



**FY2007-09 AND 2010-12 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:**

Karl Fredrickson, Director of Public Works and Utilities, presented the proposed TIP. He explained that it essentially mirrors at least the City's CIP and is done as a federal requirement through the Department of Transportation regulations to inform the public where their federal dollars go. It includes the Airport Authority, County, State and every other governmental agency which uses Federal transportation funds.

(Commissioner Larson left at this point in the meeting.)

Mike Brienzo of Public Works & Utilities also explained that this public hearing is the element of public participation for the TIP. From this point, the TIP will separate off from the City CIP and go to the MPO policy board. It will be attached to the state TIP for state review and go on to the FHA. This is part of the overall process and comments received here will be attached to the document.

There was no other public testimony.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 06003**

**ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

May 24, 2006

Carroll moved approval, seconded by Cornelius and carried 5-0: Esseks, Cornelius, Carroll, Sunderman and Carlson voting 'yes'; Taylor, Strand, Larson and Krieser absent at time of vote. This is a recommendation to the City Council.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW EDITION  
OF THE DRAFT SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM.**

**ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

May 24, 2006

Carroll moved to close public hearing and delay vote for two weeks, seconded by Cornelius and carried to 5-0: Esseks, Cornelius, Carroll, Sunderman and Carlson voting 'yes'; Taylor, Strand, Larson and Krieser absent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**DRAFT FY2007-09 AND 2010-12  
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN.**

**ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

May 24, 2006

Carroll moved to close public hearing and delay vote for two weeks, seconded by Cornelius and carried to 5-0: Esseks, Cornelius, Carroll, Sunderman and Carlson voting 'yes'; Taylor, Strand, Larson and Krieser absent.

The Commission directed that these two items appear immediately following the Consent Agenda and Requests for Deferral on the Planning Commission agenda of June 7, 2006.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 06003**  
**TO CHANGE THE ROADWAY DESIGNATION**  
**OF THE EAST/WEST PORTION OF THE PHASE I**  
**ANTELOPE VALLEY ROADWAY PROJECT FROM FOUR LANES TO 6 LANES**  
**FROM THE 9TH/10TH STREET CONNECTION EAST TO**  
**CORNHUSKER HIGHWAY.**

**PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

May 24, 2006

Members present: Esseks, Cornelius, Carroll, Taylor, Sunderman, Strand, Larson, Krieser and Carlson.

Staff recommendation: Approval.

Ex Parte Communications: None.

Staff presentation: **Sara Hartzell of Planning staff** explained that this proposed amendment to the map in the Comprehensive Plan is part of the Antelope Valley Roadway system, known as the east/west leg of the Big X. The current Comprehensive Plan shows this as a four-lane roadway on the map, but in the text of the plan it is referred to as "four to six lane" roadway. During the environmental impact statement, this east/west leg was looked at as a six lane roadway and has been approved as such. Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-60, approved in 2000, brought Antelope Valley into the Comprehensive Plan and also identified this as a six-lane roadway. It was kept as a four-lane in the Comprehensive Plan as we moved through the design process. But, in the final design, it is a six-lane and Public Works would like to proceed with it as a six-lane roadway. This change does not conflict with the text; however, the map shows it as four lanes and Public Works would like to amend the map in the Comprehensive Plan to show it as six lanes.

There was no testimony in support nor in opposition.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PUBLIC WORKS: Streets and Highway:** **Karl Fredrickson, Director of Public Works & Utilities**, stated that through the work of different committees, we are continuing to say that we are short of money. Fredrickson then reviewed the proposed projects. Projects 1 through 11 represent repairs to the existing system, operational improvements and safety projects. The series of projects for Antelope Valley are a priority, and Public Works continues to construct those projects. They should be pouring the bridge deck on the Big T next week, and there are tours coming up on that. The city continues to lobby our Congressional delegation to receive more funds through the Federal Highway Trust, and there has been success in doing so. Fredrickson highlighted the following projects: East O Street; 48<sup>th</sup> & O; Harris Overpass replacement, which is scheduled for next year; South Beltway – there may be a small change in the dollar amounts as the state provides the schedule; East Beltway - intend

to start corridor preliminary design and start protecting the corridor, and continue to ask for federal demonstration funds; SW 40<sup>th</sup> Street railroad viaduct; bridge repair at Adams and N.W. 12<sup>th</sup>; and Project 34 identifies impact fee type projects. There have been a couple of annexations recently where impact fees have been directed back to the construction. Developers are fronting the money to build the roadways and as they draw their building permits, they will be reimbursed. New roads in new development areas are "kind of hobbling along". Public Works is looking for additional funds to finish those.

Fredrickson advised that the comment for Project 16 on page 85 will be revised to state, "The Antelope Valley Urban Development project....". (Instead of Parks Department).

Strand referred to the letter from DaNay Kalkowski regarding S. 84<sup>th</sup> and Hwy 2, and inquired when the road work would be done on Pine Lake Road between S. 84<sup>th</sup> and 98<sup>th</sup> Street, and 98<sup>th</sup> Street between Pine Lake Road and Hwy 2. Fredrickson noted that to be a development prior to the impact fee ordinance. In the agreement, the developer had a cost share where he contributed toward that road and several others. Based on priorities, the dollars have not gone to the project to build it; however, the design work is completed. It would have been done if the bond had passed two years ago. We do not have the dollars to build it. Fredrickson has talked with the developer about contributing from other projects. There is also right-of-way which the developer does not own that would need to be acquired.

Strand noted that 27th Street from Pine Lake Road to Yankee Hill Road is not four-lane. She thinks that will need to be done in light of the Target at 40<sup>th</sup> and Yankee Hill Road. Fredrickson stated that the plan is to attempt to do that next year.

Strand inquired what an additional 2.5 million would do. Fredrickson suggested that would build South Street from 8<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> or 20 blocks of residential resurfacing or approximately one mile of two-lane arterial.

Carlson referred to Project 10 on page 94, sidewalk maintenance and repair. He recalled that about four years ago the City did some work to figure out where we were on repair of sidewalks. At that time we had about a 40-year list of projects. We had been accelerating that to get up to a 10-year wait list. Now it appears that we are back down to the 40-year amount. Based on the amount budgeted in the CIP, how are we going to accomplish the Comprehensive Plan goal to have a safe, extensive and thorough sidewalk system, particularly in older neighborhoods? Fredrickson's response was that "there is not enough money to do it." Carlson inquired whether there are any other resources. Fredrickson suggested that one way or the other, the dollars come from the residents. He would like to see the sidewalks fixed but it is a balancing act. If there were additional dollars, this would definitely be accomplished. However, he would rather not see street construction funds used for those sidewalk repairs. He believes that general funds are fair, but general funds are tight. Carlson wants this to be made a priority.

## Public Comments:

1. **Rick Krueger** pointed out that years ago, the WC wheel tax was raised for new construction, amounting to four million dollars, which is not 1/10th of the street funds being used this year. They are being used in this CIP for the bridge in Antelope Valley and at 48<sup>th</sup> and "O" Streets. When the WC wheel tax was raised in 1996, that money was to be used for new construction in new areas. That four million needs to be used in new areas. We need some funds put somewhere in a growth area. He does not see them allocated to any particular location on the fringe.

2. **Peter Katt** expressed concern about allocations in the CIP. The Comprehensive Plan conformance findings do not envision a town that goes from 48<sup>th</sup> and "O" to Downtown and the Antelope Valley. It's an entire community. We need to plan for the entire community. The staff report indicates that this is a decision as to conformance with the Comprehensive Plan so the focus is very limited. One of the components that should help guide the decision is the reality that our dreams, our wishes, our wants for capital improvements and what we want government to do are well beyond the means of what the citizens are willing to pay. What we want costs more than we can afford. There is no strategy or policy for making those really hard choices if we don't have enough money. We don't have enough money to do it all, so how are we going to decide what gets done? In his view, one of the things the Planning Commission should not do is simply allow all of the city's "pet projects", i.e. Antelope Valley, 48<sup>th</sup> & "O" Streets, Harris Overpass, SW 40<sup>th</sup> bridge replacement, Downtown. We need roads built in other parts of the town. He has a client who has had a project on N.W. 56<sup>th</sup> and Adams for over 8 years. He has built hundreds of homes. Those people still need to drive on gravel roads. The city agreed in 1999 to pave these roads. Not done. That's wrong. Nothing in the CIP says it will be done this year or in the next six years. As a part of the deliberations, the Planning Commission needs to discuss the policy choices and how we treat all of the community fairly – not simply city pet projects in the existing community, but the entire community.

3. **Bruce Bohrer, Chamber of Commerce**, suggested that it really is a matter of balance. A lot of the studies point to the fact that we know what we need but we don't have the funding. We need to find some mechanism to find a way to balance our priorities. The Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors passed a resolution last Thursday to direct the wheel tax dollars to new growth areas. They also suggested the formation of an Advisory Council for Public Works. Our gap for Streets and Highways is about 180 million over the next six years. The Comprehensive Plan talks about the efforts in economic development to keep jobs here and to have infrastructure so that we have facilities and parcels ready for new growth. If that's the standard for conformance, this is certainly not adequate on streets and highways. It is out of balance.

Bohrer also advised that he just returned from Washington, DC, and believes that Lincoln does get very favorable response from our Congressmen and Senators who worked very hard to get the South Beltway into the Highway Bill as well as Antelope Valley. A bill has been passed for the channel work of Antelope Valley. LB904 gives

us about 1.3 million dollars more annually in Lincoln and Lancaster County. But, we need to find resources locally as well.

***(Editorial Note: The resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce was submitted by Mr. Bohrer on May 25, 2006, and is attached hereto as Exhibit C, and made a part hereof by this reference.)***

Staff response:

Fredrickson stated that he does not disagree with the comments. Many of the roads discussed were on the bond issue that would have been paved by the end of 2007 if the bond issue had passed. Thus, the community chose otherwise. It now comes to different and harder choices to make.

Esseks inquired whether there is any budgetary flexibility. Let's say the opportunity for a really good development that would either attract new jobs or retain existing jobs comes along. Is there any flexibility to tap the impact fee budget, or how constrained are we in helping the city be an entrepreneur? Fredrickson commented that many of the departments work with Darl Naumann, Economic Development Coordinator in the Mayor's office, to come up with different ways of doing just that. Water and street impact fees have seven different benefit districts and the dollars collected have to be spent in those districts. We do have the discretion as outlined in the CIP. The downside is that sometimes Public Works is ready to go and sometimes the developer is not ready to go when the dollars are there.

With regard to the WC wheel tax, Fredrickson agreed that it was raised in 1998 for new construction. At the time, it was when the south and south fringes came about and they identified streets in those studies such as Old Cheney Road, S. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Pine Lake Road, 84<sup>th</sup> Street, 70<sup>th</sup> Street, etc., and a schedule was lined up. For the most part, we are pretty close. The actual ordinance that created the WC wheel tax was for new construction and it could be used anywhere, thus Antelope Valley was perfectly eligible. Antelope Valley is a city priority, and that is where the WC wheel tax has been used.

Larson observed that Antelope Valley, the South Beltway and Harris overpass all have large elements of federal funding, and commented that we don't have a choice if we want to take advantage of those federal funds. Fredrickson stated that federal funds all require a local match. We have asked to be able to spend federal highway dollars to match the Corps of Engineers dollars. Federal demonstration funds cannot be used anywhere else. Railroad Transportation Safety District funds have to be used on railroad crossings. Bridge replacement funds have to be used on bridge replacement.

There was no other public testimony.

\*\*\*\*\*