

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO CHAPTER 15 ORDINANCE
PROPOSED BY DWIGHT HUDSON**

PAGE 1

G. Delete changes.

PAGE 5

E. Hydrologic Design

1. The Drainage Impact Study shall indicate existing conditions for peak ten (10) year and twenty-five (25) year flow rates at the development and exit points.
2. The Drainage Impact Study shall indicate future condition peak ten (10) and twenty-five (25) year flow rates at the development entry and exit points.
3. If ponds are used in design for routing of flows, the ten (10) and twenty-five (25) year storm event shall be used in design of the pond capacity and site discharge. The interior conveyance system shall be designed for the ten (10) year storm event.

PAGE 11

Delete Changes in section 2.

Add Section to confirm that projects already approved but not yet constructed will not be subject to any revised ordinance changes.

TALKING POINTS

Twenty-Five Design Standard

1. The Changes to language moving to only a 25-year design storm event needs to be better defined. Present language could be interpreted in a way that could cause greater flooding downstream. The study should consider both the 10-year and 25 year storm event on the overall development.
2. The ordinance needs to clarify that the interior conveyance system does not have to be built to the 25 year standard.
3. Present ordinance would cover projects such as PUD's, and SPUD's already approved but not yet fully built out.

Ten (10) percentage increases in storage proposal:

1. No jurisdiction in Louisiana makes such requirement.
2. Imposing a burden to hold additional volume on the dominant estate may be considered a violation of Civil Code articles 655 & 656 and result in possible litigation. Does the police powers to impose an unnatural burden on property may be a violation of law? The current ordinance recognizes that the development will not decrease the existing volume storage capacity.
3. The proposed ordinance does not apply to Baker, Zachary or Central. It would be easier to develop in these jurisdictions as well as Livingston and Ascension. This will drive development out of Baton Rouge and to these other jurisdictions. This would not help the city of Baton Rouge or in particularly north Baton Rouge where there was substantial flooding. Infill or redevelopment sites will be penalized based on the size of existing tracts and the limitation of the already developed properties that surround such sites.
4. If this was implemented it would take decades for sufficient volume to accumulate and make any appreciable improvement in the overall flood plain management. The decision to provide additional storage capacity should be tabled until the results of the parish drainage study are completed. Without cooperation from surrounding Livingston and Ascension Parishes, the effect of such additional 10% storage will have even less effect.
5. There has been no engineering determination that this proposal would provide sufficient benefit for the unknown price it will cost for such change. The language is not clear as to how this 10% will be implemented in the overall design and execution or its interpretation by the parish.
6. No one appears to know how much this will cost and what the corresponding benefit.
7. There is concern that a commercial development would not be able to meet this requirement. For an example, CVS Drugstore on a 1.5-acre site would have to provide underground storage or acquire some offsite property for detention.