DIRECTORS’ MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2006 - 11:00 A.M.
CONFERENCE ROOM 113

I. MAYOR

*1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Mayor Presents Award Of Excellence For December - (See Release)

*2. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Mayor Seng Welcomes Novartis Expansion - (See Release)

*3. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Human Rights Commission Premieres Show On 5 City-TV - (See Release)

*4. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Second Open House Planned On Stormwater Drainage Improvements - (See Release)

*5. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Save Money - Use E-Bill Option To Pay City Water and Wastewater Bills - (See Release)

6. Letter from Mayor Coleen Seng to Matthew M. Maude & Kathryn P. Halperin, Heathrow Development LLC - RE: The decision to decline the City Council’s counter offer for the K Street Building - (See Letter)

II. DIRECTORS

FINANCE/BUDGET

*1. Material from Steve Hubka - RE: City Sales Tax Reports for January, State Report for January - (See Material)

2. Material from Steve Hubka - RE: Recent History of Land Acquisition Fund - (See Material)

FINANCE/CITY TREASURER

PLANNING

*1. Letter from Tom Cajka to Lyle Loth, ESP - RE: Boulder Ridge Final Plat #05076 - Generally located at S. 84th St. & Pine Lake Rd. -(See Letter)

2. Letter from Tom Cajka to Marcia Kinning, ESP - RE: Hartland Homes NW 5th Addition Final Plat #05129 - Generally located at NW 53rd & W. Madison Ave. -(See Letter)

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION ..... 


PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES

*1. Public Works & Utilities ADVISORY - RE: Pine Lake Road Widening - Project #700014 - 40th - 61st Streets - 56th Street; Shadow Pines-Thompson Creek -(See Advisory)

WOMEN’S COMMISSION

1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: New Appointments Join LLWC Advisory Board - (See Release)

III. CITY CLERK

IV. COUNCIL

A. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE

JON CAMP

*1. E-Mail from Jon Camp to Karl Fredrickson - RE: N. 48th - Dick Hartsock - (See E-Mail)
ROBIN ESCHLIMAN

1. Request to Nicole Fleck-Tooze, Public Works & Utilities Department - RE: Requesting copy of letter sent out to businesses & families recently put in the floodprone (RFI#3-01/26/06)

V. MISCELLANEOUS -

*1. E-Mail from Dave Oenbring - RE: The Union Conspiracy Against Wal-Mart Workers - (Council received copies of this E-Mail on 1/23/06 before Formal Council Meeting.) (See E-Mail)

*2. Letter from Heathrow Development, LLC - RE: K Street Complex Purchase Agreement - (Council received their copies of this Letter on 1/23/06 during the Formal Council Meeting) (See Letter)

*3. E-Mail from Laurie Colburn - RE: Colburn Water Damage - Jan. 23rd Meeting - (See E-Mail)

*4. E-Mail from Jeanette Smith - RE: City Council Meeting Jan. 23rd - (See E-Mail)

*5. Response E-Mail from Jeanette Smith to Marvin Krout - RE: City Council Meeting Jan. 23rd - (See E-Mail)

*6. E-Mail from Ron Robinson - RE: LES - PCA - (See E-Mail)

*7. Letter On behalf of the M Class employees, Steven Huggenberger & Richard Anderson - RE: M Class salaries - (See Letter)


9. Letter from Robert A. Downey, Executive Director & George Green, President, Board of Directors, Capital Humane Society to Mayor Coleen Seng - RE: Considered your request for the organization to continue housing the stray animals picked up by Lincoln Animal Control. After discussing many options we have reaffirmed our previous decision not to. - (See Letter)
10. E-Mail from Bill Wiseman - RE: Sidewalks -(See E-Mail)

11. Letter from Richard Saffee, Pfizer Inc. - RE: ‘Thank-you’ for removing the Power Cost Adjustment language from the electrical rate increase request from LES that came before City Council - (See Letter)

12. LES Report - RE: Proposed Rate Schedules and Service Regulations -(Copy of this Report on file in the City Council Office) (Council received their copies in their Thursday packets on 2/02/06)

VI. ADJOURNMENT

January 30, 2006

Matthew M. Maude  
Kathryn P. Halperin  
Heathrow Development LLC  
P.O. Box 6165  
Lincoln, NE 68506-6165

Dear Matt & Katie:

I share the regret you must feel at the decision to decline the City Council’s counter offer for the K Street Building. As disappointed as I am at the decision, I am not surprised.

Because your task was made much more difficult, an excellent economic development opportunity has slipped through the community’s fingers. You offered a unique and exciting vision to convert an old power plant being used as a government warehouse into a focal point for new activity in downtown. The housing project you envisioned matches the kind of private business investment I have encouraged to attract more private investment in downtown.

Unfortunately, there were some who raised doubt after doubt focusing on roadblocks rather than working through them to clear a path. In the end, I understand why you rejected the City Council’s counter offer.

Meanwhile, the issues that Heathrow’s offer raised about what to do when the K Street building reaches its storage capacity will not go away. The building still will reach storage capacity before long. Your proposal offered a unique chance to address the future long-term public record storage needs and also put the K Street Warehouse on the property tax roll for the first time in its history. It is a missed opportunity that may not come again.

On the bright side, I am pleased that I have come to know you better. I am confident you will remain passionate about the potential in downtown Lincoln and I look forward to your next idea. I want to encourage you to not be discouraged and continue to be innovative in developing projects in Lincoln. Your spirit of entrepreneurism is refreshing and I want to encourage you to continue investing in Lincoln.

Thank you for all your hard work.

Sincerely,

Coleen J. Seng  
Mayor of Lincoln

cc: Kent Seacrest  
Polly McMullen, Downtown Lincoln Association  
Dallas McGee, Assistant Director, City Urban Development Department  
Joel Pedersen, City Law Department  
Lincoln City Council  
Public Building Commission
At our budget meeting on January 4th, a five year history of the activity of the Land Acquisition Fund was requested. The records for this fund are kept in a thick binder that would not have been very useful for your purposes. Over a number of hours, Jan Bolin from the Budget Office compiled the attached summary of fund activity from 7/31/2000 to 12/31/2005. 7/31/2000 was used as the starting point because it was convenient in the records we keep in Finance and we still had more than the five years of history requested. Otherwise, Jan prepared the summary by City fiscal year. We hope this meets your needs. If you have questions or need other information, feel free to call or e-mail Jan or myself.

LAND ACQUISITION.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Acquisition FY 2000-01</th>
<th>GENERAL Property</th>
<th>FLEMING Property</th>
<th>139 N. 18th St.</th>
<th>501 &amp; 539 N. 27th St.</th>
<th>HIGHLANDS M0-PAC RR R.O.W.</th>
<th>FIRE CASH</th>
<th>URBAN DEV.</th>
<th>PARKS</th>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance @ 7/31/2000</td>
<td>476,259.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,691.96</td>
<td>22,588.54</td>
<td>377,983.70</td>
<td>114,466.40</td>
<td>193,170.05</td>
<td>87,127.49</td>
<td>154,490.25</td>
<td>1,450,778.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle fund interest</td>
<td>31,893.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23,944.90</td>
<td>7,251.35</td>
<td>3,517.58</td>
<td>9,391.88</td>
<td>1,018.00</td>
<td>1,018.00</td>
<td>88,236.34</td>
<td>88,236.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of deeds</td>
<td>-1,018.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,237.13</td>
<td>3,517.58</td>
<td>3,517.58</td>
<td>9,391.88</td>
<td>1,018.00</td>
<td>1,018.00</td>
<td>88,236.34</td>
<td>88,236.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign lease</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>522.00</td>
<td>355.00</td>
<td>9,391.88</td>
<td>3,517.58</td>
<td>1,018.00</td>
<td>1,018.00</td>
<td>88,236.34</td>
<td>88,236.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation (Sale of Land)</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
<td>108,151.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger sales include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,300 H St. from 6 St. West</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,600 Public ROW adjacent to west side of stadium Dr.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,300 48th &amp; Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsson Associates</td>
<td>-927.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to BLOCK 35</td>
<td>-85,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briarhurst West 4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Cheney Place N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiera Home Owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Transfers</td>
<td>-35,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer BE 88240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL @ 8/31/2001</td>
<td>614,395.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,691.96</td>
<td>22,588.54</td>
<td>401,928.60</td>
<td>121,717.75</td>
<td>205,407.18</td>
<td>5,645.07</td>
<td>38,354.13</td>
<td>1,434,728.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition FY 2001-02</td>
<td>GENERAL Property</td>
<td>FLEMING Property</td>
<td>139 N. 18th St.</td>
<td>501 &amp; 539 N. 27th St.</td>
<td>HIGHLANDS M0-PAC RR R.O.W.</td>
<td>FIRE CASH</td>
<td>URBAN DEV.</td>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>WASTEWATER</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance @ 8/31/2001</td>
<td>614,395.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,691.96</td>
<td>22,588.54</td>
<td>401,928.60</td>
<td>121,717.75</td>
<td>205,407.18</td>
<td>5,645.07</td>
<td>38,354.13</td>
<td>1,434,728.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle fund interest</td>
<td>17,334.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,246.21</td>
<td>3,405.74</td>
<td>5,707.41</td>
<td>153.50</td>
<td>3,419.20</td>
<td>3,419.20</td>
<td>49,662.89</td>
<td>49,662.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of deeds</td>
<td>-1,559.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-5.50</td>
<td>-1,559.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses</td>
<td>3,419.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,419.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>-500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation (Sale of Land)</td>
<td>18,352.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,352.50</td>
<td>18,352.50</td>
<td>18,352.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger sales include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.94- S. 22nd &amp; J alley</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,830 ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,675 SW 27th &amp; S. St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,627.50 N 67th &amp; Seward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$654,167.50 At Holmes Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land lease</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Treasurer</td>
<td>-478.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,621.22</td>
<td>-1,621.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Park Place Add.</td>
<td>-139,509.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-139,509.86</td>
<td>-139,509.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase 1030 N. 44th St.</td>
<td>-106,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-106,500.00</td>
<td>-106,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Revenue</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL @ 8/31/2002</td>
<td>651,606.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,691.96</td>
<td>22,588.54</td>
<td>413,174.81</td>
<td>125,123.49</td>
<td>208,914.59</td>
<td>5,319.83</td>
<td>457,108.80</td>
<td>1,908,528.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Acquisition FY 2002-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
<th>FLEMING</th>
<th>139 N.</th>
<th>501 &amp; 539</th>
<th>HIGHLANDS</th>
<th>M0-PAC RR</th>
<th>FIRE</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>PARKS</th>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance @ 8/31/2002</strong></td>
<td>651,606.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,691.96</td>
<td>22,588.54</td>
<td>413,174.78</td>
<td>125,123.49</td>
<td>208,914.59</td>
<td>5,319.83</td>
<td>457,108.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,908,528.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle fund interest</td>
<td>6,877.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of deeds</td>
<td>-854.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcharge on ordinance</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation (Sale of Land)</td>
<td>122,905.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Sales include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,400 62nd &amp; Wagon Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,225 ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 R from 9th-10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,125 SW 13th/W O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,362.87 land around Highlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Lease</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Community Rec Sports Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/UNL &amp; Antelope Valley</td>
<td>-410,838.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase from State of NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus Mopac RR</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL @ 8/31/2003</strong></td>
<td>279,621.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,691.96</td>
<td>22,588.54</td>
<td>420,968.99</td>
<td>127,786.79</td>
<td>212,855.62</td>
<td>5,420.19</td>
<td>63,201.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,157,134.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Acquisition FY 2003-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
<th>FLEMING</th>
<th>139 N.</th>
<th>501 &amp; 539</th>
<th>HIGHLANDS</th>
<th>M0-PAC RR</th>
<th>FIRE</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>PARKS</th>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance @ 8/31/2003</strong></td>
<td>279,621.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,691.96</td>
<td>22,588.54</td>
<td>420,968.99</td>
<td>127,786.79</td>
<td>212,855.62</td>
<td>5,420.19</td>
<td>63,201.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,157,134.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle fund interest</td>
<td>5,822.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of deeds</td>
<td>-821.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign lease</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation (Sale of Land)</td>
<td>20,642.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Sales include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$950 Public Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,065 Alley 55th &amp; South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,825 Alley Prescott &amp; Lowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,300 Alley S 6th &amp; M to N St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$42,000 N 47th &amp; W St to Mopac RR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,660.81 Land around Highlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,700 32nd &amp; W. O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWS Consulting Group</td>
<td>-3,086.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Plains Appraisals</td>
<td>-6,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Fleming Foods</td>
<td>-2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Williamson W. Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Transfer</td>
<td>-50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of NE Printers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL @ 8/31/2004</strong></td>
<td>168,588.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>185,373.99</td>
<td>172,461.20</td>
<td>217,303.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>74,244.11</td>
<td>2,749.14</td>
<td>820,720.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land Acquisition FY 2004-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
<th>Fleming</th>
<th>139 N. 18th ST.</th>
<th>501 &amp; 539 N. 27th ST.</th>
<th>HIGHLANDS</th>
<th>M0-PAC RR R.O.W.</th>
<th>FIRE CASH</th>
<th>URBAN DEV.</th>
<th>PARKS</th>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance @ 8/31/2004</td>
<td>168,588.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>185,373.99</td>
<td>172,461.20</td>
<td>217,303.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>74,244.11</td>
<td>2,749.14</td>
<td>820,720.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle fund interest</td>
<td>7,844.90</td>
<td>45,834.67</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td>7,333.11</td>
<td>9,239.81</td>
<td>3,216.06</td>
<td>116.90</td>
<td>81,467.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of deeds</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td>-648.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land lease</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>2,041.00</td>
<td>157.57</td>
<td>27,422.57</td>
<td>74,244.11</td>
<td>2,749.14</td>
<td>820,720.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation (Sale of Land)</td>
<td>2,749.14</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td>7,882.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger sales include:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,690 N 58th Colfax-Murdock Tr.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,250 21st &amp; Y to Missouri Pacific</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR ROW</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,400 Alley 21st-22nd &amp; Vine</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,550 S. 1/2 Madison Ave.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,075 Public Way</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,491,197,42 Fleming Building</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td>2,491,187.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Fleming Building</td>
<td>-2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL @ 8/31/2005</strong></td>
<td>203,229.46</td>
<td>2,534,522.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>193,256.15</td>
<td>179,794.31</td>
<td>226,543.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79,658.74</td>
<td>2,866.04</td>
<td>3,419,870.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Acquisition FY 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
<th>Fleming</th>
<th>139 N. 18th ST.</th>
<th>501 &amp; 539 N. 27th ST.</th>
<th>HIGHLANDS</th>
<th>M0-PAC RR R.O.W.</th>
<th>FIRE CASH</th>
<th>URBAN DEV.</th>
<th>PARKS</th>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance @ 8/31/2005</td>
<td>203,229.46</td>
<td>2,534,522.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>193,256.15</td>
<td>179,794.31</td>
<td>226,543.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79,658.74</td>
<td>2,866.04</td>
<td>3,419,870.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle fund interest</td>
<td>2,424.63</td>
<td>26,588.40</td>
<td>2,338.94</td>
<td>2,176.01</td>
<td>2,381.92</td>
<td>848.60</td>
<td>34.69</td>
<td>36,793.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of deeds</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td>-399.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of deeds appraisal</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td>-5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of SW corner of 22nd &amp; Holdrege</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash transfer</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td>-610,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge development</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td>-39,250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP transfer</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td>-40,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL @ 12/31/2005</strong></td>
<td>201,504.59</td>
<td>1,951,110.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>195,595.09</td>
<td>181,970.32</td>
<td>189,675.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,923.66</td>
<td>2,900.73</td>
<td>2,763,680.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 31, 2006

Marcia Kinning
ESP
601 Old Cheney Rd. Suite "A"
Lincoln, NE 68512

RE: Hartland Homes NW 5th Addition Final Plat #05129 Generally located at NW 53rd and W. Madison Ave.

Dear Marcia:

Hartland Homes NW 5th Addition generally located southwest of NW 48th St. and West Adams St. was approved by the Planning Director on January 31, 2006. The plat and the subdivision agreement must be recorded in the Register of Deeds. The fee is determined at $.50 per existing lot and per new lot and $20.00 per plat sheet for the plat, and $.50 per new lot and $5.00 per page for associated documents such as the subdivision agreement. If you have a question about the fees, please contact the Register of Deeds. Please make check payable to the Lancaster County Register of Deeds. The Register of Deeds requests a list of all new lots and blocks created by the plat be attached to the subdivision agreement so the agreement can be recorded on each new lot.

Pursuant to § 26.11.060(d) of the Lincoln Municipal Code, this approval may be appealed to the Planning Commission and any decision of the Planning Commission to the City Council by filing a letter of appeal within 14 days of the action being appealed. The plat will be recorded with the Register of Deeds after the appeal period has lapsed (date + 14 days), and the recording fee and signed subdivision agreement have been received.

Sincerely,

Tom Cajka
Planner

CC: Duane Hartman
City Council
Dennis Bartels, Public Works & Utilities
Terry Kathe, Building & Safety
Sharon Theobald, Lincoln Electric
File
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PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION
NOTIFICATION

TO : Mayor Coleen Seng
     Lincoln City Council

FROM : Jean Walker, Planning

DATE : February 1, 2006

RE : Special Permit No. 1866A
     (Wireless Facility extension - 2401 North 48th Street)
     Resolution No. PC-00975

The Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission took the following action at their
regular meeting on Wednesday, February 1, 2006:

Motion made by Taylor, seconded by Esseks, to approve Special Permit No.
1866A, with conditions, for authority to extend the existing wireless tower from an
approved height of 85 feet to a height of 98 feet to accommodate the collocation
of additional antennas, and to waive the fall zone requirement from 49 feet to 40
feet from the north property line and 4 feet from the east property line, on
property located at 2401 North 48th Street.

Motion for conditional approval carried 6-0 (Esseks, Pearson, Taylor, Suonderman,
Carroll and Carlson voting 'yes'; Krieser, Larson and Strand absent).

The Planning Commission’s action is final, unless appealed to the City Council by filing a Letter
of Appeal with the City Clerk within 14 days of the date of the action by the Planning
Commission.

Attachment

cc: Building & Safety
Rick Peo, City Attorney
Public Works
Ralph Wyngarden, Faulk & Foster, 2680 Horizon Dr. SE, Ste. E,
Grand Rapids, MI 48546
Alltel Communications, 1440 M Street, 68508
Sprint Sites USA, 6550 Sprint Parkway, Overland Park, KS 66251
University Place Community Organization (3)
RESOLUTION NO. PC-00975

SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 1866A

WHEREAS, Alltel has submitted an application designated as Special Permit No. 1866A for authority to extend the existing wireless tower from an approved height of 85 feet to a height of 98 feet to accommodate the collocation of additional antennas and to waive the fall zone requirement from 49 feet to 40 feet from the north property line and 4 feet from the east property line on property located at 2401 North 48th Street, and legally described to wit:

Lot 2, UPC 1st Addition, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska;

WHEREAS, the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission has held a public hearing on said application; and

WHEREAS, the community as a whole, the surrounding neighborhood, and the real property adjacent to the area included within the site plan for this wireless communications facility will not be adversely affected by granting such a permit; and

WHEREAS, said site plan together with the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth are consistent with the comprehensive plan of the City of Lincoln and with the intent and purpose of Title 27 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission of Lincoln, Nebraska:

That the application of Alltel, hereinafter referred to as "Permittee", to extend the existing wireless communications facility to a maximum height of 98 feet be and the same is hereby granted under the provisions of Section 27.63.720 of the Lincoln Municipal Code upon condition that construction of said wireless communications facility be in strict compliance with said application, the site plan, and the following additional express terms, conditions, and requirements:

1. This permit approves a 13 foot extension to allow a 98 foot tall wireless facility capable of accommodating at least two wireless carriers consistent with the revised site plan.

2. A reduction of the required fall zone from 49 feet to 40 feet from the north property line and 4 feet from the east property line is hereby approved.

3. Before receiving building permits:
   a. Permittee must complete the following instructions and submit the documents and plans to the Planning Department office for review and approval:
      i. A revised plan set that includes only a site plan and elevation plan.
      ii. The site plan expanded so that the detail contained on it is legible.
      iii. The correct scale on all the plan sheets.
iv. Clearly delineate the property lines for Lot 2, and show the setbacks from all wireless facilities (tower, shelter, etc.) to the property lines.

v. A note stating that all antennas mounted on the facility must of a flush-mount design.

vi. Revise the elevation plan sheets to note:

A. Antenna elevations are approximate.

B. Change the note "CL of Proposed Lightening Rod" to "Top of Wireless Facility."

b. The construction plans shall comply with the approved plans.

4. Before use of the facility all development and construction shall have been completed in compliance with the approved plans.

5. All privately-owned improvements shall be permanently maintained by the owner.

6. The site plan accompanying this permit shall be the basis for all interpretations of setbacks, yards, locations of buildings, location of parking and circulation elements, and similar matters.

7. This resolution's terms, conditions, and requirements bind and obligate the permittee, its successors and assigns.

8. The applicant shall sign and return the letter of acceptance to the County Clerk within 30 days following the approval of the special permit, provided, however, said 30-day period may be extended up to six months by administrative amendment. The clerk shall file a copy of the resolution approving the special permit
and the letter of acceptance with the Register of Deeds, filling fees therefor to be paid in
advance by the applicant.

The foregoing Resolution was approved by the Lincoln City-Lancaster
County Planning Commission on this 1st day of February, 2006.

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Chair

Approved as to Form & Legality:

[Signature]
Chief Assistant City Attorney
PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION
NOTIFICATION

TO: Mayor Coleen Seng
   Lincoln City Council

FROM: Jean Walker, Planning

DATE: February 1, 2006

RE:  Comprehensive Plan Conformance No. 05017
     (Permanent Conservation Easement - N. 28th & Leighton Drive)
     Resolution No. PC-00976

The Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission took the following action at their
regular meeting on Wednesday, February 1, 2006:

Motion made by Taylor, seconded by Esseks, to find the proposed acquisition of
a permanent conservation easement to protect the stream channel and wildlife
resources associated with an unnamed tributary to Deadman's Run, a tributary
of Salt Creek over a portion of Lots 1-3, Block 23, a portion of Lots 13
and 14, Block 20, Abbott and Irvine Addition, as well as a part of vacated N. 29th
Street and Vacated Huntington Avenue, generally located in the northwest
corner of Northeast Community Park, located near North 28th Street and
Leighton Drive, to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Motion for a finding of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan carried 6-0: Esseks,
Pearson, Taylor, Sunderland Carroll and Carlson voting 'yes'; Strand, Krieser and
Larson absent).

A resolution proposing that the City accept this permanent conservation easement agreement
will be scheduled for public hearing before the City Council in the near future.

Attachment

cc: Building & Safety
    Rick Peo, City Attorney
    Public Works
    Joel Pedersen, Law Department
    Omaha, Lincoln and Beatrice Railway, 1815 Y Street, 68508
    City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. PC-00976

Comprehensive Plan Conformity No. 05017

WHEREAS, the Omaha, Lincoln, and Beatrice Railway, at the request of the Joint Antelope Valley Authority, has proposed to convey to the City of Lincoln a permanent conservation easement to protect the stream channel and wildlife resources associated with an unnamed tributary to Deadman’s Run, a tributary of Salt Creek over a portion of Lots 1 - 3, Block 23, a portion of Lots 13 and 14, Block 20, Abbott and Irvine Addition, as well as a part of vacated N. 29th Street and vacated Huntington Avenue located in the Northwest Quarter of Section 18, Township 10 North, Range 7 East of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska. The easement is generally located in the northwest corner of Northeast Community Park, located near N. 28th Street and Leighton Drive; and

WHEREAS, the City of Lincoln is authorized to accept and hold conservation easements under the terms of the Conservation and Preservation Easement Act (Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 76-2,111 to 76,2,118); and

WHEREAS, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 76-2,112 requires that, in order to minimize conflicts with land use planning, the proposed conservation easements must be submitted to the Lincoln City - Lancaster County Planning Commission for comments regarding the conformity of the proposed conservation easement to the Lincoln City Comprehensive Plan prior to acceptance of the easement by the City of Lincoln; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Planning has submitted a request designated as Comprehensive Plan Conformity No. 05017 to find the proposed acquisition of
permanent conservation easement by the City of Lincoln to be in conformity with the
Comprehensive Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lincoln City-Lancaster
County Planning Commission of Lincoln, Nebraska:

That the proposal of Omaha, Lincoln, & Beatrice Railway that the City of
Lincoln accept a permanent conservation easement to protect the stream channel and
wildlife resources and to restrict the development on the property described above be
and the same is hereby found to be in conformance with the Lincoln City/Lancaster
County Comprehensive Plan.

The foregoing Resolution was approved by the Lincoln City-Lancaster
County Planning Commission on this 1st day of February, 2006.

ATTEST:

Chair

Approved as to Form & Legality:

Chief Assistant City Attorney
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: January 26, 2006
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Bonnie Coffey, Director, 441-8695
Diane Mullins, Public Information Specialist, 441-7717

NEW APPOINTMENTS JOIN LLWC ADVISORY BOARD

The Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission (LLWC) announces the following volunteers recently appointed to the Advisory Board:

Giovanni Jones is employed by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln’s Office of TRIO Programs as an Academic Advisor. She joined the commission because she believes all women regardless of age, race, or economic status have the right to be empowered and valued in society. She also believes the Commission serves as a catalyst for pro-active changes.

Kaci O’Brien is employed by Clear Channel Radio and works as the Morning Drive on-air personality for My 106.3 Radio. She serves as co-chair for the WomenTalk project, a televised educational series on women’s issues within the realms of health care, public policy and leadership. She joined the Women’s Commission to help educate, promote, and empower women in Lincoln and Lancaster County. She believes she’s personally invested in seeing that women remain visible and powerful in the home, workplace, political arenas and beyond.

All appointments are approved by the Mayor, City Council and County Board of Commissioners. The Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission is a City-County agency housed in the Office of the Mayor. LLWC is dedicated to:

• Identifying, representing and serving the diverse needs of women in Lincoln and Lancaster County
• Raising awareness regarding deficiencies in policy that negatively impact women
• Advising City and County officials on public policy issues
• Educating the public regarding women’s issues through a network of coalitions
• Serving as an advocate for change by empowering all women in our community and working to improve their lives.

LLWC works to assure that the women of Lincoln and Lancaster county have full participation in the issues that have an impact on their lives.
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Members of the County Board:

I have been concerned for some time by the educational property tax exemptions allowed certain organizations.

Many months ago, I spoke with County Assessor Norm Agena who explained that he reviewed the applications for such exemptions and then extended his recommendations to you. He suggested that normally his recommendations were accepted by the board. I found that rather arrogant -- but did not argue with him.

I want, therefore, to challenge some of those exemptions.

The most egregious, it seems to me, are those extended to the labor organizations in Lancaster County. All of the union halls have them. My observation is that there is nothing educational in the least about what happens in those labor halls. What the unions describe as educational is not about being better plumbers or electricians or firefighters, but politics! Note, if you will, that they end up being the locations where Democrats hold "victory" celebrations for politicians like Don Wesley and Coleen Seng. Nothing educational about that! Certainly, there is nothing "educational" about party rallies! In the case of the firefighters, which has two exemptions (I understand), the venues are more like Democrat Party meeting places -- venues to plan labor union members' involvement in political campaigns and the results thereof -- and, perhaps, the spoils
Please explain why such organizations deserve get a tax break. I don't get it!

The other major class of educational tax breaks? Churches! I am no novice to politics -- I realize that elected public officials are loath to deny churches such breaks. But, think about it. Take Westminster (my former church). Yes, Westminster has an educational wing (for Sunday school and other programs), and parking lots and, yes, rental property. Westminster holds nearly two square blocks of property (except for the library at 27th and South). I will buy the idea that Westminster deserves the exemption for its sanctuary and possibly the adjacent parsonage on Sheridan Boulevard -- but what is educational about the gym, the day care center, the parking lots, the rental properties and the "parsonage" in Piedmont? I don't get it!

It seems to me that churches are more in the real estate business that in the religion business! As are the unions! Education has nothing to do with parking lots, rental properties, parsonages or political planning/celebration centers! Or, for that matter, the Catholic Church (I am a Recovering Catholic!). I assume (kinda/sorta) the parish churches are legally entitled to an educational exemption but I am not so sure about other Church properties. The same applies to Seventh Day Adventist properties -- which are legion here. I am an all-faith skeptic!

Please explain to me how these properties, all privately owned, deserve an educational property tax exemption! Thank you!

By the way, I am neither Republican nor Democrat. I am a Libertarian. So, I am not grinding an Elephant/Donkey political axe here. There are so few Libertarians in Lincoln that we really have no influence at all (and, technically, we are not libertarians but independents right now). We do have a habit, however, of asking interesting questions.

I do hope to hear from you -- and if I don't, well, I will share non-response widely. A few of those are shown in CC above.

Thank you for your public service -- and your opposition to the K Street sale which our dear mayor pushed so secretly and heavily! Well done! Mayor Seng's cronies have apparently backed out. Wonder what their real connection with her really was! I am sure some of the County Board members really know!

Best wishes!

Lt Col Joseph W. Johnson, Jr., USAF Retired
2800 Woods Blvd., No. 908
Lincoln, NE 68502-5844

402-423-1447
January 30, 2006

Mayor Coleen J. Seng
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, Ne.  68508

Dear Mayor Seng,

The board of directors of Capital Humane Society has carefully and thoughtfully considered your request for the organization to continue housing the stray animals picked up by Lincoln Animal Control. After discussing many options we have reaffirmed our previous decision not to.

Our responsibility to our mission and to our donors remains foremost in our minds as we chart a new direction for the shelter.

We once again offer our expertise in helping the city with its transition plan.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Downey
Executive Director

George Green
President, Board of Directors

cc: Lincoln City Council
I suggest that sidewalks be installed from "O" street up to the mopac trail where the bridge crosses "O" Street. It would provide a crossover so oe would not have to cross the busy 6 lanes.

Bill Wiseman
6721 L Street apt 333
Lincoln
January 30, 2006

Honorable Ken Svoboda
City Council – City Hall
555 S. 11th – Room #111
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Mr. Svoboda:

On behalf of the Pfizer Lincoln Operations, I thank you and your fellow council members for removing the Power Cost Adjustment language from the electrical rate increase request from LES that came before the City Council on Monday, January 23rd. As you know, Pfizer was opposed to the LES power cost adjustment request because it unfairly taxed large power users at a much higher rate (percentage of total use) than residential customers and other rate classes.

At Monday’s meeting, several members of the City Council and the Lincoln Employer’s Coalition (LEC) suggested that LES needs to look at alternative revenue methods to make up its predicted energy cost shortfall for 2006 rather than to use rate increases alone. Those alternative revenue streams could be in the form of late fees, higher start-up fees and other service charges. Prior to Monday’s meeting, LES management had refused to consider cutting any of its budgeted operating costs for 2006. In today’s economic environment, we believe cutting costs should be part of any business strategy. You can’t pass along all of the cost increases to your customers without feeling some of the pain yourself.

Pfizer supports the City Council, Mayor’s office and the LEC in their approach to work with LES to develop a comprehensive solution to the City of Lincoln’s ever changing energy costs. We applaud these cooperative efforts!

Sincerely,

Richard Saffee
Site Leader, Lincoln Operations
ADDENDUM
TO
DIRECTORS’ AGENDA
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2006

I. MAYOR

1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Work To Begin Monday On East “O” Street Project-
   Public meeting on project set for February 21 -(Council received this news release
   in their Thursday packets on 2/02/06)(See Release)

2. NEWS ADVISORY - RE: Mayor Seng’s Public Schedule Week of February 4
   through February 10, 2006-Schedule subject to change -(See Advisory)

II. CITY CLERK - NONE

III. CORRESPONDENCE

A. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE -

ROBIN ESCHLIMAN

1. Request to Nicole Fleck-Tooze, Public Works & Utilities Department - RE:
   Requesting copy of letter sent out to businesses & families recently put in the
   floodprone (RFI#3-01/26/06). — 1.) SEE RESPONSE FROM NICOLE
   FLECK-TOOZE, PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES DEPARTMENT
   RECEIVED ON RFI#3 - 02/05/06.

B. DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS - NONE

C. MISCELLANEOUS

1. E-Mail from John Huff - RE: Support to approve Change of Zone #05082 -(See
   E-Mail)

2. E-Mail from Dan Haase - RE: The proposed LES rate increase -(See E-Mail)

3. 2 E-Mail’s from Ron & Susan Samson - RE: LES Rate Increases - (See E-Mail’s)
4. E-Mail from Ron Samson - RE: LES Fees Increase -(See E-Mail)

5. E-Mail from Rich & Tammie Burns - RE: Commercial development of 84th & Adams -(See E-Mail)

6. E-Mail from Beatty Brasch, Executive Director, Center for People in Need - RE: LES Rate Increase - (See E-Mail)
PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES DEPARTMENT
Engineering Services, 531 Westgate Blvd., Lincoln, NE 68528, 441-7711, fax 441-6576

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: February 2, 2006
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Larry Duensing, Engineering Services, 441-7711

WORK TO BEGIN MONDAY ON EAST "O" STREET PROJECT
Public meeting on project set for February 21

Lane closures will begin Monday, February 6 on "O" Street from 32nd to 45th streets to remove raised medians near the intersections and prepare the area for replacing water lines. This preliminary work is scheduled in preparation for the "O" Street widening and water main project that is scheduled to begin in March.

Beginning March 1, "O" Street from 44th to 52nd streets is tentatively scheduled to close for reconstruction for about one year. During construction, traffic will be detoured to "R" Street on 44th and 52nd streets. A public meeting on the project is scheduled from 5 to 7 p.m. Tuesday, February 21 at the Villager Motel, 5200 "O" Street.

The project includes the widening of "O" Street from 46th to 52nd streets to six lanes; dual left-turn lanes at the intersection of 48th and "O" Street; and safety and capacity improvements to 48th Street from "M" to "R" streets. It also includes water main improvements along "O" Street from 33rd to 48th streets and along 48th Street from "O" to "M" streets.

Motorists are urged to drive with caution and allow extra time when driving in the construction area.

For more information on the water main and street project, see the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: ostreet) or contact Larry Duensing, construction project manager, at 441-8401 or Holly Lionberger, design project manager, at 441-8400.
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Date: February 3, 2006
Contact: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

Mayor Seng’s Public Schedule
Week of February 4 through February 10, 2006
Schedule subject to change

Saturday, February 4
• Nebraska Student Nurses Association convention, remarks and proclamation - 11:30 a.m., BryanLGH School of Nursing, 1600 South 48th Street

Monday, February 6
• League of Nebraska Municipalities mid-winter conference, remarks - 8 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 South 13th Street
• City-County Common Meeting - 8:30 a.m., County-City Building, Room 113, 555 South 10th Street
• League of Nebraska Municipalities luncheon - 11:45 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 South 13th Street

Tuesday, February 7
• AFL-CIO annual legislative conference, remarks - 9:30 a.m., Holiday Inn Downtown, 141 North 9th Street
• League of Nebraska Municipalities Senator appreciation luncheon - noon, Cornhusker Marriott, 333 South 13th Street
• County-City Volunteer of the Month Award presentation - 1:30 p.m., Council Chambers, 555 South 10th Street

Wednesday, February 8
• Lincoln Chamber of Commerce annual luncheon, remarks - 11:45 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 South 13th Street
• Foundation for Lincoln Public Schools Celebration of Excellence, remarks and certificate presentations - 4:30 p.m., Randolph Elementary, 1024 South 37th Street

Thursday, February 9
• “Go Red for Women” luncheon proclamation - noon, Country Club of Lincoln, 3200 South 24th Street
• Mayor’s Neighborhood Roundtable meeting - 4:30 p.m., County-City Building, Room 113, 555 South 10th Street

Friday, February 10
• Northview Business Association meeting, remarks - noon, Golden Corral Restaurant, 3940 North 27th Street
Embedded PDFs:
060206_Eschilman_RFI_No3.pdf  060207_Stevens_Ltr.pdf  060207_BealCardwellSEUSC_Ltr.pdf
MEMORANDUM

Date: February 6, 2006

To: Robin Eschliman.

From: Nicole Fleck-Tooze - PW/U Dept.

Subject: RFI #3 - Copies of Letters to Floodprone Properties

cc: Mayor Coleen J. Seng
    Lincoln City Council
    Karl Fredrickson, Ben Higgins, Lana Tolbert

Attached are copies of two letters which are expected to be mailed no later than Wednesday to properties within recently recognized Floodprone Areas. The mailing was broadened to include any property within the Stevens Creek, Beal Slough, SEUSC, or Cardwell Branch watersheds which is identified as Floodprone Area that was not previously identified as a FEMA Floodplain, and any property within a locally adopted Floodway not yet identified as a Floodway on the FEMA maps.

On January 10th, I attended the Commercial Brokers committee of the Realtors Association to discuss the Floodprone Area designation, and staff from PW/U and B&S are working to coordinate information with the association’s newsletter and to develop an educational presentation relating to the map updates and the Floodprone Area designation.
February 7, 2006

Property Owner
XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXX

RE: Map Update of Floodprone Areas in the Stevens Creek Watershed

Dear Property Owner:

Our records indicate that all or a portion of your property falls within a recently mapped Floodprone Area, as designated by the Stevens Creek Floodprone Area map adopted by the City Council in December of 2004, and recently updated on January 9, 2006. The 2004 mapping update for Stevens Creek included revisions to update the Floodway boundary, thus some properties not previously identified as being within the Floodway are shown in the Floodway on the updated maps. Floodprone Areas are locally regulated within the jurisdiction of the City of Lincoln, which extends three miles from the City limits.

Floodprone Areas are those areas having a 1% chance of flooding in any given year, usually referred to as the 100-year flood. The map update which resulted in the designation of these Floodprone Areas is part of a cooperative effort with FEMA to update the FEMA floodplain maps for Lincoln and Lancaster County. It is expected that sometime within 2007, the Floodprone Areas adopted by the City Council for local regulation will be officially designated as Floodplain on the FEMA floodplain maps.

If you have a home or commercial building that is within the Floodprone Area, it is likely that you will be required to obtain flood insurance once the Floodprone Area is reflected on the FEMA maps and officially designated as Floodplain. You may be able to obtain this insurance at a lower rate if you purchase it prior to the FEMA floodplain maps being updated. The process for adoption of these maps by the federal government includes a formal federal six month review period which is expected to be initiated in the Fall of 2006 and completed in the Spring of 2007. Any federal flood insurance requirement would not be effective until the map is adopted following this review period.

For more information:
Floodplain/Floodprone Area Maps
Maps of both the FEMA-designated Floodplain and the Floodprone Area can be viewed on the City’s website at lincoln.ne.gov keyword: watershed, or interactively on the City’s internet map server at http://lims.lincoln.ne.gov.

Flood Insurance Information
For information regarding flood insurance, view the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/nfip/infocon, contact your local insurance agent, or contact Bill Jones at Nebraska Department of Natural Resources, 471-3932 or bjones@dnr.state.ne.us.

Flood Map Update Project Information
For information regarding the flood map update project contact Devin Biesecker in the Public Works and Utilities Dept. at 441-4955 or dbiesecker@lincoln.ne.gov.

Floodplain/Floodprone Area Permits
For information regarding floodplain/floodprone development permits, contact Lana Tolbert in the Building and Safety Department at 441-6885 or ltolbert@lincoln.ne.gov.

Sincerely,

Ben Higgins, P.E.
Public Works and Utilities Dept.

c: Mayor Coleen J. Seng
Lincoln City Council
Lancaster County Board
Don Thomas, Doug Pillard - Co, Engineering
Karl Fredrickson, Nicole Fleck-Tooze - PWU Dept.
Mike Merwick, Lana Tolbert - B&S Dept.
Marvin Krout - Planning Dept.
Brian Dunnigan, Bill Jones - NDNR
Glenn Johnson - LFSNRD
February 7, 2006

Property Owner
XXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX

RE: Map Update of Floodprone Areas in Beal Slough, Cardwell Branch and Southeast Upper Salt Creek Watersheds

Dear Property Owner:

Our records indicate that all or a portion of your property falls within a Floodprone Area in the Beal Slough, Cardwell Branch or Southeast Upper Salt Creek (SEUSC) watershed. Updated Floodprone Area maps for Beal Slough, Cardwell Branch and SEUSC were adopted by the City Council on January 9, 2006. The mapping update for Beal Slough and Cardwell Branch include revisions to update the Floodway boundary, thus some properties not previously identified as being within the Floodway are shown in the Floodway on the updated maps. Floodprone Areas and associated Floodways are locally regulated within the jurisdiction of the City of Lincoln, which extends three miles from the City limits.

Floodprone Areas are those areas having a 1% chance of flooding in any given year, usually referred to as the 100-year flood. The map update which resulted in the designation of these Floodprone Areas is part of a cooperative effort with FEMA to update the FEMA floodplain maps for Lincoln and Lancaster County. It is expected that sometime within 2007, the Floodprone Areas adopted by the City Council for local regulation will be officially designated as Floodplain on the FEMA floodplain maps.

If you have a home or commercial building that is within the Floodprone Area, it is likely that you will be required to obtain flood insurance once the Floodprone Area is reflected on the FEMA maps and officially designated as Floodplain. You may be able to obtain this insurance at a lower rate if you purchase it prior to the FEMA floodplain maps being updated. The process for adoption of these maps by the federal government includes a formal federal six month review period which is expected to be initiated in the Fall of 2006 and completed in the Spring of 2007. Any federal flood insurance requirement would not be effective until the map is adopted following this review period.

For more information:
Floodplain/Floodprone Area Maps
Maps of both the FEMA-designated Floodplain and the Floodprone Area can be viewed on the City’s website at lincoln.ne.gov keyword: watershed, or interactively on the City’s internet map server at http://ims.lincoln.ne.gov.

Flood Insurance Information
For information regarding flood insurance, view the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/nfip/infocon, contact your local insurance agent, or contact Bill Jones at Nebraska Department of Natural Resources, 471-3932 or bjones@dnr.state.ne.us.

Flood Map Update Project Information
For information regarding the flood map update project for Beal Slough and SEUSC contact Devin Biesecker in the Public Works and Utilities Department at 441-4955 or dbiesecker@lincoln.ne.gov. For information regarding the flood map update project for Cardwell Branch contact John Callen in the Public Works and Utilities Department at 441-7018 or jcallen@lincoln.ne.gov.

Floodplain/Floodprone Area Permits
For information regarding floodplain/floodprone development permits, contact Lana Tolbert in the Building and Safety Department at 441-6885 or ltolbert@lincoln.ne.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ben Higgins, P.E.
Public Works and Utilities Dept.

cc: Mayor Coleen J. Seng
Lincoln City Council
Lancaster County Board
Don Thomas, Doug Pillard - Co. Engineering
Karl Fredrickson, Nicole Fleck-Toozé - PWU Dept.
Mike Merwick, Lana Tolbert - B&S Dept.
Marvin Krout - Planning Dept.
Brian Dunnigan, Bill Jones - NDNR
Glenn Johnson - LPSNRD
Rick Wilson - USGS
Dear City of Lincoln Officials,

As a lifelong Lincoln resident I have come to know many people in our community. I have witnessed both good and bad leadership and both good and bad decisions related to the welfare of our wonderful city. I have watched with interest the Antelope Valley Project and its affects, including those that are being displaced and the hope this project brings for the future of Lincoln.

One of the businesses in the way of the project, Glenn's Carstar Body Shop 2121 P Street is seeking a change of zone for nearby property at 21st & K streets for the purpose of relocating his business to stay in the downtown area. If it hadn't been for the Antelope Valley Project, this relocation would not have been necessary.

I have known Glenn and his sons for many years, as I have used their repair services on several occasions and find them to be an outstanding business operation. I have also served as the President of the Capitol Beach Community Association with Glenn as Vice President, and find him to be a great neighbor and friend.

It would truly be a sad day if Glenn is forced out of business, due to an inability to relocate. His commitment to keeping his business in the downtown area when many others have abandoned the heart of our city should be commended.

I am familiar with the area in question and do not see how anyone would find a body shop operation like Glenn's to be offensive in any way. He runs a very clean and orderly operation.
I urge you to act on the change of zone CZ #05082 and approve his request.

Respectfully,

John Huff
505 Pier 2
LincolnNe. 68528
402-474-5092
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
General Council

Name: Dan Haase
Address: 3612 S 75
City: Lincoln, NE 68506

Phone:
Fax:
Email: dh43849@alitel.net

Comment or Question:
Dear Council Member,

Thank you for looking at an alternative plan ans shedding light on the original LES flexible proposal.

Might the final plan you adopt should now meld the two plans as neither meets the needs of our city?

While citizens appreciate, "Chairman Ken Svoboda ...," saying, "it wasn’t designed to hurt the poor," the end result remains it IS structured to hurt the poor. "It would hit low-income families, those on fixed incomes and the disabled too hard.

"They really do not have the extra money. They don’t have the discretionary money that often big businesses do. It’s very regressive," said Beatty Brasch, executive director of the Center for People in Need."

While most of the "fee increases" relating to "operational activities" and "connecting" to the system are prudent, can members identify those that might be "harmful" or imply a negative impact defying "socially responsible attributes" that would have negative impact on the "moral character of the system"? I believe members can identify changes that would demonstrate higher standards and will make appropriate changes so they do not mar the integrity of this council.

Too, a lack of "robust fiscal security" as the reserve fund has been severely compromised remains a void and due diligence should address the situation. Volatility and a future holding excessive uncertainty in national energy
resource management coupled with soaring profits of gas and oil corporations leaves our community vulnerable to economic risks. For elected officials to neglect working closely with federal departments and members of Congress may limit opportunities for changes required to reach a more stable energy pricing environment. When irrational exuberance of capitalism dictates and affects viability and profitability of local corporations, does that demonstrate failures of national policy when excessive economic burdens are placed on states and communities?

Flexibility to quickly respond to changes in the economic climate could with reasonable care and astute leadership be incorporated into a responsible pricing model by IES and our council. Cutting corners, "robbing Peter to pay Paul" is not acceptable.

There is a significant difference between an "earlier estimate of $13 million to $9 million be," While, "natural gas prices have come down recently," she cautioned that natural gas prices could spike again or the utility could face other power supply challenges later this year."

Challenges do exist and the proposals remain improved but a wee bit short of where our community can be so economic fairness shines to a future holding an energy package and energy portfolio other communities can look to as a model.
Please copy all City Council Members ASAP.

We are writing to express our dismay with the City Council's decision to ignore the LES Board's recommendation regarding rates. This has come about because of politics. The LES board is responsible to all rate payers including businesses as well as individual customers.

Now the City Council has stepped in, reacting to the complaints of some businesses. While we feel the City Council shouldn't be a rubber stamp for LES recommendations, they should be aware of the fine history of low rates for businesses as well as other consumers.

A final concern is that lower income people will feel the brunt of increased fees more than businesses. We hope that the City Council will fairly consider the overall effects of its actions.

Ron and Susan Samson, Lincoln

while listening more to some businesses
Please copy all City Council Members ASAP.

We are writing to express our dismay with the City Council's decision to ignore the LES Board's recommendation regarding rates. This has come about because of politics. The LES board is responsible to all rate payers including businesses as well as individual customers.

Now the City Council has stepped in, reacting to the complaints of some businesses. While we feel the City Council shouldn't be a rubber stamp for LES recommendations, they should be aware of the fine history of low rates for businesses as well as other consumers.

A final concern is that lower income people will feel the brunt of increased fees more than businesses. We hope that the City Council will fairly consider the overall effects of it's actions.

Ron and Susan Samson, Lincoln
Please copy all Lincoln City Council Members

Dear Mayor Seng and Lincoln City Council Members:

In past years LES has paid "In Lieu of Taxes" amounts to the City of Lincoln. About $9 million is budgeted for 2006 which would be about 5% of revenues. The City owns LES and seems to be taxing itself and using such funds as if they were property taxes received from a private company. Why don't we do away with the "In lieu of Taxes" and we can do away with the rate increase?

Respectfully,

Ron Samson
Served on LES Board 1986-1995
Dear Mayor Seng and Council members,

I'm a resident of Regent Heights Neighborhood. We built our home here approximately 10 years ago and absolutely love our neighborhood.

Regarding the commercial development plans for 84th & Adams, we appreciate the Mayor and Council members who have denied the developer's requests for a Super Walmart. We very much would like to see a Neighborhood retail center that the Mayor has proposed with a grocery store and few retail or restaurants. This is very much needed for our the northeast sector of Lincoln.

We are opposed to the Super Walmart concept, not because it's Walmart, but just because of the size of store they are proposing. If Walmart will "downsize" their proposal, we'd support that. However, as Mayor Seng and a few of the council members have noted that Northeast Lincoln does not have infrastructure (streets) to carry the increase volume of traffic that a Super Walmart would generate. It was noted early in the discussions that the other local Walmarts are on major arterials, Hwy 2 or 27th & Superior. As you're aware, the streets that would carry traffic east and west are two or at best three lanes, i.e., Havelock, Adams, Holdrege & Vine, east of 56th or 70th. We just don't have the street capacity to safely carry the traffic that a large commercial development would generate.

Again, we want to express our gratitude to the Mayor and Council members who have denied Walmart's requests for this very reason and would urge those council members supporting the development to consider and recognize traffic flow as an extremely valid reason for requiring the developer to modify their plans and bring back to the council a Neighborhood Center as Mayor Seng has defined.

Rich & Tammie Burns
2431 North 79th Street
FW: LES Rate Increase PLEASE EMAIL YOUR CITY COUNCIL PERSON TODAY.

----- Forwarded by Tammy J Grammer/Notes on 02/06/2006 08:04 AM -----

"Beatty Brashc"
<bbrash@mail.centerforpeopleinneed.org>
02/04/2006 03:28 PM

To <atomkins@nebraska.edu>, "Beatty Brashc"
<bsbrash@mail.centerforpeopleinneed.org>,
<buntain@foundation.nebraska.edu>, "DON AND KAY WITT" <cawitt@inebraska.com>,
<DONHELMUTH@EARTHLINK.NET>,
<aecrump@aatl.net>, <helen_raikes@gallup.com>, "Herb Schimek" <hschimek@nsea.org>,
<JANE@NEBRASKAHUMANITIES.ORG>, "Jean Lovell"
<jlovell@ci.lincoln.ne.us>, <bbrashc@turnunco.com>,
<kklagar@nsea.com>, "Katherine Endacott"
<brendacott@class.com>, <lynn_roper@ml.com>,
<r34712@alltel.net>, <maxinemoel@nebcomfound.org>,
<pberger@nebrwesleyan.edu>, "RICK AND PAT LOMBARDI" <makerscove@EARTHLINK.NET>,
<nataliehdg1@aol.com>, "Sandra K Scofield"
<sscofield@unlnotes.unl.edu>, <council@ci.lincoln.ne.us>,
<ABCHIKE@CHARTER.NET>, <BCoffey123@aol.com>,
eaperson@alltel.net>, <sfb@medlinc.com>,
<breler@nebrr.com>, <bmathebs@lincoln-action.org>,
<rck@theNations.net>, <MBOIESCAROLE@nebrr.com>,
<cljiggett@stez.org>, <chris.funk@ppfa.org>,
<cseng@ci.lincoln.ne.us>, <Ckielty@ci.lincoln.ne.us>,
<CFITCHETT@alltel.net>, <regys1@ix.netcom.com>,
<dlandis@unicam.state.ne.us>, <daynak@L-housing.org>,
<ddaily@centerforpeopleinneed.org>,
dschrimek@EARTHLINK.NET>, <dmayhew@lps.org>,
<devane@lps.org>, <HWSCEO@aol.com>,
hraikes@nebrr.com>, <jeanjeffrey@alltel.net>,
jgreenwald@nehumanesociety.org>,
<LPD454@cis.ci.lincoln.ne.us>, <Kborsch@cs.lancaster.ne.us>, <lcaldwell2@unl.edu>,
linda.hellerich@ppfa.org>,
<LBUNTAINT@unfund704nt.uned.edu>,
r34712@alltel.net>, <marybethrahte@canhelp.org>,
claynaff@yahoo.com>, <nschweiger@unl.edu>,
Pam.Baker@alltel.com>, "Penny J. Berger"
pberger@remlud.com>, <rick.carter@hsfed.org>,
<SSCHOFIELD1@unl.edu>, <spipher@gmu.edu>,
sasschroeder@alltel.net>, "SCOTT YOUNG"
(scottyoung@lincolnsfoodbank.org)
<scottyoung@lincolnsfoodbank.org>, <phscudder@aol.com>,
<dssettie@ci.lincoln.ne.us>, <DEBS@LCF.ORG>,
<shhirchis@lincoln-action.org>, <outson3@aol.com>,
<sscott@ywcphilincoln.org>, <lwarme@vacation.org>,
<thansen@centerpoint.org>, <czuzjohnson@hotmail.com>,
"Alan Frank" <afrank2@unl.edu>, "Barb Straus"
<jebs@navix.net>, "Debbie Stief" <rabstief@aol.com>,
"Deborah Swearingen" <dswmgen@aol.com>, "Elaine Monnier" <ekmonnier@juno.com>, "Eleanor Kirkland"
kirklandels@aol.com>, "Ellen Feingold"
eeingold@nebrr.com>, "Hilda Raz" <HRAZ1@unl.edu>,
FW: LES Rate Increase PLEASE EMAIL YOUR CITY COUNCIL PERSON TODAY.

From: Beatty Brasch
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2006 2:40 PM
To: Beatty Brasch
Subject: FW: LES Rate Increase PLEASE EMAIL YOUR CITY COUNCIL PERSON TODAY.
Importance: High

Beatty Brasch
Executive Director
Center for People in Need
2025 Holdrege St.
Lincoln, Ne. 68503
work 402-476-4357, cell 402-730-0029
home 402-423-1085
bbrusch@centerforpeopleinneed.org
From: Beatty Brasch
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2006 2:39 PM
To: 'Ron Samson'; 'Mary Pipher'; 'Mariella Wightman'; 'Catherine Witt'; 'SJHerrin@operaanic.com'; Alan & Barb FRANK (ufrank@unl.edu); BARB BARTLE (BBARBLE@LPS.ORG); bbaier@ci.lincoln.ne.us; BARBARA TOM (ctyrmmm@aol.com); BLEICHER BOB AND STACIE (srb@medlinc.com); BONNIE COFFEY (; 'Susan Hale'
Subject: FW: LES Rate Increase PLEASE EMAIL YOUR CITY COUNCIL PERSON TODAY.
Importance: High

We are working hard to voice a large opposition to the proposed increase in and implementation of service-type fees by LES. There is a 4.5% rate increase across the board that we cannot do much to oppose because LES' costs have risen. But, on top of the rate increase are new or raised fees (connection, re-connection, and late) that will disproportionately affect low-income individuals and families. We are fighting for these to be removed from the proposal and for LES to make up the costs in some other way. Some ideas are a higher flat increase which would be one and half percent and effect everyone, or some kind of fee exemption for the low-income people on the fees that particularly effect them such as re-connect fee.

The original proposal included a power cost adjustment. This means that rates would fluctuate according to LES costs. The PCA has been strongly opposed by the Lincoln business community and because of that the City Council asked LES to change its proposal.

Please consider emailing letters (sample letters attached, please change the wording) to the City Council regarding the new proposed fees and their detrimental impact on the low-income. The hearing on the proposal is this Monday, February 6 at 1:30 p.m. We are planning on testifying at the meeting. If you are interested in doing the same, please let us know. See articles below.

Thanks,
Beatty
Center for People in Need

City Council emails: ksvoboda@lincoln.ne.gov, jcamp@lincoln.ne.gov, dmarvin@lincoln.ne.gov, pnewman@lincoln.ne.gov, amcroy@lincoln.ne.gov reschliman@lincoln.ne.gov, jcook@lincoln.ne.gov

Mayor: mayor@lincoln.ne.gov
LES customers could face rate hike
By ALGIS J. LAUKAITIS / LincolnJournal Star

Lincoln Electric System customers could be paying new and higher fees for utility services under a resolution that will be presented Monday to the City Council.

[IMAGE]

(LJS File)

The fees range from $25 to $400 and cover a number of services, including opening new accounts, late payments, reconnecting electricity, and installing underground service to new residential areas.

The new fees and increases would take effect March 1.

The resolution was hammered out by several City Council members and LES staff after the council rejected the utility’s earlier proposal for a flexible surcharge.

[IMAGE]

*

More than 20 of Lincoln’s largest companies had opposed the surcharge, calling it unfair and costly.

The City Council then asked the utility to look at alternatives, including reducing costs, charging more for services, and a rate hike. The resolution includes all of those — and a 4.5 percent rate increase.

But a critic of the plan said it would hit low-income families, those on fixed incomes and the disabled too hard.

“They really do not have the extra money. They don’t have the discretionary money that often big businesses do. It’s very regressive,” said Beatty Brasch, executive director of the Center for People in Need.

City Council Chairman Ken Svoboda, who helped develop the package, said it wasn’t designed
to hurt the poor.

“We felt that it was a necessity to get us up and running with what other utilities do,” Svoboda said. “It’s our recognition that they would be only hit if they are late in their payment or if they have a disconnect for lack of payment ... As long as the bill is paid on time, there’s no additional finance charge.”

The new fees and increases are part of a package designed to help LES cope with $9 million in unexpected power costs this year due to hurricane damage along the Gulf Coast and a volatile wholesale power and natural gas market.

The measures include:

* Cutting $530,000 in costs from the 2006 LES budget and eliminating $230,000 in deferred costs from 2005.

* A 4.5 percent rate hike and a 5 percent increase in the monthly customer and facilities charge for residential, business and industrial customers, both effective Feb. 13. A typical residential customer would pay $3.43 more a month.

* Reducing the utility’s new service contribution to commercial customers in half.

Svoboda said the plan was not designed to appease some of the city’s largest employers, who fought the flexible surcharge.

“Absolutely not. Several of the fees that we increased have an an effect on high industrial users as well,” said Svoboda, who worked on the package with Councilmen Dan Marvin and Jonathan Cook.

Marvin said updating the service fees parallels what the city and local health department recently did with their some of their own fees.

And LES had been looking at overhauling its fees since last year and had planned to make a proposal in May, Marvin said.

The new fee structure, excluding those charged to developers in new residential areas, would raise about $1.1 million annually.

In addition, the 4.5 percent rate hike and 5 percent increase in monthly customer and facilities charge would raise about $7.5 million over about 10 months, said Shelley Sahling-Zart, vice president and assistant counsel for LES.

Asked if the rate hike and new service fees package would be enough to cover the $9 million and maintain the utility’s financial bond ratings, Sahling-Zart said: “It’s workable, yes.”

She said LES revised its earlier estimate of $13 million to $9 million because natural gas prices have come down recently. However, she cautioned that natural gas prices could spike again or the utility could face other power supply challenges later this year.
Coming soon to your electric bill?

Several City Council members and Lincoln Electric System staff have worked out a proposal to help the utility cover about $9 million in unexpected power costs. And it includes new service fees and higher existing fees.

Here's what the City Council will consider Monday:

NEW FEES

New account service fee: $25 charged to every new account, move, transfer, etc., upon request for service installation. (Excludes accounts managed under a landlord’s agreement.)

Late payment fee: 3 percent of past due amount charged to accounts for amounts not paid by the due date on or after the first business day past the due date.

Field collection payment: $20 charged to delinquent accounts for which LES collects payments in the field.

Rereads: $20 charged to customers who ask LES to reread a meter or if it must return more than once monthly to reread the meter due to restricted access. The charge applies when original reading was not in error.

FEE INCREASES

Reconnect service after disconnect for non-payment of bill:

$40 — Applicable during the utility’s normal working hours. Fee is now $25.

$75 — Applicable after normal hours. Fee is now $50.

$75 — Operations line crew required anytime. Fee is now $50.

Non-sufficient funds check fee: $30 charge when check is returned due to non-sufficient funds. Fee is now $20.

Aid to construction charge: Customers or developers charged $400 per lot, subject to annual review, for installing underground service in new residential areas. Fee is now $180.

Source: Lincoln Electric System

Letter to the editor in Friday’s paper

Will others pay more?

Recent reports regarding the Lincoln Electric System rate proposal and power cost adjustment cause me great concern. It troubles me that a small group of “big businesses” in Lincoln...
have such a significant impact on a rate proposal that affects all LES customers. I am concerned that the push to minimize the impact to big businesses will increase the impact to the average residential user, particularly those on fixed incomes and the working poor, who already struggle to keep payments up on their utility bills.

I understand the need for LES to raise rates in order to cover its own increasing power costs. Traditionally, LES rates have been extremely reasonable and in the lower 10 percent nationally.

If the City Council chooses not to pass the current increase on big business, won’t that mean that the smaller customers, particularly residential and small business, will pay more?

Alternatives to the LES rate increase include implementation of service connection fees and late payment fees. Both of these proposals will disproportionately affect low-income working families as well. These people should not be penalized. This is not a good alternative solution.

The 250,000 residents of Lincoln should be very concerned that 20 self-interested large businesses have had such an impact on the City Council. The council needs to take control of the process and be sure that the impact to all customers is considered. It is easier for big business to shoulder the cost compared with middle- and low-income individuals and residents. Businesses argue lost jobs, but low-income families may have to deal with lost homes if their costs continue to increase.

As a former board member, I trust the folks at LES; they are trying to spread the costs equally among all residents. I trust them more than I trust the business coalition and their lobbyist.

Beatty Brusich, Lincoln, executive director
Total Home Furnishings

Better Brands  Better Prices
402.474.2666    800.288.1115

- LES sample letter.doc
- LES sample letter 2.doc
Dear Lincoln City Council,

My name is _________ and I am writing to oppose the new proposed LES fees.

I understand that LES needs to raise the rates because of its rising costs. I do not appreciate the other fees that are going to be attached to my bill should I have a late payment or if I should have my electricity disconnected. The people of Lincoln would not vote for this alternative.

Please reconsider the proposed fees. It may not be better for Lincoln’s businesses, but it is better for Lincoln’s “common” people.

Sincerely,

Your name
Dear Lincoln City Council,

Please do not impose the late, reconnection, and connection fees proposed by LES. I am against this alternative to LES' higher costs.

The people of Lincoln do not deserve these type of fees from their publicly owned power company. LES understands that and that is why they were not included in their original proposal.

Thanks,
Your name here