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The Chair noted the location of the Open Meetings Act and opened the meeting at 8:31 a.m.

## AGENDA ITEM

## 1 APPROVAL OF THE MI NUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2014, STAFF MEETI NG

MOTI ON: Raybould moved and Smoyer seconded approval of the minutes of the October 2, 2014 Staff Meeting. Smoyer, Amundson, Raybould and Hudkins voted aye. Schorr was absent. Motion carried 4-0.

## 2 ADDI TI ONS TO AGENDA

None were stated.

## EMERGENCY ITEMS AND OTHER BUSI NESS

Amundson inquired about the schedule for the Board's next community volunteer opportunity. The consensus was to delay such activity until mid to late November.

## 3 (A) UPDATE ON WEED CONTROL ACTI VI TI ES; AND (B) REPORT ON NORTH AMERI CAN I NVASI VE SPECI ES MANAGERS ASSOCI ATI ON CONVENTI ON - Brent Meyer, Lancaster County Weed Superintendent

Brent Meyer, Lancaster County Weed Superintendent, distributed information related to the North American Invasive Species Managers Association Convention and Weed Control Activities. (Exhibit A)
(B) Report on North American I nvasive Species Managers Association Convention

Meyer provided a brief overview of the convention. Some of the issues discussed included mapping, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and glyphosate research. He referenced a new national ad campaign - "Play, Clean, Go" - which encourages people to be aware of invasives before they move to the next trail, field, etc. It was spearheaded by the State of Minnesota who is allowing others to "buy in" to the campaign at no cost. Meyer said he will share this information with the Nebraska Weed Control Association.

## (A) Update on Weed Control Activities

Meyer discussed recent educational/training opportunities, roadside weed control, landowner spraying, LR309 (examine means to minimize conflicts resulting from phenoxy herbicides and sensitive crops) and 2014 inspections.

With regard to the application of herbicides such as 2,4 D and glyphosate (i.e., Round Up), Meyer said the key is education. It was noted that these chemicals should not be applied when wind speeds are in excess of 10 miles per hour or the temperature is over 85 degrees as warmer temperatures and humidity can cause vapor drift. Meyer added that new technologies should help minimize drift in the future.

Raybould exited the meeting at 8:48 a.m.
Meyer noted City weed abatements have increased 12\% and noxious weed inspections increased $22 \%$ as of September 30, 2014. Additionally, one case has been turned over to the County Attorney for prosecution.

## 4 LANCASTER COUNTY ZONI NG RESOLUTI ON TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 14013, EXTRACTI ON \& STONE MI LLI NG - Sara Hartzell, Planner II

Sara Hartzell, Planner II, gave an overview of Text Amendment No. 14013, Extraction \& Stone Milling. She said this issue arose in working with Gana Excavating and Trucking on the Schwarck Quarry on S. $54^{\text {th }}$ Street. Documented use of this quarry dated back to 1971 but it is believed that rocks from this site were used on downtown Lincoln buildings in the 1930s.

Raybould returned to the meeting at 8:52 a.m.
Hartzell noted that prior to 1979, such things as mining and processing of stone or timber were allowed uses in an agriculturally (AG) zoned district. In 1979 the zoning code was changed to allow for these activities under a Special Permit with moderate requirements. In the late 2000s, the demand for soil mines in the County increased due to the construction along Interstate 80. People in the area became concerned that these soil mines were not being closed out and the land returned to agriculture use, thus, a group was formed to better regulate excavation permits. Hartzell said at that time, amendments were made to both the County and City codes which focused on temporary soil mines but, when these conditions were applied to quarries, it was discovered they do not match. She said this text change is intended to provide "clean up" language, to define "stone milling" and to allow stone milling as an accessory use to excavation operations.

It was noted this item will be forwarded to a Tuesday County Board meeting for action.

## 5 PROBATI ON CONTRACT UPDATE - Sheli Schindler, Youth Services Center Director

Sheli Schindler, Youth Services Center Director, distributed a probation revenue update.
(Exhibit B) She said there is still not a contract in place as the State did not agree to the County's most recent request. A phone call to discuss the issue was held approximately four weeks ago and, to date, no response from the State has been received. Schindler added that she has been in touch with the State on a weekly basis.

With regard to the per diem, Schindler indicated she has been reviewing reports on the legislative web site submitted by Health \& Human Services, Office of Juvenile Services (HHS/OJ S) which reflect a $\$ 347$ per diem for youth detained at the Kearney and Geneva facilities (state owned). It was noted that Lancaster County has received no payments from the State since June, 2014.

In response to Raybould's inquiry, Schindler indicated that last she knew, Douglas, Madison and Scottsbluff Counties also did not have contracts in place with the State. She said she anticipated the State will pay something as LB 464 (change provisions relating to the juvenile justice system, arraignment, court jurisdiction, services for juveniles and families, and truancy) addresses their financial responsibilities. The anticipated revenue amount is \$979,717.25 (for J anuary-September, 2014).

Schindler verified that some of the billing difference prior to July, 2014, resulted from the lack of clarity regarding who (State or County) is responsible for certain payments. This issue was addressed through LB 464 but now the specifics, such as the per diem, are being negotiated. She added one reason for the delay in payment is that perhaps Probation was not allocated enough funds for detention.

It was suggested that juvenile probation issues be discussed at the upcoming Tri-County Meeting.

With regard to the increased detention numbers, Schindler said there are issues with some placements not accepting kids with certain behaviors, thus, they stay longer at the Detention Center. She felt if these services remain with the private sector, there will continue to be issues as private placements can refuse to accept a youth. Schindler added that behavioral health reform, in general, should also be considered.

In reference to the budget, Dennis Meyer, County Budget \& Fiscal Officer, confirmed that it is serious anytime revenue is down $\$ 1,000,000$. Schindler said billing/payment timeliness is a factor with both the County and the State, as is the billing structure. She added the cost of implementing a new billing system would then effect the per diem. Meyer felt the County should not front more money for this purpose when the State is not paying the current per diem. Schindler said it all comes down to the per diem and added that detention "costs what it costs" and these true costs are influenced by the Commission on Industrial Relations (CIR), jail standards and other care components. She confirmed the current per diem is $\$ 307$; the previous rate was $\$ 304$. Hudkins agreed that this is not an unreasonable amount, considering the State appears to be paying $\$ 347$ for youths detained in Kearney and Geneva. He added that the County also cannot continue to serve as the State's bank.

It was suggested to schedule additional discussion on juvenile probation issues at the October 30, 2014, County Board Staff Meeting and to invite Lori Griggs, Chief Probation Officer, J uvenile Probation, and J eanne Brandner, Deputy Administrator, Office of Probation Administration, Juvenile Services Division, to attend. Schindler said inviting someone from the judiciary may also be beneficial.

Raybould said it appears kids are staying longer in detention which is contrary to the intent of the recent juvenile probation initiative. Schindler clarified that a number of youth are repeat offenders who come in with a variety of different behaviors exhibited while they are under supervision, thus, these kids tend to stay in detention longer as their cases are more complex. But, subsequently, this also effects placements.

MOTION: Amundson moved and Raybould seconded to authorize Kerry Eagan and Sheli Schindler to draft a letter to J eanne Brandner requesting payment (for the housing of youth in accordance with LB 561 and LB 464) and her attendance at the October 30, 2014 staff meeting. Smoyer, Amundson, Raybould and Hudkins voted aye. Schorr was absent. Motion carried 4-0.

62015 LEGI SLATI VE PRI ORI TI ES - Gordon Kissel and J oe Kohout, Kissel/E\&S Associates

Gordon Kissel, Kissel/E\&S Associates, provided an overview of ongoing priorities: protecting inheritance tax, relieving state mandates to counties, seeking funding for sex offenders, expanding Medicaid and examining the 300,000 population threshold. He said juvenile
justice issues should also be included. Additionally, he noted that Senator Kate Bolz is interested in working on the issue of eliminating the responsibility of counties to pay rent for Health \& Human Services (HHS) facilities.

Amundson said she would like to see a change in the maximum pension contribution from $13 \%$ to $16 \%$ (at a 1 to 1 match) impacting only Lancaster County. Hudkins thought this might fit within the 300,000 population threshold. Additionally, he felt if the threshold number was increased, it would save a lot of time rewriting statutes.

Raybould said the County Board previously discussed a study addressing deferred compensation but not increasing the pension contribution. She had reservations about making it a "priority" before a study is performed. Hudkins noted many other factors would come into play for this change could be implemented. Kissel said he would discuss the idea with Senator Jeremy Nordquist, Chair of the Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee. Hudkins confirmed that this issue could fall under the 300,000 population threshold priority.

The 2014 Lancaster County Legislative Priorities list was distributed. (Exhibit C)
Smoyer exited the meeting at 9:27 a.m.
Eagan summarized priorities (in no specific order) as follows:

1. Property tax relief (to include such things as protecting inheritance tax, eliminating unfunded mandates and increasing fees);
2. Supporting Medicaid expansion;
3. Monitoring adult corrections reform;
4. Funding for community-based sex offender treatment;
5. Address Lancaster County's obligations under the 300,000 population threshold; and
6. Eliminate responsibility of counties to pay HHS rent.

Smoyer returned to the meeting at 9:30 a.m.
With regard to the 300,000 population threshold, Eagan felt a more in-depth approach may be needed than simply raising the threshold.

Smoyer said funding for bridges and roads should also be considered.
Eagan said another item to include under property tax relief is "restore state aid to counties."
In response to Raybould's inquiry, Eagan said a number of priorities could fall under property tax relief but suggested that HHS rent and Medicaid expansion remain separate because previous legislation has been introduced on those issues.

Hudkins suggested that the monitoring of LB 561 (change provisions and transfer the responsibilities regarding the juvenile justice system) be included as a priority. Eagan said the lack of payment is an administrative, rather than legislative, issue. Hudkins felt it is a
legislative issue if the State has not allocated appropriate funds to fulfill their obligations. The consensus was to include "sufficient appropriations for juvenile justice" under property tax relief.

It was noted the priorities will be placed on the October 14, 2014 County Board of Commissioners meeting agenda for approval.

## $71 \& 6$ YEAR ROAD AND BRI DGE CONSTRUCTI ON PROGRAM - Pam Dingman, County Engineer

Pam Dingman, County Engineer, distributed the following handouts:

1. Article entitled, "Meeting a Federal Highway Trust Fund Crisis" (Exhibit D)
2. Article entitled, "Why the Highway Trust Fund is Doomed to go Broke" (Exhibit E)
3. $1 \& 6$ Year Road and Bridge Construction Program for Fiscal Year 2015 (Exhibit F)
4. Map of the Proposed Highway Improvement Program - Fiscal Year 2015 (Exhibit G)
5. Map of the Proposed Highway Improvement Program - Fiscal Years 2016-2020

## (Exhibit H)

6. Map of ADT \& Movement (Exhibit I)
7. Map of Graded Roads (Exhibit J)
8. Map of the Proposed Highway Improvement Program - Fiscal Year 2015 (enlarged) (Exhibit K)

Dingman thanked Mike Brienzo, Transportation Planner, Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department, for his assistance with this process.

With regard to funding sources, Dingman said, "the system is broken from the top to the bottom." She recently testified at two hearings regarding bonding for county bridges (LR 528 - interim study to examine issues surrounding financing the maintenance and replacement of county bridges) and recommended the County monitor this issue. Dingman also noted that the County Board reduced her 2014-15 budget in order to balance the County's budget and felt strongly that there needs to be a road and bridge funding solution in order to maintain these structures going forward.

Raybould exited the meeting at 9:46 a.m.
Dingman discussed a recent bridge closure near $176^{\text {th }}$ Street and Waverly Road and pointed out that the age and style of the bridge made it very difficult to repair. She also noted that her employees are extremely committed to keeping the County's infrastructure operational and safe.

Raybould returned to the meeting at 9:48 a.m.
Dingman provided an overview of the $1 \& 6$ Year Road and Bridge Construction Program for Fiscal Year 2015. She highlighted the projects which were completed in fiscal year 2014 as well as carryover projects (see Exhibit F).

In reference to Exhibit K, Dingman said the map shows road projects which will be coordinated with the City of Lincoln through interlocal agreements.

Dingman pointed out that no replacement bridges are included in the proposed plan. She added there are 297 bridges in Lancaster County and each has a 50 -year life span. In order to keep up with bridge replacement, six bridges would need to be replaced annually, although, this number has been drastically reduced over the years. Dingman cautioned the County Board about "kicking the can down the road" with regard to bridge replacement.

Dingman also suggested better criteria be developed for placing roads in the $1 \& 6$ Year Program so the County is not simply appeasing constituents (i.e., some of the roads have been on the list for 20 years). She added the program also needs to be constrained by the amount of anticipated funding.

It was noted the public hearing on the $1 \& 6$ Year Road and Bridge Construction Program for Fiscal Year 2015 will be held on October 28, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. Dingman said a press release was sent and notices were mailed to all schools, towns and villages.

## 8 CITY-COUNTY ROAD INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT - Roger Figard, City Engineer; Pam Dingman, County Engineer

Roger Figard, City Engineer, appeared and said the Board of Public Roads (which is under the authority of the Nebraska Legislature) has been working diligently on an initiative to create 3 R standards for County roads and municipal bridges. If approved, this would allow agencies to perform heavier maintenance and/or deck repair under the old design standards, whereby local funds could be stretched without compromising safety. He encouraged the County Board to support the initiative should it come forward.

Figard thanked Dingman and Brittany Behrens, Deputy County Attorney, for their assistance in bringing forth this document. He said it will enable the County and the City of Lincoln to make better and more efficient use of resources by allowing the City to grade, pave, build, etc., a road, with the County Engineer's approval, that is anticipated to be annexed into the City in the near future (1-10 years) and pay for the work. In the interim, the County would perform the maintenance and get reimbursed by the City until the road is annexed. Figard provided examples of how this collaboration would work along NW 48 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street and 70th-84th Streets north of Rokeby Road.

It was noted this item is currently before the City Council and would likely be placed on next Tuesday's County Board agenda.

Eagan questioned whether road and bridge funding should be discussed at the Tri-County Meeting on October $23^{\text {rd }}$. Dingman indicated she has a conflict on that day but could send a representative from her office and/or written materials. She said another person who could address this topic would be Mark Mainelli of Mainelli Wagner \& Associates, Inc.

## 9 RAYMOND VOLUNTARY I NCOME TAX ASSI STANCE (VITA) PROGRAM Kit Boesch, Human Services Director

Kit Boesch, Human Services Director, requested \$1,000 to fund a Voluntary Income Tax Assistance (VITA) site in Raymond. The program assists low income citizens in filing tax returns. She stated that Community Action Program previously funded 13-15 sites in Lincoln but has since lost their federal grant resources. Due to the success of the program, CAP will continue to fund the Lincoln sites but Boesch thought it would be valuable to add a county site. It was noted that these funds would cover supervisory staff, which is a requirement of the program. Other support is provided by volunteers and facility rental is typically donated.

Various funding options were discussed, as was the economic benefit to the Raymond. Boesch said refunds could be tracked to see how much is being returned to area citizens.

In response to Amundson's inquiry, Boesch said no other communities have requested VITA sites to her knowledge.

MOTION: Raybould moved and Smoyer seconded to authorize payment up to $\$ 1,000$ for supervisory support at a Voluntary Income Tax Assistance (VITA) Program site in Raymond, Nebraska, and to direct the County Attorney to draft the necessary contract with the funding source to be determined by the County Budget \& Fiscal Officer.

Amundson asked Boesch to keep the Board apprized as to utilization. Boesch said she will inquire about the number of people served and the supervisor hours/cost. Hudkins suggested that the hours of operation be advertised in the Malcolm Clipper and The Nebline.

ROLL CALL: Raybould, Smoyer, Amundson and Hudkins voted aye. Schorr was absent. Motion carried 4-0.

## 10 ACTION ITEMS

There were no action items.

## 11 CONSENT ITEMS

There were no consent items.

## 12 ADMI NI STRATI VE OFFI CER REPORT

A. Tuesday Staff Meeting (Between October 9 and 23, 2014)

It was noted there will not be staff meetings on October 16 and October 23. The consensus of the Board was to schedule a meeting on Tuesday, October $21^{\text {st }}$ if necessary.

## B. Air Carrier Refund

Eagan said Atlantic Southeast Airlines is due a refund on centrally assessed property based on a recent Tax Equalization and Review Commission (TERC) decision. Lancaster County's obligation for tax years 2006-2009 is $\$ 37,508.25$. Eagan said he would work with Dennis Meyer, County Budget \& Fiscal Officer, on how to proceed with payment.

## C. Tri-County Meeting Agenda (October 23, 2014)

Eagan said the Sarpy County Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Program will now be presented by Sarpy County Attorney Mike Smith. Douglas County has also requested discussion on Statewide Enhanced 911.

Raybould asked if the DUI and legislative agenda discussions could be switched. Eagan felt it was important to retain the legislative agenda discussion at 9:30 a.m., since it is the primary focus of the meeting. He added that the DUI program was grandfathered and is now prohibited by State law. He felt it would be difficult to attempt to expand it. Thorpe said this issue may also come up as the State considers adult corrections reform.

Other discussion topics included bridge and road funding and juvenile probation contracts.

## D. Pension Study on Contribution Rates

Eagan suggested that he work with Frank Picarelli, Vice President, Segal Rogerscasey (Pension Plan Consultant) and Prudential to see who could perform this type of study and how much it would cost. He added that lowering the contribution rate now could actually cost the County more in the long term. Another factor is that some unions no longer receive contributions to a post employment health plan (PEHP) - a program which helps fund the retirement gap. Eagan said the study will be discussed at the next Pension Review Committee meeting. Raybould said she would also follow up with her contact at Ameritas to see if they have any additional information available on this issue.

In response to Smoyer's inquiry, Eagan said a salary (comparability) study for the unrepresented employees has not be done for many years and it would be a massive undertaking. (Note: A salary study has been performed on all union positions more recently to assure comparability with other counties in the array.) He said a salary study would be separate from the compensation study. Smoyer suggested contacting Doug McDaniel, Human Resources Director, to see what it would take to "get the ball rolling" with regard to reviewing the unrepresented salaries. Amundson agreed that such a study should be done. Eagan said there would likely be some cost involved.

Hudkins asked if the study on contribution rates could be funded through the employee expense account. Eagan said this may warrant another County Attorney opinion as that fund must be used for the exclusive benefit of the pension plan participants.

MOTION: Amundson moved and Smoyer seconded to authorize Kerry Eagan to seek a County Attorney's opinion on whether funds from the employees expense account can be used to fund the contribution study.

After further discussion the motion was withdrawn, with the understanding that Eagan would pursue a legal opinion on the contribution study.

## 13 PENDI NG

There were no pending items.

## 14 DI SCUSSI ON OF BOARD MEMBER MEETI NGS

There were no meetings listed.

## 15 EMERGENCY ITEMS AND OTHER BUSI NESS

Item moved forward on agenda.

## 16 ADJ OURNMENT

MOTI ON: Raybould moved and Amundson seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:56 a.m. Amundson, Smoyer, Raybould and Hudkins voted aye. Schorr was absent. Motion carried 4-0.


Thank you for allowing me to attend this conference. With invasive managers from Alberta, BC, Alaska, Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Colorado, New Mexico, California, Wyoming, Montana, and many other states and Federal Agencies. This is a great organization, and a very informative conference.

NAISMA - North American Invasive Species Management Association Conference in Fargo, ND

Monday - Education Summit and Committee meetings

- Education Summit - CLEAN, PLAY, GO - National ad campaign to encourage folks to be aware of invasives and clean their boots, equipment, etc., before they move to the next trail, field, etc. www.playcleango.org

- Professional Improvement, Certified Manger of Invasive Plants certification
- Mapping Standards, updating the national minimum mapping standards

Tuesday - General session and NDSU tour

- Dr. Rod Lym - NDSU on the success story of leafy spurge control in North Dakota
- Leafy spurge has been on ND noxious list since 1935, NE not until 1962
- Terry Fleck - "Attitude Dr." www.attitudedr.com
- Tour of NDSU Agricultural Research facilities

Wednesday - General session and Breakout sessions

- Dr. John Nowatzki - Use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, crop scouting, mapping of weeds and the future of UAV's
- Research - What goes into making research successful
- Bio control - Niobrara High School, NE on the national award winning bio control project
- Glyphosate research - Very technical presentation on glyphosate and resistance
- Invasive Grasses Identification - More invasive grasses may be joining phragmites
- NPDES - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Waters of the United States
- EDRR - Early Detection Rapid Response, How to organize private, local, state and federal agencies to all work together

2015 Conference - Vancouver, BC, Canada

2016 Conference - Salt Lake City, UT

- Education
- UNL Plant Pathology Class tour of phragmites
- Master Naturalist Invasive Species ID Course - 3 presentations
- County Engineering training
- Private Applicator Trainings - 3
- Nebraska Department of Roads Noxious weed training
- Chasity Smetter - Lincoln Southeast student doing her Senior Project on phragmites
- Fall control of phragmites, leafy spurge and sericea lespedeza on roadsides is complete.
- Private landowner spraying of phragmites is at about $80 \%$
- LR 309 - Agriculture Committee, Examine Means to Minimize Conflicts Resulting from Phenoxy Herbicides and Sensitive Crops. Working Group is focusing on more education, training, etc. vs legislation. Dow AgroSciences new Enlist Duo technology is to be tested next growing season. New generation of 2,4 D + glyphosate technology.
- 2014 Inspections - Through September 30, 2014
a. Weed Abatement $-7,557$ inspections ( $+12 \%$ ) on 3,436 properties $(+15.03 \%$ )
b. Noxious Weeds $-2,689$ inspections ( $+22.44 \%$ ) on 1,888 properties $(+12.56 \%)$
i. One case has been turned over to the County Attorney to prosecute


## Probation Revenue Update

|  | Billed | Received | Anticipate Receiving | Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| October 2013 | \$139,587.00 | \$56,028.00 | \$0.00 | For days prior to $10 / 1 / 13$, violations of home detention and electronic monitor |
| November 2013 | \$104,121.00 | \$62,859.00 | \$0.00 | For days prior to $10 / 1 / 13$, violations of home detention and electronic monitor |
| December 2013 | \$90,942.00 | \$61,479.00 | \$0.00 | Violations of home detention |
| January 2014 | \$171,741.00 | \$50,922.00 | \$5,451.00 | Violations of home detention or electronic monitor. Anticipated revenue is one where probationary status was questioned. |
| February 2014 | \$174,322.00 | \$115,989.00 | \$11,070.00 | Violations of home detention. Anticipated revenue is one where probationary status was questioned and the difference in rates ( $\$ 276$ vs. $\$ 304$ ). |
| March 2014 | \$162,465.00 | \$74,313.00 | \$21,532.00 | Violations of home detention or electronic monitor. Youth held on adult charges. Anticipated revenue is one where probationary status was questioned, youth ordered to a YRTC, and the difference in rates (\$276 vs. \$304). |
| April 2014 | \$189,848.00 | \$96,876.00 | \$27,797.00 | Violations of home detention. Anticipated revenue is one where probationary status was questioned, a couple drug court stays, and the difference in rates ( $\$ 276$ vs. $\$ 304$ ). |
| May 2014 | \$102,144.00 | \$50,094.00 | \$16,163.00 | Violations of home detention or electronic monitor. Anticipated revenue is one where probationary status was questioned and the difference in rates ( $\$ 276 \mathrm{vs}$. $\$ 304$ ). |
| June 2014 | \$253,046.31 | \$226,044.00 | \$25,972.00 | Anticipated revenue is one where probationary status was questioned, incorrect amounts of days were paid, and the difference in rates ( $\$ 276$ vs. $\$ 304$ ). |
| July 2014 | \$245,399.00 | \$0.00 | \$232,623.50 | Invoices sent 30+ days ago |
| August 2014 | \$211,581.50 | \$0.00 | \$211,581.50 | Invoices sent 15+ days ago |
| September 2014 | \$427,527.25 | \$0.00 | \$427,527.25 | Invoices sent 2 days ago |
| Totals | \$2,272,724.06 | \$794,604.00 | \$979,717.25 |  |

## 1. Oppose Elimination of Inheritance Tax

Elimination of the inheritance tax would have a devastating effect on Lancaster County. In FY 2010 11 Lancaster County collected $\$ 6,685,528$ of inferitance tax, equivalent to a $3.5 \phi$ property tax Levy and almost $14 \%$ of the entire property tax levy for that budget year. In FY 2011-12 the County collected $\$ 8,185,277$ of inheritance tax, equivalent to a 4.34 levy and $17 \%$ of the entire levy. Last fiscal year the County collected $\$ 8.6$ million of inheritance tax, again equivalent to a 4.34 property tax levy and more than $15 \%$ of the entire property tax levy

## 2. Support Expansion of Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act

Lancaster County expends over $\$ 2$ million a year for General Assistance medical services, If Medicaid is expanded under the Affordable Care Act, virtually all of these medical services would be covered by Medicaid.

## 3. Monitor the Implementation of 2013 Neb. Laws LB 561

LB 561 makes many positive changes to the juvenile justice system. Lancaster County supports the emphasis on commanity-based treatment instead of incarceration, and strongly believes that providing services in the conmunaty is not only less expensive that incarceration and out-of-home placements; but also more effective. However, Lancaster County also has serious concerns about LB 561 . Under this Bill the Nebraska Juvenile Probation Office assumes the lead role for community superyision, evaluations, treatment, and re-entry from the Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Centers (YRTC). The Juvenile Probation Office in Lancaster County is hiring 43 new juvenile probation officers to perform its new duties under LB 561. By statute, the County is obligated to provide these new employees with office space and equipment. Another concern is that if the State fails to adequately fimd the services and programs implemented by Juvenile Probation under LB 561 , then counties are statutorily obligated to annually appropriate a fund to pay for these services and programs until suitable funding can be found. See Neb. Rey. Stat. $8843-284,286$, and 290. Lancaster County will carefilly monitor the implementation of LB 561 . The County will work closely with the State and NACO in the upcoming legislative session to help guarantee the success of juvenile justice reform, while at the same time guarding against the shifting of State responsibilities and costs to the counties.

## 4. Eliminate Responsibility of Comnties to Pay HHS rent (LB 632)

When the State assumed responsibility for welfare, a legislative provision was added requiring counties to maintain facilities for the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as they existed on April 1, 1983. See Neb. Rev. Stat. \$68-130. Although some relief from this antiquated statute was provided in 2011 Neb. Laws LB 234 (allowing payment reductions for HHS space eliminated since 1983 and determining whether additional space can be eliminated), the use of local property tax to pay for HHS facilities should be eliminated in its entirety. This is especially true in light of the State's total elimination of state aid to counties. LB 632 will accomplish this purpose.

## 5. Monitor Adult Corrections Reform

Prison overcrowding in Nebraska is at a critical stage. Possible solutions being discussed by the Legislature could result in housing more state prisoners in county jails, thereby shifting the financial burden to counties. Lancaster County will carefully monitor prison reform, and strongly oppose solutions which transfer state responsibilities to the counties.
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## INDUSTRY

## Meeting a Federal Highway Trust Fund Crisis

By Public Works Staff

On Feb. 28, 1961, President John F. Kennedy recognized a threat to the nation's future economic growth and acted accordingly.

The problem: The user-based revenue stream going into the Highway Trust Fund was not sufficient to sustain the levei of authorizations necessary to keep the highway program running without going into deficit spending.

The solution: Kennedy offered what he called "A New Plan to Finance the Highway Program." He urged Congress to sustain the federal gas-tax revenue stream and increase the user fees on trucks.

The outcome: On June 29, 1961, Congress approved the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961, (Public Law 87-61). The Highway Trust Fund crisis was averted. Construction of the $41,000-$ mile interstate Highway System and ongoing improvements to the 848,677 miles of state roads deemed worthy of federal investment due to their importance to the nation's economy and security continued.

So what's the crisis today? The problem with the gas tax as a revenue generator is that the rate has been frozen for 20 years and has never been indexed, or adjusted, to keep pace with inflation or to meet identified needs. If Congress had indexed the 1961 federal gas-tax rate of $\$ 0.04 /$ gallon to future annual inflation, the gas tax alone would generate almost $\$ 56$ billion this year for Highway Trust Fund investments and there would be no 2014 HTF crisis looming on Oct 1 that could shut off federal investment for state transportation department highway, bridge, and transit projects during FY 2015.
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## Why the Highway Trust Fund is doomed to go broke

By Stephanie Johnston


This chart shows when the U.S. DOT expects Highway Trust Fund obligations to exceed revenues, which is a fancy way of saying "broke." At that point, money from the U.S. Treasury will have to be transferred into the fund to keep road and bridge work nationwide from ceasing (they've already begun to slow down)

Congress has approved $\$ 50$ billion over the last six years to keep the fund from going broke. While that tactic keeps projects going, it doesn't solve the underlying problem: As assets age, the formula for feeding the trust fund will never meet U.S. DOT- estimated demand for repair and rehabilitation: $\$ 16$ billion every year.

The authors of a bipartisan Senate proposal that would stop emergency transfers once and for all know it won't happen by mid-August. They just hope their plan dovetails with work the House is doing in such a way as to increase the likelihood of their bill becoming law.

12 CENTS OVER 2 YEARS

The proposal comes from Sens. Chris Murphy (D-Conn.) and Bob Corker (R-Tenn.):

- Add 6 cents to the price of a gallon of gasoline (currently 18.3 cents) and diesel (now 24.3 cents) this year and next.

Result: annual revenues increase from $\$ 34$ billion annually to between $\$ 49$ billion and $\$ 68$ billion annually.

Asking Americans to pay more at the pump isn't as crazy as you'd think, say Corker and Murphy. They cite a recent AAA survey in which respondents belleve taxing fuel is the right funding mechanism and are willing to pay more to lower commute times and vehicle damage. (Americans also say they'll pay more for water, but look what happens whenever you propose a rate increase.)

- Return to indexing the increase to infiation using the Consumer Price Index, like we did during the 1980 s . The tax would now be 30 cents per galion if it'd been indexed to inflation when President Bush added 4.3 cents 21 years ago.

Result: ensures there's enough money to meet future need.

A Portland Cement Association analysis (request a copy), however, says the proposal would raise $\$ 46$ billion more than the senators' estimated $\$ 164$ billion over 10 years: $\$ 210$ billion.

That won't matter, though, if the White House continues opposing any and all tax increases. The Obama administration's solution:

- Raise $\$ 150$ billion by reforming the corporate tax code.
- Let state DOTs collect tolls on interstate highways.


## Realistic? Nope, say critics

## 4 OTHER WAYS TO BEAT THE DEADLINE

1. May 30 Cut Saturday postal delivery. The House of Representatives says delivering everything except priority and express mail just five days a week would raise almost $\$ 11$ bition over the next decade and keep the Highway Trust Fund solvent until May 2015. Realistic? No: House Appropriations Committee killed the idea.
2. Steal from another fund that the gas tax supports. Having collected 0.1 cents of fuel tax revenue per gallon sold since 1986, EPA's Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) program is sitting on almost $\$ 4$ billion. It spends only $\$ 100$ million annually, so the Senate figures that giving $\$ 3$ billion to the Highway Trust Fund is a no-brainer. Realistic? Still under consideration.
3. Give corporations a one-time tax break. Lexuing multinational companies deduct $85 \%$ of the income their overseas operations make would raise $\$ 20$ billion to $\$ 30$ billion in two years, say Sens. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) and Harry Reid (D.-Nev.) Realistic? No, not enough time to hammer out the details on something that critics say would end up costing money.
4. Eliminate federal funding entirely. Introduced by Rep. Tom Graves (R-Ga.) and Sen. Mike Lee (RUtah), the Transportation Empowerment Act lowers the federal gas tax to 3.7 cents over five years while transferring all authority over federal highway and transit programs to the states. Realistic? Maybe.

Everyone talks about how public roads should be paid for with public funds, but must that funding flow to the feds and then back to the states? Especially when more states (and municipalities) are taking matters into their own hands by increasing - with voter support - their fuel taxes?

According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials/U.S. DOT Center for Excellence in Project Finance, the Highway Trust Fund was established by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956 to build highways and help finance primary, secondary, and urban routes.

Our challenge today isn't building roads and bridges; it's maintaining them. So maybe the time has come to turn the system on its head.

What do you think? How would you keep the fund from going broke? Would you care if it did? Why (or why not)? E-mail me at sjohnston@hanleywood.com

And have a safe July Fourth holiday weekend out on those roads.
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## FISCAL YEAR 2015



## LANGASTER COUNTY, NE

LANCASTER COUNTY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
444 CHERRYCREEK ROAD, BLDG. C
LINCOLN, NE 68528


Normally projects that are programmed for work in Fiscal Year 2015 are also included in Fiscal Years 2016-2020 being advanced one step.

Projects that are included in Fiscal Year 2015 program on a "stand-by" basis are repeated in the Fiscal Years 2016-2020 program listings at the next advanced step. They are included on the Fiscal Years 2016-2020 map of programmed work at the advanced step.

The County Board has indicated that unless projects are included in the Comprehensive Plan's "Future Paved County Street and Road Network" that they will not be approved for pavement unless the Comprehensive Plan is amended accordingly. Therefore, in such instances, projects are not advanced in the 2016-2020 listings.


FISCAL 2015
$\mathrm{C}=$ County $\quad \$ 3,413,017$
$\mathrm{L}=$ City of Lincoln $\$ 405,879$
ROADS

| ROAD OR STREET | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | ACTUAL COST | SCHEDULED FOR IMPROVEMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\text { South } 98^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-K-412(2) | Local | N.A. | Lancaster | W-25 | 1.0 Mile | Right-Of-Way | $\begin{aligned} & 405,879 \text { (C) } \\ & 405,879 \text { (L) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2003 |
| Firth Rd. | C55-XY-402(5) | Other Arterial | Pavement | South Pass Panama | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{s}-25,26 \\ & \mathrm{~s}-27,28,29,30 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 5.2 Miles | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage <br> Pavement | 828,460 | 2014 |
| Pine Lake Road | C55-Q-409(1) | Local | Gravel | Stockton | S-16,17,18 | 2.5 Miles | Grading \& Structures | 414,199 | 2014 |
| Roca Road | C55-R-401(2) | Other Arterial | Pavement | Nemaha | S-15,16,17,18 | 3.7 Miles | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage <br> Pavement | 570,134 | 2014 |
| Saltillo Road | C55-PQ-406(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | Stockton Grant | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{s}-31 \\ & \mathrm{~s}-36 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1.6 Miles | Pavement | 589,823 | 2014 |
| Sprague <br> Road | C55-U-401(4) | Other Arterial | Pavement | Highland | S-25,26,27,28 | 4.0 Miles | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage <br> Pavement | 604,522 | 2014 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

ROADS
PROJECTS CARRIED OVER FROM FISCAL 2012

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { STREET } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | PROJECT No. | CLASSIFICATION | EXISting SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | DESIGN STANDARD | ESTIMATED COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N. } 27^{\text {nh }} \\ & \text { Street } \end{aligned}$ | C55-C-407(2) | Local | Gravel | 166-255 | North Bluff | W-18,19 | 1.5 Miles | ROW | ROA-1 | 120,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PROJECTS CARRIED OVER FROM FISCAL 2013

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROAD } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | PROJECT No. | CLASSIFICATION | Existing SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DESIGN } \\ & \text { STANDARD } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESTIMATED } \\ & \text { COST } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S. } 68^{\text {th }} \\ & \text { Street } \end{aligned}$ | C55-5-401(5) | Other Arterial | Pavement | $\begin{aligned} & 4,982- \\ & 5,251 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Saltillo | W-22,27 | 1.3 Miles | ROW | ROA-1 | 100,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ROADS
PROJECTS CARRIED OVER FROM FISCAL 2014

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROAD } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | PROJECT No. | CLASSIFICATION | EXISting SURFACE | A.d.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | dESIGN STANDARD | ESTIMATED COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McKelvie Road | C55--405(1) | Local | Gravel | 82-121 | Oak | S-21,22, 23 | 3.0 Miles | ROW | ROA-1 | 120,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
C = County $3,948,000
L = City of Lincoln $1,800,000
```

| ROAD OR STREET | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | DESIGN STANDARD | ESTIMATED COSt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North 27th Street | C55-C-407(2) | Local | Gravel | 166-255 | North Bluff | W-18,19 | 1.5 Miles | Grading and Structures | ROA-1 | 245,000 |
| ${ }^{*}$ NW 48 ${ }^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. | C55-L-410(3) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 11,409 | W. LincolnCarfield | In-29 | 1.0 Mile | Pavement | Urban section | *1,100,000(L) |
| South $54^{\text {th }}$ <br> Street | C55-5-405(3) | Local | Gravel | 174-223 | Saltillo | W-21,28 | 2.0 Miles | Grading and structures | ROA-1 | 340,000 |
| *South $70^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-P-412(1) | Local | Pavement | 2858-5787 | Crant | W-22,27,34 | 2.0 Miles | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage Pavement | N/A | *340,000(L) |
| S. $110^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-R-402(2) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 246-338 | Nemaha | W-30,31 | 1.0 Mile | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage Pavement | N/A | 175,000 |
| Bluff Road | C55-H-402(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 265-344 | Waverly | S-15,14 | 2.0 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 800,000 |
| * Holdrege St. | C55-JK-408(4) | Local | Pavement | 1787-2587 | Lancaster Stevens Creek | $\begin{aligned} & s-13,14 \\ & s-16,17,18 \end{aligned}$ | 3.2 Miles | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage Pavement | N/A | *560,000(L) |
| Pine Lake Rd. | C55-P-408(2) | Local | Pavement | 1001 | Crant | S-13 | 1.0 Mile | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage <br> Pavement | N/A | 175,000 |
| *Rokeby Rd. | C55-P-427(2) | Local | Gravel | 50 | Crant | S-26,27 | 1.25 Miles | Grading and Structures | RUTS | *700,000(L) |
| E. Van Dorn Street | C55-J-409(3) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 472 | Stevens Creek | S-31 | 0.5 Mile | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage Pavement | N/A | 88,000 |
| *W. Van Dorn Street | C55-LM-404(2) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 1459-4611 | Middle Creek W. LincolnGarfield | $\begin{aligned} & s-35,36 \\ & s-31,32,33 \end{aligned}$ | 4.0 Miles | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage Pavement | N/A | *700,000(L) |
| Wagon Train Road | C55-5-406(2) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 468 | Saltillo | In 36 | 1.0 Mile | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage Pavement | N/A | 175,000 |

[^0]-Transfer into One Year Plan-

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { STREET } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROJECT } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | DESIGN STANDARD | EStIMATED COSt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street | C55-0-412(1) | Local | Gravel | 371 | Yankee Hill | W-2 | 0.5 Mile | ROW | ROA-1 | 12,000 |
| SW 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ St. | C55-0-413(2) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 678-1236 | Yankee Hill | W-22,27 | 2.0 Miles | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage Pavement | N/A | 350,000 |
| N. $112^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. | C55-J-401(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 309-316 | Stevens Creek | W-18,19 | 2.0 Miles | Engineering | RUTS | 60,000 |
| N. $141^{\text {st }} \mathrm{St}$. | C55-\#11 | Local | Dirt | 8 | Mill | In 16 | 1.0 Mile | Rock Surfacing | RL-3 | 8,000 |
| S. $162^{\text {na }} \mathrm{st}$. | C55-\#109 | Local | Dirt | 17 | Nemaha | W-14 | 0.25 Mile | Rock Surfacing | RL-3 | 2,000 |
| W. Agnew Road | C55-D-401(2) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 303 | West Oak | S-12 | 0.1 Mile | Pavement | ROA-1 | 50,000 |
| W. Alvo Road | C55-F-406(3) | Local | N/A | 0 | Oak | In 34 | 0.2 Mile | Grading, Rock Surfacing | RUTS | 20,000 |
| Ashland Rd | C55-\#14 | Local | Dirt | 6 | Mill | N-3 | 0.65 Mile | Rock Surfacing | RL-3 | 5,200 |
| Bennet Road | C55-\#116 | Local | Dirt | 28 | Saltillo | S-2 | 0.4 Mile | Rock Surfacing | RL-3 | 3,200 |
| East Beltway | DPU (156) | Expressway | N/A | N/A | Stockton <br> Stevens Creek <br> Waverly | In 29,20,17,8,5 In 32,29,20,17,8,5 In 32, 29 | $13.0$ Miles | Engineering, <br> ROW | DR-2 | $\begin{array}{r} 600,000(\mathrm{~L}) \\ 600,000(\mathrm{C}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| W. Little Salt Road | C55-\#37 | Local | Dirt | 6 | Little Salt | S-2 | 1.0 Mile | Rock Surfacing | RL-3 | 8,000 |
| Rokeby Road | C55-0-410(2) | Collector | Pavement | 362 | Yankee Hill | S-27 | 0.5 Mile | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage <br> Pavement | N/A | 88,000 |
| Wittstruck <br> Road | C55-\#108 | Local | Dirt | 13-18 | Nemaha | S-10,11 | 1.2 Miles | Rock Surfacing | RL-3 | 9,600 |

## ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2015
BRIDGES
PROJECTS COMPLETED IN FISCAL 2014

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROAD } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | COUNTY BRIDGE No. | ROADWAY WIDTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | ACTUAL COST | $\begin{gathered} \text { SCHEDULED } \\ \text { FOR } \\ \text { CONSTRUCTION } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Bridge Completed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2015
BRIDGES

| ROAD OR STREET | PROJECT | Classification | Existing SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | COUNTY BRIDGE NO. | ROADWAY WIDTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H}- \\ \text { LOADING } \end{gathered}$ | estimated COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Bridge Scheduled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

LANCASTER COUNTY
ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2015
BRIDGES
STANDBY BRIDGES

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROAD } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { STREET } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PROJECT | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | COUNTY BRIDGE No. | ROADWAY WIDTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H}- \\ \text { LOADING } \end{gathered}$ | ESTIMATED COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West Raymond Rd. | C55-C-91 | Other Arterial | Asphalt | 1,394 | Little Salt | s-34 | C-91 | $32 '$ | $140^{\prime}$ C.C.S. | HL-93 | 1,200,000 |
| N. $14^{\text {th }}$ St. | C55-F-88 | Other Arterial | Asphalt | 3,022 | Oak | W-12 | F-88 | $40^{\prime}$ | $125^{\prime}$ c.c.s. | HL-93 | 1,300,000 |
| Firth Rd. | C55-x-205 | Other Arterial | Asphalt | 883 | South Pass | s-28 | X-205 | $32 \cdot$ | $145^{\prime}$ c.c.s. | HL-93 | 960,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



ROADS

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { STREET } \end{aligned}$ | PROJECT NO. | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | A.D.T. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | DESIGN STANDARD | ESTIMATED COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S. $1^{\text {st }}$ Street | C55-0-408(4) | Local | Gravel | 217 | Yankee Hill | W-11 | 1.0 Mile | Pavement | ROA-1 | 400,000 |
| N. 7th Street | C55-F-418(1) | Local | Dirt \& Gravel | 14-99 | Oak | In 26 \& 35 | 1.5 Miles | Engineering | RL-1 | 20,000 |
| SW 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ <br> Street | RS-532(14) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 286-321 | Centerville | W-15,10 | 2.0 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 800,000 |
| N. $14^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-F-417(2) | Other Arterial | Pavement | $\begin{aligned} & 2,920- \\ & 3,082 \end{aligned}$ | Oak | W-13,24,25 | 2.5 Mile | Engineering | ROA-1 | 45,000 |
| N. $14^{\text {th }}$ <br>  <br> Waverly <br> Road | C55-F-417(3) | Other Arterial | Pavement Gravel | 232-3,022 | Oak | $\begin{aligned} & s-11,12 \\ & \mathrm{~W}-12,13 \end{aligned}$ | 1.0 Mile | Pavement, Grading \& Structures | ROA-1 | 600,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S. } 25^{\text {th }} \\ & \text { street } \end{aligned}$ | C55-T-404(1) | Local | Gravel | 134-243 | Centerville | In-1,12 | 1.5 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 20,000 |
| NW $27^{\text {th }}$ <br> Street | C55-F-415(3) | Collector | Gravel | 212-268 | Oak | W-16,21,28 | 3.0 Miles | ROW | ROA-1 | 80,000 |
| NW 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-F-419(1) | Local | Gravel | 32-66 | Oak | W-32,29,20,17 | 3.5 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 40,000 |
| SW 42 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street | C55-TW-401(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 138-192 | Centerville Buda | $\begin{aligned} & W-20,29,32 \\ & W-5,8,17 \end{aligned}$ | 5.5 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 55,000 |
| *NW 48 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-F-414(2) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 3,577 | Oak | In 31 | 0.8 Mile | Engineering (4 Lanes) | Urban Section | *20,000 |
| $\mathrm{S} .54^{\mathrm{th}}$ Street | C55-5-405(3) | Local | Gravel | 174-223 | Saltillo | W-21,28 | 2.0 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 800,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S. } 68^{\text {th }} \\ & \text { Street } \end{aligned}$ | STPE-3265(7) | Other Arterial | Pavement | $\begin{aligned} & 4,982- \\ & 5,251 \end{aligned}$ | Saltillo | W-22,27 | 1.3 Miles | Grading \& Structures, Pavement | ROA-1 | 1,500.00 |

ROADS

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROAD } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { STREET } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING <br> SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | DESIGN STANDARD | ESTIMATED COSt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S. $82^{\text {nd }}$ Street | C55-S-404(4) | Local | Gravel | 238-259 | Saltillo | W-2,11,14 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5 \\ & \text { Miles } \end{aligned}$ | Grading \& Structures | ROA-1 | 300,000 |
| NW 84 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-EM- 401(1) | Collector | Gravel | 199-253 | Elk Middle Creek | W-35 <br> W-11 \& 2 | 3.0 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 1,200,000 |
| S. $96^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-x-403(2) | Local | Gravel | 314-378 | South Pass | W-36 | 1.0 Mile | Engineering | ROA-1 | 15,000 |
| S. $98^{\text {th }}$ <br> Street | C55-KP-412(1) | Local | Gravel | 242 | Grant | W-1 | 0.7 Mile | Paving | RUTS | 300,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S. } 98^{\mathrm{th}} \\ & \text { Street } \end{aligned}$ | C55-K-412(2) | Local | N.A. | 0 | Lancaster | W-25 | 1.0 Mile | Grading \& Structures | RUTS | 200,000 |
| S. $98^{\text {th }}$ <br> Street | C55-KP-412(3) | Local | Gravel | 188 | Lancaster | W-36 | 1.1 Miles | Pavement | RUTS | 440,000 |
| S. $98^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-KP-412(2) | Local | Gravel | 400 | Grant | W-12 | 1.0 Mile | Pavement | RUTS | 400,000 |
| N. $112^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-GH-402(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 140 | North Bluff Waverly | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } 25 \\ & \mathrm{~W}-30 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 Mile | Engineering | ROA-1 | 10,000 |
| S. $112^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-J-401(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 243 | Stevens Creek | W-30 | 1.0 Mile | ROW | ROA-1 | 20,000 |
| N. $148^{\text {th }}$ <br>  <br> S. $148^{\text {th }}$ <br> St. | C55-HJK-408(1) | Other Arterial | Pavement | $\begin{aligned} & 1,943- \\ & 4,329 \end{aligned}$ | Stockton <br> Stevens Creek Waverly | W-3,10,15,22,27 <br> W-3,10,15,22,27,34 <br> W-15,22,27,34 | $14.5$ <br> Miles | Engineering \& Traffic Study | N/A | 20,000 |

ROADS

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { STREET } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { NO. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | DESIGN STANDARD | ESTIMATED COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N. $162^{\text {nd }}$ Street | C55-A-401(5) | Local | Gravel | 220-300 | Waverly Mill | W-2 <br> W-26,35 | 2.3 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 920,000 |
| N. $162^{\text {nd }}$ Street | C55-H-410(1) | Local | Gravel | 201-236 | Waverly | W-2,11 | 1.7 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 680,000 |
| West "A" Street | C55-ML-405(1) | Collector | Gravel | 249-455 | west <br> Lincoln <br> Middle <br> Creek | $\begin{aligned} & s-30 \\ & s-26,25 \end{aligned}$ | 2.2 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 880,000 |
| E. <br> Adams <br> Street | C55-KJ-403(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 284-397 | Lancaster Stevens Creek | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{s}-12 \\ & \mathrm{~s}-7,8,9 \end{aligned}$ | 3.3 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 1,320,000 |
| E. <br> Adams Street | C55-J-411(1) | Local | Gravel | 248-363 | Stevens Creek | S-10,11,12 | 3.0 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 30,000 |
| W. Adams | C55-M-415(2) | Local | Gravel | 223-326 | Middle | S-11,12 | 1.6 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 20,000 |
| W. <br> Agnew | C55-D-401(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 37-211 | West Oak | s-7,8,9,10,11 | 5.1 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 75,000 |
| Alvo Road | C55-H-411(1) | Local | Gravel | 119-182 | Waverly | S-28,29,30 | 2.5 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 25,000 |
| Arbor Road | C55-C-408(1) | Local | Gravel | 315-370 | North Bluff | In-29,30 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.75 \\ & \text { Miles } \end{aligned}$ | Pavement | ROA-1 | 700,000 |
| Bluff <br> Road | C55-H-402(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 213 | Waverly | In 23,24 | 1.2 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 480,000 |

ROADS

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROAD } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | PROJECT NO. | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | LENGTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | DESIGN STANDARD | ESTIMATED COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W. Bluff Road | C55-E-406(2) | Local | Gravel | 127-210 | Elk | S-17,18 | 2.0 Miles | Engineering | ROA-1 | 20,000 |
| W. <br> Denton <br> Road | C55-N-404(1) | Collector | Gravel | 235-447 | Denton | S-17,18 | 2.0 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 800,000 |
| Firth Road | C55-X-402(5) | Other Arterial | Pavement | 829 | South Pass | s-30 | 0.2 Mile | Engineering | ROA-1 | 10,000 |
| Fletcher Avenue | C55-H-403(2) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 235 | North Bluff | S-35 | 1.0 Mile | Pavement | ROA-1 | 400,000 |
| McKelvie Road | C55-F-405(1) | Local | Gravel | 82-121 | Oak | S-21,22,23 | 3.0 Miles | Grading \& Structures | ROA-1 | 600,000 |
| W. Mill Road | C55-E-401(1) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 115 | Elk | S-6 | 0.5 Mile | Engineering | ROA-2 | 10,000 |
| W. Mill Road | C55-E-408(1) | Local | Dirt | 15 | Elk | S-2 | 1.0 Mile | Engineering | RL-3 | 10,000 |
| Old Cheney Road | C55-Q-407(2) | Collector | Gravel | 347-502 | Stockton | S-10,11,12 | 3.0 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 1,200,000 |
| *Rokeby Road | C55-P-427(1) | Local | Gravel | 150 | Grant | S-27 | 0.7 Mile | Pavement | ROA-1 | *700,000 |
| W. Van Dorn | C55-M-404(5) | Other Arterial | Gravel | 271-337 | Middle Creek | S-33,34 | 2.0 Miles | Pavement | ROA-1 | 800,000 |
| *Yankee Hill Road | C55-P-425(2) | Local | Gravel | 522 | Grant | S-22 | . 06 Mile | Pavement | ROA-1 | 240,000 |

[^1]FISCAL YEARS 2016-2020
BRIDGES

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROAD } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { STREET } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROJECT } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CLASSIFICATION | EXISTING SURFACE | A.D.t. LATEST COUNT | TOWNSHIP | LOCATION FROM SECTIONS | COUNTY BRIDGE NO. | ROADWAY WIDTH | TYPE OF IMPROVEMENT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{H}- \\ \text { LOADING } \end{gathered}$ | EStIMATED COSt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agnew Road | C55-C-284 | Other Arterial | Asphalt | 382 | Little Salt | S-12 | C-284 | 36' | C.B.C. | HL-93 | 175,000 |
| North14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | C55-F-78 | Other Arterial | Asphalt | 3,082 | Oak | W-25 | F-78 | $40^{\prime}$ | C.B.C. | HL-93 | 222,000 |
| West <br> Pioneers Blva. | C55-N-19 | Local | Gravel | 167 | Denton | S-4 | $\mathrm{N}-19$ | $30^{\prime}$ | 75' Bridge | HL-93 | 376,600 |
| SW $91^{\text {st }}$ Street | C55-N-114 | Local | Gravel | 5 | Denton | In-22 | N-114 | $30^{\prime}$ | 100' Bridge | HL-93 | 434,500 |
| West <br> Princeton <br> Road | C55-W-164 | Local | Gravel | 28 | Buda | S-18 | W-164 | $30^{\prime}$ | C.B.C. | HL-93 | 149,200 |
| Panama | C55-X-129 | Other Arterial | Asphalt | 354 | South Pass | S-4 | X-129 | $36^{\prime}$ | 75' Bridge | HL-93 | 376,500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Proposed Highway Improvement Program - Fiscal Year 2015




## LANCASTER COUNTY ADT \& MOVEMENT




XHIBIT



[^0]:    *Project to be constructed in cooperation with the City of Lincoln

[^1]:    *Project to be constructed in cooperation with the City of Lincoln

