

Meeting Minutes

Comprehensive Plan Community Committee
August 27, 2020, 3:00 p.m., Zoom Video Conference

Attendees: David Cary, Paul Barnes, Andrew Thierolf, Kellee Van Bruggen, Stacey Hageman, Allan Zafft, Tom Cajka and Teresa McKinstry of the Planning Dept.; Jenny Young from Felsburg Holt & Ullevig; Dennis Scheer, Tracy Edgerton, Tom Beckius, Dick Campbell, Deane Finnegan, Karalyn Hoefler, Marilyn McNabb, DaNay Kalkowski, Stephanie Fischer, Marco Barker, Grant Daily, Sheila Dorsey Vinton, Meghan Sittler, Burdette Piening and Dave Johnson.

David Cary welcomed everyone and thanked them for their participation in this process.

Andrew Thierolf stated that at previous meetings, we have talked about the growth scenarios. The growth scenarios report was put out in July. The report is online. We are working on developing a recommended scenario. There has been a lot of work done with GIS and surveys. Staff worked with Lincoln Transportation and Utilities (LTU) to look at infrastructure costs on developing the basins. The actual cost from today, to 2040 or 2050 will be much more expensive. The areas are broken out into cost per square mile. Area 2 in the northwest with a cost of \$22 million and Area 10 on the southwest with a cost of \$18 million are the least expensive. The south and southeast areas are moderately expensive. Area 3 on the northeast and Area 11 on the west are more expensive. Area 4 on the east and Area 9 on the southwest are the most expensive. This information helps us narrow down the growth areas, and helps us hone in on the areas that are more reasonable. We talked a lot about the scenarios and put together some maps. The scenario with 4.0 dwelling units per acre on the edge and 25 percent infill came out to 7.7 square miles. Costs for serving that area vary based on which basins are utilized. One scenario that adds 7.7 miles costs \$247,370,000.00. We could do a further south scenario. There is for a scenerio at a lower cost, but it only adds 6.8 square miles. The northeast scenario ends up costing significantly more. A far south/southeast scenario costs more, but gives us over 8 square miles of land. Another scenario has growth in all four quadrants of Lincoln. It adds 7.2 square miles of land for a total cost of \$240,860,000.00. This looks close to the scenario that we may end up with. Staff will work on refining the boundaries and develop land uses.

The spatial analysis is a Geographic Information System (GIS) exercise. We end up with hot spot maps for the best areas for development. We are essentially looking at different factors. There are positive and negative factors. There are different weights to each factor. We are still refining the map. Infrastructure cost is a factor. He pointed out the different areas on the map. We did the same thing for industrial. There is a spatial analysis with different factors. He pointed out the different areas on a map. Industrial locations are still something that staff is looking at. We are looking to add one to two square miles of industrial. The final scenario staff looked at was acreages. There is a spatial analysis for this as well. Later this fall, we will talk to several rural groups. He showed a map. The driving force is paved roads, along with rural water districts. This is something we will continue to keep working on.

Another piece of the puzzle is the virtual meeting. Staff is collecting input through the end of August. A little over 100 surveys were completed. One question asked which scenario was preferred. Scenario C was the overwhelming choice. The people who took the survey really liked high density. This is being used for discussion. The highest amount of infill selected was 25 and 29 percent. The preferred edge density was five-plus units per acre. Another question asked where new growth should be located. The most responses were for the lowest infrastructure cost. We are trying to balance growth in all four quadrants and the lowest infrastructure cost.

We are in the process of collecting land use proposals. We are sorting through those now. We received a total of seven from developers. Staff is also working on internal proposals. He believes we will have well over 100 changes to the land use map. There are some minor changes. We organized them into some bigger themes. The themes handout will be posted on the website. The first theme is there are some existing homes in substandard locations. The first example is 14th St. and Salt Creek. The area is completely in the floodplain and adjacent to industrial. It is not an ideal location for residential. Another one is at 1st St. and West 'O' St. It is surrounded by industrial. The question will be 'how do we address these?' There are a lot of things to consider. These homes are presumably affordable homes. Our goal is to have quality affordable homes. We want to know if these meet the criteria.

Another topic is natural resource protection. One example is Nine Mile Prairie. They have a plan that recommended some land use changes. They looked at environmental factors. Another topic is prime farmland. There is a lot of prime farmland surrounding Lincoln. It is hard to avoid it. We want to preserve it as much as we reasonably can. We want to know if there is another way to identify the most critical pieces of farmland. Another theme is existing inactive industrial sites. There is land designated for industrial that is not built out. We have to balance economic development versus having too many industrial areas that no one wants to build on. One example is NW. 27th St. and Highway 34. There hasn't been much interest in this area. Another area is at 21st St. and 'Y' St. Acreages that are annexed into the future service limit is another issue that needs to be addressed. We would like to see areas of these develop over time. Aspirationally, we could see more of these in urban areas. Another issue is non-agriculture uses in rural areas. There are a lot of non-agricultural uses that have happened in recent years such as event facilities, animal feeding operations, alternative energy facilities and other miscellaneous commercial and industrial uses.

Jenny Young wanted to present some items for the Long Range Transportation Plan. The goals are livable, equitable, resilient and innovative. We have worked to craft goals for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) that align with these elements of the Comprehensive Plan vision. The goals for the LRTP serve as the vision. They are foundational to the planning process. The draft 2050 goals are maintenance, mobility & system reliability, livability & travel choice and transportation equity. The last four goals are safety & security, economic vitality, environmental sustainability and funding & cost effectiveness. We have looked at how the goals support the vision and how they are linked. You can see that some of the goals tie directly to the elements.

She wanted to talk about land use and transportation. Part of the LRTP update process includes developing a travel demand model that allows us to test different transportation improvements. The timing of developing the model is happening concurrently with the land use discussions. We did some research to see if there are other communities that have done a similar land use scenario and modeled it. Madison, Wisconsin also developed growth scenarios. They are very analogous to the scenarios that

this group is looking at. Madison is midwestern, similar in size and has a university. They looked at five different transportation metrics; transportation related greenhouse gas emission, average annual fuel costs per household, total annual vehicle miles, average annual VMT (vehicle miles traveled) per household and VMT ridership. They found the infill scenario would result in households spending an average \$400 less per year on passenger vehicle costs compared to the edge focused scenario which would include \$106 less in fuel. In looking at new households in the growth areas, the edge focus had the highest number of VMT. When they looked at transit ridership, infill focused was the highest increase. Lincoln's Scenario C is likely to have the least transportation impacts. It is likely to have low additional VMT, the lowest transportation cost per household and lowest transportation related emissions. It also has the highest potential for increased transit ridership, and biking and walking.

Then we looked at other communities across the country and ways to support land use decisions. We came up with some likely investment priorities. A likely strategy for Scenarios A and B would be to focus on the bike and pedestrian trails. Some capacity and operational improvements would probably be needed to service some new growth areas. Park and ride facilities could be invested in to get to a transit network. Focusing on Travel Demand Management could be done. This is done by working with developers and employers to do more work from home, flexible work hours or non SOV (single occupancy vehicle) commuting. Scenario C has more infill development. The way you consider investing in transportation could be different. You could invest in high quality transit service, particularly in the urban core. Investing in bicycle and pedestrian network improvements could be in the form of completing a network in the downtown area, connections to key employment centers, enhancements to regional trail network and investing in crossing improvements and wayfinding. We looked at how might you use transportation as an incentive or disincentive. We identified three primary ways. One is through transit. This can be appealing to developers. Other communities have implemented fare free service within their downtown area. The next area is in parking, either by reducing or eliminating minimum parking requirements. That concept could be expanded to other areas of infill development. There could be parking restrictions or by using parking meters. These are all meant to be ideas for consideration. The third category is the idea of tiered impact fees. They could be reduced or eliminated to focus development in a particular area.

Paul Barnes addressed the framework of impact fees. There are arterial road impact fees, with the exception of an exclusion area that covers downtown and Antelope Valley. This was done with the intent of encouraging redevelopment. He noted that any changes in the fees or structure would most likely require more investigation and action by the City Council.

Young continued that for public engagement, there are three phases. The first phase is scheduled to launch September 19. There will be a virtual public meeting. On the website www.lrtplincolnMPO.com there is a comment wall and a pin map. We want to hear from a good cross section of the community. We are going to have a survey and focus groups. We will use social media posts and project flyers to get the word out and encourage participation. The virtual public meeting will be available as a 15-20 minute session or individual links. The survey will have transportation goals, modes, and issues and challenges. We will do a series of focus group meetings in September. It will be a virtual meeting with the same content for each group. We will be doing some interactive polling as well. The public review period will be open until mid-October of this year.

Kellee Van Bruggen stated that staff wanted to bring forward information on what has been happening with underrepresented outreach. Staff co-hosted a campaign with South of Downtown Facebook and Instagram pages. We want to talk about why and how planning has an impact on your everyday life.

We have been getting some questions and feedback. We have also done Facebook advertising to boost the public event and survey. This advertising effort runs through tomorrow. We will take a look at the analytics when this campaign ends. We are exploring additional survey options for underrepresented populations. We have been talking with different groups about exploring different questions that are more specific to their needs. We are also talking with the CLC's about doing a project with them. We are also developing an equity subcommittee. We are going to ask the committee to review the existing and proposed policies. Most of that work will continue this fall through next spring. Since we are looking at updating the four themes, thriving will be changed to equitable. A lot of what we had anticipated was related to equity. This gives us the opportunity to define equity. The subcommittee will work on that definition as well. We are also looking at developing an equity toolkit through an equity lens. Madison, Wisconsin has two toolkits available. The fast track equity analysis asks what, who, how and why. We are looking at using this as a model. We will utilize the toolkit to evaluate and provide information to the committee, but then facilitate a discussion on policies.

Thierolf stated that everyone will break up into discussion groups. The following are the discussion questions and responses from all groups.

Land Use Topic – Inactive Industrial Areas

Description: There are several large industrial sites in Lincoln that receive little interest from industrial developers. We are considering new industrial sites within our 2050 growth areas. Are there existing sites designated as Industrial that are no longer desirable for industrial development?

- NW Industrial area west of Highland View on north side of Highway 34 across from Kawasaki
 - Suggestion to change this land use to urban residential
 - This would provide serviceable land for more residential
 - Appears there has been little to no interest in this area for industrial uses
 - Provides for additional multi-directional residential growth in an area with demand
 - Could be some benefit to be across from a major employer and near schools and commercial areas
 - Should confirm that residential across street from Kawasaki is OK by the Health Department
 - Continue to consider the rising sun economic development/employment site to the west of this area as viable
 - Confirm that area is serviceable
- 21st and Y area
 - A commercial designation that is not the existing and likely continue industrial uses could provide more options
 - Can see this being a dynamic area if more uses were allowed and occurred
 - Any potential new housing would need to be far enough away from the concrete plant and railroad
 - This could limit new housing in this area
 - Would need to retain industrial land use designation for land to the west of this area (NEBCO and Commonwealth Electric)
 - The plan should suggest this shift in land use where it makes sense

Transportation Questions

- What are the transportation implications for this land use change? (e.g., how might travel patterns change and how might transportation infrastructure needs change?)
 - One change that could occur if these land uses shifted from industrial to either residential or commercial would be increased traffic demand in and around the areas. Also:
 - There may need to be a new access point off Highway 34 if that became a new neighborhood
 - This is a State highway so that could be challenging
 - A more mixed-use development at 21st and Y appears to be supported by the street network and transit services that are already there
 - Interesting to note that the transportation system at 21st and Y already changed dramatically in the last 15 years with the closure of Holdrege and installation of the ped/bike bridge over the railroad tracks with the Antelope Valley project and then the new tie-in to the AV project off of Y Street
- Mobility goals for the new plan
 - Safety and Security of the transportation system is key because without this all the other themes may not be possible or successful
 - Funding and Cost Effectiveness is next in line of importance due to the limited nature of funding streams and the amount of needs that are out there
 - Livability and Travel Choice appears to be a rising theme, especially with more infill and redevelopment and more density
 - Equity has also been on the rise, especially over the past three months and should be a bigger part of this new plan
- What strategies and investments would best support infill and redevelopment?
 - Lower the impact fees that are charged in redevelopment areas outside the Downtown since the infrastructure is already built there. Perhaps only charge 50% of the impact fees? This could be very impactful to get more infill to occur.
 - Encourage developers to engage the neighborhoods they are proposing to build in early and often so get buy in and understanding for the projects.

Land Use Topic – Acreages within the Future Service Limit

Description: There are many Low Density Residential areas located in Lincoln and the immediate surrounding area. Several of these acreage subdivisions are starting to urbanize with redevelopment proposals around their edges. In an effort to promote continued urban redevelopment, do we want to designate certain acreage subdivisions as Urban Density Residential?

- We should look at a way to show visually the change for an acreage area. Visual representation of acreages changing over time. “Acreage transition” areas.
- We need a place to add additional population, acreage areas are a good opportunity to increase our density.

Transportation Questions

- What are the transportation implications for this land use change? (e.g., how might travel patterns change and how might transportation infrastructure needs change?)

- There would be more traffic. More people more traffic.
- Need to plan on a good route to get to and from where these new residents will be. For example, the challenge of getting north-south across Lincoln. We should look at several primary routes through the city.
- Most important transportation goals:
 - Environmental Sustainability. Climate change is a critical issue. Transition to electric vehicles will take a lot of planning and it's necessary.
 - Cost effectiveness is something that we should be looking at all times. Tied into that is the idea of maintenance.
- How to facilitate infill redevelopment:
 - Transit is important to facilitate redevelopment.
 - Some sort of transportation considerations for older and less mobile people who aren't as active. More buses and other transit modes.

Land Use Topic – Non-Agriculture Rural Uses

Description: There have been a variety of applications in recent years that have raised the question of what types of uses are appropriate for the County. Several of these applications have resulted in long and contentious approval processes and made it clear that the Comprehensive Plan should include more guidance about rural uses.

Examples:

Non-traditional agriculture uses (such as animal feeding operations – commercial chicken barns, cattle feedlots, etc.)

Event facilities

Alternative energy facilities (wind turbines, solar farms)

Miscellaneous commercial & industrial uses

- Blurred edge between the City and County – differing opinions on type of use; including uses that should not be considered in AG uses
- Feel like playing catch-up on county issues – be forward thinking on how we can be proactive on the issues
- Pre-emptively identify areas where non-traditional uses are likely to occur?
- Most contentious have been solidly outside of the city. Work with groups on commercial feedlots and wind turbines.
- What is agriculture going to look like in 2040-2050?
- City services allow development to occur, county is not similar with dependent service – self sufficient. How do you plan something that can change so easily and fast?
- What protections are guaranteed to residents in the county? Non-traditional usually requires a special permit which do require distances.
- Do we want the county to open more acreage lots or have farming as the primary use within the County. What does the County want to look like in 2050 and what is defined as agriculture?
- Uses that we can collectively don't need to be a special permit use but a conditional use, for example. Set up for a more relaxed use.

Transportation Questions

- What are the transportation implications for this land use change? (e.g., how might travel patterns change and how might transportation infrastructure needs change?)
 - Change from gravel to black-top as needed; more focus on whether development needs to reimburse for those improvements
 - See a requirement for lit intersections with arterial and paid for by developer
 - Maintenance on roads and bridges, when is it going to become a priority and allocate the funds for them?
 - Road funding may impact what can happen out in the county related to development
- Most important transportation goals:
 - Maintenance is the most common comment that is heard from community members
 - Will we have additional hubs in the community and not just downtown? People working from hubs on the edges – how does that play into transportation, smaller vehicle miles, more active transportation
 - Concept of physically laying infrastructure encourages development – transit route and commitment to having it in the area for 20+ years. Aligns with environmental sustainability goals and funding and cost effectiveness
- How to facilitate infill redevelopment:
 - When we think about impact fees, mostly think about roads. Don't believe that infill has impact fees; for example with TIF – improvements in a public nature but haven't heard about it being used in a bus nodule
 - Noticed so many areas that could be used for infill and for most part along bus routes; infill seems spread out.
 - Large development interest in bus service (rapid) to downtown?
 - Hard to commute by bus to work and appointments.
 - Give developers room with parking minimums

Land Use Topic – Existing Homes in Substandard Locations

Description: There are a few existing residential areas that are within the floodplain and adjacent to industrial uses. Should the Future Land Use map continue to promote residential uses in these substandard locations, or should their land use be updated in order to encourage non-residential redevelopment over time?

- 14th & Salt Creek...Consider changing to green space, it's in floodplain between two creeks that have nearly overtopped their levees. Future climate trends will continue to see higher flood events. We also don't want new residential to be developed here. Should reach out to property owners to discuss any changes in advance of public discussion/approval.
- W O & 1st St... Long-term, what's the viability of these residential structures? We will continue to be faced with additional flood events in the future.

Transportation Questions

- What are the transportation implications for this land use change? (e.g., how might travel patterns change and how might transportation infrastructure needs change?)
 - Residential to Green Space: Could reduce maintenance.
 - Residential to Industrial: Could see increased truck traffic, heavy use of streets.
- Most important transportation goals:
 - Maintenance: System must be maintained. This should be ‘front of mind’.
 - Livability and Travel Choice: Continue to support – “Silicon Prairie” concept with new people coming to Lincoln. This also links to Environmental Sustainability.
- How to facilitate infill redevelopment:
 - Bike/Ped & Reliable Transit: W/ bike/ped, people should be able to access goods and services needed w/out investing in time to drive.
 - Bike/Ped & Transit: This is key in dense areas.
 - Parking needs to always be addressed. Lots of parking being built Downtown, including parking garages.
 - If parking requirements are not required, other infrastructure needs to be in place, including a strong public transit system.

Land Use Topic – Natural Resource Protection

Description: Balancing protection of our natural resources while still providing adequate land to meet our growth needs.

- There could be significant conflict with people living in that area, when burns occur. Education should happen, but still may not be enough. Burn permits need to be obtained from local fire department. No notice to neighbors.

Thierolf stated that the next step is the recommended growth scenario scheduled to be unveiled September 30. We are in the process of focusing on goals and strategies. That will continue through the fall. The equity subcommittee will kick off in the next month or so. The next meeting for this group will be on September 10, 2020. The focus of the next meeting will be infill and redevelopment. Public event number three will be in October. Public event number four will be in early 2021. Much of 2021 will be focused on plan development. This leads to the approval process by the end of 2021.

Cary thanked everyone for participating. He thinks this is a great help to frame the process, and he appreciates everyone being involved.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.