

## MEETING RECORD

**NAME OF GROUP:** PLANNING COMMISSION

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:** Wednesday, May 22, 2002, 1:00 p.m., City Council Chambers, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Jon Carlson, Steve Duvall, Patte Newman, Greg Schwinn, Cecil Steward, Gerry Krieser and Tommy Taylor (Mary Bills-Strand and Roger Larson absent); Duncan Ross, Kent Morgan and Jean Walker of the Planning Department; various departmental staff; media and other interested citizens.

**STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:** Special Planning Commission Meeting  
**FY 2002/2003-2007/2008 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM and  
FY 2003-2005/2006-2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Chair Schwinn called this special meeting to order and opened public hearing on the 2002-2008 Capital Improvements Program and the 2003-2008 Transportation Improvement Program.

Duncan Ross of the Planning Department introduced and reviewed the role of the Planning Commission in its review of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as to conformity with the Comprehensive Plan. As specified in the City Charter, the role of the Planning Commission in the CIP and TIP process is to determine if the capital projects being requested by the various City and County departments are in conformance with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

According to the Charter, City Council ordinances and resolutions dealing with capital improvements cannot be acted upon until a finding of Plan conformity has been made by the Planning Commission and/or the Planning Department. However, the Charter does not prohibit the City Council from approving capital projects which are not in conformance with the Plan; but only that a finding of conformity needs to be established.

In column 9 of Form B for each department's project, Planning staff has provided the Commission with a recommended finding of conformity. As in past years, the staff has

employed a four-tiered approach to the conformity finding. A project can be determined to be within one of the following categories:

- ICWP - In conformance with Plan
- GCP - Generally conforms with Plan
- NICP - Not in conformance with Plan
- NIP - Not in Plan

Ross pointed out that all of the projects in this year's draft CIP are being recommended by staff as being either "in conformance with Plan" or "generally conforms with Plan."

Following Planning Commission action on the CIP, the Planning Commission recommendations will be forwarded to the Mayor for incorporation into the City Council Edition of the CIP to be issued in conjunction with the City's Operating Budget -- tentatively targeted for release sometime in June.

The Council will have a hearing on both the Operating and Capital Budgets on August 5th, with approval of both budgets typically occurring in late August -- the City's 2002-2003 Fiscal Year begins on September 1<sup>st</sup> of this year.

Ross reminded the Commission that the City Council only approves the first year of the CIP; no formal action is taken on the remaining five years, although it is part of their discussion of the capital improvement needs.

## **FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

**Pershing Auditorium:** Tom Lorenz, General Manager, appeared to answer any questions.

Steward commented that there has been considerable discussion in the recent past about potential replacement of this facility and perhaps a study has already been funded. Lorenz concurred. Steward would have expected that in some manner planning for the facility over the next 5 years would reflect that direction or at least some indication of perhaps a reduced study. Lorenz explained that the study was a market study that reviewed the market in Lincoln and other facilities that are there. The study is not yet complete so it may be premature to make projections of what a replacement cost would be. At the present time, the focus is to maintain and keep the building safe. Steward assumes that next year or the year thereafter might look differently in the CIP. Lorenz concurred.

There was no other public testimony.

**Communications:** Sharon Codr, Administrative Officer, advised that the request for funding in 2003-04 is a replacement system, basically a capacity need. There is no funding yet approved for this project.

There was no other public testimony.

**FIRE & RESCUE:** There was not a department representative present.

There was no other public testimony.

**PARKS & RECREATION:** Lynn Johnson, Director, stated that there are 80 projects proposed in the 6-year CIP at a total cost of 33.6 million. They have attempted to split projects as one-half for maintenance and repair and one-half for new facilities.

Steward's questions are not about "what's here" but about "what is not here". There is an intent in the future to tie the CIP and Comprehensive Plan much more closely together. He noted that projects 7 and 8 have to do with golf course irrigation, which bring up a question of something that he does not see in the strategic thinking through this CIP—that is, how do we continue to maintain the parks landscapes that we have with a potential limited water resource? Has there been any thought about whether or not a "gray" water system might be an applicable condition when we have this kind of irrigation requirement? Johnson agreed that particularly on the golf courses and athletic facilities, we need to look at a variety of models. He indicated that Parks is trying not to use potable water as an irrigation supply. They are currently using groundwater supply on the new facilities. Johnson agreed that there is a need to be creatively thinking about where we get water and how we use water. There is also a need to be conscious of the landscaping used, as in low maintenance.

Schwinn inquired whether the Parks CIP includes funding for the new ball diamonds in the Antelope Valley project. Johnson indicated that it is identified as project #20, the Northeast Community Recreational Sports Complex. This is just the Parks contribution to that project. That is about a 5 million dollar project in total, budgeted in a number of places – Public Works, State, UNL, NRD.

There was no other public testimony.

### **PUBLIC WORKS**

Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works & Utilities, commented that the Public Works CIP is a rather ambitious program. There are over 500 million dollars worth of infrastructure projects listed in the 6-year CIP. The proposed CIP is compatible with the existing Comprehensive

Plan but does not include infrastructure needed for the new Comprehensive Plan being considered at this time by the City Council and County Board.

**StarTran:** Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works & Utilities, appeared to answer any questions.

Newman inquired whether the wheelchair accessibility issue had been resolved. Abbott stated that they have not been able to find buses that can accommodate any size scooter or wheelchair that an individual might try to use. All of the StarTran buses do meet ADA requirements. If the wheelchair or scooter is larger than those regulated by ADA, StarTran cannot accommodate them.

There was no other public testimony.

**Business Office (Parking):** Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works and Utilities, was available to answer questions.

Steward again expressed that his concerns are more “what’s not here than what is”. He noted the east downtown garage and future parking study. In terms of the new Comprehensive Plan thought process, Steward is interested in a comprehensive analysis (not just pieces and parts) of circulation in general, including alternative public transportation potential, pedestrian accommodations and bicycle accommodations downtown. Are we at a point where there should be a new comprehensive transportation study at least for downtown, if not for the entire city? Abbott observed that the new Comprehensive Plan does call for a transit study, and Steward’s suggestion would be the intent of that study. Abbott agrees that it does not make much sense to do it in pieces and parts.

There was no other public testimony.

**Streets and Highways:** Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works and Utilities, was available to answer questions.

**Rick Krueger** submitted the following questions regarding traffic (Also see Exhibit “A”):

1. How are we funding the traffic circle being built at 33<sup>rd</sup> and Sheridan, and was it designated as a project in last year’s CIP?

2. Project #14 Antelope Valley in the streets and highways portion of the CIP shows a total cost of \$105,770,000 for the 6 years of this report and the cost beyond the 6 years. In the 1998 CIP, the total cost for the 6 years and beyond is \$42,800,300. Why has this cost increased so much in the last 4 years?
3. The prior years' appropriations in the Antelope Valley project show a total cost of \$9,474,600 up to January of this year. Can you provide a summary of the source of those funds, what they were for, and who they were paid to?

Abbott advised that the traffic circle was funded from safety funds from the Nebraska Department of Roads. It was money over and above what we had programmed. It was not taken from real taxes or from the city's share of federal city revenues. It was approved through the Nebraska Department of Roads and the Federal Highway Administration. It was not specifically mentioned in the CIP but was included in "safety improvements".

Roger Figard of Public Works added that typically the city spends funds for traffic signal systems and the roundabout allows the elimination of the traffic signal system.

With regard to the Antelope Valley project, Figard advised that at the time of the 1998 CIP, we were still more than 2 years from an approved environmental document. Throughout the entire planning process we have continued to show earmarked street construction funds (not wheel tax) to build a portion of the transportation improvements if and when we have an approved project. It has only been in the last year that we have finished the document and this CIP attempts to project the actual projects and the total costs; however, it does not indicate that it is all money in the bank. A good portion of the increases are anticipated to be requested from the federal government to finish Antelope Valley. Figard clarified that 55 million has not been added to the project. This CIP just more clearly delineates a refined plan and where those funding sources may come from. The other projects that are on the books have stayed on the books. The Antelope Valley project has not bumped any other project.

With regard to Krueger's question about prior years' appropriations, Figard indicated that he could not make Krueger's numbers add up, but from January of this year through the end of the fiscal year we are in now, there is approximately 16 million--5.7 million from RTSD, 5.2 million from State Gas Tax, and 5.2 million of the City's federal urban money. To date we have expenses of a little over 10 million for the planning, environmental work and function design. Schwinn assumes that we have the ability to use the appropriations to offset the budget for city staff to pay off the time that is used. Figard clarified that Engineering Services and Street Construction pay for projects which includes the staff time to do the work, planning and design.

Schwinn inquired whether the 105 million includes the portion of widening the creek in the floodplain. Figard stated that it does not include the actual flood control project. It does

include the portion of the bridge cost to go over the channel. It does not include land acquisition for the channel but it does include the transportation element.

**Mark Hunzeker** referred to the South and East Beltway project. The cost beyond the 6-year CIP has gone from 12 million in last year's CIP to \$189 million in this year's CIP. He would like to hear an explanation of that increase. He also suggested that in the future CIP budget, the South and East Beltways be broken into two separate projects for purpose of clarity and to be able to track where the money is going.

Hunzeker then referred to the "O" Street project, the total cost of which has gone from a little over 13 million last year to over 19 million this year.

Abbott agreed that the South and East Beltways should be listed as two separate projects.

As far as the costs beyond the 6 years, Abbott indicated that to be primarily the East Beltway. We have better estimates now and an approved document. That is why it has increased. The consultant will be selected quickly to start the South Beltway plans so by the time we put the next CIP together, we'll have a better idea of the various costs.

With regard to the "O" Street project, Abbott advised that the CIP represents the bid that came in for this project. Right-of-way costs were a lot higher than anticipated. There is money included for the bonuses and incentive if the contractor completes the project ahead of schedule.

**Rick Krueger** does not believe that landscaping in connection with street improvement projects should be paid out of state highway funds. He does not think this is proper use of construction funds. He realizes it is legal, but as a matter of public policy, he believes we should find another pocket to take that money from.

**Krueger** also noted the use of 1.1 million of state highway dollars for bike trails and landscaping. He believes this money should be preserved for building roads. Another source should be found for the landscaping.

Abbott's only response was that Krueger is entitled to his opinion.

Steward respectfully disagreed with Krueger on the policy matter. There will be pro's and con's when it comes to aesthetics and beautification. The federal highway program was altered to include landscaping and community improvement characteristics and it is

only appropriate that the local entity does the same. It is part of the comprehensive transportation strategy.

**Transportation Improvement Program:** Mike Brienzo of Public Works explained that the TIP is prepared annually like the CIP and follows a similar format; however, the TIP does include transportation projects from transportation agencies within Lincoln and Lancaster County, including city projects and county projects, state projects, Airport Authority projects, and RTSD as well as program enhancements. The TIP is reviewed as to conformity with the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), which is located in the Comprehensive Plan. The MPO Technical Committee reviewed the TIP and this version does include their comments and their recommendations for all the areas except for those included in the Memorandum from Allan Abbott dated May 9, 2002 (***Exhibit "B"***). The additional recommendations included in this Memorandum are minor changes in funding codes. The Memorandum does not include any substantive changes in the projects themselves. Brienzo recommended that the notes in the Memorandum dated May 9, 2002, be put in the TIP as well as the CIP for clarification of funding sources.

Brienzo went on to explain that the TIP is a federal funding requirement. If we are to seek federal funds for any road improvements or transportation improvements, those improvements must be located in the TIP and receive comment before the Planning Commission. The TIP is then reviewed by the MPO Officials Committee, which makes a recommendation to the state. The state then puts it in the state TIP and sends it to the Federal Highway Administration.

Steward referred to the Airport Authority and commented that from a comprehensive transportation planning standpoint, public access is a concern and it appears that we are short on any evidence for increased service and public access. It is a community concern and whatever this infrastructure planning can do to help public access and service would be appreciated.

There was no other public testimony.

**Watershed Management:** Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works & Utilities, was available to answer questions. He mentioned that several of the projects used to show up in Engineering Services or Street Operations. They have been combined to show them in one place for clarity as to what is going on in the watershed management operation.

There was no other public testimony.

**Street Operations:** Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works & Utilities, was available to answer questions. Schwinn asked for an explanation of the “gasboy card control system”. Abbott explained that these are the cards used by city employees at certain gas sites to put gas in city vehicles.

There was no other public testimony.

## **PUBLIC UTILITIES**

**Water Supply and Distribution:** Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works & Utilities, was available to answer questions.

Duvall inquired why there are no Lancaster County or Developer Contribution funds after 2003. Abbott explained that unless they have signed agreements beyond that time, they don't know what they are going to be.

**Rick Krueger** submitted the following questions (Also see *Exhibit “A”*):

1. What is the makeup of the Utility Revenues (UR)? Is it a combination of income from all utility sources?
2. When comparing the 6 year totals of the Utility Revenues we see \$164,731,900 in the 98 CIP and \$53,407,300 in the 01 CIP. Why the dramatic change between these two reports?
3. Why are there no Lancaster County (CO) or Developer Contribution (DC) funds after 2003?

As far as the makeup of the Utility Revenues, Abbott suggested that it depends on where you are in the book. Page 3 is a combination of water and wastewater revenues. The reason it is so much bigger in 1998 is that 1998 also included LES revenues. Since that time, LES revenue has been broken out of the utility revenue line and this page is now the combination of water and wastewater.

When looking at the individual public utilities, wastewater production is from the utility rates from that particular operation. In other words, we cannot use wastewater money to do water works and we cannot use water money to do wastewater work. We also cannot use

wastewater or water revenue for streets. Abbott also explained that the revenue and projected expenditures will not total because bonds are issued to help pay for water and wastewater. The bonds are included in the total cost of projects, but not listed in the revenue stream.

Steward noted that there is well replacement money but no new well addition. He assumes this means that supply is adequate at least for this 5 year period. Nick McElvain of Lincoln Water System concurred, further advising the Commission that sometime in the next 2-3 months, Public Works intends to come before the Planning Commission with an updated master plan. Steward inquired whether that plan will include hazards, pollutants, safety and emergency preparedness. McElvain suggested that safety and emergency preparedness is not a capital issue. Steward believes there is public interest in knowing there is planning for safety and emergency preparedness. McElvain advised that the master plan would indicate that there are needed improvements to treatment and to the well supplies at Ashland in a 10-year period. The large main project getting the line from Greenwood to Lincoln that will complete that pipeline is moved up on the list, and the treatment and well supply will follow shortly thereafter. There are significant investments in the fifth to ninth years.

**Wastewater**: Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works & Utilities, was available to answer questions.

Steward observed that project #18, Electrical Control and Automation Improvements at Treatment Facilities, suggests that possibly there are opportunities for alternative sources of energy in the management of electrical control. Has there been any analysis or study of the electrical consumption that is required to operate the facility and whether or not alternative sources of energy are a practical condition? Gary Brandt of Public Works, Wastewater, indicated that Public Works has been involved with LES on all of the energy consumption at both of the treatment plants. The city does have co-generation facilities at Theresa Street whereby methane gas is being used to cut electrical loads, which amounts to 50% supply of what the city would normally take from LES. Brandt advised that wastewater is also completing a facilities master plan similar to water and they are looking at additional ways to cut those electrical costs. Some of the improvements are for more energy efficient equipment. Project #18 goes somewhat hand in hand with that; however, this project updates older technology that has not been previously updated in the city facilities.

Steward referred to "gray" water use for landscape maintenance and asked whether there is any planning or thinking in that direction. Brandt indicated that wastewater refers to it as "treated wastewater effluent". Public Works is working with LES with regard to supplying treated wastewater effluent. Wastewater currently utilizes it on their own grounds and in their plant. Brandt stated that Public Works continues to explore other alternatives. Public Works has received requests from various athletic fields and others looking to see what they could use. Even the State Fair Grounds has inquired.

Abbott pointed out that Public Works is also working with Health Department on the issue of treated wastewater effluent because Health did have some concerns about safety as far as using it on athletic fields.

Duvall inquired about increased wastewater rates. Brandt indicated that they do not see an increase in wastewater user rates this year. There are rates that are projected down the road in the future. Abbott suggested that it depends on how fast the community wants to expand as far as when the next rate increase will be necessary. When the new Comprehensive Plan is in place, Public Works will have some idea about the rate of growth and when that rate of growth is going to occur. It appears we will have to issue revenue bonds at the end of this year for water. That is not a general obligation bond--it is approved through the Council. Utilities bonds do not have to go to the vote of the people.

There was no other public testimony.

**Landfill:** Allan Abbott, Director of Public Works & Utilities, was available to answer questions.

Steward commended the landfill gas to energy project. He is assuming this means that it simply looks feasible but there is work to be done to make it a reality. Gary Brandt concurred. LES is taking a look at it and they have to investigate the feasibility. It is a combination of the two utilities getting together to see if it is going to work.

Steward inquired whether consideration is being given to policies and a comprehensive approach to construction waste. Brandt believes we are in pretty good shape. Those wastes are separated now and go to No. 48<sup>th</sup> landfill. We are using those materials that we can within the bounds of our permit to cap the old 48<sup>th</sup> Street landfill. We have 8-10 years capacity before we need to look for another location. Locally there is a tremendous amount of recycling going on, especially in the concrete side and other private contractors working with that material. We are reusing a lot of those materials.

Steve Masters, Public Utilities Administrator, advised the Commission that the water and wastewater projects will be funded on a cash flow basis as opposed to the previous manner of first accumulating the total funds before bidding the project. This will help accelerate the program. There will be a need to go to the City Council on numerous projects to get their approval to proceed in advance of accumulating the total fund balance. Abbott added that we are behind on a few trunk sewer lines and if we have to wait until we get the money accumulated, it is going to take a lot longer. We have advanced the Salt Creek and Beal Slough trunk sewers. We have the ability to issue bonds, if necessary. We are trying to manage the money to get the infrastructure in place faster.

There was no other public testimony.

**URBAN DEVELOPMENT:** Marc Wullschleger, Director of Urban Development, advised that there are 10 projects in the CIP with only \$40,000 of general funds of the \$1,428,000 total for 2002-03. The 2 projects using that \$40,000 of general funds are Antelope Valley at \$30,000 per year, and street trees for \$10,000. They are pushing this year's \$10,000 into next year for downtown street tree replacement. Most of the funding for the other eight projects comes from TIF and a large portion from CDBG, our federal tax dollars.

The biggest and only new project is #1, Lincoln Mall Revitalization. That \$500,000 comes from the building across the street from the County-City Building that Nebco is building. That will fund Lincoln Mall improvements. We can do improvements to the landscaping, street frontage, parking, utilities and sidewalks within that area.

Newman inquired whether there are any income restrictions on CDBG funds for commercial areas. Can anybody tap into that? Wullschleger indicated that anyone can tap into that. On a facade loan, income does not matter. It is money to fix up the exterior of certain commercial districts—the income of the owner does not matter. They can do two facades for a total of \$50,000. A portion of it is covered by a grant that includes the architectural services—10% of the entire project—if they have two facades that qualify.

Steward commented that the focus on the “village centers” is terrific and important to the overall city. However, except for the street trees, he noted that there is nothing listed for downtown, unless Antelope Valley would be considered part of that. Why is Centennial Mall not in the Urban Development domain? Wullschleger explained that Centennial Mall has been in the Parks CIP and Urban Development is a player in that. There are two projects that were in last year's CIP that are continuing, the Downtown Entertainment Center (TIF funds) and Old Federal Building (TIF funds). Those are still on the table and are still real, but not continued in this CIP. We continue to pour a lot of money into the Downtown. The reason it does not show up in this CIP is because it was in last year's CIP and the money has been allocated.

Lynn Johnson of Parks & Recreation confirmed that the renovation of Centennial Mall is identified in the Parks CIP and it is a partnership project with Urban Development, Public Works, the State and a number of private individuals and organizations.

Steward wonders whether the CIP should contained a component on affordable and low income housing. Wullschleger stated that 65% to 70% of the CDBG money is spent on affordable housing.

Wullschleger added that another Downtown project is the Star building.

Duvall inquired as to what activity is now going on with the Downtown Entertainment Center. Wullschleger indicated that there are some local and regional developers (contractors) that are extremely interested—some from Lincoln and Omaha and some from a larger region. He has a lot of confidence that the project will get done. Duvall wondered whether there is any idea how much public finance will be involved. Wullschleger indicated that the previous amount is still on the table with the new developers.

There was no other public testimony.

**LINCOLN ELECTRIC SYSTEM:** Dan Pudenz, Engineering Manager for LES, was available to answer questions.

Steward commended projects #3 and #4 on renewable energy. However, it appears that the aggregate of those two projections is about 1.5 million with an unknown amount indicated to come from continuing or future public subscriptions. Out of a 273.3 million dollar projection, Steward calculates that to be less than half of one percent. Does this indicate LES' commitment to renewable energy? Pudenz characterized it more as an accurate representation of the support of the LES customers. The two wind turbines were constructed with the customer participation that was demonstrated. In fact, Pudenz advised that they are slightly under subscribed to fully pay for the two units. LES is looking to partner with Public Works for landfill gas as a renewable energy source, also.

Steward commented that he personally contributed to the self-tax on the experiment; however, he does not know that the public who participated has gotten much feedback on the success or failure. He wonders if in the public utility domain this may not be something that would occur with other funds other than new self-taxing in order to try to save energy and hopefully ultimately save money. Pudenz recognized Steward's comment as far as information and feedback passed on to the customers. He further added that LES has recently revamped the renewable energy program to recognize different levels of corporate sponsorship for renewable energy. As that support comes through, LES will come forward on those. LES has not at this point chosen to allocate specific funds from the LES budget other than what LES believes their customers are willing to support.

There was no other public testimony.

**LIBRARIES:** Carol Connor, Director of Libraries, appeared to answer questions. There are no new projects from last year. The renovation of Bennett Martin has been in the CIP as kind of a signal more than a real firm date or firm cost. It needs attention and needs to be addressed.

There was no other public testimony.

**AREA AGENCY ON AGING:** Gina Dunning, Director, stated that there are two projects for the next fiscal year. The project to do the renovation of the Northeast Senior Center has been pushed back a year. Last year it was divided into three different years to phase it in. Lincoln and Lancaster County own two facilities that are senior centers—Downtown and Northeast—which are funded 50/50 by the city and the county for capital improvements. The Northeast Senior Center is in need of a lot of renovation. Handicap access is very poor. There is not adequate parking. This project will provide a covered van access. There are a series of foundations that will be asked to provide some funding for things like furniture and there are some businesses that have expressed an interest in providing support.

The planning for a new senior center in southeast Lincoln is basically a place card in the CIP for the year 2006. We do not have a senior center in southeast Lincoln. There are 13 senior centers in Lincoln and Lancaster County, two of which the City and County own. The rest are in church basements, small city halls, etc. She is interested in pursuing the concept of having a senior center in each quadrant of the city. The \$50,000 is for planning. She does not want aging services to own a lot of buildings. The concept she is trying to promote is partnering with Parks and Recreation when they open a new facility, or with the Fire Department when they open a new facility, to share space.

Steward commented that in that spirit of collaboration and sharing, he knows that the Health Department has gone through a major strategic planning effort the last two days. He believes that Aging has a distinct role and a distinct connection. Are there good partner relationships with the Health Department? Dunning responded in the affirmative. Health has looked to Aging to identify what it is that we need for services for seniors, but those needs are constantly changing. Aging definitely does work well with the Health Department.

There was no other public testimony.

**POLICE:** Richard Mackey, Administrative Officer for the Police Department, made comments. The Police Department does not actually have any identified projects other than to give notice that towards the end of the 2007-08 fiscal year, the Police Department anticipates seeking master plan funding to do another stand alone vicinity station similar to the 27<sup>th</sup> & Holdrege facility.

There was no other public testimony.

Public hearing was closed.

**FY2002-2008 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

May 22, 2002

Steward moved to approve the staff recommendations, seconded by Newman.

Steward believes there are two pretty glaring omissions in the CIP, even only considering the current Comprehensive Plan and not looking forward to the new Comprehensive Plan. He could find nothing specific nor did he hear any discussion of technologies in telecommunications infrastructure funding. He finds this to be an oversight. He knows there is planning being done but in terms of financial commitment, there does not appear to be any.

Similarly, Steward knows there is community activity on affordable and low income housing, and he believes it is absolutely critical to maintaining the balance of market rate. It seems that a forward looking and objective CIP would designate specific ways and categories to take care of that issue.

Schwinn commented about affordable housing, also. There is nothing in the CIP about affordable housing, yet we know there is money being spent on affordable housing. He also noted that if a project comes forward that is not in the CIP and it is something that is desired, it seems to get it paid for whether it is in the CIP or not. He is hopeful that the new Comprehensive Plan will help in getting a better grasp on how this works.

Steward observed that it was the intent of the Comprehensive Plan Committee and the staff to try to make a closer connection between the CIP and the relevance and currency of the Comprehensive Plan. Hopefully, this is the last year that this sort of disconnected exercise will take place.

Duvall expressed disappointment that some of the departments did not attend. There doesn't appear to be a strong revenue to match the budget expense in all of these things, which leaves things open to interpretation.

Motion to approve staff recommendations carried 7-0: Carlson, Duvall, Newman, Schwinn, Steward, Krieser and Taylor voting 'yes'; Bills-Strand and Larson absent.

**FY 2003-2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

May 22, 2002

Duvall moved to approve the staff recommendation as to conformance, seconded by Steward and carried 7-0: Carlson, Duvall, Newman, Schwinn, Steward, Krieser and Taylor voting 'yes'; Bills-Strand and Larson absent.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.