Public Comments on Draft LPlan 2040 & LRTP

On August 12, 2011,* Mike Carlin *wrote:

Please consider the following recommended changes to LPlan2040:

Recommendation #1a:

Chapter 9: Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces, page 9.3

Regional Parks and Tournament Sports Facilities, Level of Service

Change to read as indicated in **bold**: "*The current citywide Level of Service (LOS) is 2.5 acres of Regional Park land per 1,000 Lincoln residents.* ***This LOS will be maintained in LPlan 2040 with the understanding that there may be minor variances*** *~~No set LOS goal is stated in LPlan 2040~~ since the size may vary depending on the feature or facility. ~~In addition, Regional Parks may attract visitors from outside the immediate area and thus do not have a defined service area."~~*

Recommendation #1b:

Chapter 9: Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces, page 9.4

Community Parks and Tournament Sports Facilities, Level of Service

"The current citywide LOS is 2.9 acres of Community Park land per 1,000 Lincoln residents. ***This LOS will be maintained in LPlan 2040.*** *~~LPlan 2040 establishes an LOS goal of 1.3 acres per 1,000 new Lincoln residents in new growth areas and a service area radius of approximately 2 miles in the urban area. The resulting citywide Community Parks LOS goal for LPlan 2040 will be 2.4 acres per 1,000 Lincoln residents.~~"*

Reason for recommendations:

1a. To change the LOS from 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents to "no set goal" is inviting disaster. Each individual developer will be able to say "it's not my responsibility" if planners try to include land for parks because there is "no set goal." Maintain the current LOS for Regional Parks at 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

1b. To reduce the LOS from 2.9 acres to 1.3 acres per 1,000 residents will result in a ring of new development around the city that has fewer and smaller Community Parks than the inner part of the city. The mathematical average doesn't look that bad on paper but the residents of the lower LOS won't be on paper, they will be in an area with a lower LOS. In addition, with a higher percentage of new development areas paved and roofed, the amount of storm water runoff will increase at the same time that the percentage of permeable park land decreases. This will drive the cost of storm water management up as the quality of life

goes down. Ultimately it will cost the city more in storm water management costs than it might make if the land that should have been park land becomes taxable (not all developed land is taxable you know).

The combined effect of the proposed changes for Regional and Community Parks would cut the guaranteed LOS from 5.4 to 1.4 acres. That is a 75% reduction in Regional and Community Parks LOS in new development areas. This is in direct conflict with the guiding principle cited at the beginning of the very chapter that proposes this drastic cut: *"Parks and open space enhance the quality of life of the community's residents and are central to the community's economic development strategy—the community's ability to attract and retain viable businesses, industries, and employees is directly linked to quality of life issues, including indoor and outdoor recreational opportunities."*

Keep the LOS that has helped to make Lincoln the great city that it is. To decrease the LOS for regional and community parks in future development would decrease the opportunities that our citizens will have to connect with and learn from our ecological community. Maintaining the current level of service for regional and community parks will help to maintain a uniform beauty citywide and a healthier, secure community throughout.

Recommendation #2:

Chapter 3: Environmental Resources, page 3.16

Greenways and Open Spaces, Strategies: Salt Creek South/Wilderness Park Link

Change to read as indicated in **bold**: *"Pursue the acquisition of additional greenway* ***and the extension of Wilderness Park*** *south from Saltillo Road along Salt Creek. This future greenway should generally follow the 100-year floodplain along Salt Creek, and incorporate the right-of-way of the abandoned Union Pacific rail line. This area could eventually connect a network of trails that would extend into northern Kansas. This extension may be accomplished through a combination of land purchases, conservation easements, donations, and other options."*

<u>Reason for recommendation</u>:

Designating the extension of Wilderness Park south as park land carries with it a greater level of protection than designating it as greenway. The current confines of Wilderness Park are being surrounded by our expanding city and losing the "illusion of wilderness" that the park is intended to provide. Recognized as an environmental legacy (Comprehensive Plan 2030 page A-23), it is essential that we extend and protect Wilderness Park for the growing population to enjoy for generations to come.

On August 9, 2011, **Eric Bigham** *wrote:*

I think the 2040 plan is very short sighted in it's proposed perpetual growth model (a.k.a. let's look like Omaha). Denser development is more sustainable in the type of future we face (lack of natural resources/global warming, aging population, lack of funding for infrastructure, etc.). I strongly urge reconsideration on what type of city we want to look like in the future. Also, not too hot on the conservative position taken on capital improvements to streets in the city - wouldn't more of a mix make more sense (like 65% maintain/35% capital)? Right now, just looking at the improvements proposed, is seems like 80%/20%... not very impressed. Anyways, thank you for your time and consideration!

On August 2, 2011, **Ron Hill** *wrote:*

I do not feel that the converting of the two properties to commercial are necessary. There are plenty of areas that are commercial already that are vacant, abandoned or unused. It would be better that the investors use those properties first for their ventures in beautifying the city. I see no reason whatsoever to give real investment companies a “hand up” unless they can improve areas that need to be improved first. We enjoy the 70th and Pine Lake Road properties as they are now. Please do not convert these properties.

On July 20, 2011, **Stuart Long** *wrote:*

LPlan40 is a beautiful local version of Infinite Planet Theory. One pictures the Titanic, a gash in its side, steaming into the night. But Peak Oil means the 140-year petroleum growth party is over. Some time in the very near future an oil order will be placed and the market will not be able to deliver. Pandemonium and sudden media obsession. Price spikes, panic buying, hoarding, shortages, lines, rationing, etc. The truth of the human predicament will be hotly denied, scapegoats identified, crazy solutions proposed, governments replaced. But nothing will alter the fact that from then on more people will share a shrinking pie: less production, less wealth, less credit, less gasoline, less food. The city will not grow as forecast. Number of dwellers per residence will rise, however. “Lots For Sale” signs will bleach in the hot sun.

On July 9, 2011, **Lillie Larsen** *wrote:*

> It seems reasonable and appropriate to improve and widen Pioneers from 84th Street to 98th street since 98th street is currently in process of being widen to four lanes. A decade ago there was a fatal accident at 98th and Pioneers because of poor road conditions. Now would be the best time to make this necessary to avoid future accidents. Thank you for your consideration of my suggestion.

On July 9, 2011, **Mike McClure** *wrote:*

> Lincoln is the only city I know of it's size that doesn't have a bypass highway circling the city. Why can other cities afford to have modern road systems while Lincoln remains a transportation system backwater?