

j Comments

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, May 25, 2011, 1:00 p.m., City Council Chambers, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Leirion Gaylor Baird, Michael Cornelius, Dick Esseks, Wendy Francis, Roger Larson, Jeanelle Lust, Lynn Sunderman and Tommy Taylor (Jim Partington absent); David Cary, Michael Brienzo, Sara Hartzell and Jean Preister of the Planning Department; other Departmental representatives; media and interested citizens.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Special Public Hearing on the City of Lincoln's draft six year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for FY 2011/2012 - 2016/2017 and the draft FY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Lincoln and Lancaster County area (Lincoln MPO)

Chair Lynn Sunderman called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the back of the room.

This is a special public hearing on the City's six-year Capital Improvements Program and FY2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program for the Lincoln Metropolitan Area (MPO) .

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW EDITION
OF THE CITY OF LINCOLN
DRAFT SIX YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)
FOR FY 2011/12 - 2016/17.**

PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: May 12, 2010

Members present: Larson, Esseks, Cornelius, Taylor, Francis, Gaylor Baird, Lust and Sunderman (Partington absent).

Ex parte communications: None.

Staff presentation: **David Cary of Planning staff** provided a brief overview. The Capital Improvements Program (CIP), provides a multi-year list of proposed capital expenditures for the City and is one of the most important responsibilities of municipal government. This program attempts to set funding strategies not only for the next fiscal budget year, but also to project future needs for major construction projects and land

acquisition. The City constantly looks ahead to consider how we will improve major items such as roads, utilities, police facilities, fire facilities, parks, libraries and other community buildings for the people of Lincoln. Capital expenditures are viewed not only in the context of how much the new project will cost, but also what impact the project will have on the City's operating budget. Capital improvements are projects that generally have a useful life of fifteen or more years that maintain, upgrade or replace public infrastructure and public service providing facilities.

The CIP is not intended to be an all-inclusive inventory of the City of Lincoln's capital needs for the upcoming six years. It is a document that outlines planned capital improvements given available financial resources.

The Lincoln City Charter assigns responsibility for assembling the City's annual six-year CIP to the City's Planning Department. This process involves coordinating the assessment of the City's capital needs across more than a dozen different departments and agencies. Each City department assesses its capital needs and creates an improvement program for a six-year period. The individual capital project requests are submitted to the Planning Department and assembled into a single document that becomes the CIP. Each program is evaluated for conformity with the City-County Comprehensive Plan along with the most recent funding projections and revenue calculations.

Lincoln's six-year CIP is updated annually, beginning in the winter, when City departments prepare their proposed capital improvement program. The Mayor's Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) guides the development of the document. A great deal of effort and work is done by dozens of staff members across city departments to develop this program and their efforts are appreciated.

Per the City Charter, the CIP is reviewed for conformity with the 2030 City-County Comprehensive Plan by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission makes a recommendation as to conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and this recommendation, along with public testimony, is passed on to the Mayor and City Council for consideration in budget discussions over the summer. Year one of the CIP becomes the Capital Budget for fiscal year 2011/12.

Cary then proceeded to provide a brief overview for each department as follows, and department representatives were available to answer questions.

FINANCE: Communications

The proposed Communications/911 CIP includes two projects designed to enhance operations over the six-year period, including a 800 MHz Trunked Radio System upgrade and a mobile Communications Command Post to provide support in the field. The radio upgrade project is part of a proposed Public Safety Bond Issue planned to go

before voters in FY 12/13, and the mobile command post is part of a proposed Public Safety Bond Issue scheduled in FY 16/17.

There was no other public testimony.

FINANCE: Pershing Auditorium

Pershing Auditorium's proposed capital improvements program includes General Revenue funds for the continued minimal maintenance of the Auditorium during the first three years of the program. A bond issue was approved by the voters of the community in May 2010, to build a new arena facility in the Haymarket area. With this approval, the long-term use of the Pershing Center is up for discussion, but in the near-term, Pershing Auditorium will still need to be operational as an arena venue and maintained in a safe and operable condition for several years before the new arena is available for use.

There was no other public testimony.

FIRE & RESCUE

Lincoln Fire and Rescue Department's proposed CIP submittal includes four projects. These projects involve one new fire station, a relocated fire station, a replaced third station, and a general use fire station modifications and repairs project. All projects are proposed to be part of Public Safety Bond Issues planned to go before voters in FY 14/15 and FY 16/17 respectively.

Esseks stated that he would like the audience and the viewing public to know that the Planning Commission did receive a briefing on various parts of the CIP last week, at which time the Commissioners were able to ask questions. This would explain the reason for there being a lack of questions from the Planning Commissioners during this hearing.

LINCOLN CITY LIBRARIES

The Lincoln City Libraries program includes six projects in the six-year CIP. The largest single project is the proposed replacement of the Bennett Martin Library in FY 2016/17. This project is proposed for a combination of a general obligation (GO) bond issue and other financing likely to include private fund-raising. Using General Revenue funding, needed heating/cooling and HVAC projects in Bennett Martin Library are slated for FY 12/13, as is a geothermal conversion project at Gere Library. Anderson Branch Library is slated for new HVAC improvements in FY 13/14 using General Revenue funds. Bethany Branch Library is slated for a roof replacement in 14/15, also using General Revenue.

Taylor wondered whether the plan is that the current Bennett Martin Library would be relocated to the Pershing Auditorium. Cary stated that there is ongoing discussion and there will be a study specifically about that topic. There has been consideration of Pershing Auditorium but no decision has been made on that location.

Gaylor Baird sought confirmation that the expenses projected for 2011/12 to renovate Bennett Martin are actually necessary to maintain the building prior to a potential sale. Cary indicated that they are very much needed projects to gain efficiencies for the building over the longer term, regardless of who is owning the building or the use. If sold, the improvements would be required to be done before the sale.

There was no other public testimony.

LINCOLN ELECTRIC SYSTEM

The Lincoln Electric System's proposed \$292.7 million capital program embodies a substantial investment in electrical power supply and distribution for the community over the six-year period. The program plans for 11,000 new customers and an addition of 47 megawatts of power over the six-year period. Underground distribution, with the majority going to new residential and commercial development, new transformers and meters, and power supply, including LES's investment in the Laramie River Station and new base load generation startup costs for a future plant, account for the largest portions of the program.

There was no other public testimony.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

The proposed capital program for the Police Department involves five projects – relocation of the LPD K9 Training Facility, a study for a new Team Assembly Station in south Lincoln and construction of that facility, and a master plan for a new LPD Garage-Maintenance & Repair Facility and construction of that facility. The first project is shown in FY 11/12 using Other Financing to relocate the existing K-9 facility. The LPD Garage-Maintenance & Repair Facility Phase I and II is slated to be part of a Public Safety Bond Issue in FY 14/15. The LPD Team Assembly Station Phase I and II is slated to be part of a Public Safety Bond Issue in FY 16/17.

Esseks inquired about the "other financing" category. Cary explained that that has been a carryover for many years to continue to identify the need for a new canine training facility. The "other financing" is intended to be in grant form – when that funding is made available that project would move forward.

There was no other public testimony.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The Urban Development Department's proposed CIP includes twelve projects totaling over \$18.5 million over the six-year period. The funding for the program consists of Community Improvement Financing (or Tax Increment Financing), Community Development Block Grants, Revenue Bonds, City General Revenue funds, Service Charges, and Other Financing in the form of private financing. Public parking program projects, which were formerly part of the Public Works and Utilities CIP, are a major portion of Urban Development's CIP.

Notable projects included in the Urban Development CIP are the Civic Plaza project at 13th and P Streets, the Centennial Mall reconstruction project, a Wayfinding Signage project, and a Parking Meters replacement project.

Gaylor Baird inquired about the recommendation for the credit card meters as opposed to leaving them as they are today. **David Landis**, Director of Urban Development, stated that there is a need to move from our existing meters to one of two options which are upgrades making use of technology. One is something that looks like what we have now but is capable of being swiped with a credit card. The other alternative is a multi-space meter, in which there would be a module in two or three places in a block that will cover six, eight or ten stalls. The parker would get a sticker from the module and put it on their car window. Both options have advantages, but they are distinctly different from a cost perspective, i.e. \$4,600 versus \$6,000 to \$8,000. We are moving to a cashless society and lots of people use credit cards – it is convenient and quick. The use of the credit card technology improves the amount that the consumer is likely to buy. For that reason the payback on these mechanisms are relatively quick. One of the downsides is that it requires that you pay the service fee necessary to use the credit card. In either capacity we will have fewer parking meters than what we have now – at least visually – and secondly, we should have greater convenience for people using downtown parking. Of the two options, Landis prefers the single stall option.

There was continued discussion about the costs and the maintenance of the parking meters. The installation costs are factored into the cost of the meter.

Larson inquired as to the number of parking meters in the downtown. **Ken Smith**, Parking Manager, stated that there are currently 3800 meters. The approach is to look at replacing the meters in a phased approach.

Lust inquired about the source of energy for the parking meters. Smith stated that the meters operate on solar power with battery backup.

Larson believes that the typical parker will buy more time if they can use a credit card, but wondered about credit for anytime that is not used. Landis indicated that there are options available at a higher cost. With the multi-space meter, that situation does not apply because you get a sticker that you put on your window. If you leave that stall with

time left, you have an hour of downtown parking and you can park someplace else with that same sticker.

Smith added that there is an option to acquire occupancy sensors that provide information for operations, which would allow the opportunity to do a study and status to understand the management of the system. If there is sufficient money, the intent would be to acquire the occupancy sensors.

Larson asked about the revenue from parking meters. Smith advised that the revenue from the parking meters and off-street facilities all goes to the parking fund with a contribution back to the general fund. Landis further explained that Urban Development gets a significant amount of the parking meter revenue to help pay for the parking system, as well as revenue from parking garages and parking meters to pay off bond issues. That is different than parking tickets, where the money goes to the general fund and it goes to the schools. There is a difference between the revenue from parking meters and from parking tickets.

Landis then suggested that the city is underselling its parking and it has a system that is the opposite of the rational approach of parking theorists who would tell you how to operate. The theorists would tell you to make the highest price for that which is most convenient because people will pay for convenience. Thus, we are selling the most convenient parking for the lowest possible price. Whether we did parking meter changes or not, there is a structural imbalance in the way we are handling parking in the city. If you were to do a rational approach of charging for value, you would have the garages cheaper than on-street parking. Landis believes it would be rational to make that change whether we purchase new parking meters or not.

Francis inquired as to the cost to maintain the current parking meters and their life expectancy and repair time. Smith stated that a lot of the services have been recently consolidated and they are still in the early stages of analyzing that information. We are working through those numbers to establish the cost to write a ticket.

There was no other public testimony.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Proposed capital improvements to the City's parks and recreation system are projected to cost \$50 million over the six-year period. Athletic fees, General Obligation (GO) bonds, general revenue, Keno funds, Transportation Enhancement funds, impact fees, tennis fees, and the Parks & Rec repair/replacement fund account for the majority of funds programmed for the CIP. Funds from private sources are also being shown for a substantial portion of the six-year improvement program. A general obligation (GO) "Quality of Life Bond Issue" request amounting to \$19.9 million is planned for FY 14/15 for various improvements to the Parks & Recreation system.

There was no other public testimony.

PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES

StarTran

StarTran's six-year, \$9.1 million proposed capital improvement program is funded largely through Federal transportation funding with \$7.6 million in funds, with the balance coming from City general revenue funds and special reserves. The largest single capital item is the accumulation of funds for replacement of 20 buses in FY 15/16. No General Revenue funds are programmed in the first year of this year's CIP.

There was no other public testimony.

Streets and Highways

The Streets and Highways capital program proposed by Public Works & Utilities identifies a program totaling \$150.4 million over the six-year programming period, a decrease of approximately \$5 million from last year's CIP. These projects range from resurfacing projects to pedestrian facilities to system management programs to the construction of major new roadway facilities.

With the adoption of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan in November of 2006, a list and map of specific street projects were included as part of the Plan. The "Streets and Highways" CIP submittal has been closely coordinated with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan which was used in determining Comprehensive Plan conformity. The 2040 update of the Comprehensive Plan, and with it the Long Range Transportation Plan, is underway. Changes in the priorities of the transportation plan are likely. These changes, once formally adopted into the new 2040 Comprehensive Plan, will need to be acknowledged in the capital programming beginning with the 2012/2013 CIP next year.

A variety of Federal, State and City revenues are utilized to fund the Streets and Highways program, including impact fees that began in 2003, City Wheel Tax revenues, and Federal transportation funds. The Public Works & Utilities Department anticipates a decrease in Highway Allocation Funding (State gas tax revenues) over the next six years that will ultimately reduce the City's ability to meet the needs of the transportation system.

At this time, some of the on-going traffic signal, arterial and residential street rehabilitation, new street, trail rehabilitation, new trail, and sidewalk rehabilitation projects are not being funded to their full need in all 6 years. In particular, the referenced goal in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan to fund the sidewalk rehabilitation program annually to meet the stated goals of the Pedestrian Facilities ADA Transition Plan is not being met in the proposed CIP.

The notable projects in the first year of the program include arterial and residential street rehabilitation, the Southwest 40th Viaduct project, North 14th Street widening from Superior to Alvo, Traffic Optimization and Management Program projects, Safety and Operation Improvement Program projects, Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair Program projects, and impact fee funding for various arterial street projects within impact fee districts.

Esseks began to discuss the sidewalk maintenance program. How will the \$500,000 in the first year be spent – will it be on an as needed basis, whole blocks, problem areas? Cary stated that there is a full blown program employed by Public Works to manage the needs for repair of sidewalks. As part of the update of the Comprehensive Plan, there are many needs beyond the \$500,000. There is a program set up to identify the specific areas and where to concentrate their efforts, and based on the age of the sidewalks, in general. Where there are sidewalks that are dangerous with children and elderly people walking on them who face some real risks and dangers, Esseks is hopeful that Public Works will go in there and fix those dangerous situations. Cary pointed out that part of that program is on a complaint basis as well and Public Works will assess the condition of the sidewalk segment. **Thomas Shafer**, Manager of Design and Construction, confirmed that they do work off a complaint basis first; then known places of disrepair; and then curb ramps for the ADA transition plan. If we have money left over, we identify neighborhoods for more concentrated efforts.

Cornelius reiterated that the amount specified in the CIP is insufficient to meet the needs of the community. Yet the Comprehensive Plan is pretty specific about sidewalks being a priority, stating that they should receive consistent maintenance. This amount is the same as last year – consistent in under-funding. Cornelius indicated that every year, he tends toward wanting to find that the Comprehensive Plan is not in conformance with the budget, but that is not something that you can address when you try to build this budget using the amount allocated. The Comprehensive Plan is put together through a public process, and to a great extent, the community dictates what we put in the Plan. In the case of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, regular and consistent maintenance of sidewalks is specified and we consistently fail to meet that. Cornelius is unsure how to reflect that in the findings on the CIP. It seems like there is a disconnect in what we want and ask for and what we are willing to pay for. He is hopeful that the 2040 Comprehensive Plan finds a way to make that more consistent and reconnect.

Lust agreed with Cornelius. It is a real concern that we are out of compliance with ADA. Secondly, at the briefing, a program was mentioned where a private landowner could contribute or arrange for repair of their sidewalks. How would someone go about doing that? Shafer suggested that Public Works should be contacted or go to the Web site and use “sidewalk” as the keyword. There is a pamphlet which provides information on this program. A contact would be made with Public Works. Public Works would inspect the location, make sure the sidewalk is a public sidewalk, determine that the

sidewalk does have disrepair, and then would be willing to accept the fixed cost assigned. The City generally gets a majority of the cost but not 100%, depending on the contracting and who does the work. We do have that capped.

Larson pointed out that available revenue must be factored in when these budgets are prepared. He assumes that involves some guesswork. Cary stated that it is much less guesswork for the first year than for the future years. We are working on a more refined listing in the new Plan.

Larson wondered whether a volunteer to pay for their own sidewalk could be a block long association of homeowners. Shafer did not know why that couldn't be done, but he does not believe that has been experienced. They usually work with individual property owners. There have been situations where two property owners have each individually requested reimbursement and then found one contractor.

Gaylor Baird noted that the funding goes down in 2014/15. Shafer explained that the gas tax is looking very flat or even declining. Street maintenance costs continue to go up. Something has to give. It is not just sidewalks that goes down. There are other programs such as signal replacement that go down. Our arterial and residential street maintenance is as underfunded as sidewalks, and that program goes down, too.

Sunderman asked Shafer to discuss sidewalk and street maintenance dollars that are available. Shafer stated that increasing costs – price of oil, labor costs – continue to increase. The cost of doing business is going up and revenues are staying very flat, e.g. we are not under any federal transportation bill right now. That is an unknown that takes away from the ability to do projects.

Public Testimony

1. Russell Miller, 341 S. 52nd, referred to the street portion of the proposed CIP budget starting in September 2011. The money for residential street rehabilitation (code 0183) in the amount of \$1.154 million comes from the wheel tax. Under the least costly circumstance, it costs \$105,000/mile to rehab a residential street. But if curb and gutters need to be replaced, the cost can be \$160,000 - \$170,000/mile. Thus Lincoln can only rehab approximately 10 miles per year. When you realistically consider the necessity of replacing curbs and gutters, we would only be able to rehab 7 miles per year. Approximately 170 miles of Lincoln's streets are rated poor or fair, which means they should be rehabilitated or replaced very soon. Miller recommended that the City rehab a minimum of 15 miles of residential streets per year. This could be funded by reapportioning the wheel tax. The money removed from the wheel tax construction fund and residual fund could be made up by increasing impact fees, which have not been adjusted for inflation since 2007. We need to spend more money on rehabilitating our streets by increasing impact fees.

Esseks asked how Miller came up with the 15 miles/year. Miller stated that he just doubled what is being done now. If we have 100 miles of streets that need to be repaired today, 10 miles or 7 miles is not going to work. 15 miles won't do it either but we'll get closer. We need to do a minimum of 10-15 miles per year.

Francis inquired why Miller targeted raising the impact fees as opposed to property taxes. Miller's response was that traditionally, streets have come out of wheel tax and gas tax. A lot of the wheel tax money is going toward new road construction, which is the consequence of Lincoln's growth. Lincoln's growth should pay for more of it. Most of the wheel tax money comes from people that live in the non-fringe area. In his opinion it is reasonable to expect that money to be used to repair our streets.

Gaylor Baird observed that Miller's concerns are shared by a number of people in the community and this group, along with a number of citizens serving on the LPlan 2040 Advisory Committee (LPAC) who have been looking at the issue of maintenance costs and roads. There is an interest in starting a shift towards funding maintenance at greater levels.

2. Terry Schwimmer, 3724 NW 57th, in Green Prairie Heights, discussed NW 48th Street, the future widening of which he understands is again being re-prioritized and delayed or funded to a much lesser degree. NW 48th has many different subdivisions utilizing it – Arnold Heights, Olympic Heights, Oak Hills, Green Prairie Heights, Ashley Heights, Hub Hall Heights, Cardinal Heights, Hartland Northwest, View Pointe West and Hidden Acres. The area has been growing. These developments have been paying impact fees and property taxes. NW 48th also serves Duncan Aviation, Kawasaki, and many other factories in the area. Schwimmer moved to Lincoln in 1992, and ever since then he has heard about NW 48th being widened. Yet every year it is a moving target.

Esseks asked what part of NW 48th Street needs to be improved. Schwimmer suggested at the very least, the area from West Adams Street down to just north of the Interstate. When you come off the Interstate and go north you have two lanes that abruptly go into one lane and it becomes pretty constricted. And that is an area where there is more of the development. You could go all the way to Hwy 34.

Larson inquired whether NW 48th eventually turns into a four-lane thoroughfare. Schwimmer stated that it is only four-lane down near the Interstate. We keep hearing about four-lane, but it doesn't happen.

Cary clarified that in this proposed CIP, there is a new program that has been identified this year in advance of the new LRTP, i.e. the LRTP Priority Project Program. In that program, the NW 48th project description does point from O Street to Adams for widening to four lanes. We would have enough funding for that project in years five and six. It has been identified as a need. In addition, in the current work on the new Comprehensive Plan, that segment is a very highly prioritized project. Cary assured

that it has not been forgotten. The funding is the trick, but at this point in time we still have a place-holder in years five and six of the six-year program.

Francis expressed appreciation to Schwimmer for coming and testifying about this street. She is familiar with that area and there has been a lot of growth in the last 10 years and a lot of business growth in the last couple years.

At this point in the meeting, the **FY 2012-2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)** was called.

Mike Brienzo of the Planning Department and staff for the MPO element presented the proposed TIP. The TIP is a programming document that lists projects for the purpose of funding with federal program funds. The TIP covers any project within Lancaster County that is seeking federal funding and is developed cooperatively with any transit agency or organization seeking funds for a project, including NDOR, Lancaster County, City, StarTran and federal transit administration programs. It also includes the Airport Authority and a listing of transportation enhancement projects by various organizations, including the City, NRD, Game and Parks, and one project for the City of Hickman.

The TIP is a four-year document that schedules projects in terms of their priority. They are all fiscally constrained and it is an effort to obligate those federal funds to these projects. Any major changes would require an amendment to this document. The TIP is a listing of projects that come from the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, which includes the current Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The TIP must go through public review and is recommended to the Planning Commission. This year's TIP comes with a staff recommendation of general conformance with the transportation plan in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. From here, the recommendation and findings will go to the MPO Officials Committee and then to the state to be appropriated with the state program.

There was no other public testimony.

The discussion then returned to David Cary on the Public Works and Utilities CIP.

Watershed Management

The proposed Watershed Management CIP contains approximately \$34.5 million in improvements over the six year period. The passage of three general obligation (GO) bond issues (in FY 2012/13, FY 2014/15, and FY 2016/17) would constitute the bulk of the funding for these improvements. The remaining watershed management projects are proposed to be funded through State/Federal Funds and Other Financing. These projects include water quality projects, stream rehabilitation on Parks property, floodplain/floodprone engineering and projects, urban storm drainage projects, implementation of Watershed Master Plan projects, and the continued development of Comprehensive Watershed Master Plans.

There was no other public testimony.

Street Maintenance Operations

The Street Maintenance Operations proposed CIP includes a New Salt Storage Shed at 3200 Baldwin Ave. using General Revenue in FY 2012/13, and the Southeast District Shop Addition project using Lease Purchase Financing in FY 2016/17.

Sunderman noted that the Southeast District Shop Addition continues to be carried over due to lack of funding.

There was no other public testimony.

Water Supply and Distribution

The proposed Lincoln Water System CIP contains approximately \$61.3 million in water supply, treatment, storage and distribution improvements over the six-year period. This is a lower total amount compared to last year's CIP. Included in this year's submittal are projects intended to enhance water services to the existing City, while others will serve developing areas of Lincoln. The CIP has been prepared based upon information and recommendations contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and Lincoln Water System Facilities Master Plan. Funding sources for projects include community improvement financing (TIF), revenue bonds, utility revenues, and impact fees. This proposed CIP assumes a 5% revenue increase in water utility revenues in FY 2011/2012. It should be noted that a comprehensive rate study of the City's utilities is underway and the findings of that study will be discussed later this year.

Continued in this year's program is general programming of projects intended to serve growth in the community. Specific programming of funding for these projects will be identified as planning and need become more apparent in future years. At this time, \$4.5 million in Impact Fees, Utility Revenue, and Revenue Bond funding has been programmed for a list of potential projects that total \$27.8 million in costs. To help meet the continuing growing need to replace the aging water main system, the Selected Main Replacement program is funded in FY 11/12 at \$4.86 million and at \$23.32 million over the 6 years of the program. Similarly, the Infrastructure Rehab program that funds needed maintenance of Water System facilities is funded at \$2.14 million in the first year and \$8.18 over the 6 years of the program. Specific developer commitments are funded in the program per annexation agreement requirements.

There was no other public testimony.

Wastewater

The proposed Lincoln Wastewater CIP contains approximately \$61.7 million in projects, encompassing both the Theresa Street and Northeast Treatment Plants, construction of new sanitary sewer mains, and the selective replacement of existing mains over the six-year period. This amount is lower than last year's program by about \$5 million. The CIP

has been prepared based on information and recommendations contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and the adopted Lincoln Wastewater Facilities Master Plan. Funding sources for projects include community improvement financing (TIF), revenue bonds, utility revenues, and impact fees. This proposed CIP assumes a 5% revenue increase in wastewater utility revenues in FY 2011/2012. It should be noted that a comprehensive rate study of the City's utilities is underway and the findings of that study will be discussed later this year.

Continued in this year's program is more general programming of projects intended to serve growth in the community. Specific funding for projects will be identified as planning and need become more apparent in future years. At this time, \$3 million in impact fees and utility revenues have been programmed for a list of potential projects that total \$27.4 million in costs. To help meet the continuing growing need to replace and repair the aging wastewater equipment, facilities, and collectors, the Selected Repair/Replacement of Wastewater Facilities/Collectors program is funded at \$14.4 million over the 6 years of the program. Of note is the funding of construction of Phase III and Phase IV of the Stevens Creek trunk sewer down to 98th and O Street in the first 3 years of the program. Also, specific developer commitments are funded in the program per annexation agreement requirements.

There was no other public testimony.

Solid Waste Operations

Proposed capital improvements for the Solid Waste Operations program include projects related to the Bluff Road Sanitary Landfill, the North 48th Street Landfill and Transfer Station, and the Solid Waste Management System. The CIP totals approximately \$25 million over the six-year period which is a decrease from last year.

Notable projects include liner and leachate collection systems for new phases and final caps for older phases of the Bluff Road landfill, development of a landfill gas collection and utilization system, expansion of recycling facilities, consideration for park development for the N 48th Street landfill after closure, and closure of the North 48th Street landfill.

Esseks inquired about the landfill gas utilization system being "voluntarily" constructed. **Gary Brandt** of Solid Waste Operations, explained that the word "voluntary" is used because it is not imposed by a regulatory requirement. We are proceeding forward with a collection system and utilization system to utilize the gas in advance as opposed to being forced regulatorily to do that. The utilization would be either through looking in the community for those that could do a direct use of that gas, or look at the possibility of a use by an entity or the city or someone else for generation of electricity. There is some wasting of energy in that regard if it is not fully utilized.

There was no other public testimony.

**CITY OF LINCOLN'S DRAFT SIX-YEAR
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR
FY2011/12 - 2016/17.**

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 25, 2011

Taylor moved to find the draft CIP to be in full or general conformance with the 2030 Lincoln-Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Francis.

Cornelius thanked the members of city staff for being here today and expressed appreciation for the availability of information at the briefing last week. It was very helpful in getting through this. He reiterated his concern that while it seems that each of the items that were presented is in full or general compliance, in the abstract, it seems as though we have a gulf between the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the funding to achieve those goals in all cases.

Sunderman agreed. The Comprehensive Plan is a community based document with public input. But the budget is also a public based type document. The City Council is looking for all sorts of input in various ways from the public on how to pay for these programs. There is definitely a disconnect in what we want and what we can pay for. We somehow need to narrow that gap.

Larson agreed with Sunderman. As the gentleman promoting NW 48th Street pointed out, projects just seem to be moving targets as we delay and defer. Somehow or another, society needs to look at these things differently and somehow close that gap that is restricting our desires or increasing our willingness to pay. It is a serious problem here as well as in our whole country. Also, Larson wonders how much of our funds are being expended for duplication of approvals, etc., and how to go about eliminating any duplication.

Gaylor Baird observed that costs are very crucial to these discussions. She does not want to maintain the thought that people can't adapt to changes. She is confident in our community and thinks people can and will adapt to change.

Motion for a finding of full or general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan carried 8-0: Esseks, Francis, Cornelius, Gaylor Baird, Taylor, Larson, Lust and Sunderman voting 'yes'; Partington absent.

DRAFT FY2012-2015
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM
FOR THE LINCOLN AND LANCASTER COUNTY AREA
(LINCOLN MPO).

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:

May 25, 2011

Francis moved a finding of general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Taylor and carried 8-0: Esseks, Francis, Cornelius, Gaylor Baird, Taylor, Larson, Lust and Sunderman voting 'yes'; Partington absent.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Q:\MPO\TIP\2012 TIP_draft\Comments\TIP Public Hearing Minutes.wpd