I. MAYOR

*1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Mayor Seng Proposes New Downtown Projects - City to pursue parking garage and high-rise building -(See Release)

*2. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Mayor Presents January Award of Excellence - (See Release)

*3. NEWS ADVISORY - RE: Mayor Seng and Lincoln Fire & Rescue will unveil one of the City’s new fire trucks at a news conference at 10:45 a.m., 02/14/06 -(See Advisory)

*4. NEWS RELEASE - RE: First Of New Fire Pumpers Arrives In Lincoln - (See Release)

*5. NEWS RELEASE - RE: City of Lincoln - Snow/Traffic Condition Report - Feb. 16, 2006 - 9:15 a.m. - RE: 21 Public Works’ material-spreading vehicles were operating at 4am - (See Release)


II. DIRECTORS

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

*1. Response Letter from Doug Ahlberg to Danny Walker - RE: Emergency Shelters -(See Material)

FINANCE/CITY TREASURER

HEALTH

*1. Physician Advisory from Bruce Dart - RE: Bordetella Pertussis -(See Advisory)

*2. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Lincoln-Lancaster County Environmental Awards Nominations Sought -(See Release)

LAW DEPARTMENT

*1. Response E-Mail from Dana Roper, City Attorney to Steve Wolsleger - RE: Amendment to Chapter 8.22 which pertains to littering -(See E-Mail)

PLANNING

*1. E-Mail from Marvin Krout, Planning Director - RE: Development codes - (See E-Mail)

PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES

*1. Draft Media Release - RE: Open House Planned On Safety Project For S. 56th Street from Linden St. To Quail Ridge Rd. -(See Release)

*2. Draft Media Release - RE: Open House Planned On Safety Project For Vine Street From 35th Street To 44th Street -(See Release)

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

*1. Letter, Amendment, & Map from Marc Wullschleger - RE: West O Redevelopment Plan -(See Material)

WOMEN’S COMMISSION

*1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Women’S Commission Honors Award Recipients- “Weaving Women’s Voices” pays tribute to annual award winners in saluting of International Women’s Day -(See Release)
III. CITY CLERK

*1. Response E-Mail from City Clerk Joan Ross to Steve Wolsleger - RE: Amendment to Chapter 8.22 which pertains to littering -(See E-Mail)

IV. COUNCIL

A. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE -

JON CAMP -

*1. E-Mail Response from Jon Camp to Maurice Baker - RE: Litter Ordinance - (See E-Mail)

*2. E-Mail Response from Jon Camp to Derek Buckley - RE: Flyer Ordinance Concerns -(See E-Mail)

*3. E-Mail Response from Jon Camp to Marc Schniederjans - RE: The Mayor’s proposed plan to tear down the Starship movie theater & other small businesses to build a new big building -(See E-Mail)

V. MISCELLANEOUS -

*1. E-Mail from Steve Wolsleger - RE: Amendment to Chapter 8.22 which pertains to littering (E-Mail forwarded to Dana Roper, City Attorney; & City Clerk Joan Ross on 02/15/06)(See E-Mail)

*2. E-Mail from Trudy Schneckloth - RE: The Starship Theatre -(See E-Mail)

*3. E-Mail from Derek Buckley - RE: Councilman Camp’s proposed changes to Lincoln’s littering laws -(See E-Mail)

VI. ADJOURNMENT

*HELD OVER UNTIL MARCH 6, 2006.
MAYOR SENG PROPOSES NEW DOWNTOWN PROJECTS
City to pursue parking garage and high-rise building

Mayor Coleen J. Seng announced today the City’s plans to build a new parking garage in downtown Lincoln and to seek a private developer to build a high-rise building above the garage. In making her announcement, Seng invited private developers to “dream big and look to the skies” by building an ambitious tower at this location. The last high-rise tower built in Lincoln was constructed more than 20 years ago.

“I am proposing a new creative way to expand the tax base, encourage investment and add parking,” Mayor Seng said. “I will keep trying new ideas to stimulate investment, and I believe the private sector will respond. This project will meet a public need and create an opportunity for private investment at the same time.”

The City will build a new parking garage at 1311 “Q” Street where the Starship 9 movie theater is now located in order to meet a growing demand in the central business district. The City will purchase the Starship 9 from Center Associates LLC. The project could add from 400 to 600 parking stalls depending on the size of the tower above the garage. The Downtown Master Plan identified this block as the appropriate location for a parking garage. Seng said the location is ideally situated to serve the downtown and also be close enough to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to serve campus visitors. Because the block is outside the view corridor for the State Capitol, the allowable building height on the block is 275 feet, which could accommodate a structure of up to 25 floors.

“The City will advertise for one or more private developers to build an innovative project to provide street level retail and a building above the parking garage,” Seng said. “There is opportunity to create something better and expand the property tax base by building above a parking garage. This will attract more private investment to downtown. It is important we move ahead with a project that could change the City’s skyline.” The high-rise building could be an office tower, hotel, residential housing or a combination of those uses.

“Building up makes the best use of downtown land,” said Seng. “The parking garage will serve as the catalyst to stimulate more economic development and potentially more jobs.”
The Downtown Master Plan recommends the garage site include the northeast end of the block along 14th Street. The City has begun negotiating with the owners of Taste of China and Wasabi restaurants to explore this possibility. The additional space could add more parking and provide more garage design flexibility.

“I would like the City to reach an amicable agreement with these owners that will allow the restaurants to relocate successfully,” Seng said. “I have directed the Urban Development Department to work closely with both of them to achieve a positive result, as we did with Center Associates.”

The City also will purchase the vacant Douglas 3 Theater at 1300 “P” Street. The Douglas 3 will be cleared to prepare the site for a future civic square as called for by the Downtown Master Plan the City Council approved in October.

The City does not have immediate plans to develop the future civic square. Mayor Seng said it was important to secure the site while the Douglas 3 was vacant. Seng said planning for the future civic square would begin after a developer is selected for the high rise. The square would be constructed only after financing is available.

“A civic square at 13th and “P” streets will be a valuable attraction for community events and a centerpiece for the downtown,” Seng said. “It will be an inviting focal point that will generate further reinvestment. I look forward to the day when it becomes a hub of activity in Lincoln’s thriving downtown.” The City has planned to build a new parking garage in this part of the downtown for several years. Site selection was integrated into the Downtown Master Plan.

The Mayor will ask the Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Commission and the Lincoln City Council to amend the Lincoln Center Redevelopment Plan to reflect these projects. If the City Council amends the redevelopment plan later this year, the City will request proposals to build the tower above the garage. The City will take ownership of the Starship 9 and the Douglas 3 in June.

The $2.1 million purchase of the Starship 9 will use available parking enterprise funds that are designated for a new garage. Tax-increment financing funds, possibly in combination with a portion of the City’s advance land acquisition funds, will be used to purchase the Douglas 3 for $1.1 million.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: February 13, 2006
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

MAYOR PRESENTS JANUARY AWARD OF EXCELLENCE

Mayor Coleen J. Seng today presented the Mayor’s Award of Excellence for January to Randy Heiser of the StarTran Division of the Public Works and Utilities Office. The monthly award recognizes City employees who consistently provide exemplary service and work that demonstrates personal commitment to the City. The award was presented at the beginning of today’s City Council meeting.

Heiser has been a StarTran bus driver since 1998. He was nominated in the categories of loss prevention and valor by Mike Weston, Bus Operations Superintendent, and Larry Worth, StarTran Transit Manager.

On December 6, 2005 Randy was operating a bus when he smelled smoke. He stopped his bus, investigated, immediately evacuated his passengers and called dispatch for assistance. Heiser then used the fire extinguisher on the bus to put out the fire. Once the bus was towed to StarTran, it was discovered that the insulation in the rear seat of the bus had caught fire due to a mechanical malfunction.

Weston said, “Had Randy not acted as quickly as he did, the fire would have spread throughout the bus.” Weston and Worth said that Heiser’s actions assured the safety of the passengers who were evacuated immediately upon smelling the smoke. Heiser also prevented the potential loss of a $280,000 City vehicle. Because of Heiser’s quick action, the bus had only about $400 worth of damage.

The other categories in which employees can be nominated are customer relations, safety and productivity. All City employees are eligible for the Mayor’s Award of Excellence except for elected officials and some managers. Individuals or teams can be nominated by supervisors, peers, subordinates and the general public. Nomination forms are available from department heads, employee bulletin boards or the Personnel Department, which oversees the awards program.

All nominations are reviewed by the Mayor’s Award of Excellence Committee, which includes a representative with each union and a non-union representative appointed by the Mayor. Award winners receive a $100 U.S. savings bond, a day off with pay and a plaque. Monthly winners are eligible to receive the annual award, which comes with a $500 U.S. savings bond, two days off with pay and a plaque.
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
555 South 10th Street, Lincoln, NE 68508, 441-7511, fax 441-7120

DATE: February 14, 2006
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

Mayor Coleen J. Seng and Lincoln Fire and Rescue will unveil one of the City’s new fire trucks at a news conference at 10:45 a.m. TODAY, Tuesday, February 14 at Fire Station #14, 5435 N.W. 1st Street.
FIRST OF NEW FIRE PUMPERS ARRIVES IN LINCOLN

Mayor Coleen J. Seng today unveiled the first of seven new fire pumpers that Lincoln Fire & Rescue will soon place in service. The first pumper will be based at Fire Station #14, 5435 N.W. 1st Street, to replace an 18-year old vehicle. The other six pumpers will be delivered over the next few months after the installation of the radio system and other equipment.

“Public safety is a top priority for City government, and these new fire pumpers give Lincoln Fire and Rescue the equipment to do an even better job of protecting this community,” said Mayor Seng. “These are the first new pumpers added to the fleet since 2000, and they will replace the department’s oldest vehicles. The replacements have added features that will not only help in fire response, but also will make the pumpers easier to maintain.”

Fire Chief Mike Spadt said the department’s goal is to replace units after 10 to 12 years of service. He outlined the improved features of the new pumpers, which include:
• roll-up doors on each equipment compartment to allow firefighters total access to equipment;
• LED warning lights, which are more durable and offer better visibility on the road;
• quick rise, telescoping lighting stands;
• a telescoping nozzle for rapid set up during large fire incidents to deliver up to 1,000 gallons per minute; and
• a computer-controlled diagnostics system to assist in making need repairs more quickly.

Spadt said all Firefighters will be trained on the new equipment as needed.
CITY OF LINCOLN
SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITION REPORT

A COMPLETE VOICE REPORT IS AVAILABLE AT 441-7783. THIS NUMBER IS
FOR NEWS MEDIA USE ONLY.

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center -- 441-7644
Citizen Information Center -- 441-7831

Date: Thursday, February 16, 2006
Time: 9:15 a.m.

Twenty-one Public Works' material-spreading vehicles were operating at 4 a.m. in an effort to
counter the freezing rain that hit the Capital City during the overnight hours. Snow emergency
routes and major arterials were targeted with bus routes slated for spreading beginning at 10 a.m.
The effect of the freezing rain was somewhat lessened by the fact that -- in anticipation of the
approaching storm -- street crews engaged in a liquid material-spreading operation yesterday,
targeting bridges, key intersections and areas with new pavement.

Lincoln Police Department reports less accidents this morning compared to last Saturday
morning, when inclement weather hit Lincoln following weeks of unseasonably warm weather.
Motorists are urged to allow for more time to reach their destination and to allow for the proper
"following distance" between their car and other vehicles.

StarTran reports that buses are running about five to ten minutes behind schedule.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln.
Additional information is available on pages 40 and 41 in the blue pages of your Alltel phone
directory. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
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HOUSING AND CD
White House continues assault on CDBG. While abandoning the idea of moving the program to the Department of Commerce, the President’s FY 2007 budget proposes the largest reduction for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program in recent memory.

The FY 2007 HUD budget proposes $2.975 billion for CDBG formula grants, down $736 million (19.8 percent) from the FY 2006 level that had been reduced by 10 percent form the year before. If Congress were to accept such a reduction, it would continue a downward trend for the program that began in FY 2002. In FY 2001, CDBG formula grants received $4.399 billion and levels have steadily decreased since then. The Bush Administration defended the large cut in CDBG funds by maintaining that it would propose legislation later this year to make formula changes to the program that would result in funds being better targeted toward areas that are most in need. The Bush Administration defended the large cut in CDBG funds by maintaining that it would propose legislation later this year to make formula changes to the program that would result in funds being better targeted toward areas that are most in need. The Section 108 loan guarantee program would also be consolidated into the new CDBG framework according to the HUD budget proposal.

The FY 2007 HUD budget would also provide no funds for the $99 million HOPE VI Severely Distressed Public Housing Program, the Brownfields program that was funded at $10 million in FY 2006, nor would it fund Round II Urban Empowerment Zones, which did not receive funding in FY 2006. Other HUD program recommendations are as follows, with difference from FY 2006 enacted levels in parentheses:

- $2 billion for the HOME Investment Partnership (+217m)
- $1.536 billion for Continuum of Care Homeless Grants (+$210m)

TRANSPORTATION
Highway law is set to receive near full funding in the President’s FY 2007 budget, but aviation grants would be slashed. The President’s $65.6 billion FY 2007 Department of Transportation budget requests near full funding for surface transportation programs as set by the recent highway law, SAFETEA-LU.

Under the proposal, the federal-aid highway program would receive the authorized level of $39.8 billion while transit programs would receive $8.87 billion, or $100 million less than the authorized amount. This reduction is reflected in the recommendation for the new Small Starts program at $100 million instead of the $200 million authorized in SAFETEA-LU. Other recommended levels for transit programs include:

- $3.6 billion for transit formula grants (+5.1%)
- $856 million for bus and bus facilities (+5.1%)
- $1.47 billion for New Start rail projects (-1.5%)
- $1.45 billion for rail modernization (+8.9%)
- $144 million for Job Access reverse Commute Program (+5.4%)
Additionally, the budget proposes $100 million for a pilot program to test alternatives to the gas tax for funding highway construction and managing congestion. The pilot program is designed to test fees, tolls, and new approaches to raise funds and ease traffic on congested roads. Up to five states will participate in the program.

The President requested $900 million for Amtrak this year—$900 million more than his FY 2006 request but about half of what the struggling railroad needs to maintain operations. Of that amount, $500 million is for capital needs and maintenance. The remaining $400 million would fund Efficiency Incentive Grants to encourage reforms of the railroad service.

Meanwhile, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would receive $13.77 billion, a cut of $562 million. The Airport Improvement Program (AIP), the FAA capital program to build airport infrastructure, was again targeted for deep cuts under the Administration’s proposal. AIP is slated to receive only $2.8 billion this year—a $765 million cut. The budget request does not propose new user fees, but there is some concern among industry representatives that an FAA reauthorization package that is expected to be introduced this year may include new fees to fund agency programs.

**HOMELAND SECURITY**

President cuts firefighter funds by 55 percent. In its FY 2007 budget plan, the Bush Administration proposes an increase of six percent to $42.7 billion for the Department of Homeland Security. However, overall funding for key first responder programs would be cut from $4 billion to $3.4 billion, and the funding would be more targeted.

The budget proposes $293 million for firefighter grants, a reduction of $252 million, and would eliminate funds for the SAFER firefighter staffing grants, the Metropolitan Medical Response System, Citizen Corps, and Urban Search and Rescue task forces.

The President once again proposes to consolidate port, transit, rail and other infrastructure grants into a new Targeted Infrastructure Protection program, forcing the sectors to compete with each other. The program would receive $600 million in funding in FY 2007.

The Administration’s budget also continues the President’s focus on risk and need-based funding by proposing to increase the State Homeland Security Block Grant program to $633 million (+$83 million) and the Urban Areas Security Initiative to $838 million (+$98 million).

Other programs of note with change from FY 2006 in parentheses:

- $170 million for Emergency Management Performance Grants (-$15 million)
- $150 million for Pre-Disaster Mitigation (+100 million)
- $1.9 billion for the Disaster Relief Fund (+$190 million)
- $151 million for Emergency Food and Shelter (same)
- $199 million for Flood Map Modernization (+$1 million)

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

Local law enforcement assistance would be slashed under President’s budget proposal. The White House’s proposed budget for the Department of Justice would cut overall federal assistance to state and local law enforcement by 61%.

The most severe cut to local law enforcement agencies in the President’s budget is the proposed elimination of the Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants (JAG) Program. Last year JAG received $416.5 million, a figure which already presents a considerable cut from funding in previous years.

COPS programs would be cut to $102.1 million, $170.4 million less than last year’s final funding of $272.5 million. The Administration’s proposed budget would also decrease funding for the Violence Against Women Act by $39 million to $347 million.

On a brighter note, the Administration proposes an increase of $66.5 million to DNA Enhancements by proposing $175 million for the programs.

Congress is unlikely to implement the President’s proposals. Local law enforcement assistance is popular with rank and file members of both parties and enjoys a strong constituency among local elected officials, police chiefs, and police unions.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Budget bill includes $1 billion for interoperable communications grants. The budget reconciliation bill (S 1932) that President Bush signed this week includes $1 billion for interoperable communications grants to state and local public safety agencies.

The grants will be administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) and will be available from FY 2007 through FY 2010. The grants will require a 20 percent match and will have to be spent within three years. NTIA will administer the grants in a manner consistent with interoperable communications guidelines developed by the Department of Homeland Security and grantees will have to use the funds in a manner consistent with all state interoperable communications plans.

The Conference Report accompanying S 1932 also includes language “encouraging” NTIA to distribute a “limited portion” of the funding to public safety agencies in areas at high risk for natural disasters and threats of terrorism to: agriculture, food, banking and chemical industries; the defense industrial base; emergency services; energy; government facilities; postal, shipping, public health, health care, information technology, telecommunications and transportation systems; water; dams; commercial facilities, and national monuments and icons.

NTIA will develop guidance and application materials for these grants in the coming months, and we will notify the City when they become available.
HUMAN SERVICES

President proposes three percent increase for HHS budget in FY 2007. All but $70 billion of the proposed $698 billion budget request for the Department of Health and Human Services is dedicated to mandatory programs, which is why the centerpiece of the White House request is a $36 billion reduction in Medicare spending over the next five years. In addition, the HHS budget proposes to eliminate the Community Services Block Grant that was funded at $637 million in FY 2006, as well as the $103 million Runaway and Homeless Youth program.

Proposed funding levels for other HHS programs of interest (with changes from FY 2006 levels in parentheses):

- $6.9 billion for Head Start (same)
- $1.963 billion for Community Health Centers (+$181 million)
- $2.158 billion for Ryan White AIDS programs (+$95 million)
- $1.657 billion for bioterrorism programs (+$25 million)
- $2.782 billion for Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (+$621 million)
- $1.338 billion for Aging Administration (-$28 million)
- $2.062 for the Child Care Block Grant (same)
- $1.7 billion for the Social Services Block Grant (same)
- $1.7 billion for the Substance Abuse Block Grant (same)
- $615 million for Refugee Assistance (+$45 million)
- $102 million for Healthy Start (same)
- $693 million for the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant (same)
- $2.554 billion for CDC Immunizations (-$76 million)
- $428 million for the Mental Health Block Grant (same)
- $141 million for Environmental Health (-$9 million)
- $2.652 billion for pandemic influenza (-$668 million)

JOB TRAINING

Administration calls for consolidation of job training programs. The President’s proposed budget includes $3.4 billion for a new Career Advancement Accounts job training initiative that essentially folds Adult Training, Dislocated Workers Assistance, Youth Training and Job Corps programs into it. Last year, these programs were funded at $857 million, $1.4 billion, $941 million, and $1.5 billion, respectively, approximately 28% more than what is included in this year’s proposal. These funds are aimed at helping out-of-school youth, low-income adults, and dislocated workers find employment.

The Youthbuild Program, which targets 16-24 year olds for construction job training, has been moved under the Administration’s proposal from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to the Department of Labor. This year’s proposal would put funding at $50 million, a slight increase from HUD’s FY 06 level of $49.5 million. The President’s proposed budget also includes $15 million to the Department of Justice for his Prisoner Re-Entry Initiative that incorporates programs at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services.

The President’s proposed budget is similar to last year’s and illustrates the Administration’s efforts to consolidate programs as Congress reauthorizes the Workforce Investment Act. To date, however, Congress has shown no inclination to follow the Administration’s lead. The lead WIA proposals in the House and Senate would generally maintain the current grant structure. In addition, it is unlikely that Congress will consider legislation to shift Youthbuild from HUD to Labor.

ARTS & RECREATION

President renews call to eliminate LWCF state grants. President Bush is once again proposing to eliminate Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) state grants as part of a plan to cut overall LWCF funding by $50 million to $24 million. Although Congress has resisted the Administration’s yearly proposals to eliminate LWCF state grants, tight budgets have taken their toll in the past few years.

As recently as FY 2005, LWCF state matching grants alone were funded at $90 million, $16 million more than FY 2006 funding for the LWCF as a whole and a whopping $66 million more than the President is proposing for the entire LWCF in FY 2007. The LWCF program is authorized at $900 million annually – a level that the program has never come close to achieving – to fund both state grants and federal land acquisitions at four Interior Department agencies.

Although Congress will probably not eliminate LWCF state grants or implement cuts to the overall program as severe as those proposed by the Administration, further cuts are likely. Advocates of the program, which provides funding for the purchase of environmentally sensitive land and for park improvements, worry that the program will soon shrink to the point that it no longer serves a useful purpose.

The news is somewhat brighter for other federal recreation and conservation programs. The President is proposing a small cut of $1.4 million, to $71.8 million, for the Historic Preservation Fund. Of that amount, $14.8 million would be for Save America’s Treasures, a cut of $15.2 million. For the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund, the Budget calls for an increase of $1.6 million, to $41.6 million.

On the arts front, the President is proposing a small cut of $2 million, to $124 million, for the National Endowment for the Arts, and an increase of roughly the same size, to $141 million, for the National Endowment for the Humanities. Funding for the Institute of Museum and Library
Services (IMLS), a favorite of First Lady Laura Bush, would increase by $12.6 million to $262.24 million.

Congress will likely follow the President’s lead on most of these other programs, though they may be reluctant to provide an increase for IMLS.

**ECON. DEVELOPMENT**

Administration calls for increase and restructuring at EDA. As part of his FY 2007 Budget Proposal, President Bush is calling for an increase of $43 million in funding for Economic Development Administration (EDA) grants. However, the increase would be coupled with a major restructuring of EDA that would eliminate Public Works Grants as well as Technical Assistance and Economic Adjustment Grants.

Those grant programs would be replaced with a Regional Development Account that would be used to build regional capacity to adapt to and create new technologies, including the development of University Centers to provide employment-related education and training. The proposal is part of the Administration’s scaled back Strengthening America’s Communities Initiative (SACI). In last year’s incarnation, SACI called for the elimination of 18 federal programs, including EDA grants and Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), and their replacement with a single, targeted block grant administered by EDA.

Chastened by a massive lobbying effort by state and local officials and a tepid response on Capitol Hill, the Administration has considerably scaled back SACI. For example, CDBG would remain a separate program at HUD (though its funding would be cut considerably and formula changes would make it more targeted – see related story). In addition, the New Markets Tax Credit would be spared and the Department of Treasury would continue to administer it.

Even in its scaled-back form, Congress is unlikely to enact any portion of SACI. EDA grants enjoy broad popularity among Members of Congress and they will likely have little stomach for making wholesale changes to a popular grant program in an election year.

**ENVIRONMENT**

Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund again the target of major reduction in the Administration’s new budget proposal for FY 2007. After Congress rejected the President’s proposed cut in the FY 2006 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) budget and restored funding to $900 million, the President has again proposed a cut of 24 percent to $688 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund. The Administration claims that, at that level, the program meets the capitalization commitment that the President laid out in 2004 and would also still meet the program’s long-term goal of $6.8 billion in loans available by 2011.

Overall, the Administration requested $7.3 billion for the EPA, a reduction of $300 million from the previous year. Outside of the clean water program, most EPA programs would receive funding close to their FY 2006 levels. The Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund would receive an $8 million cut to $842 million, the Brownfields program would be cut by $2 million to $163 million, and the Leaking Underground Storage Tanks program would receive $73 million, an increase of $1 million. The Superfund program would stay the same at $1.3 billion.
February 15, 2006

Mr. Walker
427 E Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Mr. Walker,

On February 14, 2006 I received a memo from the City council asking me to respond to your letter dated February 13, 2006.

I must first say I'm extremely disappointed with the comments and assumptions referred to in your letter. You may or may not remember that on at least two separate occasions I extended an invitation to you to visit the Emergency Operations Center for Lincoln and Lancaster County. As of today you have not accepted this invitation. I am again extending this invitation in writing for you and any member of your neighborhood group to visit the Emergency Operations Center and review the county's response plan, Local Emergency Operation Plan, our daily operational plans, and other policies and procedures we have in place. I would also suggest that your neighborhood association hold one of their meetings at the Emergency Operations Center to allow all members an opportunity to see our operations first hand.

On July 5, 2005 I wrote a letter to Mr. Wineberg regarding concerns the neighborhood association had concerning shelters, evacuation routes, etc. I assume from your comments you have a copy of the letter. Please read the last paragraph. I am again offering my assistance as I have in the past.

I am not going to address several comments and assumptions you have made in your letter to the City Council, except for one that is important for you to understand. You mentioned the Federal funding being funneled into Lincoln from the Department of Homeland Security and that no funds have been spent on the construction of emergency shelters. You are absolutely right. No money has been spent on shelters. The Department of Homeland Security will not allow funding for construction of any type of building or shelter. As matter of fact, the Department of Homeland Security provides, along with the application, a list of materials and equipment that can be purchased with grant funds.
I am in contact with Zion Church about establishing a severe weather shelter. They have offered their facility to their neighbors, but will not have space available until 2007.

I am available any time, day or evening, to visit with you and any other neighborhood members concerning the safety and well-being of residents in your neighborhood. All you have to do is ask. You and your neighbors know your neighborhood far better than I do. If there are better solutions to concerns you’ve voiced, I am open to your suggestions. Here is my phone number again, 441-7441. I’m also including my cell phone number, 450-7650. I’m available any time.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Doug Ahlberg, Director
Lincoln Lancaster County Emergency Management

Cc: Mayor’s Office
Cc: Lincoln City Council
Cc: Lancaster County Board of Commissioners
July 5, 2005

Dear Mr. Wineberg,

Thanks you for your letter dated June 9, 2005. It speaks volumes about how concerned and active your community organization is. Your concern for the safety of the citizens of Lincoln and your neighborhood is very refreshing. I’d like to address your concerns in two areas: Tornadoes is one area and flooding is another. Both events have special needs and concerns separate from the other.

Let’s discuss tornadoes first. I have enclosed copies of the information sheets we have developed relating to severe weather. If there are not enough, please call me and we’ll send additional copies. In the City of Lincoln two (2) tornado shelters have been opened to the general public. One shelter is operated by Pfizer Inc. at 601 West Cornhusker. I’ve enclosed a copy of their facility. The second shelter is at the Lincoln Regional Center which allows the use of their tunnel system connecting their various administrative buildings.

I would suggest that those residents living in your neighborhood without basements or safe areas in their homes make arrangements with a neighbor who has a basement to use in the event of severe weather. My department has long advocated the purchase of a “NOAA all hazards weather radio” for each household in Lancaster County. These radios are very inexpensive and provide not only weather information, but advanced warnings of possible flooding or other hazards. We have the ability to interrupt television and radio broadcasts through the EAS program here n Lancaster County. This is the “emergency alert system” you hear which is tested on a monthly basis. In addition, we also have the ability to interrupt cable vision’s broadcasts in the event of severe weather. Outside warning sirens are the last form of warning available to warn residents of the approach of severe weather.

A new system has been installed at 2nd and A Street that has an effective range of 5280 feet, or one mile, but again these are outside warning sirens. They will not wake you up at 2 AM inside your home. I would be more than happy to meet with you about visiting with a business or facility manager in your area regarding the use of their facility as a tornado shelter. I have also enclosed a copy of our “storm spotters” locations throughout Lancaster County. This program has been recognized across the United States as one of the best.
Second issue to discuss is flooding along Salt Creek. You may or may not know that several years ago the City of Lincoln along with the NRD installed water level measuring equipment along Salt Creek. This particular system will alert us when the creek is half full and again when the creek is ¾ full. This, along with visual observation, will allow for advanced warnings of rising waters in Salt Creek. Public shelters would be opened by the Lancaster County Chapter of the American Red Cross upon my request. Evacuation routes to these shelters would be determined and made public via television and radio. All roads leading into and out of your neighborhood would remain open until the evacuation had been completed. In the event of a declared emergency we can stop all rail movement into Lincoln, leaving all crossings open to vehicle traffic. The elderly are a major concern during evacuations. The Lincoln Area on Aging has developed a data base that we can access giving emergency responders names, addresses, etc. of the elderly. With this information 1st responders will then know which homes to go to and assist with the evacuation of neighborhood residents.

I very much appreciate your letter and I apologize for taking so long to respond. I would be more than happy to visit with you and your neighborhood groups to better explain what plans are in place to assist you in the event our assistance is needed. Please feel free to contact me at 441-7441.

Respectfully,

Doug Ahlberg, Director
Lincoln Lancaster County Emergency Management

Cc: Mayor’s Office
Cc: Lancaster County Board of Commissioners
MEMO

To: Doug Ahlberg, Emergency Management Director
From: Lincoln City Council member Jonathan Cook
Date: February 14, 2006
RE: Emergency Shelters

Would you please respond to the attached Letter and Newsletter article from Danny Walker. Please respond to Mr. Walker and send a copy of the response to Council.

If you will send your response to the Council Office at CouncilPacket@lincoln.ne.gov, in a pdf format, I will distribute your response in the usual manner on the Directors’ Agenda. Thank-you.
City Council Members  
City Of Lincoln  
February 13, 2006  

SUBJECT: Emergency Shelters  

Dear Council Members:  

The South Salt Creek Neighborhood has recently been advised (IN WRITING) that there are no Emergency Shelter provisions in the proximity of the neighborhood. Be advised, this amounts to very poor planning and or preparedness when one considers the fact that over half of the neighborhood is in fact located in the floodplains of Salt Creek. Also be advised, to make matters worse, the so-called new mapping of the Salt Creek Floodplain offers little or no relief in regards to flooding and in fact seems to be somewhat of a shell game. 

One would think that after the recent fiasco involving the Gulf Coast that reviews and or corrections both on the local and federal levels would take place. After all, lets not forget the mess at Hallam when there were poor decisions made regarding volunteers and or the need of additional volunteers. 

You will receive a copy of the latest Neighborhood Newsletter (page three (3) bottom) regarding Emergency Shelters in our area of which there are currently NONE. 

This amounts to poor emergency planning and preparedness by the City of Lincoln. 

It seems strange that with all the federal funds funneled down to Lincoln for so-called homeland security that shelters such as the aforementioned are not either provided in proper locations or do not exist. 

It would be appreciated if the Council members would give this problem some consideration. I am hoping that Lincoln can do better then Washington DC done on the Gulf Coast. 

Thank you  

Danny Walker, President, SSsco
FIRST AND "J" STREET OVERPASS STUDY

The study will involve pedestrian AND vehicular traffic. Approximately 2100 cars and 77 trains use the 1st and "J" street crossing daily.

The expected cost of the study will be $25,000 and it will take approximately three (3) months to complete the first phase of the study.

Primarily, the study will concentrate on pedestrians and therefore, supposedly the study will take place during the months of March, April and May due to the fact more pedestrians will be walking and utilizing the near by playground during those months.

School age children living in the area will also be given consideration.

FLOOD PREPAREDNESS

It is fast approaching that time of year when eyes will turn to the sky and to Salt Creek and its tributaries. Sure we are in the midst of winter and the thoughts of spring are a long way off, but now is the time to prepare. Many of you live in a flood-prone area and need to start thinking of the possibilities of being flooded and what to do to be prepared for the worst. Some priorities are:

Learn flood warning signs and your community alert signals.
Request information on preparing for floods and flash floods.
Stockpile emergency building materials. These include plywood, plastic sheeting, lumber nails, hammer and saw, pry bar, shovels, and sandbags.
Have check valves installed in building sewer traps to prevent flood waters from backing up in sewer drains. As a last resort, use large corks or stoppers to plug showers, tubs, or basins.

Plan and practice an evacuation route. However, be advised that according to Doug Ahlberg, Emergency Management Director, there is no official evacuation route for flood evacuation in the Salt Creek area. It is best to look around your home for streets that reach the highest level away from potential flooding and remember them for future use. Take a map, the one you can find in your phone book and mark that route on it and keep it in the car or with you emergency kit. Keep in mind the recent events that transpired in the coastal areas point to the fact that one cannot rely on the local government, state government or FEMA nor the Corps of Engineers for help.

Since the city and the county have not provided evacuation routes you should not rely on any shelters within the immediate area. Two are offered by the city/county but they are in areas that would not be accessible from the South Bottoms area in the event of a flood nor are they close by. Make arrangements with friends or family to meet them at their home in the event of a flood.

Have disaster supplies on hand:
Flashlights and extra batteries
Extra batteries
Emergency food and water
Essential medicines
Sturdy shoes

Portable, battery-operated radio
First aid kit and manual
Non-electric can opener
Cash and credit cards
OFFICE OF TREASURER, CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

FEBRUARY 14, 2006

TO:      MAYOR COLEEN SENG & CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
FROM:    FINANCE DEPARTMENT / CITY TREASURER
SUBJECT: MONTHLY CITY CASH REPORT

The records of this office show me to be charged with City cash as follows at the close of business January 31, 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward</td>
<td>$213,477,424.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Total Debits January 1-31, 2006</td>
<td>$23,704,965.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Credits January 1-31, 2006</td>
<td>($29,190,601.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance on January 31, 2006</td>
<td>$207,991,789.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I desire to report that such City cash was held by me as follows which I will deem satisfactory unless advised and further directed in the matter by you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Bank Nebraska, N.A.</td>
<td>$37,548.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>($60,837.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank Credit Card Account</td>
<td>$11,355.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comhusker Bank</td>
<td>$31,871.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Bank</td>
<td>$4,963.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>$143,626.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate Bank</td>
<td>$62,627.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Short-Term Pool</td>
<td>$30,171,222.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Medium-Term Pool</td>
<td>$177,404,068.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Checks and Warrants</td>
<td>$185,142.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash on Hand January 31, 2006</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,991,789.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The negative bank balances shown above do not represent the City as overdrawn in these bank accounts. In order to maximize interest earned on all City funds, deposits have been invested prior to the Departments' notification to the City Treasurer's office of these deposits; therefore, these deposits are not recorded in the City Treasurer's bank account balances at month end.

I also hold as City Treasurer, securities in the amount of $25,302,896.06 representing authorized investments of the City's funds.

ATTEST:

Joan E. Ross, City

Melinda J. Jones, City Treasurer
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February 9, 2006

To: All Physicians, Administrators and Laboratory Personnel

From: Bruce Dart, PhD, Health Director

Subject: Physician Advisory

**Bordetella pertussis**

The Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department continues to receive reports of pertussis in Lancaster County. A total of 87 cases of pertussis were reported in Lancaster County in 2005. **Fifty-eight** of these were laboratory confirmed cases. The remaining 29 individuals were close contacts of a laboratory confirmed case, and had a cough lasting two weeks or more and either paroxysmal coughing and/or post-tussive vomiting but were not lab confirmed. These individuals are defined as epidemiologically confirmed cases.

**B. pertussis Cases**

*Lancaster County (2004-2005)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Lab case</th>
<th>Epi case</th>
<th>% cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months- under 1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 19 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 +</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are asking that physicians continue to maintain a high index of suspicion for pertussis in patients presenting with an acute illness characterized by a prolonged cough. Pertussis is highly communicable in the early catarrhal stage and at the beginning of the paroxysmal cough stage (first 2 weeks). Thereafter, communicability gradually decreases and becomes negligible in about three weeks, despite persisting spasmodic cough with whoop. When treated the patient is no longer contagious after the fifth day following initiation of treatment with an appropriate antibiotic.
Serology is NOT recommended as a diagnostic test for *Bordetella pertussis*. Serology is not currently standardized in the U.S. and, therefore, is not considered reliable for laboratory confirmation. The two recommended diagnostic tests for *Bordetella pertussis* infection are PCR and culture. The challenge of laboratory diagnosis is two-fold: specimen collection requires an appropriately collected nasopharyngeal swab, and successful culture requires careful specimen handling, along with the use of special transport and culture media.

All household contacts of a pertussis case should be treated regardless of immunization status or age. Chemoprophylaxis should be considered for adults who have close or extensive contact. Other contacts outside the home that are symptomatic should be evaluated and treated as necessary. Asymptomatic contacts outside the home need not be treated.

*Bordetella pertussis* infections should be reported to the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department at 441-8053 (Monday–Friday 8:00–4:30) or after hour and weekends call 441-8000 and ask for the Communicable Disease program.

**INFLUENZA UPDATE**

Flu activity in Lancaster County is showing an increase during the last two weeks. Flu-like illness in the schools has been gradually increasing over the past three to four weeks. There have been 73 positive Influenza lab reports in Lancaster County through February 4, 2006 (54 type A and 19 type B). Provider patient visits for flu-like illness (ILI) are at one percent of total patient visits (graph).

**Physician Advisory Available By E-Mail**

Physicians, Advance Nurse Practitioners, Physician Assistants, Health-Care and Laboratory Administrators can receive periodic physician advisories by e-mail. Send an e-mail to ttimmons@ci.lincoln.ne.us with your name, type of practitioner (MD, ARNP, PA-C, Administrator, etc.) and location of practice.

PC: Mayor Coleen J. Seng
Board of Health
Steven Rademacher, MD, Medical Consultant
Thomas Stalder, MD, Medical Consultant
James Nora, MD, Medical Consultant
Joan Anderson, Executive Director, Lancaster County Medical Society
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: February 15, 2006
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Harry Heafer 441-8035; Gene Hanlon 441-7043

LINCOLN-LANCASTER COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL AWARDS
NOMINATIONS SOUGHT

Nominations are being sought for the 2006 Lincoln-Lancaster County Environmental Awards. Lancaster County residents are encouraged to nominate an individual, school, organization or business for an environmental award. These annual awards recognize local efforts to preserve and better the environment.

“The environmental awards program is an opportunity to thank individuals, businesses, youth groups and other organizations for their efforts to protect our environment and the public’s health. Each year, I am impressed by the awards presentation which highlights each winner’s environmental accomplishments. The actions of our winners and nominees demonstrate why Lincoln is such a great place in which to live. I also want to thank the many generous donors who make the awards program possible,” said Mayor Coleen Seng.

The awards recognize local efforts in the following categories:

Pollution Prevention:
Elimination or significant reduction in the use of toxic products

Waste Reduction and Recycling:
Reduction in the amount of waste sent to the landfill

Water Conservation:
Reduction in water use by utilizing water conservation equipment or planting drought tolerant plants

Cleanup/Beautification:
Improvement in an area’s visual quality

Residential/Commercial Development:
Smart growth, sustainable development, and active living by design including reducing waste during construction, utilizing drought tolerant landscaping, and energy efficient and green building techniques

Environmental Education/Awareness:
New or unique efforts for
providing or supporting environmental education programs; increasing awareness about local environmental issues

Nomination forms are available by calling 441-8035 or 441-7043, or may be completed on-line at: www.lincoln.ne.gov/city/health/environ/klleb/awards.htm. Nomination deadline is March 16, 2006. The awards luncheon will be on Thursday, April 27, 2006 from Noon – 1:30 p.m. at the Nebraska Alumni Champions Club across from Memorial Stadium on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln’s campus.

###
Please be aware that this ordinance has been placed on pending indefinitely. As I understand your question, you would not be in violation of the proposed ordinance. This matter is covered by Lincoln Municipal Code sec. 8.22.150 which requires the handbill to be secured to prevent it blowing onto public property.

TBogenreif@ci.lincoln.ne.us wrote:

Dear Steve Wolsleger: Your message has been received in the Council Office and will be forwarded to the Council Members. Also, will be forwarded to the City Law Department and City Clerk's Office regarding your questions on this issue. Thank-you.

Tammy J. Grammer
City Council Office
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE  68508
Phone: 402-441-6867
Fax: 402-441-6533
e-mail: tgrammar@lincoln.ne.gov

DO NOT REPLY to this- InterLinc <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Comment or Question:
Dear Councilman Camp,
I am sending this email to inquire about your amendment to Chapter 8.22 which pertains to littering.
My business', Address Nebraska-Operation House ID, main tool for marketing is through putting flyers on individual residences. We use tape to apply the flyer, but once in a while the wind can be very strong and cause a flyer or 2 to come loose from the storm door window or some other place on the house that is suitable to tape the flyer.
Over the last 8 years we have taped thousands of flyers in Lincoln and have never had a complaint about littering. I guess my question for you is this. Would my company be liable under this ordinance? If so, is it still possible to come before the council about this?

Sincerely
Steve Wolsleger
As most of you know, the City Council held a public hearing on January 27 regarding a set of amendments to the development codes regarding landscaping, screening and pedestrian walks in business areas and waivers of design standards. Planning staff since then has developed several more revisions, summarized below, which we think are responsive to many of the comments and questions raised at the hearing. We are still working on the final language for these revisions, but want to provide interested parties with this summary of proposed revisions at this early date, plus responses to other issues raised at the hearing.

We invite your individual comments and suggestions on these proposed revisions, by phone or email, and would be glad to come out to a meeting of your organization to discuss them in more detail. We will send out the technical language to you as soon as they are ready, prior to the continued public hearing scheduled for February 27.

Revisions:

1. **Screening of parking lots from street view.** The proposed increase in the density of screening of parking lots from the street, from 60% between 2-4 feet to 90% between 0-3 feet, simply brings this standard in line with many other communities, and the proposed streamlined waiver provisions will allow staff to make exceptions as appropriate. Ground signs generally sit on bases that are 3 feet in height, they are usually sited at driveways which are separated from parking lots, and the 90% standard allows for an area around the sign to be left clear. The proposed reduction in front yard setbacks is a real benefit to businesses because it allows these signs closer to the street for improved readability. However, in an effort to provide more flexibility, we offer the following revision to this section:

   A variable percentage of screening depending on the front yard setback: 90% screening if the parking lot is set back 35 feet or less from the street right of way, 60% if the lot is set back 35-50 feet, and 30% if the lot is set back 50 feet or more.

   This is similar to language in the code today that allows for reduced screening with increased setback.

2. **Six foot landscape strip in older business districts.** We recognize that most older business areas are on small, shallow (half-block depth) lots for which giving up even a small area of land could hurt the feasibility of some redevelopment projects. A future set of amendments could compensate for the landscape strip requirement by reducing rear yard setbacks. In the meantime, we offer a revision that would limit the six foot landscape strip requirement in the older business districts to only lots that are more than 150 feet (more than a half-block) deep.

3. **Improvements that trigger landscape/screening and walkway standard.** The proposed language before the Council provides different language for these two categories as to what kind of property improvements, besides new construction, would trigger compliance with the new standards. We reexamined the language to make sure that interior improvements would not be part of any calculation triggering these requirements, and found that a clarifying revision is needed. We also looked at using the same language as the trigger for both types of standards, but decided to stay with two different triggers. Landscaping and screening can be installed in increments such that even partial compliance with the standards can have a positive effect, whereas a walkway system is more of a yes-or-no proposition. We offer to revise the language as follows:

   Require that pedestrian improvements be installed on the premise (defined as including multiple buildings
in a unified contiguous ownership) if the permit value of the improvements, not including any interior improvements, exceeds 50% of the existing assessed value of improvements. The language in this provision now referring to "reconstruction" would be deleted.

Require that landscaping and screening improvements be installed on the premises in proportion to the area of the parking lot and/or building addition, if the addition exceeds 10% of the existing building floor area or parking lot area.

Responses to other issues:

1. Won't these create more of an enforcement problem? Enforcement of the development code is done on a complaint basis, the code already contains landscaping and screening requirements, and the proposed revisions should not create a substantial additional load on City staff. While there are some enforcement problems, most required plantings today are being installed and maintained. The bonding requirement when planting is delayed until after occupancy will provide an incentive for the developer to install the landscaping in a timely manner. The requirement for developers to have plants installed by contractors certified by the Park Department should result in a better survival rate for these plantings.

2. How is this bond requirement going to work; is the City going to plant on private property? First, we already have a requirement through the subdivision process to bond street trees if not immediately planted, and in most cases, there is insufficient right of way to plant those trees and so they are planted on private property. The Subdivision agreements provide for the City's right to do this work if necessary. Second, the City has never in staff's collective memory been required to call in a bond for any subdivision improvements; developers want to clear these encumbrances from their credit reports and be responsible for doing the work themselves.

3. Why are you eliminating the provision allowing gas pumps and gas pump islands to be installed within 12 feet of the street right of way? The current provision "exempts" these facilities from the front yard setback requirements that are applied to buildings, parking areas, and driveways. It is inconsistent to allow these facilities to have less of a buffer from the street and sidewalk than other uses. We are proposing a minor revision to the amendments now before the City Council, leaving in language that we thought was unnecessary that allows drives associate with pump islands to encroach into the front yards in older business districts.

4. What does it mean to say that the front yard must be devoted to landscaping? This is existing language that has been in the code for many years, and it has always been intended and interpreted that grass is sufficient. The intent is for landscaped areas to be primarily devoted to live plantings, and not mostly or entirely covered with paving, rocks, stones, etc.

5. When is a driveway perpendicular to the street? This means the driveway that provides access to and from the street, and is an exception to the landscaped front yard requirement.

6. Please exempt health care facilities from any new requirements to hold down health care costs. These facilities are usually among the best landscaped and pedestrian-oriented, and any additional cost of installing walkways or additional shrubs should be minimal. Creating exceptions like this will undoubtedly lead to requests for additional exceptions.

7. Won't screening of loading areas be impossible in some cases or require excessive construction? The requirement to screen loading areas only applies to areas visible from and within 150 feet of the street or residential district. Very large warehouses will always have extensive paved areas for maneuvering adjacent to their loading areas and the loading areas, so they generally are set back more than 150 feet from the perimeter. Buildings also can be oriented so that loading areas are all or mostly hidden from street view or view from residential properties, if they are within 150 feet of the property line.

8. Do we need sidewalks in all developments? First, the design standards for many years have required
sidewalks along both sides of public and private roadways. Requests to waive these requirements are rare, and they have been rejected most of the time. The City Council generally has taken the position that if they are ever going to be built, they need to go in with the initial street construction or incrementally with phased building construction. The proposals in front of the Council today deal with connecting building entrances to these sidewalks and to each other. The design standards already call for walkway systems in parking lots; we are just trying to provide some guidance as to where and how they should be designed. If the Council is serious about providing opportunities for walking as part of "healthy living", as the Health Board and Planning Commission have recommended, then safe routes for exercise and recreation as well as more functional purposes should be provided in all developments.

9. Won't it be difficult and expensive to try to retrofit parking lots with sidewalks or trees or screening when the only work being done is building renovation? The revisions to the "triggers" offered above clarify that building remodelling would not trigger any of these requirements, only new construction or additions.

10. Do your standards for landscaping rights of way imply a higher cost for the City? The agreements between the City and private party on special landscaping in right of way would include provisions requiring the private party to be responsible for maintenance, and allow the City to come in and remove the landscaping and maintain the area to normal standards (mowed grass). (right??)

11. How can you meet the proposed parking lot screening requirements? The same options would be available as exist today: shrubs, berm, wall, or some combination of these elements.

12. Do homeowners or neighborhood associations have to hire certified contractors to plant in public right of way? City Council expressed concerns about requiring landscaping by individuals or neighborhood associations in right of way to be installed by certified (by the Park Department) landscape contractors. We reexamined the Park Department's proposed amendments to Chapter 4 of the City Code, and they do not require a landscape contractor to do any work. The Park Director does not intend to require homeowners or homeowner associations to hire contractors, as he indicated at the Council hearing. The landscape/screening provisions would only apply to developers' plans for screening (including the proposed landscaping in front of backyard fences along arterials) that are submitted with subdivision plats (street trees are already required to be planted by certified contractors) and to building permits for development in multifamily and commercial/industrial zoning districts.

Marvin S. Krout, Director
Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department
tel 402.441.6366/fax 402.441.6377
February 10, 2006

Marvin Krout  
Planning Director  
Lincoln Lancaster County Planning Department  
555 S. 10th Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Marvin:

Please find enclosed an amendment to the *West O Redevelopment Plan.* This amendment identifies nine potential new projects, under the section entitled Redevelopment Activities: Commercial and Industrial, page 23 of the redevelopment plan. Since the Lincoln City Council adopted the West O plan in September, 2005, the Mayor’s Office and Urban Development have received many inquiries concerning redevelopment opportunities in the area.

This amendment adds nine projects for potential redevelopment. Under each location are the possible redevelopment activities that could be done in support of the projects. I’ve also included an amended map entitled *Exhibit 4 Location of Commercial/Industrial Redevelopment Activities.*

Please forward the amendment to the Planning Commission for their consideration at their March 15, 2006 meeting. If you have any questions please call Ernie Castillo at 1-7855.

Sincerely,

Marc Wullschrueger  
Director

cc.  Wynn Hjermstad  
     Ernie Castillo  
     Darl Naumann
2. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Irregular Tract Lot 23 SE 24-10-5.
   - Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
   - Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
   - Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
   - Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
   - Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

3. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at EDM Industrial Center Add, Block 3, Lots 8, 9 and Irregular Tract Lots 18, 62, 79, & 80 NE 29-10-6, generally known as 3001 and 3201 West O Street.
   - Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
   - Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
   - Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking, including O Street access as approved by Public Works and Utilities.
   - Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
   - Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

4. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at 7.98 +/- AC in NE part Irregular Tract Lot 26 NE 25-10-5, generally known as 5905 W. O Street.
   - Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
   - Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
   - Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
   - Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
   - Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

5. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Lot 2, T.O. Haas 3rd Addition, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.
   - Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
• Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
• Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
• Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
• Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

6. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at a portion of Lot 98, Irregular Tract in the Northeast 1/4 of Section 27, Township 10 North, Range 6 East of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, consisting of 8.87 acres in the Northeasterly corner, more particularly described in Instrument #2004-63821, except that part sold for right-of-way in Instrument #2004-70571.
• Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
• Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
• Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
• Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
• Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

7. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at All of Lot 106, and part of Lot 105, Irregular Tracts in the Northeast 1/4 of Section 29, Township 10 North, Range 6 East of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.
• Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
• Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
• Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
• Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
• Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

8. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Lot 38 and 39, Irregular Tracts, in the Southwest 1/4 of Section 19, Township 10 North, Range 6 East of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.
• Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
• Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
• Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
• Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
• Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

9. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Lot 74 and 75, Irregular Tract in the Southwest 1/4 of Section 20, Township 10 North, Range 6 East of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.
   • Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
   • Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
   • Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
   • Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
   • Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

10. Support commercial/industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Lot 52, Lot 70, and Lot 97, Irregular Tracts in the Northeast 1/4 of Section 27, Township 10, Range 6 of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.
    • Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
    • Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
    • Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
    • Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
    • Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

11. Support commercial industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Lot 51, Irregular Tract in the Southeast 1/4 of Section 19, Township 10, North, Range 6 East of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.
    • Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.
    • Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.
    • Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.
    • Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.
    • Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.
12. Support commercial industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Lots 2 through 7, Earl Carter Addition, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.

Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.

Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.

Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.

Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.

Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

13. Support commercial industrial redevelopment efforts at property located at Lot 92, Irregular Tract in the Northeast 1/4 of Section 28, Township 10 North, Range 6 East of the 6th P.M., Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska.

Acquisition of property described above from willing seller to complete public improvements.

Construction of public utilities on-site including sanitary and storm sewer and water.

Construction of public roads, alleyways and parking.

Sidewalk construction in the public ROW.

Construction of landscaping, ornamental lighting and streetscape in the public ROW.

14. Acquire substandard commercial/industrial structures. This activity is included in the following section, "Acquisition of Substandard Housing and Commercial/Industrial Structures."
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: February 10, 2006
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Bonnie Coffey, 441-8695
Diane Mullins, 441-7717
*Winners’ pictures available upon request

WOMEN’S COMMISSION HONORS AWARD RECIPIENTS

"Weaving Women’s Voices" pays tribute to annual award winners in saluting of International Women’s Day

The Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission (LLWC), along with Friends of the LLWC, will host an awards luncheon in recognition of International Women’s Day to celebrate its 30th anniversary, “Weaving Women’s Voices.” Scheduled for Friday, March 10, 2006, the event will be held at the Cornhusker Hotel, 333 South 13th Street, Lincoln, NE. Doors open at 11 a.m. and the program starts promptly at 11:30 a.m.

Mayor Coleen J. Seng will present an International Women’s Day proclamation and First Lady Sally Ganem will present an Admiralship in the Nebraska Navy to Ms. Shinae Chun, Director of the U.S. Department of Labor Women’s Bureau in Washington, DC.

On May 9, 2001, Chun was confirmed by the U.S. Senate as the 15th Director of the Women’s Bureau. Serving under Secretary of Labor Elaine L. Chao, Ms. Chun is President Bush’s highest ranking Korean American appointee, and heads the only Federal agency charged with advocating on behalf of women in the workforce. During her tenure she has transformed the way the Women’s Bureau does business through innovative projects and increasing partnerships. Under her leadership, the Women’s Bureau strives to advance the status of 21st Century working women in the pursuit of better jobs, better earnings and a better Living.

She has received the “Alumni Merit Award” from Northwestern University and the “Outstanding Alumni Award” from Ewha Womans University; the Business Women’s Network “Special Achievement for Leadership Award;” the Southern Women in Public Service “Pacesetter Award;” and the Asian American Coalition of Chicago “Excellence in Public Service Award.” She is author of From the Mountains of Masan to the Land of Lincoln (1996).

The Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission is pleased to announce the following award recipients:

• The Alice Paul Award is presented to a woman whose life’s work reflects her dedication to the struggle for women’s equality. Sen. DiAnna Schimek has been a state senator representing District 27 in the Nebraska Legislature since 1989. She serves on the Legislature’s Committee on Committees, the Business and Labor Committee and the Urban Affairs Committee, and she chairs the Government, Military and Veteran’s Affairs Committee. She is a former member of the Legislature’s Executive Board and served as vice-chair of the Legislature’s Reapportionment Task Force in 2001. Sen. Schimek’s legislative priorities during her years of service have been in the areas of children and families, health care, election law, Indian issues and consumer protection. Sen. Schimek is the past chair of the Midwestern Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments (CSG) and serves on its Executive Committee. In 1999, she was selected as a Toll Fellow by CSG. In 2003, she was appointed co-chair of the Intergovernmental
Affairs Committee of the Council of State Governments, and serves on the Executive Committee of CSG. In 2000, Sen. Schimek was appointed by the Governor to the Women’s Health Advisory Council. In 2001, she was appointed by the Legislature to serve on the Midwest Interstate Passenger Rail Commission. In 2001-02, she chaired the National Conference of State Legislature’s Task Force on Initiative & Referendum. Sen. Schimek has been involved in many community organizations including the Southwest Business and Civic Association, P.E.O., Downtown Rotary Club, and Soroptimist. In 1989, Sen. Schimek received the University of Nebraska at Kearney’s Outstanding Alumni Award. She is an honorary member of Mortar Board and Delta Kappa Gamma. She was named Woman of the Year by the NOVA Chapter of Business and Professional Women in 1999; Woman of Distinction by Soroptimists of Lincoln; Distinguished Service Award by the National Guard Association of Nebraska in 2000; Legislator of the Year Award by the Nebraska Dental Hygienist Association in 2001; and the Distinguished Service Award by the Nebraska League of Municipalities in 2002. The Lincoln Interfaith Council presented the Interfaith Leadership Award to Sen. Schimek in 2003. The ARC of Nebraska presented the Harold Sieck Award in 2004.

Among many bills affecting women’s issues, she cosponsored or sponsored seven bills that have been enacted into law:

- **LB 68**: Provided mandated insurance coverage for breast and cervical cancer for women over 35
- **LB 228**: Adopted the Address Confidentiality Act for victims of domestic abuse
- **LB 256**: Provided statewide program for mammography screening for low income women
- **LB 303**: Changed provisions related to judicial nominating commissions, more women judges names were sent to the governor
- **LB 480**: Created the women’s Health Initiative of Nebraska, creating the Office of Women’s Health
- **LB 1098**: Provided for the crime of stalking
- **LB 1213**: Provided payment of forensic examination for sexual assault victims
- **LB 1322**: Created the Nebraska Affordable Housing Act

Sen. Schimek embodies the spirit of the Alice Paul Award. Her life reflects a strong steadfast commitment to women’s rights. She has dedicated her career of public service to addressing the needs of those who are traditionally underrepresented, especially women and children.

- **The Erasmus Correll Award** is presented to a man who has exhibited outstanding commitment through his individual leadership and community involvement to the issues that affect women, who has encouraged and supported women in their pursuit of equal status, and who has enhanced women’s quality of life. **Mr. Milo Mumgaard**, executive director for the Nebraska Appleseed Center for Law in the Public Interest, has pioneered its direction since its inception in 1996 by leaders of the Nebraska Bar Association. Under his leadership, the center successfully litigated the return of transitional Medicaid coverage to more than 10,000 working Nebraska families in the wake of state budget cuts, most of which are headed by single mothers. He also navigated the center’s work to return millions of dollars in the unlawful denial of benefits to more than 1,000 disabled mothers in a case that was the first in the nation to successfully challenge a punitive vestige of welfare reform known as the “family cap.” He successfully argued to reunify the family of an undocumented mother from Guatemala and established a path breaking legal precedent requiring that all families, regardless of immigration status, be provided full due process rights within the child protection system. Mumgaard took the lead in bring together a groups of hundreds of low-income working women who had been denied assistance under the state’s child care subsidy program. These women banded together to form the Working Mom’s Safe Kids Coalition. The coalition fought for the preservation of benefits in order to continue working while in transition from public benefits to self-sufficiency. Mumgaard has dedicated his entire professional career to eliminating poverty and alleviating its effects for low income families. He has worked tirelessly for equal opportunity for newcomer populations and to ensure public policies assist communities to effective and efficiently integrate newcomers into our state.
He operates an open door policy in mentoring law students and social work students in understanding the importance of advocacy for underrepresented individuals and groups.

- The **Woman Artist - Visual Arts** will be presented to a local woman artist who excels in her work as deemed by peers and colleagues. Water color artist, **Karen Dienstbier** was selected for the Woman Artist award for her dedication and support to the arts, and women’s issues. She has been publicly and privately teaching art for the past two decades, and stands as Artist-In-Residence at several colleges across the nation. She has received multiple recognitions and awards for her work locally, nationally and internationally. Her art work has been seen in 34 juried shows in 11 states, 20 group invitational exhibits in Nebraska and 21 in other states. Her paintings appear in 29 corporate collections in six states including the Great Plains Studies Art Collection at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the Pillsbury’s International Headquarters in Minneapolis; 17 one-person shows including the Nebraska Governor's Mansion, the Stuhr Museum, Sioux City Art Center, Bannister Gallery of Rhode Island College and the Museum of Nebraska Art. For several years, she coordinated a regular informal group of women artists to support their endeavors and original works. She belongs to a number of women advocacy groups, including Friends of LLWC. Her activism spans the roles of artist, teacher and supporter. She currently supported the Haydon Gallery as an artist advisor and Education Committee member. Karen is very supportive of women, their art and efforts to equality. Her personal endeavors exemplify the adage of women helping women as she teaches English for the Suradaese community at the Lincoln Literacy Council.

- Formerly known as the Young Feminist Award, the **Sojourner Truth Award** is a rotating award accomplished by women, from ages 14 to 40, who through actions or example, attempts to enhance the quality of life for girls or women in Lincoln or Lancaster County. Union College student and writer for the college's newspaper, *The Clocktower*, **Kate Simmons** enlightens her peers on the true meaning of feminism while advocating women's equality in college, in the church and in the work place. She is an member of Amnesty International and the Peace & Social Justice club. In her spare time, she teaches English to political refugees and immigrants through her involvement with Lincoln Community Gardens program. In the words of her nominator, Mark Robinson, "Even though she is not enrolled in (my) class currently, I have had at least one student cite Kate as instrumental in his adopting a feminist stance."

For more information or to make reservations, contact the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission, 441-7717. These recipients will be honored for their professional and/or personal efforts in promoting opportunities for women, improving the quality of life and making an impact on women’s issues in the community. LLWC was formed in 1976 and works to assure that the women of Lincoln and Lancaster County have full participation on the issues that have an impact on their lives.
Mr. Wolsleger,

The current littering ordinance can be found in the Lincoln Municipal Code Section 8.22.150. You can review the entire Chapter on littering via the City's website: Interlinc www.Lincoln.ne.gov. Then click on Government, City of Lincoln Departments, City Attorney, Lincoln Municipal Code.

The ordinance (Bill No. 06-11) you are referring to is now on the Pending list of the City Council's formal agenda. It is to remain on Pending indefinitely. However, upon removal from Pending for Council consideration, there will be a public hearing.

Joan Ross, CMC
City Clerk
402/441-7438
Fax: 402/441-8325

Dear Steve Wolsleger: Your message has been received in the Council Office and will be forwarded to the Council Members. Also, will be forwarded to the City Law Department and City Clerk's Office regarding your questions on this issue. Thank-you.

Tammy J. Grammer
City Council Office
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone: 402-441-6867
Fax: 402-441-6533
e-mail: tgrammer@lincoln.ne.gov

DO NOT REPLY to this- InterLinc <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
General Council

Name: Steve Wolsleger
Address: 321 Indian Road
City: Lincoln, NE 68505
Phone: 429-6814/489-3907
Fax:
Email: SWOLSLEGER@neb.rr.com

Comment or Question:
Dear Councilman Camp,
I am sending this email to inquire about your amendment to Chapter 8.22 which
pertains to littering.
My business', Address Nebraska-Operation House ID, main tool for marketing is
through putting flyers on individual residences. We use tape to apply the
flyer, but once in a while the wind can be very strong and cause a flyer or 2
to come loose from the storm door window or some other place on the house that
is suitable to tape the flyer.
Over the last 8 years we have taped thousands of flyers in Lincoln and have
never had a complaint about littering. I guess my question for you is this.
Would my company be liable under this ordinance? If so, is it still possible
to come before the council about this?

Sincerely
Steve Wolsleger
Maurice:

Thanks for your email. Your observation has merit. However, I would doubt such a situation would be prosecuted unless the littering constituted a huge amount--then the party putting out the newsletter should lose its advertisers!

Regardless, my colleagues joined me in putting this measure on pending so that future discussion can occur on potential implications--we will consider your observation as well.

The goal of my amendment is to discourage the rampant posting on right-of-way poles.

Thank you for your input,

Jon

Jon Camp
Lincoln City Council
City Council Office: 441-8793
Constituent representative: Darrell Podany
I am very much in support of the basic idea of controlling litter in Lincoln. Litter detracts from all neighborhoods and causes increased costs to pick it up. However, I request that action be postponed on the current proposed change in city ordinances until its impact is more thoroughly understood. For example, as it is currently worded, a neighborhood organization newsletter which may be dropped by house occupants may result in a fine for advertisers in it. If this is the situation, most advertisers will cease placing ads and many neighborhood organizations may have to cease issuing newsletters because of the lack of funds.

**LET'S PUT A HOLD ON THIS UNTIL THESE UNINTENDED EFFECTS CAN BE EXAMINED.**

Maurice Baker
Derek:

Good points.

Hopefully you heard that my Council colleagues and I put this matter on pending so that I can meet with interested parties to explore concerns and options.

I do agree that the intent is not to penalize the single incident but rather the egregious situation of multiple intended violations, such as affixing "literature" to a power pole. City officials have had great difficulty enforcing the current ordinance, especially for bands, smoking cessation groups and diet counseling. My amendment is an attempt to put teeth into the ordinance and encourage the assistance of interested parties to assist, such as a venue that hires a band.

Please suggest solutions. And again, thanks for emailing.

Jon

Jon Camp
Lincoln City Council
City Council Office: 441-8793

-----Original Message-----
From: Andrea Hiatt Buckley <ahiatt@neb.rr.com>
To: campjon@aol.com
Sent: Thu, 16 Feb 2006 00:13:50 -0600
Subject: Flyer Ordinance Concerns

As a previous and current member of a few local bands, I feel that you have not properly considered the implications of your proposed bill. By making all parties involved with the show accountable you are indiscriminately placing an undue burden on all of the bands and promoters involved with the show. Because of your proposed changes to existing litter laws I could be fined $500 for handing someone a quarter-page sized flyer if that person then throws that flyer on the ground. Many bands in the area print up a lot of small handbills and leave them at the counters of local record stores (or in other designated free or promotional materials areas) in the hopes that people will pick up a flyer and go to the show. If even one of these people drops or improperly disposes of this flyer the band, promoter, and venue of that show would now be liable. That seems really excessive in my opinion. I think that Councilman Cook indentified the precise problem with such legislation when he mentioned the far reaching implications of such a law. Being as you hold a public office, I'm sure you do, from time to time, distribute some sort of campaign literature or other promotional materials. Are you willing to be held accountable for the whereabouts and disposal of each and every pamphlet or newsletter you send? I would also like to ask you if you think it's right that it is incumbent on the recipients of your promotional materials to dispose of
them?
I would also like to address your response on the local news last week wherein you stated that bands should just explore other means of advertising. I don't know if you realize the extreme cost of some of the forms of promotion you mentioned. Ads in newspapers and on radio are extremely cost prohibitive and oftentimes local bands make no money for many of the shows they play. I know that most of the bands I have been in or befriended in Lincoln spend more in organizing shows and making equipment repairs than they actually make performing. If our means of promotion was reduced radio and newspaper ads, we would go broke trying to put on one show. By effectively eliminating this form of advertising (who could afford to print up flyers with the intention of hanging and distributing them legally when they run the risk of a large fine for even one being thrown on the ground by someone they've never met?) you would be reducing our avenues of promotion. What if local politicians were prohibited from mailing campaign materials? Every piece of campaign literature or informational newsletter distributed by the city council members is a promotional material and is, in essence, no different from a flyer or handbill. While I can understand a citizen being dismayed at a litter problem in an area of the city, I don't think that expanding the culpability for that litter problem to people who may or may not have actually contributed to the problem is an appropriate action. I think by exploring other options for litter reduction, you and the other city councilmen could find a solution which doesn't place a hefty potential burden on well intentioned and law abiding citizens. I would greatly urge you to reconsider this proposal. If you have time, I would appreciate a brief response.
Lifelong Lincoln Citizen,
Derek Buckley
126 Trenridge Way
Lincoln, NE
Marc:

Thank you for your email concerning the announcement earlier this week on a proposed downtown building/parking facility.

The proposal was just announced, so we need to sift through the information. I will mention that I was told by the Douglas Theatre officials that they are pursuing an alternate location for a second-run movie facility, similar to the Starship 9. I will forward your comments to the Douglas Theatre for their consideration.

Again, thank you for your email.

Best regards,

Jon

Jon Camp
Lincoln City Council
City Council Office: 441-8793
Constituent representative: Darrell Podany

-----Original Message-----
From: MJS4835665@aol.com
To: jcamp@lincoln.ne.gov
Cc: reschliman@lincoln.ne.gov; ksvoboda@lincoln.ne.gov; dmarvin@lincoln.ne.gov
Sent: Thu, 16 Feb 2006 04:57:44 EST
Subject: Constituent Calling/Marc Schniederjans/District

Dear Councilmen Camp:

I am in District 2 and very proud to have you as my councilmen. I have watched and appreciated your many votes, even when they did not change the direction of the final outcome of the vote. I am glad you just don't give in on important issues.

I recently read in the Lincoln Journal Star an article by Deena Winter about the Mayor's
proposed plan to knock down Starship Movie Theater and other small businesses to build a new big building. I am apposed to this proposal for several reasons:

1. The Starship is the only low priced theater in Lincoln. It ideally serves the students at UNL for inexpensive dates and some of the faculty like me who like to see a film a second time at $2 rather than the regular price of all the other theaters at $8. It may be the only means for low income people, students from other colleges, older citizens living in the city and young people in general to see a movie in a theater.

2. Small businesses with long-term histories are the backbone of our tax base, and should be encouraged, not killed off for the convenience of a single large project. This type of action will discourage other small businesses from wanting to start-up in the City of Lincoln. Why would anyone risk opening a small business if at the whim of the Mayor she can put them out of business if she sees a possibility to have something else built in their location that would bring in more taxes?

3. A really tall building as near as this will be to the UNL campus will violate the esthetic low-lying look of the campus.

Mr. Camp, I am sending a copy of this email to the At-Large members of the City Council as well but I wanted you to know that as a former President of Edenton South Homeowners Association and the current Chairman of the Board of Directors for the University of Nebraska Credit Union I am committed to seeing the City of Lincoln be the best it can be. I think that Mayor Seng is misguided in some areas and this proposal in particular. I know politicians seem to foam-at-the-mouth to get more tax money (I recognize that a big new building will help achieve that) but willfully ending businesses like the Starship, that provide low income citizens the opportunity to afford to go to a movie is not the way the City of Lincoln should go about its business of governing. SPAN>

Please do not support Mayor Seng's proposal to wipe out the Starship.

Best wishes,
Marc Schniederjans
5901 S. 72nd Street
Lincoln, NE 68516
Phone: 483-7898
Email: MJS4835665@aol.com
Dear Steve Wolsleger: Your message has been received in the Council Office and will be forwarded to the Council Members. Also, will be forwarded to the City Law Department and City Clerk's Office regarding your questions on this issue. Thank-you.

Tammy J. Grammer
City Council Office
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE  68508
Phone: 402-441-6867
Fax: 402-441-6533
e-mail: tgrammer@lincoln.ne.gov

DO NOT REPLY to this- InterLinc <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sincerely
Steve Wolsleger
Dear Trudy Schneckloth: Your message has been received in the Council Office and will be forwarded to the Council Members. Thank-you.

Tammy J. Grammer
City Council Office
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE - 68508
Phone: 402-441-6867
Fax: 402-441-6533
e-mail: tgrammer@lincoln.ne.gov

DO NOT REPLY to this- InterLinc <none@lincoln.ne.gov>

InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name: Trudy Schneckloth
Address: 7834 Stonewall Court
City: Lincoln, NE 68506

Phone: 402 489-0946
Fax:
Email: Trudyschneck@hotmail.com

Comment or Question:
I am residing in Mesa, AZ over the winter, but read online the Lincoln Journal Star. I regretted to hear that the Starship Theatre is scheduled to be torn down. What are your views on keeping a second run movie theatre downtown? Thank you for your replies. Trudy Schneckloth
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
General Council

Name: Derek Buckley
Address: 126 Trenridge Way
City: Lincoln, NE 68505
Phone: (402) 310-9409
Fax:
Email:

Comment or Question:
I would like to mention a few points in regards to Councilman Camp's proposed changes to Lincoln's littering laws. Councilman Camp, as a previous and current member of a few local bands, I feel that you have not properly considered the implications of your proposed bill. By making all parties involved with the show accountable you are indiscriminately placing an undue burden on all of the bands and promoters involved with the show. Because of your proposed changes to existing litter laws I could be fined $500 for handing someone a quarter-page sized flyer if that person then throws that flyer on the ground. Many bands in the area print up a lot of small handbills and leave them at the counters of local record stores (or in other designated free or promotional materials areas) in the hopes that people will pick up a flyer and go to the show. If even one of these people drops or improperly disposes of this flyer the band, promoter, and venue of that show would now be liable. That seems really excessive in my opinion. I think that Councilman Cook, as quoted in the Journal Star, indentified the precise problem with such legislation when he mentioned the far reaching implications of such a law. Being as you hold a public office, I'm sure you do, from time to time, distribute some sort of campaign literature or other promotional materials. Are you willing to be held accountable for the whereabouts and disposal of each and every pamphlet or newsletter you send? I would also like to ask you if you think it's right that it is incumbent on the recipients of your promotional materials to dispose of them? I would also like to address your response on the local news last week wherein you stated that bands should explore other means of advertising. I don't know if you realize the extreme cost of some of the forms of promotion you mentioned. Ads in newspapers and on radio are extremely cost prohibitive and oftentimes local bands make no money for many of the shows they play. I know that most of the bands I have been in or befriended in Lincoln spend more in organizing shows and making equipment repairs than they actually make performing. If our means of promotion was reduced radio and newspaper ads, we would go broke trying to put on one show. By effectively eliminating this form of advertising (who could afford to print up flyers with the intention of hanging and distributing them legally when they run the risk of a large fine for even one being thrown on the ground by someone they've never met?) you would be reducing our avenues of promotion. What if local politicians were prohibited from mailing campaign materials? Every piece of campaign literature or informational newsletter distributed by the city council members is a promotional material and is, in essence, no different from a flyer or handbill. While I can understand a citizen being dismayed at a litter problem
in an area of the city, I don't think that expanding the culpability for that litter problem to people who may or may not have actually contributed to the problem is an appropriate action. I think by exploring other options for litter reduction, you and the other city councilmen could find a solution which doesn't place a hefty potential burden on well intentioned and law abiding citizens. I would greatly urge you to reconsider this proposal.

Sincerely

Derek Buckley
126 Trenridge Way
Lincoln, NE 68505