

# Questions & Answers

As of August 8, 2023

## Traffic:

1. The Summary on Page 29 of the TIA recommends, in order 1) adding a westbound turn lane at Monroe and E Causeway; and 2) widening of Monroe St. to include a median. I have the following questions regarding these:

- a. What is the estimated cost of these improvements, including any utility relocation, signaling, landscaping, etc? **USI concurs with the \$300K estimate. The improvements suggested may not be needed until 2045, if at all. It should be noted that the need for these improvements is to support the anticipated increase in traffic volumes from developments in the surrounding area and not as a direct result of the trips estimated for the Sucette Harbor development.**
- b. Will the applicant pay for these improvements or will they be incurred by the City? **The funding source for the improvements will be decided by others**
- c. How would the two live oak trees currently in the median be impacted? Would they be lost? **The estimated storage length is 175' and the taper would be 150' for deceleration based on the speed. This should fit and/or can be designed to avoid any impact to the live oak trees.**
- d. Approximately how wide would the eastbound and westbound lanes of Monroe be vs. current conditions; and what would be the width on either side of Monroe and in the new median available for trees and landscaping? **The existing lane widths on Monroe are not expected to change. The proposed left turn lane could be a minimum 11 feet. The existing median is approximately 15 feet. After striping and curbing, a minimum of 3 feet of median could remain.**

2. How specifically does the projected growth rate in the TIA (1.5% per year through 2045) reflect:

- a) Old Mandeville/the Lakefront being a destination for all surrounding heavy projected growth areas such as Covington, Madisonville, Abita Springs, Unincorporated Mandeville, etc;

**I believe looking at a cross section of all the above listed count locations and data (LA 22 from West, US 190 from North, and Jackson Ave/Girod/US190 from the East), it portrays the current growth of vehicles from each direction into Old Mandeville. If we are showing that historically, and with a lot of recent data for the major corridors, that the traffic daily has somewhat "flattened out", then the 1.5% percent annualized growth should be a very conservative number. Keep in mind that 1.5% percent growth is essentially applied to each year in the horizon year, which means 1.5% at 20 years.**

- B) the fact that the Old Mandeville/Lakefront destination has only three real entry points by vehicle - Monroe, Girod, Jackson?

**The “3 entry points” are part of the data collected and shown above. The 1.5% ends up being a general percent annualized growth based off of all data collected.**

3. Page 17 of the TIA states **"the proposed restaurant is intended to provide amend amenities to the residents. It is not intended to attract patrons from the surrounding area. The marina is not planned to include a boat launch and therefore will not be utilized by the general public. Trips for both of these land uses, although small, were included to be conservative."** However, the developers marketing materials both printed and online indicate that the project is a "a charming new mixed-use waterfront destination that **will bring new life to the Northshore of Mandeville. Sucette Harbor will be home to an 80 key boutique hotel and event venue, a 55+ active adult apartment complex, a marina and boat docks, plus retail, food and beverage, and will attract a range of locals and regional visitors alike."** Which one of these statements is correct...will the restaurant, marina and boat docks, plus retail, food and beverage attract a range of locals and regional visitors or will they simply be amenities for the apartments with only minimal trips associated with these uses as indicated in the TIA? **The marina will not have a boat launch that attracts vehicular trips. Boats docks will allow boat access from the lake to the facilities, reducing potential vehicular traffic. The fast casual restaurant use is representative of the cafe, which will have limited hours and services and attract few patrons outside of the residents and guests of the development. The High-Turnover Sit-down restaurant trips in the traffic study are representative of attracting locals outside of the development. The hotel land use trips account for the regional visitors.**

4. In the Council meeting on June 8, the City Engineer confirmed that only an additional 9 vehicles would be expected on Monroe during peak hours as a result of this development. Please confirm this number.

**This number needs to be clarified as we were discussing several locations on Monroe. The portion of Monroe where this topic was discussed was the amount of additional vehicles that would be traveling from Covington during the AM and PM peak hours and making the u-turn to utilize the Service road and ultimately a right turn on Monroe, under the overpass and ultimately on the Old Mandeville side of Monroe. We didn't go deep into the breakdown, but the number "9" needs to be clarified as the number "9" is actually the additional vehicles that would be generated every 15 minutes for the AM peak hour for this area. This number was said instead of the 33 vehicles that is discussed below, which is the information Councilman Zuckerman is looking for**

**The additional vehicle trips generated by the development in the peak hour from Covington, that would perform the above movement to east side Monroe for AM is 33 vehicles and the PM is 68 vehicles. These are calculated by taking the total trip generation estimates listed in page 18 in the report (93 total AM and 194 total PM) and apply the trip distribution factor of 35% to it (i.e.  $0.35 * 93 = 33$  AM vehicles from that direction). The 35% number comes from the fact that the traffic engineer has estimated that 35% of new trips will be coming from this direction.**

**Question 1) How will locals continue to have a normal commute during this two-or-three year construction period of the connection facilities and the project itself, if approved?**

**Question 2) How will traffic on Monroe be affected during the operating years when the SYSCO truck (and others so configured) are making turns from Monroe to Antibes?**

A WB-40 (45'-6" length) truck is the first size truck that cannot make the turns onto and from both Antibes. Anything shorter in length can make the turns. This means that some mods would be needed to the radii and most likely the medians along both streets to accommodate the trucks. I would imagine that a lot of these curbs would have to be readjusted after construction anyway due to the construction vehicles off tracking over them too

**Question 3) How much will all the infrastructure connections cost?**

**Question 4) Are the capacities of the City facilities existing on Monroe Street large enough to handle the incoming connections or do they have to be enlarged further upstream?**

**Question 5) Who pays for the connection facilities and any enlargement if required?**

***And while asking questions:***

**The money question:**

***Has the Council yet determined whether there is any net revenue that will flow to the City of Mandeville from the proposed Sucette Harbor project when projected concomitant expenses are accounted for?***

Folks in Lewisburg have brought to my attention an allegation that the Sucette Traffic Study only focused on Monroe Street east of the Causeway (coming from the south and headed down the East Approach). Specifically, the subject study did not look at the traffic effects associated with travel under the Monroe Street overpass. The traffic in question would be coming from either the West Approach and/or North Causeway going south that must exit on the down ramp and circle back to Monroe Street.

For all practical purposes the Monroe Street underpass is the only viable route out of OGS / Lewisburg to the COM. It would be a great hardship for residents to have to travel four miles out on the Causeway Bridge and loop back to get to the COM if this artery becomes clogged like Highway 22. The exit on the 20 foot wide Sandra Lee at the West Approach is quite limited given the volume of traffic that must enter / exit both OGS and Lewisburg.

Is it true that the subject developer paid study omitted the traffic effects associated with the Monroe Street Underpass as noted above? **To answer your question, the study included the traffic that travels under the Monroe Street overpass. Any vehicle that would utilize this approach to travel to the proposed development site gets captured at the signalized Monroe/E Causeway Approach intersection since there is no other direct way to the development.**

The travel under the Monroe Street overpass is greatly associated with how efficient or non-efficient the signal is at Monroe/E Causeway Approach