

**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, NOVEMBER 7 , 2006**  
**COUNTY-CITY BUILDING**  
**555 SOUTH 10<sup>TH</sup> STREET, ROOM 113**  
**8:30 A.M.**

1. **APPROVAL OF COMMON MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2006.**
2. **COMMON MEETING DATE FOR DECEMBER. POSSIBLY TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2006.**  
(Originally set for Monday, December 4, 2006. If held on Tuesday, December 12, 2006 would follow the Joint LPS/County/City Meeting at 7:30 am)
3. **8:35 a.m. DISCUSSION OF YANKEE HILL ROAD PAVING (40<sup>th</sup> to 56<sup>th</sup> Street) - Ken Svoboda, City Council**
4. **8:45 a.m. 2030 COMP PLAN/LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN - Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission - Jon Carlson, Chair; Gene Carroll, Vice Chair.**

# CITY-COUNTY COMMON MINUTES TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2006

## Common Members Present

**County Commissioners:** Bob Workman, City-County Common Chairman, Bernie Heier, Deb Schorr (8:43 am) and Larry Hudkins (8:46 am)

**City Council Members:** Dan Marvin, City-County Common Vice-Chairman, Patte Newman, Ken Svoboda, Robin Eschliman, Annette McRoy, and Jon Camp (8:41 am)

**Other Common Members:** Mayor Coleen Seng (8:51 am)

**Members Absent:** Jonathan Cook (City Council) and Ray Stevens (County Commissioner)

**Others in Attendance:** Marvin Krout, Planning; Karl Fredrickson, Public Works and Utilities; Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer; Gwen Thorpe, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer; Stephen Henrichsen, Planning; Kent Morgan, Planning; Trish Owen, Deputy County Clerk; Mike Eckert, Civil Design Group; Jon Carlson and Gene Carroll, Planning Commission; Mary Meyer, County Commissioners/City Council Clerk; and other interested parties.

The City-County Common Meeting was called to order by Chairman Workman at 8:32 am on Tuesday, November 7, 2006. Workman introduced Common members present.

## Approval of Minutes

**Motion:** Heier moved and Marvin seconded a motion to approve the minutes from the October 3, 2006 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

## Yankee Hill Road Paving (40<sup>th</sup> to 56<sup>th</sup> Street)

Svoboda stated Yankee Hill Rd., between 40<sup>th</sup> & 56<sup>th</sup>, was not included in the Highway Bond allocation meetings. He understood asphalt was being laid and as the City Council recognizes as a RUTS project wants to discuss additional grading and offset on the paving in order to transition into a future urban road. Heier replied the Board recognizes the need to pave the road and be more complete, however, understood the City doesn't have the money. Marvin said with the resolution passed in February, 2006 the County has an interlocal RUTS agreement and should be their obligation to fund the RUTS interlocal. He asked why the County would be looking to the City.

Heier asked if areas were annexed. Marvin responded in cases where it is to be annexed, the agreement says "...for those RUTS improvements and unpaved County roads that can reasonably expect to be annexed into the City in the near terms, the payment should be built urban as shown in Exhibit A, page 2", adding the County is building roads down the middle. Heier stated the County does not have money to execute. Workman stated the County Engineer indicated this could not be offset as there was an alignment problem. Newman asked for cost numbers on the difference with Workman stating he thought it was a problem of aligning sections of roads, not a cost issue.

Fredrickson stated the issue is money with an actual cost not determined, but an estimate of \$300,000 to \$500,000, including additional grading. He gave example of 98<sup>th</sup> Street of adjacent sections with different features and what to avoid. Fredrickson said he understood Thomas and Figard want to start designing and play in as an offset, possibly foregoing curb/gutter trying to maximize costs. Fredrickson added they want to maximize the utility of the future roadway, saving costs when putting in two additional lanes, this being the City's preference but it is a County road with County jurisdiction.

Marvin asked if an alignment problem, or if the alignment problem was a result of the County not paying to pave? Fredrickson said he didn't necessarily know, adding the alignment problem was 70<sup>th</sup> Street, where there is a parallel drainage ditch. He stated years ago a design investment was made, widening the road and shifting the payment offset, which now would entail additional design and costs, with the estimate of \$300,000 to \$500,000. He stated he didn't know of any specific design issue. Heier added this is scheduled to be discussed with the County Board on November 30<sup>th</sup>.

Svoboda inquired to the County's schedule for laying blacktop and Fredrickson said next year or the following year. Workman asked for an estimate of the savings on the end? Fredrickson said approximate as the City would not be there until traffic volumes exceeded 13,000 to 15,000 cars a day, with cost then to add additional lanes with re-routed traffic resulting in disruption to citizens and to income, profit, and sales tax of businesses.

Marvin stated Target will be on the northwest corner of 40<sup>th</sup> Street, and commercial properties approved on the southside of Yankee Hill, these could generate up to 15,000 trips a day he feels it is important to build the road at the front end. Marvin reiterated the agreement was signed and passed by both bodies. Workman said the County is following the County engineers lead and will discuss. Schorr stated Thomas had said if it's to RUTS standards there isn't enough money, but will be discussed at the One and Six Year Road & Bridge public hearing. Schorr believed cost is three, or more, times as much with additional grading, culverts, and drainage needing to be changed, and adding a year as the road has to lay over, where now there is a roadbed. If to RUTS standards would require more money and time.

Svoboda said he would want the offset. Even if blacktopped, and not to urban standards, would be a better preference than laying down the center line. Stated the road will close for a year plus to re-grade resulting in total disruption to the commercial developments and possibly a better grading plan if offset at the other direction, and still remain blacktopped, with the \$300,000/\$500,000 being grading, drainage issues, not curb and gutters. Fredrickson said the County would blacktop with the cost already there, but it's getting the dirt underneath. If curbs, gutters and storm sewer not needed there should be no additional costs for paving material. Schorr said depending on the offset might be an additional delay, needing to re-pack, to see how far to offset. Fredrickson replied that is the County engineers practice, but wasn't done when Pioneer Blvd. and Yankee Hill Road were re-graded, and would depend on the compaction requirement.

Camp stated he also thought the offset should be initial as in the future might be more disruptive to area businesses. Fredrickson said this has been the direction with no one disagreeing on scaling the scope back, but thought the reason for discussion was who would pay to offset. Workman said the County would meet with the County Engineer and that it appears the City Council's preference is to offset the road. Workman said possibly this option would not cost significant extra money but would be a convenient arrangement for the future.

Svoboda asked Fredrickson if he, and the County Engineer, could finalize the estimates. Marvin asked to also look at delay costs, as in the future would have access closure to businesses. He preferred initial offset and believed it was agreed on in February, with the County Board signing off and essentially the City Council agreeing to the terms of who was paying. Marvin said the expectation was the County Board would pay. Schorr and Heier commented they did not remember the statement.

Hudkins stated he thinks if offset it makes sense to put the roadway where it will be in the future. Marvin added he researched newspaper articles and one comment made was the County has no money in the budget now. He feels the County should pay for the road and felt it was an obligation of the County to fund RUTS. Workman acknowledged and said it would be discussed at the November 16<sup>th</sup> Bridge & Road meeting.

### **Common Meeting Date for December**

The December Common meeting date proposed is December 12<sup>th</sup>, following the Joint LPS/City/County meeting at 7:30 am. After discussion Workman stated December 12, 2006, 8:30 am, is the date for the next Common meeting.

### **2030 Comp Plan/Long Range Transportation Plan (Attachment A)**

Workman welcomed Planning Commissioners Jon Carlson and Gene Carroll. Referring to Attachment A, Carlson said the first 6 items had minor corrections, such as language updates. No. 7, the S.W. corner of 84<sup>th</sup> and Adams, included urban residential to commercial and changing the neighborhood center designation. No. 8 would have a commercial sites on the N.E. and S.E. corners. Carlson said additional square footage will be offered in the commercial, with a change of the S.E. corner from commercial to office. He stated commercial would be concentrated in a new design on the N.E. corner, with the S.E. corner having offices. Carlson stated the North 40 is going to be a block road and a commercial area is near the interchange of I-80 & 56<sup>th</sup>. Carlson questioned if there

was commercial expansion and a change to priority, which would move from Priority B to Priority A, and have on line for an industrial track.

Carlson said No. 10 is Saltillo Road to the future South Beltway. Wants some ag land moved up in priority and growth tiers. He added that around the by-pass interchanges were looking to put commercial and some into higher priorities. No. 11, the S.W. corner of S.W. 12<sup>th</sup> and W. Denton Road, was to move up in priority.

No. 12 is the City of Hickman. Carlson stated their Comp Plan is complete and incorporated into our Comprehensive Plan. A Hickman Planning Commissioner testified, stating how they have a larger voice through the Planning Commission and the County Board by working through the Comp Plan. Carlson said Hickman has a vision plan which includes their one mile extra territorial jurisdiction with the zoning power, and an extra mile outside for future growth plans. Carlson commented another item mentioned was to develop discussions regarding build through for the towns. Carlson said Hickman is ambitious, thinking 20 to 30 years out and seeing a chance to get some proposed acreages to be built through centers.

Hudkins said No. 12 shows an area S.E. of Hickman's ETJ as urban residential and asked if beyond the one mile limit in the Comp Plan? Fredrickson referred to the map showing the current one mile jurisdiction, and the area to the S.E. is in their vision/horizon plan, shown as future urban residential. He stated Waverly also has an area south of their jurisdiction shown as Long Term Future Urban Residential, and included in the current Comp Plan. Hudkins asked if it's notification only to the County Board as they do not have jurisdiction? He stated as Hickman and Waverly do not have jurisdiction it is good to be cognizant of plans but didn't want ramifications of the County giving up jurisdiction within one mile of the villages. Carlson said he thought the Hickman Commissioner came to the Planning Commission to start sending ideas for this body to discuss.

On No.13, Sun Valley Blvd. and W. Charleston Street, Carlson didn't specifically know if College Park but has apartments tailored to university students, with commercial and residential originally shown. Carlson stated they have plans to work through, but this is the Comp Plan which would be changed. Marvin asked if this group wanted to build the off apartments and this is phase two? Carlson said they had a mix of commercial and apartments, but now want some commercial out for more apartments. He added the occupancy is increasing because of population but the site is challenging, including environmental, access, industrial, and railroad.

Regarding No. 14 Carlson said they wanted to be specific on the highway oriented commercial description, and changed the language to allow a wider commercial use, saying these were the kinds of commercial likely to be on a Beltway, or Interstate. Carlson stated No.'s 15 and 16 added at the Planning Commission meeting. No. 15 was a motion to add a study of east-west locations for additional two plus one streets in N. E. Lincoln. No.16 was to encourage new development to increase connectivity, creating a better motion throughout a square mile.

Carroll said the Comp Plan is 52 square miles and taking out park land results in 32 square miles of developable land. In Tier 1, Priority A, down to 20 square miles of land ready to be built, leaving a lot of land ready to develop. Carroll said they worked over a year on the Comp Plan and believes a very good map was provided for the City of Lincoln and Lancaster County.

Camp questioned No. 16, the mobility transportation to increase connectivity. Stated there are standards for connectivity and the City Council has had a number of waver applications. His concern is putting in the Comp Plan and later someone extracts making it a mandate. Camp stated his district has a residential development concern for safety and the theories are recognized but here it's one issue. He then asked for a complete definition. Carlson stated the idea was to increase the ability to navigate within a developed square mile. There is concern regarding safety to travel through neighborhoods, and a discussion would be how to create more internal motion, more ways to travel a neighborhood. The Commission does want public questions on the pros and cons.

Camp said on internal connectivity there isn't a grid layout and sees this as putting a not specific plan in place. He questioned what's wrong with what we have? Carlson said it's not a change to design standards but a direction in the Comp Plan to explore. Carlson stated someone could go to the Comp Plan and say they don't like the plan as it says you should be doing this, but they can't hold you to it. He said this would be the procedure for an idea,

having discussions, getting with developers and engineers to obtain input. Carlson added this is what is being said, and there is a need to talk about it.

Carroll said the Planning Commission and Health Department worked together almost a year on this problem. One reason was obesity in the City with an item being connectivity, allowing kids to walk to school. The City has a walking school bus program with kids walking to school together. Also, want connectivity so kids can play, work, and walk through neighborhoods. Carroll said this is not mandating new standards, but saying the City of Lincoln wants a friendly environment where people can move around inside the City without major problems.

Newman expressed similar concerns over No. 15, saying she sees two plus one streets increasing. Stated if we make arterial streets out of residential streets not sure the people want the same thing, and would see these two going together. Marvin asked everyone to remember 40<sup>th</sup> Street and Yankee Hill Road with five plex town homes and the issue of having one road to school, with increased density. Marvin had heard if there's a school within the mile maybe have more than the minor arterial as the only route to school. Because of density certain roads will be plugged, as they were not designed to have that amount of traffic, and need to get people on different routes.

Camp answered saying this is trying to fix something which isn't broken. He appreciates the comments on obesity but this is a societal change. He agreed obesity is a concern but stated without specificity this is opening the door to increased costs on development and if we have a standard doesn't know what else is being talked about. Camp added we might be talking about the length a walk can go, or getting internal movement in commercial areas, not on arterials, taking away development land. Camp said he would rather have specificity instead of a general phase under mobility and transportation connectivity, adding some think connectivity is sidewalks between back yards.

Mayor Seng asked if there is a standard on the books which helps with a new development joining another development? Krout replied yes, in the subdivision regulations there are requirements for connectivity. One area which possibly Camp has in mind is Fletcher Street. Krout said some mile section designs are a maze once into the mile, and not a legibility from one portion to another. He said there is a classification system approach with the collector street, but often doesn't work as we don't have large 300 or 600 acre developments at a time. Krout stated it's usually a half mile road with bends/ turns, but more of a direct route from one side of the mile section to the another, usually at the half mile point, and north-south. He stated this would be a slightly different design, easier to have a bus route through the neighborhood and likely where an elementary school is, creating more structure with some traffic using an arterial street. Krout said they're not talking about a half mile grid, but a compromise of a legible collector street system. The ordinance states we're to pay for the difference between a regular residential street and a collector street, and the City should pay if they want the additional level of service. Krout stated there have been discussions with Public Works about designing collector streets, telling us how to get in/out easily and have centralized locations mid-mile. Krout said he thinks this is upmost rather than issues regarding left over pedestrian easement on arterial streets.

Eschliman asked if there was something in the current Comp Plan, with the City having a developer and finding the right balance it wouldn't put additional burdens in our Comp Plan? Krout replied there's language on connectivity with an understanding of goals. Stated there are ideas on design standards which might encourage a finished street, a walk way requirement, not getting into the pedestrian easement.

Carlson said the Comp Plan is perfect for these ideas, illustrating the community wants and if we believe in the ideas should have the language. He said a Comp Plan would show the direction wanted and how implemented becomes the purpose of the designing codes and the designing teams.

Camp said that is his understanding of the Comp Plan. He stated the problem is the future, even if it's general people believe it's specific, causing a problem. He added there's been seven different definitions at this meeting of connectivity. Carlson said a version is brought forward and it's our job to debate and decide, and that we don't want a plan requiring a fine tooth comb. Camp said too many times with connectivity people say it's in the Comprehensive Plan. Camp said he wants specificity unless there is a preamble saying "this is general".

Newman said the discussion is on new development, with rules, but the Council is always waving those rules when it comes to connectivity. She sees the discussion going in the direction of sticking with the new development rules

and not having problems in the future. This discussion/problem deals with connectivity and is also what No. 15 deals with.

Hudkins stated on No. 11, W. Denton Road is a county road, serving as a major arterial for the western part of the County and a major farm to market road. He added the development/proposals at the Highway 77 intersection are excellent but shows a third of the mile not finished. Hudkins thought the idea was to finish the road as quickly as possible. He stated at the Chamber Coffee Councilman Marvin and he had a little discussion and Marvin thought it was fine to leave the third of a mile unfinished and not make it a priority to finish. Hudkins wondered what the Planning Commission recommendations were.

Krout said it isn't a Planning Commission issue. Timing, spacing of public improvement, and when it occurs is an issue negotiated between staff and applicant as far as an annexation agreement, which begins before the Planning Commission hearing and extends until the City Council agenda. Krout stated the Planning Commission wasn't presented with staging plans on doing improvements or what the interim traffic situation would be, and County staff were invited to negotiations with the developer. Hudkins said he registered concern and maybe the problem is communication. Krout said there are technical issues which the Planning Commission hasn't traditionally been involved with. Krout said they try to keep the process streamlined which usually doesn't create problems. Krout stated he saw Denton Road in the listing of the new bond programs and stated possibly that communication is a way to deal with the issue.

Fredrickson asked who's willing to pay? Hudkins said he understands it's a funding program, agreeing the alignment is better. Hudkins said there will be a time when W. Denton Road will not be continued for the one third mile and asked Fredrickson if he and Thomas had a solution?

Fredrickson answered it goes to discussions where we want economic development, and growth, and don't disagree on the road design but the question is payment. Fredrickson stated the City Council had public hearing on highway allocation bonds and one proposal is to finish the section with highway allocation bonds. He stated there is still the final decision but probably would occur. Fredrickson said it serves economic development interests but believes it goes back to not solving funding issues with transportation in the City or the County. He stated we have a direction to grow the City and want economic growth, sales tax increase, property taxes and the tax base to increase, but need dollars to put in the infrastructure.

Marvin said with road projects there is going to be a period of inconvenience but these are needed projects and there's no way to avoid it. Workman said this would be debated again as it will be brought before the City Council and the County Board for approval or denial.

Workman thanked each person for appearing. Motion to adjourn passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:26 am.

Mary Meyer, Clerk