RECEIVED
APR 2 2002
STER COUNTY
BOARD

JOINT MEETING
LINCOLN CITY COUNCIL/LANCASTER COUNTY BOARD
MAYOR DON WESELY/LINCOLN BOARD OF EDUCATION

Monday, May 13th, 2002
7:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.
New "F" Street Recreation Center
1225 "F" Street

I	Tour of the New "F" Street Facility - 15 Min
II	Approval of Minutes from January 25, 2002 Meeting
III	School Facilities in Relation to the Proposed Comp Plan (Including Flood Plain Concerns) - 30 Min
IV	School Board Planning Committee Report - 15 Min
V	The Arnold School/Library Facility - Carol Conner (Libraries); Lynn Johnson (Parks); Scott Weiskamp (LPS) - 30 Min
VI	Sidewalks/StarTran Bus Route in West "A" Neighborhood (PW/StarTran) - 15 Min
VII	CLC & Resource Officers (LPD/LPS) - 15 Min
VIII	Continuing/New Business - Future Meeting Date
IX	Adjournment

May13thJointLPSCityCountyAgenda

MINUTES
for the
JOINT LPS/CITY/COUNTY MEETING
7:30 - 9:30 a.m. - May 13, 2002
"F" Street Rec Center - 1225 "F" Street
Lincoln, Nebraska

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jonathan Cook, Chair; Jon Camp, Vice-Chair; Glenn Friendt, Coleen Seng, Terry Werner; ABSENT: Annette McRoy, Ken Svoboda. MAYOR: Mayor Don Wesely, in Attendance.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Bob Workman, Chair; Bernie Heier, Vice-Chair, Kathy Campbell, Ray Stevens; ABSENT: Larry Hudkins.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Doug Evans, President; Kathy Danek, Jim Garver, Lillie Larsen, Don Mayhew, Keith Prettyman, Ed Zimmer; ABSENT: None.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Director Carol Connor, John F. Dale, Lincoln City Libraries; Darrell Podany, Library Board Member; Scott Weiskamp, LeaAnn Johnson, Dave Myers, Dennis Van Horn, Fred Craigie, Nancy Biggs, Marilyn Moore, Eszter Boda (Hungarian exchange student), LPS; Ann Harrell, Amy Tejral, Mayors Office; Bonnie, Coffey, L/L Womens Commission; Kent Morgan, Stephen Henrichsen, City/County Planning Department; Director Lynn Johnson, Sandy Meyers, Parks & Recreation Dept.; Chief Casady, Lincoln Police Department; Scott Opfer, Randy Hoskins, Public Works Department; Bob Valentine, Self-Employed Taxpayer; Joan Ray, Council Secretary; Nate Jenkins, Lincoln *Journal Star* Representative.

I & II Tour and Minutes Approval - Mr. Jonathan Cook, Chair of the City Council, called the meeting to order at approximately 7:30 a.m. The group recessed for a 15 minute tour of the new "F" Street Rec Center Facility. The meeting resumed at approximately 7:48 a.m. with the approval of the minutes from the January 25, 2002 Joint Meeting.

Mr. Cook called for a motion to approve those minutes. A motion for approval was made by Coleen Seng. The motion was seconded by Glenn Friendt and carried by the following vote: AYES: Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Glenn Friendt, Coleen Seng, Terry Werner, Mayor Wesely, Kathy Campbell, Bernie Heier, Ray Stevens, Bob Workman, Kathy Danek, Doug Evans, Jim Garver, Lillie Larsen, Don Mayhew, Keith Prettyman, Ed Zimmer NAYS: None.

OTHER ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED:

School Facilities in Relation to the Proposed Comp Plan (Including Flood Plain Concerns)

The School Board Planning Committee Report

The Arnold School/Library Facility

Sidewalks/StarTran Bus Route in West "A" Neighborhood

CLC & Resource Officers

Continuing/New Business - Future Meeting Date

III *School Facilities in Relation to the Proposed Comp Plan (Including Flood Plain Concerns)*

Mr. Cook called the item, noting that the issue had been discussed in the past with location of parks and schools being an issue of concern.

Mr. Kent Morgan, and Steve Henrichsen, City/County Planning Department, made the presentation. Mr. Morgan explained that the Comp Plan was in its final stages with adoption being planned within the next few weeks - by the 28th of May when, hopefully, the new Plan will be adopted by both the City and the County.

Mr. Morgan passed out materials to the Commission, Council and Board members. [Copies on file in the Planning Department and the Council Office] Mr. Morgan reviewed these materials noting the similarities and differences between the Old and the New Comp Plan. He noted that the Similarities between the two plans is that both are actually three plans in one (City Comprehensive Plan/County Comprehensive Plan and a Long-range Transportation Plan) So, in reality, it is actually three separate documents which we've been able to maintain as one for a very long time - over decades. We've been very successful in keeping those plans together.

Both Old and New Plans are based on City and State regulations and Charter Requirements so all legal requirements are met.

The Planning Horizon for both plans is basically twenty-five years. This has been done in the past. The time-horizon for this new plan is 2025.

In terms of the new plan, we've looked at a lot of the existing planning policies and kept them in place. Continguous growth, growing around the edge of the city, to help in the efficient use of infrastructure. Drainage basins are also the basis for development as natural features of the growth area. The utility services policy is designed to maintain the water/sewer systems and to insure that they are extended logically; and that the efforts are done in the context of remaining a single community, which is very important when we talk with the School Board and other service agencies. We want to make sure all services are provided under one umbrella.

The density issue was discussed throughly in the development of the new plan. The density is very similar to the old plan...approx 3,000 people per square mile. The density in urban areas has been staying very much the same.

The Differences: Premise of *all* policies being open for discussion and change.

The Planning Time-Horizon has been extended by tiers that go beyond the twenty-five year time-horizon into 50 years and beyond.

We make sure the surrounding rural communities are aware of this time-line; infrastructure growth and urban expansion is being planned around this longer-term time-horizon.

Drainage basins are being opened up - most notebably the Stevens Creek Basin, and areas to the southwest as well.

The population growth figure has been a source of controversy for some time. We've moved from the traditional 1% growth rate to a 1.5% growth rate assumption for both the 25 year and 50-year time horizon planning. This means that the quarter million County population, in 25 years will increase by over 110,000 people, and increase to approx 363,000 people by the year 2025. Mr. Morgan noted that Lincoln would have well over a half-million people by the year 2050. This time horizon isn't really that long in community planning terms.

Mr. Morgan reviewed other issues noted on the "differences" list of the new and old Comp Plan comparison: Commercial/Industrial development; general areas of market flexibility/predictability; prime land flexibility; infrastructure procedures; CIP/Comp Plan combination; benchmark indicators (not just population); roads; trails/transit; other Nebraska regions; economic factors; natural resources issues under the Greenprint challenge; information technology; and the inclusion of surrounding Villages in the planning process.

This plan has been put together in the shortest period of time of any Comp Plan in the history of the City and County. It has taken a little over a year and a half. Most have taken anywhere from 3-4 years to seven years. We're proud of the fact that we were able to get this through, in a very cohesive way with a great deal of community involvement.

Mr. Henrichsen went through the land-use map to review the strategies and discussions that have taken place regarding the projected urban growth of the City of Lincoln. The future growth of surrounding communities has also been incorporated into the strategies and are shown on the land-use maps.

He noted the industrial growth pattern along the South Beltway which is, essentially, to be a light industrial area. He continued, noting the entire beltway system will have an impact on the industrial and commercial growth, which is also shown on the land-use maps as they were reviewed for the Comp Plan. In addition to showing future urban residential, several commercial and industrial centers are shown. Approximately 39 square miles of future urban area are added.

Overall, (once existing things such as Wilderness and Pioneer Parks, and some of the flood plain areas are considered), the City limits would expand from about 75 square miles in the year 2000 to just over 125 square miles by the year 2025. So, this plan would be adding about 52 square miles over-all. However, since a lot of that area (Wilderness and Pioneers Parks and the flood plain area) is not shown for future development, there are nearly 32 square miles shown that would be available for development outside of the flood plain, and which does not have any existing uses such as golf courses or churches, etc.

The areas surrounding the future City limits are shown in three tiers of growth. The first tier represents the first 25 years of development; the second tier represented shows development beyond 2025 to 2050 or beyond. The Tier Two area has approximately 45-47 square miles for additional development. All Tiers were given a lot of support for multi-directional growth, continuing the current growth pattern.

The land-use map focuses within Tier One, the next 25 years of proposed growth. It shows where the priorities for the City will be for providing infrastructure, and the coordination with the Lincoln Public Schools in order to give the Lincoln School System some indication of where development will be going and where new schools and the subsequent land acquisition would be necessary.

Priority areas for infrastructure development were pointed out and explained. The Comp Plan looks at these areas and the individual needs of each one for future development.

Mr. Morgan stated that this is really three plans. One is the Long-range Transportation Plan, which is a federally required document. It is multi-modal. There has been a lot of discussion and focus on the roadway improvements, but we have been talking about the other transportation options as well. Since the roadway improvements have been the main focus, however, we will give you a run-down of those improvements.

Some proposals for the next 25 years in terms of the Long-range Transportation Plan: The early approach has been to try to build upon the existing system and to supplement that system where possible. New roadways, expanded roadways. Because of federal requirements, we are under a "Fiscal Constraint Requirement". Basically, what this says is that in terms of the improvements that are shown in the Plan, there must be some reasonable expectation of being able to pay for those projects. This would eliminate the inclusion of spurious types of projects that would have no hope of ever being approved for funding or implementation. This Plan is not fiscally constrained in the sense that the number of dollars required to build it equal the number of dollars we know we are going to get; but it does meet federal requirements.

The cost of this Plan is probably about 1.4 billion dollars. The expected revenues are about 1.1 billion dollars. In terms of the deficiency, we're at about $346,000,000. But, the requirement also allows us to look at other funding possibilities. We're looking at impact fees and other funding from the state and federal governments. We've worked with both governmental agencies and they are satisfied that this program meets the fiscal constraints' criteria.

Mr. Morgan outlined some of the major projects that are on the board and underway at this time. The Interstate between Omaha and Grand Island will be widened to six lanes - this will be occurring within the next decade. The East and South Beltways are projects currently in the works. The South Beltway will be done first; the time horizon for implementing the South Beltway is about a ten-year time-frame.

The East Beltway is a little more problematic in terms of when it will be constructed. We will certainly begin on design and right-of-way acquisition. In may or may not be in place by the time this plan is in place 25-years out. That will depend on funding; but certainly the South Beltway is ready and will be moving forward quickly.

Antelope Valley is moving forward. The final elements are being put together. West and East "O" elements are being improved and upgraded to expressways. And other roadways surrounding the City are being upgraded as well. There will be, ultimately, a loop free-way system that would have only access points at interchanges

There are other improvements in older areas. We're doing a `Two + One' in these older areas which is two through lanes and one turning lane. This is being done extensively throughout the interior part of the community as a lower impact alternative [to street widening] that was recommended five or six years ago by the Task Force.

There are 21 local projects that are considered to be committed with the spending in place to do them. There are 69 proposed projects where money is available. A Committed Project is usually a four-to-six year time-frame; Proposed Projects, obviously, would be beyond that in the 25 year time horizon. Many of these are along the fringe areas, such as the Highway 2 widening. There is also a corridor preservation project proposed along Highway 2. Once the State Highway is moved to the South Beltway, this will become a City facility and we want to protect the corridor in case we have to widen that; then this would be in place.

There are several studies for possible overpasses, access improvements into development areas and railroad crossing improvements. There are also two studies underway to look at ways in which we can better enhance improvement of Beltway usage along the fringe areas and a study to look at the needs of those who are more transit dependent.

Mr. Henrichsen closed by stating that the Comprehensive Plan is basically split into two different sections. The first section covers existing conditions; the second focuses on future conditions. Within each section there are 16 different Chapters, with Education being one of those. Within the existing conditions, Mr. Henrichsen pointed out the sections within the "existing conditions" portion dealing with Education and the "future conditions" regarding Education. One of the things mentioned when reviewing all of the policies that were on the table, certainly one of the important ones that the Comprehensive Plan does recommend being retained is that within the City Limits, there continue to be a single school district. At any time that the Lincoln City Limits expands, the Lincoln Public School District limits expand to include the areas. That is certainly one of the important policies that will be continued in the new Comprehensive Plan. The Plan also continues to identify the future school sites, which is very important when the Planning Department is talking with developers in order to continue to coordinate those.

Mr. Werner commented that it had been mentioned that this Plan was multi-modal, but in the presentation, nothing but the roads were mentioned. Mr. Morgan responded that that was

correct. Mr. Werner continued, noting that this would not be multi-modal in its implementation if only roads were a consideration. Mr. Morgan stated that there are other elements in the Plan, but in the interest of time, they had not been mentioned. He noted that there were several different references concerning trails, pedestrian ways, and a great deal of review went into those kinds of things which we haven't gotten into here today. He did agree that the emphasis of the presentation had been on roads.

Mr. Henrichsen noted that today's presentation had slighted Historic Preservation, Libraries, Fire Stations, whole groups of folks which time constraints on the presentation did not permit them to mention.

Mr. Lynn Johnson stated that, within the plan, are guidelines and recommendations that we continue to work to co-locate school sites with public park sites. He noted that, ideally, we've formalized a process wherein as we've identified school sites, we continue to look at co-locating elementary school sites with neighborhood park sites; and community park sites with middle school and high school sites. Another thing, from the transportation standpoint, is that it is our intent to try to make sure that these park sites are linked into the trail system. I think that helps make sure the school sites are also linked into the trail system to provide non-motorized transportation routes to those future school and park sites.

IV *The School Board Planning Committee Report* - Mr. Scott Weiskamp, Director of Facilities for the Lincoln Public Schools, made the presentation. [A copy of the report is on file in the School Administration Office and in the City Council Office.] Mr. Weiskamp noted that the relationship between the Lincoln Public Schools and the City and County governments has been very good. He stated that he could not have asked for better dialogue and communications with these entities. He complimented everyone on the effort to achieve a job well-done.

The report and video [which was made available to Council Members and County Commissioners] are materials from the Building Fund & Planning Budget Work Session of April 23, 2002 held at the District Office.

The report is a presentation of Lincoln Public Schools future planning in terms of building construction and future construction....more so in the short term. But, with Lincoln/Lancaster County working on the Comp Plan, it gave LPS an opportunity to look at long-range planning on the City's growth and what impact that would have on Lincoln Public Schools.

Some of the things targeted as we looked at growth areas, just in the next 25 years, show an impact of about 10,000 LPS students, which will obviously have an impact on future facilities within the District. The Tier One areas on the proposed Comp Plan also show the sites that are currently owned by the District within and around the perimeter of the City. It's a tribute to the Board of Education's past efforts in purchasing sites (along with needed dialogue with the Planning Department) to have the District in a position where future schools could be built within the projected growth of the City.

This report is just a starting point. We need to continue to look forward to purchasing additional sites as the City continues to grow because the locations currently shown will probably just absorb the growth currently projected. We know that additional growth will take place, so future sites and future development is a necessity. Mr. Weiskamp felt this report was a tribute to the Board of Education and the efforts that they have made.

Mr. Weiskamp offered to answer any questions that the Council Members or County Commissioners might have regarding public school sites and development.

Mr. Cook asked if, when the LPSD considers a building site, does the flood plain issue enter into it...or only to the extent of the discussions with Parks Department about such siting? He wondered, specifically, about Southwest High School, which is essentially in a flood plain area. He added that the value there is, if the school site is not in the flood plain, the parks nearby might be the buffer space for flooding as well as recreational space for school use.

Mr. Weiskamp answered that the flood plain is obviously one issue out of many given consideration when selecting a site. The High School sites were probably selected and purchased in a much shorter time-frame and are much larger sites, acquired during the planning process for the two High Schools. Many of these other sites are probably 20-30 years old in terms of the ownership by Lincon Public Schools. Purchasing larger parcels, we're a little bit more restricted in the locations - such as in these High School sites. But, flood plain is one issue considered, along with many - such as infrastructure, parks & trails, etc. He noted that there is a Common Facilities Committee which meets with Sandy Myers and many other Parks & Recreation Department personnel as we look for and develop future sites.

Mr. Cook asked what the smallest number of acres needed would be for an elementary school site today? Mr. Weiskamp answered that, typically, with an elementary school, they would like to look at a minimum of about 17-18 acres. It was noted that City Ordinance requires LPS to impound their own water, so they must add about 3 acres to keep storm water out of the system for three days. That adds to the land acquisition requirements.

Mr. Camp asked if the growth projections of about 10,000 more students is over the proposed 25-year time period of the Comp Plan? Mr. Weiskamp answered that that was correct. Mr. Camp asked what percentage that would be in terms of student population growth. Mr. Weiskamp noted that it was just an interpolation of the Comp Plan figures. He stated that they had not used a particular formula to arrive at the figures.

Dr. Moore stated that the population figures that had been looked at in terms of school growth in the next 25 years originally came from the City-County Planning Department, which projected a County-wide K-12 population growth over 25 years. From those figures, we took the percentage of the present K-12 students in the LPS system who make up 82% of the K-12 students in Lancaster County. So, 82% of the projected County-wide student population growth over the 25 years, for the LPS system, was about a 14,000 student increase. The 10,000 Scott referenced came from those seven development areas and does not represent total growth. We're looking at a growth of nearly 50% over the next 25 years. She noted that LPS's own population projections show a population growth over the next 10 years of about 3500 students.

Mr. Camp stated that the reason he had asked was because of the shift in population demographics from a younger to an older population with the maturing of the baby-boom group. Dr. Moore stated that the 3500 over the next 10 years is the LPS projection and she noted that they are usually pretty accurate on those projections. The farther out a projection is cast, the harder it is to project accurately. The 25 year LPS figure comes from working with the City-County Planning Department's figures.

Dr. Prettyman noted that the methodology that LPS applied to the numbers received from the Planning Department was relatively conservative. The projected growth percentages for the over-all populations were figured with the shifting demographics in mind. At the elementary level, 15% of all new "roof-tops" would include an elementary age student; 16-1/2% would include secondary with 42% of those being in middle school and 58% being in high school.

Mr. Friendt asked what sort of planning flexibility is in place in case we were to run into a dramatic drop in enrollment? Dr. Prettyman stated that at this point in time, they could not project that sort of problem in enrollment. Based on all of the information LPS and Planning Department

have reviewed, including the cohort survival method, an accurate projection of the school age population can't be made. He noted that there is a dire need for the school district to do a compressive plan for both sites and facilities. Dr. Prettyman stated that every one of the current school sites, in the short term, can and will be used as school sites. We'll have to replace every one of those sites and do so relatively soon. The amount of available land, at any kind of an affordable cost, is running out. That is a huge planning issue for the LPS, just on sites.

Regarding facilities, if we take just the plans that have been approved for development over the next two-three years, we're showing a huge growth in the number of students in the district. The figures show the projected number of additional elementary students at 780, and a brand new building is designed to hold 525 students. This growth, already approved on the books, is over just a two-three year period. There will be an additional 360 middle school students being thrown into a population where there is no additional program capacity. Three middle schools are a little below capacity, but three are very much over capacity. Goodrich has at least 200 students over building capacity; Lux is 150 over capacity and at Mickle there are 150 students over the capacity of the building. Middle schools are already over-populated with an additional 360 students to be added over the next two-three years.

At the high school level, the district is in better shape, because of the two new high schools being built. In another two years, the projection is 500 additional high school students for those areas already approved. There is additional capacity with the new schools, so there isn't nearly the problem that we have at the elementary and middle school level.

Dr. Prettyman noted that LPS is putting an incredible amount of money into the existing facilities. The citizens of this community can and should be very proud of the way that the buildings are maintained. In Southeast, Northeast and Lincoln High, over the next four-five year period, there will be over $26 million dollars in those three buildings for improvements, renovations, repairs - especially the indoor air quality concerns.

Over the next five years, LPS will be spending for repairs and renovations to all buildings about:

Year One - $15,000,000
Year Two - $19,000,000
Year Three - $18,000,000
Year Three - $10,000,000
Year Five - $5,000,000

Dr. Prettyman added that at the same time, based on LPS's own numbers, there will be an additional four elementary schools needed, one middle school and one high school over a ten year period - in addition to the two high schools that are being built. Over the 25-year period, using Planning's numbers, we're talking about ten elementary schools, four middle schools and two new high schools. If the population trends hold, and the way it appears they will hold over that period of time, there is an absolute, desperate need for us to enter into this planning process, to engage the community in that discussion so that they can fully understand the needs of the district with regards to sites and facilities. In that way, we can move forward in taking care of our school age children the way that we always have.

Mr. Ray Stevens asked Mr. Weiskamp if LPS owns the sites or has options on the land now. Mr. Weiskamp stated that the District owns the lots they've shown.

Mr. Friendt asked if they sited in coordination with the City Planning Department's Comp Plan. The answer was that they had been, absolutely. Mr. Friendt asked why there were none in the Southwest quadrant? Mr. Weiskamp stated that they had looked in the Southwest and didn't find the appropriate location.

It was noted by Mr. Steve Henrichsen that this site had just recently been added in as part of the discussion within the last six months. Part of the discussion with the Lincoln Public Schools was to keep up-to-date as to where sites were being studied, but until the Comp Plan was adopted by the City Council and County Board, that part of the discussion would have to be postponed until the Plan is adopted. The rest of the sites are mostly in areas where the previous Comprehensive Plan had indicated the need. Mr. Henrichsen also suggested that the Council, and the County Commissioners might be interested in viewing the LPS Video on this issue, including the District's recommendations.

Mr. Friendt noted that the LPS desire to have their plan overlap the City's Comp Plan was a great first step, but he felt, based on input he had received from constituents, that what is needed is to take this to the next level as City Planning begins talks about the Comp Plan and CIP process. Mr. Friendt asked how we can open the highschool out on 14th Street when we don't have the road capacity, or the infrastructure construction that will be coming along after the school is open? This will disrupt a whole lot of stuff. How does that happen? How should it *not* happen again?

V *The Arnold School/Library Facility* In Mr. Weiskamp's report, he noted that this was one area where no future site for school construction is shown, but there have been some plans discussed in recent months about what might be done here in the future. Ms. Carol Connor, Director of the Lincoln City Libraries made a brief presentation on this issue. She commented that the Arnold Heights branch opened in 1974, started by volunteers. After a couple of years, the City Libraries took it over and provided staffing. It's a small facility which circulates about 10,000 items per year. Its mission is much more modest and different from the quadrant strategy. She noted that the City Library system was open to any type of collaboration or cooperation that would help serve the people in the area with better library service. The library's collection is very small and Ms. Connor saw many opportunities to reach the children and adults in that area by cooperating with the schools as we have in the past. She felt summer reading programs would be one way, with perhaps some other ways in the future in cooperation with the Parks and Recreation Department.

She said there are about 600 "units" (houses) planned for the area in the next 5-10 years. If those really come about, that will make a major impact in the use of those types of facilities there. She reiterated that the Library system was open to any type of cooperative process with other agencies or entities that would enhance the Library and other services available to the public in that area.

Mr. Lynn Johnson noted that the neighborhood park sites may be needed, but what is truly needed there are additional athletic fields and a community center location that can be well-utilized by the total area. There are approximately 1000 kids in the Air Park neighborhood and they don't have a good access to community recreation facilities. So, the Parks Dept. and the Aging Department are also interested in partnering in trying to put together a multi-agency approach to providing services in that area.

It was noted that the Arnold building was built in the late 50's and was built and designed to different standards than todays 70-80 year life buildings. It probably was not designed with the intent that it would be there this long. So discussion on renovating vs. replacing has been held within the LPS District. Everyone agreed that a cooperative, collaborative effort would be welcome.

The Indoor air-quality upgrade is two to four years out at the facility in terms of the plans for the facility and what will be done next.

Mr. Johnson noted that one thing that we've got going on in our City is the community learning centers. He stated that is a good model that can be used out there. There is a planning process in place that identifies what the needs of the neighborhood are and then identifies what resources there are to meet those needs. He felt that the community learning center planning process model should be used to help look ahead and identify what the needs will be in that neighborhood for a facility that would best serve the public.

Mr. Graver stated that LPS was looking at the possibility of developing a K-8 school in the area. There are 260 middle school kids out there that take the longest bus ride in the City into Northeast Lincoln. Some research has indicated that if you can develop a well-thought-out K-8 school... Many times the students loose a half to a year of learning transitioning between schools. LPS Staff is now researching that possibility. That would have a big impact on what we're hearing parents requesting - help in stabilizing the neighborhood and stopping the flow of people moving out of Airpark Neighborhood at mid-school level time. If they have the middle school right in the neighborhood, that flow might be slowed and a big difference in the ownership patterns throughout the neighborhood might occur.

He asked if, working with the Mayor and LPS, if the City is interested in some services (and County Health Department as well), asking what is the optimum location for such a facility, if we can coordinate. Our site may not be the best one, or it may be...maybe there is the possibility of another site, given all the new neighborhoods that are being created out there. We should see if, working together, we can get something done.

Mayor Wesely said that, in speaking with Dr. Schoo several weeks ago, Dr. Schoo had stated that he wants to use the discussion at this meeting as start for a joint planning effort. Mayor Wesely stated that the City is willing to go forward with a formal work group to initiate that. The Urban Development Department, working with the Housing Authority, did develop a program a year ago - an Arnold Heights Plan. This would be more of a specific strategy for public services in that area. It would incorporate the City, County and LPS. Mayor Wesely stated that he was willing to help form the group that can begin this planning process.

VI *Sidewalks/StarTran Bus Route in West "A" Neighborhood* Mr. Larry Worth stated that regarding service in the West "A" area, and he was not quite sure the context of the item, but he was contacted by one person at the end of last year who wanted the West "A" Route extended with added service to the route to accommodate students in the Timber Ridge area. Mr. Worth stated that StarTran had looked at that option. He noted that they had looked at the cost of extending service out to the Timber Ridge area, which would be adding about 20 miles per day. He noted that we also looked at extending service to the Park Middle School which would add only about a mile per day, and also adding an additional trip at approximately 3:00 p.m., which, of course, is when school lets out. This extension would run between Timber Ridge and Park Middle School, using the regular route. The cost of that was about $31,000. He indicated that he had told the individual who had inquired that StarTran had no additional monies to add that level of service. He stated that he had explained the potential of a long-term financial commitment (if any legal entities wished to contract with the City), that opportunity could be entertained.

Mr. Worth went on to say that he had reminded the individual that any services that StarTran does provide have to be open to the public. Charter and School Bus type services can not be provided...no matter what the funding source. He stated that he had never heard from the individual again and had heard nothing from anybody else in the West "A" Street area.

He added that he would simply note that there are 7800 Lincoln Public School students transported every day. There is a "tripper" type service to Scott School and Lux. There is a "tripper" type service to Leffler and there will be an extension of the Scott's "tripper" service to Southwest High School as was requested by some parents who will have students going to that school. These routes are all open to the public and are simply take-offs of existing service. The extension to Southwest wouldn't cost anything because it is in very close proximity to Scott Middle School.

Mr. Mayhew made comments that were inaudible. Mr. Worth's response was that it would be the 20 extra miles per day, to serve Roper School. This service would make up most of the $31,000 cost. Again, these are elementary students. He noted that this issue has been discussed before at a Joint Meeting as to whether elementary students are appropriate candidates for riding Lincoln Public School's buses. He noted that the buses have to be open to everyone. But, there would be a cost to do that.

Ms. Lillie Larsen stated that she was actually surprised that StarTran had received only one contact, because she had been assured by the neighbors in the Roper School area that they had been in contact with the City...maybe it was in regard to just putting in the sidewalks. She thought that what families there are willing...or at least want the option of...is a sidewalk so that they are able to walk from Timber Ridge - if you cannot do the busing.

Mr. Lynn Johnson stated that they had looked at a trail connection between Timber Ridge and Roper Elementary School. There is a good trail running between them. The challenge is that there is about a half-mile gap that is within the area between the airport and [inaudible]. So there is a gap where there aren't any houses, which means there aren't any eyes on those kids walking back and forth between Timber Ridge and the elementary school. There is a site there where a reasonable trail could be placed. We haven't identified funding because we've had a difficult time prioritizing that with our own trail master plan; but there is a route.

Discussion continued with comparisons and questions of sidewalks/added bus routes. The City's new Traffic Engineer, Randy Hoskins, was introduced. A brief presentation was made by Scott Opfer of Public Works which reviewed the maps of major bus routes near Maxey and Humann Schools and also a review of the Missing Sidewalk Segments near Roper Elementary School. [These maps are on file in the Council Office.] Mr. Opfer noted that there really are no opportunities for public sidewalks from Timber Ridge to Roper Elementary School because of the nature of West "A" Street - rural cross-section, ditches; the abutting properties, where there are homes, are right up against the back of the right-of-way. He stated that in his estimation, the nearest opportunity for sidewalks along West "A" Street would be whenever "A" Street comes up for a complete re-building with storm sewers and curb guttering.

He stated that he had also gone out and looked at the route being discussed. He noted that it was a great route, but he had the same fears as expressed by Mr. Johnson. The children would be walking back in a farm field for about a half a mile...a quarter mile at least. That is not a really good option for elementary age students.

Ms. Larsen asked what the actual cost of putting in the sidewalks would be. Mr. Johnson noted that the cost would be approximately $150,000. Ms. Larsen observed that the cost per year for busing is $31,000. Eventually, you achieve what you want in terms of having the sidewalk in. Why not put in some type of system, a light system or something such as what is on campus - emergency boxes on poles- through that secluded area. These kids cannot get to school by walking. If we're not going to do the buses, and we can't do the sidewalks, which is what you're telling us, then we have to offer something else for their safety.

Mr. Johnson stated that there may be a partnership opportunity because there is certainly grant funding out there. It is something we can look into. The challenge really, is that half-mile. The route runs right along the back side of the detention center...so that is where the kids would be walking....with a farm field to the north and detention center to the south.

Mr. Werner noted that the issue is keeping kids safe on that path. He asked if the teachers could monitor that area? He asked if that might be too far out of the school's jurisdiction area. Ms. Larsen stated that perhaps it was something neighborhood groups could do. Mr. Opfer said that it had been noted that it was a long way from the school area. He stated that Roper is one of the exceptions of the public schools system. They actually have staff that will walk over to the near-by Coddington & South intersection where there is a signal, to help the kids. That is the exception. Most times, they aren't going too far off the school property because of liability issues.

He noted that it is a difficult situation. He stated that there are many people in the community who make arrangements to drive their kids to school. He added that there have been lots of studies regarding kids walking to elementary schools. There will be very few kids that would actually walk that far....even if a walking path is provided. He stated that car pooling and different aspects such as that will have to take place. It's a tough situation.

Mr. Camp asked if there was a less expensive alternative? Mr. Johnson answered that the costs involved in maintenance for street surfaces varied with the differences in the surfaces. Gravel surfaces can't be plowed & wouldn't be a good alternative.

Discussion continued with a clarification of the route of a proposed bike/walking path, which would be along South Street and come in on the north side of Roper Elementary School. It would run for about a half mile along the section there and connect into the 2nd Addition of Timber Ridge (Timber Valley).

Mr. Steve Henrichsen stated that part of the situation is that on one side there is the Correctional Center with it's fence all the way up to the path. To the north is land that is slated for commercial/industrial use and potential warehouses. The Airport Authority is beginning a process to review the noise zone, so it's possible that this block of land could then be developed into a residential tract if it is on the very outer edge of the noise zone. The property owners in that area have discussed waiting to see what happens when that process is completed before they develop their land.

Mr. Johnson stated that if the tract were developed with houses, that would be the ideal situation because then there would be the indirect supervision of having eyes on the trail as the kids are walking. If you can image that area being developed with self-storage units, there would be nobody to keep an eye on those kids as they're walking through. Some communities have organized walking school buses, but that's a local effort. It has to be coordinated to walk the kids to school.

The issues and options were discussed further. A suggestion was made to make the installation of sidewalks -in future developments- the responsibility of the contractor along with the other infrastructures required for a new development.

A request was made that the option of continuation of the trail be pursued since it was obvious that a sidewalk option was not a possibility and the bus situation would not be economically possible. The trail plan could be pursued to include safety measures along the route.

VII *CLC & Resource Officers* - Chief Tom Casady came forward and made a brief presentation, explaining what LPD would be doing with services to schools in the next school year. He stated that there are eight school resource officers assigned to middle and high schools. There is one for each high school and a group of four that is split among the middle-school/junior high schools. Those are jointly funded by the City and by LPS on a 3/4 - 1/4 split with LPS paying the majority 3/4 split.

Next year under the Mayor's proposed budget, LPD will be suffering a budget cut which will figure out to approximate seven full time equivalent police officer positions. That may change depending upon what the Lincoln Police Department decides at its meeting tomorrow. He continued, noting that there have been a series of meetings at the Department trying to figure what the best course would be if those cuts become a reality. It is the consensus of Chief Casady's management staff that we should reduce the services to elementary schools. We presently have five officers who work exclusively with elementary schools. Those five officers are entirely funded by the Police Department's operating budget.

That was the consensus of the entire management staff as to where the best place for a cut would be if we suffer that kind of a budget cut. That's the bad news. The good news is that this has a delayed impact. The Police Department has about a 15-16 month lag between the time when a position is approved and the time when that position is actually filled. The reverse is also true. The impact of a lost position is about 15-16 months in the future.

Chief Casady noted that right now they believe this will start impacting the Department in March or April in 2003. There is, however, a chance that we might be able to carry through the entire school year. He noted that essentially, his commitment is that they will not remove those five officers from elementary schools until we're at the point that we have to. If it happens in March, or June or July, so be it. We'll carry on as best we can with the resources that we have.

He continued, noting that even though they could not have officers assigned full time to the elementary schools, they would still have an officer designated as the liaison with each of the elementary schools. It doesn't reflect any less commitment on the part of the Police Department in serving the schools...it's just a financial reality of applying the resources and the need to reduce programing where it will have the least impact on the core services to the public.

VIII *Continuing/New Business - Future Meeting Date* - Mr. Bernie Heier requested that the Youth Services facility's success be acknowledged. Mr. Heier wished to inform the Joint Meeting Members that Mr. Richard Krause, who is a member of the public school staff who works at the new Youth Assessment Center, has some good news to share. Mr. Krause passed out a multi-page document for the Council/County Board/and School Board members to review. He explained that three years ago when the County Board decided to build a new detention or Youth Services Center, it was determined very quickly that the education program needed to be redone. We've accomplished that, but not without some problems.

He noted that Mr. Heier had asked if there would be reading classes at the facility. Mr. Krause had responded that they didn't have any reading teachers. Mr. Krause related that Mr. Heier had then stated, "we're going to *have* reading". Mr. Krause then agreed...we'll have reading...even though he felt it would at best be just a shot in the dark.

As it turns out, Mr. Krause related, he now has two reading teachers. Both are from the Boys' Town Reading Program. Since this reading program was initiated, we have been able to move kids at least one grade level within two weeks of training. Some kids, we've been able to move two grade levels in two weeks; other kids we can't move even one grade level in two months, but for the most part, the program is there and has been successful.

Mr. Krause noted that this is now a cutting-edge national program. They've had verifiable results. Nobody is doing what we're doing right now. He noted that he is really pleased. Last week they had received a call from San Francisco asking what we were doing with this program. He had answered that they were doing the program the way it should be done. We have added reading; we've added the life skills program and another science program; we've added health and `phys ed' because

they have equipped us with a nice elementary size gym. We've taken on the task of providing state-of-the art, computer technology training. All of the courses are coordinated directly with the Lincoln Public School curriculum.

All of the planning we've done is due to the County Board's prodding to continue to look at options. All of our teachers are trained with the National Juvenile Detention Curriculum. All of our teachers are trained to really look at kids with heavy-duty emphasis on individualized instruction.

The program is one we're very proud of and we're just beginning to bring it forward. We've only been in operation for four months. He thanked Mr. Heier for the Board's encouragement in getting this program started. Mr. Krause invited everyone to visit and see what the Center is doing.

Mr. Heier thanked the City and the County Board for their continued cooperation in this effort.

A future meeting date was discussed after the meeting was adjourned. The final decision was to hold the meeting on August 15, 2002 at 7:30 a.m. at the new Southwest High School.

IX Adjournment: 9:28 a.m.

jointlps05-13-02