

CITY-COUNTY COMMON

County-City Building • 555 S. 10th Street • Lincoln, NE 68508

County Commissioners
(402) 441-7447

Mayor
(402) 441-7511

City Council
(402) 441-7515

AGENDA MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2006 COUNTY-CITY BUILDING ROOM 113 8:30 A.M.

1. **APPROVAL OF COMMON MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY,
MAY 2, 2006**

2. **PRESENTATIONS**

**8:30 A.M. Briefing on 2030 Comp Plan/Long Range Transportation Plan
Update - Joint presentation by Planning and Public Works and
Utilities**

CITY-COUNTY COMMON
JUNE 5, 2006, 8:30 A.M.
County-City Building, Room 113

County Commissioners Present: Ray Stevens, Bernie Heier, Deb Schorr, Larry Hudkins.
County Commissioners Absent: Bob Workman.

City Council Members Present: Dan Marvin, Jon Camp and Robin Eschliman.
City Council Members Absent: Jonathan Cook, Annette McRoy, Patte Newman, and Ken Svoboda
Other Common Members Present: Mayor Coleen Seng

Others Present: Eugene Carroll, Planning Commission; Kent Morgan, City-County Planning; Randy Hoskins, Public Works/City Traffic Engineering; Kerry Eagan, County Chief Administrative Officer; Gwen Thorpe, Deputy County Administrative Officer; Coby Mach, LIBA; Don Thomas, County Engineer; Trish Owen, Deputy County Clerk; Mark Bowen, Mayor's Chief of Staff; Mike Brienzo, Transportation Planner Engineering Services; Virendra Singh, Long Term Planning Manager Engineering Services, Mary Meyer, County Commissioners/City Council Staff

Vice-chairman Marvin brought the meeting to order. Approval of Common Meeting minutes of May 2, 2006 suspended until next meeting as a quorum wasn't present.

Briefing on 2030 Comp Plan/Long Range Transportation Plan Update: Kent Morgan/Gene Carroll/Randy Hoskins

Carroll stated the Commission spent numerous hours updating the Comp Plan and are about two-thirds through, including the Long Range Transportation Plan. The update classified as minor as four years ago a major update was completed. Along with transportation looking at economical development, with focus groups and information being submitted to the design commission before presenting to bodies present here.

Issues being looked at include standards and policies for retailers in the city, particularly in neighborhood centers. Rural roads brought forward and will look at transportation modes and other non-transportation subjects. Carroll stated not only did the Planning Commission, but staff in Public Works and Planning, pushed hard to submit needed data. The Commission kept asking for alternatives and now believes there is a very good recommendation. Thanks to both staffs.

Morgan stated the current Comprehensive Plan was adopted in May, or June, of 2002, and the review now is basically due to the Federal Transportation Planning regulations requiring update of our LRTP every five years, making sure we have at least a 20 year road plan, with the update due by spring of next year. Feel the plan was fine tuned as much as possible with this minor update. (Exhibits A, B, and C)

Morgan said with the Comp Plan really talking about three separate documents. The City's Comprehensive Plan, the County's Comprehensive Plan, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO's, Long Range Transportation Plan. So the Comp Plan document is three documents being worked on, with added updates.

Morgan stated as it is a minor update, and looking at the Charter, decided on a different process to be used by the Planning Commission than in the past. Have been through a Comp Plan, LRTP's before with various groups and decided on the Planning Commission being the actual body doing the update. Beneficial to have them involved. Also used other ad hoc committees with representation from the public, but with the Planning Commission really being the focus of the work accomplished.

Morgan said in terms of out-reach made the community aware with a series of Comp Plan and LRTP open houses. The Planning Commission has listing forms where we value people to come see the Planning Commission. Each time we do this we send over 2,000 newsletters out and also have a Web site for information, with people submitting comments. Visited all Community centers, explaining how they could be involved, and had an ad in the newspapers. Public Works used signs and had groups at various meetings. The word is out on what is being done and also listening to what people would like to see their plan become.

Morgan said in the Land Use Plan (Exhibit A) some changes occurred. Worked with the Planning Commission, beginning last summer, doing projections. Kept the 1.5% population increase, making the 2020-2030 population almost 400,000 for the county as a whole. Worked with the Commission on division and various planning assumptions. The plan, in this drafted stage, adds about six (6) square miles of topical area to the Future Service Limit. As this takes us to '20-'25 to '20-'30 did expand the Future Service Limit. Also have sunrises, working with Public Works and County Commission, to look at opportunities. If a major employer comes we want the position of having infrastructure in place to expand the Future Service Limit to accommodate the economic opportunities. The Land Use Plan was close to being wrapped up in December last year with changes/transitions on the land use.

Information was available to the public and did receive a lot of comments on what they'd like to see. (Exhibit B-Schedule for six months) In review, had an open house on the LRTP May 3rd and specifically a StarTrans study on the 11th, looking at public transportation needs/ wants. On May 17th, 24th and 31st had public forums regarding transportation issues. All information defined and taken to alternative networks, with Public Works and Carroll analyzing and then back to the Planning Commission. On Exhibit B the orange and green boxes refer to a Health Department and Planning Commission committee, meeting for a year, looking at issues related to land use and health. Some results/standards/ideas promoted were the Health Department's Active Living by Design Program, the pedestrian standards, and issues relative to hazardous waste materials storage and related land use. Continuing to meet and will bring recommendations to the Planning Commission for incorporation into the plan.

Also on schedule, the green boxes represent a business community group; police staff, Chamber, civic leaders, with Carroll as chair, who looked at various economic issues and also will forward a report to the Planning Commission to incorporate into the plan. On the June schedule, this meeting today giving update, and the Planning Commission meets every other week, if not weekly. Over the next several weeks will talk about the LRTP and Comp Plan issues and community retail issues.

In July, and into August, will continue working with the Planning Commission having a target internally for a draft of August 22nd, with release of the draft plan being September 21st. Have open houses with Planning Commission's formal draft plan hearing on October 18th. Regular meeting on the 25th and in November looking, and working on scheduling, and tentatively will be adjusting on November 13th-14th. Traditionally there is a City-County Meeting on the County Plan and LRTP, and encourage that time to look forward, but will work on schedule and let everyone know what the target date is.

Hoskins reiterated the primarily task is working on the LRTP element. The LRTP encompasses a lot more than roads but will have a heavy dose of the roads plan. The department is using a new software package for modeling efforts, which predicts how traffic is going to look, and have looked at the '20-'30 land uses and traffic on the system. The new system can do environmental impact modeling and feel it's replicating existing conditions well and is a good tool as we look forward to the year 2030.

Hoskins then gave information on the Planning Commission work. Started out with different options, worked down, with a date of May 31st set for having 1 option. Started with 1, went to 12 or 13, but the Planning Commission brought down to 1 on time. Not sure we could afford to build the whole plan which was on the

'20-'25 plan, so started with the '20-'25 light plan. Took some roads around the fringes and where 4 lanes were expected thought if downsized to 2 lanes could get roads out to all proposed areas of growth. Then, as listed on the chart, different options thrown back in. Different widening scenarios, which were modeled to see impacts of each and for data. The Planning Commission looked at the impact, deciding on the number of lanes to particular roads, seeing if it helped the system as a whole, and put some things back into the plan. Demonstrated on last page of the LRTP (Exhibit A) and the map.

Schorr asked now down to 1, or 2 with alternatives, after being up to 12? Hoskins replied they started out basically with 1, the '20-'30 continuing growth base network. The plan was to have roads around edges where it looked like development by 2030. Various combinations of widening projects were added and studied.

Stevens asked if Alternative A12 was picked it would mean the things not set there are secondary priorities? Hoskins said at this time they have taken out the ones not checked, but could put in at some point. Stevens stated as an example, 84th Street, "O" Street, 6 lanes are not in the draft plan at this point? Hoskins said it is in the plan. Stevens then questioned 98th Street with 4 lanes not in the plan and Hoskins agreed. Carroll said Number 12 falls under the 2020 Plan.

Camp asked for a quick itemization of Line 12, which are in the CGBN? Hoskins said 84th Street is, 98th Streets from Adams to Pine Lake was 4 lanes in the 2025 plan. Numbers 1 and 2 included. Three (3) would not be in and 4 would be. On Number 5 looking at streets which would connect on 84th Street out to the East Beltway. The only one in there was "O" Street, the other 3 in as 2 lane roads. Superior Street and Cornhusker Highway, with 6 lanes, not in. Eight (8), 9 and 10 were 1 way pairing systems with none in. On 11, portions of "O" Street with 6 lanes basically from 70th to 98th which is under construction now in, and added more of "O" Street, all the way to Antelope Valley.

Eschliman asked about the 1 ways on 33rd, 40th, and 48th from Highway 2, Vine and Holdrege Streets, thinking it isn't as expensive as building a new road and possibly a matter of changing lanes, striping, and signage. What was the reason for dropping? Hoskins stated even if fairly low cost, the model showed increased delay in commute time and generally a half mile apart which may encourage travel through neighborhoods. These two points were primary. Eschliman asked if there were problems in the Westfield Area? Hoskins replied no, as they're not residential streets, and only a block apart.

Hoskins stated they take the information and do heavy duty analysis. Looking at environmental impact, and other issues, with the big one of funding. Carroll said dollars are the overriding factor but have to look at how the City is growing, with the Northeast area towards the interstate, and the I-80 corridor seeming to be the natural growth of the City now. Dollars important but want to make sure in 2030 the City is functional.

Hoskins pointed out the average trip time with the selected network. In 2030 the model indicates the average trip time of approximately 13.4 minutes compared to today's average trip time of under 8 minutes. Obviously as the City grows trips will be longer but it will also include increased congestion on the roads.

Hudkins stated after 3 weeks in Egypt very glad to be back and hearing the planning and comments here. Have to look to the long range future and we think we have congestion in Lincoln and Lancaster County but overall do not and part of this is because of Planning. We, as policy makers, have to commit to funding for the future. On the East Beltway we need a ring road going around Lincoln, and access to the ring road. Trip times might double, or quadruple, as the population grows and it is imperative we stay committed to the by-passes, and develop a road system to get there. A little concerned with the back up on getting Van Dorn to the East By-pass. Need to think through and proceed, particularly to hold the land needed to complete in the future. Camp said he appreciates this comprehensive report but cost discussed very briefly. On some

alternatives in the 2030 Long Range Plan we're looking at the one-half billion dollar level. Everyone is challenged budget wise, can you give an idea of portions for the City, County, Federal and State dollars?

Hoskins replied they've been successful in getting approximately 80% of the South Beltway paid for with outside, non-local funds. Assuming with the East Beltway will be able to get 80% paid by other sources. Also, looked at "O" Street being largely funded from outside sources. Gained Federal demonstration funds for Antelope Valley and expect to continue. With Cornhusker Highway/Highway 6 and then Highway 2 expecting to get State or Federal aid to help with widening. As far as an actual breakdown about a billion dollars would be local funds, but may be off somewhat. For the 80% there are limited locations where we expect to receive. Most are city streets, grid streets, and are going to be ours. Camp reiterated at first glance a billion and a half for Lincoln is a lot.

Eschliman said on the chart noticed there are no projects south of Highway 2, or Old Cheney Road. Expecting growth to go Northeast and not south so roads should service until 2030? Hoskins said on the 2025 Plan expected growth in the south end and had quite a few roads in the plan. These roads show up on the map. Other than Highway 2 didn't have any for 6 lanes at this point and have a lot of 4 lanes now. Eschliman questioned if it would be adequate. Hoskins said they will be looking on how it works and possibly to talk about growth since the last plan and take a better look at the area.

Stevens said he thought there was talk about the airport area having a major north-south road, roughly at NW 38th Street, which doesn't show up. Hoskins said it's shown but possibly not as a major road. Do have NW 40th to the east of NW 48th Street. Shown with an overpass on I-80. Stevens said he understood it was to go north to Highway 34 and NW 48th Street being downgraded to a local road. Hudkins agreed saying he thought the Airport Authority was behind the plan. Hoskins said they looked at different alignments and alternatives and thought 48th would be the major carrier. Hoskins then stated the airport is still interested in looking at the area north and west of the airport, and interested in how the intersections work with Highway 34.

Eschliman asked for explanation along the highway towards the southeast, the corridor preservation and protection. Hoskins said it's very similar in the current plan, just further to the west. As any development comes along this section of the Highway 2 corridor, first look to limit access out onto Highway 2, so traffic moves rapidly and then also look to make sure of sufficient right of way if future widening is needed. Need to be able to easily widened as City grows into the area, filling the areas between the Beltways and existing City. Eschliman asked if it meant protecting the right to purchase property and with interchanges at 120th and 98th, or a little further northwest? Hoskins stated at this time they don't know but now have roughly half mile spacings. Probably continue with half mile spaces until the area urbanizes.

Camp stated on Saltillo, by 14th, shown as 2 lanes, possibly keep in mind it may need to be 4 lanes with the South Beltway and development. Secondly, perhaps to help mitigate some costs with roads, interject a session for zoning and encourage the private sector to possibly continue owning the South Beltway Park lands, encouraging the private sector to develop attention on green space. An example would be Novartis. A beautiful campus, lots of green space, they take care of maintaining and we enjoy the benefits and still tax. This creates a nice atmosphere for the private sector and the for the corridors of Lancaster/Lincoln.

Schorr questioned the highway portion with possibly 6 lanes but a lot of businesses have different approaches. Does this include acquisition and relocation monies? Hoskins said the cost per mile is high as the projects will be expensive. All costs are in 2006 dollars, without inflation added as we don't know when individual projects will be billed. Put in a factor to account for the number of businesses which will be impacted. Try to minimize the impact on the businesses with possibly a little less walk time, narrower lanes, things to lessen our impact. Hudkins addressed the East Bypass not having an interchange on Van Dorn, asking if this was analyzed and is Pioneers really the best location? With two mile intervals it's a long way from "O" Street to

Pioneers on the East Bypass and with Van Dorn kind of an extension of Normal Blvd might make more sense. Carroll replied they looked at land use, and computer models, to see where on the East Beltway, and intersections, the traffic was. The existing interchanges helped area better than Van Dorn. With computer models actually see traffic drawn to certain intersections. Tried different scenarios and it was clear these intersections worked better. Hudkins asked if there was worry going three miles from "O" Street before an intersection. Carroll said these are major intersections and not suppose to be close together, creating more traffic. The area is more speed and not off and on interchanges.

Heier asked with Van Dorn and the east-west roads to the East Beltway will we stop traffic at the Beltway to go because we don't have interchanges? Carroll replied the public should understand the interchanges are to create the traffic to where they want to go. People will respond to the need to get to their destination. Heier asked if there's going to be traffic allowed to go under, over, or through where interchanges don't exist? Closing these roads? Carroll said he imagines overpasses, or underpasses, at these locations because the City is not going to stop at the East Beltway. Heier said the same question is coming up about Highway 77. Hudkins added on the west part of Old Cheney, where do you go if you don't give people an alternative? Schorr asked if along the South Beltway they cross at 98th and 56th? Carroll thought all existing roads crossing the South Beltway would continue to do so, except 40th Street.

Hudkins thought there was a problem at 98th, which would be kind of evenly spaced between 70th and Highway 2. Hoskins responded partly this comes down to what is done with 84th Street. The Department of Roads wants a minimum of two mile spacing between interchanges to which Hudkins replied they didn't have that between 84th and 70th. Hoskins said it's like a three mile stretch with no way to get two miles one side or the other. Hudkins encouraged a look at 98th as it's the next 84th.

Heier addressed question to Don Thomas, saying on 120th Street we stop at Pine Lake Road and then there's a mile and then it's closed. Any intention to open up this road? Thomas replied either 112th or 120th would be the choices. Heier stated at 112th there's a golf course. Heier said he thought we had the right of way to 120th but apparently don't, but at 120th, between Pine Lake and Yankee Hill, there use to be a road.

Marvin asked on streets identified (blue) as 2 lanes plus turn lanes, would they be Urban RUTS, where we do curb and gutter and off set the street? Hoskins stated where possible around the fringes building 2 lanes and expect those to be offset for ease in the future if they go to 4 lanes. Even roads identified as 4 lanes will be determined at the time of construction. In all cases probably looking to build them with RUTS, and then come back in later without having to close the road to add the other 2 lanes.

Marvin asked on the identified red streets, could those originally start as a 2 lane RUTS road? Hoskins said particularly now with funding concerns unless we're very sure that within a few years the roads will need more than 2 lanes will probably build as 2 lane originally. Marvin said in using the traffic modeling, triggering to go to 2 or 4 lanes, is there a trip count, or using the computer models for which direction to go? Hoskins said typically they look at how many and it's generally like a straight line in-between now and then. How many years until we need the 4 lane section? Yankee Hill, from 27th to 40th, is probably a good example. Again, funding concerns, and we were ready to build as a 2 way roadway, but after looking and analyzing realized we were only approximately 5 years away from needing the 4 lanes. With the problems it would cause businesses and people living in the area we put in originally. So, will do analyzation on each road.

Marvin thanked the presenters. The next meeting will be on July 11th at 4:00 pm for Budget Hearings.

Hudkins announced starting tomorrow morning, the County Board will hold their normal Tuesday Board Meeting, at 9:30 am instead of 1:30 in the afternoon, on Tuesdays for June and July. Will be decided later whether to continued with this time change.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 am.

F:\FILES\COMMISS\COMMITTEES\COMMON\mCommon060506.wpd