Mr. Kevin Belanger, Ms. Sidney Coffee, Ms. Donna Fraiche, Mr. Dan Garrett, Ms. Ternisa Hutchinson, Ms. Kristy Jones, Ms. Boo Thomas, and Mr. Stephen Villavaso.

Ms. Fraiche pointed out that the meeting was open for public comment; however, no witness cards had been submitted.

Ms. Thomas suggested the task force meet again on January 3, 2008.

Ms. Fraiche commented that we should make sure to invite the governor-elect to the next meeting.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no other public comments.

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ms. Donna Fraiche
Office of State Planning Task Force Chairwoman

/fa

Date approved: _____

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶