

Nebraska Innovation Zone Commission  
Board of Commission Meeting  
June 4, 2009  
Quarry Oaks Golf Course – Club House  
Ashland, NE.

*Draft*

**Commissioner Attending:** Tom DeLong, Tim Gilligan(alternate), David Potter (alternate), Pete Kotsiopulos, Marlin Petermann, John Plucknett, Jon Camp, Ernie Abariotes, Brad Stauffer, Mark Stursma(alternate), Mary Ann Borgeson, Rich Jansen, Pat Thomas, Marsha Babcock, Dave Nielsen, Jeff Weak  
Kathy McKillip – NIZC Director, Richard Baier, NDED Director, Patty Wood, NDED Marketing Director

**Members Excused:** Phil Mullin, Dr. Jack Huck, Chuck Sigerson.

**Visitors:** Mark Wayne, Duane Dowd, Jarel Vinduska, James Rughe, Rebecca Horner, Donna Lyman, Kevin Anderson, Randy Schultz, ( two names unreadable).

NIZC Chair, Brenda Gunn, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Kathy McKillip, NIZC Executive Director, then took the Commission roll call at 7:05PM. As requested by Commissioner Potter, a review of current Commission representation and refresher of what Commissioners serve in alternate positions was presented to the group. A new Commission roster was distributed to update and correct any outdated information.

#### **Approval of the Agenda**

Commissioner Gunn asked for approval of the agenda as distributed. *Motion made by Commissioner Jansen and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Borgeson, to approve the agenda as distributed. Motion approved by consent.*

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Commissioner Gunn asked for approval of the minutes from May 7, 2009. *Motion made by Commissioner Stauffer and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Plucknett to approve the May 7, 2009 minutes. Motion approved by consent.*

## **Public Comment Period**

**Public Comment Period opened at 7:15pm.**

**Jarel Vinduska– SAVE organization, resident of Sarpy County.** Mr. Vinduska wanted to share concern about the ability of getting the local jurisdictions to buy in to the regional design guidelines. He stated that it is very important to create nothing short of a genius method to get people to cooperate together. Competition will cause issues and disruption to the area. A mechanism needs to be developed to create incentives to cooperate and then a mechanism needs to be in place to guarantee participation.

Seeing no other interested in speaking at that time, Commissioner Gunn asked for a motion to close the public comment period. ***Motion made by Commissioner Jansen and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commission DeLong to close the public comment period. Motion approved by consent.***

**Public Comment period closed at 7:17pm**

## **Executive Director Report**

If there are additional correspondences that McKillip needs to be aware of and add to the list please let her know. Hard copies in the mail have been eliminated to only those specifically requesting them.

Remember, if you are a guest, please sign in and provide contact information so that the Commission can keep you updated and informed.

## **Marketing Update**

Patty Wood, NDED, presented an update to the Commission regarding the challenge and task of developing a marketing process for NIZC, as charged by LB 546. Patty gathered a committee together to seek input regarding the Commission's goal and expectations. From this committee, consisting of NDED staff members, several marketing target approaches were distributed to the Commission. Comments included that this was a good starting point, possibly consider using a broader marketing approach utilizing an ad agency to fine tune the preliminary findings. Going as broad with a message will serve the communities at large best. Don't limit the marketing to just "green" ideas, and possibly limit the approach of specifically targeting a "zone". One suggestion was "endless possibilities" to compliment the state slogan of "possibilities endless". Several Commissioners really thought a marketing campaign titled "in the zone" was very good, but the trademark would have to be checked.

***Motion by Commissioner Kotsiopoulos, and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Babcock to continue moving forward and generate concepts with local marketing firms/organizations, and then bring back the results in two months or by the Aug. 2009 NIZC monthly meetings for continued review by Commissioners. Friendly Amendment offered by***

*Commissioner Weak and accepted by Commissioner Kotsiopoulos; to not limit Patty and her staff to only seek outside opinions from the firms mentioned, but to be as broad as possible. Motion approved by consent.*

### **Commission Discussion & Olsson Associates Presentation/Consultant Update**

Elizabeth Garvin, Clarion & Associates, presented the most current update draft to the group. Changes in this draft include a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier of options for communities to consider when planning. Next approach will be the “hypothetical test cases”; three areas are being considered, big box development by I-80 and Hwy 370 targeting the southwest corner, a mixed use travel services center in the area of I-80 and Hwy 66, and another location yet to be decided. Discussion regarding the “hypothetical sites” began and it was suggested by Commissioners to move the mix use travel services center to the Greenwood interchange and to add one to deal with Ashland and Gretna’s Hwy 6 areas.

Discussion from Commissioners regarding the draft was as follows:

- Pg. 16 – tighten this section up, there should not be an area that allows communities to “opt out”, they should only be encouraged to “opt up” and increase the level of design for create better projects.
- Include language of balance so that it does not permit short cuts if a project is cut or compromised, it must then be made up somewhere else – if there is a compromise, then balance needs to be found that is acceptable.
- A letter of concern from Waverly was shared by Commissioner Stauffer regarding the limitation of metal buildings within the targeted area.
- Are there additional types of incentives that we have to encourage communities to step it up?
- Incorporate more options into the plan for industrial development regarding metal buildings, and that they must have some element of composite design to them.
- Include language to encourage development be built from already existing structured areas with infrastructure in place.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): Currently, where are the local jurisdictions at with this, is there a chance of implementation? Most communities already have stronger or more strict standards in place, but could still evolve, and compliment the minimal standards being offered.

Is there a possibility of utilizing the Federal Fly-Back event to promote the design standards? The Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, welcomes the opportunity to work with NIZC and would be fine with NIZC hosting such an event immediately following the luncheon on Aug. 20<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 pm. This could be an educational event, promotional event or an unveiling of what the design standards and guidelines look like, possibly a “sign in 80” theme, encouraging local jurisdiction to agree to work together and adopt the standards by incorporating them into ones that already exist.

Direction was given to Ms. McKillip to check with NDED Legal about the legalities of MOU’s and if this was a reasonable consideration for the Commission to encourage communities to do.

At this time, sensing that the Commission will need to meet in July to keep up the pace of the work being completed, and to prepare for the Aug. 20<sup>th</sup> Federal Fly-Back event discussion about when to meet in July occurred.

***Motion made by Commissioner Babcock and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Borgeson to post a public notice of the meeting change as soon as possible, and to meeting on Thursday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009, 11:30am-1:00pm, at Mahoney State Park, with Ms. McKillip making the arrangements at Mahoney. Motion approved by consent.***

### **Closing Comments**

At this time, seeing that there was no other Commission business. ***Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Camp 2<sup>nd</sup> by Commissioner Weak. Motion approved by consent.***

**Meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Kathy McKillip  
Executive Director - NIZC

In general, the key phrase that incorporated the most consensus was to promote the development of a “Documented Voluntary Participation” plan. This plan includes a marketing component that serves as the common venue for cooperation. Included would be the following items:

Develop incentives for Green Design and Development “America’s Leading Corridor” which also would support Leed education opportunities and incentives. Also, identify and promote the “benefits” of the regional design standards such as, leveling the playing field, maintaining property values for developers and communities incorporating the “First Principles” from the NIZC Phase I study. Utilizing interlocal agreements as the basis for moving forward, and having a promoted “signing day” for elected officials and community members to come together and promote. This would also create an opportunity for the private sector to provide input and involvement. Highlight the benefits of regional design standards to the Chambers, Industry groups, and existing businesses, demonstrating that this plan and process can be a win/win. This will occur by pulling together the incentives from all parties and developing a regional “view” point which will expose a regional “venue” for united utilities also.

The Accountability mechanism needs to include a Memorandum of Understanding, with common tools to be used in the design review process, such as using a design review board to help those with cost issues. This could also provide the opportunity to develop a “score card matrix” that helps communities determine how the current environment influences the pattern of growth and development. Scorecards also help communities view their current development patterns through a smart growth lens taking into consideration current conditions in the built environment.

Implementation: This can vary from the current, nothing to the other end of the spectrum of a state authority body. How to implement the design standards, possibly target and Interstate Zone 1, communities within the zone are required to be a member. Is it time to create a regional association or authority? It will be critical to “pick-a-lane” as to what mechanism should be used for maintaining continuity or forward progress. Do we consider a Marketing body versus a Governing body or a combination of both? It is important to create a 3<sup>rd</sup> party association that provides “friendly mediation” and is a mentoring role for the review process. In addition, it is also important for the 3<sup>rd</sup> party association to incorporate and encourage a “Common Thread” within the zoned, which also addresses the need for native landscape material usage in development and as good practice within the corridor.