

**CITY-COUNTY COMMON**  
**County-City Building • 555 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street • Lincoln, NE**

County Commissioners  
(402) 441-7447

Mayor  
(402) 441-7511

City Council  
(402) 441-7515

**AGENDA**  
**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2006**  
**COUNTY-CITY BUILDING**  
**555 SOUTH 10<sup>TH</sup> STREET, ROOM 113**  
**8:30 A.M.**

- 1. APPROVAL OF COMMON MEETING MINUTES OF MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 2006.**
- 2. COMMON MEETING DATE FOR NOVEMBER. (Scheduled for Tuesday, November 7<sup>th</sup>, Election Day)**
- 3. 8:30 a.m. 2030 COMP PLAN/LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE - Planning and Public Works Departments**
- 4. 9:20 a.m. DATE FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON 2030 COMP PLAN/LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN - Possible Date of November 16, 2006.**

# CITY-COUNTY COMMON MINUTES OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2006

## Common Members Present

**County Commissioners:** Bob Workman, City-County Common Chairman, Ray Stevens, Bernie Heier, Larry Hudkins, and Deb Schorr.

**City Council Members:** Dan Marvin, City-County Common Vice-Chairman, Patte Newman, Ken Svoboda, John Camp, and Robin Eschliman.

**City Council Members Absent:** Jonathan Cook and Annette McRoy

**Other Common Members Absent:** Mayor Coleen Seng

**Others in Attendance:** Marvin Krout, Planning; Steve Masters, Karl Fredrickson, Public Works and Utilities; Don Thomas, Engineering; Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer; Gwen Thorpe, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer; Kent Morgan, Stephen Henrichsen, Planning; Trish Owen, Deputy County Clerk; Mary Meyer, County Commissioners/City Council Clerk; and other interested parties.

The City-County Common Meeting called to order by Chairman Workman at 8:30 am with self-introductions of Common members following.

## Approval of Minutes

Motion : Hudkins made motion to approve Common meeting minutes of Monday, August 21, 2006. Heier seconded. Minutes approved by accumulation of Common members.

## Common Meeting Date for November, 2006

The Common Meeting date for November had originally been set for Tuesday, November 7, 2006. After discussion of this date being Election Day the Common Board decided to remain with the Tuesday, November 7, 2006 date with the time being moved to 8:30 a.m.

## 2030 Comp Plan/Long Range Transportation Plan Update

## Overview (Krout)

Krout thanked the Board for having the meeting on October 3<sup>rd</sup>, instead of October 2<sup>nd</sup>, the Jewish New Year. He stated there is a parallel between the Jewish year end and now as we're in a community introspection period, which has been lasting for 15 months. Planning is leading the introspection with community involvement, the last being 2 open houses. This period allows the Planning Commission to adjust, re-calibrate, re-prioritize goals, and to rededicate themselves to use the Plan as a tool to develop the best community possible.

Krout said the Planning Commission will present at the November Common meeting, after the public hearings in October. The Commission should act on and/or adopt the Plan by October 25<sup>th</sup>. Also, the draft plans have been released and are on-line for the public. Krout stated Planning is looking 5 years ahead, as required by the Federal Government, setting a date of 2030, almost 25 years, basically having 4 years, or so, before being out of compliance with the 20 year requirement.

Krout said in 2030 the City population would be approximately 350,000 and 390,000 for the County. The City of Lincoln will be looking to add land area of 52 square miles to the present 85 square miles. Referring to the Future Service Limit, or Tier 1 Growth Area, Krout pointed out the red shades on map represent the possible 52 square miles which are deemed necessary and appropriate for Lincoln to grow to the urban population of 350,000. One new direction, and considered a natural for growth even though downstream, is between Lincoln and Waverly. This area contains wetlands and considered an appropriate direction. Previously discussions held about this land having good potential for the future.

Krout stated the Chapter on the Economy has been revamped. Basically to reflect goals, priorities, and directions which have been set since the Angelou report. A special business committee was formed to review the Chapter and it is now reworded to reflect a shorter, more precise, chapter which Planning believes would represent the

City's, and County's, economic policy.

Krout emphasized certain points made in the Chapter including:

- Development incentives directed toward primary employment, a market generating new revenue into the community. Discussed with the tax increment finance district, which the City Council approved, up I-80 and No. 56<sup>th</sup> Street and reflected in Mayor's draft policy on handling set increment financing, as a financial incentive tool;
- The Plan also had Committee recommendation stating they did not want the City or LPED to be in the land development business and competing with the private market. Purpose of government is traditional, i.e. infrastructure and services, and to provide incentives, sometimes needed, to encourage development;
- Emphasis on downtown. Mr. Angelou remembered and talked about downtown as part of the report card, for the first time. Reflected in the Economic Development and Business and Commerce Chapters. The downtown plan has now been updated with new emphasis.

In the Commercial/Business Section Krout mentioned changes of:

- Neighborhood Centers defined in a more careful way. What are they? What do they look like? How are they different from other kinds of centers? Where located? Clarified more in the Plan.

Krout continued with Large Employer Opportunity Areas:

- Fairly new concept. Established approximately a year ago (black dots on right map);
- Areas where it would be relatively easy to have infrastructure, beyond areas defined in Tier One;
- Areas beyond what is projected in the CIP but having ready, as needed, (sleeper cells) and could activate;
- Areas being made appropriate are I-80 and No. 56<sup>th</sup> St. and interchange of I-80 and North 48<sup>th</sup> St.;
- Being on board, in reserve, and not encouraging lots of land speculation, knowing when the time comes we'll know what directions to move into.

Krout stated build-through is included in the Commercial section. Believes we have been fairly successful with the build-through model for acreage developments, designing in the 3 mile area in order to transition easily as the City expands, to subdivide and become urban subdivisions. Need to keep in mind when large tracks of land are available for commercial development, i.e., shopping centers, parks, etc. which might have 40 acres but now have 30 acres as a parking lot. In the future may want to do a build-through on the 30 acres of parking lot, creating commercial buildings and parking, identifying future needs and being prepared for increased density. Being careful with these corridors, planning for underground utility lines, and basically setting up lots and blocks to be further subdivided and built on in the future. As the City matures, and being prepared for future redevelopment this would definitely be easier and a worthwhile goal.

Krout said the County Board has done a good job of following the Comp Plan even if sometimes it's saying no. Adding cluster developments is working well. Krout stated a few years ago there was some worry about the concept of build-through acreages in the 3 mile area. People can buy land, or move on land, which will become a urban subdivision. Very marketable and we have developments today which are working well and good projects. Krout stated they will again work on transfer of development rights, a concept with a lot of merit. The County assists in terms of helping provide some financial reward to someone who doesn't want to develop his land. This allows the landowner to sell the rights to develop to other property owners in areas where it is logical and where the County can accept more density, being closer to services, paved roads, etc. Krout stated Bennet and Hickman are concluding their Comprehensive Plan processes and we are in touch for what their plans call for.

Krout said the last point is on the 24/25 year area called Tier One, which has been divided into two 12 year sections; each consisting of 12 years of growth, but we have a CIP of 6 years. Did financial planning for more than 6 years, and will continue. With the CIP being a formal document have divided the first 12 years into 2 periods, of 6 years each. On the map the brightest red represents what is in the CIP now to be served, but the Plan reflects the City's intentions in the CIP in terms of serving and opening up new land. A couple of additional areas were not in the CIP and would suggest to the City Council that when the CIP comes next spring, to make it the first priority when the last 6 CIP years are opened to look at programming projects. Some areas recently approved for

annexation include 84<sup>th</sup> and Rokeby area, over a square mile, another is the Cornhusker Corridor to Waverly and the East Beltway/I-80 Interchange, which is going to require funding not currently in the 6 years of the CIP.

A related concept would be reviewing requests to add on for the next development project. Really a first come, first serve basis, and looked at over the year. Would encourage applicants to come in when we're reviewing the new CIP, and looking to update the Comp Plan, this would open up the opportunity for new infrastructure, asking them to compete with each other. This way would have a better idea of the merits of one development versus another in terms of pay back, and how they meet the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Having projects in mind at the same time gives better choices towards the best direction of growth affordable in the CIP. These are some new directions with the general direction of the plan being the same and as always the big issue is money.

Marvin asked if adding 52 square miles would be an increase of 65%, including parks? And if population is 230,00 making the assumption the density, over 30 years, will go down? Krout said the City would have 135 or 140 square miles, with areas not currently included. Also, it's how one defines density. If Wilderness Park, Pioneers Park, Salt Creek and Stevens Creek Flood Plains are included, and density is based on that growth it probably is lower. With net density do make assumptions and plan for the same approximate densities seen on the fringe for past 10 or 15 years. The Plan calls for efficiency, the code word for density. Krout said trends continue towards higher density. May be a conservative number but want to build in competition by having more land than the minimum needed to support the population, in order not to have land costs get too high.

Camp asked with the calculations in 30 years projecting the population of the County would be the same as now? Krout replied no, it's 30 thousand outside of Lincoln today. Project about the same proportions but more people living in the county, and small cities.

#### **Implementing the Priority Map - Financing (Masters)**

Masters stated the importance to acknowledge areas critical to planning the infrastructure needed, and having specific areas identified to place pipes and treatments in the future. As noted the sleeper cells aren't in these areas and will require creative financing to get pipelines. Masters said areas for growth are being emphasized but a area with some constraints, and relatively higher costs to move into, is the western part of the City, because of topology, limitations of pipelines, and pumping stations in place. Discussions have occurred about prioritizing and examining those areas for growth, and about the timing and need to examine proposed changes to the Comp Plan. Specific areas are critical to being able to have a design and construction plan for utilities. Traditionally the focus of the Comp Plan is on capital needs, pipes and what kind of treatment we need but Masters pointed out with operations and maintenance the growing infrastructure has increased demand while we still need to maintain equipment. Masters said on the water side in 2000 had 25,000 hydrants and valves in the City. Now have almost 32,400 and it is recommended these be operated annually, adding to the number of items needing attention. Masters said over the last few years have had to meet increasing requirements for wastewater treatment and have made sufficient investments in wastewater plants. With pumps, motors, etc. in 2000 had 2300 in our wastewater plants and pumping stations. Today have about 3900. This is the type of equipment we have to inspect, calibrate, etc. So, a commitment to this community is maintaining the facilities we have, and on new technology.

Masters said on water and sewer rates, recent annexation agreements rely upon the retainment, developer constitution of projects, which are staged in future years in our CIP. Each agreement brought forward would require some kind of rate adjustment. Masters stated they have identified this within the agreements and do anticipate the annual wastewater utility rates to increase annually over the next 12 years to meet the areas identified for growth. Also expect some water rates to increase. Won't be quite as high as expected as some of the debt issued with the Ashland Plant is being retired.

Masters continued with impact fees and stated it's important to point out the way impact fees were developed and implemented, they were not extended pipelines and treatment facilities. And the utilities, of which there is an outline, have talked of a goal ultimately getting to 25 %. Not there but it is important to revisit our strategy on the fees. Critical need not only for a Comp Plan but the financial plan. A long term financial plan matching capital, operations, and maintenance needs, with annual reviews, is important to providing the water and wastewater

facilities we want to serve the areas shown on the map.

### **Long Range Transportation Plan(Fredrickson)**

Fredrickson stated there have been a series of meetings with the public seeking input. As far as the Comprehensive Plan Chapters the existing environment has been up and completed over the last four to five years.

Fredrickson said the future has a few changes, some of which are;

- Added sections on, and emphasized, the ADA compliance.
- Emphasis on multi-module and multi-use trails throughout the community.
- The Multi Transportation Section, ITS, upgraded and reflects where we've been and where we would like to provide emphasis.
- Do have a transportation development plan with StarTran to update potential routes, which is underway.
- Updated street and rail crossing protection at different locations, others added.
- Discussions conducted on the light rail, a study item, when corridors are abandoned.
- Airport access issues include the potential for multi-module facilities of air-rail and ground transportation.
- Updated air quality modeling that would relate to any congestion in the community of vehicle omissions.
- Street changes actually on the LRTP map. Added portion of "O" Street from the Antelope Valley Parkway east to 46th where we finished this summer.
- Cornhusker Highway added as a 6 lane facility. Highway 2 is 6 lanes with potential intersection improvements, trying to improve the intersection traffic flow, especially the rail corridors on the southside.
- Added the section on the Rural Urban Transition Streets, RUTS, for coordination between the City and County in the 3 mile zoning jurisdiction.
- Added emphasis on safety and security for the Transportation System in light of Homeland Security. Emphasis to access management on corridors in order to preserve the public investment in mobility, safety and environmental quality.
- Continued with the South Beltway as a committed project, along with Antelope Valley.
- Planning and programming for the East Beltway continuing .
- Introduced a build environment map regarding emphasis for contact sensitivity for any improvements, which may be proposed in areas. Several factors to look at. The sensitivities of the contacts to the area taken into account and used in whether those projects would go forward, change, or how designed.
- Re-confirmed commitment to finish the 2 plus 1 system as proposed many years ago and now in current plan.

Fredrickson stated essentially those are the changes to the Comprehensive Plan on the Long Range Transportation Plan. Continuing he said with finances the need was to identify the costs of the roads, and now phased in construction using the RUTS capacity. Approximately 480 million dollars short on the 25 year projections, and did put in a potential of a gas tax and a half cent of sales tax for use in financing this gap. A sales tax would bring in approximately 20 plus million dollars on the city side but have to remember this is a 25 year plan, roadways to be built over 25 years. With taking RUTS and deferring some design elements, from the edge of the lane out, will see if it further reduces future costs. The motor vehicles sales tax has contributed dollars but not close to the 480 million over the 25 year plan and financing for roadways continues to be a very large challenge. As annexation continues it changes the financing plan but going into the future will continually update the financial model and try to stay ahead of pay backs.

Hudkins expressed his appreciation of people having education on the road costs stating the County has been completing one-half mile a year, with the need of 4 to 5 miles to be paved. On the gas tax Hudkins stated last year there was a bill in the Legislature for a one cent increase for Cities, County and State, and is a shame the legislation isn't in place. Hudkins said it's a matter of educating people on what roads cost, and the fuel tax is a direct correlation to usage.

Fredrickson added with higher prices people have been using and buying fuel economy cars, using less fuel. We may increase but still see declining revenues. As of a month ago tax receipts were approximately a quarter of a million less from the prior year, with the State seeing the same. Hudkins added that's the reason it would take a cent instead of a half cent. Fredrickson replied if financing options aren't available items can be cut and have a

reduction in service but if you don't have it, you can't do it.

### **County Road Plan (Thomas)**

Thomas said on the County road program they are adding 5 roads; NW 40<sup>th</sup> South of Raymond; Waverly Road down to Highway 34, about 3 miles. South 96<sup>th</sup> Street south of Cheney; and Saltillo down Roca Road. South 82<sup>nd</sup> northeast of Hickman for 2 miles between the Roca and Hickman Roads. Panama Road going west from Stagecoach Lake over to Highway 77, 3 miles; and South First Street between Pioneers and Old Cheney is a mile presently. These are the changes/additions.

Thomas said he spoke to the Chamber regarding the road program development. Giving a short history he pointed out some demands on the system. During most of the 80's the County graded roads to higher standards and replaced bridges with virtually no paving completed. In the late '80's had traffic counts and realized the needs. Thomas stated they began paving, which added another demand/ new category on the budget. Between 1991 and 2003 paved 74 miles of county roads. Also during this time made No. 84<sup>th</sup> Street 4-lane, and rebuilt South 56<sup>th</sup> Street, another category of reconstruction of paved roads. Now have RUTS and the East Beltway. Parts are in cooperation with the City and a shared responsibility. Over the years have gone from 2 to 5 or 6 categories. Workman stated the Waverly Road was just repaved, 7seven miles of necessary asphalt. Workman then said he had a bond council ask him why we were requiring the citizens of today to pay for infrastructure for the future 25 years. An interesting point in if we bond projects short term we're paying for items to be used 25 to 50 years in the future. Bonding used for infrastructure and capital expenditure would be a very appropriate way to finance but not to use bonding for operations, as some cities do. So, when we think about the bonds we have to think about who will be living here in 25 to 50 years too.

### **Date for Public Hearing on 2030 Comp Plan/Long Range Transportation Plan**

Another item is setting a hearing date for a concurrent meeting to have a public hearing on the Plan. Discussion focused on time for the One and Six Year Road and Bridge Public Meeting on November 16, 2006 with Workman stating to possibly hold the public hearing on the 2030 Comprehensive Plan/Long Range Transportation Plan the same evening. After discussion it was decided to change the time of the One and Six Year Road and Bridge Public Hearing to 6:30 pm and to have the Joint Public Hearing on the 2030 Comprehensive Plan/Long Range Transportation Plan begin at 7:30 pm. Camp and Heier stated they would not be able to attend on that date, with Newman saying she would arrive late due to another commitment.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

Submitted by,  
Mary Meyer  
County/City Clerk