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**


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

Krzyszewski 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.

Krzyszewski 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.

Krzyszewski 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.

Krzyszewski 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 96th 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