

A G E N D A
CITY-COUNTY COMMON MEETING
Tuesday, April 9, 2002 - 8:00 to 10:00 a.m.
County-City Building - Room 113

- I. MINUTES** - Common Meeting on February 25, 2002

- II. 8:00 a.m. MAYOR'S ECONOMIC COORDINATOR POSITION** - Jon Camp

- III. 8:15 a.m. PROCEDURE FOR JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN HEARINGS;
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS** - Planning
Department

- IV. 10:00 a.m. ADJOURNMENT**

M I N U T E S
CITY-COUNTY COMMON
Tuesday, April 9, 2002 - 8:00 a.m.
County-City Building, Room 113

County Commissioners Present: Bernie Heier, Common Chair; Kathy Campbell, Larry Hudkins, Ray Stevens and Bob Workman

City Council Members Present: Ken Svoboda, Common Vice Chair; Jon Camp, Glenn Friendt, Annette McRoy, Coleen Seng and Terry Werner

Others Present: Mayor Don Wesely; Kent Morgan, Duncan Ross, Steve Henrichsen, Mike DeKalb, Mike Brienzo, Planning Department; Don Thomas, County Engineer; Allan Abbott, Roger Figard and Randy Hoskins, Public Works; Bruce Medcalf, County Clerk; Trish Owen, Deputy County Clerk; Joan Ross, City Clerk; Dana Roper, City Attorney; Mark Bowen, Ann Harrell and Amy Tejral, Mayor's Office; Lynn Johnson and Terry Genrich, Parks & Recreation; Gwen Thorpe, County Deputy Administrative Officer; Darrell Podany, City Council Staff; Mike Carlin, Friends of Wilderness Park; Nate Jenkins, Journal Star; and Cori Beattie, County Board Secretary

MINUTES

Campbell moved approval of the February 25, 2002, Common meeting minutes; seconded by Seng. Roll call vote. Ayes: Campbell, Camp, Cook, Heier, Seng, Stevens, Werner and Workman. Nays: None. Motion passed 8-0. (Wesely, Friendt, Hudkins, McRoy and Svoboda absent for vote.)

MAYOR'S ECONOMIC COORDINATOR POSITION

Camp noted the City Council voted 6-1 to proceed with the hiring of an economic development coordinator. In speaking with several County Commissioners, he felt it would be beneficial to discuss economic development today. Camp indicated the Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development (LPED) has been in operation for six years and he felt it would be better to find ways to work within the structure before setting up an individual bureaucracy. (Hudkins, Friendt, Svoboda, McRoy and Wesely arrived.)

Camp distributed copies of a letter addressed to him from James Haga, CEO, Hamilton College and Kaplan College, regarding LPED. **(See Exhibit A.)** Mr. Haga is concerned that taxpayer dollars in a strained economy would be spent when the private sector would be willing to add this position to the Chamber of Commerce staff. Camp stressed economic development is very critical to the local economy and both the City Council and County Board want to see the community thrive. He felt open dialogue, such as today, would greatly help officials to focus on the best mechanisms to achieve success.

Workman said he testified before the City Council yesterday. He added Mr. Haga's comments were quite interesting, especially when he said he wished representatives from the County and Lincoln Electric System (LES) attended LPED meetings. Workman noted County and LES representatives were at every meeting. He then quoted Mr. Haga as saying, "I don't know how many board meetings I've gone to where we wished the University of Nebraska (UNL) would get involved. We did not know how to get them involved. We did not know how to get their attention. We've been walking around waiting for these people to be involved. They want to be involved today because they want their own group. So I'm very confused why they are all excited today. They weren't excited about it yesterday." Workman added if it takes an interlocal agreement to get UNL involved, the City and County should go for it. He respects everything LPED has done since 1996, but feels that moving forward will allow some fine-tuning of the process.

Wesely said he appreciates Mr. Haga's involvement with LPED but the reason things are going forward is because it's clear that when the City, County and UNL work together, some good things happen. He added discussions on this issue have been ongoing for months.

Hudkins agreed with comments from Workman and Wesely. He said everyone worked to get Kawasaki in this community and feels the position is one that will help pull things together. The County Board previously voted 4-1 to support the hiring of an economic development coordinator.

Camp stated the City and County should have discussed the position months ago. He asked Campbell to elaborate on her vote against the position. Campbell said she philosophically has difficulties with economic development being removed from private partnership, and realizes a vote in favor of the position is not in any way a negative against LPED.

Stevens said the County Board's staff meeting contained good discussion regarding the concept of funding the new position. He recollected that the County Board's 4-1 vote was taken at that time. Since then, an interlocal agreement was developed which flushed out the details and somewhat changed his perception of the concept. Regardless, he still feels it is important to proceed. He hoped that being a joint position, the person could serve as an expediter in getting things done through government bureaucracy. He mentioned a concern with funding. Initially the County mentioned funding the position with keno funds. Workman testified to the City Council that he was looking at an alternative funding source. Stevens noted this approach appealed to him in that dollars would be redirected from other budgeted funds.

Camp commented if the new position is approved, he hoped government would serve as a facilitator and not a dictator in economic development as he feels economic development should not be driven by the political sector. Also, he noted concerns regarding the process as the Mayor's Office solicited applications for the position before the interlocal agreement was drafted or a public hearing was held.

PROCEDURE FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN HEARINGS

A handout was distributed regarding items for today's Comprehensive Plan discussion. **(See Exhibit B.)**

With regard to the protocol for the joint public hearings, it was noted the County Clerk will staff the public hearing on May 8 and the City Clerk on May 22.

The public hearing on May 8 will begin at 1:30 p.m. and continue through 5:00 p.m. A dinner break will be taken from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m., with testimony resuming from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Medcalf said officials may want to set a specific ending time on this date, although, the hearing could complete earlier if testimony is finished. If an ending time is advertised, Hudkins said he would prefer not to adjourn early as people figure they can testify until that time. Cook stated that the Planning Commission used split times for the hearing.

The public hearing on May 22 will begin at 4:00 p.m., and continue until all comments were heard. If necessary, a dinner break would be taken from 6:00 to 6:30 p.m., otherwise, the hearing would continue. Ross said it might be best to continue with testimony until everyone is done versus taking a dinner break. A decision should also be made regarding which body would vote first on May 28.

Werner commented that he spoke with Marcia Malone at Madonna. A tour of the new research rehabilitation center has been set up for Thursday, April 18, 2002 at 11:00 a.m. Svoboda encouraged elected officials to attend as the facility is nationally recognized for rehabilitation.

Testimony will be limited to three (3) minutes per person, though, chairpersons will have the discretion to extend this limit. The Planning Department will provide sign-in sheets. If someone misses their place in line, they can be allowed to speak later.

Cook asked if an announcement should be made at the beginning of the meeting regarding redundant testimony, short remarks, etc. Morgan indicated the City Council or County Board Chair could use an introductory statement similar to what the Planning Commission used. Campbell said the expectation is that a person can only testify one day, not both. Wesely added he feels much has been resolved since the Planning Commission meeting, therefore, the number of people testifying may be less.

With regard to voting on May 28, Morgan clarified the County Board will vote at its meeting at 1:30 p.m. The City Council will meet at 4:00 p.m. to take action. The County Board has agreed to stick around after their meeting in case any differences need to be worked out.

Heier said time had been reserved to meet the morning of May 23, if necessary, for carry over. He wondered if business shouldn't be finished on May 22 versus coming back the next day. Campbell indicated the 8:15 a.m. meeting on May 23 was to deal with separate amendments prior to voting.

Werner questioned the amendment process. Morgan said the County Board's primary jurisdiction is outside the three-mile area, though, they could make amendments within as some of their interest lies there as well. Friendt asked whether amendments can be made on May 23 and a vote taken on May 28 without an additional public hearing. Morgan said there is some leeway in making amendments. Campbell added the purpose is not to vote on May 23, but rather to notify the other body of proposed amendments. When the Comprehensive Plan was amended four years ago, written communications were exchanged between the City and County. Friendt felt making substantive changes without another public hearing would not be legal. Morgan said the Law Department should speak to these concerns.

Heier suggested adding amendments to the May 22 meeting as to include the public. Morgan said the meeting on May 23 would be beneficial if there are any areas of discrepancy. Campbell asked if a date between May 8-22, like the 13th, could be set to go over any major amendments allowing ample time to notify the public before the next hearing date.

Campbell moved that the City Council and County Board notify the other respective body by Monday, May 13 or Tuesday, May 14 of amendments they wish to make so the public can be notified prior to the hearing on May 22; seconded by Hudkins. Roll call vote. Ayes: Wesely, Campbell, Camp, Friendt, Heier, Hudkins, McRoy, Seng, Stevens, Svoboda, Werner, Workman and Cook. Nays: None. Motion passed 13-0.

Heier asked if other amendments from the City or Council would be allowed after May 13. Werner said consideration should be given to testimony taken on May 22. Cook clarified written comments from both bodies need to be submitted by May 13 or 14. Planning can then package the information and provide copies to the City and County. He felt the option to meet after the May 22 hearing should remain open up until the day of the vote. It was agreed that time on May 23 would remain open for a work session, if necessary.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Preparation of Draft Plan

Morgan said the Planning Department would spend the next two weeks making changes to text and maps with regard to last week's Planning Commission action. Copies of the revised Plan should be available by April 19.

Morgan noted it is not the intent to radically modify the format of the report, as it exists today, prior to the May hearings. After the Plan is approved, a new format will be reviewed. While resources are not available to print large quantities of maps, color versions are on the Internet. A map atlas will also be developed once the revised Plan is done, as well as a CD version of the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Expanded Urban Growth Tier I

A three-tier system was introduced in the Plan so that urban growth patterns could be looked at 50 years from now and beyond. **(See Exhibit C – Growth Tiers Map.)** Tier 1 is red; Tier II is dark green and Tier III is light green, an area very similar to the three-mile jurisdiction.

Morgan noted the Comprehensive Plan Committee began looking at various growth options. The first set of maps generated had roughly 23 square miles of Tier 1 growth. Further discussions increased the area to 32 square miles for a 25-year time frame. An additional 7 square miles were added at last week's Planning Commission meeting for a total of 39 square miles being available in Tier 1 for the next 25 years. This does not include 14-15 square miles shown in orange which are within the existing future service limit and are not developed. By the year 2025, the overall outside limits of city growth will be at 125-130 square miles compared to about 79 square miles today. Morgan added with this growth there comes some major infrastructure financing issues which will be addressed later.

Priority Areas

Henrichsen said a lot of testimony was heard regarding priority areas. Amendments were made to the map. **(See Exhibit D – Planning Commission Priority Areas Map, dated 4/4/02.)** He then distributed a memo regarding priority areas amendments and map, dated 3/29/02. **(See Exhibit E, pgs. 1-4.)** The priority areas will provide direction not only for any departments preparing a six-year capital improvement program, but also as they prepare their 20-year plans.

It was noted the original map had three priority areas. These were combined into two areas showing a lot more development in the Priority "A" area. The second part of the amendment was to review the text. (See handout for changes.) Language was revised to allow for potential development to more easily move into the Priority "B" area before infrastructure improvements were completed in the Priority "A" area. It also suggests that before considering infrastructure improvements in the Priority "B" area, staff should address its effects on the ability to do further infrastructure improvements in the Priority "A" area. Public Works earlier indicated they do not have the ability to completely change the priorities every six to twelve months as many projects take two to four years to complete. This becomes extremely important in the planning of new schools. Henrichsen added the City would try to have infrastructure improvements in the Priority "A" area begin within the next 12 years.

In reference to 70th & W. Superior Street, Hudkins asked if the present sewer system is showing in the service area. Henrichsen said the sewer line currently in place is in the area of 56th Street. The concerns in moving farther west deal not with the sewer but the water pressure due to the elevation. The area is in Tier III with regard to future development. Hudkins felt the sewer should be utilized and requested staff to review this issue.

Camp said he has concerns regarding the changes to Wilderness Park. He added he is still vague on how the transportation study might alter the Comprehensive Plan. Morgan

indicated this issue would be addressed momentarily during the transportation study discussion.

A summary of rural amendments was distributed. **(See Exhibit F, pgs. 1-11.)** DeKalb said the County Board addressed their concerns in writing via a letter to the Planning Commission. Planning staff then prepared a package of amendments to implement the Board's concerns with the Planning Commission essentially adopting all of them (see handout).

Workman commented that Hudkins had the idea of studying N.W. 12th Street, including Wildrose Lane. Morgan said some options were reviewed such as an interchange at N.W. 12th and Highway 34 but all that is currently shown in the Plan is a bridge. Abbott added the County's request for an interchange study at N.W. 12th was not included in the Plan. The Planning Commission did not take any action to revise the Plan as requested by the County Board with regard to N.W. 12th Street and Wildrose Lane. Abbott said he would elaborate on some major problems with an interchange at that location during the transportation discussion.

Hudkins figured the County Board would need to revisit this issue as there is a major problem at Interstate 180, Highway 34 and N.W. 1st Street. If a full interchange cannot be placed at this location, he stressed the need for one west of there. A study of this area should be done as it would address a lot of issues for northwest Lancaster County, as well as Kawasaki and the railroads. McRoy asked how this ties in to the improvements the State was proposing along Highway 34. Abbott said this issue is not tied in to the State's study, which called for an overpass not an interchange. He added the spacing with the Fallbrook development is entirely too close for an interchange to work. But, if it is this group's desire, a study can be added. He stated there are major safety concerns when mixing an interchange and intersections at that location. The project would also add significant cost to the City.

It was noted Senator Carol Hudkins has been speaking to John Craig, Director of the Nebraska Department of Roads, about this issue since the area is in her district. Craig indicated it is up to the local people to determine if they want a study. If there were support, the State would consider it. Larry Hudkins said the County was going to contribute \$300,000 for a connection between 27th & 31st Streets. A meeting was held whereby participants thought this was one viable option. Highlands residents were very concerned about increased traffic if Fletcher Avenue is opened to the east. Another proposal called for going along the railroad tracks through the golf course. The interchange was thought to be a much better alternative. Hudkins added the County might consider diverting funds for the replacement of Wildrose Lane to this project.

Workman said he attended the meeting with Kawasaki at which time the idea of going across the railroad tracks was nixed due to expansion by Union Pacific. Thus, they figured it was only reasonable for the 900 future Kawasaki employees to enter/exit to the east. He thought a more generalized wording for the study, such as, "the study needs to be done to accommodate Kawasaki's growth", may be desirable. Abbott stressed he has no problem in doing what officials would like. He simply was informing the group that the Planning Commission did not add a study. He reiterated his concerns about an interchange and

added in 1988 or 1989, a commitment was made to Highlands residents not to build an interchange at N.W. 12th as they did not desire one at that location.

Seng said there seems to be enough questions regarding this issue that a study should happen. She asked how much cost would be involved. Abbott said this depends on what the study would cover and how detailed it is. Also, Kawasaki's expansion to the east would have to wait until this study was done so the City would know how to build any roads.

Figard reminded the group of the conditions of the original annexation agreement with Kawasaki. If a study is done, one of the commitments in the Comprehensive Plan annexation amendment was the extension of Fletcher Avenue to 31st Street if extending back east to N.W. 1st Street. The condition of connecting Kawasaki back to N.W. 12th Street was predicated on going to N.W. 31st Street. If this does not occur, the commitment to Kawasaki will be jeopardized as they think Fletcher Avenue will be extended east and paved.

Abbott stated the railroads have now indicated concerns which were not brought up during previous discussions. He could not estimate at this time how much a study would cost, though, a decision on it should be made very quickly. He added no matter what the outcome is, not everyone will like it.

Seng asked Abbott if he thought officials have enough information without the study to back up their decision regarding this issue. Abbott felt a study will not change what has previously been said, but that does not mean a study should not be completed. He noted this project revolves around the ability to leave Wildrose Lane open and extend Fletcher Avenue across the railroad. Without consent from the railroad to cross Fletcher Avenue to the west, there is a major problem. He would prefer seeing an expanded study which determines how to best serve Kawasaki, rather than an interchange at N.W. 12th Street.

Transportation Planning

Morgan distributed a list of transportation planning discussion items for today's meeting, as well as a memo on maximizing usage of roadway facilities. **(See Exhibits G and H.)**

Morgan said the Yankee Hill study, which included the crossing of Wilderness Park, and the N. 14 Street study were both removed. Abbott said an amendment was added by the Planning Commission for a beltway and fringe arterial study on the entire southwest area, which may or may not find a conclusion for the crossing of Wilderness Park. Staff will be working with the Nebraska Department of Roads who is currently studying the west beltway to see how it should be upgraded. He mentioned particular concerns with the area around S. 14th Street, Old Cheney and Warlick Boulevard.

Campbell said she has real difficulty with people saying, "There will never be a crossing through Wilderness Park", when thousands of cars go through it everyday. She feels the question is, "Which is worse for the park, going through or going over?" Abbott added this is a very emotional issue, as well as a transportation issue.

Hudkins asked if there is adequate study for the widening of S. 14th Street. Figard said the 25-five year transportation plan proposes 27th Street as the corridor with primary access to Saltillo and the south beltway. Under this plan there is no proposed project or improvement on the corridor south of Yankee Hill.

Stevens said he feels the major crossing through Wilderness Park is Warlick Boulevard. He indicated his concern with a bridge when there are already four surface roads and a railroad which cross through the Park. He hoped there is a long range plan on how to resolve traffic issues in this whole area since it is sure to increase with the new high school and other developments along S. 14th Street.

Hudkins noted one reason not to retain the closure of Wildrose Lane is that new information recently received indicated the railroads are going to upgrade the rail line and increase the speed. It will become their main line from northwest Lincoln to Wahoo. The other reason is the railroads requested as much space as possible along Kawasaki because they plan to back railcars in from the north. Therefore, Wildrose Lane could remain where it is or, eventually, it could be closed if a full interchange was constructed to the east.

With regard to Humphrey and Pennsylvania, Figard said the original 25-year transportation plan showed Humphrey as a four-plus-one roadway between 1st and 14th Streets. In reviewing this recommendation, Public Works thought it made more sense to initially designate both Humphrey and Pennsylvania as two-plus-one roadways between 1st and 14th Streets. If necessary, future adjustments could still be done.

A handout was distributed regarding Special Public Transportation Services. **(See Exhibit I.)** Morgan noted several different perspectives provided input. The StarTran Advisory Committee expressed concerns about the delivery of services to those who are transit dependent. The Community Services Implementation Project (CSIP) organization expressed concerns as well. Also, the Comprehensive Plan Committee had their own transit workshop and were looking at alternatives. The Planning Commission introduced one new amendment on Community-Wide Mobility Review (see first paragraph of handout). There was also a specific change with regard to the Special Needs Demand Responsive Transit recommendation to look at the coordination of existing services. Morgan added this would probably be included as part of the Community-Wide Mobility Review.

Campbell noted some of the work done by the Human Services Planning effort may want to be referenced. She encouraged everyone to read CSIP's transportation coalition report. Morgan said it is the intent to incorporate the activities of CSIP.

Downtown Pedestrian Study

A handout regarding an amendment to the "Transportation System Management Program" Section of the Comprehensive Plan was distributed. **(See Exhibit J, pgs. 1-5.)**

Brienzo brought to everyone's attention the Planning Commission's amendment to the strategy for dealing with bicycles in the downtown area. Bicycle lanes were included in the draft Plan. Implementation was to be within a year of the Comprehensive Plan's adoption.

The Planning Commission is now proposing that implementation of bicycle lanes be a year after the Facilities Plan is completed and adopted, rather than the Comprehensive Plan. Brienzo explained that the Long Range Transportation Plan calls for a Downtown Bicycle Facilities Plan to look at all bicycle facility needs within the downtown area and how to deal with bicycles crossing the north, south, east and west connections. The ultimate goal is to create a safe environment for everyone.

Camp asked if the Facilities Plan would contain a good assessment of the needs of downtown parking if lanes are removed for bicycles. Abbott said the plan would look at the impact on a number of factors within the area. Brienzo added the intent is to also work with downtown businesses on these efforts.

In regard to the Transportation System Management Program, Brienzo said it established an ongoing process for evaluating the public transportation system. The Planning Commission emphasized that this report be delivered to them concurrent with the Comprehensive Plan Annual Review.

McRoy asked if the information under Street System Standards (see pg. 2 of handout) would address criteria for when there is clearly a need for a neighborhood traffic signal or sign but counts are not at the necessary level. Abbott said this is primarily for moving traffic on arterial streets, not traffic calming within neighborhoods. Brienzo added staff could do an evaluation of a particular neighborhood if there is a concern.

Workman said it would be nice to have a map outlining the best-suited locations for bicycle paths in the County. Brienzo noted the Long Range Transportation Plan identifies bike routes along County roads. Workman said the Board has indicated a preference to have a shoulder on new, paved County roads.

Camp inquired about trigger mechanism changes. Abbott said the proposed text replaces the language for a trigger mechanism. It includes the concept but is a much better way for staff to assess travel speed throughout the entire system.

Miscellaneous Items

Morgan said 14 amendments were submitted to the Planning Commission on specific changes to the land use map. The Commission suggested instituting a procedure where after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted, Planning staff will review the individual proposals and come back to the Commission with specific recommendations. He hoped this would happen within the next two to three months. Campbell requested letters be sent to all those interested in the changes, noting that once the Comprehensive Plan is completed, the individual proposals will be addressed.

Cook asked if the additional land in the Stevens Creek area would require changes to the Transportation Plan. Morgan said staff would be identifying ways to accommodate this land.

Seng said a Planning Commissioner forgot to make a motion on adding industrial property to the south. Morgan noted an amendment was approved by the Planning Commission to

look at additional industrial and commercial sites in the long run. There should be a way to incorporate the request for more industrial property into this action.

In reference to Kuklin Pool, Johnson said the original version of the Comprehensive Plan included moving the pool to a location north of "O" Street as determined through a neighborhood process. The Planning Commission did recommend inclusion of the relocation in the forthcoming version of the Plan. He added the primary reason for relocation was to get the pool closer to service neighborhoods, i.e., Clinton, Hartley and Malone. The other reason is the existing pool basin has a life expectancy of only 3-5 years. Johnson clarified the Antelope Valley Study is not the reason for relocating Kuklin pool.

A handout was distributed regarding affordable housing. **(See Exhibit K, pgs. 1-6.)** Morgan noted the Planning Commission added two additional pieces of language. Henrichsen said the first four pages highlight previous discussions on affordable housing. The last two pages include the language added by the Planning Commission which references the promotion of home ownership and the importance of affordable housing to the community.

Morgan said the Planning Commission also added a request to look at the priorities map with regard to development in the southwest area. There is interest in this area, but the private sector would like to work a little harder to see exactly which subarea is best. Staff will work with the private sector to review this issue during the next year.

Campbell asked if the draft will be totally clean or if it will include strikeouts and deletions. Morgan said it would be a clean copy of what will be before the bodies in terms of the public hearing and voting. Morgan added the draft should be ready around April 18th or 19th.

To summarize, Morgan noted 55 Comprehensive Plan amendments were passed by the Planning Commission, 13 were defeated and 7 withdrawn.

Werner questioned the process if the County Board passes an amendment and the City Council does not. Morgan said the goal is reconciliation between the two bodies, otherwise, two Plans would have to exist outlining the differences. He added there has always been one Comprehensive Plan for the City and County.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Submitted by,

Cori R. Beattie
County Board Secretary