

DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
3015 MENKE CIRCLE
OMAHA, NE 68134

January 11, 2006
6:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hayes with roll call vote.

Members Present: Bob Boozer, Bob Bruhn, Michael Gerdes, Barbara Hayes, Anne Houlihan, Luke Janke, Joe Roberts, and Milo Vacanti.

Other County Officials and Staff Present: Barb Frohlich and Kent Holm (Douglas County Environmental Services), Tom Baker (Douglas County Health Department), and Bernie Monbouquette (County Attorney Office).

Chair Hayes asked for a motion to approve the November 9th, 2005 minutes. Ms. Frohlich stated that she would be adding the power point presentation by Mr. Shukert as an attachment to the minutes.

Motion by Commissioner Gerdes, seconded by Commissioner Houlihan to approve minutes of the November 9th, 2005 meeting

Voting Yes: Boozer, Bruhn, Gerdes, Hayes, Houlihan, Janke, Roberts, and Vacanti.
Voting No: None
Abstain: None

APPLICATION G-1-06

REQUEST: Amend Water Supply Systems (Private) Section of the Douglas County Zoning Regulations to delete the strikethrough sentence

CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS

Construction standards as outlined in NE Health and Human Services System regulations governing water well construction shall be complied with. A domestic water well to be used for human consumption shall not be constructed as a driven sandpoint well.

The well casing shall project at least 12 inches above the well platform or at least twelve inches above grade if no platform is required. ~~If a well is located in an area designated as less than 500 year floodplain, the well casing shall extend 48 inches above ground.~~

There shall be no sewer located nearer than 10 feet from the well. Any sewer located between 10 and 50 feet from the well shall be constructed so as to be water-tight when subjected to a hydrostatic test of ten feet of water.

APPLICANT: Douglas County Health Department

Tom Baker, Douglas County Health Department, presented the application with the following: This change is to correct an error and comply with the State of Nebraska Health Department and the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality regulations.

No one from the public spoke for or against the application at the public hearing.

Chair Hayes closed the public hearing.

Motion by Commissioner Roberts to recommend approval of the application, seconded by Commissioner Janke.

Voting Yes: Boozer, Bruhn, Gerdes, Hayes, Houlihan, Janke, Roberts and Vacanti.

Voting No: None

Abstain: None

APPLICATION G-2-06

REQUEST: Review and Adoption - Douglas County Comprehensive Plan

APPLICANT: Douglas County Environmental Services

Marty Shukert, RDG Planning & Design, presented the draft Douglas County Comprehensive Plan with the following comments:

1. The process of developing the proposed Comprehensive Plan has been over the past six to seven months, and has included a public workshop, community meetings, interviews with specific stakeholders, environmental groups, builders, developers, resource extraction groups, neighbors, and a variety of other individuals.

Profile of Douglas County – Population, land use distribution, and resources.

3. The population in 2004 was estimated at 482,000 with 427,000 people living in municipal jurisdictions, 51,000 people living in extraterritorial jurisdictions, and 2,700 people in the jurisdiction of the County which is 72 square miles.
4. In 1999 the City of Omaha's Planning Department projected the population for Douglas County in 50 years to be 663,000 people.
5. The City of Omaha Planning Department has developed policies based on that projection and if that growth is not accommodated within Douglas County it will take place in more decentralized parts of the metropolitan area.
6. The greater dispersion of population will increase the cost of providing services because the cost is directly proportionate to the dispersion of the population.

7. The question becomes how to accommodate that population of 663,000 within the boundaries of Douglas County as we are rather close to build out of the County.
8. Since the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, there have been significant changes in the development environment.
9. In 1998, it was believed that the areas in Douglas County outside of municipal jurisdiction would remain essentially rural in character and the Comprehensive Plan was based on a more decentralized low density population.
10. Since then developments like Newport Landing have been built and the 1,000 lot Heritage Development has been proposed which involve extension of urban services and changing the development environment.
11. In 1998 we did not think there would be extension of sewers to the edge of the Omaha jurisdiction.
12. As a result, urban development patterns are occurring in areas previously envisioned to remain rural.
13. There is interest in the southwestern part of the County for urban subdivision developments with municipal services for larger lot and smaller acreages.

Environmental and Development Resources

14. We have used the McHargian analysis to map various kinds of environmental constraints and resources and overlay those to look at areas more suitable for development as opposed to those that ought to be conserved.
15. The floodway and floodplain are outlined on the maps.
16. Tree cover is an important environmental resource in a County that has little natural vegetation and these areas generally follow streams.
17. The areas that have sand and gravel in the soils are mapped. These are the areas most likely to be subject to resource extraction over the next 50 to 70 years and then may ultimately form the basis for lake oriented development and communities.
18. Wetland areas are very important for drainage and wildlife habitat.
19. The wetlands identified on the map are from the National Wetlands Inventory and by no means a comprehensive list.
20. Identification of wetlands in specific development projects will be addressed as the regulations are developed.
21. Hydric soils generally have high water content or water tables.
22. Slopes are a significant constraint as well. There is very sharp definition along the Elkhorn River.

Transportation and Infrastructure Resources

23. Traffic patterns within the county and municipal jurisdictions have focused traffic loads on rural section line roads and sometimes beyond their capacity as growth occurs.
24. Long term transportation improvements are to improve 192nd Street north to Military and widen Highway 36 to Highway 31.
25. In 2006, there will be a study commissioned to study the feasibility of an outer transportation loop and other growth areas.
26. The extension of the interceptor sewer into the northwestern part of the Papio Watershed makes everything east of the drainage divide between the Papio and Elkhorn systems potentially suitable for higher density development.

27. Valley and Fremont have a joint venture where wastewater from Valley is conducted by a force main to the Fremont wastewater system.
28. MUD has also developed well fields in the extreme southwestern part of the County.

First Principles

These are the guiding assumptions that direct some of the conclusions that we have come to in terms of land use and development policy.

1. Douglas County will protect and steward the environment and natural resources.
The concept of this plan is very much trying to understand the constraints and characteristics of the land and to propose appropriate policies given those natural resources.
2. The County will preserve and enhance the unique character of the County.
In talking to Planning Commissioners, stakeholders and residents there is a high degree of unity in believing that development in the beautiful parts of the remaining county should be unique and different from more conventional subdivision development. We believe it is possible by employing best practices and conservation development to provide the same kind of return on property as people get in conventional development. This greatly improves the quality of the environment and maintains the very lovely landscape of the undeveloped parts of the county.
3. Major development within the large floodplain of the Platte and Elkhorn Rivers will be limited to lake development around resource extraction sites and developments that do not overly alter the floodplain. Remaining floodplain land should develop at very low densities or remain agricultural use.
We think current best practice is to reduce and minimize encroachments into the floodplain to concentrate development in areas that are outside of the floodplain.
4. Former resource extraction sites should incorporate recreation and habitat preservation.
Sand and gravel extraction operations will continue in the foreseeable future until those resources are mined out. Those operations create great opportunities because the high water table allows the creation of lakes. Those lakes provide opportunities for development but also for natural habitat, special areas, and recreational possibilities as well. Increasingly, cooperative organizations, non profit industry groups, and environmentalists are looking at multi purpose uses of those water resources that will emerge from sand and gravel operations when they are completed.
5. Areas in Douglas County that are located in urban services areas should be reserved for urban density development. Large lot acreage development should occur only in those areas that will **not** accommodate future urban services.
Urban service areas should be reserved for urban density development. Douglas County is facing a full build out of the easily developable parts of our county. Not very many years ago we thought that land was an unlimited commodity and now we see it as a precious resource. The developable portion of the county may be built out in as little as 25-30 years so we need to make wise use of those resources
6. Developments should incorporate innovative conservation development techniques.

Important and special characteristics of the land are identified in a conservation development. Open space is preserved to manage storm water and wastewater. This open space creates webs of habitat and open space, green way corridors, and clusters development in those areas that are less vulnerable and more suitable for development. It means that valleys and drainage ways are preserved as greenways and the uplands are developed. It means that roads are developed along the contours of the land minimizing cutting and filling. Federal mandates will demand this kind of treatment and regulate the water quality of storm water as well as wastewaters. Techniques that manage storm water on site are going to be ultimately cheaper and less difficult than having large quantities of storm water that possibly have to be treated at water treatment plants which is a very expensive proposition. We can make a difference and reduce those costs by planning intelligently with these types of successful practices. A large part of the comprehensive plan appendix identifies best storm water management practices. These are very important things to think about and take into consideration because they can make a large improvement on both the character and appearance of the county for the better and ultimately for the cost of taxpayers in terms of municipal infrastructure.

7. Storm water management techniques should focus on on-site retention and distribution.

Part of best practices of storm water management is to slow down the discharge of storm water and can prevent it from going dramatically and quickly into the Papio system and other drainage ways.

8. Within all new developments, a standard will be established for reservation of a specific percentage of open space.

This principle calls for preservation of open space. Rural character is something that we were told in our various meetings that is prized. Preserving open space within the context of development is a way of creating something that is different and protects the special character of the land.

9. Significant drainage ways within the county should remain as green spaces that are incorporated into storm water management.

Preservation of drainage ways is one of the mechanisms by which we can do this and create a network of open spaces.

10. Local transportation systems should provide continuity between developments.

We do not want the section line roads to be the only way that people can move from one place to another. There should be a secondary system of collectors streets that allow people to move from neighborhood to neighborhood and from area to area without using the arterials. Continuity means that it is easy to get from place to another but doing it in way that don't necessarily carry a lot of traffic onto local streets.

11. Major transportation corridors should be multi-modal and incorporate green street elements.

The streets should look good whether they are in the county or in the cities, villages, or towns of the county. It should be easy and possible for pedestrians and bicyclists to move around as well and to create balanced transportation systems that ultimately use less energy and create greater experiences for all of us.

12. Open space, streams and trails should be integrated into the design of new residential developments.

A practice that is increasingly done as developers have found added value in subdivision development that is relatively more “green.”

13. County assessments should encourage conservation easements in specifically designated resource conservation areas.

This principle calls for changes in state legislation that would encourage property owners and developers to donate conservation easements. It would provide property tax breaks for land that is permanently constrained from development. These kinds of easements receive federal tax breaks but get assessed as developable ground under current state law. Changing this would encourage the economic donation of open space and be an important tool in helping to maintain the conservation concept.

Land Use Plan

1. **Existing development.** These are subdivisions that are already platted or areas that are already subject to subdivision. Within these areas we suggest that any new residential development including replats should retain rural aspects through the preservation of open space to the maximum degree possible. We know that it is not an easy thing to do but there are situations where it can in fact be accomplished.
2. When urban services are extended and small lot subdivisions that are currently on septic systems can be feasibly connected, connection to these services should be required and financial mechanisms should be provided. Fawn Heights is an example of a subdivision with relatively small lots that use septic systems. There probably will be more point where connection of those subdivisions onto municipal systems will make sense.
3. When possible we should employ best practices for storm water management even within existing development. Again this is not necessarily calling for dramatic changes but what can be done within the existing projects to further the implementation of the first principles
4. **Urban residential districts.** These are the areas that can be served by municipal wastewater services. This area includes the northern part of the county that is outside of the municipal jurisdictions and to the east of the Elkhorn Papio drainage divide. It also includes areas within the Elkhorn watershed but relatively unconstrained or unlimited environmentally. These are small areas and we suggest that they can also be developed to urban densities but its wastewater would be pumped over the drainage divide and into the Papio, mainly the City of Omaha system. Those areas ultimately can easily and effectively be provided with urban services.
5. Within these areas we project a typical density greater than one unit per acre. These are the densities that support municipal sewage extensions and development within this area should ultimately be furnished with municipal water and wastewater services.
6. There are a number of other policies that relate to how development should occur within this urban residential area that is significantly different from conventional suburban development in west Omaha. These policies include preservation of

drainage ways, rural road systems that follow the contours of the land, and the use of conservation subdivision techniques.

7. The transportation network should include a continuous transportation grid which is conceptualized in the plan. It indicates where the roads should occur and connect neighborhoods on the half section lines. The system should follow land forms and the street system should provide for multi-modal access including non-motorized access.
8. **Environmental Resource Districts.** This includes areas with steep slopes with vegetation and tree cover in the floodway, floodplain and wetland areas.
9. Some of the most beautiful land within the county in the slopes above the Elkhorn River valley in both the northern and southern parts of the county's jurisdiction.
10. Steep slopes, wooded areas, native habitat, and prairie are of significant scenic value and the overall objective is to preserve these wonderful and unique environmental features.
11. Within the Environmental Resources Districts, mandatory conservation development at moderate to low densities is proposed. The overall density within developments within these environmentally sensitive areas would be 5 acres per unit with lot sizes that could be as small as 3 acres in cluster developments
12. Individual systems or connection to community or municipal systems is permitted if feasible.
13. The development of open spaces should ideally be open ended in order to connect to the open spaces of other developments.
14. **Preserves.** This involves open space corridors along drainage ways in open spaces within the floodways of the Elkhorn and Platte Rivers.
15. The concept of an Elkhorn preserve and network of public and private property that would maintain openness along the Elkhorn floodplain was in the 1998 plan.
16. This idea has been incorporated into the Omaha suburban parks comprehensive plan and also the City of Elkhorn's Master Plan.
17. Provides a very exciting opportunity for unique development in some places that has public access but in many places retains its private character and private access.
18. **Floodplain.** The continued use is anticipated to be agricultural open space and very low density residential development.
19. A 20 acre minimum for residential use is recommended in this area and would be served by private wells and septic systems.
20. **Urban Reserve District.** This is the 500 year floodplain and will be primarily agricultural.
21. This could transition to urban density development and be served by the Valley-Fremont sewer system.
22. This area would be 20 acre per unit minimum but with lot clustering or the build through acreage concept, smaller lot sizes could be used.
23. **Resource Extraction.** These are parts of the county where gravelly and sandy soils exist where we expect resource extraction operations to occur.
24. End stage development is expected to combine recreation, wildlife habitat, and lake communities.

25. Water oriented development in Douglas County has historically generated a growth density of approximately 2.5 acres per unit including the water. Population projections and capacity analysis are based on that concept.
26. This population may require sewer services and those services may be along the 264th Street corridor connecting to the Valley-Fremont system.
27. Mixed Use. Along Highway 275, there is an area that has already begun developing industrially and should continue to be a combination of a business park and light industrial uses.
28. This is a continuation of the City of Valley's comprehensive plan.
29. Some limited residential development may occur in this area.
30. Mixed use districts with commercial growth along Highway 36 are anticipated to occur at major intersections.
31. A similar mixed use district is anticipated for the intersection of 264th Street and Highway 92.
32. The Venice area is a neighborhood commercial area that services lakefront developments in the area.
33. **Capacity Analysis.** This gives an idea of what the population of the county might be if developed under this system.
34. The areas anticipated for development produce a population of about 95,000 people.
35. With the current population of 480,000 plus another 70,000 capacity within the unbuilt portions of Omaha, Elkhorn, Waterloo, and Valley, the population is approximately 650,000 which will accommodate population demand in Douglas County through the year 2050.
36. This is pretty rapid buildout and full occupancy for Douglas County.
37. Growth will then divert to other urban areas such as Sarpy County. Sarpy County's comprehensive plan anticipates the extension of major municipal services to support a population of up to 300,000 people.
38. Redevelopment will occur in areas that become depopulated and represent new opportunities for growth.
39. Continued development at relatively low densities means we will run out of land rather quickly.
40. **Transportation and Public Facilities.** An interconnected grid of arterial and collector streets is anticipated that includes rearage roads or access roads that serve development at mixed uses and industrial development along our major arterials Highways 275, 36, 31 and 92.
41. A web of trails and greenways that serve both wildlife and human wildlife such as pedestrians and bicyclists is also anticipated.
42. An interconnected system of green spaces and implementation of the western Douglas County trail system is also proposed.
43. **Implementation.** A number of implementation techniques are outlined within the plan.
44. Interlocal cooperation with consistent policies among the various municipalities and the County so municipalities are not annexing or incorporating areas that do not meet their policies.
45. Development of an inter local plan for the extension of Omaha's interceptor sewer system into the areas identified for municipal services.

46. Define long term ultimate jurisdictional boundaries.
47. Development of land use regulations that implement the recommendations of the plan.
48. A long term mechanism much like the City of Omaha has to finance improvement and construction of streets to serve the population.
49. Maintain funding for trails, pedestrian sidewalks, and safe routes to schools and other activity centers.
50. Extend the comprehensive parks plan and the parks plan concepts of municipalities into the County jurisdiction.
51. Implement the concept of an Elkhorn Preserve using a committee to develop priorities and patterns of land ownership.
52. **Best Practices.** The plan includes a manual of best practices to be used by developers and reviewers for effective management of storm water because storm water will have a huge impact on the form of development we see in the future.
53. Transportation used to be the primary determinant of land use but storm water management is increasingly becoming a more critical issue.
54. Effective storm water management policies can reduce the cost of government, the cost of facilities and improve the quality and enjoyment of a development.

Conclusion

1. We are excited about the concepts in the plan and believe as it is perfected and implemented that it can become better and better and have a very large impact for good within the County.
2. We hope that this plan will give you the guidance that you deserve and need to make the kinds of decisions that will work in all aspects toward the greater benefit of Douglas County and for the creation of a really unique environment in our county.

OTHER COMMENTS

Denise Arnold, 14554 Ohio Street, Nelson's Creek, made the following comments:

1. She grew up in the Dundee area and my husband and I both love to bike ride.
2. Troubled to see green spaces lost, believes people interact on a much more personal level when they have the opportunity to walk.
3. The proposed plan will help the health of individuals, help the environmental and beautify our living space.
4. Wholeheartedly embraces the plan.

Bob Doyle, 11440 West Center Road, representing numerous developers in the Douglas and Sarpy County area made the following comments:

1. Mark Westergard, an engineer also for many developers, and Dave Petrocchi from Boyer Young Development, are also attending this meeting with me.
2. Believe in most respects it is an excellent document and support the concept of the 13 first principles.

3. Concerned about the Environmental Resource District on page six of Chapter five.
4. The specific concern is the mandated density of 5 acres per lot.
5. Each parcel in every area is different and unique in its own way. In one area, 80% of the property maybe environmentally sensitive while in another area, 20% may be environmentally sensitive.
6. His specific concern is an 800 acre sub basin west of 222nd Street along Q Street to the Elkhorn River.
7. Believes the requirement for 5 acre lots in this area is contrary to the stated policy influence on the first page of Chapter 5.

“Existing land use patterns and current demands. These factors establish the facts on the ground that the land use plan should accommodate. While the plan will direct the market to some degree, a realistic plan cannot and should not reverse market directions.”
8. There is significant development going on in that area. The Hamptons, where Street of Dreams for 2006 will be, is under construction.
9. The second policy influence mentioned was the feasibility of urban services.

“Specifically those areas that fall within feasible urban service areas should be dedicated to providing urban density development. However, the use of conservation standards and best design practices can create distinctive projects rather than conventional subdivisions.”
10. Urban services are already in this area. The installation of a sewage treatment plant was approved for the Hamptons. It is designed and will be able to serve the entire 800 acre sub basin with modifications and phasing.
11. Not allowing urban density in this area will adversely impact the people already in the Hamptons because the cost of providing sewer services to them will be abnormally high. The costs will be less if the service is spread out over the 800 acre sub basin.
12. MUD has agreed to extend water service to the Hamptons but that will be impossible without additional urban type development in the area.
13. The requirement of five acre lots will surround the Hamptons area served by public water and sewer.
14. From the bluff area at Elk City down to this area, there is already a pattern of higher density subdivisions that he believes is not causing any harm.
15. A higher density subdivision that uses urban services can be designed that will not impact environmentally sensitive areas.
16. Five acre lots will have private roads and the scenic beauty will only be available to a very few people.
17. A public road with environmentally sensitive areas deeded to the Sanitary Improvement District opens the area to the public.
18. Suggests flexibility for page 6 of Chapter 5 to allow for urban design with protection of environmental sensitive areas. This urban design would require a natural features inventory report to identify all significant natural resources on site and designate which features or parts of features would be disturbed by the proposed development. The natural features would be slopes, channels, wetlands,

- unique soils, tree cover, floodway and floodplain areas, and other areas of significant historical interest.
19. A certain allowance, such as 25%, would be made for disturbance of the natural features without a provision for mitigation.
 20. Also suggests a variable density dependent upon availability of public water and sewer.
 21. Believe our alternative would provide and enhance conservation of these previous resources with denying access to all but a select few and without limiting the county tax base which is going to be necessary to provide county services in this area.
 22. The ASIP Program which requires developers to pay more money is not necessarily popular but they know it is necessary in order to get the services out to their particular area.
 23. Requests that the Planning Commission delete the 5 acre requirement and grant the developer the flexibility to come and prove their point that they are in fact preserving the natural resources.

Robert Peterson, Lawson Peterson & Lang, 11718 Nicholas Street, made the following comments:

1. Also represents a number of developers that have been involved with development and SID's in the metropolitan area for a number of years
2. Concerned about the Comprehensive Plan and the same 800 acre sub district.
3. Melvin Sudbeck and his extended family own property in this area. Mr. Sudbeck is also in negotiations with MUD to provide service to this property.
4. There will be essential services, water and sewer, available for this area yet five acres per unit is recommended for this area even though the Plan
"Areas in Douglas County that are located in urban services areas should be reserved for urban density development. Large lot acreage development should occur only in those areas that will not accommodate future urban services."
5. Doesn't believe an environmental district fits this area because of the following quote from the Comp. Plan:
"The ability to provide sewer and water services is a fundamental imperative of development policy in Douglas County. Specifically those areas that fall within feasible urban services areas can be dedicated to providing urban density development."
6. This area should be viewed as residential by the definitions in the Comp. Plan and the one acre restriction on urban development should be removed.
7. Not giving a developer some flexibility is really not justifying the policy of the principles and it is not being fair to those property owners that have property that is certainly suitable for residential development.

Chair Hayes clarified with Mr. Peterson that he wanted higher densities for this particular area.

8. Urged the Planning Commission to remove the density caps to allow flexibility because the area has unique characteristics.

Dave Petrocchi, 9719 Giles Rd., representing Boyer-Young Development, made the following comments regarding the preservation of trees:

1. In the Hamptons there are two entrances, one is at the top of the hill, and one about half way down the hill, going down toward the river bank. There is also a curve in "Q" Street here.
2. We are going to be required by the County Engineer to remove all the trees for a distance of 800 feet from the west entrance because of the 55 mph speed limit along here. A certain sight distance must be maintained. we have to have a certain sight distance.
3. Unless this part of "Q" Street has a lower speed limit sometime in the near future, we immediately will be required to remove all those trees up to the back of our lots.
4. We designed the streets in the Hamptons so they follow the contours of the hills. The County requires a maximum of 10% slope. The streets can only be so steep so we didn't get quite to those but I think we got to the 8-9%.
5. We had to take out more trees because we then had to take the hills down more and grade out more.
6. Flexibility would be great when developing subdivisions among trees.

Linda Gale, 12306 William Street, made the following comments:

1. Expressed concern about the availability of affordable housing in the Omaha area.
2. Lot sizes of two or three acres makes it financially and physically impossible for builders and developers to build homes that people can afford below \$120,000.
3. Affordable housing is an issue not being addressed by anyone.
4. Higher density can be accomplished and still maintain trees, trails, and vegetation and everyone can have a nice view.

Chair Hayes closed the public hearing.

Questions, Comments, and Discussion among Commissioners:

1. Commissioner Gerdes stated he believed the plan did have flexibility and agreed with Mr. Shukert that if the plan is completely flexible, it is meaningless. Also stated that he was open to looking at a plan for that area and conservation design is important.
2. Commissioner Roberts stated that he agreed with Commissioner Gerdes and suggested another meeting to discuss this particular issue with Mr. Shukert.
3. Chair Hayes stated she agreed with that.
4. Mr. Shukert stated that the committee spent more time talking about this area than any other part of the plan because it is an area experiencing development and that areas without environmental limitation could be developed to urban density. Those areas with significant slopes and tree cover could be developed at a lower density. It is similar to what was adopted in Sarpy County in similar areas. Also stated he would support another committee meeting to discuss protecting the environmental resources as well as addressing the active development in the area.

5. Chair Hayes stated she was more comfortable laying the Comp. Plan over and discussing the issue before forwarding the Comp. Plan to the County Board.

Motion by Commissioner Vacanti to lay over the Comprehensive Plan until the February 8, 2006 meeting, seconded by Commissioner Boozer.

Other Discussion:

Commissioner Houlihan asked what laying over the plan was going to accomplish. Is it going to be researched as a group?

Chair Hayes stated the committee would meet to research the issues.

Mr. Shukert stated he would like to take a look at the specific projects and the densities that can be supported. He would like some time to make sure everything makes sense.

Commissioner Gerdes made these additional comments regarding the plan:

1. Believes it is a very good plan that is well thought out and provides balance.
2. When development is proposed and identified for a particular land use, you also have to look at what the land is currently being used for and what the infrastructure will be.
3. This plan allows for the balance of those two needs.

Voting Yes: Boozer, Bruhn, Gerdes, Hayes, Houlihan, Janke, Roberts, and Vacanti.

Voting No: None

Abstain: None.

A meeting for the committee will be scheduled in the next week or so.

Meeting adjourned 7:35pm.

Minutes approved February 8, 2006.