MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, January 16, 2008, 1:00 p.m., City Council Chambers, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:	Leirion Gaylor-Baird, Gene Carroll, Dick Esseks, Wendy Francis, Roger Larson, Robert Moline, Lynn Sunderman and Tommy Taylor (Michael Cornelius absent); Marvin Krout, Ray Hill, Mike DeKalb, Brian Will, Tom Cajka, Sara Hartzell, Jean Walker and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Chair Gene Carroll called the meeting to order and requested a motion approving the minutes for the regular meeting held December 19, 2007. Motion for approval made by Sunderman, seconded by Francis and carried 8-0: Gaylor-Baird, Carroll, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Moline, Sunderman and Taylor voting 'yes'; Cornelius absent.

CONSENT AGENDA #1
PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 16, 2008

Members present: Gaylor-Baird, Carroll, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Sunderman and Taylor; Moline declared a conflict of interest; Cornelius absent.

The first Consent Agenda consisted of the following item: **SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 04044A, an amendment to the North Creek Villas Community Unit Plan.**

Ex Parte Communications: None

Larson moved to approve the first Consent Agenda, seconded by Taylor and carried 7-0: Gaylor-Baird, Carroll, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Sunderman and Taylor voting 'yes'; Moline declaring a conflict of interest; Cornelius absent. This is final action unless appealed to the City Council within 14 days.

CONSENT AGENDA #2
PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 16, 2008

Members present: Gaylor-Baird, Carroll, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Moline, Sunderman and Taylor; Cornelius absent.

The second Consent Agenda consisted of the following items: **SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 07054 and WAIVER NO. 07010.**

Ex Parte Communications: None.

Larson moved to approve the second Consent Agenda, seconded by Francis and carried 8-0: Gaylor-Baird, Carroll, Esseks, Francis, Larson, Moline, Sunderman and Taylor voting 'yes'; Cornelius absent. This is final action unless appealed to the City Council.

REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 07003;
ANNEXATION NO. 07005; and
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 07063,
I-80 WEST LINCOLN BUSINESS CENTER
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT,
ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED
AT N.W. 48TH STREET AND INTERSTATE 80.
REQUEST FOR DEFERRAL: January 16, 2008

Members present: Esseks, Sunderman, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll; Cornelius absent.

The Clerk announced that the applicant has requested a two-week deferral.

Motion made by Esseks, seconded by Moline to defer two weeks, with continued public hearing and action scheduled for January 30, 2008, and carried 8-0: Esseks, Sunderman, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll voting 'yes'; Cornelius absent.

There was no public testimony.

CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 07061
FROM B-1 LOCAL BUSINESS DISTRICT
TO B-2 PLANNED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT
and
PRE-EXISTING USE PERMIT NO. 07001A,
ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED
AT S. 70TH STREET AND VAN DORN STREET.
REQUEST FOR DEFERRAL: January 16, 2008

Members present: Esseks, Sunderman, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll; Cornelius absent.

The Clerk announced that the applicant has requested a two-week deferral.

Motion made by Larson, seconded by Gaylor-Baird to defer two weeks, with continued public hearing and action scheduled for January 30, 2008, and carried 8-0: Esseks, Sunderman, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll voting 'yes'; Cornelius absent.

There was no public testimony.

ANNEXATION NO. 07004,
CHANGE OF ZONE NO. 07062
FROM AG AGRICULTURAL TO R-3 RESIDENTIAL,
and
PRELIMINARY PLAT NO. 07005, PARROTT ADDITION,
ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT
NORTH 14TH STREET AND ALVO ROAD.
REQUEST FOR DEFERRAL: January 16, 2008

Members present: Esseks, Sunderman, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll; Cornelius absent.

The Clerk announced that the applicant has requested a deferral until February 27, 2008.

Motion made by Taylor, seconded by Francis to defer, with continued public hearing and action scheduled for February 27, 2008, and carried 8-0: Esseks, Sunderman, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll voting 'yes'; Cornelius absent.

There was no public testimony.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 07002
TO ADD THE DEADMANS RUN WATERSHED MASTER PLAN
TO THE LIST OF SUBAREA PLANS AND
TO THE LIST OF WATERSHED STUDIES.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: January 16, 2008

Members present: Esseks, Sunderman, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll; Cornelius absent.

Ex Parte Communications: None

Staff recommendation: Approval.

Staff presentation: **Sara Hartzell of Planning staff** submitted a letter from Dr. Darryll Pederson in opposition to the proposed flood retention in Taylor Park as part of the Deadmans Run Watershed Master Plan.

Hartzell explained that this is an application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the Deadmans Run area. This is unique because it is the first fully urbanized drainage basin for which we have a plan. There are thirteen projects, the first six of which are directly for reduction of floodplain. A preliminary benefit and cost analysis was done. This master plan removes about 807 structures from the floodplain and significantly reduces the flood heights on the remaining flood zone areas. This master plan does not include any land use changes. The is a request to add the Deadmans Run Watershed Master Plan to the list of subarea plans and to the list of watershed master plans in the Comprehensive Plan. Esseks observed that it is an amazing reduction in the extent of the floodplain.

Proponents

1. Devin Biesecker of Public Works & Utilities, gave a power point presentation. The purpose of this master plan is to minimize the flood damage, control erosion and sedimentation in the channel, and to preserve watershed resources such as water quality, stream stability and riparian habitat. The overall goal is to develop a unified master plan for the entire City of Lincoln that identifies projects to get out in front of development in the newer areas and to address existing problems in the existing urban areas.

Public involvement was fairly comprehensive including three open houses; newsletter; Web site; stakeholder meetings with landowners that would be affected by the capital projects proposed; and a 20-member citizens advisory committee met three times during the study. The floodplain mapping is being updated with this study. New floodplain mapping will be brought forward to the City Council to adopt the floodplain mapping as “best available information”.

This is also going through the FEMA process. Once FEMA adopts the floodplain, it will

become the FEMA regulatory floodplain in Lincoln.

Biesecker pointed out that they started with 982 structures in the existing floodplain in Deadmans Run, most being residential. The main focus was to identify projects that would reduce this number. They considered channel improvements (Projects 1-4 identify channel projects that help channel more of the water downstream to reduce some of the overbank flooding). Since Deadmans Run is built out, there are several areas where it would be difficult to widen the channel without impacting structures or adjacent property. In these areas, a more engineered channel is proposed with vertical stone walls. Where there is more room to work, they are proposing to lay the banks of the channel back to increase the capacity of the channel and allow more water to flow into the channel.

The further upstream they went with the improvements, they began to negate the benefits downstream so they had to look at other ways to control the water flowing into Deadmans Runs. Thus, the decision to look at detention in the watershed, where the study ends up showing two viable sites for stormwater detention that would help reduce the flooding, the first being on private property located near 56th & Holdrege (Chateau) and Lincoln Lutheran School. The proposal is to lower the ground in those two areas, which would allow the stormwater to flow into those detention areas and then slowly be released out as the flood waters recede. These areas are intended to be multi-use so that they could be used for recreation. The Lincoln Lutheran site currently serves as practice fields and that use could remain.

The second detention site is actually a city park site, Taylor Park, located south of O Street near 66th Street. This is proposed to be a multi-use facility, involving an earthen berm to hold back stormwater. They would need to excavate some high ground.

Biesecker explained that Project 7 is a local flood control project and has nothing to do with reducing floodplain. It is a local stormwater problem near Seacrest Park. Projects 8-13 are all water quality projects. These projects would take existing detention sites and modify them using either extended wet detention or extended dry detention to help filter out the pollutants in the stormwater.

Biesecker acknowledged that the cost of this master plan is fairly high ($50,000,000), with the majority of the cost being in the flood control projects, and the majority of that cost is the downstream projects. Almost all of the channel projects have bridge replacement involved.

The benefit of this watershed master plan is a reduction of the floodplain and removing a little over 800 structures from the floodplain.

Biesecker stated that a simplified benefit cost analysis was done on these projects, considering the physical damages that would result from a 100-year storm event. They did not consider loss of function, business or transportation. They came up with a benefit cost

ratio of about .8. Adding in the loss of function would result in a benefit cost ratio above 1.0.

It is anticipated that funding would be sought from the federal and state government to help with these projects.

Biesecker advised that the Lower Platte South NRD Board approved this master plan in December, 2007.

Larson inquired as to the reliability of these floodplain. Is it based on real scientific evidence? Biesecker stated that they used the same technology that was used to develop the floodplain mapping. He is very comfortable about getting that much reduction in the floodplain.

Larson inquired as to how much insurance savings there would be by taking these 800 structures out the floodplain. Biesecker believes that the flood insurance on a moderately priced home would be about $1,000 per year. They would not have to pay flood insurance if they are not in the floodplain.

Larson confirmed that there would be no local funding and no property tax impact. Biesecker believes there would have to be some local funding because most federal money is based on a cost-share.

Esseks inquired whether there are examples of the technology being proposed actually working, such as adding cement or other type of solid barriers. **Pat O'Neill of CDM,** the lead consultant for the study, stated that CDM has some real recent experience with these kinds of channel improvements. For example, Lenexa, Kansas, just restored a channel of two miles in a residential neighborhood with back yards abutting the channel with severe erosion and flooding. They used the vertical walls, coupled with natural vegetation. The construction has gone well and they plan to finish this spring. There are other multiple examples where they have had similar success.

Esseks confirmed that there is evidence that the houses are no longer in the floodplain because of these engineering changes. O'Neill concurred.

Gaylor-Baird asked Mr. O'Neill to address the concerns raised by Dr. Pederson. O'Neill believes that Dr. Pederson is concerned that excavating some of the higher ground could impact the cost of excavation and impact the ability to put natural vegetation back in the area. In the master plan, it is recommended that the first step is to do exploration of the subsurface condition, which will require some boring of the soil. If it is determined that the groundwater could have a substantial impact, the project would not proceed. The goal

would be to excavate and keep the bottom of the detention basin above the groundwater table so that there is not flowing water. They will not be able to fine-tune this until they get additional soil borings, which is the next step.

Esseks wondered what kind of impact there would be on the ultimate goal of the master plan if Project No. 6 (Taylor Park) were removed or put on hold. O'Neill noted that there are two sites for detention. If Project 6 is removed, it would make the ability to get all the detention at that one site even more difficult. While it may be possible to get it all at one site, our study is not far enough along to conclude that. At this point it is better to have two sites in the master plan. Esseks and O'Neill agreed that there is a potential option to delete Project 6. O'Neill reminded the Commission that this is all at a conceptual level at this time.

Nicole Fleck-Tooze of Public Works and Utilities offered that one of the reasons you see the two detention sites included is to insure that we have adequate areas to provide the detention. If we do the channel improvements without the detention, we risk an adverse impact on the downstream properties. The detention is to make sure we have only a positive benefit and no adverse impact. We need to provide adequate storage area for that detention. We could not continue all the way up to Project 4 without all of the detention.

Moline suggested that if this detention area is taken out, it could harm the people downstream greater than they are today. Fleck-Tooze responded that if we are going to have the benefits we want, we must couple that with detention or we risk some adverse impact on some properties. You can't have one without the other. In order to seek federal funding from the Corps and FEMA, it is important to have a project composed in a way that is comprehensive to have that benefit cost greater than 1.0, which is the key to getting federal funds.

Moline wants specific answers about Dr. Pederson's concerns. Dr. Pederson is very qualified and Moline is not comfortable that Dr. Pederson's concerns have been mitigated. Fleck-Tooze referred to the big picture – we are saying that the detention in general is absolutely essential to make the flood reduction projects workable. Part of the challenge is that we are now only at the level of a "conceptual" master plan and we have the obligation to examine all of the details when we go forward with a design. We do know today that we cannot proceed with many of the improvements or reduce the floodplain without also having that detention.

O'Neill stated that he does not dispute Dr. Pederson's concerns about groundwater becoming an issue. But, since we are at a conceptual level, there is no money to go out and do subsurface borings. That would definitely be the first step as far as moving forward with design. If his concerns are then validated, we would not be able to proceed with the project.

Moline wondered what happens if the borings are done and Dr. Pederson is correct. O'Neill suggested that then Project 5 (Chateau and Lincoln Lutheran) becomes even that more important. Fleck-Tooze added that it may just be that the design for Taylor Park needs to be modified to take those issues into consideration.

Esseks does not believe that Dr. Pederson is challenging the position that detention is needed. He is suggesting that it may not be cost-effective. If the cost estimates are valid, let's spend it to get those homes out of the floodplain. The on-site costs are significant, but the overall goal is so important.

Gaylor-Baird wondered whether Project 5 will be able to go forward. O'Neill reiterated that the master plan is still at the conceptual level. We are going to get much more detailed data as we move forward. All of the projects are going to be fine-tuned as they are taken through to design. There is potential that they could get modified, but at this point we feel they are viable.

Gaylor-Baird observed that we don't have as much to work with as we do in less urban areas. Fleck-Tooze agreed. We don't have the flexibility here with the constraints of the urban environment. Biesecker also noted that they did look at several sites for detention, with these two ending up being the ones that might be feasible.

Carroll noted that the Planning Commission did receive a briefing on this master plan about a month ago.

Support

1. Russell Miller testified in support and submitted his testimony in writing. He also showed some photographs depicting how high the water will be under current conditions and showing examples of floodplain creep. Variances to the floodplain regulations should not be granted. Mr. Miller served on the Mayor's Floodplain Task Force and the Deadmans Run Task Force.

Opposition

1. Stefan Gaspar, managing partner for **Chateau Development**, 3100 S. 72nd Street, testified in opposition. He has been in charge of Chateau Meadows for 16 years. In those 16 years, the FEMA floodplain has changed three times. There were seven buildings which border Deadmans Run and they were all in the floodplain. After that, the floodplain was changed with only three buildings remaining in the floodplain. And in the last 5-7 years, there have been no buildings in the floodplain. In other words, Deadmans Run has changed at least three times. They have put in rock and wire cages to slow down the flow of the water. They have also made concrete liners around Cotner Boulevard. Things change over the years.

Gaspar is concerned about detention Cell A because it is very close to the apartments. The slope is 33%. His sidewalks can have a maximum of 2% slope. He is concerned that the grade drop is quite significant and very close to an existing building.

He has looked at the cost of flood insurance. He owns a property in York, Nebraska, where the premium for flood insurance is $300 on a building value of $159,000. Thus the average cost to insure these structures in the floodplain is $294,600. The cost of this project is $49,846,000, so that means he can pay 169 years of flood insurance for those houses and break even. As a taxpayer, Gaspar questions the financial validity of this project.

Gaspar acknowledged that Cell A is vacant land at the present time and that he has no plans for that area. There is a sidewalk that was a contingency to get Adriana Apartments approved in 1986. It was a big deal to have that sidewalk constructed and this would require that it be rerouted.

Gaylor-Baird suggested that another issue the Commission may have to consider is that some of these buildings are businesses which have an impact on the community's well-being, thus she thinks this is really a greater economic development picture.

Larson inquired as to the financial impact on Chateau Development if this is approved and goes through. Gaspar wants his tax money to go to a project that is going to have a positive financial benefit. He would rather pay flood insurance for everyone.

Francis believes that the flood insurance rates in York are different than in Lincoln. From her experience, a $58,000 house in Lincoln equates to $475/year for flood insurance. Gaspar believes the question would be whether they are also insuring the contents of the house in addition to the building value.

2. Fred Hoppe also appeared on behalf of **Chateau Development.** Chateau does not want Project 5 in conjunction with this amendment. Chateau is not opposed to the FEMA mapping change, but the Planning Commission's approval of the other two parts is an implicit agreement with both the cost/benefit analysis and each and every one of the projects set forth. He believes that the Planning Commission approval is an implicit approval of each one of the projects. That is why Chateau objects to Project 5. It is his understanding that Project 5 is pivotal to the entire set of projects because that detention is the critical detention in the batch of projects. Chateau has consistently come forward against using their property for the detention cell. For a project that protects 800+ private properties, you are wanting to condemn another private property. If Chateau does not go along with the use of that property, it will have to be condemned. Are we going to condemn private property for a non-public use? You're looking at taking some private property for the benefit of other private property. You're not allocating the cost, which is directly allocable to moving private property out of the floodplain. We know that those property owners in the floodplain have a direct stream of payments that they are relieved of if they are out of the floodplain. That money could be used toward the project. There is a

measurable benefit that can be assessed against those properties that are benefitted. Antelope Valley was sold on the fact that it would be federally funded, and that federal funding has not come through. How much of that do we have in this project? Should some of those properties be replaced rather than protected? Some of those structures in those neighborhoods probably should be replaced and not protected because most of those properties were built in the 1930's. The Planning Commission needs to recognize the full extent of what this does.

Neutral

1. Mark Fahleson appeared on behalf of **Lincoln Lutheran School Association** in a neutral capacity. Lincoln Lutheran wants to be a good citizen, but at the same time they are very concerned about their property located at 1100 N. 56th, which is landlocked, and the school is at capacity and enrollment is thriving. The area of Project 5 has been used for training fields by Lincoln Lutheran. This property has been improved in excess of $50,000. If Project 5 goes forward, Lincoln Lutheran's interest needs to be considered as the property is developed.

2. Scott Ernstmeyer, Executive Director of Lincoln Lutheran School Association, stated that Lincoln Lutheran serves nearly 400 families on 18 acres. Their biggest concern is the ability to continue to use the facility for the sake of the families and students. Lincoln Lutheran has spent time and money in the last 2.5 years modifying and creating a game field, whereas before it was a much less investment on the far east end of the property. Their biggest concern is that throughout the course of project, the activities of Lincoln Lutheran need to be taken into consideration and the ability to continue to use as much of the space as possible before, during and after the project.

Since the land is in the floodplain, Esseks assumes there are no plans to put a building there. The issue is whether the city can design whatever modifications are required for flood storage in such a way that Lincoln Lutheran's rightful uses of the property will not be damaged. Erntsmeyer concurred.

Hartzell clarified that the Chateau outlot is a required open space for the community unit plan/apartment houses and is not slated for future development. The sidewalk would have to be rerouted in some way but she assumes they would have to deal with the grade. Biesecker confirmed that any sidewalk would have to meet ADA standards when replaced after this project. It would have to be meandered and meet the required slope, at the city's cost. The property would be put back in a way that is consistent with its designation as green space.

Gaylor-Baird inquired as to what staff sees as the biggest risk if we let all of the property owners continue to pay flood insurance and do not proceed with this project. Biesecker stated that the biggest risk is if the 100-year event were to occur – there would be several houses damaged by flood waters. There would be a question as to whether those houses

would be allowed to be rebuilt. If they were in the floodway, they would not be able to be rebuilt. Hartzell offered that one of our primary concerns as public volunteers and employees is health, safety and welfare, and flooding is definitely a risk to all three.

Esseks inquired whether some of the 807 homes would be in jeopardy if there were a 50-year flood. O'Neill stated that when the flood damage assessment was done, they looked at how many homes would be impacted by the 10, 50 and 100 year events, and there were definitely impacts for all three storms.

Esseks observed that a very conservative benefit cost analysis approach is being used. It does not discount present values – it only looks at damage to the physical properties. O'Neill stated that the benefit cost analysis is based on a lengthy and stringent procedure that FEMA has published. They do estimate physical damage to the properties; however, there are a lot of economic damages also associated with flood, such as emergency management, displacement, temporary housing, loss of business income, etc. These will be taken into account when the benefit cost analysis is finalized. We have not even gone to estimating all the costs that could be saved if these projects were in place. FEMA insurance is directly related to how much of a flood risk you have. We have seen insurance premiums go as high as $2,000. In Deadmans Run we have depths of 7-8 feet, which is very significant, resulting in a much higher flood insurance premium.

Esseks wondered whether it is possible that some of these homes in the 1930's may not have that much disposable income and maybe cannot afford the insurance. O'Neill did not know how many people in the area have insurance, but depending on the premium and what it is meant to replace, it does not guarantee that they will get their home put back in the condition that it is today. This master plan attempts to protect all of the homes that are in the floodplain. All of the structures were treated equally.

Carroll pointed out that the Planning Commission is voting whether or not to add this master plan to the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission is not being asked to approve each project or the expense of each project.

Gaylor-Baird asked whether there are communication mechanisms that would be in place that will allow conversation to occur to address the concerns. Biesecker explained that if this project were to move forward to design, such as through an easement agreement where the property owners would be paid for the use of their property, their concerns could be addressed and the property owners would be involved in the design of the improvements.

O'Neill believes that Lincoln Lutheran has a good point about having usability of their site during construction. Playing fields would be located to the right of Cell B on undisturbed ground before they even started construction. After lowering the ground for Cell B, the playing fields would be put back in the condition that they exist today. That area would only be flooded on a very infrequent basis. With regard to Cell A, the trail would be put back

right along the alignment where it is today with the proper slope requirements.

Sunderman inquired as to the sort of event for which the cells would be used. Biesecker advised that Cell A (Chateau) would fill up during a 5-year or greater event. Cell B (Lincoln Lutheran) would have stormwater flow at a 10-year event or greater. The water would run out fairly quickly within 24 hours. It would take a little longer for the ground to dry out, maybe three or four days.

Moline inquired whether the city is responsible if there is any damage to the property. Biesecker acknowledged that Lincoln Lutheran did raise some maintenance concerns during discussions. If this project were to move forward, there would have to be some discussion in the easement agreement about the maintenance after a flood event.

If nothing were done, Esseks inquired whether any of these properties would be susceptible to flood. Biesecker stated that Cell A and Cell B are currently out of the FEMA mapped floodplain. There is property immediately downstream that would benefit from just the implementation of this project.

ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: January 16, 2008

Taylor moved approval, seconded by Esseks.

Larson observed that Chateau is objecting on a matter of principle as to whether or not public money should be used to relieve private expenses, and he is not sure about that. Although, it appears that the immediate impact for Chateau is fairly neutral.

Moline asked for clarification on the Planning Commission action.

Esseks believes that the Commission is giving a signal to the people in this area whose homes are now vulnerable. Through this plan, they are likely to be protected from a flood. They can make plans for the future. This is a very serious problem. Too many properties in this community are vulnerable to flooding and flooding is a terrible experience. He thinks this is a marvelous effort to deal with a really horrendous potential flood.

Gaylor-Baird believes that there is also an economic development aspect. This is an area that also includes a mall, several business districts, and numerous parks. If we have this land at risk and there is a flood, we may not see these businesses remain in this area and we could have a dead zone in the community. She believes that there would be a lot to lose from an economic development standpoint as well.

Taylor admires what has been done so far with removing that many structures from the floodplain.

Marvin Krout, Director of Planning, explained that the Planning Commission will have

another opportunity to review any or all of the 13 projects in this master plan, but it will be as part of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), at which time the Commission's official statutory role is to determine whether or not the project in the CIP is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission can have comments at the time, but you won't necessarily have a lot of details. Approving this plan is a direction to the staff and administration to seek federal funding for these projects, through bonds or whatever, and to place them in the CIP, and then bring those projects through the budget to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission's role in the CIP process is fairly limited. The Planning Commission action on this proposal creates a presumption that this plan and the projects in it are a good strategy, and you are giving direction to pursue the elements of that plan.

Carroll believes people will have opportunity to speak when the project appears in the CIP. People living in the city and coming to the city would like to see what the city intends to do with floodplain areas, and it is up to us to give them a guide. This shows that the city intends to improve the floodplains in certain areas. This area does need to be improved. It brings over 800 structures out the floodplain. It improves the area economically.

Motion to approve carried 8-0: Sunderman, Esseks, Taylor, Gaylor-Baird, Larson, Moline, Francis and Carroll voting 'yes'; Cornelius absent. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Please note: These minutes will not be formally approved until the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission on January 30, 2008.

F:\FILES\PLANNING\PC\MINUTES\2008\pcm011608.wpd