

**AGENDA FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS' "NOON" MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2002
Immediately Following Director's Meeting
CONFERENCE ROOM 113**

I. MINUTES

1. Minutes of "Noon" Council Members' Meeting for April 4, 2002.
2. Minutes of Director's Meeting for January 7, 2002.
3. Pre-Council Meeting Minutes - RE: Comprehensive Plan Review - March 18, 2002.
4. Pre-Council Meeting Minutes - RE: Update on Text Amendment: Storage of Autos for Sale in the Front Yard - March 18, 2002.

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

1. Special Public Building Commission Meeting (Camp/Seng)
2. Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Meeting (Cook)
3. Community Development Task Force Meeting (Cook)
4. Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development Investors' Meeting (McRoy)
5. Joint Budget Meeting (McRoy/Seng)
6. C-SIP Steering Committee (McRoy/Seng)
7. C-SIP Funding Committee Meeting (Seng)

OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS:

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS - NONE

IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS

1. Come Visit Beautiful. . . . Technology Park - "Home of Digital IMS" - Ribbon-Cutting - Open House at 4:30 p.m. on Friday, April 12, 2002 (See Invitation).
2. Installation of Officers - Lincoln Lodge #80 - Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks cordially invites you to attend the public installation of Thomas H. Roper - Exalted Ruler for the Fraternal year 2002-2003 and fellow officers - Wednesday, April 10, 2002 at 7:30 p.m., 5910 South 58th Street - Reception following installation (See Invitation).

3. Invitation from City Clerk Joan Ross - Official's Night -SE Area Municipal Clerk's Association - You are cordially invited to the SE Area Clerks' Association Annual Elected Officials Dinner – On Wednesday, April 17, 2002 at Lincoln, Nebraska at The Knolls Restaurant & Lounge, 2201 Old Cheney Road (Turn south at the stop light for Norman Rd., which is approximately 22nd & Old Cheney Rd.) - Social Hour from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. & Dinner served at 7:00 p.m. – Cash Bar Available – \$16.00 per person – Lynn Rex, Director, League of Nebraska Municipalities speaking on recent legislation – RSVP to City Clerk Joan Ross at 441-7438 by April 11, 2002 (See Invitation).
4. On behalf of the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department and the L/L County SAFE KIDS Coalition, we cordially invite you to help kick off the 6th Annual Diaper Derby - This awareness activity is held in conjunction with National Public Health Week April 1-7, 2002, - on Friday, April 5, 2002 at 1:00 p.m. in the Lincoln Wal-Mart Supercenter, 4700 North 27th Street - (Council received their copies on 4/1/02) (See Letter of Invitation).
5. You are invited to attend the 2002 School Health Fair Awards Banquet as a guest of the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department - The Banquet will be held on Tuesday, April 16, 2002 at the Auld Recreation Center located in Lancaster Extension Education Center, 444 Cherrycreek Road - The evening's festivities will begin at 6:00 p.m., and will include dinner, entertainment, and a special recognition ceremony to honor the winning students - The theme for this year's School Health Fair is "Breathing Easy!" – RSVP to Brenda Harter at 441-6285 or Janette Johnson at 441-8045 by April 11, 2002 (See Invitation).
6. The Mayor's Office and the Lincoln Police Department will be holding a Methamphetamine Summit on Tuesday, May 7, 2002 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the Cornhusker Hotel, Lancaster Room – Please contact Sergeant Mike Woolman at 441-7215 to register to attend (See Letter of Invitation & Agenda).
7. You are cordially invited to a luncheon honoring the 2002 College of Business Administration Alumni Association Award recipients - On Friday, April 26, 2002 at 12:00 p.m. - University of Nebraska - The Champions Club - \$15.00 per person - RSVP by April 22, 2002 (See Invitation).
8. You are invited to the Downtown Lincoln Technology Fair kickoff luncheon featuring keynote speaker C. Edward McVaney - McVaney, a graduate of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, will discuss partnerships for economic development – Downtown Lincoln Technology Fair Luncheon on Thursday, April 25, 2002 - Doors open: 11:30 a.m. - Lunch & Program: 12:00 p.m. (Noon) – University of Nebraska Student Union, 14th & R Streets, Centennial Room, 2nd floor – Cost: \$15.00 per person or \$120.00 to sponsor a table of 8 - RSVP by April 15th - Please fill out RSVP enclosed card and send to them (See Invitation).

9. You are invited to attend a luncheon hosted by the Friends of the Mayor's Committee for International Friendship on Monday, April 29, 2002 at Noon – At the Governor's Mansion, 14th & H Streets – Professor Charles Drummond Speaking on "Prospects for Peace" – Luncheon reservations, \$15.00 per person AND Notice of Joint Annual Meeting Mayor's Committee for International Friendship (MCIF) & Friends of MCIF on Monday, April 29, 2002 Following The Luncheon & Speaker – (See Invitation).

V. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - NONE

VI. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Discussion on LPED & Economic Developers position.
2. Discussion of Council Rules regarding Resolutions. (Requested by Jonathan Cook)

VII. CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS' "NOON" MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2002
CONFERENCE ROOM 113

Council Members Present: Annette McRoy, Chair; Jonathan Cook, Vice-Chair; Jon Camp, Glenn Friendt, Coleen Seng, Ken Svoboda, Terry Werner; **ABSENT:** None

Others Present: Mayor Don Wesely (for a portion of the meeting), Mark Bowen, Ann Harrell, Amy Tejral, Mayor's Office; Dana Roper, City Attorney; Joan Ross, City Clerk; Joan Ray, Council Secretary; Nate Jenkins, *Lincoln Journal Star* representative.

I. MINUTES

1. Minutes of "Noon" Council Members' Meeting for April 1, 2002.
2. Minutes of Director's Meeting for January 7, 2002.
3. Pre-Council Meeting Minutes - RE: Comprehensive Plan Review - March 18, 2002.
4. Pre-Council Meeting Minutes - RE: Update on Text Amendment: Storage of Autos for Sale in the Front Yard - March 18, 2002.

Vice-Chair Jonathan Cook requested a motion to approve the above-listed minutes. Ken Svoboda moved approval of the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Coleen Seng and carried unanimously by consensus for approval.

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

1. SPECIAL PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION MEETING (Camp/Seng) Mr. Camp reported that there had been so much covered at the meeting, this report may have to be continued at another time, just to cover everything. He noted that they have been working on three major areas. One is the parking garage to the north, on which Sinclair-Hille has presented quite a few plans. On the north lot, we will build one level which will encompass the whole block with 300 parking spots; then the south floor ½ portion, would have another deck added, with another 178 stalls. They would be separate, not ramped together [?].

PBC came to a consensus to have footings put in so we would be able, down the road, to put more decks above that for an addition of approximately 900 stalls (Mr. Bowen indicated that the exact number was 875).

Mr. Camp explained that the provision for elevators, (initially a two-level and later installing a 5-stop, if we build up that high), was also discussed. He noted that PBC was trying to remain [architecturally] compatible with the County-City Building and the Capitol Environs guidelines (even though it is not in the Capitol Environs area). We *did* want to make sure it [structure style] didn't conflict with this three-building complex.

Mr. Camp reported that Kathy Campbell wanted to have us think about the possibility of, eventually, putting a garage addition on the north 1/3 of the block, if we want to have just a lower level parking area.

Ms. Seng mentioned that one of the things they were really trying to do is to envision what will be needed 30-40 years down the road. We wanted to make sure we had the footings there to enable others to do whatever might be needed, whether that would be another deck, or an office building, or whatever. That needs to be done now, so the footings are in there when needed, so the City won't get in trouble because *we* weren't far-sighted.

Mr. Camp reported that in the summary, the cost per stall is shown as \$7,000. But if you add the footings, that would bump the price up to between \$7-8,000. That doesn't include land acquisition.

Mr. Camp reported that another issue discussed was access from the garage to this building. The consensus seemed to go with an underground walkway under "K" Street. It would be a culvert of 8 feet square internal dimensions. There would be lighting on it under "K" Street. The construction would shut down "K" Street and the hope is it would be quickly completed in order to have "K" Street re-opened quickly. It would be constructed of a thick plastic substance ... a slanted material that would allow ceiling light to come down so it would be well lit and, in addition, have electrical lighting. On this campus side of the structure, it would come into the stairwell that is in the present garage. So, there would be good accessibility. A disabled individual would be able to access the elevators or a person could go right up the stairwell.

Mr. Camp reported that there is about \$300-400,000 cost for that, but it seemed to be the consensus of the PBC that a method of crossing "K" Street safely would warrant the expense. Mr. Svoboda laughed, noting, with apology, that he couldn't even believe this was being talked about. In the budget constraints that we have coming up and that we currently have -that we're going to spend \$400,000- instead of people just walking from a parking garage across the cross-walk?

Ms. Seng suggested that we start way-back. This is a Larry Hudkins suggestion that we have a tunnel, between the buildings...if it was possible. We are looking at the person who was always upset that we couldn't do something across the street [east]. So, Jim Hille figured out that we could do a tunnel, and we could get something out on the front of this building so it would look good. Ms. Seng noted that she had been worried about how it would look if we try to do some kind of a porch affair out there. And how were we ever going to get the public to think that they ought to be able get over here. After spending some time on the question, Hille came up with this. She noted that it looks better every time we review it. This needs to be coming and it needs to provide accessibility so that people can park over there and get across this street -under the street.

She explained that there would be just a slight incline to get up to where they would come into the garage here. Mr. Svoboda stated that he had no doubt that it would be nice. But, when they say \$400,000, you know it'll be \$450-500,000 once they finally get into it. He just thought it seems like a huge waste of money.

Mr. Werner asked what this would do to the security into the parking garage? Ms. Seng said that is an issue that would have to be addressed. She stated that there have to be elevators on the other side if we're going to make it accessible. She noted that you can't look at just what we need today. We need to be looking at

long-range needs. Mr. Svoboda stated that he didnt see a need for a tunnel or a skywalk, or anything...even 50 years down the road. We've got cross-walks. It's just a walk across the street.

Mr. Cook commented that City/County government would eventually have buildings all the way down to "O" Street. [Truly a specter for the Public's imagination] Mr. Friendt stated that by then people will probably not want to go outside at all, ever....let alone walk across the street! [Laughter]

Mr. Werner agreed with Mr. Svoboda, thinking that the cost seemed excessive. Mr. Camp asked Mr. Werner if he had reservations, too. Mr. Werner noted that he would have serious reservations. Mr. Camp noted that he and Ms. Seng were making this presentation to get Council input, so he wanted to hear what everyone thought. Ms. McRoy stated that the feelings went beyond reservations to the level of objections. Mr. Svoboda agreed, there were no reservations, this was a flat-out objection.

Discussion continued, with a general consensus of scepticism being expressed. Mr. Cook stated that he would be interested in getting further information on this.

Ms. Seng noted that there was another issue that needed to be discussed. Mr. Camp gave a brief report on the Space Study report. It was noted that the last study had been done 10 years ago, so Joanne Kissell presented the current report to PBC . The idea is to consider what we need in terms of office space. He noted that a lot of the report is premised on what will happen with the Old Fed Building, adding that on April 15th, there should be some definition on that.

Mr. Camp reported that one of the difficult issues is the Police & Law Enforcement and Judicial area. Though all of the departments are expanding and struggling with space concerns, this is the area where huge growth is occuring. The County Attorney will have 70 more attorneys with the Public Defenders Office and the City/County Attorney's Offices....a tremendous number of people (including support staff). There was discussion of moving the City Attorney's Office to the 3rd Floor of this building. There are a number of issues to be determined in such a move, including costs.

Ms. Seng noted that the main issue of concern to Council Members would be the proposal that Council Offices be moved to the County Commissioners area and turn the Council Offices into a conference room...similar to Room 113. She stated that she had never thought of the Council Office space as being the size of this conference room, but it would probably, by taking the walkway out of it, be about this size. Ms. Seng told Council members that after several meetings, with 70 different groups, Ms. Kissell had related that the main issue of concern had been conference rooms.

Ms. Seng said the plan that was shown would be County Commissioners on 2nd, with the Mayor's Office on 3rd. We'd be "stacked", one above the other. This is just a draft that was presented to us today. Ms. Kissell would like to have two more long sessions with PBC and Council will be kept updated.

Mr. Werner stated that it would seem like a huge piece of this puzzle is the Old Federal Building. Does she provide alternatives, depending on which way the Old Fed goes? Mr. Camp said that her very first statement was that everything discussed was dependent upon the Old Federal piece. If that is not vacated, then a lot of this would be... Mr. Werner asked if she had gone on the assumption that

it will be vacated. Ms. Seng noted that that is the premise that everything in this draft is based on.

Mr. Friendt asked what sort of time-frame we were looking at on the expansion? Mr. Camp answered that the study projects about 10 years into the future for space needs. Mr. Friendt asked if this would provide space plans for a united Public Works? Mr. Camp stated that it would not. Mr. Camp noted that the portion presented by Ms. Kissell included just this campus [three-building complex]. He noted that it did not include the entire Public Works areas. Part of the Public Works administrative offices would be included here, but the Engineering Services, the Garage & related areas were not included in this study.

2. PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD (Cook) Mr. Cook reported that a Mr. George Day had attended the meeting. He was there to discuss the Winnett Trust which was started 75 years ago and currently has a balance of over \$1,000,000. It produces a certain amount of money each year -approximately \$30,000.00 for fountains and sculptures in Lincoln. Ms. Seng was pleased. Mr. Cook stated that Mr. Day was very upset about the fountains having been filled-in at the Centennial Mall, since back in the '80s this Winnett Trust helped fund some work on those fountains to keep them operating. He was upset because no one came to the Trust to ask for more money to maintain them. Mr. Cook reported that Mr. Lynn Johnson, Parks Director, had explained that the fountains were in such bad shape that, really, they were falling in.

Ms. Seng asked if Lincoln could have more fountains if we utilized that fund? Mr. Cook said that was potentially so; but this money is being used for the landscaping around the elk at Pioneers Park. He added that Lynn Johnson was going to prepare a list of what projects this money has been used for over the last 10 years. Mr. Werner asked if there wouldn't be Board of some sort to oversee the funds? Mr. Cook stated that he did not know if there was a board, or exactly how it's administered as this was the first time he had ever heard of the fund. So, he will be finding out more about the fund and reporting back to Council when he has a list of the projects it has been used for.

Mr. Cook continued his report, stating that they had discussed the irrigation of the golf courses. Their ultimate goal is to move to non-city water for all the golf courses, except Pioneers, because the underground water there is too salty. Of course, they haven't made much progress on reaching that goal...but it is the goal.

The Board voted on a pool fee increase. Mr. Cook stated that last time they had discussed 'no increases'...foregoing the increase because of the hours cut-back. They had determined that the hours cut-backs would save more money than the fee increase. These increases are very minor, a tiny number of increases, with pool rentals going up. Most of the rates, however, stayed the same.

Mr. Friendt asked if the usage data of the pools indicate the new restricted hours might effect that many pools? Mr. Cook stated that the hours they're restricting to will effect the fewest people...the exact number, Mr. Cook did not recall, believing that they would be the hours of least use.

Ms. McRoy asked if they were closing them at six o'clock in the evening? Mr. Cook stated that that was the information in last months report. He did not recall the pool hours, however. Ms. McRoy was concerned that six o'clock was when the people who get off work would take their kids; so closing at six would effect the working people who want to take their kids at that time. Mr. Werner noted that the six o'clock closing hour was not at all the pools, though. It was noted that it was just the neighborhood pools...the ones we would want to remain open. Mr. Cook noted that he would get the pool hours for Council Members.

He continued his report, adding that they had voted to recognize Bill Story with a plaque at the University Place Pool, but will continue calling it University Place Pool. Ms. Seng asked if there was a date on the opening of that pool? Mr. Cook stated that he did not know.

Mr. Cook reported that the proposed park at 98th and Adams would be named Burnside Park. This time there is a legitimate reason for naming it that, since the Burnsides are donating the land, which qualifies under the Parks & Rec Naming Policy as a proper designation.

Mr. Werner asked if the property was all drainage? Mr. Cook stated that it does go through drainage and Stevens Creek. It is a tree-lined area along the drainage way, so it's a good place for a park.

Mr. Cook stated that the Holmes Lake Restoration Project was discussed. The original discussion was that the water would be drained, let the area dry for six months or more, then take heavy equipment in and scoop it out. The new thought is that, maybe they will dredge it while the lake bed is under water. They can basically pump the dirt (or sludge) out of the lake in sort of a slurry. They can pump it to any location...as long as they can run a long enough hose. Right now they're talking about moving it to the Holmes Lake Golf Course and piling it up there. It would change the topography of the golf course, but that is the closest location of deposit.

To haul the sludge away would cost \$10.00 per cubic yard; to keep it there on the golf course would cost \$3.00 per cubic yard. This would save a lot of money. Ms. McRoy asked if the material could be sold? Mr. Cook stated that there had been discussion of that issue, but we're not sure what all is in the dirt. They'll look into the possibility of the sale of the "goo". Once it's pumped out and piled up, it will take a long time to dry. But, they won't have to irrigate that land when they plant grass on it because it would be so wet to begin with.

Mr. Friendt stated that he had heard one of the concerns about draining the lake would be the smell during that drying process. So, will this mountain of "goo" smell like a confined feeding operation? Mr. Cook noted that that was a good question, stating that they had not discussed smells. He told Council that there had been discussion on lowering the lake 3-1/2 feet anyway in order to do the dredging. They were talking about having to take out 450,000 cubic yards of dirt...which is a lot of dirt.

They're doing the preliminary design and are investigating the dredging options. If they do decide to do the dredging under water, it would save a lot of money.

Mr. Cook stated that what they want when they're all finished is for the Lake to be clean enough so that you can see your hand at 30 inches down. Right now, visibility is only eleven inches down. Mr. Cook thought this was a pretty aggressive goal...wondering if it had ever been that clear. Mr. McRoy asked, wryly, why one would need to see a hand, since no one can swim in the lake?

Mr. Svoboda stated that after the cleaning, the hope is that there will be swimming allowed. That's one of the things they planned to do - install buffers upstream that would hold any silt and waste from coming in from the untreated areas to the east.

Council discussed other areas of contamination in the area and it was noted that the dog run is not a major area of contamination of the lake. Ms. Seng stated that chemical seepage was the main source of lake contamination. The sediment from development in southeast Lincoln was another major source and would be reduced since that area has been fully developed. Ms. Seng noted that is why we can do the restoration project now. Mr. Cook observed that it is a once-in-a-life time project.

He reported that there would be two public meetings on May 14th and June 25th at 7:00 p.m. with no locations announced at this time.

The last issue of discussion at the Parks & Rec Advisory Board meeting was the dedication of the "F" Street Community Center. That will be at 9:30 a.m. on April 25th. However, if any Council Member is interested in a pre-dedication tour, the Park & Recs Advisory Board Members are invited (and Mr. Cook assumed they would welcome any Council Members who wished to attend) on Tuesday, April 23rd at 3:00 p.m.

3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE (Cook) Mr. Cook reported that this meeting conflicted with the Parks & Rec Advisory Board meeting schedule and he did not attend. He did understand that they voted on the One-Year Action Plan. That will be moving along.
4. LINCOLN PARTNERSHIP FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INVESTORS' MEETING (McRoy) - Carried over to 04-15-02 "Noon" Meeting.
5. JOINT BUDGET MEETING (McRoy/Seng) - Carried over to 04-15-02 "Noon" Meeting
6. C-SIP STEERING COMMITTEE (McRoy/Seng) - Carried over to 04-15-02 "Noon" Meeting
7. C-SIP FUNDING COMMITTEE MEETING (Seng) - Carried over to 04-15-02 "Noon" Meeting

OTHER MEETING REPORTS - None

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS - Noted Without Significant Comment, but Ms. Tejral passed out material on upcoming appointments for consideration and input from Council. The request that Council be given advance updates on upcoming appointment nominees, as well as those actually selected for consideration, was addressed again.

Mr. Werner asked that Council Committee Assignments be discussed sometime soon. *Staff noted that lists of the committee assignments would be included for discussion on next week's "Noon" Agenda.*

Mr. Werner asked when the Council would be electing the new Chair and Vice-Chair. Mr. Cook determined that the date for that election, which is officially scheduled on an undetermined Monday in May, would be discussed at a later date.

IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS - Noted Without Significant Comment

V. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - None

VI. MISCELLANEOUS -

1. Discussion on LPED & Economic Developers position. Council discussed the LPED Economic Developer position in preparation for the Public Hearing to be held at today's Formal Council Meeting. Mr. Bowen handed out a summary of how the position had evolved through the early Fall through the Winter and into the current time frame. The summary shows how the position would be structured and the advancing of the inter-local agreement.

Mr. Bowen commented that Council had brought forward concerns regarding both the need and the funding for this position. This summary addresses both of those concerns. A part of working with LPED, which they say they aren't doing currently, is having someone who can or does speak for the City/County or LES. We deal with them on a regular basis with all kinds of projects, so it is very evident to us that it is time for us to give them an individual who can be a single contact resource to deal with all three entities and who would coordinate the things that we do with LPED and those things we do separately.

Concerning the funding issue, it is a jointly funded project -\$25,000 from each entity (City/County/LES). The City's share is coming from Unprogrammed Funds. That is the source of our contribution toward the \$75,000 total amount. Mr. Werner asked if that was the funding source for this year only? Mr. Bowen answered that it would be for this year only; then, we'll advance the amount into the regular budget. He reported that Urban Development had assured them that these are not funds being taken away from anybody this year. These are Unprogrammed Funds.

Mr. Bowen also passed out to Council copies of letters from LPED and one from the University, received this morning, which support this position.

Mr. Bowen indicated that Bob Workman from the County Board plans to come forward at the meeting in support of the position.

Ms. McRoy asked if a representative of LPED would be at the public hearing today? Mr. Bowen indicated that there would be no representative from LPED at the hearing. The two people he had contacted regarding attendance were both out of town. The joint statement received March 21st will be submitted as the official comment from them.

Mr. Cook called for questions. Mr. Werner asked if this would not preclude any discussion at some point in the near future of restructuring LPED? Mr. Bowen stated that we are in a three-year contract with LPED and we are completing the first year of that three-year contract. So, there would be two years left on the contract. Mr. Werner noted that there may be reasons to get out of that contract, perhaps. And he would at least like to have the discussion about including other entities, such as small businesses, in the structure of LPED.

Mr. Werner commented that he did not know what had happened to the LIBA Letter he had sent, but it seemed no one had received a copy, which he requested be done. *[A check with Council Staff indicated that the Council Members had been given their copies of the letter after the evening meeting of March 25th. The Mayor's Office was sent a copy through inter-office and the original letter was sent to Mr. McCue (both of which would have been sent in Tuesday, March 26th morning mail). Mr. McCue also was sent a faxed copy at the Chamber of Commerce office. LPED personnel also received a fax'd copy - sent on the evening of March 25th.]*

Mr. Cook asked what becomes of this position? It may be funded with Unprogramed dollars for the remainder of this year, but what about the \$25,000 for next year. And if we restructure LPED and this person is presumably one that we would want to keep on. Can this person have his/her assignment changed or his/her funding changed for next year, when we make some changes in LPEDs structure?

Mayor Wesely stated that he thought we should consider this as an ongoing position, because there will be an ongoing need. The problem of trying to work through beuracracy in getting projects done is always there. The under-staffing we've experienced in economic development is really severe. Adding several additional staff won't even come close to what really needs to be done. So, there will be an ongoing need. Obviously, we have to be flexible and willing to make adjustments as we work through any changes.

The Mayor noted that one of the reasons we looked for partners is because he felt the University was not as closely involved with LPED as they needed to be. They are really an important part of the economic future of this community and they haven't really been directly involved. The Mayor didn't believe that the University had even been giving any money to LPED at any point prior to this. So, he felt the fact that they're willing to put in some money and help with some staffing and play a bigger role is important. Likewise, the County hadn't played that big a part, though they had put some money into the LPED budget - but not very much. Adding those two partners [into an active role] broadens our base and increases our effectiveness.

The Mayor noted that Mr. Werner was correct in saying that the broader the inclusion we have, the more commitment and financial as well as staffing resources available, the more we can do. He felt being open-minded about that is a good idea. Mr. Cook asked, when it comes to the funding of this position, what is the City's obligation under the interlocal agreement - as far as getting out of it, or changing funding sources - or anything like that?

Mr. Bowen stated that it doesn't identify how each will contribute from their own budget. Mr. Cook asked what the City's obligation under the interlocal was regarding the number of years of financial obligation. What are our options for

getting out of the interlocal; for making changes in LPED? Mr. Cook stated that he would assume if we make some changes, that may involve County and LES and UN-L in some other way, which hopefully they'd be excited about.

Mr. Bowen answered that in the interlocal agreement there is a clause allowing termination by any party of the agreement with 60 days notice. Mr. Bowen gave Council a schedule of notification requirements. It was noted that termination of the agreement would require a one year notification to LPED.

Ms. Seng asked if there was a need to keep LPED as well as this proposed position? Mayor Wesely answered that he thought, in some form, LPED serves a very important purpose [inaudible]. The Mayor stated that LPED would need to be the lead, because they're the focal point where the partnerships come together.

Ms. Seng asked if this person would actually be a back-up person for LPED? Mayor Wesley answered that Bruce Wright, who is on the LPED Board, came up with a strategy where this position will become the head of a team of City/County/LES employees who would meet, probably weekly. The person would coordinate efforts, checking to see who was working on what projects. Assignments would be delegated to appropriate staff to expedite the completion of any projects being considered.

This person would become the one that meets weekly, too, with the LPED staff, where assignments would be made from that side to coordinate the efforts directly with the companies being worked with. LPED would be the lead entity making those assignments; we would be a part of the team.

The Mayor explained that it's a couple of teams working together. Likewise, the University would step in and have a staff person involved as part of the team. That person would go back to the campus with requests for help that the University could provide. It has a potential of, again, broadening our base and being more inclusive.

Mr. Cook called on Ms. McRoy and then Mr. Camp for comments. Ms. McRoy indicated that she had received a letter from a constituent with the notation that the private sector would fund this position and asked if LPED was willing to do this? Mr. Bowen stated that he had not seen that letter, so could not comment.

Mayor Wesely stated that the writer could be referring to a position that LPED is planning to add. They will add another staff person. There is the potential for a third person added to the team when the University adds one. The Mayor noted that it may seem like going from one to four is a huge leap, but he wanted to state that we are really in need of all that attention to the economic development issue.

Ms. McRoy stated that there is more work than one person can handle. Mayor Wesely agreed, noting that the work load is just unbelievable. There are companies out there right now that are needing attention and aren't getting any whatsoever. We need some staff that we don't have. He noted that this is no reflection [on anyone], it's just that we're understaffed.

Mr. Werner noted that that is the reason we need the audit - to find where the money is going. He noted that he doesn't disagree... The Vice-Chair noted that Mr. Werner was out of order, though the audit should be discussed. Mr. Cook stated that a few more questions regarding the position, itself, should be addressed first, however.

Mr. Camp stated that he had requested the position be placed on the City/County Common meeting scheduled for April 9th. He indicated that he would like to postpone discussion until after that meeting, noting that he felt he'd been receiving mixed signals from the County Commissioners on this issue. The Commons is the forum to have a discussion with the County Commissioners regarding this position. He noted that there had already been 50 applications received and the position hadn't even been approved yet.

Mr. Bowen stated that Mr. Bruce Wright's draft of the position talks about the addition of an LPED person on their own staff, the addition of a University staff person, and the City/LES/County position also being filled, as unified additions.

Mr. Camp reiterated his opposition to this economic development position, but favored the fine-tuning concept for the LPED structure. LPED had been developed with a great deal of foresight and taking such a drastic jump is re-active to the many job lay-offs we've experienced recently. . He felt economic development was a long-term program. He questioned the caliber of individual that would be hired for \$75,000 per year for what will probably be a "step & fetch-it" position.

Mr. Bowen stated that the position is being set up to answer the need to coordinate the three public entities. Discussion on this issue continued. Council members reiterated their comments made at previous pre-council meetings on this issue.

It was determined that the position and the resulting support staff requirements would be budgeted under the Mayor's Office in future budgets cycles. This position will be coordinating efforts within the City and would be traveling only if necessary, if a Lincoln representative were needed at out-of-state negotiations. The LPED budget would cover any such additional expenses incurred from the monies they already receive from the City.

Mr. Werner finally stated that the restructuring was a necessary criteria for the effectiveness of the LPED program which has proven not to be a partnership nor to afford an adequate level of cooperation. He felt economic development is too important for us to just let it go, stating that he would therefore support the position. But the restructuring which he envisioned would have the University, LES and such organizations as LIBA become full partners and not be attending the meetings under the auspices of just one strong entity. When LIBA or the County or the University comes to the table, it is really important that they come to the table as a full partner...not just as one of three appointees of the Mayor which Mr. Werner felt would minimize their effectiveness. He would support the position, but would like to pursue the investigation of other options, including the audit information he had requested.

Ms. Seng requested that "full partner" be defined, noting that it may be beyond the realm of the County to be paying. That is a question we would probably have to work through. Mr. Werner agreed, stating that would be something which would be a huge part of the equation. Mr. Cook agreed that restructuring needed to take place and all the partners need to be involved. This is, ultimately just a contract with a private entity. While the Chamber is who we are partnering with now, this doesn't necessarily need to be the case. We might make some other choice; or we might restructure this in a very different way. We want to keep the

Chamber involved, but Mr. Cook did not know if they need to be administering the contract. He hoped that could be evaluated yet this year, as part of our budget talks and deliberations. He wanted to deal with their contract at that time.

In the meantime, Mr. Cook stated as he summarized the situation, the Mayor would be seeking answers to Mr. Werner's questions and any additional information which the Mayor might deem related or relevant, either through the City Auditor, or otherwise. The Mayor answered that the person involved would probably be the Finance Director, Don Herz. They would sit down and go through the list of concerns and see what Paul [McCue] and Frank [Hilsabeck] have to say.

Mr. Cook noted that he was concerned because they've been very unwilling, so far, to answer these questions. Mayor Wesely responded by stating that he had a good conversation with them this morning and he felt they were willing to, within reason, provide the information. They're worried about making public specific salary information, but they're willing to share a lot of information. Mr. Cook stated that he did not necessarily care about individual salaries, but just about how the City's money is allocated to their operations. And that is all we're trying to get. How they function internally, outside of what LPED does, is not necessarily important to our inquiry. What we've received here is no information back and sort of an idea that it's hard to account for what's going on here when, in fact, companies keep track of how all time is allocated to their employees & details of each account. Surely, LPED can keep track of some of that information. If they haven't been, that's problematic.

Mr. Friendt asked, that since this was never required of them, why would we assume that they would keep that information, Mr. Werner stated that the concern is that the monies are public funds. How are these funds being allocated? These are very basic questions which we have the right to know.

Mr. Friendt stated that if that is an important part of what should be in the contract as we move forward, then we need to do it. But, if we haven't in the past, to assume that they have been doing this tracking, is unfair. Mr. Werner asked, if Mr. Friendt were receiving that kind of public money, wouldn't he be very careful to keep track? Mr. Svoboda stated that we would do it to the letter of the contract. He noted that the conversations that we're having publicly are going to make it extremely difficult for anybody to want to enter into a contract with this City again.

Mr. Cook read the audit provision from the contract: "All Partnership assets have to be maintained in separate accounts. The City Auditor has the right to effect all Partnership work, materials, payroll records, personnel records, materials, invoices and other relevant data, documents and records and to audit the books, records and accounts of the Partnership and LCEDC ..." insofar as those various things pertain to our operation.

Mr. Svoboda stated that is fine, but there are a few of you who are talking about re-structuring of LPED at this point, and we're currently under contract and you don't have the right to do that until it comes time for contract renewal again. Mr. Werner noted that we might have the right to do that, depending on the results of this audit. He thought there would be a lot to be said here.

Mr. Cook noted that if we're putting on a new position that relates to this and we feel it's partly because LPED hasn't been functioning the way it needs...we need to continue that discussion.

Mayor Wesely noted that there is a way to work through this. If we can go over this in public...the current contract ends in 2004. Mr. Bowen stated the notification would need to come in 2003. The Mayor asked then, the contract can be amended with one years notice? He continued his remarks, stating that as we work with the budget, we can get more information and get the answers to Mr. Werner. He noted that some stability is really important. We can't be changing things without some notice. But, we do have provisions in the contract to make changes with a years notice.

Regarding this inclusion issue, that change is bringing in the University...the only one we haven't talked about is LES. That is really a big change. Public Power - LPPD, OPPD, they send folks all over and spend lots of money on economic development...LES wasn't doing this. Now they are. That's a big, positive change as well as the addition of the County and the University to the partnership. So, we're bringing in partners. We need to bring in more private sector partners and build up the strength that we have. This is just one step along the way.

Mr. Cook stated that he would like to see LIBA and Labor Unions involved as well. Mayor Wesely stated that he thinks all that can happen. The dialogue is beginning now. We're having a broadening of the perspective.

Mr. Roper had an answer to Mr. Werner's question of what the provisions were for getting out of the contract? Mr. Roper responded that there are about seven terms in the contract that could be determined obviously, though he did not know if any were applicable to this situation, but can be looked at to make a determination. Mr. Cook stated that we could continue to look at that.

Mr. Cook asked if Mr. Camp had a question....not a speech, because we'll make our speeches out in the chamber at the public hearing. Mr. Camp stated that this was called the Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development. It is not truly a partnership. He thought that merely lends a little credibility when you look at going out and recruiting businesses. It was meant to be a coordinated effort to have a body that would perform economic development. So, when we say Partnership, we need to understand that it's not a true, legal partnership *per se*. We've got a contract with the Chamber or LCEDC and LPED. We have oversight in the steering committee, but his biggest concern is having a dialogue tomorrow with the County Board and get them to flesh out what he is hearing in private. He stated that he was hearing two different stories, and felt that before Council votes on something this important, we should have full information. That is his request.

He added, that we need to look at economic development. We've suffered some job cuts here, but economic development is not a political beast. Government isn't by nature an economic development tool. He felt we were suddenly changing some big gears here which concerned him. He noted that a lot of planning was put into developing the LPED program and if it needs to evolve, it needs to evolve; but this is a major change to get the government back involved in Lincoln's economic development. Mr. Camp expressed some real reservations in that regard.

Ms. Seng noted that the reason the City went into a partnership is because it was not working with just the government side involved. We needed to be in a partnership with the Chamber. She felt it was obvious that some things are not working now. Times have changed and we need to have someone on the City side to coordinate efforts. We still need the Partnerships, but we need someone on the City side as well.

2. Discussion of Council Rules regarding Resolutions. (Requested by Jonathan Cook) - Carried over to 04-15-02 "Noon" Meeting.- *Due to time constraints, held over to the April 15, 2002 "Noon" Meeting. Ms. McRoy and Mr. Cook both apologized to Ms. Ross for not getting to this issue which she had attended the meeting to discuss. She will be back for discussion next week.*

VII. COUNCIL MEMBERS

JON CAMP - No Further Comments

JONATHAN COOK - No Further Comments

GLENN FRIENDT - No Further Comments

ANNETTE McROY - No Further Comments

COLEEN SENG - No Further Comments

KEN SVOBODA - No Further Comments

TERRY WERNER - No Further Comments

ANN HARRELL - No Further Comments

AMY TEJRAL - No Further Comments

MARK BOWEN - No Further Comments

DANA ROPER - No Further Comments

VIII. MEETING ADJOURNED - Approximately 1:17 p.m.

cm040802/jvr