

CITY-COUNTY COMMON
County-City Building • 555 S. 10th Street • Lincoln, NE

County Commissioners
(402) 441-7447

Mayor
(402) 441-7511

City Council
(402) 441-7515

AGENDA
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2005
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING
555 SOUTH 10TH STREET, ROOM 113
8:30 A.M.

1. **APPROVAL OF SUPER COMMON MEETING MINUTES OF MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2005**
2. **PRESENTATIONS**
 - 8:30 A.M. Planning Department Super Common Briefing on: "Draft Lincoln Land Use" and "Urban Growth Tier" Maps as Approved by Planning Commission on October 26, 2005 - Planning Department**
 - 9:00 A.M. Combined Staffing for County Commissioners/City Council Office - Don Taute, Personnel; Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer**
 - 9:30 A.M. RUTS Update - Roger Figard, City Engineer; Don Thomas, County Engineer**

CITY-COUNTY COMMON MEETING

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2005

County Commissioners Present: Bob Workman, Common Vice-Chair; Bernie Heier, Larry Hudkins, Ray Stevens and Deb Schorr.

City County Members Present: Patte Newman, Common Chair; Jon Camp, Robin Eschliman, Ken Svoboda and Annette McRoy **Absent:** Dan Marvin and Jonathan Cook.

Others Present: Mayor Coleen Seng, Marvin Krout, Steve Henrichsen, Kent Morgan, Mike DeKalb, David Cary, Planning Department; V. Singh, Roger Ohlrich, and Mike Brienzo, Public Works and Utilities; Don Thomas, County Engineering; Roger Figard, Public Works; Kerry Eagan and Gwen Thorpe, County Board Office; Duane Eitel and Allan Abbott, Olsson Associates; Mike Eckert, Civil Design Group; Bruce Bohrer, Lincoln Chamber of Commerce; Mike Rierden, Attorney; Mark Bowen and Rick Hoppe, Mayor's Office; Don Wesley; Mary Meyer, County Board/City Council Clerk.

Chair Patte Newman brought the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

Chair Newman called the Minutes of October 3, 2005 for approval. Hudkins made motion for the minutes to be approved. Svoboda seconded. Approved by unanimous consent of Common Members. Introductions made with Heier introducing Dick Esseks.

Briefing on "Draft Lincoln Land Use" and "Urban Growth Tier"

Carlson gave an overview of the last Common meeting where emphasis was on the Future Service Limit. Specifically where the 2025 Service Limit would be moved in the 2030 Service Limit update. General agreement of where this line will be.

The next stage of the process is future definition into how the growth Tiers 1, 2, and 3, inside the Service Limit, will expand and completion on how the Land Use Map would look. Meeting and hearing held regarding the draft map with the public agreeing with the Planning Department's amendments. Will further model as progress continues.

Henrichsen said in keeping with scheduled time frame will try to have a draft completed for the Planning Commission by June or July, 2006. The new plan for the year, 2030, will be before the City Council and County Board for adoption in about a year. Until then it is a draft and will be amended.

Henrichsen continued saying they are at the end of the third step of Service Limit adoption and drafting a Land Use Plan. The third step is the process of developing specific plan elements from this model. Spending time on details, with a lot of time on transportation, particularly in the Lincoln Land Use Area. The Land Use Map set forward by the Planning Commission is a draft of land use for 2030 which will be a model when doing transportation modeling. In terms of steps in the Land Use Map are on schedule as this is the last step in terms of the first three steps.

(Handout distributed) Henrichsen stated the first item is the Urban Growth Tiers. In the handout there is a description of the Urban Growth Tiers, a 8 ½ by 11 copy of the map, and description of changes between 2025 and 2030. On the right of the two maps is the Urban Growth Tier map which comes out of the 2025 Comp Plan Stage. We then have the 2030 draft. In reviewing the 2025 map the red is basically areas served in the year 2025. The dark green would be 2nd Tier growth and light green is the 3rd Tier. These tiers help when sizing the infrastructure, such as mandatory sewer size for the next 50 years. Also gives indication of where Lincoln might grow in the future.

While there is a specific time frame for the red, or 1st Tier, the tier beyond doesn't have a particular set date at this time. Considering the size, and 25 years plus, is difficult to say. Accumulatively would add over 200 square miles to the city if all three tiers were ultimately added. Today we have 82 square miles.

Also in 2025 is lighter and darker red. The difference represents Priorities A and B. These are areas the City Council and County Board previously adopted in giving direction of laying out the Capital Improvement Program. Where to go with infrastructure first, and then Priority B. At this time have not identified Priority A or B for the 2030 map. Will continue working on draft and present as part of the update process. Henrichsen reiterated now focusing on Tiers 1, 2, and 3.

In terms of differences between the two notice, in the handout, the updated boundary showing the Service Limit adopted by the Planning Commission. Also, what the city limits would be. Tier 1 adds about 49 square miles to the city limits, almost a 50% increase. By the year 2030 looking at about a 50% increase in population. Camp pointed out the 2025 map shows larger city limits than on the 2030, because of annexation?

Henrichsen responded the boundary wasn't exactly the city limits. It's representing an urbanized area and includes Pioneers Park. Using at this time. For instance, within the 49 square miles if you take out Wilderness and Pioneers Parks, which is 4 square miles, would be approximately 45 square miles. Last map showed out of the 45 square miles not all was vacant agricultural land which could be developed. Within the area are acreages, golf courses, etc. So, more in the range of 30 to 33 square miles of vacant, or agricultural land, which could be developed.

Svoboda asked if this explanation follows through for Southeast Lincoln, a Tier 1 area, red on 2025, and on draft of 2030 a portion is missing. Henrichsen said at the time the map was adopted in 2002, the dark red area was outside the city limits. Some is now annexed, around 84th and Highway 2, more of an urbanized area. At the time had questions as this really being the city limits? Thought is was easier to use although it really wasn't the city limits.

Hudkins pointed out on the 2030 Tier 1 map, in the Northwest 70th area, there appears to be ground which would be an access and service area if we solved the problem on West Superior, but on 2025 it's deleted. Henrichsen stated on the 2025 map the land is owned by Wes Fur and hadn't been a part of this plan previously. It is now Lincoln Federal Land, south of Superior, and added on the 2030 map. More of a condition of adding to Tier 1 the land owned by Wes Fur and other property owners. This was actually done as part of a condition to the Future Service Limit.

Henrichsen said regarding the Northwest area we previously didn't have any Tier 2 designations and now have a significant area of Tier 2 in the Northwest area and to the east in the Stevens Creek drainage basin. This is generally around 112th, 134th, and Fletcher, added to Tier 2, which was previously listed as Tier 3.

The Southeast portion, approximately 84th and Saltillo Road which drains down into Hickman, is probably more appropriate because of the sanitary sewer service to be a Tier 3 area. Previously listed as a Tier 2 area. Also very appropriate to list as Tier 2, and previously a Tier 3 designation, are the areas around the East Beltway and "O" Street. In the Future Service Limit did look at the near term potential and listed as Tier 2, which is quite significant. Have 1,000 square miles plus an additional 70 square miles, or about 80% of what we need in the city limits. Have nearly 50 square miles of Tier 1, another 70 square miles in Tier 2 and then 87 square miles in Tier 3. The outer boundary of Tier 3 will be kept the same between the two maps.

On map we have a square looking Tier 2 in places and this is because there is not a bridge line one can use to make a more logical break, so more of an artificial line. As plan is amended, and as we get closer to these areas, might move the boundary out. Is a general idea in terms of future development.

Eschliman said in the Northeast corridor, the gateway to I-80, there is a white area before the Waverly limit. Asked if we shouldn't address since it is the gateway to the I-80 corridor. Henrichsen pointed out the dash lines, which today is the boundary between Waverly's Zoning and Planning jurisdiction and the City of Lincoln, and about the east half of the future intersection of the East Beltway. Everything east is actually in the Waverly Zoning and Planning jurisdiction. The rest is generally shown as a Tier 2.

Eschliman said there are several white areas on the map west of the Waverly jurisdiction. Why not automatically be a part of our plan? Henrichsen responded it's quite possible this is a bridge line because of an update. Certainly can go up the area which could be a hundred acres or so.

Esseks asked how many acres have been added to Tier 1, including those along Cornhusker Highway? Henrichsen answered in Tier 1 this was included as part of the Future Service Limit. Generally includes 160 acres owned by Novartis, which is

zoned for industrial expansion, and on 98th Street, both sides from Alvo down Fletcher. Probably in range of slightly less than a square mile outside of the flood plain. Actually more than a square mile when including the flood plain. Some flood plain land is zoned and developed. Actually all area in Tier 1 in terms of providing services.

Camp questioned if this allows us to move in that direction and also to annex on that corridor? Henrichsen replied that was correct. Svoboda said Waverly is shown in the brown area, and comes along between Cornhusker and I-80. Questioned how the dotted service line goes up, actually poking through the service limit line of Waverly.

Henrichsen answered initially the City limits, the three mile zoning limit for Lincoln, first came out in this area. Then as Waverly started to expand their one mile came out. Since our three mile was there first their one mile cannot go inside of our three mile. However, when they annex they can annex inside the City of Lincoln's three mile. So, the brown area is when they annexed inside of our three mile. From outside of the city limits they can't actually throw out a one mile because the City's three mile was there first.

Svoboda asked what is the population of Waverly and Henrichsen thought in the range of 3,000. Lincoln is a different class of city, a primary class city. The city attorney is checking on the type of restriction of 10,000 that Omaha has but is not in place in Lincoln. Lincoln actually cannot annex Waverly without a vote of the Waverly citizens to consolidate with Lincoln. Lincoln does not have the ability to annex cities of a second class as defined by state statute. Waverly has reached the second class city size, and state statute requires their city council to put it on the ballot and have a vote to consolidate.

Camp asked if there was rationale, or strategy, to move ahead and annex as close to Waverly as we can to protect Lincoln, as we'll be going in that direction? Henrichsen referred to the maps where they have shown about as much as could be served back to the existing Stevens Creek trunk line with the Tier 1 area. There is about a half mile, before the Interstate, which does not drain back into Stevens Creek. Might require a separate line directly to the Theresa Street Plant. This was the reason it stopped short of going the last one-half mile, due to the sewer service. Camp asked what if we kept it agricultural use?

Krout replied it would raise questions about our annexation ability. To annex Lincoln needs to provide the tools and services. Would need to provide full services for the property owners not to challenge us. In this relatively moderate time frame we need to be intent on providing these services. If it is a strong desire that this area be available for annexation we would need to show, at least in our capital improvement program, that we are finding a way to extend city water and services to this area. It is another drain carrier, as stated before, so would require a special look. The area should be profitable for us to annex if we could provide services. If of interest will check into as we move forward.

Hudkins stated he thinks it's of interest and glad to hear the City Council is considering. Lincoln might want to get to the Interchange quickly. Last year with Tractor Supply the County came up with economic development money to build a road from that industrial park. Should already have the water lines and if worried about the drainage a lift station could service this area. Almost everything north of the area is in a conservation easement, which would preclude building there. Other than the service availability there shouldn't be anything else.

Krout answered that's true almost in any direction. It then becomes an issue of limited funding and if we're going to try to serve the area in the next six years. Then, the area we were planning to serve, do we tell people we can't get there because this is a high priority to us, or come up with the money? One idea behind the rising suns, the areas for large employment centers in the draft plan, is there may be extra money available through tax funding for some of these projects. Possibly the extra money would allow expanding the CIP and getting into some areas we otherwise couldn't afford to.

Eschliman said given the fact money is put into the budget for capital expenditures, for all areas, would it make sense that the market seems to want to go the direction of the I-80 corridor? If we put money into capital expenditures for all around Lincoln but have less popular areas could we re-coop the investment quicker by shifting towards priority areas?

Krout said people will challenge the priorities. Thinks we can get into the frame of mind of looking at Priority A within Tier 1, the six year CIP area. Will look to the Council to help set priorities. Employment is a priority, so if more residential area exists, but not enough employment areas, will examine. Another part is the fact they all include residential, with the employment looked at mostly for support. Tax increment financing is a possible new tool to help get to the money we have. It's a struggle and we'll talk more specifically with options when we talk about CIP.

Heier asked if a sewer line runs from Novartis to the Theresa Street plant and they receive city water? Henrichsen believes it's a private line running to the Northeast Plant. Henrichsen said if there's an area which people would like as a Tier 1, an example is north of Alvo and 11th, to give an indication now as the modeling is moving forward. Schorr asked if they perceived dividing Tier 1 into Priority A and B, as it was the last time? Henrichsen answered yes, absolutely.

Camp said members have stated they would want to see a northeast push. Thinks several members firmly believe it's where the market is. Has the I-80 Initiative and needs a rising sun. Krout thought it would be a Tier one. Henrichsen apologized for not getting back and making sure there is a general consensus.

On the Land Use Map Henrichsen focused on city equipment in terms of transportation alternatives. Again, the draft Comp Plan includes the entire County. On the land use category not a lot of changes. Have included, on the new map, the potential large employment sites in terms of their potential if selected as a site. Other changes have been some significant commercial and industrial areas added to the Comprehensive Plan, as a result of the Planning Commission, or other changes. Potential commercial space on the N.W. corner of No. 56th and I-80. At least 2 to 3 million square feet of potential industrial space shown on map. Also added several potential square feet of industrial space in this corridor. Would add industrial out to 112th and Alvo. The commercial and industrial space along the west area has a good 8 million square feet of potential space. Eight hundred acres, or so. A little added to the west of Lincoln Poultry, and added urban residential areas to the Southwest.

Along the South 40th Street corridor are several developer proposals. Ranges from Yankee Hill to the intersection of the South Beltway, at about So. 38th Street. Additional commercial areas added for a total of approximately 2 million square feet. Additional commercial and industrial on the Northeast part of intersection. With this step need to model what the transportation impact would be throughout this additional space. Will be modeling the So. 40th Street corridor. After studying may make adjustments to the land use designations to have balance between the transportation network and land uses. May result in increasing the transportation network, example, So. 40th Street with six lanes. Hopefully will have results by February on what traffic is doing at that point.

Combined Staffing for County Commissioners/City Council Office

(Handout distributed) Eagan distributed a proposed organizational chart of joint City/County office staff. Over the years the City Council and County Board have discussed the possibility of a combined staff to serve the administrative needs of both City Council and County Board. Now have an interlocal agreement for joint receptionist. Opportunity for further discussions came with the recent resignation in the City Council office, presenting favorable conditions to proceed, if wanted, with a joint staffing agreement.

Eagan anticipated an interlocal agreement would be needed to define the relationship. In discussions it was decided the Chief Administrative Officer would be overall supervisor, but believes the key would be the creation of a joint City-County office manager. No additional personnel added but revamping of existing duties. The office manager would serve the administrative needs for County and the City Council. Would be daily supervisor of city administrative staff and joint receptionist. The Chief Administrator would be more of a figurehead than an actual day to day administrator.

An office manager would oversee staffing needs of the Board and City Council, making sure everything is covered. Work, including administrative, being done, plus City Council and County web pages, helping with developing office budgets, administering financial system, paying bills, payroll, reimbursements. There is an existing description in the County Civil Service called Operations Manager, but anticipates a title more like City Council/County Board Joint Office manager. Besides supervising the person would make recommendations on evaluations and disciplinary actions, but for city staff the City Council would retain ultimate decision making. All correspondence going through the office manager, possibly being assigned to various staff.

Believe Council members are aware that Thorpe has implemented TRIM, the records management system, which is going very well for the County, and may be something the City Council would want to consider.

Newman stated the City Council has been considering having a researcher on staff and where would that person fit? Camp asked with the Council considering this position who would supervise? Probably not a lot of time necessary to supervise. Eagan answered this person would be more responsible to the City Council and would report to the City Council on research. The person might be overseen by the City and County manager as well.

Hudkins believes the City Council would need a research person. In the Board office Thorpe has been a tremendous asset with research. At first Hudkins thought Camp meant they needed a researcher but also wanted to administer this program.

Workman asked if the joint City County office manager would be a County or City employee? Eagan responded a County employee. Workman asked if it would be fifty-fifty on payroll? Eagan answered they would negotiate and added there is an existing person, Beattie, who is doing the County work now. Looking at her job, responsibilities, and expertise, feels she is positioned for the City County Office manager. Worked for the City Council for a number of years, knows all the functions, JD Edwards, payroll system, personnel system, and the type of person who could run both offices efficiently. The contract would be for this person to perform the oversight of the City administrative work. A County person who Eagan would evaluate.

Taute added, if Beattie, she would stay a County person, essentially upgrade position through an audit, and as part of the interlocal agreement would address the cost. Would assume some duties associated with the Council office in addition to the Board office, and the pay would be addressed in the interlocal agreement. Eagan said he wouldn't anticipate the salary of the person who left, but assume it would be equitable to compensate the position for the work done.

Camp said as part of the process would hope both offices find ways of streamlining, avoiding duplication, and have resulting efficiencies. Beattie, for example, having experience with County and City, could offer suggestions. Would like to see constructive criticism, lay it on the table, and see how both organizations can operate more efficiency.

Newman said she sees a hole now with Meyer needing access to a computer with web software. The Common meeting did not get posted because Meyer does not have the software on her computer. There are a few holes now that need to be filled. As long as we have three people doing different aspects, each should be trained to do office functions which need to be done.

Svoboda wanted to know how to proceed. Newman said Marvin and Cook wanted to be a part of the discussion, and thinks the consecutive bodies should discuss. Another thing is to start looking at the three positions, get job descriptions, and know exactly where we will be going.

Taute answered that is the key, need to formulate exactly what duties the person would be performing and where are they going to fit into the hierarchy. What Camp asked about a researcher, solely a Council position, fitting into the organizational chart is that if the Council doesn't supervise believes it would fall to Eagan, which is another duty to be addressed through the approximate channels.

Newman asked if the City Council office has ever had a comparable position, researcher, to what we think we want? Mayor Seng said they hired someone for that specific purpose. This person was hired and left after one year. We were very disappointed the position didn't work out but the person became very frustrated having seven bosses who didn't always work together.

Workman thought maybe the research person would be listed as an administrative assistant to the City. Newman stated they were looking at folks with degrees, possibly a law degree. Svoboda thought this position might be comparable to a legislative aide position. Should discuss options then come back with suggestions, recommendations or details. The chair and vice-chair of both the County Board and the City Council will meet, discuss options, and report back. Eagan stated one main item is to keep everyone informed. Hudkins agreed saying on the County side the communication is through Eagan and distributed and this way there are no duplications.

RUTS Update

Figard stated the County Commissioners have asked that the RUTS agreement be redrafted in language to be included in the county budget and working with Mundt and Thomas, wrote the draft. On October 21st a copy of the draft interlocal was transmitted to the County. The City Council was not copied. Now waiting for further direction.

Hudkins said an editorial on KFOR said the County Board was dragging their feet on RUTS. Again, would like to state the County Board has always been five-zero on the concept of RUTS. Even before the acronym, RUTS, it was the County Board's wish that when acquiring right-of-way to acquire in sufficient quantity to satisfy future needs. The Board felt a need, for approximately 12 to 15 years to protect the right-of-way for future needs. And the Board has participated in a number of

streets which were ultimately annexed by the City of Lincoln, and tried to work with them. Believes one large project was North 84th Street where the Board actually contracted with the City to do the work and supplied the money for our share. We've had an ongoing commitment to RUTS. Unfortunately now seems the emphasis is on expanding the wheel tax more than the adoption of RUTS. The County Board has directed the County Attorney to draw up an interlocal agreement, indicating we want to move forward with the creation of the JPA, and a wheel tax at that time. As this evolved we found out from our attorneys, that this tax had to be applied uniformly across the county and would be controlled by the City Council which raised some red flags. We have told the Mayor this was going to be problematic as it moved forward.

Hudkins continued, saying the County found out the City was already committed to two future increases of \$5.00 each. In 2007 and in 2010, which would have to be extended across the county. Also found the wheel tax, being controlled by the City Council, does allow use of proceeds for snow removal, trails, other things besides roads. This became a concern. Now wrestling with a fair and equitable way to fund RUTS. No problems with the RUTS concept, however did direct the County Attorney to develop an interlocal agreement. We saw it for the first time last week and believe there needs to be further refinement of this interlocal agreement. Another key factor is whether a Joint Public Agency is created, or not, and would need an interlocal agreement. The JPA would be a way of functioning to collect something other than property tax, which property tax is the only authority we have in the County now. We would have to go to the Legislature to get authority to collect a fuel tax or a county wheel tax. Do not have that authority now, but by creating a JPA could do that. If we do create a JPA we still need an interlocal agreement to put the framework together on who does what and that it is a cooperative effort.

Hudkins went on to say the Board visited with the lobbyists and area senators last week who indicated a willingness to work with the County on several fronts. They understand our problem of a half mile of new roads in the county this year. Possibly we could use a task force to work out situations and offer solutions. Possibly Thomas and Figard could look and work at within a month.

Workman said maybe the County Board is the only one having the taxing authority to fund. Possibly the City Council can't do as their constituency is just the City of Lincoln. The Board's constituency is the entire county. If this is the case if we can find money in property tax than may be it should just be the county which funds. Workman stated he looked at the fifteen cent lid, where RTSD is situated, indicating we had some of that, but then possibly need to take a hard look at services not mandated. Cut back as we have lids which everyone is close to. When county taxes and property taxes are very equal, everyone pays the same. Ten percent of the population pays ten percent of the bill. If we could have had a wheel tax for everyone contributing \$5.00 it would have been equal but state law prohibited us from doing that. It ended up being \$50.00 for those more removed from the problem, those living outside of the three mile, and \$5.00 for all residents within the three mile. Believes there is a solution and we've got to find the money and cut back on other areas. Maybe it is the County that has to do this.

Newman asked if the City would only get a copy of the interlocal once it's no longer a draft? Hudkins didn't see a problem in having a copy now, believes it is a public document, and happy to share with the City. Hudkins stated as they reviewed it looked as if the County was picking up most of the cost for right-of-way for city culverts, and other things. May be it's okay as the City has made one point very clear to the County and that is the heavy funding is coming from the city residents. He thinks 85%, or higher, approximately 90% of the residents of Lancaster County live within Lincoln. So, the dollars are being generated by Lincoln citizens, while the RUTS program is primarily for the benefit of Lincoln and the surrounding areas. Mainly the three mile area. Possibly it is a good application of monies that the City contributes to the County Road Fund. Doesn't know if the County can proceed as quickly as the City might want. Thinking the County usually purchases a hundred feet of right-of-way and if the City wants future expansion they may want to purchase a hundred and twenty, or a hundred and forty feet. The County has been thinking the additional part the City wants us to purchase might be the part that the city pays for. To the interlocal, which some of it is in controversial language, the entities haven't decided how to proceed. Is there a portion? Or, does one entity pick it all up? Hudkins believes the main thing needed is the type of structure found in the RTSD so we have one entity making the decision, putting forth the budget for the City Council, or the County Board, or jointly if we decide to do it that way. And have like a one and six year program. So we know where we're going and know what needs to be prioritized. Sees no resistance from the County Board on trying to step up on the RUTS program.

Figard stated he doesn't want to compound things but believes we need to be careful, this interlocal agreement has nothing to do with creating any kind of an entity similar to an RTSD. This interlocal agreement would only bind Thomas and the director of Public Works on the design standards, and how they work together. Hudkins and Newman agreed. Figard reiterated

it would not create another agency. Need the interlocal to agree on the design standards and how the work is done. Has nothing to do with a separate agency.

Heier said his concern with what was brought up on the interlocal agreement said we “pay all costs” and had a difficult time defining what all costs are. Want to make sure we’re really looking at easements, plan drawings, paving of the road, etc., but this included all costs. Wasn’t comfortable with the word all. Secondly, heard 98th Street was funded, taken care of, correct? Thomas replied yes. Heier then asked, what’s the quickest we need more money to do the next road? How much would it take, talking the RUTS Program? Or, leave RUTS out and say how much the next road is costing to meet the RUTS standard. But really talking about RUTS.

Thomas replied the design phase will help him know how much it is going to cost. Would be looking at the next budget. Heier asked for another road, or for 98th Street? Thomas answered the next portion of 98th Street.

Hudkins had one clarification, asked Mundt if the County’s direction to her was to model an interlocal agreement using the pattern of the Railroad Transportation Safety District? Mundt said she would go back to the motion. Stated we could do it that way but the RTSD’s model is statutory. But if some of those provisions are wanted in here, you can add. Camp said RTSD has accumulated money for future projects, which is good to see. This money could be put into economic development.

Schorr stated that in order to have a wheel tax for the County, per legislation, it has to go before the County citizens, who would then vote. Has talked to citizens in the County and most sound agreeable to a sales tax specific for the paving of County roads. Newman inquired as to the City residents? Schorr stated this was only for outside the three mile limit where the paving is tremendously down and is where the support lies.

Hudkins added we would have to go to the Legislators for a fuel tax or a reallocation of fuel tax. If we work with other counties to increase the fuel tax, everyone, the City, County and State would receive money. Believes an increase in the fuel tax may have a chance as the fuel tax would be equitable to everyone. With the wheel tax, an example would be trucks using I-80 not paying a City wheel tax, and the County roads would continue having increased traffic. Schorr said possibly need a County State tax.

Svoboda added not only the County but a prime example is “O” Street which trucks use daily. If we had a fuel tax should include diesel fuel. But if we had a wheel tax for the County would it only apply to the Villages? Schorr answered yes as we are classified as a County of a certain size with Cities of certain sizes. Eagan stated it would be a split levy and would need legislation authorization to split. Any City/Village can do a wheel tax.

Svoboda stated the City is not always in direct communication with lobbyists. Possibly ask the County and City lobbyists to attend Common Meetings so the understanding is grounded. Hudkins agreed with the recommendation. Schorr stated that Gordon Kissel is to have a County wheel tax draft to the legislation by next month. Hudkins added we also need the interlocal draft with the City.

Workman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Hudkins seconded. By accumulation the meeting was adjourned.

Next Common meeting to be held Monday, December 5, 2005.

Submitted by,
Mary Meyer, Clerk