



DICK ESSEKS

1. Is there anything that is missing from the summary or something that needs clarification?

Here are some questions, mostly editorial in nature, about six sections of the summary:

1. On page 2, under "Vision Statements," should there be some clarifying addition to the reference to "Downtown Lincoln" such as "promoting the viability of Downtown Lincoln"?
2. On the same page, there is the phrase, "particularly over the 50-year time period." I find this somewhat confusing since the new LPlan goes to 2040.
3. On page 3, there is the statement about the distribution of new dwelling units in the city's current borders—"3,000 in DT and AV, 1,000 in existing neighborhoods, 4,000 in commercial nodes and corridors." There has been some controversy about how realistic these numbers are. Do we have models from other cities to give us confidence in them? A friend of mine suggested that the "Crossings" development in Omaha might be a model. Also, in Lincoln's existing neighborhoods are there currently enough vacant lots and/or opportunities for upzoning?
4. P. 14 says that the new plan "includes a discussion of the economy in a land use context and more specifically details commercial and industrial center types." The USDA Census of Agriculture for 2007 found that, of the 536,033 total acres of land in Lancaster County, 78.6% consisted of farms. Given this importance of agricultural land uses, we need something about:
 - the income that agriculture generates in our county—directly to the farmers and landlords—an estimated \$125.9 million in 2007 (according to the Ag Census),
 - that local businesses (dealers in ag chemicals and equipment, repair facilities, banks providing operating loans, etc.) share in the county's farm production expenses—estimated by the Ag Census to have been \$87.4 million in 2007, and
 - that probably most of the \$5.5 million paid in 2007 to hired farm labor (estimated to total 1,029 persons that year) went to local residents. Maybe this kind of material is already found in the draft plan. P. 7 of the Summary refers to a subsection on "Employment" entitled "Importance of agriculture."
5. Pages 21-22 "acknowledges the important services provided by the Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department and the Community Mental Health Center of Lancaster County (CMHC) via multiple service sites." Apparently the powers-to-be are closing down the CMHC and trying to privatize that sector of public health. How should the new plan adjust to this reality?
6. P. 23 presents new acreage standards for community parks and also for neighborhood parks. Should there not be written justifications for these reductions? One will be needed also for the prescription on p. 24 "no additional neighborhood pools should be constructed in the future."

1. Is there anything that is missing from the summary or something that needs clarification?

p. 2.5 Population Density: Might be worth discussing disaggregating the “third trend.” By lumping together “the increasingly diverse racial, socioeconomic and ethnic mix”, the Plan may inadvertently suggest that racial minorities and immigrants are the primary reason that there are increasing numbers of low-income residents in Lincoln. While this may be partially true, it feeds a stereotype AND does not address other different, major contributors to the likely future demand for more affordable housing: changes in home mortgage and bank lending practices, higher levels of unemployment, and changes in consumer spending brought on during the recession that we have been experiencing during the last several years. Consumer spending is experiencing a fundamental shift: past growth rates in consumer spending were linked to access to credit and equity that people no longer have. Using debt to spend is both theoretically and practically much more difficult today. Perhaps devoting one paragraph to the increasingly diverse racial and ethnic mix trend and a separate paragraph to the socioeconomic challenges facing many in our city, county (and state & country!) would be a way to solve this concern.

p. 10.69 Mitigating Impacts on Environmental, Social and Cultural Resources: this entire section sounded more like a report than a Plan that synthesizes the results of a report. This section felt very different than the rest of the Draft in a way that felt less polished or finished.

2. Are there major LPAC decision or discussion points on which you would like to comment?

The new chapter on “Mixed Use Redevelopment” is perhaps one of the most exciting features of the 2040 plan. Bravo! Its sections “Obstacles to Redevelopment” as well as the “Strategies for Removing” them (p.6.10) are fundamental to the Plan and were at the heart of many LPAC discussions. The “Strategies for Commercial Infill” section (p. .14) in the preceding chapter likewise does a great job of reflecting our LPAC discussions and concerns. I hope that this important groundwork results in others acting to make these strategies a reality. *So much depends upon it.* What is the Planning Department’s role in this going forward?

The repeated inclusion of the need for new, effective design standards (e.g. pp.4.6, 4.7, 5.3, 6.6, 12.10 etc) and the justifications given for doing so thoughtfully reflect the LPAC discussions. I likewise appreciate the emphasis on pedestrian-friendly development and parking at the rear of residential and neighborhood commercial uses. The Plan’s repeated stated preference for development where services and infrastructure are already or are soon available makes so much sense. I was especially impressed by the “Strategies for Financing Urban Infrastructure” section (p.12.11).

The Plan gives mention to the issues of complete streets and alternative transportation modes. The density and awareness levels may not be there (yet) to support more detailed discussions of these important issues. However, it seemed like the Transportation summary paragraph (p. 1.11) places significant emphasis on multiple modes of travel - whereas the full chapter and funding plan doesn’t. And on p. 3.2, the highlighted quote: “...urban design that minimizes single occupant vehicle trips” left me asking where in the “Environmental Resources” chapter does the Plan elaborate on this? After all of our LPAC discussion about growth scenarios, I couldn’t help but notice that the illustration of Tier III (p.1.10) sets the expectation for far-future contiguous growth in every direction that perhaps is not especially dense. How is Tier III determined?

3. Are there any important considerations that need greater emphasis or elaboration?

It's a touchy subject, but the "Fire and Rescue" section doesn't sufficiently acknowledge the impact that Lincoln's growth is having on response time at the edge of the city. It seems that the fact of lagging response times at the city's perimeter (as cited by the Fire Department) ought to result, at a minimum, in the Plan stating on p.8.4 that "changing development patterns" etc **do** "warrant changes to effective emergency response" as opposed to "may warrant."

4. Other comments

- I really like the inclusion of so many graphics that depict sample development layouts which adhere to desired urban development principles. I hope that relevant development stakeholders find them useful and instructive.
- p. 2.5 Lancaster County Population chart: adding the number value as a % of the total in parentheses, e.g. "15,996 (x%), 4,956 (y%), 171,932 (z%)" might make this chart more illuminating at a glance.
- p. 2.7 "Develop sustainable practices" bullet had me asking myself 'what kind of practices?' - sustainable building design practices? This seems very general as it relates to urban development. Can we/do we want to be any more specific?
- p. 2.8 Adding a title to the graphic would be helpful to the reader, e.g. "Example "roadmap" of integrated urban development principles" since the graphic's explanation occurs on the next page.
- p. 3.9 how relevant to Lincoln's topography is this graphic?
- p. 5.15 This chart would be more clear if a color-coded key was included.
- Small photos throughout the document might serve it better if brief captions are included. On pp. 6.6 and 6.11 for example, it's hard to determine what these photos are communicating.

BILL LANGDON

1. Is there anything that is missing from the summary or something that needs clarification?

At this point, I believe the summary is adequate.

2. Are there major LPAC decision or discussion points on which you would like to comment?

I believe it would be useful to provide more detail as to how the plan gives direction to future development. How the plan sees the implementation of future growth.

3. Are there any important considerations that need greater emphasis or elaboration?

I believe a Public Policy chapter as we discussed would be useful. Also I think in the future more thought should be given to the interaction between the City and County.

4. Other comments

ROGER LARSON

Roger indicated that he does not have any comments at the present time.

JIM PARTINGTON

1. Is there anything that is missing from the summary or something that needs clarification?

No

2. Are there major LPAC decision or discussion points on which you would like to comment?

No

3. Are there any important considerations that need greater emphasis or elaboration?

No

4. Other comments

Now that I have had time to review the Summary and draft plan I don't have any negative comments. I like the revised chapter organization, the assumptions are as agreed during the process.

I think the approach you selected on sustainability makes sense but this may be the subject of a lot of discussion at public hearings. Sustainability in absolute terms requires that we use no resources faster than they can be replenished naturally. Practical sustainability requires maximum efficiency in the use of resources and ongoing research to identify effective replacement of the resource as it becomes scarce.

You all did a great job managing this process.

DENNIS SCHEER

1. Is there anything that is missing from the summary or something that needs clarification?

The summary is representative of everything that we discussed during the LPlan2040 process. I think it is concise and clear.

2. Are there major LPAC decision or discussion points on which you would like to comment?

I feel good about the group discussions that we had, and made my comments during those times.

3. Are there any important considerations that need greater emphasis or elaboration?

I think that the document is well written. I do think that we need to continue to promote an approach and plan for the greatest amount of balance between issues, resources, etc. as possible (which has generally been achieved- but it can't be understated).

4. Other comments

CECIL STEWARD

CHAPTER #1, VISION AND PLAN

p 1.3 “Downtown”

Suggested addition:

- “• LPlan2040 recognizes that Downtown Lincoln has become, and will continue to be promoted as, a vibrant urban mixed use neighborhood, offering many choices for residential lifestyles and daily needs commerce. Downtown will continue to be developed as a walkable and bicycle-friendly environment.”

p 1.4 “Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability”

- “• Natural and environmentally sensitive areas are preserved and thrive. Wetlands, native prairies, **endangered species**, and stream (riparian) corridors are preserved to ensure the ecological health of the community.”

CHAPTER #2, THE COMMUNITY

p 2.7 “The Rural Environment

Suggested addition:

- “• Geographical Information Systems (GIS) will be used to designate inappropriate areas of the County for acreage development, such as habitat of endangered species, limited or poor soils or water resources, and potential degradation of natural water sheds.”

CHAPTER #4, PLACE MAKING

p 4.7 Entry Corridors and Public Art

Suggested addition:

- Complete a wayfinding system of related, attractive signs guiding and orienting motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians throughout the community. **Coordinate the wayfinding system with the Lincoln Green by Design “Green Map” of green resources and green urban assets.**

4. General Comments:

1. Outstanding job, and kudos to the Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Department for this excellent draft of the LPlan2040!!!
2. From my personal checklist of the “Five Domains of Sustainability” (which you accurately describe in the Introduction of the “Vision and Plan” section, as being “environmental, socio-cultural, technologies, economics, and public policy”) the two areas that could be strengthened are:
 - Socio-cultural – heritages, distinctions, quality of life, diversity, notable institutions, social networks, etc, etc. Lincoln as a “learning” community?
 - Technologies – repair, replacement, conservation of existing infrastructure, maximization of long-term cost benefits of growth/expansion/innovations of urban infrastructure (i.e. communications, transportation, utility systems).

Totally absent:

- Planning principles for resilience and preparation for potential “natural” disasters (or other unanticipated community disasters).

For Marvin:

- I’m looking forward to a conversation about how the E/STEP system can assist you in the “Plan Realization” efforts.

Thanks for including me in the Advisory process!

LYNN SUNDERMAN

1. Is there anything that is missing from the summary or something that needs clarification?

* Implementation of the Vision - change "3 dwelling units per acre" to "3 dwelling units per gross acre"

* Lincoln and Lancaster County: One Community - While nicely written, I would have preferred a stronger statement about the importance of keeping a strong Lincoln, Lancaster County by balancing the interests of its parts with the interests of the whole.

2. Are there major LPAC decision or discussion points on which you would like to comment?

None

3. Are there any important considerations that need greater emphasis or elaboration?

None

4. Other comments

I've read this summary several times over the last few weeks and I can honestly say I'd support it as is. The changes I've proposed are minor and may just be the way I read the document.

DONNA WOUDEBERG

1. Is there anything that is missing from the summary or something that needs clarification?

Nothing is truly missing, from my perspective; it's just that I had hoped for more of an emphasis on climate change impacts, mitigation, and adaptation. I will take some of the responsibility for that. I could have (should have) asked to have a meeting or two focus on climate, climate variability, climate change, community vulnerability vs. community resilience, etc, for my own peace of mind in knowing that others on the committee were better informed. But, on the other hand, I know that Cecil Steward has been discussing sustainability for years, and it is only now that folks are more familiar with and comfortable with the concept, and willing to let it be more fully incorporated into the comprehensive plan. In that light, I suppose that I should consider it a small victory that climate change is specifically mentioned in print in a couple of places in the plan. I will hope that it will be accepted and incorporated in the future. We'll just have to keep plugging away at the message . . .

2. Are there major LPAC decision or discussion points on which you would like to comment?

- I am quite thrilled that emphasis has been placed on infill development. I feel with the projected change in demographics (baby boomers becoming older) and with nationwide trends in housing and lifestyle choices for the “twenty- and thirty-somethings,” that mixed-use and urban redevelopment are the smart ways to go. The Planning Commission (or the appropriate entity) must make it a point to educate the public about the benefits and lower long-term costs of this decision.
- I am pleased to see that the plan gives attention to rural needs and development (or appropriate lack of development). I think it will be necessary in the future to place more emphasis on our urban-rural connection (particularly local foods) and the related benefits and costs, taking care to enhance the benefits and minimize the costs.
- I am pleased to see more discussion of natural and environmentally sensitive spaces than I thought I would see. I feel more emphasis should be given to this sector in the future – these areas are a real treasure.
- I am disappointed that there is not more emphasis on public transportation. I feel this is a component of mixed-use development/redevelopment that will become more desired and required by our citizens in the future.

3. Are there any important considerations that need greater emphasis or elaboration?

As above in # 1, but I feel more education, understanding, and acceptance of potential impacts of climate change will be necessary before that can happen.

4. Other comments

A ‘political’ statement – I feel more public education about the lack of funds in the city / county budget is necessary. My personal opinion is that citizens should simply bite the bullet and accept the fact that we need to raise taxes. We (the citizens of Lincoln and Lancaster County) are responsible for the goods and services we expect. Where do we think the money comes from? If we want all of the fire stations, libraries, swimming pools, parks, schools, etc open and fully functioning; if we want high quality and aesthetically pleasing roadways, public buildings, public spaces, redevelopment; if we want top-of-the-line public transportation, etc – then we need to step up to the plate, do our share, and pay for it.