IN LIEU OF
DIRECTORS’ MEETING
MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2007

I. MAYOR

II. DIRECTORS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1. Northern Lights 17th Addition Final Plat #06124, Generally Located at No. 84th and Holdrege.
2. Reply to Patte Newman from Planning Director Marvin Krout on Request for Information: Potential Commercial Space.
3. Cover Story in the Lafayette, Louisiana newspaper after Lafayette officials visited Lincoln regarding growth management issues.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION

WEED CONTROL AUTHORITY

III. CITY CLERK
1. Letter from Aquila on filing an application for a general rate increase with the Nebraska Public Service Commission in November 2006.

IV. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE

ANNETTE McROY/PATTE NEWMAN
*1. Request to Scott Holmes & Bruce Darl, Health Department /Dale Stertz & Mike Merwick, Building & Safety Department/Tonya Skinner & Dana Roper, City Law Department - RE: Bar owners, outdoor smoking areas (McRoyRFI#175 & NewmanRFI#41 - 12/18/06). — 1.) SEE RESPONSE FROM SCOTT HOLMES, HEALTH DEPARTMENT RECEIVED ON McRoyRFI#175 & NewmanRFI#41 - 01/11/07.

*2. Request to Darl Naumann, Mayor’s Office/Karl Fredrickson, Public Works & Utilities Director/Nicole Fleck-Tooze, Public Works-Watershed Management - RE: 50th Street corridor costs (NewmanRFI#42 & McRoyRFI#177 - 01/10/07)

V. MISCELLANEOUS
1. Email from Julie Nordlee re: Recycling, or lack of, in Lincoln.
2. Email from Lisa Blakey re: Quality of snow removal in Lincoln.
3. Email from Bill Garthright re: Dogs running loose in Lincoln.
4. Letter from Lincoln Electric System (LES), Dan Pudenz, Vice President, Engineering regarding proposed development of area surrounding 84th and Adams Streets.
5. Memo from Vince Mejer, Purchasing Agent, to City Council, in response to email from Paul Haith, regarding bid proposal for Emergency Medical Billing.
6. Letter from Dr. Robert B. Rhodes, Clinic with a Heart, regarding NCIHC standards for trained qualified medical interpreters.
7. Email from Jimmie Cooley re: Do not cut funds from the Lincoln trail system.

VI. ADJOURNMENT
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Congress completes “100 Hours” agenda, while Senate wraps up ethics reform. The House this week completed action on the final two measures in the set of seven bills Democratic leaders had pledged to consider in the first 100 legislative hours of the 110th Congress. Meanwhile, after a two-week debate, Senators came to an agreement on a package of ethics and lobby reforms.

On Wednesday, the House approved legislation (HR 5) that would reduce interest rates on student loans for low-income students, followed by approval Thursday of a measure (HR 6) to scale back tax breaks for energy companies and require that they pay royalties on offshore drilling leases issued in the late 1990s. The revenue from those actions could be as much as $14 billion, with HR 6 setting aside those funds to offset subsequent legislation that would encourage energy efficiency and the use of alternative fuels.

The Senate debate over lobby and ethics reform demonstrates the significant differences of conducting business in the chamber in contrast to the House. With a solid majority and rules that favor the party in power, Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) was able to complete her 100 Hours agenda with over 57 legislative hours to spare. Senate Democrats, on the other hand, enjoy only a slim 51-49 majority, and rules in that chamber tend to favor the minority. As a result, 60 votes are often needed to avoid a filibuster of contentious legislation, and new Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) needed two weeks to approve legislation that was approved in the House in a matter of hours.

The Senate debate over lobby and ethics reform demonstrates the significant differences of conducting business in that chamber in contrast to the House. With a solid majority and rules that favor the party in power, Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) was able to complete her 100 Hours agenda with over 57 legislative hours to spare. Senate Democrats, on the other hand, enjoy only a slim 51-49 majority, and rules in that chamber tend to favor the minority. As a result, 60 votes are often needed to avoid a filibuster of contentious legislation, and new Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) needed two weeks to approve legislation that was approved in the House in a matter of hours.

The Senate ethics package had come under some scrutiny in that it was not as strict as House rules with regard to prohibiting gifts, meals, and travel from lobbyists as well as earmark reform. Conservative Republicans were ultimately successful in their efforts to strengthen the Senate bill on the floor after many hours of debate. An effort to re-institute a Presidential line-item veto of earmarks (previous legislative efforts have been found to be unconstitutional) also delayed the bill until it was agreed that the amendment would be voted upon separately next week.

Next week, the annual State of the Union speech will garner the most headlines, and the House will have a short legislative week to allow for a Republican retreat Thursday and Friday. The Senate will likely spend the week on legislation to increase the minimum wage, a non-binding resolution regarding the proposed troop surge in Iraq, and the line-item veto proposal mentioned above.

Transportation
House panel seeks solution to stalled highway and transit funding. All 75 members of the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee sent a letter this week to the leaders of the House Appropriations Committee asking them to honor the FY 2007 funding levels for federal surface transportation programs that were guaranteed in the 2005 SAFETEA-LU law.

In February, the House will take up a joint resolution to fund federal programs in FY 2007, and it is believed that many programs will simply revert to their FY 2006 levels. If that is the case for programs at the Department of Transportation (DOT), highway and transit programs would lose out on a $4 billion transportation funding increase that was guaranteed under SAFETEA-LU. The T&I Committee letter contends that highway and transit programs deserve special...
In a related item, Democrats on the T&I Committee expressed concern this week that a DOT commission designed to examine transportation funding alternatives is focused too much on private sector investment. The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission is expected to deliver a report to Congress at the end of this year, but T&I Committee Chairman James Oberstar (D-MN) said the panel “seems to be moving in the direction of replacing the highway trust fund with public-private partnerships” and has not studied other alternatives. Committee Democrats appear to be skeptical about the benefits of privatizing roads and will launch their own inquiry into ways to boost the revenue that flows into the Highway Trust Fund.

Finally, a Senate Committee held a transit security hearing this week. On Thursday, the Senate Banking Committee held a hearing to examine the state of transit security. Witnesses discussed the urgent need for increased transit security funding, specifically for rail. The Senate has been working on this issue in a bi-partisan manner for the last two Congresses, but a comprehensive transit security bill has failed to take final form.

During the hearing, several Committee members examined the imbalance of security funding spent on aviation versus rail. Chairman Chris Dodd (D-CT) pointed out that since 2001, $24 billion has been spent on aviation security while only $386 million was invested in transit security. This equals an investment of $7.50 per passenger on aviation security but less than one cent per transit rider on transit security. Richard Canas, Director of the Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness, encouraged Congress to engage the private sector to help improve rail security and said that local risk assessments should not be undertaken by the federal government.

The committee plans to further evaluate the risks to transit networks and hopes to pass a comprehensive transit security bill this year.

**WATER RESOURCES**

House and Senate Committee chairmen see action on WRDA bill in the coming months. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman James Oberstar (D-MN) and Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chairman Barbara Boxer (D-CA) each indicated this week that they anticipate floor action on the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) within the next two months.

Traditionally approved every two years, the popular WRDA bill has been stalled since 2000, mostly over objections of Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Russell Feingold (D-WI), who would like to see stringent reform of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers operations. While neither Senator has indicated a willingness to back off of their position, both Oberstar and Boxer sounded confident that success could be achieved this year.

Boxer will hold hearings in her committee in February with the hope of a formal committee markup in mid-March. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) has assured Boxer that there will be floor time available for the bill. For his part, Oberstar hopes that the House and Senate could go to conference on a WRDA bill within the next two months. He indicated he was confident that he and Boxer could work out the differences between the House and Senate bills in short order, and that Boxer would be able to bridge the gap with Senators McCain and Feingold.

**GRANT OPPORTUNITIES**

**Department of Agriculture:** USDA is soliciting applications for the Community Food Projects Competitive Grants Program for FY 2007. The object of this program is to help communities develop food assistance programs that become self-sustaining after receiving the one time funding. Programs also allow for the assessment of long term food security needs for communities. It is anticipated that there will be approximately $4.6 million available. This is a two-part application process. A letter of intent is due by February 13, 2007 and the project’s application deadline is April 13, 2007. For more information see: http://www.csrees.usda.gov/funding/rfas/pdfs/07_community_food.pdf.

**Department of Housing and Urban Development:** HUD has published a notice for prospective applicants for the FY 2007 “SuperNOFA.” HUD is promoting applicants to become familiar with and address certain provisions in the General Section of SuperNOFA prior to its annual publication later this year. For example, all applications now must be submitted online through grants.gov, with the exception of the Continuum of Care homeless assistance program. The guidance describes all policy requirements to all NOFAs that will be available in FY 2007. See January 18, 2007 Federal Register, pages 2396-2420 or: http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/nofa07/gensec.pdf.
January 18, 2007

Mike Johnson
Olsson Associates
1111 Lincoln Mall
Lincoln, NE 68508

RE: Northern Lights 17th Addition Final Plat #06124
    Generally located at N. 84th and Holdrege

Dear Mr. Johnson

Northern Lights 17th Addition Final Plat generally located northwest of N. 84th Street and Holdrege Street was approved by the Planning Director on January 18, 2007. The plat and the subdivision agreement must be recorded in the Register of Deeds. The fee is determined at $.50 per existing lot and per new lot and $20.00 per plat sheet for the plat, and $.50 per new lot and $5.00 per page for associated documents such as the subdivision agreement. If you have a question about the fees, please contact the Register of Deeds. Please make check payable to the Lancaster County Register of Deeds. The Register of Deeds requests a list of all new lots and blocks created by the plat be attached to the subdivision agreement so the agreement can be recorded on each new lot.

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

Sincerely,

Brandon M. Garrett, AICP
Planner

CC: Northern Lights LLC
    Yeutter Family LLC
    City Council
    Dennis Bartels, Public Works & Utilities
    Terry Kathe, Building & Safety
    Sharon Theobald, Lincoln Electric System
    Jean Walker, Planning
    File
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Patte Newman, City Council

FROM: Marvin Krout, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Request for Information: Potential Commercial Space

DATE: January 22, 2007

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION:
Please provide the most recent totals for vacant and potential commercial space in Lincoln.

REPLY:
As of January 2005, there was the potential for an additional 41 million square feet of commercial space based on zoning and commercial designations in the Comprehensive Plan (see table below). As of that date, there was an estimated 38.4 million square feet of occupied commercial space in commercially zoned areas of Lincoln. This includes retail, office and service oriented commercial space – everything from fast food restaurants and offices to warehouse and storage. This inventory does not include some of commercial space on I-1 and I-2 industrial zoned land. Some subareas may have more potential commercial space than others, such as West O Street, has significant potential for additional space. Also note that most of the 19 million square feet of potential space not yet zoned commercial is outside the city limit and may not have services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Zoning</th>
<th>Potential Commercial Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Zoning, Land is Vacant, no buildings</td>
<td>17,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Zoning, Building Built, but part or all of building is unoccupied</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Zoning, Building Under construction</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Space</td>
<td>41,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
(1) Comp Plan as of as of November 2005  
(2) Floor area estimates assumes 10,000 square feet of space per acre of land, unless land is covered by a use permit

In the past, we have updated this inventory every two years, and so we would have launched an update early this year. However, due to the loss of a planner and intern position in this year’s budget, we are not able to update the data base til later this year at best.
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A couple of months ago, our department "entertained" a party of 15 public and private officials from Lafayette, Louisiana who thought it would be useful to fly in and see/hear how Lincoln has approached its growth management issues. We assembled a team of local staff members and private sector representatives to give this group a tour of our community, make presentations, and discuss mutual concerns. And we gave them lots of ideas about where they could leave their money before leaving the city.

I thought I would share a followup story from a weekly journal in Lafayette, below, which highlights the observations of the group on their return from Lincoln. Certainly our department and others involved in planning recognize we have plenty of room for improvement. But it is also useful to compare situations with and hear perceptions from folks who are more than 50 miles away.

**Cover Story**

**Growing Pains**
Lafayette officials look to other communities for “smart growth” answers to fund and maintain a viable city infrastructure.

*By Nathan Stubbs | 1/17/2007*

“*Our feeling is that this centralized method of funding roads just doesn’t work anymore. You know we send all of this money to Baton Rouge and then try to beg for some of it back. And basically we’re at the mercy of DOTD all the time. We’d like to see the money sent directly to the parishes.*” - Sen. Mike Michot

“We have no infrastructure to support sprawl development. I mean, let’s face it, you go down Verot School Road any time between 7 and 8:30 in the morning and it’ll take you 45 minutes to an hour to get where you’re going. We have no

Subject Please forward to City Council and County Board
When Lafayette Planning Commissioner John Barras went online searching for a progressive city similar in size and feel to Lafayette, Lincoln, Neb., stood out. Its visitors’ bureau Web site bills it as “the prairie capital” with a reputation for food, arts, and warm hospitality. And much like Lafayette’s atmosphere, Lincoln “offers the exhilaration of a big city and the serenity of the countryside all in one place.”

Most important, Lincoln has been heralded for being one of the most well-managed “smart growth” cities in the country. Smart growth, which encourages denser developments with a mix of both commercial and residential properties, along with sidewalk-friendly streets and green space, has been a buzz word in Lafayette since the runaway success of traditional neighborhood development River Ranch. Last year, the Greater Lafayette Chamber of Commerce made smart growth its platform issue — and it was the chamber that asked Barras to locate a city Lafayette could use as a model for implementing more smart growth practices. The effort culminated with Barras and representatives from the chamber and Lafayette Consolidated Government heading out on a two-day fact-finding trip to Lincoln last November.

In Lincoln, which has a population of 240,000, they saw some major differences with Lafayette. Streets are pedestrian friendly. Neighborhood parks and green space dot the city landscape. And traffic congestion is almost non-existent, to the point where it only takes about 20 minutes to traverse the city at any time of day during the week.

“The traffic situation is much, much better than ours,” Barras says. “I would say on a Saturday afternoon or an early Saturday morning here [in Lafayette] is about what the traffic is like in Lincoln all day during the week.”

Downtown, they saw few empty lots or vacated buildings. And with new developments, including a 14-screen movie theater, the old downtown continues to evolve.

On their bus tour, they were amazed by the way Lincoln’s bustling city streets, dense with development, almost instantly give way to serene countryside and farmland once they crossed city limits. “Sprawl is really not a problem as far as they’re concerned,” Barras says.

Credit for that goes to Lincoln’s aggressive zoning and development laws. “The way it’s set up with them, if you develop a subdivision out of the area, you’re in trouble cause you can’t get sewage or water to it.”

Lincoln actually goes even further than restricting access to its city utilities as a tool for controlling development. Lincoln’s zoning jurisdiction extends for three miles outside the city limits. These regulations typically prohibit anyone outside the city limits with less than 20 acres of land from building a house. The rules have kept developers from buying up cheap farmland outside the city to build subdivisions and helped preserve Lincoln’s countryside. The city also uses an array of other tools — including Tax Increment Financing districts, impact fees (charging developers about $4,000 for every lot developed in the city) and other zoning measures — to shape development that complements the city’s own transportation, drainage and land use plans.

Recently, Lincoln even went as far as adopting a zoning regulation related to movie theaters, which prohibits theaters with more than six screens anywhere outside of the designated downtown district.
Marvin Krout, the city’s planning director of the past three years, says the law “puts an emphasis on trying to concentrate the entertainment downtown, and not have these giant megaplexes out in the more suburban areas.” The theater policy played a big part in helping downtown Lincoln land the city’s latest megaplex — a development which also got assistance from downtown’s Tax Increment Financing district.

Krout says smart growth is just as much about using tax money more efficiently as it is about preserving green space or other quality of life issues.

“In the end, having growth that’s compact and contiguous means less dollars spent than otherwise would be on infrastructure and annual services. If you’re less spread out you have fewer fire stations to build,” he adds. “Each fire station here costs about $2 million a year to operate after you spend $2 million to build it. So those are huge expenses, and to the extent that you can have good service but have a compact community, that’s a real savings to taxpayers.”

Barras, who served as chair of the Lafayette Planning Commission over the past two years, says Lafayette has a lot to learn from Lincoln.

“We need to cut the sprawl out,” Barras says. “What is the problem with that? We have no infrastructure to support sprawl development. I mean, let’s face it, you go down Verot School Road any time between 7 and 8:30 in the morning and it’ll take you 45 minutes to an hour to get where you’re going. We have no infrastructure.”

The trip to Lincoln came at a time when many city leaders were re-evaluating Lafayette’s future. In November, most local officials were stunned when city voters overwhelmingly shot down a proposal from City-Parish President Joey Durel to increase sales taxes by 1 cent in order to fund sorely needed road and drainage projects throughout the parish.

While most people agree the city needs more roads, the sales tax still proved unpalatable to most residents.

“Joey Durel, his mindset was right about the tax proposal,” notes Broussard Mayor Charlie Langlinais. “What he did not do was reinforce to the citizens that if these improvements would be built, they estimate a 20 percent decrease in travel time for our average citizen. And we can prove by using our studies and data that a 20 percent reduction in travel time equates to six to eight gallons less per vehicle per month in fuel. And so, who are you paying? You pay yourself or you pay the pump. It’s just too simple not to understand that concept. I think that was his mistake. He did not get that information out and make people understand that.”

Durel stumped for the sales tax for months, selling it as “the most dedicated tax in the history of Lafayette” and a means for the city to “take control of our own destiny.” In large part, the sales tax proposal was framed as a do-it-yourself attitude that grew out of the state telling Lafayette that it would soon be unable to pay for the roads it had promised.

“Now of course everyone’s heard that the state has this largesse of surplus funds,” says Lafayette Planning Director Mike Hollier. “But that’s outside of the transportation program.”

Louisiana’s transportation budget is funded through a state gasoline tax of 20 cents for every gallon sold. As in many parts of the country, revenues from the gas tax are starting to dwindle as cars become more fuel-efficient. At the same time, the cost of building new roads and maintaining existing ones is
skyscraper. In the past two years, the prices of concrete and asphalt have each gone up by 50 percent. Steel and labor costs have also increased considerably.

Projections from Louisiana’s Department of Transportation and Development indicate that in 2009, these market forces would converge and drain the budget for building new road projects. Hollier says DOTD sent out a letter to parish governments last July, asking them to start removing from transportation plans all state road projects scheduled to begin construction beyond 2009. The letter stated that without sufficient funds to build the projects, federal guidelines required these projects be removed from state and parish plans. DOTD Communications Director Mark Lambert did not return a phone call or e-mail for comment.

Over the next five years, Lafayette will see construction begin on three major road projects funded largely through state and federal funds: the South College Road bridge and extension to Kaliste Saloom Road, Ambassador Caffery south (extending Ambassador to U.S. Highway 90), and the widening of Verot School Road from Highway 90 to Vincent Road.

Beyond 2009, the state likely won’t be able to fund any major new road projects in Lafayette until DOTD finds a way to increase its revenue.

Lafayette is now removing six projects from its Transportation 2030 plan. The projects total more than $110 million and include a Highway 93 extension, Broussard Road improvements, and the Kaliste Saloom and North University road widenings. Those are only a fraction of an estimated $10-13 billion backlog of road projects at DOTD.

For Kam Movassaghi, president of C.H. Fenstermaker & Associates, the state’s unwillingness to fund its transportation needs was a point of continual frustration while he served as secretary of DOTD from 1998 to 2004.

He says studies show that transportation pays for itself six to 10 times over in economic development activity once roads are built. But he says Louisiana’s state leaders have lacked the political willpower to find a way to invest in a progressive transportation system.

“It takes leadership,” he says. “It takes the governor to take ownership and stand up and say, ‘I know you don’t want to pay more taxes, but this is good for your future and your children’s future and we’re going to do it.’ That’s what [Texas] Gov. Rick Perry has done. We haven’t had that. I haven’t heard any one of the governors that either I’ve served with or observed stand up and say that.”

With the state not providing any direction, Movassaghi commends Durel for taking the initiative and trying to find local solutions for Lafayette’s transportation needs. With tax increases now clearly out of the picture, Durel has teamed with state Sen. Mike Michot and Treasurer John Kennedy to push a new plan for the May legislative session.

The plan calls for the state to divert an annual estimated total of $270 million in motor vehicle sales taxes back to municipalities across the state to use at a local level for road needs. The details of the proposal are still being ironed out, with debates ongoing about how the money will be allocated across the state, and whether cities should only be able to use those funds to help care for roads currently under DOTD jurisdiction.

Michot says the plan could mean an additional $10-15 million a year for road maintenance in Lafayette. But the proposal has met some criticism — including an indignant editorial in The Advocate — for not going far enough in restricting local government’s use of the money. Others have doubted whether lawmakers will be willing to give up $270 million that now goes into the state general fund.
Michot remains optimistic. The bottom line, he says, is that the old model of funding doesn’t work, especially for areas like Lafayette, which don’t get their fair share back from the state. Because so many rural parishes don’t generate enough gas tax revenue to meet their infrastructure needs, wealthy parishes like Lafayette wind up subsidizing other parishes to meet demand.

“The larger, more affluent parishes are typically donor parishes,” Michot says. “Our feeling is that this centralized method of funding roads just doesn’t work anymore. You know we send all of this money to Baton Rouge and then try to beg for some of it back. And basically we’re at the mercy of DOTD all the time. We’d like to see the money sent directly to the parishes.”

Regardless of where the money comes from, Hollier says the parish needs to make a serious effort to explore all its options.

“The cost of those projects is not going down,” he says. “It is skyrocketing. And we don’t have skyrocketing revenues. So the reality of the situation is we’ve got to turn around and look at what we’ve been doing and how we’ve been doing it, and come up with another game plan. The previous method is not going to work. Everything is up in the air, and no one knows where it’s all going to settle.”

Hollier says that Lafayette has a $1 billion traffic problem, estimating that it would take approximately $1 billion to bring traffic across Lafayette to “an acceptable level of service” — one that didn’t back up with congestion. In addition, the parish millages dedicated to funding drainage improvements and parks and recreation are woefully inadequate.

The answer, in the long term, may be smart growth. By more aggressively planning and directing development, the city can make better use of its existing resources. And by pulling development back into the city core, drivers can use the smaller streets of the urban grid, alleviating traffic from congested arterials. Denser development also tends to offer residents more walkable destinations, further reducing vehicle traffic.

“Some of the biggest complaints we hear,” Hollier says, “is that all people get in Lafayette is a subdivision, that’s their only choice. Now River Ranch has changed that quite a bit. But we need more choices.”

In his opinion, Barras says that perhaps the silver lining in the failure of Durel’s sales tax proposal — an initiative he supported — is that it will encourage parish officials to focus more on smart growth. He says without good planning, the parish will never be able to solve its infrastructure problems.

“The sales tax [passing] would have been more of an immediate help,” Barras says. “But I think we need more long-term help, and smart growth initiatives will do that.”

Developer Robert Daigle, who brought traditional neighborhood development and smart growth principles to Lafayette with River Ranch, says he hopes to see Lafayette get more serious about smart growth. City-parish government has been talking for more than a year about adopting a smart code — a permitting process that would make it easier for developers to do more high-density traditional neighborhood developments (Daigle had to get more than 200 permitting variances approved in developing River Ranch.)

Beyond adopting a smart code, Daigle says Lafayette needs to look at parish-wide zoning ordinances, such as those in use in Lincoln, Neb., that can help prevent costly sprawl.
“The biggest problem out there to me in the development industry,” he says, “is suburban sprawl. We’re developing further and further away from the hub of the municipalities [in Lafayette Parish] on larger and larger pieces of property. And the bottom line is, that type of growth taxes the ability of a municipality to provide necessary infrastructure to these areas.

“Zoning ordinances,” he adds, “when they’re well thought out, they’re not only a good thing, they’re absolutely necessary.”

Daigle adds the city should also look to provide some incentives to encourage developers to do infill development in the city. In Lincoln, these types of incentives often come in the form of Tax Increment Financing districts. The TIF districts are formed when the city reaches an agreement with a developer and is able to bond out future property tax revenue from that development to pay up front for related road and other infrastructure improvements. Downtown Lincoln alone has approximately 15 TIF districts.

With Louisiana’s property taxes so much lower than Nebraska’s, that type of financing would be difficult to accomplish here. However, Daigle says Lafayette should try and get creative and perhaps come up with breaks on permitting fees or utility rates to encourage more city infill from developers.

Barras notes that the planning commission now has several committees exploring options ranging from a restrictive parish-wide zoning code, impact fees on developers and builders to help cover infrastructure costs, and incentives for building within the city’s existing infrastructure. The commission is also trying to move forward with a comprehensive plan for the parish — which solicits input from all residents — to try and coordinate this infill around existing neighborhoods.

Barras hopes all these initiatives will move forward quickly.

Other areas in Acadiana are already proceeding with similar smart growth planning. St. Martin Parish has had parish-wide zoning for several years, and Iberia Parish is now moving toward implementing it. The city of New Iberia is also studying smart code, and the city of Abbeville, in Vermilion Parish, has already adopted its smart code.

Durel is anxious to get a smart code on the books for Lafayette and expects that to be accomplished this year. However, he doesn’t see the political and public support for restrictive zoning ordinances, especially in the unincorporated areas outside the city. “I don’t see [parish-wide zoning] happening realistically,” he says. “It’s probably not even worth talking about.”

So he’s focusing his attention on dangling financial carrots for builders. “The thing that attracts me is, how do you give people incentives to do infill?” he says. “Right now it’s just cheaper to build stuff in the unincorporated areas initially. But people pay for it eventually. So we’ve got to find some ways,” he continues, “not necessarily to penalize people but to incentivise people to get them to do more infill.”

Durel would not elaborate on what types of incentives he’s exploring.

Planning Commissioner Barras says that he has already talked to Durel and a few city-parish councilmen about making another trip to Lincoln this year — a trip that could happen as early as this summer. Barras hopes it will have the effect on Durel that it had on the local officials who visited Lincoln in 2006. For planning director Hollier, the trip was revelatory. “I’ve been working in this business for 20 years,” he says, “and I’m convinced that [smart growth] is the solution. I see the light and this is it.

“It’s one of the things we’re going to have to do,” he continues. “There’s not going to be a debate. It’s
just to what degree is it going to be applied, that’s the question. I don’t think that the resources, the revenues, are out there to do it the way we’ve been doing it for the past 50 years — that’s what generally comes out of smart growth. A lot of people and a lot of committees are studying these issues and trying to find solutions. I think 2007 may be a very historic year. Can hard decisions be made? I don’t know. I sure hope so.”
2007 Combined Weed Control Plan

The mission of the Lancaster County Noxious Weed Control Authority is: The education of the public concerning noxious weeds and to exercise the necessary authority to obtain effective control of noxious weeds county-wide and the education of the public concerning weed abatement and to exercise the necessary authority to cut and clear overgrown weeds and worthless vegetation in the city of Lincoln.

Management

Plans are to encourage voluntary compliance of required noxious weed control weed and abatement in the City of Lincoln by making inspections of 2,285 sites. 220 musk thistle sites will be inspected during the spring-summer season. This will include inspections of private lands, Union Pacific and BNSF railroads, of the Bluff Road and 48th Street landfills, of all complaints, all observed infestations.

- 25 Leafy spurge sites will be inspected
- Landfill sites will be inspected in the spring and fall.

- 40 purple loosestrife sites will be inspected. Streams in the City of Lincoln will be inspected for wild purple loosestrife plants.
- Inspections will be made on 2,000 sites for violations of City Weed Abatement Program. Notifications and needed follow-up will be made on all inspections.

Awareness

Several education efforts will be made to make the public aware of noxious weeds and City Weed Abatement.

- Publish this Weed Awareness Special insert to in the Lancaster County Cooperative Extension Service Nebline with a circulation of about 10,000.
- Maintaining and updating Internet Homepage at www.ci.lincoln.ne.us/cnty/weeds with over 55,000 hits in 2006.
- Special mailings to multiple violators, leafy spurge owners, owners of problem infestations, homeowner associations, public land managers, and Adopt-a-Clean Road volunteers.
- Prepare and display exhibit in lobby of County Cooperative Extension Service Conference Center and Nebraska State Fair.

January Planned Activities
4   Statewide WMA meeting-Grand Island
9   Commons Meeting
11  Management team Meeting
16  NEBline insert deadline
16  Threats to Nebraska Rivers Planning
17  Lower Platte WMA Mtng
18  Hand held meeting
23-24 NARD Legislative Conference
30  Commissioners approval of annual reports & plan
31  Submit required state reports
31  Monthly activity report

December Activities
6-7 NACO Annual Convention, Omaha
14 Director evaluation
18 Weed Assessment Hearing 1:30
20 Threats to Nebraska Rivers Planning
31 Monthly activity report
January 17, 2007

Joan Ross
City Clerk
County-City Building
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Joan,

After investing $42 million in delivery systems and technology improvements since the previous rate case in 2002, Aquila filed an application for a general rate increase with the Nebraska Public Service Commission (PSC) in November 2006. The $16.3 million request is 7% of Aquila’s total annual revenue. Aquila has worked to contain operating costs. However, like other businesses, we face increased costs through labor, materials, health care and fuel. These conditions prompted this rate request.

Interim rates will begin Feb. 15, in accordance with Nebraska Statutes. The PSC will take up to 240 days to conduct a thorough analysis and review prior to setting a final increase. The Public Advocate will also conduct thorough audits and scrutinize the request. If the final rates are lower than interim rates, customers will be refunded or credited with interest.

The increase is $7 per month for the average residential and commercial bill. Following a national trend, most of the increase is in the monthly customer charge because network costs are fairly constant throughout the year. The proposed interim and final rates are uniform across all of Aquila’s Nebraska customers in rate areas I, II and III.

In March, Aquila will conduct a series of town hall meetings across the state with public officials and customers to review our operations as well as the requested rate increase. As arrangements are finalized, more information will be provided.

Bonuses awarded to Aquila executives has surfaced as an issue for some parties. Aquila has never asked for recovery of these bonuses in our rate requests. The costs in the rate case filing are based solely on our costs of providing service to our Nebraska customers.

We are proud to serve Nebraska with perhaps the most efficient and environmentally-friendly energy form – natural gas. Natural gas provides comfort and its value compares very favorably with all other forms of energy. Aquila’s proposed rates remain comparable with other natural gas providers in Nebraska and surrounding states.

Please feel free to contact Aquila’s Nebraska Community Relations Manager Jan Davis at 402-935-4868 if you have additional questions. Additional information about the filing is also available at www.aquila.com.

Sincerely,

Steve Pella
Vice President, Nebraska Operations
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
General Council

Name:       Julie Nordlee
Address:    3631 Doral Lane
City:       Lincoln, NE 68507
Phone:      402-464-5945/472-2830
Fax:        Email:

Comment or Question:
I have a concern about recycling or the lack of it in Lincoln. The amount of
recycling I generated is more than what I place at the curb for pick up and I
am happy to take my items to the recycling places located throughout the city.
My concerns are about 1) What is the City of Lincoln doing to encourage more
recycling by its residents or making it mandatory, and 2) We should have
recycling of more plastics, besides #1 and #2 (a lot of #5 is used for food).
Please tell me if there is any research/fact finding in this area and what I
might to do to help.

I am also concerned that recycling of paper is voluntary and not required at
the University and do not know what the State offices are doing. Think of the
space that could be saved at the landfill if we kept all that paper out of the
landfill.

Thank you for your time and any info you can provide.
Dear Council Members,

The quality of snow removal for Lincoln is an embarrassment. Major streets often go days after a storm without being plowed (especially if the snowstorm happens over a weekend or holiday). When plows do go over the major streets, they still leave a layer of snow and ice on the street that becomes a giant sheet of ice. That sheet of ice is then left to slowly melt and/or be worn away by cars driving on it. Sand is then dumped onto the streets in a feeble attempt to reduce slickness. The problem with the sand, however, is it doesn’t reduce slick spots and it leaves a mess that can still be found well into the summer months. Side streets receive even worse treatment. When citizens try to complain and demand better, people, such as Andrew Edwards, in Snow & Ice Control department try to convince citizens a problem does not exist and the roads are not dangerous when they clearly are. Denying that there is a problem does not fix the problem.

There is no excuse for these problems and lack of knowledge on effective snow removal. Snow storms in Nebraska are not a fluke occurrence that catches the city off guard every 10 or 15 years. Snow storms in Nebraska are something you can count on having at least once every winter season. This problem is fixable. It does not need more money thrown at it, rather, the planning, preparation, man power, equipment, and execution needs to be better. Most importantly, it takes a willingness to do better. I suggest having the people who manage the snow removal for Lincoln visit other cities in the Midwest (like Chicago, Minneapolis/St. Paul, or St. Louis) for ideas (or dare I say instruction and training) on how to properly remove snow from city streets.

I would like to know what tangible efforts the City Council is making to improve this situation. I have lived in the Midwest my entire life and I have never experience such poor management of the streets as I do in Lincoln.

Sincerely,

Lisa Blakey
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name: William C. Garthright
Address: 4204 Madison Ave.
City: Lincoln, NE 68504-2557
Phone: 464-9259
Fax:
Email: billg@inebraska.com

Comment or Question:
I called Animal Control this morning about a large dog running loose in my neighborhood, and I was told that they'll do nothing about it unless it's blocking traffic (apparently, my residential street isn't considered to have "traffic"). I don't know who owns the dog, though I've seen it running loose several times recently. So far today, it's been roaming around my home for several hours, occasionally barking at people, though it hasn't actually bitten anyone (yet).

As I understand it, we have a leash law that no one will enforce because of budget constraints. Budget constraints? I feel like I'm living in a third-world country. Why have a leash law if it won't be enforced? No wonder some people let their dogs run. I've long had to put up with barking dogs, but now I've got to let them run free in my yard, too?

As you can see, I'm pretty disgusted with the whole thing. And it seems to me you're being penny-wise and pound-foolish, since clearing loose dogs from the streets would help prevent more serious problems. Furthermore, if you want a lot of upset constituents, just wait until more people discover they can let their dogs roam with impunity.

Thanks for your time,

Bill Garthright
January 25, 2007

Dear Members of the City Council:

LES staff has been involved in discussions with City staff and developers pertaining to a proposed development of the area surrounding 84th & Adams Streets. This has included both the Planned Unit Development of Prairie Village North and the North Forty Plaza projects.

This letter will summarize discussions that have involved LES to date. We understand the final configuration of 84th Street may require the relocation of the 35kV electric transmission line LES has on the east side of 84th. A 12kV distribution feeder circuit is also attached to these 35kV steel structures. Adjacent to the 35kV electric transmission line is a double circuit 115kV electric transmission line supported on steel lattice towers. The work on Adams St. is not anticipated to significantly impact LES facilities.

The relocation of the 35kV facilities could be accomplished by combining the 35kV and 115kV circuits on steel pole structures located essentially in the existing corridor occupied by the current 115kV lines. The relocated lines would be constructed on single shaft steel poles with the 115kV line on one side of the pole and the 35kV line on the other side of the pole. The reconstruction would take place from the LES substation at 84th and Leighton north to the Murdock Trail. Approximately a year lead time is needed to allow for design, material acquisition and construction. Reconstruction cannot take place during the summer months.

Since the 35kV support structures conflict with the planned road improvements, the existing 12kV feeder circuit would also need to be relocated. Lines at this lower voltage are required to be placed underground when relocated for road projects and when feasible. The relocation MOU between LES and the City prescribes the allocation of such costs to be borne by the road project since the line is currently located on easement.

At the January 11, 2007 annexation meeting, LES reiterated its commitment to fund one-third of the cost to reconstruct the 35kV and 115kV transmission lines as described above.

However, relocation of the 12kV distribution line is viewed as a cost attributed to the road project. While LES can justify expenditures for the reconstruction of the transmission lines due to capacity and life extension issues, there are no specific benefits to LES to relocate the 12kV circuit. As such, the relocation of the 12kV feeder is considered to be a reimbursable expense to the project.

As we discussed at the earlier meeting, if the lines need to be relocated or reconstructed, we will need to work out details including but not limited to, final grade, location of access roads, and any deceleration or turn lanes before the work can proceed.
The easement corridor for the reconstructed line will need to be established once the final 84th Street right of way line is established. With the transmission line configuration noted above, LES will need a straight line corridor with a minimum of forty five feet from the road right of way in which to reconstruct the electric transmission lines.

If there are any additional questions I can respond to, please let me know.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dan Pudenz
Vice President, Engineering

c:  Terry Bundy
    Charles Humble
    Steve Hanks
    Dennis Bartels
    Peter Katt, Pierson & Fitchett
    Doug Curry
    Roger Figard
    Karl Fredrickson
Memo

To: Lincoln City Council
From: Vince Mejer, City/County Purchasing Agent
CC: EMS Billing Selection Committee
Date: January 24, 2007
Re: Response to E-mail from Paul Haith

On January 12, 2006, you received an e-mail from Mr. Paul Haith, regarding bid proposal 06-397 for Emergency Medical Billing. Below I have responded to Mr. Haith’s e-mail to you point by point.

The selection committee consisted of Sherrie Meints, Don Herz, Richard Furasek, Ron Ecklund and myself.

1. The City of Lincoln Purchasing Department bidding system has recently been characterized with mistrust and compromised ethical standards as evidenced by the recent purchase of fire trucks and building contracts.

   Response: It is my opinion that this comment is off base and uncalled for.

   “Purchasing” was not characterized with mistrust and compromised ethical standards by either of the contracts mentioned.

2. Two of the nine proposals that the City received for RFP 06-347 were from Nebraska companies and neither was afforded the opportunity to be interviewed thus eliminating any opportunity to keep Nebraska tax dollars in Nebraska. Reports from the Homeland Security task force and the Lincoln/Lancaster EMS Review Committee recommended that billing be done “In House” or by a local hospital. Both reports indicated that a substantial savings could occur. Yet, the City has chosen to continue to outsource the billing to out-of-state companies in spite of local citizens input.

   Response: At this time the City does not believe it to be in our best interest to do this billing function in house. The reason to outsource this function is to gain access to the coding and billing expertise that is unique to ambulance billing. The
start-up cost to develop these capabilities would be significant and after evaluating this option the decision was to continue to outsource this function.

We did not receive a proposal from a local hospital. If a local hospital had submitted a proposal we would have evaluated it. Furthermore the City does not have a local preference, we treat all proposals equally.

There are many reasons a firm may not be selected, location is not one of them. The committee’s task was to select the firm that we feel is in the best interest of the City to provide this service.

3. EMS Billing Service, Inc.’s proposal indicated a significantly better collection rate than AccuMed at 87% vs. 77% with a similar charge rate per bill. This means that if Lincoln had $4,000,000 of allowable charges, $3,480,000 would be collected rather than $3,080,000, a difference of some $400,000.

Response: LFR’s collection rate for FY 03/04 was 80.58% with $20,000 still outstanding (primarily auto accidents waiting for payment). In addition, towns used that have high percentage of collection were populations of less than 10,000. These type cities/towns do not have the indigent population. These trips are often classified as self pay. In the projected Revenues, EMS Billing stated their return on self pay is at 70% LFR’s self-pay is approximately 35% due to the indigent population.

In addition, EMS Billing Services, Inc’s rate was listed at 8% in the RFP. All companies interviewed listed rates at 6.85% or lower, much lower than the rate proposed by EMS Billing Services, Inc.

4. It was reported at one of the Lincoln/Lancaster EMS Review Committee meetings, by Sherri Meints, that AccuMed would lower their percentage charge if Lincoln Fire would go to three year contracts, thus the RFP was for three years.

Response: Prior to sending out the RFP it was the consensus of the committee to offer a longer term contract so that the firms could spread out their start up costs over several years. It was the consensus of the Selection Committee that a longer term be offered. This option was not brought up by Sherrie during the development of the RFP.

5. Nine billing companies submitted bids for this RFP. Bids were due, and were to be opened at 12:00 noon, on December 28, 2006 and denial letters were sent January 2, 2007. This gave only one day, two at the most, for review of these rather lengthy proposals. We were told that they would be reviewed by four people. I doubt that they could be reviewed in that short of time frame, discussed and, decisions made as to who would be selected with out some preconceived idea.
Response: These proposals were reviewed by all prior to the January 2nd meeting. During this meeting there was a lot of discussion concerning who should make the short list for more extensive review.

6. Again, the City of Lincoln, is wasting peoples time, not be mention violation of bidding laws, in requesting RFP's when the decision has been made as to who is going to get the bid. Bid proposals cost companies hundreds of dollars to but together.

Response: No bid laws were broken or violated. The committee fully understands that submitting a proposal was not inexpensive for those submitting and we did consider them equally. There was no pre-selection.

7. There is no doubt in my mind that AccuMed will get the billing contract. Who loses? The taxpayers.

Response: The current provider, AccuMed, has not been identified as the first choice to provide billings service to the City.
January 24, 2007

Annette McRoy
Chair
Lincoln City Council
Lincoln, Nebraska

Dear Annette,

As a family practice physician, I am pleased to be part of a network of organizations and providers that have worked diligently to make Lincoln the healthiest community in the nation. In recent years, the network has undertaken a number of initiatives to reach that goal. The establishment of smoke free environments, wellness programs, diabetes education and prevention, and other programs are all making a significant impact on the health of Lincoln and Lancaster County residents.

The adoption of the NCIHC standards for trained qualified medical interpreters is an additional initiative that could play a major role in building a model healthcare community into the future as well as provide the most efficient use of healthcare resources. I support the adoption of the standards, recognizing that this is only a first step in developing a plan for a community-wide use of trained qualified medical interpreters. But with successful plan implementation, research indicates that the results could be impressive and include:

- a reduction or elimination of disparities in healthcare that drain resources, undermine the fabric of a culture, and disrupt families
- more effective diagnosis and treatment that results in better patient outcomes
- enhanced ability to provide effective education to each patient on disease prevention and control
- overall long-term reduction in healthcare costs for targeted populations.
At Clinic with a Heart, a nonprofit organization that provides free medical care to underserved populations, we are seeing a steady increase in the number of people who have limited English proficiency, and a growing need for trained qualified medical interpreters. I encourage the Lincoln City Council and Lancaster County Board of Commissioners to adopt the NCIHC Standards to address a widening gap in healthcare delivery, and to continue to be proactive in building a strong, healthy community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert B. Rhodes, MD, FAAFP
President and Founder
Please distribute this message to all city council members.

I do not wish to see funds cut out from trails. I am sure this will jeopardize Federal funds which are so important for the Lincoln trail system. My husband and I are in our seventies and walk some trail most every day. Observing persons in strollers, jogging, biking, or skating is such a real pleasure. Please let trails funds remain untouched. Thank you.  Jimmie Cooley.
I. MAYOR -

1. NEWS ADVISORY - RE: Mayor Seng’s Public Schedule Week of January 27 through February 2, 2007 - Schedule subject to change.

II. CITY CLERK - NONE

III. CORRESPONDENCE

A. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE - NONE

B. DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS -

FINANCE/BUDGET

1. Material from Steve Hubka - RE: January Sales Tax Reports which reflect November activity.

HEALTH

1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Flu Activity Is On The Rise In Lancaster County.

C. MISCELLANEOUS -

1. E-Mail from Larry Shaw - RE: Harris Overpass.

2. E-Mail from William Wood - RE: Opposed to changing of the name of S. 15th Street to Goodhue Blvd.

3. E-Mail from Jeanette Fanmeyer - RE: Arnold school site - Vote yes on the sale of the W. Cummings/NW 48th Street sale to the school district.
Date: January 26, 2007
Contact: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

Mayor Seng’s Public Schedule
Week of January 27 through February 2, 2007
Schedule subject to change

Sunday, January 28
- Gladys Jeurink’s 85th birthday party, proclamation - 2:30 p.m., Christ United Methodist Church, 4530 “A” Street

Monday, January 29
- Rape Spouse Abuse Crisis Center “Raising Our Voices” luncheon - 11:30 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 South 13th Street

Tuesday, January 30
- Downtown Rotary Club “Nebraskan of the Year” luncheon, Key to the City presentation - 11:45 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 South 13th Street

Wednesday, January 31
- Lincoln Chamber of Commerce annual meeting - 11:30 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 South 13th Street
- Heartland Big Brothers/Big Sisters reception for Julie Cervantes Solomon, Key to the City presentation - 6 p.m., Country Club of Lincoln, 3200 South 24th Street

Thursday, February 1
- Partners of the Americas five visitors from Brazil - 9 a.m., Mayor’s Conference Room, 555 South 10th Street
- News conference - 10 a.m., Lincoln Cares and Abraham Lincoln Birthday Celebration, Mayor’s Conference Room, 555 South 10th Street

Friday, February 2
- “Go Red for Women” American Heart Association luncheon, remarks and proclamation - 11 a.m., Country Club of Lincoln, 3200 South 24th Street
### Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2006-07 PROJECTED</th>
<th>2006-07 ACTUAL</th>
<th>VARIANCE FROM PROJECTED</th>
<th>$ CHANGE FR. 05-06</th>
<th>% CHANGE FR. 05-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$4,424,347</td>
<td>$4,546,247</td>
<td>$121,900</td>
<td>($3,081)</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$4,619,540</td>
<td>$4,545,825</td>
<td>($73,715)</td>
<td>$81,321</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$4,619,540</td>
<td>$4,654,599</td>
<td>$35,059</td>
<td>$29,295</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$4,321,330</td>
<td>$4,270,321</td>
<td>($51,009)</td>
<td>($234,764)</td>
<td>-5.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$4,435,191</td>
<td>$4,470,347</td>
<td>$35,156</td>
<td>$397,158</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$5,628,031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$4,115,294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$3,909,258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$4,559,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$4,402,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$4,446,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$4,738,824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,219,949</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,487,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>$67,390</strong></td>
<td><strong>$269,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.21%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual collections through January are within 0.30% of projected collections.
## CITY OF LINCOLN
### GROSS SALES TAX COLLECTIONS (WITH REFUNDS ADDED BACK IN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$3,844,150</td>
<td>$4,239,938</td>
<td>$4,453,875</td>
<td>$4,648,160</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>$4,630,210</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
<td>$4,573,597</td>
<td>-1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$4,116,763</td>
<td>$4,464,191</td>
<td>$4,670,587</td>
<td>$4,706,690</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>$4,823,369</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>$4,712,519</td>
<td>-2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$4,125,824</td>
<td>$4,407,744</td>
<td>$4,526,166</td>
<td>$4,687,792</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>$4,799,275</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>$4,658,480</td>
<td>-2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$3,855,906</td>
<td>$4,034,958</td>
<td>$4,314,111</td>
<td>$4,500,338</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>$4,511,403</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>$4,445,761</td>
<td>-1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$4,140,990</td>
<td>$4,046,633</td>
<td>$4,335,924</td>
<td>$4,264,010</td>
<td>-1.66%</td>
<td>$4,342,902</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>$4,554,634</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$4,982,568</td>
<td>$5,224,986</td>
<td>$5,531,405</td>
<td>$6,086,841</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
<td>$5,797,893</td>
<td>-4.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$3,908,567</td>
<td>$4,076,943</td>
<td>$3,980,041</td>
<td>$4,158,874</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
<td>$4,247,908</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$3,641,403</td>
<td>$3,711,803</td>
<td>$3,889,388</td>
<td>$4,097,988</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>$3,991,159</td>
<td>-2.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$3,949,873</td>
<td>$4,184,028</td>
<td>$4,602,788</td>
<td>$4,730,317</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>$4,543,369</td>
<td>-3.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$3,856,119</td>
<td>$4,169,550</td>
<td>$4,599,245</td>
<td>$4,557,735</td>
<td>-0.90%</td>
<td>$4,539,614</td>
<td>-0.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$4,033,350</td>
<td>$4,105,554</td>
<td>$4,391,257</td>
<td>$4,519,466</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>$4,655,061</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$4,231,174</td>
<td>$4,402,156</td>
<td>$4,893,438</td>
<td>$4,803,665</td>
<td>-1.83%</td>
<td>$4,991,723</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$48,686,688</td>
<td>$51,068,484</td>
<td>$54,188,225</td>
<td>$55,761,877</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>$55,873,886</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>$22,944,991</td>
<td>-0.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to date vs. previous year

Page 1
### CITY OF LINCOLN
**SALES TAX REFUNDS**
*2001-2002 THROUGH 2006-2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>($646,545)</td>
<td>($48,531)</td>
<td>($69,997)</td>
<td>($135,858)</td>
<td>94.09%</td>
<td>($80,882)</td>
<td>($27,350)</td>
<td>-66.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>($379,290)</td>
<td>($64,605)</td>
<td>($110,193)</td>
<td>($165,219)</td>
<td>49.94%</td>
<td>($358,866)</td>
<td>($166,695)</td>
<td>-53.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>($132,336)</td>
<td>($134,088)</td>
<td>($219,454)</td>
<td>($101,531)</td>
<td>-53.73%</td>
<td>($173,972)</td>
<td>($3,881)</td>
<td>-97.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>($240,014)</td>
<td>($177,459)</td>
<td>($390,445)</td>
<td>($325,510)</td>
<td>-16.63%</td>
<td>($6,319)</td>
<td>($175,440)</td>
<td>2676.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>($74,082)</td>
<td>($306,467)</td>
<td>($59,315)</td>
<td>($220,967)</td>
<td>272.53%</td>
<td>($269,713)</td>
<td>($84,287)</td>
<td>-68.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>($509,277)</td>
<td>($61,404)</td>
<td>($323,218)</td>
<td>($394,324)</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
<td>($73,395)</td>
<td>($327,119)</td>
<td>345.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>($428,507)</td>
<td>($17,601)</td>
<td>($22,759)</td>
<td>($99,240)</td>
<td>336.05%</td>
<td>($165,869)</td>
<td>67.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>($333,878)</td>
<td>($281,861)</td>
<td>($199,018)</td>
<td>($69,900)</td>
<td>-64.88%</td>
<td>($196,682)</td>
<td>181.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>($176,292)</td>
<td>($275,081)</td>
<td>($155,787)</td>
<td>($122,283)</td>
<td>-21.51%</td>
<td>($166,567)</td>
<td>36.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>($127,168)</td>
<td>($138,914)</td>
<td>($194,593)</td>
<td>($34,811)</td>
<td>-82.11%</td>
<td>($14,085)</td>
<td>-59.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>($181,863)</td>
<td>($563,339)</td>
<td>($42,086)</td>
<td>($162,998)</td>
<td>287.30%</td>
<td>($39,492)</td>
<td>-75.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>($63,949)</td>
<td>($341,868)</td>
<td>($531,884)</td>
<td>($148,028)</td>
<td>-72.17%</td>
<td>($57,700)</td>
<td>-61.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>($3,293,201)</td>
<td>($2,411,218)</td>
<td>($2,318,751)</td>
<td>($1,980,668)</td>
<td>-14.58%</td>
<td>($1,603,541)</td>
<td>($784,771)</td>
<td>-18.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Year to date vs. previous year*
# CITY OF LINCOLN
NET SALES TAX COLLECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$3,197,606</td>
<td>$4,191,407</td>
<td>$4,383,878</td>
<td>$4,512,303</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>$4,549,328</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>$4,546,247</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$3,737,474</td>
<td>$4,399,587</td>
<td>$4,560,394</td>
<td>$4,541,471</td>
<td>-0.41%</td>
<td>$4,464,503</td>
<td>-1.69%</td>
<td>$4,545,825</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$3,993,488</td>
<td>$4,273,655</td>
<td>$4,306,712</td>
<td>$4,586,261</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>$4,625,303</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
<td>$4,654,599</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$3,615,893</td>
<td>$3,857,499</td>
<td>$3,923,666</td>
<td>$4,174,828</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>$4,505,085</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td>$4,270,321</td>
<td>-5.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$4,066,908</td>
<td>$3,740,166</td>
<td>$4,276,609</td>
<td>$4,043,044</td>
<td>-5.46%</td>
<td>$4,073,189</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>$4,470,347</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$4,473,291</td>
<td>$5,163,582</td>
<td>$5,208,187</td>
<td>$5,692,517</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>$5,724,498</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$3,480,060</td>
<td>$4,059,342</td>
<td>$3,957,283</td>
<td>$4,059,634</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>$4,082,038</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$3,307,525</td>
<td>$3,429,942</td>
<td>$3,690,371</td>
<td>$4,028,088</td>
<td>9.15%</td>
<td>$3,794,477</td>
<td>-5.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$3,773,581</td>
<td>$3,908,947</td>
<td>$4,447,001</td>
<td>$4,608,034</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>$4,376,803</td>
<td>-5.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$3,728,951</td>
<td>$4,030,637</td>
<td>$4,404,651</td>
<td>$4,522,924</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>$4,525,529</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$3,851,488</td>
<td>$3,542,215</td>
<td>$4,349,171</td>
<td>$4,356,468</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>$4,615,569</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$4,167,224</td>
<td>$4,060,288</td>
<td>$4,361,554</td>
<td>$4,655,637</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
<td>$4,934,023</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$45,393,489</td>
<td>$48,657,267</td>
<td>$51,869,477</td>
<td>$53,781,209</td>
<td>3.69%</td>
<td>$54,270,346</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>$22,487,338</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to date vs. previous year
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: January 26, 2007
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Bruce Dart, PhD, 402-441-8001
Health Director
Tim Timmons, R.N., 402-441-8056
Communicable Disease Program Supervisor

**Flu Activity Is On The Rise In Lancaster County**

The Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department through its weekly influenza surveillance program reports that flu activity is on the rise in Lincoln and Lancaster County. The number of visits to health-care providers for influenza-like illness jumped during the previous week and local school absence due to Flu increased significantly this week.

Flu shots are still available in the community. The Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department’s Main office at 3140 N Street, has Flu shots available from 8:00 a.m to 4:00 p.m, Monday through Friday.

Health Director, Dr. Bruce Dart, said “It is not too late for those who have not obtained a flu immunization, to still get a shot.” Dr. Dart stated that “most people and particularly people at high risk who have not done so already, should be vaccinated.”

People of any age can get influenza. Most people are ill with influenza for several days, but some get much sicker and may need to be hospitalized. Influenza causes thousands of deaths each year, mostly among the elderly. Influenza symptoms can include, fever, cough, chills, sore throat, headache, muscle aches. If you are at high risk and have a flu-like illness or are
concerned about your health, you should contact your healthcare provider. It is important to get adequate bed rest and drink plenty of fluids.

The Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department offers the following suggestions for those who may develop flu-like-illness: Avoid close contact with others, especially those at high risk for influenza complications. As always, practice the good health behaviors of covering your mouth when you cough and your nose when you sneeze. Practicing good hand washing is also an important and essential way to reduce the spread of illness.
If the Vision 2015 deal goes through why do we need a new Harris overpass. If we are going to have 1

Or two tracks let them go over the highway.
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name: William J. Wood
Address: 808 "D" Street
City: Lincoln, NE 68502
Phone: 435-6260
Fax: 477-1827
Email: wmwood@alltel.net

Comment or Question:
My wife Myrna and I own 142 frontage on So. 15th Street, on the northwest corner of 15th and F Street. We oppose the changing of the name of So. 15th Street to Goodhue Blvd. This is a poor business decision as 15th Street will now have three names, 15th Street, Centennial Mall So, and Goodhue Blvd. It will make it difficult for us to advertise our apartments as the general public will not know where Goodhue Blvd. is located. It will be confusing for out of town visitors, emergency personnel, and others.

We respectfully oppose this change.

William J. Wood
I'm a registered voter and will vote at both spring elections.

Please vote yes on the sale of the W Cummings/NW 48 street sale to the school district. When this property ownership mess was started most of the parents of Arnold school children were not even born. This neighborhood has been ignored for many years. In the 1980's the land fill was to be built in this area because the maps used by the consulting firm picking the site were obsolete and showed no homes in the area. The school district wasn't aware that the current school site was owned by the housing authority. I could mention other things also but for the sake of time won't.

Vote YES on the sale.