I. MINUTES


II. COUNCIL REPORTS ON BOARDS, COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND CONFERENCES

1. DEC Board Meeting (Fortenberry)
2. Lincoln Action Program (McRoy)
3. Star City Holiday Festival Board Meeting (McRoy)
4. DLA Board Meeting (Seng) – CANCELLED

OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS:

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS

1. Discussion on Police & Fire Pension Committee.

IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS

1. East “O” Street Project Update – Open House – on Thursday, August 31, 2000 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. – at the Eastridge Elementary School, in the Gymnasium, 6245 “L” Street – Information provided by: The Schemmer Associates (See Invitation).

2. Meeting Notice – Joint Meeting of City Council – County Commission – LPS Board – On Monday, September 18, 2000 at 7:30 a.m. – at the County-City Building in Conference Room 113 (See Meeting Notice).
3. Letter of Invitation to a meeting from Timothy Kenny, Executive Director, Nebraska Investment Finance Authority - Is pleased to announce the inaugural meeting of the "First Friday Club", a forum for discussion of current housing issues affecting Nebraska’s citizens. The first meeting is on Friday, September 1, 2000 at 8:00 a.m. in the Community Room of the Woodbridge Housing Development at 7011 South 22nd Street in Lincoln. Topic will be Nebraska’s Affordable Housing Trust Fund - Space is limited - RSVP Karon Andretti at 434-3906 (See Letter of Invitation).

4. Come to Caroline Petersen’s (from Personnel Department) Going Away Party! - on September 1, 2000 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Room 106 (See Invitation).

5. Nebraska For Justice - Inviting you to two special events scheduled for Monday, August 28 & Tuesday, August 29th - 2000 with internationally respected human rights activists Angela Davis, Ph.D., and Charlene Mitchell (SEE LETTER & BROCHURE FOR MORE DETAILS, COST, & SCHEDULE).

6. Inviting you to join them in a once-in-a-lifetime celebration on Tuesday, September 5, 2000 - The Sisters of Saint Francis of Perpetual Adoration, our founders, will be celebrating their 125th Anniversary in this country. Saint Elizabeth Regional Medical Center will be hosting a day of celebration in which we are hopeful you will be able to take part. - Please join them for reception activities: on Tuesday, Sept. 5th - from 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., Reception for Sisters Mediatrix Nies and Clarice Gentrup, 5:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., Business Reception hosted by Governor Mike Johanns & Stephanie Johanns - RSVP to Saint Elizabeth Telephone Line to Care at 486-7000, by 8/30/00 (See Letter of Invitation).

7. 2000 Interfaith Leadership Awards Banquet Honoring LAAA Executive Director Reba Schafer on Sunday, October 29, 2000 at the Cornhusker Hotel - 5:00 p.m., Reception & 6:00 p.m., Dinner - Tickets are $350.00 for a Sponsor Table-of-Ten or $35.00 per person - and let me know if you would like chicken or Vegetarian (See Material of event).
V. Council Members

VI. Requests of Council from Mayor - None

VII. Miscellaneous - None

III. Adjournment
MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS’ “NOON” MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 2000
CONFERENCE ROOM 113

Council Members Present: Jerry Shoecraft, Chair; Jeff Fortenberry, Vice-Chair; Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Cindy Johnson [arrived late], Annette McRoy, Coleen Seng.

Others Present: Ann Harrell, Jennifer Brinkman, Mayor’s Office; Dana Roper, City Attorney; Darrell Podany, Aide to Councilman Camp; Richard Speidell, Developer; Joan Ray, Council Secretary; No Media Representatives were present.

I. MINUTES


Mr. Shoecraft, Council Chair, requested a motion to approve the above-listed minutes. Ms. Coleen Seng moved approval of the minutes, as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jonathan Cook. The motion to approve the minutes, as presented, carried by the following vote: AYES: Jonathan Cook, Annette McRoy, Jerry Shoecraft, Jeff Fortenberry, Coleen Seng, Jon Camp; NAYS: None; ABSENT FOR VOTE: Cindy Johnson.

II. COUNCIL REPORTS ON BOARDS, COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND CONFERENCES

1. DEC BOARD MEETING (Fortenberry) Mr. Fortenberry reported that, as Council was aware, after last week’s presentation by Peoples Natural Gas, the rate increases which will be passed on to the City will have a budget impact. DEC was going to get that information as quickly as they can to Steve Hubka [City Budget Officer]. Mr. Fortenberry did not know how much of a “cushion” is built into the budget for such increases, but he just wanted to let Council Members know that it is coming.

2. LINCOLN ACTION PROGRAM (McRoy) LAP is not a program that Council is required to attend and will be removed from the Council Committee listing. LAP notified of this on 8-29-00.
3. **STAR CITY HOLIDAY FESTIVAL BOARD (McRoy)** Ms. McRoy attended the meeting on Friday. The theme this year is “Kid Size” It appears that they’re $10,000 short on this year’s float budget. They switched directors, so there are a lot of changes. Then with new DLA organization, that’s going to cost more money, too. They’re having to pay for services that they were getting for free. So the budget is in somewhat of a shambles this year.

No souvenirs this year...guess they were saving money.

4. **DLA BOARD MEETING (Seng)- CANCELLED**

**OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS:**

Ms. Seng had another meeting, a workshop, held Thursday morning by the Community Health Partners, Public Health Foundation, Board of Health and the Community Health Endowment folks. Members of those four organizations came together at the Highlands Club House. Karen Jensen was the facilitator. Ms. Seng noted that the meeting was held to figure out if there is a need for all four organizations.

Ms. Seng reported that the Chairs of the Health Board, Health Partners, the Health Foundation and the Director of the Health Endowment, plus Helen Boosalis as a board member and one other person were in attendance. She noted that some of these people serve on maybe two out of the four boards. There is thinking that the Health Foundation and the Community Health Partners could be under one hat. That has to get worked back through those groups. There is a Health Partners meeting Thursday that Ms. Seng feared she would be unable to attend; the Health Foundation will also be discussing this issue.

Ms. Seng felt this was a good exercise. Of course, everyone had some loyalties to their own groups, so it was a long exercise.

Mr. Camp reported that he attended a neighborhood meeting regarding Richard Speidel’s development. There were 18-20 people gathered together last Wednesday night to discuss this. Mr. Shoecraft commented that this had been discussed at the Directors’ Meeting. He noted that comments had been made that Richard had come up with some good suggestions of compromise with the neighborhood representatives. Mr. Camp didn’t know if Mr. Speidel had changed his position on any of the issues. Mr. Shoecraft stated that Ray Hill had given an update on the issue at the Directors’ meeting earlier today.

Mr. Camp stated that he would like to discuss it a little more. He commented that he was kind of confused noting that he had voted for this last week; then we reconsidered for a delay of action to this week.

Mr. Camp told Council that there is still a lot of neighborhood concern. One of the things brought up was the fact that this lot is in from 84th Street several lots as opposed to...
a normal progression. Are we setting a precedent here? Mr. Camp wanted to know where the Council wanted to go from here on this issue. Do we want to proceed from a zoning standpoint? This is a Special Permit. The adjacent neighbors felt that the landscaping screen would be to their liking. He noted that he was simply relaying to the Council what he had heard from the neighbors in the community, and noted that he still had questions in his own mind on this development.

Ms. McRoy asked if the lot sizes had been changed? Mr. Camp answered that they had not. There was an access road with a total of 2.2 acres between the pond and the [inaudible]. He noted that he had received a call from Don Nelson who wants to purchase the largest of the three lots. He was very favorable and wants to preserve the agricultural feel there in the area, with goats & everything.

Ms. McRoy commented that she thought the President [of the Neighborhood Association] had spoken last week saying that if they went to three same-sized lots, the neighborhood would be more amenable to that than to the different sizes option.

Mr. Camp noted that there still seems to be neighborhood concern about the 3/4 acre sizing.

Mr. Cook noted that there were two issues - the assessment issue, which was discussed by Roger Figard at the neighborhood meeting. The other issue was regarding the memo re: the water line installation. He indicated that there won’t be any uncertainty about that. No buyers of these lots will be allowed to ask for an assessment district. That addresses what Roger Figard was talking about. Mr. Cook felt that the lot size issue just depends on whether or not one feels the amenity of the green space and water are desirable. Would it be desirable enough to adjust the arrangement of the lots to allow that? He felt that it was, but did not see how the development could be arranged without losing those features.

Mr. Camp felt there was still opposition. He noted that Mr. Speidell had made concessions, but he was not sure that there had been any changes to the development. He handed out to Council some material showing the development and noted that he would just like some input from Council on the direction the Council felt should be taken, especially from the senior Council members who may have seen this issue before.

Mr. Fortenberry commented that there are a couple of things that complicate this issue. One is the setting of precedent. It could very possibly result in damaging the type of life-style [that has been established] in this area - and in other areas. If this was being re-done now, there would be covenants to protect that type of life-style. This [proposal] would be in violation of the type of development that has previously taken place - sort of the de facto covenant.

The flip side of this, Mr. Fortenberry continued, is that the developer has approached this in a new way of clustering so as to leave more open space. This is good environmental protection and stewardship which we have encouraged in new developments. Trying to retro-
fit it to an old neighborhood is the issue. Mr. Fortenberry also reminded Council of the added complication of what that neighborhood has been through these last three years - the impositions upon it as it has been swallowed up by the City.

Mr. Camp reported on another meeting that he had attended regarding the zoning at a large development that Kent Seacrest is proposing at 84th and Highway 2. There were between 100-150 people there. The purpose of the meeting was informational with engineers and legal representatives available to explain how the 84th & Highway 2 project is proceeding. They had sent letters out ahead of time to find out how it would effect Highway 2; and explained the various stages and phases of the development which would transcend a 10-20 year completion time-frame. Mr. Camp was glad to see so many people there listening at this informational meeting.

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS -

Mr. Shoecraft’s request that Council consider names for nomination to the Police and Fire Pension Advisory Committee, and bring them forward at today’s meeting was discussed: Mr. Shoecraft stated that it had been brought to his attention last Wednesday by Administration and by Ms. Seng that there was a candidate from the last nominating session that had been promised the appointment the “next time”, which would be this appointment opportunity.

Mr. Camp, who had brought the name of Mike Donnelley of the National Bank of Commerce forward for consideration, agreed to let his nominee be next in line for the next Committee opening.

The candidate who was being nominated, Mark Westphalen, had been contacted and was still interested in serving. The Council agreed to his nomination and the Resolution request for appointment was sent to the City Clerk’s Office on August 29, 2000, requesting a 4-year term to expire in October of 2004.

IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS – Noted Without Comment

V. COUNCIL MEMBERS

JONATHAN COOK - Mr. Cook asked about Council procedures regarding public hearings in separate voting sessions. It seemed that public hearing was intruding into the voting session, which was a problem last week. Mr. Cook noted that he sometimes thought of questions during the voting session, which can’t be helped and we want to allow for that. He commented that the Planning Commission struggles with this issue at every meeting. If
something happens and a Commissioner wants to ask more questions, they ask if they should re-open the public hearing; then the Law Department says it would have to be re-advertised and carry it over for two weeks... Mr. Cook noted that Council isn’t that strict, but also noted that they need to be a little more careful, because there was nearly a debate situation last week that went on for quite a while.

Mr. Shoecraft made the observation that this same issue has come up before on other public hearing meetings. He felt that the way Roger was carrying on, the Council should be very careful. Mr. Fortenberry thought it was alright for Council Members to discuss the issue amongst themselves. It’s still a public meeting, but Council is just not taking any further public testimony, which has already been heard. He noted that he had asked Roger a question, and he felt that Mr. Shoecraft was hard on Roger when in fact, since Mr. Fortenberry had asked the question, Mr. Shoecraft, as Chair, should have been hard on Mr. Fortenberry.

Mr. Fortenberry stated that he truly was in a dilemma, which happens sometimes when a Council member is trying to get more information from Staff. He noted that when it becomes a problem, is when somebody in the audience assumes that they can get up and start addressing the issue. The question always has to come from the Council. As long as we pay close attention...

Mr. Shoecraft expressed the concern that the call for vote on an issue is not the time to ask twenty questions. He felt that is where Council may be crossing over a little bit. He noted that Council Members can state their reason for voting or there feelings on an issue at the roll call, but... He explained that the only reason he checked Roger’s response was because it got to a point where Mr. Figard could be making a statement of opinion and not allowing someone else to rebut that, which, in turn, might convince a Council Member or sway a vote - and Staff’s opinion might be wrong. Not allowing someone to rebut that - to present both sides - could convince a Council Member [under biased information... Staff could convince Council to vote a certain way without allowing the opportunity for fair hearing by the public. Mr. Shoecraft noted that Council has to be objective in their voting.

Ms. Johnson stated that with the ordinances, she understood the concern; but sometimes when those resolutions come forward, and we have testimony and then you have just a few minutes to engage, and if there are any question, all of a sudden the issue is over because we’ve already moved on to the next item. There does come a point, if a Council Member is uncomfortable making a vote because of the questions you might have, we ought to allow some questions.

Council, after further discussion, agreed that they would take special care to be fair on the question/answer issue during a voting session.
ANNETTE McROY - Ms. McRoy asked if the man who was denied his claim was to be discussed here. Mr. Shoecraft noted that Council would have to make a decision of whether to pull that claim off the agenda tort claims item and have further investigation and then bring it forward the following week for action - either approval or denial. Ms. Seng commented that she had requested the individual to write to each Council member, which he has done. His concern is that the Public Works Department’s work on the 66th Street widening preceded his troubles.

Mr. Cook stated that there would be no meeting next week, so we would have to hold it over for two weeks. Or, if we do decide to pull this, should we just put it on Pending? How much time does Law need? Mr. Roper stated that it should probably be directed to Public Works and Law can work with the Public Works Office.

Mr. Shoecraft noted that there was one that we had put off indefinitely until a settlement is reached. He didn’t know if this claim would end up in the same situation, but we can do it that way.

Mr. Roper commented that he thought Public Works has said the two - their construction and this man’s problems - were not caused by Public Works. Mr. Roper said that we would need to have Public Works take another look at that and go from there.

Ms. Seng felt this was very wise, because the gentleman stated that there was a Public Works employee who told him differently. So we need to investigate this more.

CINDY JOHNSON - Ms. Johnson asked if any one was going to the Infrastructure Financing Meeting at the Cornhusker. Jeff Fortenberry, Cindy Johnson and Coleen Seng indicated that they were planning to attend. Mr. Shoecraft asked if the public meeting notice requirement had been fulfilled. Mr. Cook asked if more than three Council Members attend that meeting, would that pose a problem? Mr. Roper stated that if it is a public meeting, and has been advertised and duly posted, it would not be a problem. Mr. Cook stated that Council would not be taking any action, but if we’re all in attendance... Mr. Roper stated that it needs to be posted.

It was not known if the meeting had been ‘duly posted’. Mr. Roper suggested that as long as the City Clerk’s Office knows, it should be handled. It does need to be posted. He noted that if there were four Council Members there, posting would be necessary. Mr. Roper indicated that he would be sure that the Clerk’s Office was aware of the meeting and that it required posting.

Ms. Johnson also commented that she felt Staff was doing a phenomenal job in working on the Trailer Court issues. She felt they were being very fair in giving the operators plenty of time. We’ve had pre-councils, and have agreed to some extensions. Staff is getting harangued a little by Mr. Olson because we’re not dealing in Mr. Olson’s time-line. Ms.
Johnson just wanted to inform Council that she is on top of that with Staff. She advised Council to call her if anyone had any questions.

JERRY SHOECRAFT - Mr. Shoecraft noted that Ms. Brinkman had planned to make comments on the public hearing being held today on the Independent Medical Oversight. He noted that EMS, Inc. is delighted with it, he felt that it is a wonderful product. He thought more time would be given to the Hospital so they could look at it too.

Ms. Brinkman stated that she had talked with Arlan Stromburg and the Mayor had talked with Bob Lanigan early this morning. They just wanted a little more time. She stated that the proposed contract that is before Council right now does not change anything as far as the Hospital’s responsibilities or financing. They just wanted a little more time to see if they wanted to tweak some things. So, the public hearing will still occur this afternoon and we’ll just ask to have it continued to the 11th of September and have them both that day, if that’s okay with everybody. She stated that she’ll have more specifics at the hearing today and would be glad to talk with Council over the next two weeks if there are any questions.

Ms. Johnson commented that she just had a few questions, but she’ll ask them later. Ms. Brinkman stated that EMS, Inc. and the Medical Society would have representatives at the public hearing, so if Council had specific questions for them, they’ll be here to answer.

Mr. Camp commended Ms. Brinkman in this process because she was very instrumental in helping this come about. There were several occasions where the Fire Department tried to dilute the Independent Medical Oversight, and Ms. Brinkman stuck by her guns and lived up to the commitment that was made originally. She got us through some difficult times and he wanted to thank her for that.

Ms. Brinkman answered that she just wanted to assure Mr. Camp that the Fire Department had nothing to do with developing the contract. She commented that when we said “Independent Medical Oversight”, we meant independent; so, you can be assured of that. She commented that she knew that Chief Spadt wants to be at the public hearing today just to assure Council that they intend to comply with the agreement.

JEFF FORTENBERRY - Mr. Fortenberry asked if the technology committee, which has already met, and was referenced at the LES Pre-Council meeting earlier this morning was a City Committee? Ms. Harrell answered that it is not a City committee, but more of an informal sort of arrangement to try to investigate what our avenues could be in the future to try to expand the City’s horizons in terms of infrastructure, in terms of economic development opportunities, in terms of quick responses when asked what kind of opportunities we do have in Lincoln - an overall wide variety of types of things. She felt
Council would be hearing more about it in the not too distant future. But it is not a formal committee in the sense of a Planning Commission.

Mr. Fortenberry asked who pulled it together, asking if it had been LES. Mr. Harrell indicated that the Mayor had, with the assistance of LES and LPED.

**COLEEN SENG** - Ms. Seng asked if everyone received “The New American’s Task Force Minutes”? Mr. Fortenberry said he just throws his away. [Laughter] Ms. Seng noted that Council really needs to read those, because our community is really changing. That is why she wanted to make sure everybody was receiving those minutes.

Ms. Seng also commented on the note she had received from Ms. Nancy Russell [a copy was passed out to each Council Member] which suggested that Ms. Johnson be put in charge of “everything” regarding the adult business zoning ordinance. (A copy of the note is on file in the Council Office)

Ms. Seng also commented on the Council being notified on upcoming press conferences. She stated that Council Members were not getting called anymore, noting that Council Members cannot attend functions if they do not know about them. She explained that they had, in the past, been notified by either the Mayor’s Office or the Council Office, especially on late notifications. Several Council members agreed that notification would be helpful. Ms. Harrell indicated that she would talk with Ms. Diane Gonzolas of CIC about notifying Council Members in these situations in time for Council Members to be able to attend if their schedules would allow.

**JON CAMP** - Mr. Camp brought up what he termed a sensitive issue in the dealing with this pre-hospital groups of care. He had concerns with the process. He didn’t want to cause division on the Council, but he noted with his legal background, he looked at these things in terms of legal context. He commented that he realized the Council will not always agree on issues, but there are some things happening in this instance that he was uncomfortable with...things aren’t going the way they should for the benefit of our constituents.

Mr. Shoecraft answered Mr. Camp by stating that “just because you’re an attorney, doesn’t mean you’re right.” Mr. Camp answered that he did not say that. Mr. Shoecraft commented that Mr. Camp was always referring to his law background. Just because you have a law background as an attorney doesn’t mean you’re right, Mr. Shoecraft stated.

Mr. Camp answered that he thought his background does enable him to see certain issues. He has read these things and... Mr. Shoecraft commented that that doesn’t mean Mr. Camp was right. Mr. Camp stated that he hadn’t said he was right, but if we don’t talk about the issue... There are certain times we can be political, but there are other times that we need to really look at the community’s best interest. This is one [issue] that has gotten
too darn political. This last year has seen nothing but that [politics on this issue] - this fact is so transparent. And Mr. Camp stated that he is concerned because he knows that each of the Council members cares about the community.

Mr. Camp felt that he was just being ignored. He noted that Mr. Shoecraft hadn’t talked to him for three months. He commented that Mr. Shoecraft hadn’t responded to Mr. Camp’s pleas to get together; but instead sent scathing e-mails. He noted that that is not the way to deal with Council concerns. He noted that he and Mr. Shoecraft had been good friends up to three months ago, and suddenly, he noted Mr. Shoecraft had just turned on him. Mr. Camp felt that is not the way life goes.

Mr. Shoecraft stated that “I’m still the same Shoe”. He noted that he just does not agree with Mr. Camp and his actions. He noted that Mr. Camp should handle his business as he saw fit and Mr. Shoecraft would handle his as he saw fit. We all do our own business. Mr. Camp said “No, Jerry...” Mr. Shoecraft continued, noting that he just does not agree with Mr. Camp’s way. Mr. Shoecraft stated that he felt Mr. Camp was dividing and polarizing the Council and the community. He stated that that was his opinion.

Mr. Camp stated that Mr. Shoecraft’s opinion has changed. Mr. Shoecraft reiterated his above remarks adding that Mr. Camp had opened up this can of worms.

Mr. Camp stated that he was simply asking questions on the RFP. Mr. Shoecraft suggested to Mr. Camp that he not refer to himself, because he has a law background, and “therefore”! Mr. Shoecraft stated that “that doesn’t mean you’re right. Dana is not always right” Mr. Roper interjected the comment “pretty close”. [Laughter]

Ms. Johnson commented that each Council member brings a different perspective to an issue. Sometimes how we do business is based on the perspective we bring, and it has nothing to do with “right” or “wrong”, it’s just how we think. Ms. Johnson stated that she respects everyone’s perspective and learns from them. She felt there was no reason why we can’t bring those perspectives to the table. Yes, we’ll probably be obnoxious in some areas. She stated that she has been obnoxious on some alcohol issue, just ask some people in the community who have been polarized in the process... but we’ve worked through it. It was a tough go the first year and Ms. Johnson revealed that she had felt polarized by her colleagues, but you have to work through those issues. She commented that she didn’t know that this issue was any different. She didn’t see this any differently than the alcohol issue. She pointed out to Mr. Shoecraft that he had brought different perspectives to the alcohol issues.

Mr. Shoecraft commented that Council can agree to disagree.

Ms. McRoy commented that on the ambulance purchase issue, she would want to see the bids and the RFPs once they’ve done their analysis and the proposals come before us, so we can make sure that we are getting the best dollar buy for the citizens. She didn’t disagree, stating that that is Council’s mission. But, her whole take on the pre-council was related to her experience with purchasing her own vehicle. She shopped and bartered with the different
dealers to get what she wanted at the best price. She noted that the Fire Department wants certain things - specifications - and she did not want to get the Council into an area where we're deciding standards. She feels those involved with the purchase should know and be allowed to work out the best options at the best price. After the Federal standards are met, perhaps bells & whistles aren't necessary, but they should be allowed to spend now to get the best ambulances for our needs and budget.

Ms. McRoy stated that Mr. Camp had valid points, but she would like to wait until the bid process is completed and then look over all the bids and be able to say this is the best price we can get for our money, because it is, finally, Council's decision. But she did not want to build the RFP for them. She didn't want to set a micro-management precedent for Council's dealing with City Departments. Our job is to oversee, but not to build specifications. We need to wait and see what they bring forward to us. If there are too many bells and whistles, then by all means, we can say so.

Mr. Camp asked if Council had read his July 25th and August 14th Memo's to Vince [Mejer] and Don [Herz]? He noted that in those memos he was not pushing the bells and whistles question, but was questioning the word for word [replication of the bid submitted] by Road Rescue. It is one thing for us as individuals to buy a car; it's another thing when a government entity is purchasing. Mr. Camp continued noting that as he read the City Charter, it is the Council's responsibility to provide a [inaudible] environment, but if you give something so specific... He asked Council if they had read the specifications on the RFPs? Council indicated that they had not seen them. Mr. Camp told them that the specs were on the Internet. Ms. Johnson commented that they don't even check their e-mail. [Laughter].

Mr. Camp commented that Council should not be doing the RFPs. His further comments regarded the specifications being so specific that they would eliminate any but the Road Rescue bid. He asked if no one else felt a concern about this. Will we wait until this is brought to the Council. Then what will we do? By then, the process is so far down the road that we don't do anything. He commented that perhaps they should follow New York City's lead by just backing off. They re-did their specs after calling in a consultant. He noted that the Council as a body were the elected officials. He is trying to say to Council - this smells. This is not good. These [ambulances] are over-priced. He felt they would be even more over-priced if he had not issued that July 25th memo questioning specifics. Who loaned the City's Fire Department the one or two Road Rescue vehicles they paraded around Lincoln during this RFI process. Gee whiz! That just doesn't look appropriate for one manufacturer to do that. Mr. Shoecraft talks about proprieties and so forth before bids. They provided that ambulance. He noted that he did hear that the Fire Union paid a dollar rental, but that's still.... The active Fire Chief and Fire personnel were driving that.

It just goes on - the specifications are 95% the same as Road Rescues specifications, with some artificial masking in it. He stated that he would be glad to walk the Council
through the specs section by section. He stated that this concerns him and he stated that he did not hear that concern from any of the other Council Members.

Mr. Camp commented maybe he’s out on a limb by himself, but this issue concerns him. He stated that he did not hear that from any of the Council. You’re saying “well, wait ‘til the [inaudible].” Mr. Camp said that he could not do that. If this causes some discomfort, then he guessed he had to create discomfort. These are just facts that I’m asking for and the Fire Chief says is that it’s just politics or that other cities have done it. Mr. Camp noted that he did not care if other cities have done a corrupted process. He stated that he wanted to do the best for our community. Let’s learn and look. He noted that he had no problem with certain general specifications. That doesn’t bother him. But, when you’re talking about such minute details ...that’s getting into construction methods.

Mr. Shoecraft asked if there was anything else Council wanted to discuss.

Mr. Camp asked if anyone else had a concern, or is it just him? Ms. Johnson asked what Mr. Camp wanted done. Mr. Camp stated that he thought this should be thrown out; either that, or let’s have an investigation. This...

Mr. Shoecraft stated that we’re not throwing [anything out]. He commented that Vince Mejer has been a part of the City for over twenty years. Mr. Camp indicated that he is not blaming Mr. Mejer, noting that Mr. Mejer didn’t have the necessary time.

Mr. Shoecraft stated that we’re not throwing any bid process out. He said the only way we’d throw a bid process out is if you [Mr. Camp] tampered with the bids. That’s the only way. That is the only way.

Mr. Camp responded that he resented Mr. Shoecraft even asking that question earlier today.

Mr. Shoecraft said they...that he had to ask the question. He apologized. But to “cover our butts” we had to ask the question. Mr. Camp asked who asked, who had indicated that to Mr. Shoecraft? Mr. Shoecraft stated that the question had to be asked because the letter on the 17th and the newspaper article made it look that way. The question helped “cover our butts. We had to ask the question”. Mr. Shoecraft went to say that there are still some additional questions because, if there was tampering...not on purpose... but contact, then we’ve got to find out. There can be no contact until the bids are opened. If there was contact, then we may have to re-bid it. If not, then we’ll leave it at that.

Mr. Shoecraft noted that there had been a pre-council on this. The process is going. If Council wants to change the bids, throw them out, he didn’t know if we have the authority to do that. If you think you’ve got four votes to do it, do it. Otherwise, we had the pre-council...and this is the “Noon” meeting. If you want to visit more about that individually with each other, do so. But he did not know if this discussion should be carried on right here right now with no directors or anybody else being in attendance.
Mr. Camp stated that if we just refuse to talk about this... Mr. Shoecraft reiterated that he was not going to talk about that here at the “Noon” meeting about the bid process and what is corrupted or whatever, etc...etc. Mr. Mejer has been here for twenty years; I’m not going to question him. Mr. Camp stated that he was not criticizing Mr. Mejer, he was criticizing the way Bill Madison sent those specs. Mr. Camp said that Vince didn’t know; Vince admitted that to the newspaper - that he didn’t know.

ANN HARRELL - No Further Comments

JENNIFER BRINKMAN - No Further Comments

DANA ROPER - No Further Comments

ADDENDUM:

Meetings/Invitations - Noted without Comment

Appointments/Reappointments

1. Memo from Jennifer Brinkman - re: Boards and commissions upcoming appointments - Noted Without Comment

2. Letter from Terry Genrich - Natural Resources Manager Re: Appointment to the Wilderness Park Advisory Committee - One Member of City Council. - Council agreed by consensus that Jeff Fortenberry would be the Council representative on this committee. (Mr. Fortenberry accepted the nomination.)

VI. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - NONE

VII. MISCELLANEOUS - NONE

VIII. MEETING ENDED - Approximately 12:47 p.m.