MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, May 9, 2012, 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:	Leirion Gaylor Baird, Greg Butcher, Michael Cornelius, Dick Esseks, Wendy Francis, Chris Hove, Jeanelle Lust, Lynn Sunderman and Ken Weber; Marvin Krout, Michael Brienzo, David Cary, Sara Hartzell, Nicole Fleck-Tooze and Jean Preister of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Special Public Hearing **Planning Commission Review Edition of the FY2012-13 thru 2017/18 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and the FY2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program**

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

THE PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW EDITION OF THE CITY OF LINCOLN's DRAFT SIX YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP) FOR FY 2012/13 - 2017/18.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: May 9, 2012

Members present: Cornelius, Weber, Esseks, Hove, Lust, Sunderman, Butcher, Gaylor Baird and Francis.

Staff recommendation: A finding of full or general conformance with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

David Cary of Planning staff informed the public that the Planning Commission held a briefing last Wednesday at which many questions were answered and discussion did take place. Cary then proceeded to provide a brief overview of the general purpose of the Capital Improvement Program and today's hearing.

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) provides a multi-year list of proposed capital expenditures for the City and is one of the most important responsibilities of municipal government. This program attempts to set funding strategies not only for the next fiscal budget year, but also to project future needs for major construction projects and land acquisition. The City constantly looks ahead to consider how we will improve major items such as roads, utilities, police facilities, fire facilities, parks, libraries and other community buildings for the people of Lincoln. Capital expenditures are viewed not only in the context of how much the project will cost, but also what impact the project will have on the City's operating budget. Capital improvements are projects that generally have a useful life of fifteen or more years that maintain, upgrade or replace public infrastructure and public service providing facilities. It should be noted that due to some federal planning requirements, some projects included in the CIP may not necessarily meet the desired fifteen year life span, but the project may need to be included in our local capital planning document to qualify for funding. The CIP is not intended to be an all-inclusive inventory of the City of Lincoln's capital needs for the upcoming six years. It is a document that outlines planned capital improvements given available financial resources.

The Lincoln City Charter assigns responsibility for assembling the City's annual six-year CIP to the Planning Department. This process involves coordinating the assessment of the City's capital needs across more than a dozen different departments and agencies. Each City department assesses its capital needs and creates an improvement program for a six-year period. The individual capital project requests are submitted to the Planning Department and assembled into a single document that becomes the CIP. Each program is evaluated for conformity with the City-County Comprehensive Plan along with the most recent funding projections and revenue calculations. This year there are two new considerations that went into the development of the CIP – the new 2040 Comprehensive Plan adopted last October that now is used for the finding of conformity, and this budget cycle begins the first 2-year budget process so the first 2 years of the CIP will be approved as the capital budget.

Lincoln's six-year CIP is updated annually (now every 2 years) in the winter, when City departments prepare their proposed capital improvement program. The Mayor's Capital Improvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) guides the development of the document.

According to the City Charter, the Planning Commission makes a recommendation as to conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and this recommendation, along with public testimony, is passed on to the Mayor and City Council for consideration in budget discussions over the summer. Years 1 and 2 of the CIP become the Capital Budget for fiscal years 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

The Clerk then called each section of the CIP for public hearing:

FINANCE DEPARTMENT: Pershing Auditorium: **Sara Hartzell of Planning staff** explained that Pershing Auditorium has two years of CIP funding in this version of the CIP, including financing for upkeep and maintenance to maintain Pershing as it is right now, which is anticipated to be sunsetted after two years after we move into the new arena.

There was no other testimony.

PUBLIC SAFETY: Hartzell explained that this is a new section of the CIP where three departments are combined, i.e. Communications Center, Fire and Rescue and Police.

Communications Center: There are two projects for the 911 Center, the first and most important being the P25 Radio System Upgrade, anticipated to occur in two phases – first phase in year two and second phase in year four. It is a needed improvement. The City's radio system is antequated to the point where it is difficult to make repairs and find replacement parts. The relocation of the 911 Center to the Municipal Services Center is the second project.

Esseks asked for further definition of the P25 Radio System. **Pat Borer of Fire and Rescue** showed an example of the P25 – it consists of mobiles and portables – they can no longer find parts and pieces to repair and keep them running. They are used by all city departments.

There was no other testimony.

Fire and Rescue: Hartzell explained that the Fire and Rescue CIP includes six projects, including the relocation plan. This CIP proposes two new fire stations; two relocated fire stations; a general use fire station modification and repairs program; and a move to the Municipal Services Center for the training and administrative sections. The first five programs will be part of a bond issue in years 2, 4 and 6.

There was no other testimony.

Police: Hartzell advised that the Police Department CIP includes five projects. Relocation of the LPD fire arms training campus located out by the airport is necessary because the Airport Authority is planning on some development out there in the near future. That would include relocation of the canine units as well. The other two projects include planning and construction for the garage that is located just to the west of this building and a team assembly station similar to 27th & Holdrege.

There was no other testimony.

LIBRARIES: Hartzell explained the five projects, the major project being the relocation of the Bennett Martin library in year six using a combination of GO bonds and private funding of some sort. The other projects are basic maintenance projects for Bennett Martin (HVAC issues that need to be addressed) as well as a roof issue at Anderson Branch.

There was no other testimony.

LINCOLN ELECTRIC SYSTEM: Hartzell stated that the LES CIP is about $239 million, which is about $54 million less than the previous CIP. The LES program is for transmission as well as contribution to different generation projects. LES is planning for 12,000 new customers in the next six years, based on the population projections in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The decrease by $54 million is largely due to some generation projects and the Central Lincoln Reliability Project that brought the lines basically up along the Antelope Valley alignment.

There was no other testimony.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT: Hartzell explained that the Urban Development CIP includes eight projects. The funding consists of TIF, CBDG, user fees, some general funds and some service charges. The majority of the funding in this CIP request is for the parking program, which mainly includes ongoing repairs but there is a possible acquisition of a parking garage at 12 & N Streets. Ongoing annual efforts include the Low to Moderate Income Area Park Improvements program and the Downtown Street Tree Replacement program.

Francis inquired whether CDBG is used by NeighborWorks. **Dallas McGee of Urban Development** stated that NeighborWorks has access to HOME funds as well as some CDBG funds.

There was no other testimony.

PARKS & RECREATION DEPARTMENT: Hartzell stated that the Parks & Recreation Department has a fairly large CIP of about $50 million over the six-year period, relying on a wide variety of funding sources – GO bonds, general funding, transportation enhancement funds used for trails, impact fees for neighborhood parks, different fees for golf and tennis facilities, etc. Parks cooperates with Watershed Management in drainage and stormwater projects. There is a GO bond planned in the year 2014/15 for a quality of life bond issue that has been in the CIP for some time – almost $20 million.

There was no other testimony.

PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES:

StarTran: **David Cary of Planning staff** stated that StarTran's program is $10.4 million over the 6-year period, 8.6 of which is from federal funding. The bulk of this capital program is the ongoing regular purchase of replacement bus and van fleet. For the two-year budget there are no general revenue funds identified, which is the result of being good stewards of previous budgets. The $8.6 million represents over 80% of their capital program. It is an ongoing program – they have to make sure they qualify for those funds annually, requiring compliance with federal regulations.

Esseks wondered whether this funding depends on annual appropriations by Congress. Cary stated that there does need to be capital appropriations. We have been going through continuing obligations without having a brand new transportation bill getting approved on the federal level. It is dependent upon the annual federal process.

Esseks then confirmed that if federal money is not available, we don't get new buses. Cary stated that it certainly would have an impact on our capital plans to make sure the fleet is replaced at appropriate times. This plan shows future purchases, so there would not be an immediate impact. They build up funds every year.

Lust inquired whether all of the replacement buses are equipped with bike racks. Cary advised that the entire fleet does have bike racks installed, and when we buy new buses as they retire old buses, the bike racks are put on the new buses. There will be no buses on the fleet without bike racks.

Streets & Highway: Cary observed that this is a significant part of the CIP, including $183 million over the six-year period, an increase of $33 million from last year, mainly because there were some additional funding sources agreed upon as part of last year's budget process. There is a major infusion of additional funding into resurfacing and rehabilitation for the residential, arterial and bridge program. There was a list of projects for streets created with LPlan 2040, which is being followed in order as adopted.

1. Barb Fraser, Chair of the Mayor's Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC), 3210 Laredo Drive, read the attached letter from the Mayor's Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee into the record. Both the Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair Program and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program were highlighted in the new Comprehensive Plan as needing more funding to accomplish needed improvements. $500,000 per year was identified as being woefully short of the identified annual need of $2.5 million. A new dedicated funding program for bicycle and pedestrian projects was identified as a high priority with an identified annual need of $700,000. $1 million of funding is shown in the proposed CIP in Years 3-6 for the sidewalk program; however, the lack of additional funding in the first two years of the program (the two budget years in which funding is formally approved for projects) is a concern and should be considered an issue when considering the needs of the sidewalk system in our community. The Comprehensive Plan states that:

> The Mayor and City Council should examine funding options prior to the 2012-13 city budget year that more closely match funding with identified needs in the sidewalk rehabilitation program.

The PBAC feels that continued examination of funding options to more adequately finance the Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair Program in the 2-year budget still needs to occur.

Regarding the Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program, the PBAC believes that the $50,000 annual funding in years 3-6 falls far short of the identified need of $700,000/year in the Comprehensive Plan. There is a concern that the lack of funding in the 2-year budget will severely limit implementing the identified needs for the pedestrian and bicycle networks.

The PBAC would like to see that the community is providing and maintaining the facilities needed to support walking and bicycling and a balanced transportation system.

Esseks pointed out that the Planning Commission is on record as believing that the funding for sidewalk rehabilitation is inadequate and we hoped it would be much more, but for various reasons it is not. One of the problems may be lack of information as to how serious this sidewalk problem is, e.g. how many feet really need to be replaced. Could the PBAC sponsor or encourage the type of surveys that might dramatize the need for increased funding? Fraser believes that Public Works does keep track of some of that information and the Health Department has been working on a computerized system for surveying neighborhoods. Esseks suggested pulling those efforts forward and promoting more of that information.

Lust pointed out that the Planning Commission also received an e-mail from Rosina Paolini with the same concerns about the sidewalk and bicycle/pedestrian funding (attached).

Thomas Shafer of Public Works & Utilities approached to advise the Commission that the CIP does not include funds received by StarTran resulting from a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant. StarTran has secured $1 million in a grant that will be used to do sidewalk repair along bus routes and ½ mile on either side of the bus routes. Starting this summer, Public Works will be using $1.5 million over the next couple of years for sidewalk maintenance and repair as opposed to $1 million each year, i.e. up to $2 million in the two-year time period. That grant was authorized last fall. It did not come through the CIP but the program agreement went through the City Council.

Shafer confirmed the amount of $2 million for two years. The cost used to be about $18,000 to $20,000 per block for residential – now it is about $24,000 to $25,000 because of the amount of sidewalks. He suggested that there is $400,000 in sidewalk repair that is not explicitly laid out in the CIP but is being done. For example, every residential block and every downtown rehabilitation includes sidewalk repair. In this summer alone, Public Works will be making over $2 million commitment to sidewalks. "It will not get us everything we want, but we are making a very big investment."

Shafer did agree with Lust, however, that the annual need is $2.5 million.

Gaylor Baird sought a sense of how the limits of that funding and where it is geographically allowed to make repairs match up with the identified needs. Cary understands that the StarTran money will be used only where it is needed. The condition of the sidewalk is assessed and the actual need for improvement is identified. The rules allow for it to be used almost anywhere throughout the city along transit routes. It will be applied where it is really needed. A lot of the improvements will be close to transit routes and stops but the rules do allow for ½ mile away from transit stop to use that money for the purpose of a sidewalk repair.

Watershed Management: Cary explained that the Watershed Management CIP contains approximately $31.5 million in the 6-year period. A vast majority of funding comes from GO bonds regularly approved for the watershed program. There is an emphasis for increased cooperation and coordination with the Parks Department to identify joint projects that make sense in the use of these funds.

There was no other testimony.

Street Maintenance Operations: Cary pointed out that this CIP includes a new self-storage shed at 3200 Baldwin Avenue and the Southeast District Shop Addition project.

There was no other testimony.

Water Supply and Distribution: Cary presented the proposed Lincoln Water System CIP which contains over $76 million in projects for water supply, treatment, storage and distribution improvements. This is an increase over last year of $15 million. It includes projects that intend to enhance water services in the existing city and developing areas, and assumes a 5% per year increase in water utility revenues for each year of the program.

There was no other testimony.

Wastewater: Cary advised that the proposed Wastewater CIP contains approximately $53 million in projects encompassing Teresa Street and the Northeast Treatment Plants, construction of new sanitary sewer mains and replacement of existing mains throughout the six-year period. This CIP is $8 million less than last year. Similar to the water program, this assumes a 5% per year rate increase for funding.

Esseks recalled that a couple of years ago there was consideration and some planning to locate a new wastewater treatment plant along Salt Creek near Wilderness Park. **Gary Brandt of Public Works** stated that such planning is currently dormant. What we do have is a master plan that looks out 25-40 years and beyond, and with the slowing of growth and reassessing and doing dynamic modeling, it has been determined that the existing system can accommodate the growth shown in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

There was no other testimony.

Solid Waste Operations: Cary advised that this CIP includes projects related to the Bluff Road Sanitary Landfill, the North 48th Street Landfill and Transfer Station and the Solid Waste Management System, including $26 million over 6-years. Notable projects include liner and leachate collection systems, Access Roadway Repair and Site Maintenance at the Bluff Road Landfill, Recycling Drop-Off Maintenance and Improvements and closure of the North 48th Street landfill.

There was no other testimony.

THE DRAFT FY2013-2016
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
FOR THE LINCOLN METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO).
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: May 9, 2012

Members present: Cornelius, Weber, Esseks, Hove, Lust, Sunderman, Butcher, Gaylor Baird and Francis.

Staff recommendation: A finding of general conformance with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

Staff presentation: **Mike Brienzo of Planning staff** and as staff for the MPO elements of city planning process, explained that the TIP is a separate document which is combined with the CIP for public review. After this meeting, the TIP will move forward to the MPO process for continued review and adoption and then on to the state for inclusion in the federal program. The TIP identifies and is designed to satisfy federal requirements for federal funding. Transportation projects which are seeking federal funds are combined in this document, including the City, the Nebraska Department of Roads, Lancaster County, StarTran, Airport Authority and any enhancement projects that are using fed funds. The FTA looks at the TIP as a document for their reference that the transportation planning process has been fulfilled and had public review.

The TIP is a four-year document. We do have the option of obligating federal dollars for transportation projects within those four years and that obligates the federal dollars to those projects.

In addition, Brienzo advised that all of the projects are reviewed as to conformance with the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Any project outside of that will not be included in the TIP.

The LRTP, as well as the TIP, are fiscally constrained so that any project in the document will be able to move forward because funding has been identified and attached to the project.

There was no other testimony.

FY2012/13 - 2017/18 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: May 9, 2012

Gaylor Baird moved that the CIP be found in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan with the exception of Project #0181, Public Works & Utilities, Streets & Highways, Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair, and Project #0665, Public Works & Utilities, Streets & Highways, Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program, seconded by Lust.

Gaylor Baird stated that well-maintained sidewalks insure walkable, livable neighborhoods; they promote good health, help reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality and preserve connectivity, and they keep people safe from falls caused by disrepair. Recognizing this, our Comprehensive Plan calls for the improvement of this important aspect of our bike/pedestrian infrastructure. Today the budget number for sidewalks falls far short of realistic estimates to maintain them. In fact, it has been pointed out in previous discussions, this particular item is under-funded by a factor of 5. The needs based plan for sidewalks called for $2.5 million annually. LPAC last year recommended that at least $1 million be included annually for sidewalks.

Gaylor Baird went on to state that the Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program represents needed bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are identified as a priority in the 2040 Transportation Plan. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program which is separate from sidewalk repairs, includes simple but essential measures that promote public safety and public health. These include, but are not limited to, improvements such as on-street bike route signs, shared lane markings, pedestrian countdown signal heads at intersections, installation of priority sidewalk connections, sidewalk connections to trails and public bicycle parking. These measures and others supported in this category help to create a truly multi-modal transportation system for our community as called for in 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the LRTP. According to the CIP we are discussing today, this category receives nothing – not one cent – for the next two years, so the CIP shows only $50,000 per year for this item starting in year 3, but the needs for this item have been identified in the six figures.

Gaylor Baird further stated that it has to be acknowledged, of course, that others in the public realm have had to make some really difficult decisions on what we fund or don't fund as a community based on available revenues. The Planning Commission, however, serves a more narrowly defined role in this process. We advise as to whether or not the allocations being discussed today support or conform to the Comprehensive Plan and what it says about how the city should prepare for the future. In the case of the allocation for sidewalk maintenance and repair and the allocation for pedestrian and bicycle safety, we can easily conclude and are obliged to advise that these line items are not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Lust stated that she feels compelled to point out what it is that our Comprehensive Plan now says about sidewalk funding. The language is: "The Mayor and City Council should examine funding options prior to the 2012-13 city budget year that more closely match funding with identified needs in the sidewalk rehabilitation program." When we were discussing the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, we agreed, as a compromise, that maybe the Planning Commission was not the forum to make every single line item budgetary decision and we agreed to remove specific budgetary items from the Comprehensive Plan and have them instead show up in the LRTP. Therefore, we have to go by what the language says in the Comprehensive Plan, and that language urges the Mayor and City Council to come up with funding that more closely matches the identified annual need of the sidewalk maintenance program. That identified annual need as agreed to by Public Works is $2.5 million. She does not think that a budget that within the first two years under-funds the sidewalk program by a factor of 5 is in conformance with that language that is in the Comprehensive Plan. Furthermore, for general conformance, we need to find that such a funding mechanism conforms with the general idea for our Comprehensive Plan. Our Comprehensive Plan encourages more compact growth within the city for lots of reasons, including public health, including the environment, but most importantly, because compact growth is the most economical type of growth for the city taxpayers. We save money on infrastructure every single time that we have infill development rather than development on the edges. The only way to encourage the public citizenry to be on board for compact

growth is to make it possible to live in that environment. And when we neglect sidewalks and the bike programs that make urban living possible, that make pedestrian walking possible, that make biking possible, we are not complying with the sprit of the Comprehensive Plan. Lust fully supports the motion that everything else complies with the Comprehensive Plan except that the funding for both sidewalks and the bike program is not supported by the language in the current Comprehensive Plan.

Sunderman respectfully disagreed. We are pulling out dollars and not looking at all of the dollars. We were just informed about the dollars coming forward for sidewalks from road maintenance and road resurfacing. #0183: Residential Rehabilitation & Intersection Improvements talks about curbs and sidewalks. #0182: Roadway and Bridge Rehabilitation also talks about bikeways, trails, and such. South 56th Street between Old Cheney and Pine Lake – there is no sidewalk there – that is part of it as well. We are not taking into account all that is actually happening here if we are just concentrating on the $500,000 and the $50,000. Furthermore, we have just heard today from Public Works (he wishes this would have come forward sooner) that StarTran is bringing forward money on their own from a surprising source – $1 million. He cannot support the motion. Are we all the way up to the $2.5 million? He questions whether the $2.5 million is for this year or the year 2040. He can't see how the same figure would apply today and in 2040. It does say this proposal is based on the 2040 future land use, some of which is not even in here yet. As far as fully funding any project, he doubts if that is the case. He doubts that we are fully funding every project in here except for sidewalks. He believes it is unfair and not appropriate to pull out this project.

Gaylor Baird further pointed out that the Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program includes safety measures that actually make bicycling more possible. It's not just enough to maintain our sidewalks which helps pedestrians as a matter of course, but also to have some of the safety measures mentioned before with signals and countdowns that really make bicyclists feel more safe and which will help to start to increase the demand and allow people to feel more comfortable bicycling on the streets where they are more safely able to transport themselves in that manner.

Esseks stated that he would support the motion if it were limited to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program. The reason is because of Mr. Shafer's comments regarding the special grant funding which he has publicly said will be applied to sidewalk rehabilitation within and up to ½ mile of transit stops, and we have a lot of transit stops. That part of the motion is probably not justified at this point. But he agrees about the bike funding. So he will have to vote against the motion the way it is now.

Lust pointed out that Mr. Shafer indicated the funding was $1 million per year, and the annual identified need that we were told about when we did the 2040 Comprehensive Plan is $2.5 million, as acknowledged by Public Works, so we are still under-funding sidewalks by a factor of 2.5 even if we consider the grant that we were advised of five minutes ago.

Esseks indicated that he does not have sufficient data to say we have to have $2.5 million every year. He agrees that $500,000 is not enough, and he is delighted there may be another $1 million available. He does not want to vote against the sidewalk part of the program based upon the testimony by Public Works.

Sunderman wonders whether we might not already be at the $2.5 million. We have $500,000 in the CIP, we have $1 million coming from StarTran for two years; he also talked about money that was coming from road projects that are already in the plan in which sidewalks are already being repaired. So we can definitely count $1 million; we can estimate more than $1 million from the road repairs and rehabilitation. We are above $1 million. He thinks we are closer to $1.5 million. As far as the bicycle portion, the $50,000 is coming in two years. On the surface it seems low, but we are also working with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. It is not saying it needs to be now. It does not say we have to start this now. We have to move into it. The City needs to gear up to get these processes taken care of. He thinks the city has done an admirable job of moving more into the rehabilitation of streets than just the construction of streets – rehabilitation of sidewalks as well – that's part of it. He believes the city and the budget process is moving in the right way. He cannot support the motion as stated.

Cornelius was not at the briefing, but there was an extensive briefing on the CIP just last week. The question of sidewalk maintenance as a budgetary issue and a sticking point in the question of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan should come as a surprise to no one – it has been for many years running. And, if there were in fact a figure within the realm of the need of the city with regard to sidewalk maintenance – if the funds were there, although distributed through the line items in the CIP – that briefing would have been a great opportunity to point that out and let us know. That did not happen. He is encouraged by what he has heard today, but what we have right now, unfortunately, is some hand-waving and he would like to see some firmer numbers before he goes on record saying that he thinks it is right.

Motion failed 4-5: Cornelius, Lust, Gaylor Baird and Francis voting 'yes'; Weber, Esseks, Hove, Sunderman and Butcher voting 'no'.

Esseks moved a finding that the CIP is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, except for Project #0665, the funding for Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program, seconded by Lust.

Sunderman commented that this is a completely new program that was put into the 2040 Comprehensive Plan last year and to expect it to be fully funded and enacted at this point in time is unreasonable. He thinks they have put the resources in the right places as far as the street and sidewalk rehabilitation. He cannot support this motion.

Esseks suggested that $50,000 is the price of a fancy SUV, so it seems like they could increase that by two or three times and make it much more meaningful. He finds it embarrassingly small and inadequate.

Motion carried 6-3: Cornelius, Esseks, Lust, Butcher, Gaylor Baird and Francis voting 'yes'; Weber, Hove and Sunderman voting 'no'.

FY2013-2016 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: May 9, 2012

Francis moved a finding of conformance with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the Long Range Transportation Plan, seconded by Weber.

Cornelius suggested that this is a simpler question although the issues inherent to it are just as complex. It is simpler because this is a financially constrained plan, we know the money is there and there is a long process behind it.

Motion carried 9-0: Cornelius, Weber, Esseks, Hove, Lust, Sunderman, Butcher, Gaylor Baird and Francis voting 'yes'.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Note: These minutes will not be formally approved by the Planning Commission until their regular meeting on May 30, 2012.

Q:\PC\MINUTES\2012\PCM050912 CIP.wpd