



**CITY OF LA VISTA**  
**8116 PARK VIEW BOULEVARD**  
**LA VISTA, NE 68128**  
**P: (402) 331-4343**

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**AUGUST 25, 2016-7:00 P.M.**

The City of La Vista Planning Commission held a meeting on Thursday, August 25th, in the Harold “Andy” Anderson Council Chamber at La Vista City Hall, 8116 Park View Boulevard. Chairman Gayle Malmquist called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Mike Krzywicki, Gayle Malmquist, John Gahan, Tom Miller, Kevin Wetuski, Harold Sargus and Mike Circo. Members absent were: Kathleen Alexander, Jackie Hill and Jason Dale. Also in attendance were Chris Solberg, City Planner; Meghan Engberg, Permit Technician; Cindy Miserez, Finance Director; Rita Ramirez, Assistant City Administrator and Jeff Calentine, Assistant to the City Administrator.

Legal notice of the public meeting and hearing were posted, distributed and published according to Nebraska law. Notice was simultaneously given to all members of the Planning Commission. All proceedings shown were taken while the convened meeting was open to the attendance of the public.

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Malmquist at 7:00 p.m. Copies of the agenda and staff reports were made available to the public.

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – July 21, 2016**

Gahan moved, seconded by Miller to approve the July 21st minutes. **Ayes: Gahan, Krzywicki, Miller, and Malmquist. Nays: None. Abstain: Sargus, Circo and Wetuski. Absent: Hill, Alexander and Dale. Motion Carried. (4-0-3)**

**3. Old Business**

**4. New Business**

**A. Capital Improvement Program 2017-2021**

- i. **Staff Report – Jeff Calentine:** Calentine started off by thanking members of the commission for being at the meeting. Calentine then said that the purpose of the City’s Capital Improvement Plan is to identify, prioritize and address community needs through careful long-term capital planning and balanced public investment in supporting physical infrastructure.

The City anticipates the completion of approximately \$7.6M worth of capital projects during FY16. The initial phases of the proposed public improvement redevelopment project and mixed use redevelopment project will begin on or in the vicinity of the Brentwood Crossing property. Other notable projects are the substantial completion of the Thompson Creek Channel Rehabilitation and a number of facility improvement projects. Specifically, the Public Works Parks Division was relocated into their own stand-alone remodeled Hupp Dr. building. The administrative wing of the existing Public Works facility was reconfigured to add additional office and meeting room space and the space above fire station

#4 (The Annex) was updated to provide for additional meeting space and staff training opportunities.

A majority of the CIP project funding in the next two fiscal years are associated with the Public Improvement Redevelopment Project and the Mixed Use Redevelopment Project. Approximately \$1.4M will be spent in the upcoming fiscal year on street improvement projects throughout the City. The CIP is a planning document and does not authorize or fund projects.

With recommendation from the Planning Commission, the CIP will be presented to the City Council for final approval of FY17 and FY18 projects within the Capital Fund. In the past the City has adopted a one-year budget; however this year a biennial budget has been prepared and submitted for approval. Consequently, expenses for two fiscal years are being considered. The CIP projects for both FY17 and FY18 will be included in this biennial budget.

Calentine then said that as things change, the CIP will be brought back and voted on for FY18 and FY19. He said that not everything is set in stone, but that this will help with some long term planning.

**ii. Public Hearing**

Krzywicki asked if we will be approving '18 twice.

Calentine said essentially yes, we will come back for approval if there are any changes or amendments, but if not it will be left as is.

Krzywicki then asked how this would correspond to the levy review every year. He wants to know how you can pass a budget before you know what the levy is going to be.

Cindy Miserez, Finance Director, came up and said that the levy is set based on the FY17 property valuation and that same levee is used for FY18.

Krzywicki then asked if the value goes up 12%, do we use the same levee.

Miserez said that we have the option on the second year to amend that second year and we plan to do that. We will always amend that second year to take into account the known property tax valuation for that new year and we just received that this week. We receive that final valuation August of every year. We will amend that second year, but we will not have to take a full blown look at the second year, we'll just update it for the property tax valuation and other things that we know that have happened, most likely with the CIP.

Krzywicki then asked if the city always assumes a change in valuation in the second year.

Miserez said no, the state requires that we use the exact same property valuation for that year.

Krzywicki then asked if the valuation went up a lot if the city would be forced to lower it because the budget would be out of balance on the revenue side unless you did something.

Miserez said that would require us to take another look at the financial picture based on that new property valuation.

Krzywicki asked Calentine if he could explain how the priorities are determined on the projects.

Calentine said that in the past we had a ranking system that we used in grading out projects and have come to find out going through that process in exercise and futility because of the funding side we prioritize our projects without using the funding piece. When we got the funding piece from finance then we realized that some of these projects we couldn't do. A lot of the projects that are prioritized as number 1 are things that really need to be addressed, so those are addressed as higher priorities. Some of the priorities that are seen as 2 or 3 are things that we would like to do in the upcoming year, but if we had to push those out based on funding or things that happen, and then we can do that.

Calentine said that we are looking at revamping our CIP process with bringing our new finance director we've looked at doing some different things as far as funding goes. With bringing the finance to the front end, it has helped us know where we stand and how to prioritize projects.

Sargus asked what some of the criteria were for the priorities.

Calentine said safety issues. He said that the streets department will go through and do a rating system on our streets and prioritize which streets need to be fixed and the highest order by traffic volume. We do some evaluations based on public safety. He said that he believed that there are 8 or 9 criteria items.

Circo asked about the widening on Giles Road and asked if it was going to be moved to 7 lanes.

Calentine said that he would have to get back to him on that.

Solberg said that it will be 6 with a center turn lane.

### **Malmquist opened the Public Hearing**

Sue Wedige, at 9815 Henry Cir., came up to speak. She said that she has followed the progress in hopes of having that signal placed at the 96<sup>th</sup> and Brentwood intersection. She goes on to say that in February of 2015 it was number 3 on the summary of the 6 year plan to install the signal in 2016. Last year in the February meeting of 2016 it was pushed back to 2017 and she questioned that and was told that it was impossible to push it back to 2016. She said that when she saw the Projects by Funding Source of the CIP it looks as if the project has been moved back to 2018. She said that she and a number of her neighbors want to have this put in (FY17) because it is a dangerous intersection. She said that is gotten worse with school being back in session and

with the placement of the gas pipes. She is asking for them to consider moving it back to 2017.

Malmquist said that she doesn't know if that's possible, but the placement of traffic signals require warranting and it's a matter of traffic and she is not sure where it is on the warrants.

Calentine said that there was a traffic study done on that corridor and the warrants have been met. There is a debate between public safety and public works on the exact location of that signal. He said that that signal was originally slated for 96<sup>th</sup> and Robin Plaza right outside the Walmart. It was determined during that traffic study that the proximity between that and the signal at 96<sup>th</sup> and Giles was too close, which is why it was moved out to Brentwood. It has also been discussed about moving it up to the Granville Pkwy. There has been some discrepancy with Public Works on the best location of that signal. He then mentioned that the reason it was moved from FY17 to FY18 was a matter of funding.

Fred Ecternacht at 8015 S. 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Cir. came up to speak. He said that would like to offer his support in the traffic signal at 96<sup>th</sup> and Brentwood. He said that the gas pipes are an obstacle for people making northbound turns. He said that he understands prioritization and funding, but as a physician that he has wonder the cost of funding as opposed to the cost of life or injury if an accident were to occur. He said that he was unable to find the statistics of the number of accidents that have occurred at that intersection, but that there is more than money at stake if someone is injured or dies and that should be taken into consideration as well.

Circo asked in regards to the traffic signal at 96<sup>th</sup> and the criteria that are used to pick these out. He mentioned that valuation, but noted that public risk and safety are at the top and wanted to know who was on that committee and who rates them.

Calentine said that they have representation from Public Works, Finance and Administration. He said that they discuss the CIP projects from the managing director level, which contains representation from administration, public works and public safety. He said that he did not want to speak on behalf of public safety or the police department about the number of accidents. It is recognized that there is a necessity for a light along that corridor, but not sure where the best location is, which is a lot of the reason that it has been in the CIP for so long.

**Malmquist closed the Public Hearing.**

- iii. Recommendation:** Circo moved, seconded by Wetuski to approve the Capital Improvement Plan from 2017-2021 as noted in the Staff Report Binder. **Ayes:** *Gahan, Krzywicki, Miller, Sargus Circo, Wetuski and Malmquist.* **Nays:** *None.* **Abstain:** *None.* **Absent:** *Hill, Alexander and Dale* **Motion Carried. (7-0)**

**5. *Comments from the Floor***

**None. No members of the public came forward.**

**6. *Comments from the Planning Commission***

Krzywicki asked how everything with Thompson Creek was going.

Solberg said that he has not been down there, but that he knows that John is routinely down there checking it out.

Calentine said that the channel itself has done really well and that they are scheduled to have a nursery come out and do some additional seeding. He said that there has been a lull in activity as far as the Thompson Creek area is concerned, but that there is going to be some additional seeding where there are some bare dirt areas. There will also be someone coming to do some mowing and weed control, but that due to the rain that we have had, it was postponed. He said that the channel seems to be doing really well with the large rain events and that there hasn't been any real major issues as far as the channel goes, it's just a matter of finishing up those items on the list.

**7. *Comments from Staff***

Solberg said that we received good feedback from the Taste of La Vista event for the Comprehensive Plan. He said that we are now moving into the final phase of finalizing the goals and are now starting in on the other chapters and refining those and get them more to a final version and the eventually getting to the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan is a major offshoot of the Comprehensive Plan and an important aspect of this. He said that hopefully in the near future they will start seeing drafts of the Comprehensive Plan coming and that they are eventually going to have a set meeting with the Planning Commission as a whole on the Comprehensive Plan.

**8. *Adjournment***

**Malmquist adjourned the meeting at 7:35.**

Reviewed by Planning Commission:

---

Planning Commission Secretary

---

Planning Commission Chairperson

---

Approval Date

I:\Community Development\Planning Department\Planning Commission\Minutes\2016\4-21-16 Minutes.Docx