MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, November 16, 2016, 1:00 p.m., Hearing Room 112 on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE	Michael Cornelius, Maja Harris, Chris Hove, Jeanelle Lust, Lynn Sunderman, and Ken Weber (Tracy Corr absent). David Cary, Paul Barnes, Kellee Van Bruggen, Mike Brienzo, Geri Rorabaugh and Amy Huffman of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Regular Planning Commission meeting

Chair Chris Hove called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the back of the room.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16005
THE DRAFT CITY/COUNTY 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: November 16, 2016

Staff recommendation: Approval

and

MISCELLANEOUS NO. 16004
THE DRAFT LINCOLN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: **November 16, 2016**

Staff recommendation: Approval

Members present: Cornelius, Harris, Hove, Lust, Scheer, Sunderman, and Weber present; Corr absent.

There were not ex parte communications disclosed on these items.

Staff Presentation: **Brandon Garrett of the Planning Department** thanked Commissioners for their patience and additional participation above and beyond their normal duties. A major update was done five years ago and this is considered a minor update. It goes along with the update process of the Long Range Transportation Plan. In years past, we added five years to the time horizon. In 2010-11, when we adopted the 2040

Comprehensive Plan, we put a 30-year time horizon on it, so we felt comfortable in staying with that year since 25 years is an ample time horizon. The data we collected throughout these past five years are very much in line with what the consultant projected, so we were confident that we could stay with the projections until the next major updates.

The important assumptions built in to the plan have proven to be accurate. The percentage of population in Lincoln has maintained at 90%, relative to the county. Building is on schedule and even a little ahead of pace, so the 40% projected is realistic and achievable.

The original in-fill goal mentioned the addition of 8,000 dwelling units from 2010 to 2040. In the last five years, that pace has been eclipsed so we are hitting the reset button on that projection making the goal 8,000 units from 2016 to 2040.

There is significant capacity for new development at the edges of the City and there are many approvals already on the books, such as special permits and preliminary plats. Altogether, that amounts to a capacity for 11,000 new units already approved and they simply need to go through the administrative process to become a reality. Additionally, there are areas within the Future Service Limit that we show as residential, though we have not yet received any approvals such as CUPs or PUDs. We look at those areas and multiply by units-per-acre to come up with a rough number of units that could be achieved by using that land. That creates another 23,000 potential units for a total of 34,000 in new growth areas.

Staff went to the private sector to see if there were any proposals for changes to the Growth Tiers and Future Land Use areas. Some were recommended and they are reflected in the plan. For example, areas at the northeast corner of 70th and Yankee Hill Road and one around N.W. 48th Street and I-80 move up in terms of priority and timing from Growth Tier C to B. The Director has recommended that there be more low-density residential, or acreage development in areas north of Hickman because it squares off the area and provides more supply for an area that has heightened need. Some of the biggest changes were to the southwest and in the Steven's Creek area. The Capital Improvement Program is very coordinated with this new future priority growth and the Comprehensive Plan.

Several text changes have been made throughout. Staff reviews all chapters with the exception of Transportation, which is lifted from the Transportation Plan. Commissioners have been provided with bullet point lists outlining the changes to each chapter.

A request was received from the Near South Neighborhood Association for an amendment to some language regarding well-designed and appropriately-placed density. There is a memo explaining that, in general terms, the Comprehensive Plan encourages additional density. There are a variety of ways of encouraging that density at a macro- rather than a micro-scale in the form of new development, existing apartment in-fill, greater use of downtown, commercial, and mixed-use areas. This is a good opportunity to clarify and Staff supports the amendment.

Garrett went on to say that Commissioner Harris requested more information about density. There are two ways to look at it. One is through population, meaning persons per square mile. The other is used more often by Planning and it is number of dwelling units per square acre.

Finally, there is some reference about generational differences. There is confusion in literature about defining generations based on the UNO Nebraska State Data Center, as there are some inconsistencies as to where generations end and often this can't be determined until more time has lapsed. It is worth mentioning since it does come up in comments.

Lust asked for further explanation of generational delineations. Garrett said that ages 0-18 are unnamed, 20-37 year olds are called Generation Y or "Millenials", and Generation X would be those 38-49 years old. It is a little dangerous to acknowledge those differences now, but they can be changed. We want to remain flexible to reflect that there is confusion in the world of demography.

Staff Questions:

Harris wished to elaborate more on generational definitions that are mentioned in Chapter 2. One proposal is to define Millenials as born after 1995. She pulled in census data that defines that generation as born between 1982 and 2000. She has proposed language that would replace the part that defines Millenials. Garrett said he thinks that is perfectly fine and reflects the ambiguity. For the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan, it is perfectly fine to omit specific date ranges and nothing would be thrown off by doing so. Harris explained that her language conveys that there is a certain segment of the population with a greater desire for a more urban setting, public transit, proximity to amenities, and smaller dwelling units. Garrett agreed that is very consistent in terms of what it achieves. In the Comprehensive Plan, dates were listed based on a variety of literature, but it was just to create a date. The important part is to acknowledge that there appears to be two groups. More time needs to pass before the break between generations can be defined.

Harris asked about the process for land use changes. Garrett said one way to proceed is to interject it into the current process, which can be awkward. After this is adopted, we would treat proposals as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and give an individual analysis to each. That would be the process for changes that we did not recommend at this time.

Next, Mike Brienzo, Long Range Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that the LRTP acts as the plan for the MPO and becomes part of the Comprehensive Plan. The other piece is the technical documentation that becomes part of the LRTP. It is a policy plan, but also the documentation that went into building that plan. The LRTP will completely replace the

existing plan. We began the process by testing goals and objectives and then ask what it takes to address those goals. We ask for the review and comments of this body to take forward to City Council, County Board, and the MPO Officials.

The planning process encompasses both the City of Lincoln and the Lancaster County. Federal Regulations passed in 1973 allows the opportunity to effectively plan our jurisdiction and is the basis for Federal funding.

The LRTP is updated on a 5-year cycle where we reassess and project travel conditions based on population, socio-economic factors, and evaluation of needed improvements. The plan extends out to 2040, so it parallels the Comprehensive Plan dates. We also assess financial planning constraints. You find projects and programs that are based on dollars we actually expect to generate and make available. Projects are programmed on an annual basis. The City has a 2-year cycle; the MPO, a 4-year cycle. That dovetails with the State's. These projects create the basis for the County 1 and 6 Plan. This does meet Federal regulations, which are continually changing and must be kept pace with. They also ask that we have an effective public outreach program.

For this update, we started with Planning Commission, eight focus groups, and public outreach in February. That developed the basis for funding in the plan itself and assessed needs. Those needs were taken to the community in May in the form of a survey. We received significant feedback. The funding element was developed for the plan, and was brought to the public in September, when we also touched base with all of our committees.

We received significant input on resource allocation and how funds should be divided up. There is a maintenance element that is strongly supported by the public. There was also a significant amount of feedback about alternative modes such as trails and the bicycle and pedestrian users. They wanted to see more and more funds for trails. Many indicated the need for a strong and effective transit system. Roadway construction is another element that is very complex due to designation of funds for certain types of projects, and not a generalized fund to draw from. A fourth piece we focus on is intelligent transportation systems and improving technology. We try to keep pace, and the City is promoting this, but it is challenging because technology is improving faster than we can plan for it. This puts a forward-looking view on the plan and follows the Green Light Program the City has developed.

When this was reviewed by the public in September, we received significant comments and input on how they see things shaping up. Of those who participated in the survey, 64% strongly or somewhat agree with the funding objectives. It is interesting to note that of the 27% who disagreed or strongly disagreed, many did so because they felt there was simply not enough funding in the plan, so there is encouragement for increased funding.

Hove noted the amount allotted to alternative modes appears to be around 20%. Brienzo agreed it was around 15-20%. Hove asked if that trend has increased since the last review. Brienzo said we have increased transit because people wanted increased hours and

service. We have ideas for how to interface transit with technologies to create additional improvements. There are also small slivers for trails and other modes. Bike and pedestrian has increased of the last five years but has not kept pace with the demand.

Hove concluded that the alternative modes have increased over time. He asked if there are comparisons for usage of alternative modes with traditional traffic. Brienzo said this is a performance-based plan. We track transit ridership and have increased the number of counters along trails. It is difficult to collect data for bike usage on City streets. We feel it has increased but there is no actual data in the same way there is with vehicle traffic.

Proponents:

1. DaNay Kalkowski, Seacrest & Kalkowski, 1111 Lincoln Mall, came forward in support on behalf of several developer clients. Of particular interest are the updates to growth tiers, movements or the areas in the southwest and east into Priority B, and changes to the Future Land Use map. These changes reflect that the areas are available for multi-directional growth for the City and create a diversity of housing choices. The City is poised to continue growing. In our practice, we have seen interest in and the need for planning in these areas as we move quickly through available inventory.

Lust thanked Kalkowski for her input throughout the process.

Opponents:

1. Richard Schmeling, 4612 Van Dorn Street, came forward as President of Citizens for Improved Transit. We were successful in getting an additional $1.2 million to allow reform of StarTran and he is happy to report that ridership is up. The money spent on the bike paths could have been better spent on StarTran. He has an extensive background in law, the Army Transportation Corps, and the military. He has used and observed transportation systems all over the world and believes transportation planning needs to be refocused away from autocentric planning. A city cannot pave its way out of congestion. There needs to be a tighter relationship between transportation and planning via transportation-based zoning where major transportation corridors are identified and planned around in terms of public transit. For example, 27th Street cannot be widened but a rail could go there. These types of solutions should be identified now to solve the problems of the future.

Lust asked how what Mr. Schmeling is proposing differs from the alternative modes and corridors identified by Staff. Schmeling replied that he compliments Staff on their work because some of what is being presented is transportation-based zoning and is a step in the right direction. He would like to see it go a step further.

2. Coby Mach, LIBA, stated that this update relies on the assumption that the wheel tax will increase at the rate of $5.00 every five years which could circumvent public input about the fact that if this is adopted, it is essentially a support of the tax increase. There are many future roadway capacity issues with high volumes of traffic and a likely increase in commute

times. This update shifts the focus from widening projects by saying the issues can be better addressed by adjusting intersections and timing of lights. Most traffic congestion occurs at intersections which is also where crashes occur. This becomes an issue of safety. A project that costs a certain amount today will double by the year 2030 and the City could get too far behind. Investing an amount equal to 30% on alternative modes is problematic. Currently, 90% of the city population drives alone. Plans to construct another bike track miss the mark. The trails are important, but they benefit a much smaller number of users. More emphasis should be placed on roads. We ask that this not move forward until changes are made.

Lust asked if Mr. Mach acknowledges that this is a fiscally-constrained plan. Mach said yes.

3. Adam Hintz, 1919 Prospect, stated that as a board member of Wilderness Park, he want to know what types of projects are planned around the park and how it will affect the ecology of the area. Native prairie areas were not represented. He also wants to know the rationale for greater density west of the park.

Staff Questions:

Harris asked if Staff agrees with the assessment made by LIBA that this body would indirectly approve an increase in the wheel tax by approving these updates. Brienzo said that Staff uses the assumption that funding will continue to grow at a rate of 2.5% per year. We recognize that costs are increasing about 5% a year. The wheel tax is outside of this plan but, yes, we assume they will continue to grow. If they were taken out of the funding element, it would mean cuts to projects. Harris stated that Planning Commission has no authority to impose a tax. Brienzo said that is correct. This is a review of a guide for how we want to plan development.

David Cary, Planning Director, stated that the assumptions about the wheel tax are based on historical trends. That is the way the plans are set up. We are expected to assess the history of revenue sources and project those out into the future. It does not assume it will happen.

Garrett said that regarding Wilderness Park, residential development is shown on the Future Land Use map. The areas are mostly undeveloped and were part of the current plan. We did not change Land Use or the Future Service Limit. The change that impacts the Wilderness Park area more directly is the Growth Tiers. An area nearby is eligible to be a next area of growth. As far as the native prairie, he will be happy to meet with Mr. Hintz so see what areas need to be addressed specifically.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 16005
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: **November 16, 2016**

Lust moved Approval; seconded by Harris.

Cornelius asked if the motion includes the proposed text revisions regarding demographics. Lust stated it does. It also includes the neighborhood's request relating to density.

Harris stated that this is the motion she seconds. She added that she is fine incorporating the language she submitted and is supportive of the language submitted by Mr. Friedman. She asked fellow Commissioners if it would be appropriate to define "density" more clearly, including when that language refers to building density rather than population density. She mentions it because there is potential to run into issues regarding the "gentrification" of areas, which can be sensitive, so it might be of use to make the clarification.

Cornelius said he is comfortable with the fact that density was discussed and does not think it needs to be added.

Lust said she is also comfortable with it remaining more open since this is more of a planning document.

Sunderman said he agrees. "Density" is used several ways throughout the plan. Density and building density go together.

Lust offered her compliments to Staff for the hard work and outreach. She was amazed at what was accomplished and how many updates resulted from the input. It is a testament to the vision of the Planning Department and of former Director, Marvin Krout.

Motion carried 7-0: Cornelius, Harris, Lust, Scheer, Sunderman, Weber, and Hove voting 'yes'; Corr absent. Note: This is a recommendation to the City Council and the County Board.

MISCELLANEOUS NO. 16004
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: **November 16, 2016**

Cornelius moved Approval; seconded by Scheer.

Cornelius said that many of the same comments apply here. Much time has been spent crafting these updates and he appreciates the comments brought forward today, particularly about the alternative modes. He appreciates both sides of that and is in favor of both.

Lust said she is comfortable with the balance achieved by these updates. It is clearly a fiscally-constrained plan. There is a whole list of things that cannot be done due to that. The updates do a good job of investing money in assets we already have, while improving technology and alternative modes. You cannot build your way out of congestion. She supports the South Beltway. This strikes a nice balance between relieving congestion, spending wisely, and the community needs.

Harris said she was glad of the public input process. Many participated in the questionnaire.

Those comments made it to this body and to City Council and to all others who will vote on this. It was very helpful to have so much information, and public input makes a difference.

Hove stated he will support the updates. He also appreciates both sides of the alternative modes issue. There is balance and a thoughtful use of resources. He noted that the usage of alternative modes is currently quite a bit less than the investment that is going into it, so that should be examined, going forward.

Motion carried 7-0: Cornelius, Harris, Lust, Scheer, Sunderman, Weber, and Hove voting 'yes'; Corr absent. Note: This is a recommendation to MPO Technical Committee and the MPO Officials Committee.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 2:17 p.m.

Note: These minutes will not be formally approved by the Planning Commission until their next regular meeting on Wednesday, November 30, 2016.

F:\boards\pc\minutes\2016\pcm111616