AGENDA
TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2007
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING
555 SOUTH 10TH STREET, ROOM 113
8:30 A.M.

1. **APPROVAL OF COMMON MEETING MINUTES OF MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2007**.

2. **PRESENTATIONS**

   8:30 a.m. **JAIL FINANCING OPTIONS** - Lauren Wismer, Bond Counsel; Scott Keene, Ameritas Investment Corporation; Mike Thurber, Corrections Director

   9:00 a.m. **YANKEE HILL ROAD AND DENTON ROAD**

CITY-COUNTY COMMON
MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 6, 2007

Common Members Present: Dan Marvin, Chair; Ray Stevens, Vice-Chair, Bernie Heier; Larry Hudkins; Bob Workman; Jon Camp; Annette McRoy and Ken Svoboda.

Common Members Absent: Deb Schorr; Jonathan Cook, Robin Eschliman; Patte Newman and Mayor Coleen Seng.

Others Present: Don Thomas, County Engineer; Trish Owen, Lincoln Chamber of Commerce; Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer; Gwen Thorpe, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer; Dennis Meyer, Budget and Fiscal Officer; Mike Thurber, Corrections Director; Karl Fredrickson, Public Works & Utilities Director; Don Hertz, Finance Director; Lauren Wismer, Bond Counsel; Scott Keene, Ameritas Investment Corporation; Mark Bowen, Chief of Staff Mayor's Office; Mary Meyer, County Commissioners/City Council Clerk and other interested parties.

Chairman Marvin opened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. and stated the Open Meeting Laws were posted at the back of the room. The approval of the February 5, 2007 meeting Minutes suspended until a quorum present.

Jail Financing Options - Mike Thurber, Corrections Director; Lauren Wismer, Bond Counsel and Scott Keene, Ameritas Investment Corporation

Thurber stated the County Jail has been overcrowded since 2001/2002 when it came out of compliance with Nebraska Jail Standards. A master needs assessment was completed in 2001 and in 2005 the County Board contracted with Clark Enersen for a pre-architectural plan giving the County Board an idea of future community needs regarding incarcerations of adult males and females. One issue from the studies was how to finance. Discussions were held with the County Board with different options developed. Scott Keene from Ameritas and Lauren Wismer, Bond Counsel, will talk about what financing options the County has and what options are available which would involve the Commons.

Keene stated they discussed with County officials the ability to finance, but State of Nebraska counties are limited on financing capital projects, under 23120. Based on the limitations the county is able to finance this type of project in the area of $60 to $70 million, which is not sufficient to complete the project as designed and recommended to the County Board. One option suggested is using the Public Building Commission to fund the project, with the County committing their financing through 23120. The City, hopefully, would finance a portion through their levy capabilities. There isn't sufficient revenues to support a bond issue to finance, absent the City's participation in the project.

Hudkins said initially as the project unfolded they thought voting would be the most economical way of financing the Corrections Facility, and hoped to put on the Primary Election ballot, when a larger number go to the polls, but State statute prohibits. He stated they were originally told it could mean up to 50 basis points if a general obligation bond, voted on by the people, versus an interlocal arrangement. Now realize Nebraska Tax Bonds are in such high demand that maybe the differential isn't as great. He stated it is a dilemma and would have liked to have had in the spring election, saving approximately $80,000 by sharing a ballot proposal with the City, but it is not a viable option.

Marvin asked what the possibility would be in waiting a year, are the Courts ready to shut the site down? Thurber replied they have been out of compliance for three years. He added, as in any building project, there are inflation costs which pushed the project up, over the last two years, even more than the County

Board being aware they would have to build as large a facility. Thurber stated another part is the interlocal between the City and County regarding City prisoners, and an option is suggested which possibly would be an advantage to the City. Wismer will explain what the City might consider doing with a part of the proceeds paid to the County to house city prisoners. The City has continued to house prisoners over the past four years and this is being brought up to discuss the 5.2 cent issue.

Heier stated he believes the City is presently paying $1.1 to $1.2 million a year for housing of prisoners. The County indicates if the City could help with the bond, some arrangement for $1.1 million could be worked out towards the bond payment in the interlocal agreement. The amount could apply to so many prisoners per year, which the City is now paying. Keene said the amount is actually just under $1.5 million a year over the last seven years.

Marvin asked how much debt service could $1.5 million generate? Keene replied about $21, $22 million over a 25 year term. Marvin asked if they looked for City participation more than $21 million? Heier stated it depends on how many prisoners, and the kind of arrangement worked out, and asked between County and City how many prisoners are counted? Thurber stated approximately 10 percent of prisoners every year are City offenders, costing about $1.4 million and constant over the last 6 years. At one time was as high as 23 percent, in the '90's, and then saw a drop of City prisoners. Thurber said the City pays every year with the interlocal, and it works as a recalculation of what is spend, giving the City a credit or asking for additional if we hold more people. Basically allowing us to run a County/City Jail.

Camp stated the $1.2 million the City pays, the County isn't going to reduce to zero what is paid and take the $1.2 million for the bond. Heier and Hudkins responded they could. Camp said there are jail operating costs and who would pay those, with Heier answering the County. Camp stated if the County can pay the operating costs, then they could do the bond.

Wismer replied the County is caught in a dilemma as basically two statutes permit the County to make a levy. Number 23119 permits the levy for operating expenses, with few limitations. Number 23120 permits the County to levy for courthouses and jails. Unfortunately contains limitations with respect to capital facilities. So, to the extent the County can pick up assistance on the facility side, they have more flexibility on the operational side to cover costs. Camp stated he appreciates the clarification, asking if the City does this do we run afoul of legal perimeters or misusing taxpayers funds? Wismer replied not that he's aware of, as in both instances it seems assuring public safety is a high priority and a stated purpose for any kind of governmental assistance. Wismer stated the County is charged with maintaining the County jail, and the City has police powers, responsibilities for events in the City, taking care of City ordinance violators, and doesn't think in either case there would be any difficulty in terms of this kind of arrangement.

Camp asked, with the jail costing $95 million, what are the additional costs? Whether the building, or operational costs, does the County have an idea of what additional costs will be to the taxpayers? Thurber said the $94 million is for the facility, to build, house, electronics, utilities, site location and design. The operation cost is what the County picks up now, and would be $14 to $18 million a year. Operational costs at full capacity would be almost $20 million. The design is for 776 beds, with a 1,000 bed core, meaning when the County needs to add beds, plus the support services of kitchen, booking areas, etc., it will be large enough with no need to recreate. Thurber added he also feeds the Juvenile Detention Facility, the Crisis Center, and helps out at Cornhusker Detox, so the kitchen transports numerous meals. All this has all been taken into consideration with the pre-architectural plans, reiterating the $94 million would build and the County would operate as they do now, with possible added staff to operate the facility.

Camp stated he's hearing at or below full capacity, how much is spent now so we know what the

incremental addition would be? Thurber said about $12 million. Camp asked if there is an $8 million annual cost, for operating plus paying for the facility? Thurber replied plus banquets, also other revenue comes in of approximately $2.3 million. This would change under 23120, but the U. S. Marshall would want to house people with us. We would bring in revenue to help offset some of the budget.

Camp said the operations will go up and concerning revenues trying to think how we interface the $1.5 million with the capital so you have that out of the $2.3 million. Thurber said the revenue would reduce as you would take the bond, with the $12 million currently expended, and wouldn't be bringing in as much revenue. He said they hope to rent more beds, taking up some of the $1.4 million. At one time Thurber stated they brought in about a million dollars from the U. S. Marshall, INS, with people coming in. Right now we cannot do as we do not have the beds, but hopefully would have beds open in the future. The other part is the operational costs wouldn't start on day one. Thurber said he would operate with the number of staff needed for number of inmates housed. Today with 471 inmates has staff to operate 471 and when it goes to 550, 600, then staffing possibly would increase. Camp asked with renting beds, how much is the operational expense coming out of the revenue? Do you make, or have a gain, in capital?

Thurber said this has always been the question, if we really make money when renting a bed. The issue being did we bring in revenue to help with the operational costs? Camp gave example of operational costs going up a dollar and Corrections bringing in a dollar. Thurber said the issue is trying to utilize how many can be watched with ten people for what cost? Could 12 or 15 inmates be watched for the same amount? This is where you bring in additional revenue. Try to safely operate the facility and bring in as much revenue as possible. He added not to overcrowd as you end up adding to your staff. So, incrementally did let the Board know the budget would grow as the population grows, but not immediately from $12 to $20 million, without an answer on operational costs. When you sell beds you actually see a hundred percent go towards the operation. Thurber stated his Board has been very pleased to bring in any money to help offset the budget each year. Camp asked what percent? Thurber replied with the question of, does he get fifty cents off of one bed? Probably not and probably doesn't make a profit as costs are constant. Workman said he heard the operation costs would go from $12, to $14, and possibly $18 million? Thurber replied as staff are incrementally added, $20 million would be totally using 776 beds, transporting 700 people, booking in 16,000 or 17,000 a year.

Workman stated the plan presented here would be nothing on the ballot, but would be an interlocal agreement with the Building Commission, with the City and County as participants. The City would take out a loan of $21 or $22 million, receiving a dollar for dollar credit on their principle interest payments towards housing City prisoners, which would be a wash unless they had more prisoners coming in. Then, the County would have a loan of about $70 million, with the reason of not going above $70 million being legislation. With 23120 limiting the County to an amount which can be bonded for jails.

Wismer added 23120 does limit the amount to levy, the amount raised through taxation for the purposes set out in the section. Workman asked if the only thing the City would have to be careful of is not attaining too much debt which wouldn't be covered in their credit for their prisoners? Wismer replied he thinks this might be appropriate financing for the Public Building Commission. Workman agreed but asked on the amount of the debt for the City if it would be limited by the amount anticipated for services we give them with Wismer agreeing. Workman added they wouldn't want to go too heavy on debt, or the credits wouldn't cover.

Marvin asked on the operations side, if $1.5 million of operating costs is absorbed, is the County levy pushed up? Keene replied currently it is about 26.5 cents and the limitation is 35 cents, so sufficient room to make the additional debt service payments described, and also the initial operating costs they are funding. At least in the short run.

Hudkins stated he heard between 60 and 70 percent of prisoners into Corrections are brought in by the police department. Where's the slippage as the City is only paying for approximately 10 percent? Thurber responded as they are brought they are charged with either State, Federal, INS crimes, etc. When charged it reduces to about 10 percent of prisoners being the City's responsibility to pay for housing. Hudkins stated the other item is the County is under a different lid limitation, even on long term capital financing, and can only go 10 years for a bond if they carry on their own. A major difference.

Wismer said the term of the bond is limited by the term of the levy. Two parts of 23120 we're interested in. One being the County can basically put an issue for this kind of building to a vote. If approved the County can borrow as much, and for as long, as needed. If not an option, 23120 provides two other avenues for the County. The first is a levy of 5.2 cents for a period of ten years. Can be done without a vote and the County has used this levy before for a variety of projects, including the Juvenile Correctional Facility, etc. The levy has a limit of ten years, and forces us to limit the bond to ten years. A separate part of 23120 permits the County to make an appropriation of $2 million a year for these purposes, with the $2 million not limited to duration. If the County had a project with the debt service less than $2 million, but took 20 or 25 years to do it, they would be able to issue bonds for that period of time, using this provision of 23120. To achieve the maximum benefit for the County out of section 23120 would use ten years at the 5.2 cent levy, the maximum time we can make the levy, and at the end of the 10 year period would fall back to the $2 million appropriation permitted under 23120. By using this combination would be able to finance approximately $69 to$ 70 million of project. Again, the numbers are very sensitive to interest rates. As rates go up, the number goes down. But gives the County a major part of the amount needed to finance the project. Wismer stated the option selected is the one which requires the least dollars over the long term. The problem is it requires more capital dollars than other options, but the operating dollars are fewer. The County is definitely trying to serve the taxpayers but the difficulty is there are limitations for the County on the capital side, but not on the operating side. He stated the County could have chosen an option requiring a lower capital expenditure with higher operational costs but did not.

Workman said timing continues to be critical as the County Board realizes the burden of a $94 million debt costs about $3.8 million a year at current interest rates. If there is a delay a lot of variables could come into play such as higher interest rates and construction costs, and it is evident a new jail is needed.

Marvin said the 5.2 cents would amount to $104 additional property tax on a $200,000 home. Keene stated the entire 5.2 cents is not available as a portion is being levied for County capital project obligations of the last 3 to 4 years. Marvin reiterated if could wait a year and possibly ask the taxpayers if they want to pay $110 a year of their property tax to fund the jail?

Hudkins responded it would have been advantageous to run a joint election but the County may elect a stand alone election as early as September, but weigh the cost of $80,000 to take directly to taxpayers. Hudkins stated the Review Committee analyzed and presented their decision to the Board which stated it was better to build a new, stand alone facility, and not operate three different facilities. We're at Air Park, 605 South 10th and we had a third one to facilitate our actual needs for now. When the Review Committee looked at the operational costs for the community in the future, anticipating growth, it was clearly beneficial to spend the money for a complete, new site, and having laundry, kitchen facilities, etc., all consolidated into one building.

Camp stated if this goes through the PBC route there would be no vote and secondly, is there any other economical option? He said $104 a year for a $200,000 home would be pretty typical, but would be in addition to what we're now paying. He then questioned the possibility of having a private prison.
Thurber replied right now statute doesn't allow for private prisons. Hall County looked at the possibility of allowing private facilities to build and could not get it passed. Now there is not the ability to put

private prisons in Nebraska for county facilities. Also, they work for profit and we would be looking at those costs, and it doesn't take the liability away, and the issue arises of per diem costs, as we would pay per head for this type of facility. A private facility might even contract out for other beds as well, trying to be as full as possible, with the county looking at a payment to get started.

Keene said it is likely because a private entity would have profit built into their operating costs, the operating expenses could be higher. Their capital costs would be higher because as a private entity their cost of capital is much higher than the County's or the City's in terms of ability to borrow at tax exempt rates. With these two differences thinks it could end up making the privatized option definitely more expensive than the county. Camp asked what if we build the facilities and private entities run them as he is not convinced the private sector can't run more economically and they're not constrained by the same rules.

McRoy asked what would be the next step? Workman stated from the County Board side trying to judge feelings to these ideas. If the Council has an idea let us know, but this seems to be the one coming to the surface. Camp said he appreciates the County looking at a variety of options and trying to get a handle on the economics of the development, as it is a challenge to the whole community.

Stevens stated the Board did ask a Steering Committee to look at options and to report. The Committee included jail specialists and knowledgeable community members from the Lincoln/ Lancaster County area who are actively involved in the community. The question was posed of what was needed for a 25 to 30 year period and they reported back with this plan. Stevens stated the Board was somewhat shocked by the numbers as they were looking for the lowest cost, and the capital construction was not the lowest to build a new jail. But, the operational costs of a single location, and incorporating multiple facilities within the jail, seemed less expensive, and therefore elected this approach. Regarding the financing looked at options and kept in mind the best way for the taxpayers to afford. Also, the question of charging today's taxpayers the whole amount in a short period of time, or spread over a period which would benefit today's and future citizens. The Board asked about other options such as if a particular wing of the jail wouldn't be built with the answer being we could save $5 million today, but in 5 to 10 years would cost $8 million. The Board is weighing all options. He stated they are pursuing with the City to help as it will effect their costs long term, and to have input so the taxpayers get the best deal over a 25 to 30 year period.

Marvin stated he is going to weigh the financing option. He doesn't question whether 95 million is the number and leaves that part to the County. Does want to weigh the issue of going to the voters to approve a bond issue, or circumvent, go around the voters and do it this way? Heier stated he doesn't think it's so much of going around the voters and stated the Board has been very up front, very open, with the news/media and anyone else. Not trying to circumvent anybody, or anything, but do the best thing for everyone. Finding the best financial route.

Svoboda said he didn't recognize as a circumvention. It is the representative form of government, representing the taxpayer, and appreciates weighing options on whether to invest in capital or operations. If put to a vote of the people and they say absolutely not, cannot afford, then what would be the outlaying costs to develop a system within and rent beds in other counties where costs are uncontrollable? Appreciates the dilemma but what is the time line? When will the Board come back to the City Council with more of a request, other than keeping us informed as to the options?

Hudkins said they could not respond to a definite time line. Wanted to share these thoughts as they have unfolded in the last three weeks. Would ask the City to visit with their colleagues so the entire City Council is informed of this possible option. The Board will work with the bond team and the architectural people, weighing costs of what could we pull, and the cost benefit ratio. But the main

thought was to bring to the table, making sure everyone is aware.

Camp said the vote is very critical and we represent government but when talking about expenditures, even $25 to $50 million, the public has been concerned when they don't have the best way of assessing. If we went ahead with this approach, which makes economic sense, believe the City and County would need a tremendous PR campaign to help the public understand we're not trying to circumvent them, but rather we're representing them the best we can. Camp stated everyone would hate to have issues later. Marvin agreed.

Approval of Minutes of February 5, 2007

Hudkins made motion to approve Common Meeting Minutes of February 5, 2007, Stevens seconded. Minutes approved by accumulation.

Yankee Hill Road and Denton Road

Marvin said his understanding of the Common agenda was the person asking for a particular agenda item would be identified, which was not done on this agenda. Svoboda stated the topic was a carry over, and they asked for it to be included on the agenda. Hudkins stated Schorr had asked as well.

Camp said the City wants to build Yankee Hill Road according to RUTS standards, and feel it is very important to do the offset. Camp stated through redesign the City is putting in approximately $130,000 more than the $270,000 or $280,000 the County has brought forward. He stated during discussions there was a strong concern that the City Council would like to see more participation by the County.

Hudkins replied he welcomes this news. He stated Fredrickson and Figard have appeared before the County Board several times as we thought the road should be done right the first time. Coming to this meeting thought at a bare minimum to put in cement culverts, so whenever we do put down it can't be torn up. Hudkins stated he's glad the City is willing to participate and we need to find a equitable solution and do it right the first time.

Camp said he heard $130,000. Fredrickson replied it is the bare minimum, trying to keep things bare bones, especially the existing grade, and add dirt work, extend the pipes and keep the profile that Thomas previously graded and whatever drainage overtopping is we leave the same. Hudkins asked how much more to install cement culverts? Fredrickson stated he would have to do the numbers, but a little higher. Hudkins said the main cost is doing the space and installation, and it's going to be a material difference. Fredrickson said the material difference might be higher, also the contractor labor, as those come in seven and a half foot sections, rather than twenty, so a little more labor for installation.

Hudkins asked if City Engineering installed cement culverts for every road built versus steel? Fredrickson said as an engineer he says concrete and yes they do for several reasons. One is people dig without letting us know and concrete is durable. Also, with a lot of salt put on our streets, salt and metal don't tend to mix well. Concrete is durable and hard to put a mailbox post, etc., through it. We do end up with water and sewer pipes having things bored through them. Hudkins said he appreciates the permanency and in the City it's different than in the County where it is usually pretty easy to dig up a culvert. Before moving forward would like to have a figure so we can at least consider.

Heier asked if any monies from impact fees charged in the City are forwarded to the roads, paying for any roads with Fredrickson replying yes. Heier said if the County were to do and the City charges impact fees for people building aside the road, could the County recoup any money if we put up another $130,000? Since this scenario will happen when this road is completed.

Fredrickson said with impact fees there are projects geared for the developments in the areas. Looking

at So. 40th Street, as well as Rokeby Road, to use the dollars generated to improve the roadways. They do get paid back as they develop, and we have different districts for the fees, seven over the city. The money has to be spent in the districts. The question is, are there monies left over? And when will they be generated?

Marvin asked for explanation of what is being done with So.40th Street. Fredrickson said on So.40th have development on both sides, and the developers want a four lane before their doors open, or as they're constructing their sites. Essentially the road, the County asphalt south of Yankee Hill will be torn out. Which again is why we want to do RUTS. Saying if they generate impact fees, and is an arterial street impact fee eligible project, the fees will go back in. The developers will front the cost to get it done, and believe work is being done on agreements with the developers now. Will pay the developer back for doing the work, so in a sense they are already spent.

Heier asked if the City is taking impact fees which would occur on Yankee Hill Road and putting someplace else? There wouldn't be a chance of recouping some impact fees to the County for paving the road? Fredrickson replied it's hard to tell now, but probably not, as they will be used on So.40th and probably Rokeby Road. Svoboda asked what is the expectation of impact fees generated there which will be applied to fully urbanizing the road? Curb and guttering in a four lane? It's a gap of $130,000 now.

Heier asked how much money would the City be willing to put in the project, to go ahead? Svoboda thinks the question from the City would be, is the County Board willing to contribute any more to the construction, on top of $270,000, which they already committed to? Heier asked if looking at Denton Road at the same time?

Hudkins stated with Denton Road thought the agreement was to finish the third of a mile when Denton Road is relocated, but it was taken out of the CIP budget. This piece of road needs to be put in. Leave old Denton Road open, but if relocating this third of a mile needs to be finished. He thought comments were made to the effect it was a farm to market road, but is a road people travel into Lincoln, with the whole area served. It is heavily used at harvest for the $7 to $8 million grain industry on that end of town, and if semis are going through a round about, it's not good.

To answer Svoboda's question Stevens said if Fredrickson would submit costs for the concrete culverts, he would be willing to look at another $25,000 to $30,000 on the Yankee Hill Road project, with money probably from the Keno fund and not directly affecting taxpayers now. He stated he knows Commissioner Schorr's concern is to have the road done before Super Target opens when there will be an increase in traffic on Yankee Hill of approximately a factor of ten, over the next years. Stevens would like to see the road done right and if the City assists would be willing to ask the County Board to contribute more to the project. Even if it delays because of doing it right, he thought Fredrickson had said it would be done by fall, or mid-winter. He stated he likes this approach so the road wouldn't completely shut down when made into four lanes, which would be a City operation as it won't be four lanes when a county road. When the City annexes hopefully will there is development on the southside of Yankee Hill Road generating impact fees. Or, when the corner develops in the southeast side of 40th and Yankee Hill, and impact fees go to 40th Street, with some to Yankee Hill.

Hudkins stated when developers do impact fees, pay to set off, possibly look at the southside of Yankee Hill Road, as it develops and the funds are paid back. He said it supports what Stevens said and would throw money into the project to complete the right way and as soon as possible. One criteria might be the difference between the concrete and metal culverts, and would like resolved, plus the third of a mile of Denton Road at the same time we come to agreement. Workman also agreed that $25,000 to $30,000 would be a number which would work for the County. Stevens said the County has money for Arbor Road, which isn't happening now. Hudkins and Workman both replied they would be reluctant to take

away from projects.

McRoy asked if the County is saying they would pay for the difference between the concrete and metal? Hudkins said it would be a factor. McRoy replied it's part of the equation. Hudkins stated it makes sense doing the road, which will be four lanes someday, to do now with no disruption in 10 or 20 years. McRoy agreed, adding it should not close it down once it's built.

Marvin asked if Fredrickson was saying if the project was done at an offset, then would become a City project, and the City would look to the County? Fredrickson replied he recalled Thomas saying here's the money budgeted and now the city can take over. Marvin asked if it requires an interlocal to facilitate? Fredrickson replied they've done transfer of monies, as well as County permission to build a road in the County, and is a matter of getting the paperwork done. Marvin asked by both parties? Fredrickson said it was mentioned the clock is ticking, and this should have been let to bid three months ago.

Camp inquired as to the numbers, the design, of Denton Road. Hudkins replied Figard is probably the main person to answer but we understand, in your rerouting of Denton Road, where it use to come out, and around, and go to Highway 77, it now takes a more improved direct route, elevating where it comes to Warlick. Hudkins stated there is a third of a mile which he believes would go up NW 1st, over and around, through the development and a round about, and then out. This other part of the road will be designed to be completed in the future, but the idea was to wait until developed and the developers pay. Hudkins said Fredrickson can probably answer questions on the discussions with the State regarding what level and where it is now.

Fredrickson said the State is experiencing the same budget woes as the City, County, Federal government in the Highway Trust Fund. The Warlick interchange is highly dependent upon Federal funds as well as State Highway Trust Funds, so probably moved into the future, further than we would like. The developer is fronting directed impact fees for Warlick Road, as well as some of Folsom, which he believes is going to be on the County interlocal agreement, and to build essentially where we're talking about and would be part of Folsom Road. Still have a gap from Denton north, from Folsom you would go east into the internal system of the shopping center and back out to the new Denton Road, and to Highway 77, as you go east. The developers are willing to front an amount of money and we will put an impact fee cap, or trip cap in, saying once this was met they would finish the rest of Denton Road, which was in the annexation agreement by Council. Fredrickson stated he received a letter from the County saying they didn't care for this solution, and he replied he didn't have funding. He stated let's put the developers money together and finish Warlick Boulevard. Now, Yankee Hill Road has come up and it's already March. Essentially think the design of the round about will handle farm trucks and everyone else. Fredrickson stated with the truck apron it probably is not a long term desirable but with funding, and budgets, getting tighter with our revenue sources and the time of finalization these are probably being pushed into the future.

Svoboda said it appears it is almost like a detour through the development. He asked if these were city roads, or? Fredrickson said he believed they are city roads. Svoboda said he was wondering why a developer would pay for roads and then have semi truck traffic which has no value whatsoever to them, traveling through the system. Is it appropriate for us to be able to use, as it wears the system down even more? Can Denton Road remain open, as Larry asked?

Fredrickson said he didn't think his department thought desirable. Svoboda asked if it's not desirable, possibly stay open during the interim period until we reach a trip count where the developer pays the remainder? Fredrickson believes they knew they didn't have the resources with all other desirables around the city to finance, and developers weren't willing to finance all of it. The annexation agreement went forward and was approved with less than recommended. Fredrickson stated they recommend to the

developers for the overall community, and the annexation agreements don't always come though with these. The reality being there isn't the money to do all and think it will operate fine for the new term. The round about will handle trucks and is the reason we put truck aprons at 33rd and Sheridan and 40th and Sheridan. The Department of Roads built larger one south of Blair with only one complaint. Fredrickson stated if they had it their way, writing the annexation agreement, Denton Road would have been completely built, and they would have funded, if the funds were available. Hudkins asked on the third of a mile gap, what would it cost as the County Board needs to know.

Marvin said he put Denton Road on pending and one thing he thought of was they would be inconveniencing people, but not making impossible for people to get to Denton. It is a road project and these projects have a tendency to inconvenience. The solution worked out in the Planning Commission was having trip caps and when the road starts to go to certain volumes we have directed impact fees, either a low interest, or an interest free loan of the City, which now is $1.2 million. Looking at getting $1.2 million using low interest rates, or free, versus financing a 4% or 4 ½% funding by three or four years. Would lose $50,000 a year on interest. If funded for three years is $150,000 to solve someone's inconvenience. Marvin stated regarding Yankee Hill, we're thinking of taking $30,000 to solve a problem, which he thinks the County Board voted to adopt RUTS standards. To adopt meaning more than just a road down the middle, and now tearing up 40th Street, south of Yankee Hill, which is good asphalt but we're tearing up and throwing away, which is what we'd really want to avoid. Marvin said he's happy to try to work on Denton Road, but would like to see resolution on Yankee Hill, which he thinks we will have.

Camp said he hopes his colleagues will consider, and Hudkins would see the City is willing to revisit Denton Road, and he would like to take the $30,000 the County is offering, with the City doing the other $100,000 to complete the road. Thinks discussions have helped everyone understand how the City and County need to work even more closely on projects, and respectfully agree to disagree and get Yankee Hill done. Marvin agreed.

Hudkins concurred and stated he would like to hear the cost to finish up the third of a mile. He addressed the fellow commissioners and said in light of what is being said, the relocation of Denton Road possibly isn't super immediate, and may have a year or two of delay. Hudkins said he would like to know the amount necessary to finish the third of a mile and is willing to discuss with fellow County Commissioners the possibility of fronting the money. He said if he understood the Engineering Department said in the best of worlds if they had the money this is the best way to finish, doing it right. When moving dirt to put the rest of the elevation in, it would make sense to put dirt there and let it settle until paved. But again would like to know the amount and therefore give the County an opportunity to possibly front the money. We may not have enough left in Keno this year, but haven't reallocated for last year, for the future year.

Svoboda stated in order not to delay his comments were directed to Fredrickson saying this body would want to complete Yankee Hill Road with the appreciative $30,000 investment from the County and the City would pay $100,00 additional. Also move towards concrete culverts, and we will continue to work with the County on Denton Road, as there's value there as well.

Stevens moved to adjourn, Hudkins seconded. Chairman Marvin adjourned the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

Mary Meyer
Clerk
F:\files\COMMISS\Mary\Cm030607.wpd