I. MINUTES


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

*1. Public Building Commission - Camp, Cook
*2. Multicultural Advisory Committee - McRoy
3. Parks and Rec Advisory Board - Cook
4. Joint Budget Committee - Newman, McRoy

OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS - To Be Announced

IV. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - To Be Announced

V. MISCELLANEOUS


2. Discussion on Council Budget.

3. City Council Member Appointment to the Visitors Promotion Council. (See Attachment)

4. Discussion on Council distribution policy. (Requested by Jon Camp)

VI. CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
VII. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS

1. Mayor’s Award of Excellence and Reception - Monday, March 13, 2006 at the City Council Meeting at 1:30 pm with Reception for Jason Brownell following in the Mayor’s Reception Hallway, Second Floor of the County-City Building.

2. Chamber of Commerce Executive Reception for Gary Collins, Tractor Supply and Mike Stapleton, Telex Communications, Inc. - Tuesday, March 14, 2006 at the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, 1135 “M” Street, Third Floor. RSVP to Chamber.

3. City of Lincoln and Lancaster County 2006 Environmental Awards Ceremony - Thursday, April 27, 2006 at 12:00 Noon to 1:30 pm at the Nebraska Champions Club, 907 Stadium Drive. Formal invitations to be sent later.

4. Sierra Club Cocktail Reception and Dinner - Thursday, March 9, 2006 at 6:00 pm, Cocktail & Reception; and 7:00 pm for Dinner and Speaker at the Tip Top Building, 1502 Cuming Street, Omaha, NE. RSVP: Phone:(402) 933-5793.

5. Matt Talbot Kitchen and Outreach “Feeding the Soul of the City” - Thursday, March 23, 2006 at 6:00 pm for Social Hour and 7:00 pm for Program and Dinner at the Country Club of Lincoln, 3200 South 24th Street. RSVP: Reservation Card to be Returned to Beth Gosselin, 6400 Pueblo Court, Lincoln, NE 68516

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

* Held over from February 20, 2006
** Held over from February 27, 2006
February 20, 2006

Ken Svoboda, Council Member
Lincoln City Council
555 S.10th
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Ken,

Our contract with the County for tourism promotion (The Convention & Visitors Bureau) provides for the creation of a Visitors Promotion Council that consists of seven (7) individuals: three (3) hoteliers; and four (4) others who have historically been chosen from “related” industries.

Additionally, three (3) ex officio members are included: (1) from the City Council; (1) from the County Commission; and (1) from the University of Nebraska.

Currently, Ray Stevens serves from the County Commission and Michelle Waite from the University. Since Terry left the City Council last year, we have not had a representative from the city and would respectfully ask that you appoint a member to serve a four-year term. Obviously the choice of the Council Member is yours, but given their involvement downtown, it seems either Annette McRoy or Robin Eschliman would be logical choices.

As we begin the new year, we are anxious to complete the board make-up as we have many exciting initiatives before us.

Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

Best regards,

J. Matt Carlson, President
CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS’ “NOON” MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2006
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING, ROOM 113

Council Members Present: Ken Svoboda, Chair; Patte Newman, Vice-Chair; Jonathan Cook, Dan Marvin, Robin Eschliman, Jon Camp.

Council Member Absent: Annette McRoy

Others Present: Mark Bowen, Ann Harrell, Rick Hoppe, Mayor’s Office; Dana Roper, City Attorney; Tammy Grammer, City Council Staff; Steve Hubka, Jan Bolin, City Budget Office; and Deena Winter, Lincoln Journal Star Representative.

I. MINUTES

Chair Ken Svoboda, by acclamation of the Chair, approved the minutes. No objections offered.

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

1. Public Building Commission (Camp/Cook) - Cook reported on the Health Department expansion status. The tour was adjusted due to the date of the Building Commission meeting. Camp commented they will have occupancy, starting the move on the 15th & 16th of March.

Cook said various security issues of the Hall of Justice and Courthouse Plaza discussed. Suggestions given on how to move some departments with one option being possibly moving 911 across the street and addressing some concerns they now have. In their present location they did get flooded and it might be useful to look at the new space. All very preliminary at this point.

Concerning Sideline’s Deli, it is again open with a new manager and employees. The menu remains the same and everyone should let the PBC know how things progress.

Regarding the Media Room in the Chambers Cook stated there is now a “Media Only” sign posted. The sign was made as guests continued to sit in the media room.

2. Multicultural Advisory Committee (McRoy) - No Report.

3. Parks and Rec Advisory Board (Cook) - Cook reported they voted to name the indoor shooting range after Jack Magorian. Magorian died in September after being a avid booster of the club and volunteering his time to teach gun safety. Felt it was very appropriate after his contribution to the shooting range.

A communications tower was approved for Cooper Park. The company will rebuild the existing bleachers for the City with their equipment going under the bleachers and the building. We will be provided some storage space on same level with their equipment. They also will be replacing a light pole with a cell tower, providing large lights for the field. A good opportunity for the City.
Talked about the Parks Bond issue and working to provide information to the public.

4. **Joint Budget Committee** - (Newman/McRoy) - Newman was unable to attend and McRoy stated the vast majority of the meeting is in the CSI (Community Services Initiative) Report.

**OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS - NONE**

III. **APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS**

Hoppe commented today’s vote was regarding Michael Cornelius for Planning Commission. Cook asked Eschliman if the RTSD (Railroad Transportation Safety District) is still an interest of hers as they had discussed the committee previously. Eschliman commented other committees approached her since then and would like to discuss. Svoboda commented now would be the time for thoughts on joining. There is a meeting tomorrow and the committee will be short a member. Eschliman asked if it would be allowed to attend as a substitute for the missing member. Cook responded he didn’t believe that would be allowed. Svoboda added even not going as a voting member could attend to observe. The meeting starts at 10:30 am in the Council Chambers and he would provide the information to her. Hoppe commented he would do the paperwork after a decision is reached.

IV. **REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR**

**MARK BOWEN**

Bowen stated by next Monday will have the City Audit and Police Fire Pension Audit ready for Pre-Councils in the morning. Possibly start at 10:00 a.m., allowing a half hour for each.

Also, the Aquila franchise time line is approaching and prior to public hearing could have a Pre-Council, on March 20th, outlining what the franchise consists of. Cooks asked what type of authority the Council has. Bowen replied it is a franchise with the City, and we have that authority. Will not be doing rates specifically, but is the ability to serve in the City. Bowen thought a Pre-Council as we do not consider issues like this often and could ask questions regarding terms of rates, service, or anything. Cook questioned whether Pedersen of the City Attorney’s Office could send a memo, outlining the process of the franchise, and the potential basis for possible turn down of their renewal. Bowen replied could do it that way or have a Pre-Council to discuss. Svoboda stated the reason for having a Pre-Council would be to have direction from the Council on any red flags that might exist. Bowen added if there’s any particular concerns or issues that may, or may not, be relevant to the franchise and be able to discuss. Svoboda stated we’ll have the City Attorney’s Office do a memo and then Council will determine whether we still want to do a Pre-Council based on information received.

**ANN HARRELL - NO COMMENTS**

**RICK HOPPE - NO FURTHER COMMENTS**

**DANA ROPER, CITY ATTORNEY - NO COMMENTS**

V. **MISCELLANEOUS**

*1. **Discussion continued regarding the Lancaster County Agricultural Society Board Advisory Panel nominations.** Harrell stated to clarify that the Event Center is relatively flexible. In conversation with Snover, believe he thought Council would appoint a community person to represent Council, but when questioned on the person being a
community person, or elected official, he thought it would be Council’s call. Harrell stated her sense was they first meant community person, going in the same direction as the County Board when they appointed a non-elected person. They did ask for two names in order to select one, but thinks they would accept one. Requested the name(s) be sent by next Monday. Harrell did tell Snover the Council had not met for a couple of weeks and he understood.

Svoboda asked for comments or suggestions saying if anyone had suggestions for names to submit to him and he’ll contact the individuals to see if they’re willing to serve, based on the limited information of meeting dates, time frame, and time commitments. Harrell thought those things had not been established yet. Marvin knew of two people. Svoboda reiterated send the names, he’ll contact and see if they’re interested in serving. If there are no other names received before Monday we can move forward and see if both of them want to serve.

*2. Discussion on Council Budget*

Svoboda called on Hubka, Budget Officer. (Budget handout distributed) Hubka stated budget requests received from all other City department except the City Council. In order to compile items for review by the Mayor need a budget request from the Council. Bolin had summarized and Hubka gave Grammer line items, like long-term disability, insurance costs, Information Services costs, and the largest being the status of the open position, what will be requested for next year, at what pay rate. Without the Council budget have revalueability from minimum to a maximum amount. Need to know what the Council is requesting to budget for next year in order to proceed.

Svoboda opened for discussion. Marvin stated the budget went from $237,000 to $306,000, is this correct? Bolin stated the Council is actually under budget, under the 97% now, but they (Budget office) took the open position and filled at an entry level of that position. If Council chooses to change the Budget Office can. Marvin stated even without Ray the salary is budgeted in for ‘05-‘06. Bolin responded on ‘06-‘07 budget for Ray’s position it’s at an entry level. Marvin then asked about ‘05-‘06, shows regular salaries of $246,000 versus ‘04-‘05 of $162,000. Why the $80,000 increase? Camp said it should be because of the wage increase, with Svoboda agreeing it would be the Council pay raise.

Marvin stated we would be down then, ‘04-‘05 to ‘05-‘06 and thinks if the position hasn’t been filled we would have accumulated unexpended cash, with Camp adding unused appropriations. Marvin said with a delay could carry into the next year with the point being of allocating this $45,000. For instance hiring someone at $65,000 it would carry over and could help cover the cost of the person for a year?

Hubka said try not to use carry over from one year to fund the next, as it would not be appropriating or accurately reflecting the cost, if appropriations were carried over. Need to budget the cost of the position for the year, whatever the position is. Marvin asked what happens to the expended cash? Hubka answered it gets re-appropriated and can be used for other purposes, but the policy has always been not to use carry over re-appropriations. Need the true cost of budgeting in a future year. Can use for furniture, or one time type of expenses, but not on staff.

Marvin asked if it isn’t spent does it roll back to Finance, or? Hubka responded saying
individual departments usually carry over from year to year. If a year comes along where
the department needs extra money, possibly a one time expenditure, it would be available.
Can be carried forward for a number of years before there’s a need to spend it. The
department doesn’t have to spend it right away or lose it.

Camp said he and Newman were on the Auditor’s Position Committee, which was shifted
to Council for approval. Was it just a matter of shifting the finance to Council? Hubka
answered affirmatively, adding at this point it’s in the Finance Department budget.

Svoboda stated he has been visiting with Personnel regarding discussion of Grammer’s
current position, Ray’s old position, and if a position exists between the two to move
Grammer into, or possibly into the senior position, which he didn’t believe would be very
much. Hubka stated it would probably be a five percent increase. Svoboda added that in
Council discussion really have not looked at replacing Joan with a staff person at that
level. Possibly more of a cross training of all current staff, between City and County,
making sure everybody was trained. With this in mind the discussion now is not to replace
office staff but to bring in a para professional to profession level person, like a legislative
aide. Have received information from Taute regarding that level but haven’t had a full
discussion on what direction we would go.

Camp asked how it would be earmarked on the analysis here. Hubka answered it’s a matter
of knowing what the Council wants, getting numbers together, inserting it in order to
proceed. Hubka said Svoboda mentioned a para-professional to a professional. Svoboda
said that was in discussion but they would narrow the options.

Cook stated Finance needs numbers to plug in as they put together the budget. If we
approve the final budget we would still be able to change the number in our own budget to
the decisions we make. Would be very helpful to have numbers close to what we might do.

Camp added the more accurate information in our budget makes it easier to have things
in the Mayor’s budget, and to keep them there, rather than trying to find money later.

Bowen stated in order to comply with budget directions, is the need to be at 97%. Can add
to your current budget and still be at 97%, and later decide where to use. Asked Hubka to
identify what FTE it might go into. Hubka said the $8,500, could take Ray’s current salary
and if you add $8,500 to it. Bolin added it’s the entry level of Ray’s position, so could add
$8,500. Bowen stated that would be the place marker now. Hubka added if the decision
was made to hire a legislative type assistant and the person wasn’t hired at the start of the
fiscal year, might be able to fit person into the dollar amount. Marvin asked if they would
be able to use the carryover from this year to cover the deficit in subsequent years. Hubka
responded he wouldn’t suggest doing as it’s not good policy.

Camp thought a historical line was taken with the City Council with the budget being
fairly flat other than the compensation increases. A couple of years before had stopped the
discretionary funds. With this in mind doesn’t mind any heat the Council may receive if
we proposed over the range of what’s being asked for just because it’s a new position.
Have been without for a while and would recommend a full year $75,000 for benefits and
compensation. Throwing this number on the table. The benefits are probably 30% to 40%
of the City’s pay structure, so maybe the $50,000 range. Hubka stated benefits go in
general expense and don’t have to be shown in the budget. Svoboda then stated the
$55,000 to $60,000 range.

Newman questioned the printing cost, and how it bounces around. Went from 57 to 87 and back down to 51. As the office went paperless why hasn’t this decreased? Grammer stated it bounces around depending on the correspondence received. Do make copies for packets; the Director’s agenda for the office, the press. Newman then commented on the $6,000 printing for ‘04-‘05, stating the number seemed huge. Grammer responded that Ray use to do the budget, and she’s not sure. Meyer also used the copier but uses the County code for County correspondence. Newman had questions on how to guess for next year based on this information.

Cook added the addendum is photocopied but goes on line after the meeting. Would it be necessary to make paper copy for the press as it would be on line? Why would press get a special copy? Grammer stated the copies stay in our office. Newman asked Roper if it’s a legal requirement to which he replied he didn’t think so. Cook said why make hard copy at all unless it’s for the purpose of archiving. Roper added Ross needs one but doesn’t know the Council office needs one legally. Grammer added with Ross it’s totally different. For the press she keeps copies for two weeks in the press packet and then they’re disposed of. Camp asked Tina (Press) if she would mind reviewing on line. Tina responded she was informed there were things in the hard copy that were not on line, but couldn’t give an example. Grammer stated everything in the packet is on line.

Marvin thought possibly to take a quick vote to suspend copies. Svoboda said it probably amounts to a ream of paper a year and stated the Council should deal with the large issues instead of micro-managing, at least in this budget. If a miscellaneous discussion is needed could do next week. Camp added just to see and have information on the reason why printing went up. Svoboda suggested doing a five year review to see why it was low one year, which could be a misprint. Camp said for least know why we went from $600.00 to $6,000.00 on our printing. Svoboda said doing a five year review to see why it was so low one year, obviously a misprint. There’s no way that printing could be $600.00.

Cook said they charge per page, and machine maintenance is in the paper cost. Svoboda stated might be the way it was calculated as photocopying was $4,100 that year and other items are $2,600, $3,200, with printing being $601, which almost looks like an offset, except for year five of $6,000. Camp said he’d like to know why the $6,000 on printing.

Svoboda interjected they should deal with personnel now. For early discussion purposes is anyone opposed to doing $60,000. Bowen added to have the 97% you have $8,500 which can be added to your budget.

Marvin added he thinks at this stage should do the 97% and argue the other. Camp answered he would go the other way, if we don’t put it in now it’s more challenging later. Svoboda said that’s why in the Mayor’s budget she had police officers and fire fighters. Doesn’t meet the 97% but would be a new position and should have flexibility, like Camp said, of putting the number in now, because it’s a restructuring of personnel costs.

Eschliman asked for clarification on Ray’s base salary/position. Hubka replied it would be $27,175, with Eschliman adding that going by that budget there would be $27,175 plus $8,504 available for the position. Hubka cautioned Council as there are other line items in the budget, which were talked about finalizing.
Svoboda thought Cook was in favor of putting the $60,000 in. Marvin and Newman opposed to putting $60,000 in as a new position? Marvin answered he’s okay with the 97% with Eschliman adding she would feel more comfortable complying with the 97% but that only gives us $35,000. Svoboda said it’s three to three. Cook added it’s a place holder, doesn’t matter either way. Camp added for reference, billed 104% at 7% of our budget is over $20,000 so really close to the $60,000.

Newman suggested delaying for six months, as it will be that time frame to find the person and interview. Camp suggested making it 104% lid with Svoboda stating to stay with the 97% and then plug the number in. If a person is hired we’ll determine the office space for them to use.

Hubka said if Grammer, in conjunction with Council, would setup the other line items they could finalize the amount for the position. Svoboda stated Taute had done quite a bit of research on the position and he and Taute would put the information together.

Svoboda then brought up one expenditure presented by Grammer which is splitting the cost with the County of a automated time stamp. Our cost would be approximately $350.00. Would be similar to what the Clerk’s office has and is acceptable to the County.

Cook inspected the stamp with Meyer and does affirm it is in bad shape, and the County would pay for half, even though their stamp is in good condition. Grammer stated the Council stamp will need to be replaced shortly because of the years inserted. Svoboda thought it would be a small expenditure, where it is figured in.

Cook reiterated the price of the date stamp being $700.00. Grammer replied it would be $664.00, having the ability to stamp the time, date, received by Lincoln City Council or the Lancaster County Board. On all documents stamped both department names will appear. Cook wondered if that mattered, as clearly now the County Board doesn’t receive our correspondence, or vice versa, with Meyer opening all mail. Svoboda suggested letting staff figure out but would be an expenditure of $330.00. Grammer stated their stamp being used was ordered in ‘97 and truly the office needs a new stamp.

Svoboda asked Hubka if he had enough direction from the Council? Hubka believed so as long as Grammer and Svoboda finalize the other numbers.

3. **City Council Member Appointment to the Visitors Promotion Council** Following discussion, Robin Eschliman was appointed to be the Council representative to the Visitors Promotion Council Committee which was previously held by Councilman Werner.

4. **Discussion on Council Distribution Policy** (Requested by Jon Camp)

Camp stated he’s received correspondence and doesn’t know where it comes from, specifically an article from the New York Times. Newman questioned Grammer if she knew, and Grammer stated there was no name, just faxed in. Marvin said if it’s on the voting discussion he would think it came from a person in Beatrice.

Camp said he receives quite a bit of unsolicited correspondence. Possibly give Grammer discretion as he doesn’t think it should have been photocopied. A waste of time and paper. Camp stated if someone sends correspondence with no name, or anything else, should be pitched. Cook added return addresses on email often doesn’t identify the person, they just send in items, and that would be fine, and doesn’t think Grammer should pitch those out.
Camp thought possibly just to put in Council’s folders, or say we’re no longer accepting anonymous correspondence, even though he’s not sure that was anonymous. Cook added there aren’t that many items received that way and the cost would pale in comparison to the cost of a new date stamp. Camp replied his thoughts were he didn’t want information he didn’t solicit. Svoboda added that possibly next week to have a miscellaneous discussion about Council policy.

Cook added the decision might have been made when the Director’s agenda was still photocopied but now we have miscellaneous email and questioned the sense to have that policy. Camp stated he likes to know if someone puts their name on correspondence but not truly anonymous like this correspondence was. Svoboda said he’d work with Grammer to put together a type of policy.

VI. CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

JON CAMP - NO COMMENTS

JONATHAN COOK - NO COMMENTS

ROBIN ESCHLIMAN - NO COMMENTS

DAN MARVIN - NO COMMENTS

ANNETTE McROY - ABSENT

PATTE NEWMAN - NO COMMENTS

KEN SVOBODA - NO COMMENTS

VII. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS - Listed on the Attend Sheet for March 6th.

VIII. MEETING ADJOURNED - Approximately at 12:12 p.m.

* Held over from February 20, 2006
** Held over from February 27, 2006