

**CITY-COUNTY COMMON
MINUTES
Monday, October 3, 2011**

Present: Doug Emery, Deb Schorr, Jon Camp, Adam Hornung, Larry Hudkins, Carl Eskridge, Jane Raybould, Brent Smoyer, Bernie Heier, Gene Carroll, Jonathan Cook and Mayor Beutler

Others Present: Marvin Krout, City-County Planning Director; Lynn Sunderman, Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Commission; Michael Cornelius, Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Commission; and Nicole Fleck-Tooze, City-County Planner

Chair Commissioner Deb Schorr opened the meeting at 12:45 p.m.

1. Approval of Common Meeting Minutes of August 1, 2011

Commissioner Heier moved approval of the Common Meeting minutes of August 1, 2011, seconded by Commissioner Raybould. Motion passed 12 - 0.

2. Recognition of Joan Anderson, Lancaster County Medical Society

Commissioner Schorr introduced Joan Anderson, Executive Director of the Lancaster County Medical Society. Ms. Anderson has served the city and the county through EMS Inc. which was the medical oversight administration of all emergency medicine within Lancaster County. Due to the non-renewal of the contract with the city and county, a new medical emergency oversight administration has been created and she was a key participant in this development. Both Councilman Hornung and Camp thanked her on behalf of the City Council. For the record, Commissioner Schorr read the resolution the County Commissioners presented to Ms. Anderson from the County Board and Mayor Beutler thanked her for her hard work and community involvement. He presented a medallion from the City of Lincoln as a small token of appreciation. Ms. Anderson said a few brief words regarding Lincoln being on the forefront of emergency medical services.

3. Information Services Update:

Steve Henderson, Chief Information Officer handed out Exhibit A, "City-County Common Meeting, October 3, 2011, Cloud Computing Discussion". This was a follow up from the July Common Budget meetings regarding cloud computing. Henderson referred to the last line of the definition from National Institute of Standards and Technology, "services that can be rapidly provisioned and released" so that notion of being able to rapidly scale up a service or to scale down a service by using a cloud computing solution. He stated this is an important element in this definition. He quoted from the definition from Wikipedia, "a services that do not require end-user knowledge of the physical location and configuration of the system that delivers the services" so just that notion of being able to offer services without needing to provide any level of detail as to where the service is coming from. Henderson offered his definition of cloud computing, "Cloud computing is the delivery of information technology solutions from a source other than your own." He gave some "everyday life" examples of "conventional" solutions vs. "cloud"

solutions. He referred to the possibility of using google docs verses Microsoft Office and google maps verses ESDI.

He then turned to what Information Services is doing and what they are contemplating doing about cloud computing. He talked specifically about two of them.

- 1) The need to examine how mainframe services is delivered and whether or not there might be some alternative such as a cloud base service that could be offered.
- 2) Email services is not being looked at closely at this time.

Henderson next referred to decision points for considering cloud computing. He listed the following key points that are needed for consideration:

- 1) Can the product or service be delivered as effectively/efficiently yourself?
- 2) Is the product/service under consideration a strategic element of the organization's operation?
- 3) Are the associated issues such as physical location, security, legal requirements and operational support pertaining tot he product/service of significant concern?

The more of these questions that are answered with a positive yes, by an organization that is considering cloud computing, would want to keep that service and deliver it. On the other hand the more questions that can be answered no, would tip the scales to seriously considering a cloud based solution.

Henderson than gave a brief background on what IS has been working on over the past couple of months. He pointed out that in the budget process this year the pricing and the way mainframe services are delivered were a key point of discussion. As he reviewed the above questions with the mainframe as the service under consideration, he answered the first question no. Not so much because the service is too big or too complex but the opposite, as mainframe services in general, it is stable or declining. There is a significant amount of fixed cost and the customer base can be variable. Every time a business customer makes a decision to no longer use main frame services, the cost per customer increases as the fixed cost remains the same. This puts the effectiveness of service delivery in jeopardy and pushes to look for an alternative. Over the last few months IS has been making calls to local and national businesses that might be able to help, and listened to the way they might approach with a solution. They have also spoke with the State of Nebraska on what they can do for main frame based services. Bottom line, the state is a very attractive alternative as a way to obtain main frame services.

Commissioner Raybould applauded Henderson for his efforts to work with local and national businesses, however, she was hoping to hear his findings and recommendations on the best direction to transition the city and the county.

She then asked if he had decided to work with a consultant and evaluate in order to make some concrete recommendations to keep moving forward. She also inquired what other government entities of similar size and scope were doing.

Henderson responded that he had not made arrangements to work with a consultant, however, he does have recommendations to keep moving forward. He is going to conduct a proof of concept with the state for main frame services. The state is willing to undertake service without a contract and on a completely variable cost basis. He stated this would be difficult for most anyone else to meet. These services could be terminated immediately if necessary. Most of the companies contacted needed fixed cost and would not make it entirely variable nor would they allow an immediate termination. In response to Commissioner Raybould's questions, he stated some government entities were doing cloud solution and some were using other kinds of computing platforms.

Henderson continued that he does not dictate where the organization of city and county government run their business. It is a dialog between the leadership of these organizations and Information Services to determine the best solution for their business needs. If the leadership of the organizations come to the conclusion that a main frame based system is what they wish to run, Information Services has been in a position historically to accommodate that. He stated he is not the sole decision maker of what kind of technology the departments and agencies use to satisfy their business needs.

Commissioner Raybould responded that she expected Henderson, as the IS director to present to the group some recommendations based on his research and his knowledge of applications, to steer the city and the county in the right direction in order for IS to capture cost savings and look for efficiencies and to bring us forward into a more appropriate information services era.

Commissioner Schorr inquired how a partnership with the State of Nebraska would help control costs. Henderson responded that currently IS has certain fixed costs that are very difficult to reduce as part of the current main frame delivery. If a partnership with the state was entered into, IS would not have any fixed cost as they would not own a main frame (hardware) nor would they own any software or a need for support staff. Commissioner Schorr inquired if we moved forward with this proposal what would be the staff reduction at IS. Henderson responded that currently there is no full-time main frame support person.

Additional discussion with Henderson took place with input from Commissioners Heier, Smoyer, Hudkins, Schorr and Councilman Camp, Emery and Carroll.

Henderson concluded that he is after the most cost effective business solution and once that is determined it will also determine what computing platform it should run on. He offered to return to a later Common meeting to report results.

4. Briefing on LPlan 2040

Marvin Krout, Planning Director, introduced Lynn Sunderman, and Michael Cornelius, both Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Commissioners.

Krout handed out Exhibit B.

Page 1:

Demographic Projections:

- 126,000 more people in Lancaster County
- 110,000 more jobs
- Aging population - Baby Boomers
- Gen Y with different preferences
- High proportion of single-person and non-family households

Krout stated there is a responsibility to try and figure out how to do good land management, good infrastructure and service support, and to make that happen as an efficient and attractive way as possible. There will be healthy growth however, it will be somewhat different than it has been in the last 30 years. Possible one in six of new housing starts will be done through redevelopment in the existing city where there is advantage of existing services.

Page 2:

Urban Growth Area:

- Public input
 - Workshop, open houses
 - Virtual Town Hall
 - LPAC
- Urban Growth Area
 - Multidirectional growth
 - Accounts for large lot supply
 - Assumes 83.5% of new units on edge, 16.5% as infill

Infill and Redevelopment:

- Primary focus for infill and redevelopment is on vacant or underutilized commercial and industrial land

Page 3:

Mixed Use Redevelopment:

- Three main objectives
 - Provide flexibility in siting future mixed use redevelopment
 - Offer level of predictability
 - Encourage and provide incentives for mixed use redevelopment

Barriers that exist need to be looked at for these kinds of developments and ways to provide additional incentives. The Planning Commission adopted amendments that reinforced the importance of existing neighborhoods and protecting them so they are not compromised in the process.

Page 4:

Bicycle and Pedestrian

- Examine funding options for increased sidewalk rehabilitation
- Dedicate funding for ped/bike capital projects
 - Shared lanes, bike lanes and on-street bike routes
 - Wayfinding
 - Improved pedestrian crossings

The plan provides more emphasis on maintaining existing facilities and improvements to safety. Most spending has and will continue to be focused on roadways both in the city and the county. The City Council adopted an additional 7 million dollars annual in funding for road improvements. This allows the plan to be more aggressive in the ability to build more new roads and improve and maintain current roads.

Urban Roadways Capital

Page 5:

Roadways: County Improvements

- \$1 million annually available for rural programmed paving projects
- Majority of funding for maintenance of rural road system

Planning worked with the County Engineer to project anticipated needs in the County as well as looking at the existing funds to try and project where roads would need to be paved in the next 30 years and also where there are existing paved roads that are high volume that need enhancements beyond the initial paving.

Placemaking

- Preserve and enhance capitol view corridors and key entryways
- Implement urban design standards for mixed use development and redevelopment
- Complete a wayfinding system

There is a new emphasis in the plan called placemaking that has to do with improving the visual appearance of the City and incorporating public art and building wayfinding signs to help greet and direct people around the community as part of the tourism effort.

Page 6:

Energy Considerations

- New state requirements to address energy in Plan
- Rising energy costs and air quality/climate change issues
- Relationship of land use to energy consumption
- Strategies for renewable energy and conservation

LPlan 2040 Public Participation

- Newsletters
- Social Media
- Virtual Town Hall
- Community Survey
- Advisory Committee
- Interest Group Meetings
- Community Workshops

There was special effort to use digital media to communicate and reach out to people who are normally not part of the process in the past.

Page 7 & 8

Opportunities for Electeds and Email Notifications. Krout reminded the elected officials there have been numerous presentations and e-mail notifications where they have had an opportunity to review and comment on the plan. There is a joint hearing scheduled of the City Council and the County Board on October 18, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. The County Board will vote on the plan October 25, 2011 and the City Council on October 31, 2011.

The long-range transportation plan is another step in the process. This plan goes to the Federal Government and needs to meet their requirements. The MPO Officials will be asked to approve the plan and make sure it does meet all the requirements by the end of the year.

Proposed Amendments Exhibit C

Page 1

Proposed Amendment #1

Table 10.12: Roadways: Current and Year of Expenditure Revenues and Costs

Page 2

Proposed Amendment #2

Parks and Recreation which is under City jurisdiction.

Page 3

Proposed Amendment #3

The statement "Prime Ag and other highly productive farmland" is not really a defined term so that language will be removed.

Page 6

Proposed Amendment #4

Krout referred to the crossed out language of:

"Consider all proposals for new acreage development in undesignated areas at one time as part of the Comprehensive Plan Annual Review". The idea was to look at all the proposals for acreage development at one time.

Previously this language was to be removed, however, it has been kept in, but will now be removed.

Proposed amendment #5A and #6A and #5B and #6B the County has recently identified three areas they would like to consider as part of the Comprehensive Plan. #5A represents the strike outs that the County Board has directed. Krout stated those would impact both the City and the County and referred to page 8 to #5B which states better what he thought the County Board is directing. Which states "Development in the three-mile ETJ should only be permitted under the "build-through" model that has been established, and without use of Sanitary Improvement Districts (SIDs). The build-through model included in the City of Lincoln subdivision and zoning ordinances is intended to facilitate a later transition to urban densities when city services are extended, including:..... He than referred to the map located on page 9 which shows the tiers of development with the yellow areas representing beyond 50 years the city would be looking at to develop. The black line represents the cities 3 mile jurisdiction. He referred back to the left hand side of page 8 stating he felt this best represented what the County Board intended to say.

Councilman Cook asked for an explanation of the "build through standards". which prompted a discussion with input from Commissioner Heier and Krout.

Krout concluded the Planning staff will be preparing a report addressing the statement "areas within the City of Lincoln jurisdiction not designed for acreages should remain agriculturally zoned and retain the current overall density of 32 dwellings per square mile (q dwelling unit per 20 acres).

Krout next addressed the approximately the ½ square mile area located north of Highway 2 approximately 2 miles north of Bennet at the interchange with 162nd Street (page 10)the County Board has requested the Planning Commission designate that area, as a yet to be determined, commercial and or industrial designation. Notices have been sent to property owners within a mile of this area about the Counties interest. A report from the Planning department will be sent to the County Board prior to the hearing.

Commissioner Raybould stated the people of Bennet have requested the County Board slow down the process of the re-designation of this area.

She then referred to the potential change in the 20 acre rule and inquired if the Planning department would showcase some of the studies that have been completed in Lancaster County that show the cost and the tax base for the new residential properties, and include what the actual cost would be, so those who support the change will have all the facts and be able to evaluate the cost clearly before making a decision on how acreages will be developed. Krout said this information would be included in the report. Discussion continued with input from Councilman Eskridge and Commissioners Heier, Hudkins and Raybould regarding the potential change to the 20 acre rule.

Commissioner Heier moved and Councilman Carroll seconded to adjourn the meeting at 2:15 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Minette Genuchi, Administrative Aide
Lancaster County Board of Commissioners

F:\files\COMMISS\COMMITTEES\COMMON\2011\October\October 3, 2011 Minutes.wpd