I. MAYOR
*1. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule for Week of July 21 through July 27, 2007. (Distributed to City Council on 07/20/07)
*2. NEWS ADVISORY. City Council Tentative Changes to Recommended Budget Available on 5CITY-TV (Time Warner Cable Channel 5)
*3. Petition on Retaining Services of Lifetime Health in City Budget.
*4. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor Calls for Continued Voluntary Water Conservation.
*7. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor Thanks Blood Donors for Response to Emergency.

Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007
**2. Response to Rev. Morris from Mayor Chris Beutler.
**3. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor Appoints Three to Planning Commission.
**4. NEWS RELEASE. Upgrading of Peter Pan Skate Park Under Way.
**5. NEWS RELEASE. Public Invited to Lincoln Fire and Rescue Badge Ceremony.
**6. NEWS RELEASE. StarTran Introduces New Fare Cards.

For The Week of August 13, 2007
8. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Public Invited To 40th Anniversary Celebration Of Mayor’s Committee For International Friendship.
9. NEWS ADVISORY - RE: Mayor Beutler and the City Public Works & Utilities Dept. will release the results of the 2005 Crash Study at a news conference on 08/09/07 at 10:00 am at the roundabout at 33rd Street & Sheridan Blvd.
II. DIRECTORS

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

FINANCE
1. Reports from Don Herz - RE: July 2007 EMS Reports.

FINANCE/BUDGET
*1. July Sales Tax Reports:
   a) Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections;
   c) Sales Tax Refunds, 2001-2002 Through 2006-2007; and

FINANCE TREASURER

LIBRARIES
*1. Letter from Carol Connor, Library Director, with Attachments of Letters and Resumes of Six Persons Interested in Being Appointed to the Library Board.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION ..... 
**1. Special Permit #07028 - Nonprofit Educational and Philanthropic Institution - Nebraska Family Council - Northeast Corner of So. 11th Street and “E” Street - Resolution No. PC-01065.
3. Special Permit #07026 (Domiciliary Care Facility-S. 25th & Old Cheney Road) Resolution No. PC-01066.

PLANNING
*3. Charleston Heights Addition Final Plat No. 06083. Generally Located at North 14th Street and Humphrey Avenue.
PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES
*1. ADVISORY. 56th Street and Elkcrest Drive Intersection Safety Improvement Project. Project No. 700846.
*2. ADVISORY. Water Main Project No. 700294. St. Paul Avenue; 42nd - 47th Street.

Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007
**1. Reply from Randy Hoskins, Assistant City Engineer, Regarding Lincoln North Creek Street Lighting.
   a) Letter from Gregory S. Nielsen, Lincoln North Creek LLC. Letter Regarding Concerns With Street Lighting in the North Creek Development.

For The Week of August 13, 2007

III. CITY CLERK -

1. Petition signatures - RE: Continue funding the Maxey Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center (Forwarded to Council on 08/07/07)

2. Letter from Don Tilley - RE: Continue funding the Senior Health Care Services (Forwarded to Council on 08/07/07)

IV. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE

JON CAMP
*1. Response from Dan Wright, Interim Fire Chief, Regarding the EMS Enterprise Fund Utilities and Explanation Regarding Workers Comp with EMS and General Fund.

Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007
**1. Email from, and Response to, Andrea Dick ey Regarding Cutting Firefighters Budget.
**2. Email from, and Response to, Norma Kamtz Regarding Continuing to Fund Lifetime Health for Senior Citizens.
**3. Email from, and Response to, Marlys French Regarding City Budget Cut on the Lifetime Health Program of the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging.
**4. Email from, and Response to, Bob Cunningham Regarding Budgets on Firefighters and County Receiving City Taxes.
**5. Response to Email from Interim Fire Chief Danny D. Wright to Council Chair Marvin on LFR Budget.
**6. Email from, and Response to, Reba Schafe r, Director for Lincoln Area Agency on Agency Prior to Retirement in 2000 Regarding Maintaining Services to Older Adults and Final Budget Cuts.
**7.** Email from, and Response to, Pat Scott. Find Funding to Continue the Life Time Health Program’s Care and Services to the Elderly in Lincoln.

**8.** Response from Public Works and Utilities to Don Wright’s Concern on the Railroad Crossing at South 56th Street and Old Cheney Road.

**9.** Email from Bob Kacvinsky on Requiring Talent Plus to Use Pollution Free Lighting in Expansion Plans, Giving Consideration to Neighbors, Hyde Observatory and the City.

**10.** Email from Norma Kamtz. Agree with User Fee Idea to Keep Lifetime Health Operational, with Fee Determined by Income.

**11.** Email from Marlys French. User Fee Program Could Work, Not Being Too Expensive for Seniors on a Fixed Income.

**12.** Email from Ken Ring Agreeing With a User Fee for the Lifetime Health Program, Structured for Everyone to Pay According to Income.

---

**JONATHAN COOK**

*1. Letter from Sharon Fry. Thanks for Supporting our Fire Department.

**Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007**

**1.** Letter from Mrs. Abe B. Sidiki. Do Not Allow Senior Services to be Cut. Do not Make the Seniors Responsible for Mismanagement of City Funds. Perhaps an Appropriate Fee Could be Charged to Keep Program.

**2.** Letter from Charlotte D. Frank. Reconsider Proposed Budget Cuts to Lincoln Area Agency on Aging.

---

**DOUG EMERY**

*1. Letter from Sharon Fry. Thank you for Supporting the Fire Department.

**Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007**

**1.** Letter from Lina Driscoll Requesting the Belmont Aging Center Remain Open.

---

**ROBIN ESCHLIMAN**


2. Request to Dave Landis, Urban Development Director - RE: 48th & “O” Street (Eschliman RFI#9 - 08/03/07). — 1.) SEE RESPONSE FROM DAVE LANDIS, URBAN DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR RECEIVED ON R. ESCHLIMAN RFI#9 - 08/06/07.

**Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007**

**1.** Letter from Tracie Foreman, Aging Specialist/LAAA/Lifetime Health, Stating Facts in Response to Comments Made About the Lifetime Health Program. (Received for, and Distributed to Other Council Members on 08/02/07)
DAN MARVIN
*1. Memo from Dan Wright, Interim Fire Chief, Regarding Impact on Lincoln Fire and Rescue if Another $250,000 is Reduced from the Fiscal Year 07-08 Budget.
*2. Letter from Sharon Fry. Thank you for Supporting our Fire Department.

**Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007**
**1. Letter from a Concerned Citizen Regarding Lincoln Fire Department Supervisory Employees.**
**2. Letter from Theresa Hohmeie. Oppose Elimination of Lincoln Area Agency Lifetime Health Program.**

JOHN SPATZ
**Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007**
**1. Letter from Alice Stillahn. Do Not Close Belmont Active Age Services.**
**2. Letter from Arlene and Herman Gerlach. Reconsider Closing the Active Age Center at Belmont Senior Center. Would be Unable to Attend Another Center.**
**3. Letter from Donald L. Jewell. Keep Center Open. Live at Malone Manor.**
**4. Letter from Wallace Gant. Need Maxey Center, Do Not Close.**
**5. Letter from Kent H. Bankson. Keep Maxey Center Open.**
**6. Letter from Roberta Malolen. Keep Senior Centers Open.**
**7. Letter from Iren Hraban. Keep Maxey Center Open.**
**8. Letter from Harlan Chamberlain. Support Keeping the Maxey Senior Center Open.**
**9. Letter from Juanita McWilliams. Keep Open the Senior Maxey Center Located at the Malone Community Center.**
**10. Letter from Joy Snell. Keep the Maxey Center Open.**

KEN SVOBODA
*1. Response from Dan Wright, Interim Fire Chief, Regarding Question of FEMA Grant, the Cooperative Agreement Reimbursement to General Fund for Assistant Chief Huff.

**Correspondence Received Week of August 6, 2007**
**1. Letter from a Concerned Citizen Regarding Lincoln Fire Department Supervisory Employees.**

V. MISCELLANEOUS
*1. Email from Russell Miller on Police and Taxes.
*2. Correspondence from Dana Roper, City Attorney. Consequences for Allowing Propane Tanks on Balconies.
*4. Letter from Phyllis Roehl. Suggestions/Comments on City Budget.
*5. Email from Paul Haith. Comments on Budget, and Councilman Cooks’ Comment on the Lincoln Fire Department.
*6. Comments from Jason Stege on City Council Actions at Meeting on 07-23-07.
*9. Correspondence from Neighbors of Talent Plus to Comply with Written Requests if Talent Plus is Allowed to Expand. (Distributed to Council Members on 07/26/07)
*10. Email from Bob Norris. Comments, Suggestions on the Budget.

**Emails Received Week of July 30, 2007 Regarding Keeping the Senior Lifetime Health Program and Senior Centers Open**

*1. Phone call from Melva Buhrdorf.
*2. Message Sent to Action Center.
*3. Letters From the Word Weaver’s Calvert Writing Group. Explanation of Participation in Various Programs/Activities at the Calvert Senior Center.
*4. Letter sent to Councilmen Jonathan Cook and Dan Marvin from Frances Bockelman. Continue to fund the Lifetime Health Program.
*5. Letter from Cy Miller. Keep the Calvert Senior Center Open, Plus Suggestions on Budget.
*6. Email from Lisa Henning. Very Saddened and Concerned with Ending the Lifetime Health Program.
*7. Email from Gerald D. Poppe. Use Lifetime Health Programs, Consider Keeping in Budget.
*8. Letter from Lavaughn Oorlog. With Different Location for Calvert Senior Center Keep Fee Paid Previously to Parks and Recreation Department.
*9. Email from Shirley Maly. Abolishment of the Lifetime Health in Aging Services seems to lack foresight and common sense. Lifetime Health offers affordable preventative care.
*11. Note from Berena Snyder. Need the Calvert Center.
*12. Letter from Gertrude N. Involved in ActivAge Programs for 28 Years.
*15. Letter from Jennie Tesch. Do Not Close the Senior Centers.
*16. Letter from Sam B. Cuts from Seniors and Youth Programs Absurd.
*17. Letter from Lincoln Citizen. Do Not Close Belmont ActivAge Program.
*18. Letter from Henry T. Upset at Closing Senior Centers, Especially the Belmont Center.
*19. Letter from Effie J. Depend on Belmont Rec Center for Resources.
*20. Letter from John B. Disappointed Belmont Senior Center is Closing.
*22. Letter from Lyle and Shirley. Upset on the Closing of the Belmont Senior Center.
*24. Letter from Connie B. Father Uses Belmont Senior Center.
*25. Letter from Charlotte Macku. Sad to Take Away Services for the Elderly.
*26. Letter from Mark F. Need to Keep Services at Belmont Center in Place.
*27. Letter from Concerned Citizen of Lincoln with Concern for the Lifetime Health Program. (Distributed to Council Members on 07/26/07)
*28. Email from Joyce Morgan. Keep the Calvert Center Open. Deeply Offended if Maintaining a Golf Course over Senior Centers.
*29. Email from Patricia Lehecka. Do Not Cut Lifetime Health Budget. Vote in the Best Interests of Lincoln Senior Citizens.

**1. Email from Teri Bullock. Very Disappointed in Proposed Cuts Affecting the Youngest and Oldest Members of our City.
**2. Email from Bob And Barbara Boyce. Proposed Sewage Treatment Plant, SW Wastewater Facility, by Wilderness Park Again in the CIP Budget at a Cost of $5.6 Million.
**3. Email from Sara Friedman. Reasons to Vote to Remove the Entire Entry of the SW Wastewater Facility Improvements from the Budget.
**4. Email from Coby Mach, Executive Director of Lincoln Independent Business Association (LIBA) Responding to Russell Miller’s Letter to the Mayor and City Council Regarding the Lancaster Event Center.
**5. Position Statement from LIBA Regarding the Storm Water Bond Issue.
**6. Letter from Kathryn Westwood Giving Suggestions for the Lincoln City Budget.
**7. Email from Pam James. Preserve Wilderness Park as a Natural Heritage Sight.
**8. Email from M. Harvey Regarding Maintenance of Trees Along Winthrop Road.
**9. Email from Steve Crouch with Suggestions.
**10. Email from Josh Mehlin Thoughts on Returning to Lincoln.
**11. Letter from Dr. Theresa de Langis on the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission.
**12. Letter and Resolution No. 490 from the Airport Authority.
**13. Email from Kathy Pauley, National Association of Commissions for Women, Regarding the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission.
**16. Email from Sam Johnson. Think of Residents at 70th and Pioneers and Deny the Land Sale to Talent Plus.
**17. Letter from Erik Hubl, Hyde Memorial Observatory. For Land Sale to Talent Plus have Written Terms of Sale on Lighting Cutoff Times, Minimum Amount of Lighting, and Reflective Surfaces.
Emails Received Week of August 6, 2007 Regarding Keeping the Senior Lifetime Health Program and Senior Centers Open

**1. Letter from Lisa A. Taylor. Mother Uses Programs and Also Gives Back to Community.**

**2. Email from Margaret Elley Distressed over Cuts Asked of the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging Members.**

**3. Email from Rev. Hughes B. Morris. Dismayed on Financial Cutback Requested from the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging.**

**4. Email from Theresa Parker. Vote No to mayor Beutler’s Proposed Budget Cut for the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging.**

**5. Letter from Frank Coyne. Keep Maxey Center Open.**

**6. Letter from Josephine Foutz. Do Not Close Senior Centers.**

**7. Letter from Florence Joseph. Keep Senior Maxey Center Open.**

**8. Letter from Maggie Whirl. Allow Consideration for Keeping the Maxey Center Senior Program.**

**9. Letter from Donna Busch. Programs Like Lifetime Health Needed in Our Community.**

**10. Letter from Jo Wallick. Do Not Eliminate the Calvert ActivAge Center. Come and Personally Visit the Class.**

**11. Letter from Betty Wilken. Do Not Eliminate the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging Lifetime Health Program. This Community Should Serve People of All Ages.**

**12. Letter from J. Houk. Volunteer at the Maxey Senior Center which Provides Individuals in Wheelchairs, with Canes, Walkers a Balanced Meal and Socialization. Give Consideration to Keep Open. (Council Members Received Individual Copies on 08/02/07)**

**13. Statement from Senior Citizens and Other Citizens and Five (5) Pages of Signatures Asking for Continued Funding for the Maxey Senior Diner Program at the Malone Community Center. (Council Members Received Individual Copies on 08/02/07)**

For The Week of August 13, 2007

14. E-Mail from Concerned Citizen - RE: The upcoming approval of Mayor Beutler’s nominees to the County/City Planning Commission.

15. Letter from Gwen Tilley - RE: Dismayed that the budget for the senior centers is being cut (Council received copy of letter on 08/06/07 during the public hearing on the budget.)

16. E-Mail from Janine Copple, Member, Friends of Wilderness Park - RE: The Southwest Sewage Treatment facility in the CIP (Forwarded to Council on 08/07/07)

17. E-Mail Letter from Marti Rule, Chair, Marin Women’s Commission; and Cecilia Zamora, NACW Director, Region 9, Marin Women’s Commission, Marin County, CA - RE: In Support - Continue to fund the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission (Forwarded to Council on 08/07/07)

18. E-Mail from Russell Miller - RE: Continue funding the Lifetime Health Programs -raise property taxes (Forwarded to Council on 08/07/07)

19. Letter from Don & Sandy Bock - RE: Please don’t cut the Senior Services (Forwarded to Council on 08/07/07)
20.  7 Letters - RE: Please don’t cut the Senior Services (Forwarded to Council on 08/07/07)
22.  E-Mail from Dave Oenbring - RE: The Budget Cuts.
23.  E-Mail from Regina L. Oldak, Esq., President, Montgomery County Commission for Women, Rockville, MD - RE: Fund the Commission for Women (Council received this email on 08/08/07 before meeting at 9:00 am)
24.  E-Mail from Rick Tast - RE: Budget cuts (Council received this email on 08/08/07 before meeting at 9:00 am)
25.  E-Mail from Harlan Milder - RE: Budget cuts (Council received this email on 08/08/07 before meeting at 9:00 am)
26.  E-Mail and Press Release from The Friends of Wilderness Park and The Nebraska Land Trust - RE: The two groups will be sponsoring an informational meeting on the Nebraska Land Trust and conservation easements on 08/23/07 at 7:00 pm at the Roca Village Hall - (See Press Release)
27.  E-Mail from Deanna McClintick - RE: Pershing decisions.
30.  E-Mail from Ellen Snortland - RE: Until we have more women visible in decision-making positions, please keep your Commission alive.
32.  E-Mail from Mel Antrim - RE: Please don’t eliminate the Senior Health Services (Council received this email on 08/08/07)

VI.  ADJOURNMENT

**HELD OVER FROM AUGUST 6, 2007.
The public is invited to join the Mayor’s Committee for International Friendship (MCIF) and the Lincoln Council for International Visitors in celebrating MCIF’s 40th anniversary Thursday, August 16. The event includes a social hour at 5:30 p.m. and a dinner at 6:3 p.m. in the Great Plains Room at the UNL East Campus Union.

Special guests will include Mayor Chris Beutler, several former Mayors of Lincoln, Mark Rebstock from the National Council for International Visitors, and Carol Grabauskas from the U.S. Department of State.

The MCIF has been welcoming visitors to Lincoln since 1966. Its goal is to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and people of other countries.

“The celebration will recognize the tremendous dedication of so many in Lincoln and the surrounding area who have devoted much time and effort in making our international visitors feel welcome,” said MCIF President Brian Ridenour. “The outstanding hospitality extended by this organization was recognized when the U.S. Information Agency announced some years ago that Lincoln was the place most mentioned favorably by former visitors.”

The cost of the dinner is $10 per person. Reservations may be made by contacting Pat Walter at 430-8410 or pattysells@yahoo.com by August 11.
Mayor Chris Beutler and the City Public Works and Utilities Department will release the results of the 2005 Crash Study at a news conference at 10 a.m. Thursday, August 9 at the roundabout at 33rd Street and Sheridan Boulevard.

Parking is available in the lot northeast of the roundabout. The entrance to the lot is on High Street, one short block north of Sheridan. The news conference will be near the parking lot.

If the weather is bad, the news conference will be held outside the Mayor’s Office on the second floor of the County-City Building, 555 South 10th Street.
CONGRESS

Congress begins a month-long summer recess but will face a number of high-profile pending issues upon their return. The House and Senate adjourned for their August recess today after a flurry of legislative activity and partisan bickering that will set the stage for a contentious and busy fall schedule.

Prior to adjournment, Congress did manage to clear legislation for the President that would implement recommendations of the 9-11 Commission, while House-Senate conference committees came to a conclusion on issues such as ethics and lobbying reform and the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). While many vital issues wait for months – even years – to be considered, Congress did manage last week to act quickly and approve transportation aid for the state of Minnesota in the wake of the bridge collapse. However, while some lip service was paid to the underlying cause of the problem, comprehensive legislation to address the nation’s crumbling infrastructure is not expected this year.

Partisan wrangling on both floors was the order of the week, as Republicans used various parliamentary tactics to prevent Democratic priorities from being considered. If nothing else, the recess may be helpful to calm the frayed nerves on both sides.

The most pressing item that must be addressed is the FY 2008 budget. While the House has completed action on all 12 of its spending measures, the Senate has approved only one (Homeland Security), all but ensuring that most federal agencies will not have finalized funding by the beginning of the federal fiscal year on October 1. Partisan squabbles have delayed the annual spending bills almost every year in recent memory, and the President’s insistence that Congress not exceed his proposed cap on domestic discretionary spending is likely to result in vetoes when those bills reach his desk. Democrats in Congress have proposed spending about $20 billion more than the President in FY 2008, an amount that represents less than 2 percent of domestic spending.

Other issues that Congress will take up when reconvening after Labor Day include: the State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP); comprehensive energy legislation (see related item below), and continued debate over the war in Iraq. For local governments, items such as the expiration of the moratorium on state and local taxation of Internet access, the creation of an affordable housing trust fund (see related story below), as well as a measure to mandate collective bargaining rights for public safety officers will likely see some activity.

Both the House and Senate are expected to resume work in Washington on Tuesday, September 4.

ENERGY

House approves comprehensive energy efficiency bill. The House approved legislation (HR 3221) this week that would, among other things, establish new energy efficiency standards for a number of products, advance alternative fuels technologies, and establish a block grant to fund local energy efficiency programs. Also approved was a package of tax incentives to bolster energy efficient technologies.
the Energy Efficiency Block Grant program has been a high priority of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and would authorize $2 billion annually over five years for local governments to create and implement energy efficiency programs in their communities. The U.S. Department of Energy would be charged with creating a formula to distribute the funds, but sponsors of the legislation see the Community Development Block Grant program at HUD as a good model. In addition to the block grant, the legislation would:

- create a renewable portfolio standard (RPS) for utilities in which they must produce 15 percent of their own power from renewable resources by 2020;
- set new efficiency standards for appliances, lighting, and buildings;
- authorize funds for research into clean energy and alternative fuels;
- promote U.S. involvement in other international partnerships to address energy issues and climate change, and;
- increase regulations on energy development and boost fines on energy firms that fail to pay royalties for oil and gas exploration.

Provisions in the $15.3 billion tax package would:

- authorize $8 billion in bonds to help state and local governments fund energy conservation projects;
- extend several tax credits for energy-efficiency projects in commercial buildings, production of renewable electricity and investments in solar energy and fuel cells;
- create a tax credit for the purchase of plug-in hybrid cars, and
- reduce or eliminate existing tax benefits for oil and gas companies.

The legislation will now be considered in a House-Senate conference committee, which could be difficult as the Senate version does not contain the renewable portfolio standard or tax provisions. The Senate bill does include language to create an Energy Block Grant for localities, but it does not authorize specific funds.

### HOUSING

House committee approves creation of affordable housing trust fund. The House Financial Services Committee approved legislation (HR 2895) this week that would create a trust fund that would provide formula funds to states and local governments for the construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of affordable housing.

According to bill sponsors, the goal of the trust fund is to construct, rehabilitate, and preserve 1.5 million units of affordable housing over the next 10 years. The fund would receive its revenues from mortgage business profits from Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs) such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, as well as the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Earlier this year, the House approved legislation (HR 1427, HR 1852) directing funds from those entities to the trust fund. Bill sponsors believe that between $800 million and $1 billion will be generated for the fund annually.

The legislation directs 60 percent of the proceeds from the trust fund to be distributed directly to local governments and 40 percent to states. If the total amount of the trust fund is below $2 billion in any year, there would be a $750,000 minimum funding threshold for localities. The legislation requires that the Department of Housing and Urban Development create a formula for distribution of funds based on factors such as population, poverty rates, vacancy rates, and amount of substandard housing. Local governments receiving funds may in turn distribute them to any organization or agency that has previously demonstrated the experience and capacity in the affordable housing arena.

The bill would allow trust fund monies for construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, preservation incentives (including for manufactured housing and community land trusts) and operating assistance to facilitate affordability. Funds may be used for both rental housing that is affordable and for down payment and closing cost assistance by first time homebuyers. Prohibited uses include administrative costs or expenses, political activities, advocacy, lobbying, counseling, travel expenses, and preparation of or advice on tax returns.

Finally, the measure requires a match for trust fund dollars equal to 12.5 percent if provided from state, local and private resources or 25 percent if provided from federal sources. Up to 33 percent of this match may be provided through binding commitments to provide services for residents. The match may be reduced or waived where a zoning variance or other waiver of regulatory barriers was required to site trust fund-assisted housing.

The House is expected to consider HR 2895 on the floor in September. The Senate Banking Committee has not moved as quickly on this issue but is expected to consider GSE and FHA reform bills after the August recess.

### WATER RESOURCES

House approves WRDA conference report despite White House veto threat. A House-Senate conference report on legislation (HR 1495) to reauthorize the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) was approved easily by the House last week. Just prior to the House vote on Wednesday, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) sent a letter to Congress indicating that the President would veto the bill.

The final WRDA bill authorizes 941 flood control, navigation, and other water resources-related projects administered by the Corps. While the measure has traditionally been approved by Congress every two years, concerns over high costs and Corps management of projects have resulted in a seven-year span between bills. This year, the House approved a bill that cost approximately $15 billion, while the Senate version had a price tag of $14 billion.

However, because the House and Senate in many cases included different
projects, it was difficult to “split the difference” between the two bills and the final product came in at approximately $20 billion. This cost increase was enough to prompt the veto threat from the White House, which had been watching the bills closely. The veto threat did not deter most members, as the House approved the conference report 381-40, more than enough to override a Presidential veto. Several Republicans in the House and Senate remarked that they would vote to override a veto if presented with the opportunity.

Senate leaders attempted to bring the WRDA conference report up just prior to adjournment late last week, but some Senators objected and the report will now be brought up in September when Congress returns from its August recess.

House panel approves dam safety bill. In a related item, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved legislation (HR 3224) this week that would establish a program to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to provide grants to states for the repair of unsafe dams. The measure requires that FEMA develop a risk-based priority system for use in identifying deficient dams for which grants may be made, and there would be a 35 percent match required by grant recipients. The bill authorizes $201 million over five years for the program.

Similar legislation was approved by the House last year, but was never acted on by the Senate.

TRANSPORTATION
House passes SAFETEA-LU technical corrections bill. Legislation (HR 3248) to make minor modifications to the 2005 SAFETEA-LU surface transportation law was approved last Wednesday by the House.

The non-controversial measure would provide an additional $37 million for transportation research programs, grant the 12-member National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission an additional six months to explore innovative highway funding options, and adds $2 million for Commission costs. The Commission’s final report is now due by December 31, 2007, and it is expected to initiate a debate about changing the funding mechanism that pays for highway programs. Lawmakers expect that issue to be a major component of the next surface transportation bill, which expires in FY 2009.

The House and Senate have each been considering SAFETEA-LU technical corrections bills, and HR 3248 represents a compromise between the two chambers that is designed to avoid a House-Senate conference committee on the matter.

The Senate did not act on the bill prior to leaving for a month-long August recess.

In a related item, the FTA issued a proposed policy guidance for New Starts and Small Starts. Friday, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) released a 200-page “proposed measures” for evaluation of projects seeking New and Small Starts funding. The proposed regulations, which were mandated by the 2005 SAFETEA-LU law, are available on the FTA Web site at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/15052_ENGHTML.html.

FTA requests comment on the proposed measures by November 1, 2007. After receiving and considering public input on the proposed guidance, FTA will issue a final guidance along with a final rule governing New and Small Starts.

HOMELAND SECURITY
Measure to implement 9-11 Commission recommendations signed into law. Both the House and Senate this week approved the conference report to legislation (HR 1) that would implement many of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, also known as the 9-11 Commission. The President subsequently signed the bill into law Friday.

Of particular interest to local governments in the bill are provisions relating to Department of Homeland Security (DHS) funding formulas and an interoperable communications grant program.

Currently, the DHS formula funding structure for the State Homeland Security Grant Program guarantees that each state receives at least 0.75 percent of the total funding allocated by Congress each year. The 9-11 Commission recommended that the grants be distributed using more risk-based criteria, and the final bill changes the formula to guarantee each state 0.375 percent of all funding in FY 2008, gradually reducing that amount each year until it reaches 0.35 percent in FY 2012.

In response to concerns of the Commission that inadequate communications was a critical failure in the immediate response to the 9-11 events, the legislation creates a new, stand-alone interoperability grants program at DHS. The bill authorizes $1.6 billion for the grant program over a 5-year period and awards would be distributed only after the submission of statewide interoperability plans and the completion of a National Emergency Communication Plan. States must allocate at least 80 percent of their funds to local governments within 45 days of receiving the award.

The legislation would also establish a grant program at the Department of Transportation to provide security assistance to public transportation agencies. Eligible uses of the funds include a variety of capital and operational expenses including equipment purchase, security training, and other security-related overtime costs. The bill authorizes $650 million for the program in FY 2008, increasing each year until it reaches $1.1 billion in FY 2011. The Department of Transportation is charged with developing the most effective manner to distribute the grants.

Finally, the legislation includes a mandatory cargo screening requirement for all cargo on passenger aircraft to be established within three years.
HUMAN RESOURCES
House approves wage bias legislation. The House approved legislation (HR 2831) this week that would clarify current law as to how employees can sue their employers for wage discrimination.

The measure is a response to the recent Supreme Court decision (Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.) that workers filing suit for pay discrimination must do so within 180 days of the actual decision to discriminate against them. Bill sponsors maintain that the legislation is a narrowly-focused effort to reverse that decision and “restore the law on non-discrimination.”

The bill would clarify current law to say that employers could be sued for pay discrimination every time they issue a paycheck, no matter how long ago the alleged discrimination occurred. People who believed they were victims of pay discrimination could win damages if they filed charges with the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) within 180 days of any paycheck, not just within 180 days of the initial discrimination. The measure would also clarify that with regard to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (which provides for relief against discrimination), an employee is entitled to up to two years of back pay.

The House approved the legislation 225-199, with six Democrats voting against the bill and two Republicans voting in favor. House Republicans believe that the legislation goes beyond the scope of Leadbetter and were angry that they were not allowed to offer floor amendments to the measure.

Companion legislation (S 1823) has been introduced in the Senate but has not been acted upon. The White House has threatened to veto the legislation if it is presented to the President in its current form.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS
FCC revises rules regarding sale of broadcast spectrum. The Federal Communication Commission (FCC) this week released an updated ruling to govern the January 2008 sale of broadcast spectrum that is to be vacated by broadcasters.

While the text of the ruling will not be available for several days, the FCC indicated in a press release this week that it will include a process by which part of the spectrum will be made available for public safety interoperable communications. Creating what would be known as the “700 megahertz Public Safety/Private Partnership,” a wireless company that is successful in acquiring bandwidth through the auction would work with public safety interests to develop a nationwide interoperable network.

Most media reports on the FCC ruling focused on a decision to require that wireless companies purchasing the spectrum allow consumers to use any kind of cellphone and software that they want. However, the FCC did not require the winning companies to resell parts of the spectrum to third-party companies, such as Google, which is looking to increase its presence in the wireless market.

Details on the interoperable partnership will be included once the FCC posts the official ruling on www.fcc.gov. The spectrum sale is expected to reap between $15 and $28 billion for the U.S. Treasury.

GRANT OPPORTUNITIES
Department of Housing and Urban Development
HUD has announced that applications are now being accepted for the HOPE VI Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing program. Funding will be awarded to applicants for the demolition, rehabilitation, or replacement of obsolete projects while continuing to provide housing that will avoid or decrease the concentration of very low-income neighborhoods. Approximately $94 million is available for the program with a maximum award of $20 million and a five percent non-federal match required. HUD anticipates awarding 4-5 projects and applications are due by November 7, 2007. More information about this grant is available at: http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6/index.cfm
## City of Lincoln
### EMS Cash Receipts/Expenditure Data 07/31/07
#### FY 2006-07

### Emergency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total Month Receipts</th>
<th>Total Month Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Receipts (Expenditures)</th>
<th>Cumulative Receipts</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenditures</th>
<th>Cumulative Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2005-06 Balance Forward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,276,555</td>
<td>19,538,446</td>
<td>(1,261,891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>255,406</td>
<td>288,784</td>
<td>(33,378)</td>
<td>18,531,961</td>
<td>19,827,230</td>
<td>(1,295,269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>334,528</td>
<td>302,377</td>
<td>32,151</td>
<td>18,866,489</td>
<td>20,129,607</td>
<td>(1,263,118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>347,188</td>
<td>221,263</td>
<td>125,925</td>
<td>19,213,677</td>
<td>20,350,870</td>
<td>(1,137,193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>303,437</td>
<td>320,433</td>
<td>(16,996)</td>
<td>19,517,114</td>
<td>20,671,303</td>
<td>(1,154,189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>282,521</td>
<td>489,999</td>
<td>(207,478)</td>
<td>19,799,635</td>
<td>21,161,302</td>
<td>(1,361,667)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>272,043</td>
<td>231,207</td>
<td>40,836</td>
<td>20,037,732</td>
<td>21,393,205</td>
<td>(1,355,473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>311,247</td>
<td>337,777</td>
<td>(26,530)</td>
<td>20,372,260</td>
<td>21,730,826</td>
<td>(1,358,566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>246,191</td>
<td>313,719</td>
<td>(67,528)</td>
<td>20,629,116</td>
<td>22,044,005</td>
<td>(1,414,889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>223,811</td>
<td>205,756</td>
<td>18,055</td>
<td>20,852,927</td>
<td>22,249,761</td>
<td>(1,396,834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>224,190</td>
<td>241,419</td>
<td>(17,229)</td>
<td>21,071,678</td>
<td>22,491,180</td>
<td>(1,414,063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>404,069</td>
<td>257,979</td>
<td>146,090</td>
<td>21,481,186</td>
<td>22,749,159</td>
<td>(1,267,973)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Emergency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total Receipts</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Receipts (Expenditures)</th>
<th>Cumulative Receipts</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenditures</th>
<th>Cumulative Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2005-06 Balance Forward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,505,771</td>
<td>1,993,120</td>
<td>(487,349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,771</td>
<td>1,993,120</td>
<td>(487,349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>1,505,771</td>
<td>1,993,205</td>
<td>(487,434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,505,771</td>
<td>1,993,120</td>
<td>(487,349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,505,923</td>
<td>1,993,132</td>
<td>(487,209)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total Receipts</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Net Receipts (Expenditures)</th>
<th>Cumulative Receipts</th>
<th>Cumulative Expenditures</th>
<th>Cumulative Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2005-06 Balance Forward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,782,326</td>
<td>21,531,566</td>
<td>(1,749,240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>255,406</td>
<td>288,784</td>
<td>(33,378)</td>
<td>20,037,732</td>
<td>21,200,350</td>
<td>(1,782,618)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>334,528</td>
<td>302,462</td>
<td>32,066</td>
<td>20,372,260</td>
<td>21,422,812</td>
<td>(1,750,552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>347,188</td>
<td>221,178</td>
<td>126,010</td>
<td>20,719,448</td>
<td>22,343,990</td>
<td>(1,624,542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>303,589</td>
<td>320,445</td>
<td>(16,856)</td>
<td>21,023,037</td>
<td>22,664,435</td>
<td>(1,641,398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>282,521</td>
<td>489,999</td>
<td>(207,478)</td>
<td>21,305,558</td>
<td>23,154,434</td>
<td>(1,848,876)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>272,043</td>
<td>231,207</td>
<td>40,836</td>
<td>21,577,601</td>
<td>23,385,641</td>
<td>(1,808,040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>311,247</td>
<td>337,777</td>
<td>(26,530)</td>
<td>21,888,848</td>
<td>23,723,418</td>
<td>(1,834,570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>246,191</td>
<td>313,719</td>
<td>(67,528)</td>
<td>22,135,039</td>
<td>24,037,137</td>
<td>(1,902,098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>223,811</td>
<td>205,756</td>
<td>18,055</td>
<td>22,358,850</td>
<td>24,242,893</td>
<td>(1,884,043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>224,190</td>
<td>241,419</td>
<td>(17,229)</td>
<td>22,583,040</td>
<td>24,484,312</td>
<td>(1,901,272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>404,069</td>
<td>257,979</td>
<td>146,090</td>
<td>22,987,109</td>
<td>24,742,291</td>
<td>(1,755,182)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Finance Department General Ledger

**NOTE:** Amount Pending in JDE: $0

**NOTE:** Amount Received in Lock Box not posted: $0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Collection %</th>
<th>Contractual Amount</th>
<th>Collection %</th>
<th>Collected</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Collection Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 910</td>
<td>468,964</td>
<td>99,940</td>
<td>369,024</td>
<td>300,749</td>
<td>84,13%</td>
<td>1,570,564</td>
<td>26.69%</td>
<td>1,570,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 832</td>
<td>455,891</td>
<td>110,199</td>
<td>345,691</td>
<td>295,675</td>
<td>80.47%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
<td>1,92%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 847</td>
<td>475,075</td>
<td>105,468</td>
<td>369,607</td>
<td>291,448</td>
<td>81.35%</td>
<td>76,458</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>76,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 670</td>
<td>496,959</td>
<td>197,284</td>
<td>308,075</td>
<td>242,611</td>
<td>78.66%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 832</td>
<td>455,891</td>
<td>110,199</td>
<td>345,691</td>
<td>295,675</td>
<td>80.47%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 670</td>
<td>496,959</td>
<td>197,284</td>
<td>308,075</td>
<td>242,611</td>
<td>78.66%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 832</td>
<td>455,891</td>
<td>110,199</td>
<td>345,691</td>
<td>295,675</td>
<td>80.47%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 670</td>
<td>496,959</td>
<td>197,284</td>
<td>308,075</td>
<td>242,611</td>
<td>78.66%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 942</td>
<td>514,924</td>
<td>125,912</td>
<td>389,012</td>
<td>295,675</td>
<td>76.22%</td>
<td>87,605</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
<td>87,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 847</td>
<td>475,075</td>
<td>105,468</td>
<td>369,607</td>
<td>291,448</td>
<td>81.35%</td>
<td>76,458</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>76,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 670</td>
<td>496,959</td>
<td>197,284</td>
<td>308,075</td>
<td>242,611</td>
<td>78.66%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 832</td>
<td>455,891</td>
<td>110,199</td>
<td>345,691</td>
<td>295,675</td>
<td>80.47%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>67,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 670</td>
<td>496,959</td>
<td>197,284</td>
<td>308,075</td>
<td>242,611</td>
<td>78.66%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 942</td>
<td>514,924</td>
<td>125,912</td>
<td>389,012</td>
<td>295,675</td>
<td>76.22%</td>
<td>87,605</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
<td>87,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 847</td>
<td>475,075</td>
<td>105,468</td>
<td>369,607</td>
<td>291,448</td>
<td>81.35%</td>
<td>76,458</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>76,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 670</td>
<td>496,959</td>
<td>197,284</td>
<td>308,075</td>
<td>242,611</td>
<td>78.66%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>84,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Emergency:</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Bills</td>
<td>Billed</td>
<td>Reductions</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Collected</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Write Offs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Gross</td>
<td>% of Net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000-01 Total</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>750,531</td>
<td>275,174</td>
<td>471,357</td>
<td>383,802</td>
<td>81.14%</td>
<td>81.42%</td>
<td>87,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2001-02 Total</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>1,565,522</td>
<td>402,525</td>
<td>862,997</td>
<td>565,995</td>
<td>55.12%</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
<td>97,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>56,319</td>
<td>16,747</td>
<td>39,572</td>
<td>36,110</td>
<td>64.12%</td>
<td>91.25%</td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>85,725</td>
<td>28,758</td>
<td>56,967</td>
<td>47,540</td>
<td>85.49%</td>
<td>83.48%</td>
<td>9,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>77,888</td>
<td>22,824</td>
<td>55,064</td>
<td>46,290</td>
<td>69.82%</td>
<td>84.08%</td>
<td>4,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>81,937</td>
<td>24,932</td>
<td>57,005</td>
<td>51,231</td>
<td>62.52%</td>
<td>89.87%</td>
<td>5,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>86,852</td>
<td>28,485</td>
<td>58,367</td>
<td>50,140</td>
<td>77.73%</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
<td>8,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>63,981</td>
<td>20,386</td>
<td>43,595</td>
<td>37,396</td>
<td>68.49%</td>
<td>88.58%</td>
<td>6,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>79,128</td>
<td>26,134</td>
<td>52,994</td>
<td>46,164</td>
<td>88.34%</td>
<td>87.11%</td>
<td>6,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>59,819</td>
<td>13,373</td>
<td>46,446</td>
<td>35,782</td>
<td>59.82%</td>
<td>77.04%</td>
<td>10,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>54,812</td>
<td>14,360</td>
<td>40,452</td>
<td>31,999</td>
<td>58.38%</td>
<td>79.10%</td>
<td>8,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td>17,333</td>
<td>39,967</td>
<td>38,309</td>
<td>66.86%</td>
<td>95.85%</td>
<td>1,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60,831</td>
<td>17,307</td>
<td>43,524</td>
<td>40,507</td>
<td>66.59%</td>
<td>93.07%</td>
<td>3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50,964</td>
<td>16,743</td>
<td>34,221</td>
<td>30,303</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
<td>88.55%</td>
<td>3,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2002-03 Total</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>815,566</td>
<td>247,282</td>
<td>568,284</td>
<td>491,772</td>
<td>60.30%</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
<td>76,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>58,362</td>
<td>19,983</td>
<td>38,379</td>
<td>36,282</td>
<td>62.17%</td>
<td>94.54%</td>
<td>1,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>51,691</td>
<td>16,142</td>
<td>35,549</td>
<td>30,678</td>
<td>69.35%</td>
<td>86.30%</td>
<td>4,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>42,922</td>
<td>12,705</td>
<td>30,217</td>
<td>28,508</td>
<td>66.42%</td>
<td>94.34%</td>
<td>1,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48,024</td>
<td>12,524</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>32,169</td>
<td>55.62%</td>
<td>88.13%</td>
<td>4,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>41,919</td>
<td>15,422</td>
<td>26,497</td>
<td>24,044</td>
<td>57.36%</td>
<td>90.74%</td>
<td>2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>71.66%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>76.98%</td>
<td>82.24%</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>74.75%</td>
<td>100.03%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>91.79%</td>
<td>100.01%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2003-04 Total</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>252,893</td>
<td>78,561</td>
<td>174,332</td>
<td>158,523</td>
<td>62.88%</td>
<td>90.93%</td>
<td>15,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-01</td>
<td>6,203</td>
<td>4,252,761</td>
<td>6,296,287</td>
<td>1,302,533</td>
<td>84.40%</td>
<td>81.08%</td>
<td>624,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-02</td>
<td>12,047</td>
<td>6,543,356</td>
<td>1,378,085</td>
<td>4,876,271</td>
<td>63.66%</td>
<td>81.57%</td>
<td>858,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-03</td>
<td>11,974</td>
<td>5,922,145</td>
<td>1,296,371</td>
<td>4,625,275</td>
<td>63.85%</td>
<td>81.50%</td>
<td>853,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-04</td>
<td>10,738</td>
<td>5,939,908</td>
<td>1,309,972</td>
<td>4,228,936</td>
<td>63.06%</td>
<td>81.15%</td>
<td>783,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-05</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>5,779,266</td>
<td>1,444,688</td>
<td>4,334,598</td>
<td>58.47%</td>
<td>77.99%</td>
<td>922,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-06</td>
<td>10,547</td>
<td>5,878,284</td>
<td>1,557,886</td>
<td>4,320,398</td>
<td>58.57%</td>
<td>77.98%</td>
<td>952,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-07</td>
<td>10,635</td>
<td>5,919,308</td>
<td>1,663,888</td>
<td>4,255,420</td>
<td>59.72%</td>
<td>78.72%</td>
<td>982,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2006-08</td>
<td>10,738</td>
<td>5,939,908</td>
<td>1,309,972</td>
<td>4,228,936</td>
<td>63.06%</td>
<td>81.15%</td>
<td>783,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The collection amounts for the first twenty months (1-1/2001 to 8-31/2001) do not reflect a reduction of the $100,000 refunded to Medicare as a result of the compliance audit. If that amount were included, the net collections would approximate 63.5% for the first two months.

Grand Totals:
- 73,074
- 39,318,233
- 9,433,319
- 29,884,914
- 22,639,961
- 13,287,050
- 58.09%
- 76.43%
- 1,618,172
- 1,705,802
- 4.34%
- 2,910,439
- 203,674

Accrued Med Total:
- 43,765
- 24,365,360
- 6,216,306
- 18,149,054
- 13,278,560
- 58.48%
- 73.14%
- 1,618,172
- 1,705,802
- 4.34%
- 2,910,439
- 203,674

Note: The collection amounts for the first twenty months (1-1/2001 to 8-31/2001) do not reflect a reduction of the $100,000 refunded to Medicare as a result of the compliance audit. If that amount were included, the net collections would approximate 63.5% for the first two months.

Grants Totals:
- 73,074
- 39,318,233
- 9,433,319
- 29,884,914
- 22,639,961
- 13,287,050
- 58.09%
- 76.43%
- 1,618,172
- 1,705,802
- 4.34%
- 2,910,439
- 203,674

Grand Totals:
- 73,074
- 39,318,233
- 9,433,319
- 29,884,914
- 22,639,961
- 13,287,050
- 58.09%
- 76.43%
- 1,618,172
- 1,705,802
- 4.34%
- 2,910,439
- 203,674

Note: The collection amounts for the first twenty months (1-1/2001 to 8-31/2001) do not reflect a reduction of the $100,000 refunded to Medicare as a result of the compliance audit. If that amount were included, the net collections would approximate 63.5% for the first two months.

Grants Totals:
- 73,074
- 39,318,233
- 9,433,319
- 29,884,914
- 22,639,961
- 13,287,050
- 58.09%
- 76.43%
- 1,618,172
- 1,705,802
- 4.34%
- 2,910,439
- 203,674

Note: The collection amounts for the first twenty months (1-1/2001 to 8-31/2001) do not reflect a reduction of the $100,000 refunded to Medicare as a result of the compliance audit. If that amount were included, the net collections would approximate 63.5% for the first two months.
PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION
NOTIFICATION

TO : Mayor Chris Beutler
Lincoln City Council

FROM : Jean Walker, Planning

DATE : August 3, 2007

RE : Special Permit No. 07026
(Domiciliary Care Facility - S. 25th & Old Cheney Road)
Resolution No. PC-01066

The Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission took the following action at their regular meeting on Wednesday, August 1, 2007:

Motion made by Taylor, seconded by Cornelius, to approve Special Permit No. 07026, with conditions, with amendments, requested by Mark Hunzeker, on behalf of Opus X, Inc., for authority to construct a 31 unit domiciliary care facility for 33 residents (AgeMark Assisted Living) on property generally located at S. 25th Street and Old Cheney Road.

Motion for conditional approval, with amendments, carried 8-0: Cornelius, Larson, Sunderman, Taylor, Krieser, Strand, Carroll, and Carlson voting 'yes'; Esseks absent.

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

Attachment

cc: Building & Safety
Rick Peo, City Attorney
Public Works
Mark Hunzeker, 1045 Lincoln Mall, Suite 200, 68509
Opus X, Inc., 2614 Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94704
Windstream Nebraska, Inc., 4001 Rodney Parham Road, Little Rock, AR 72212
Marty Hug, Agemark <mhug@agemark.com>
Andrew J. Benton II, 5925 Norman Road, 68512
Dr. William and Sharon Gewain, 2601 Cindy Drive, 68512
Dave and Vicki Shank, 5800 S. 25th Street, 68512
Layne and Cheri Nelson, 5835 S. 25th Street, 68512
Brendan McDaniel, 5727 S. 25th Street, 68512
Connie Hansen, UNL, SREC, 102 Mussehl Hall, 68583-0714
James Stevens, 5830 S. 25th Street, 68512
Dr. Steven A. Fischboin, 5905 S. 25th Street, 68512
Lori Edmonds, 5825 S. 25th Street, 68512
Marys Rezaian, 2601 Jacquelyn Drive, 68512
Lee and Renee Saleman, 5820 S. 25th Street, 68512
David Smith, 2521 Cindy Drive, 68512
Paul and Kelly Winkler, 5737 S. 25th Street, 68512
John Elliott, 2511 Cindy Drive, 68512
RESOLUTION NO. PC-07066

SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 07026

WHEREAS, the Opus X, Inc. has submitted an application designated as Special Permit No. 07026 for authority to construct a 31 unit for 33 residents domiciliary care facility on property generally located at S. 25th Street and Old Cheney Road, and legally described to wit:

Lot 2, Chez Ami Knolls 9th Addition, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska;

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

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

WHEREAS, said site plan together with the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth are consistent with the comprehensive plan of the City of Lincoln and with the intent and purpose of Title 27 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.

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

That the application of Opus X, Inc., hereinafter referred to as "Permittee", to develop a 31 unit for 33 residents domiciliary care facility be and the same is hereby granted under the provisions of Section 27.63.530 the Lincoln Municipal Code upon condition that
construction of said domiciliary care facility be in strict compliance with said application, the site
plan, and the following additional express terms, conditions, and requirements:

1. This permit approves a domiciliary care facility for a maximum 31 rooms
for 33 residents, including density bonus as provided by the City Design Standards.

2. The Permittee must:

a. License the domiciliary care facility to comply with all state
requirements for domiciliaries and/or residential care facilities.

b. Remove the circle drive from the front yard setback along S. 25th
Street.

c. Show the fire hydrants required by the Fire Department.

d. Show the minimum amount of parking required as well as any
additional parking stalls.

e. All outdoor lighting shall be full cut-off fixtures and directed
downward to minimize glare.

f. Height of the building shall be limited to one story, not to exceed
25 feet.

g. The building footprint of the main building shall not exceed 19,000
feet.

h. The building exterior shall utilize gable or pitched roofs, residential
style shingles, face brick or stone on a portion of all exterior walls,
multiple roof forms to reduce the scale of the building, and
residential style details. Design shall conform substantially to the
elevations submitted by applicant.

i. Remove fence from the triangle formed by the southeast lot
corner and points 30 feet north and 30 feet west from that corner.
Fence shall not have openings more than 4 inches in width.
3. Before receiving building permits the Permittee must provide a revised and reproducible final plot plan and five copies to the Planning Department showing the following revisions:

   a. Add to the General Notes, “Signs need not be shown on this site plan but need to be in compliance with Chapter 27.69 of the Lincoln Zoning Ordinance, and must be approved by Building & Safety Department prior to installation.”

   b. Provide documentation from the Register of Deeds that the letter of acceptance as required by the approval of the special permit has been recorded.

   c. Provide a landscape screen plan approved by the Director of Planning.

   d. The construction plans must conform to the approved plans.

4. Before occupying this domiciliary care facility all development and construction is to comply with the approved plans.

5. All privately-owned improvements, including landscaping, must be permanently maintained by the Permittee.

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

7. The terms, conditions, and requirements of this resolution shall be binding and obligatory upon the Permittee and the Permittee’s successors and assigns. The building official shall report violations to the City Council which may revoke the special permit or take such other action as may be necessary to gain compliance.

8. The Permittee shall sign and return the City's letter of acceptance to the City Clerk within 60 days following approval of the special permit, provided, however, said 60-
day period may be extended up to six months by administrative amendment. The City Clerk shall file a copy of the resolution approving the special permit and the letter of acceptance with the Register of Deeds, filing fees therefor to be paid in advance by the Permittee.

The foregoing Resolution was approved by the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission on this \textit{1st} day of \textit{August}, 2007.

\begin{flushright}
\textbf{ATTEST:}

\textit{/S/} Original signed by \\
Jon Carlson \\
Chair
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushleft}
Approved as to Form & Legality: \\
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{signature}

Chief Assistant City Attorney
\end{flushleft}
Memorandum

To: Robin Eschliman, City Council
From: Karl Fredrickson, Director of Public Works and Utilities
Date: August 9, 2007
Subject: 84th & Augusta Project

You had posed questions to Dennis Bartels if this development would be precipitating any money on the part of the City and if he was comfortable with the ingress/egress issue.

The right turn lane and traffic signal that would be located at Glynoaks/Augusta Drive and 84th Street will likely cost around $200,000. Since this location is at approximately the half mile point, these improvements would be eligible for impact fee reimbursement from the City. No impact fee water or sewer mains would be required for this project.

During initial meetings regarding the traffic study for this development, City staff stated that the only way an access to 84th Street would be allowed to remain at the Hampton driveway (the proposed location of Lindberg Street, which is not currently an intersection) would be if the traffic study could show that the traffic generated by this development would not operate acceptably without a second access to 84th Street. I spoke with Joe Hampton and his engineer, Dan Rosenthal, who both stated that they “don’t need the driveway for the development to work.”

Neither the initial traffic study nor the subsequent update could show that a secondary access is needed for acceptable traffic operation into or out of this development. Since 84th Street is one of the few north/south streets that run the length of the City, and since it is a truck route which is part of the National Highway System, we feel that managing and limiting access to this street is crucial to ensure that it will continue to be a safe and efficient transportation route long into the future. Minimal impacts from one single driveway can add up to major impacts when multiplied along the entire 84th Street corridor. As a result, Public Works and Utilities continues to oppose the addition of this access onto 84th Street.

cc: City Council Packet
    Dennis Bartels
    Roger Figard
    Randy Hoskins
To: Mayor Chris Beutler; Lincoln City Council Members:
       Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Doug Emery, Robin Eschliman,
       Dan Marvin, John Spatz, Ken Svoboda

We, the Senior Citizens and other Citizens, who have paid taxes
To the city of Lincoln throughout our residency, ask the Mayor
and the City Council to continue the funding for the Maxey
Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center.

Many of us are on low incomes and need the excellent services
of the Maxey Senior Center. Programs such as: nutritious
meals, companionship, recreation and educational programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Street Address; zip code</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana Brown</td>
<td>P.O. 30268 68503</td>
<td>8/16/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience Kellogg</td>
<td>1700 J. St 81601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma York</td>
<td>Yance 930 Yance Ave 68503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean McNeil</td>
<td>6930 Whitney 68521</td>
<td>8/4/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Schreiber</td>
<td>1812 226th 8-6-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamar Payton</td>
<td>1541 N. 14 81407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrle A. Schmit</td>
<td>2050 IND/Creek 68521</td>
<td>8/6/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Lukas</td>
<td>7300 Hodgdon 81407</td>
<td>8/6/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>5239 Belleview 81407</td>
<td>8/6/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>9301 Dekman Rd 81407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc: Council
To: Mayor Chris Beutler; Lincoln City Council Members:
    Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Doug Emery, Robin Eschliman,
    Dan Marvin, John Spatz, Ken Svoboda

We, the Senior Citizens and other Citizens, who have paid taxes
To the city of Lincoln throughout our residency, ask the Mayor
and the City Council to continue the funding for the Maxey Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center.

Many of us are on low incomes and need the excellent services
of the Maxey Senior Center. Programs such as: nutritious
meals, companionship, recreation and educational programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Street Address; zip code</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron Heston</td>
<td>4200 W. Billy Ct. 68524</td>
<td>8-5-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Wohlers</td>
<td>4200 W. Billy Ct. 68524</td>
<td>8-5-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fitchner</td>
<td>7521 S. 32nd St. 68516</td>
<td>8/15/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Christie</td>
<td>2555 Stockwell 68502</td>
<td>8/5/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmie White</td>
<td>3816 Summit</td>
<td>8-5-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Mayor Chris Beutler; Lincoln City Council Members:  
Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Doug Emery, Robin Eschliman,  
Dan Marvin, John Spatz, Ken Svoboda

We, the Senior Citizens and other Citizens, who have paid taxes  
To the city of Lincoln throughout our residency, ask the Mayor  
and the City Council to continue the funding for the Maxey  
Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center.

Many of us are on low incomes and need the excellent services  
of the Maxey Senior Center. Programs such as: nutritious  
meals, companionship, recreation and educational programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Street Address; zip code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>555 S 10th Ave 68507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>7521 S 3rd St (16) 68507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Herschel</td>
<td>4016 Mormon 68507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Polishchuck</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Vanover</td>
<td>8300 Calvert 68506 8-3-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Mont</td>
<td>4000 N 57 St 68507 8-3-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wells</td>
<td>5300 Lehigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Knudsen</td>
<td>1705 S 15th St 68522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Houlton</td>
<td>1714 Benton St 68521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Russell</td>
<td>5545 S 31st St 68504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanna Letcher</td>
<td>7521 S 322 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Munsey</td>
<td>2611 Jacqueline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Mayor Chris Beutler; Lincoln City Council Members:
Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Doug Emery, Robin Eschliman,
Dan Marvin, John Spatz, Ken Svoboda

We, the Senior Citizens and other Citizens, who have paid taxes to the city of Lincoln throughout our residency, ask the Mayor and the City Council to continue the funding for the Maxey Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center.

Many of us are on low incomes and need the excellent services of the Maxey Senior Center. Programs such as: nutritious meals, companionship, recreation and educational programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>zip code</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rick Wilke</td>
<td>3737 Modewick</td>
<td>68510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Hayden</td>
<td>2756 Alpha</td>
<td>68510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helma McHone</td>
<td>930 Peterson #5</td>
<td>68501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Forato</td>
<td>4245 Black Ave.</td>
<td>68501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty Neumeister</td>
<td>418 Carter</td>
<td>68307</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna White</td>
<td>14735 N. 3rd</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice L. Carver</td>
<td>4600 Twenty</td>
<td>LINCOLN</td>
<td>8-3-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerri McWilliam</td>
<td>2320 S St  LINCOLN</td>
<td>8-3-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose A Kubicek</td>
<td>2103 N W 55</td>
<td>LINCOLN</td>
<td>8-3-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie L. Brandish</td>
<td>10540 N 138th</td>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>8-3-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Rediger</td>
<td>4731 Gladstone St</td>
<td>LINCOLN NE</td>
<td>8-3-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Mayor Chris Beutler; Lincoln City Council Members:
Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Doug Emery, Robin Eschliman,
Dan Marvin, John Spatz, Ken Svoboda

We, the Senior Citizens and other Citizens, who have paid taxes
To the city of Lincoln throughout our residency, ask the Mayor
and the City Council to continue the funding for the Maxey
Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center.

Many of us are on low incomes and need the excellent services
of the Maxey Senior Center. Programs such as: nutritious
meals, companionship, recreation and educational programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Street Address; zip code</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. Rhonda</td>
<td>2400 Dudley St. Lincoln, Ne. 68503</td>
<td>8/1/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Fosler</td>
<td>1212 W. 24th, Bridge Ne 68507</td>
<td>8/1/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Adams</td>
<td>1048 Claremont Lincoln, Ne 68508</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice M. Tesman</td>
<td>5727 Holdridge St. 68505</td>
<td>8/2/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Brown</td>
<td>5401 W. Hughes Line 68524</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Gansser</td>
<td>2710 S. 9 68502</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada M. Robinson</td>
<td>927 Newport Blvd 68521</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Copr</td>
<td>440 W. Beat Lincoln, Ne 68521</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Eames</td>
<td>7125 Oxford Rd Lincoln 68506</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcella Fetter</td>
<td>4401 S. 49th 68524</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Marshall</td>
<td>2415y St. 68503</td>
<td>8/3/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Mayor Chris Beutler; Lincoln City Council Members:  
Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Doug Emery, Robin Eschliman,  
Dan Marvin, John Spatz, Ken Svoboda

We, the Senior Citizens and other Citizens, who have paid taxes  
To the city of Lincoln throughout our residency, ask the Mayor  
and the City Council to continue the funding for the Maxey  
Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center.

Many of us are on low incomes and need the excellent services  
of the Maxey Senior Center. Programs such as: nutritious  
meals, companionship, recreation and educational programs.

NAME 66 years old  Street Address; zip code  DATE
Retired from State Office, w/Serious Arthritis, I need this  
program!

Joe Maxey 8414 "T" Lincoln, NE 68503
Holland & 13th and 8th 2926 Apple 68503
To: Mayor Chris Beutler; Lincoln City Council Members:
Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Doug Emery, Robin Eschliman,
Dan Marvin, John Spatz, Ken Svoboda

We, the Senior Citizens and other Citizens, who have paid taxes
To the city of Lincoln throughout our residency, ask the Mayor
and the City Council to continue the funding for the Maxey
Senior Diner program at the Malone Community Center.

Many of us are on low incomes and need the excellent services
of the Maxey Senior Center. Programs such as: nutritious
meals, companionship, recreation and educational programs.

Sherry Bradley 1745 N. 28th St. Lincoln, NE 68503 8/13/07
NAME _______________________________ Street Address: ____________________________ zip code __________ DATE __________

I feel cutting this program is very unfair! These people enjoy and look forward to socializing and for some it's all they have. I'd appreciate it if you could reconsider your decision.

Thank you!

Sherry Bradley
August 6, 2007

To: Members of City Council  
From: Don Tilley, 4533 Starr, Lincoln, NE 68503 466 6622  
RE: Elder citizens in Lincoln

The mayor made an inhumane, careless decision about cutting the $278,000. Please restore it.

1. How many persons in the lower 1/3 financially category are in East Mount Towers, Legacy, etc. Answer: Probably zero. To take away the $278,000 for Senior Health Care services will especially be a burden placed on the backs of the poor -- that’s where they receive services that they cannot afford. Let’s don’t punish the poor because they are poor.

2. How much money will it cost the City of Lincoln to cut the $278,000? According to experienced nurses I interviewed, the cost will probably add well over a million dollars in extra costs to the City of Lincoln for hospital, doctors -- for not addressing ailments in their earlier stages. It’s short range versus long range.

3. How much of our money in Lincoln and in Nebraska that we send to Washington is not being returned to us? We expect the Feds to efficiently use our money -- as they do with Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. But our money is being squandered in Washington on a lie. That’s hard to take. The war in Iraq has now cost us 1/2 a trillion dollars. Economists estimate that it will eventually cost us 1.5 trillion. Nebraska’s share would be ten billion dollars for this war. Now do you see the impact on Lincoln? The money, our money, is not being returned to us for these social programs. The mayor and the city council in unbelievable bind trying to pay for programs that we sent to Washington to be returned to us. This war has become a local issue.

4. Do you want the senior citizens home as it’s currently planned for the ½ block on the other side of Nebraska Book Store and St. Mark’s Episcopal Church? In the focus group of 15 that I was in last week I could see that it’s very tradition and it doesn’t represent the best in the world (we need to know the options). It is not linked the advantages from the University. Could the city council facilitate more than it regulates? Get the vision and see possible options that could be made available.

Copy for cc
TO: City Council Members
FROM: Dave Landis, Urban Development Department
DATE: August 6, 2007
RE: 48th & O Status

Dear Council members, on the South side we will sign a concluding agreement wrapping up all expenses and reimbursing Runza and the Bank for landscaping this Monday at 1:15. This is in lieu of a disputed claim they wanted paid and about which we had not received documentation establishing our obligation to pay. We will also have the concluding part of a federal grant dedicated to this site that will let us run water to our public space. We are now receiving water courtesy of a hose running from the Bank.

On the North side, we have received a response to our invitation for offers. The offer we received, however, did not mirror the terms and documentation we had outlined in our invitation. Rather than agree to terms different from those we publicly announced, we declined the offer. We have met with the interested party and discussed ways of proceeding. There is a right turn lane that the developer will need to build and we will have to amend our plans by accepting the reality of an access between 50th and 48th. This is something we had hoped to avoid to keep traffic flow on O as safe and quick as possible.

I have a recommendation on how to proceed with disposal of the land and will make it to the Mayor once the budget is done and attention can turn to this matter. I am working on a public process to sell the land in a manner that treats all interested parties equally. One in which the terms do not vary depending on whom we are speaking to. I think we can do this forthwith. If this is not dispositive of your question I am available to respond to other queries as you see fit.
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name: Concerned Citizen
Address: 123 Anywhere
City: Lincoln, NE 68501
Phone: 
Fax: 
Email: 

Comment or Question:
In regards to your upcoming approval of Mayor Beutler's nominees to the County/City Planning Commission: Mary Stand's (I believe an associate of Woods Brothers/Home Services) term is one of the three terms that are expiring this month...of the three nominee's for those replacements are Wendy Francis & Robert Moline both of whom are associated with Home Services, Moline being the CEO and Francis a sales person from Woods Brothers. They may both be very qualified to sit on the Commission, but I find it very unsettling to have one company with that much influence. Even if only one of them were ultimately approved by the Council, it would give Homes Services 12 years of uninterrupted influence. If they are both allowed to serve, one company would effectively have more than 22% of the influence for the next 6 years. Are there not other "as qualified" persons in this community to fill these positions.
Dear City Council Members,

I am dismayed that the budget for the senior center is being cut.

It has meant a lot to my husband and me to be able to go to the clinic for basic foot care. And, for many, the clinic is their main source of care.

It seems that those with less money and influence are being singled out. But, projects that bring millions of dollars to the city are retained.

The city also has an investment in the building & equipment.

Many letters have been written in protest to the editor regarding the closing of the centers. I add my voice to those.

Sincerely,

Sue Silley
4533 Starr St.
Lincoln, NE 68503
To: Members of the City Council  
Re: SW waste treatment plant funding in CIP

I write this to express my concern and opposition to the fact that funding has been included in the CIP for the first stage of a proposed SW sewage treatment facility, namely a holding basin, without the cost-benefit analysis study voted for by the city council last year. My understanding was that this study would help determine if indeed a new facility was needed at all, or whether existing facilities would better be improved and expanded. Many municipalities are finding consolidation at one site to be better and cheaper in the long-run, so I am concerned that this new study has not been forthcoming, which money was allocated for. Please do not allow this to be pushed through without a well informed study.

Thank you for your vigilant service,  
Janine Copple  
Member, Friends of Wilderness Park  
920 S. 8th St.  
Lincoln, NE  
68508
DATE: August 6, 2007

TO: City Council Members of the City of Lincoln, Nebraska
   The Honorable Dan Marvin, Council Chair
   The Honorable Robin Eschliman, Vice-Chair
   The Honorable Jonathan Cook
   The Honorable Ken Svoboda
   The Honorable Jon Camp
   The Honorable Doug Emery
   The Honorable John Spatz

SUBJECT: Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission

The Marin Women's Commission has become aware that the Lincoln-Lancaster Women's Commission (LLWC) is being reconsidered for funding by the City Council of Lincoln, Nebraska. We also understand that the LLWC has been funded in the past by both City and County resources. The Marin Women's Commission is very aware of LLWC and its Executive Director, Bonnie Coffey, through our work with the National Association of Commission on Women's (NACW). In fact, we have been honored to serve with Bonnie Coffey, in her tenure as Secretary and President of NACW through our Region 9 NACW Director, Cecilia Zamora, a Marin Women's Commissioner since 1995.

You may well know that the Lincoln-Lancaster Women's Commission is considered one of the most effective and outstanding women's commissions across the country. In fact, many women's commissions have used LLWC's programs and projects as a model for the "status of women" work that we are responsible for in our own states, counties and cities. The Marin Women's Commission, for example, successfully replicated the "Women Vote" campaign initiated and shared by LLWC through the NACW network.

Bonnie Coffey, as the director of the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission and as president of the National Association of Commissions for Women serves as a visionary and innovative leader with integrity and commitment. She was responsible for bringing the very successful 2006 National Meeting and Convention of the National Association of Commissions for Women to the City of Lincoln, Nebraska. At that convention, national sponsors, women leaders and commission members were proud to see first-hand the Lincoln City Council prioritizes its agenda for women and girls in Lincoln, Nebraska, by maintaining and supporting the LLWC.
The issues and projects of the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission have served as a model for commissions for women nationwide. In addition, LLWC played a prominent role in the United Nation’s 51st Convening of the U.N’s Commission on the Status of Women, March 2007, where an NACW Panel moderated by Bonnie Coffey was well-received by women and men from across the globe who seek to employ the models of NACW Commissions for the empowerment of women and girls in their countries, regions and villages. To have this honor bestowed on NACW during Ms. Coffey’s tenure as NACW President is very indicative of her leadership and the role it plays not only in your community but now across the country and, indeed, around the world.

It is our hope that the City Council of the City of Lincoln, Nebraska, will stand tall for the thousands of women who benefit from the resources and services of the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission, and continue to fund the important Commission. To act to the contrary would be detrimental to the women and girls of Lincoln, Nebraska, and in fact, to your entire constituency.

Marin Women's Commission, the Women's Commissions across the country, as well as women leaders and corporate friends and sponsors of NACW, are hopeful that the thoughtful deliberations of the Lincoln City Council will result in the re-funding of the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

Marti Rule, Chair
Marin Women's Commission

Cecilia Zamora, NACW Director, Region 9
Marin Women's Commission

cc: Bonnie Coffey, Executive Director, Lincoln-Lancaster Women's Commission
At today's City Council budget hearing it was pointed out that the Lifetime budget cut would reduce my taxes **less than** $2 per $100,000 valued home per year.

I cannot invest my $2 ‘savings’ in anything that would net me more value than what Lifetime is bringing. If that $2 tax increase would cause someone to lose their house than that person would definitely qualify for the Homestead exemption.

Remember the County Commissioners raised our taxes without any consequences. So can you, because Lifetime is certainly more important than a horse barn!

Russell Miller  
341 S. 52  
daytime 499-2611
Dear City Council Members,

We are writing to you asking you to please do not cut the Lifetime Services from the Lincoln Area Agency on Aging. We believe this service is vital to our health and well-being.

Seniors have worked hard and paid taxes all our working years, and now that we need these services, we don't want to have them taken away. Why would you cut this program and give so much to the illegal aliens who break the laws and still get so many free services?

We are in Lincoln often, because we have two daughters who live there. We may end up there permanently to be by them since our health is not what it once was. We know they would be more comfortable with this if they knew their parents had some outside support.

We attended the Senior Fair there this year and felt it was very important. We would not have been able to afford some of the health tests such as...
Cholesterol and calcium which showed
that Sandy needed to do something about
both levels.

We believe that if seniors have
places to go and things to do together,
we won't be so depressed and lonely which
in turn affects health and saves on the
medical expenses & maybe even mental
illness or hospitalization or worse.
We really need companionship and
things to do together to take the
pressure off our busy, working families.
Maybe you could quit spending so
much on decorations, flowers and the
like on the city landscapes - roads and
put that towards your living,
feeling and still important humans,
who are formerly hard working, worthy
& still voting seniors.

Sincerely,
Don & Sandy Bock
TO: LINCOLN CITY COUNCIL/MAYOR

Don't Cut Funding to the People That Have Served the City of Lincoln Well and Paid Taxes all these years and Still Do! Quality Services Such as Senior Centers Provide MORE than a Meal, it is People Caring! For People, we care that someone has not been heard from for a while, and go call them, or see if they are ok. By going in person to check.

We are NOT Numbers to just be shuffled around, we ARE Actual People. Believe it or Not! Oh, and WE DO VOTE Too!

Lorie Millenstein
APT 28
3541 North 9th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68521

RECEIVED
AUG 06 2007
CITY COUNCIL OFFICE

ACTIVE AGE PARTICIPANT
# Mayor and City Council

## Comparison Shopping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belmont Active Age Program</th>
<th>Lifetime Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Congregate meals</td>
<td>Duplication of services that are provided at Belmont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Screenings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent support base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation between Aging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation and Belmont school on using the same facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,
Mercedes L.
John Spatz + other Council Members,

I dare you to find a well-balanced, generous, portioned nutritious meal for $2-3/ each week day. I do not drive and am provided with transportation to and from the center. I can find this at Belmont Active Age and I depend on this nourishment and the nourishment of my soul that I receive from this program and its caring manager. Have Councilwoman Robin Eschelman count the fat grams in a meal at McDonald's. Would that be a suggestion. She would give to one of her senior family members.

Shame on you!

Betty G.
Dear John Spatz, City Council, Mayor,

Please make sure when you are campaigning for re-election that you emphasize and stress your support for concrete, dirt, a new hotel and shopping developments over direct, daily unduplicated and affordable services for the older adults in the Lincoln Community. You appear to have no comprehension, empathy or foresight as to their importance in terms of preventative and maintenance of independence for older adults.

From,
T. Buck
Mayor and City Council,

A couple upper management administrative positions in Aging, which are wasteful and unnecessary, could save some of the daily service delivery to older adults through ActivAge Programs. Why does the Aging Division require nine accountants to run their agency when Parks and Recreation uses two or three?

Jeane C.
City Council,

In the next 10-15 years when your older adult population continues to skyrocket and many of them are lower income, hungry and lonely - where will they receive necessary services on a daily basis?

The Aging Program's purpose is to take care of those who are older.

Guess what? As you age and have taken away all the affordable locations and services - you all may be out on the street!

I would hate to be your parent or grandparent! What a lack of care and concern for the older voters and taxpayers. You are crippling our community with your
Selling out. I hope you all are booted out of office the sooner, the better.

Evelyn K.
August 6, 2007

Dan Marvin, Chair  
Lincoln City Council  
555 S. 10th Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508

RE: Continued funding of the Commission for Women

Dear Mr. Marvin:

I am writing to ask your support for the continuation of a Commission for Women in your city, Lincoln. My knowledge of the work of the Lincoln-Lancaster Commission for Women goes back many years:

- From 1982 to 1989 as a member of the Board of the National Association of Commissions for Women, including three years as President.
- Now as Executive Director of the California Commission since 2001

During all of these years, Nebraska has been blessed to have two fine Commissions – yours and the state’s – working on behalf of Nebraska Women. It was with dismay that we recently learned of the defunding of the Nebraska State Commission. The even more recent decision by Lancaster County not to fund their portion of your Commission was a disappointment not only to women in Nebraska, but also to the many other women who know of the value of your Commission and the leadership model it has been to other Commissions nationwide.

At a budget hearing three years ago during California’s budget crisis, I was asked, “Well, Ms. Wiberg, the Commission was established in 1965. Haven’t these issues about women pretty much been taken care of by now?” My answer was that, unfortunately, that was not the case. It is true throughout the entire nation that women continue to face many critical issues. These include:

- Violence against women, including teen dating violence
- Lack of adequate access to health care
- Increases in the incarceration of women and girls
- Lack of financial literacy
- Higher levels of poverty, especially for older women
- Long term care and aging
- Teen pregnancy and parenting, among many others.

Your Commission for Women has been using its very limited resources to specifically address women and economics, a major factor in almost every issue facing all girls and women.

Providing women with financial tools and skills to ensure their financial security is a step toward the vision of ultimately reducing their need for public assistance of all kinds. Lincoln women are served well through this strategy.

On a separate note, I would like to comment on the leadership Bonnie Coffey has provided to your community. She is a strong leader and one who manages resources well. At the national level, she has also demonstrated outstanding leadership ability and has effectively worked to eliminate a budget deficit and build partnerships with other organizations, business and industry. Her election to a second term as President recognizes those leadership skills.
Budget deficits are not pleasant for anyone. As you make your important deliberations, consider that the money you as a City Council invest in funding the Commission is a demonstration of your commitment to Lincoln women and their positive future. Please vote to support the Commission.

Sincerely,

Mary M. Wiberg
Executive Director
Dear Lincoln City Council Members

First, thank you for the hard work you have done on the city budget. Commitment of funds to aggressive urban renewal projects has predictably drained city resources and left us unable to pay for the frills in the budget. While I’m sure that the programs for the aged are popular and well attended you will find that to be true whenever a thing is given for free. There will always be unlimited demand for a free service. Were the city to offer a free "butt-kicking" there would be eventually be a demand. The question you need to ask is "Are these programs a proper and legitimate use of tax dollars". Viewed through that lens I think you will have to conclude that "toe nail clipping for the aged" or "free butt-kickings" are not essential functions of government. More over, many of these seniors likely have the resources to pay for these services but from a sense of entitlement refuse to. I have seen first hand, seniors refuse to pay for needed physical therapy after the limits of insurance because of a belief that they shouldn't have to pay for their own care.

Many of these same seniors will encourage you to go ahead and raise property taxes to pay for their toenail clipping and yoga classes. It’s important to ask how many are actually paying property taxes. Even if they own their own homes, many if not most, have homestead tax exemptions. I’m sure there are more than a few with net worth in the high 6 figures who qualify for a homestead exemption. Meanwhile the working man earning $40,000 gets handed a higher property tax bill.

As painful as it may seem it’s time for this city to put the breaks on spending. Since the city was unwilling to put high-ticket projects such as Antelope Valley to a vote of the people the revenue shortfalls must be made up somewhere else. Public service employees, children and the elderly have long been recipients of governmental largess. Where else can you look for the funds?

Sincerely,

Dave Oenbring
Lincoln, NE

faber est quisque fortunae suae
The Honorable Dan Marvin and Members of the Lincoln City Council:

On behalf of the Commission for Women of Montgomery County, Maryland, I write to urge continued funding and staffing for the Lincoln Lancaster Women's Commission. The LLWC has provided excellent service to and advocacy for over half the residents of the City of Lincoln and Lancaster County for years. It is viewed by Commissions for Women across the nation as a model of extraordinary responsiveness and quality public service.

A budget officer for the City of Lincoln advises that the proposed tax supported budget for the city this year is $131 million, and that the proposed budget for the LLWC is $82,000. We understand that until now, the Commission's budget had been $164,000, but that Lancaster County has unconscionably terminated its share of this funding.

It is important to note that a budget of $82,000 is less than one tenth of one percent of the total budget for the City of Lincoln. No matter what the current fiscal picture is, that tiny amount would make almost no difference and could surely be found from some other source that would not require the elimination of the only program in city government designed specifically to provide a voice for the women of your community. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau indicates that there are 125,188 women and girls living in Lincoln (as of 2003). The $82,000 proposed budget for the LLWC represents an investment of less than $1.53 per woman and girl per year. Yet, that tiny amount pays for an extraordinary amount of service to over half the population of your city.

We urge you to continue the full funding of the Lincoln Lancaster Commission for Women.

Regina L. Oldak, Esq., President
Montgomery County Commission for Women
401 North Washington Street - Suite 100
Rockville, MD 20850
My mother is an Attorney for the county, and I work as a nurse in Lincoln, providing me with Monday August 6th off. I have lived in Lincoln all my life, and recently had a son with my wife, who is 8 month sold. I brought Jack down to see grandma in her office at the city/county building, and noticed the news trucks outside, reminding me of the budget meetings that were going on. I stepped inside and watched for about 5 minutes with my son, and quickly was reminded of what a great country we live in and how special democracy is. Only in America does every single person have a say in how the government is being run.

What I wanted to pass along is that I know you are being inundated with people trying to tell you why this budget or that department does not deserve to be cut. However I want to say to each of you how very proud I am that you are stepping up and keeping the budget in check. If a private business were facing a financial shortfall, that business would simply have to trim its spending. The government should be no different. This means tough decisions, but you are doing the right thing. I also applaud you on making each department take part in this, including public safety. They should be held accountable just as much as every other department.

Thank you for keeping spending in line, and keeping the budget in check.

Rick Tast

Be a better Heartthrob. Get better relationship answers from someone who knows. Yahoo! Answers - Check it out.
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name: Harlan Milder
Address: 1915 Garfield Street
City: Lincoln, NE 68502

Phone:
Fax:
Email: harmild@aol.com

Comment or Question:
I just wanted to let you know that I am very supportive of the efforts of the Mayor and Council to cut costs rather than raise taxes. Yes, even the police and fire departments can do with a little less. The proposed cuts in recreational activities for the elderly should be shored up by faith based initiatives and/or city use fees. It's time that we operate government like a business and cut costs during lean times. Thanks for your efforts.
Please find attached a joint press release from The Friends of Wilderness Park and The Nebraska Land Trust.

The two groups will be sponsoring an informational meeting on the Nebraska Land Trust and conservation easements on August 23 at 7:00 p.m., at the Roca Village Hall. The meeting is open to the public.

- Press Release 8.7.07.doc
Press Release
August 7, 2007

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Nebraska Land Trust contact:
  Dave Sands (402) 438-5263, (402) 430-3931, dsandsnlt@alltel.net

Friends of Wilderness Park contact:
  Mike Carlin (402) 420-9092, mcarlin@neb.rr.com

Time May Run Out on Conservation Tax Benefits for Farmers and Ranchers

Farmers, ranchers, and landowners who want to permanently protect agricultural, natural, and historic resources on their land from development, have until December 31, 2007, to benefit from enhanced tax deductions for the donation of voluntary land preservation agreements known as conservation easements. Landowners who want to learn more about the tax incentive and conservation easements are invited to attend a public information meeting on August 23 at 7:00 p.m., to be held at the Roca Village Hall.

In August of 2006, Congress passed a law designed to make the tax benefits for the donation of conservation easements more useful to landowners with modest incomes, especially farmers and ranchers. The new tax rules allow landowners to use the deduction in the year the easement is donated and any unused portion can be carried forward for 15 years. The old law only allowed a carry forward period of five years.

In addition, the new rule allows annual deductions to equal 100% of a farmer or rancher’s income, whereas the old rules limited the deduction to 30% of annual income in a given year. Other landowners also have 16 years to use up the deduction, but their annual deduction for an easement is limited to 50% of their Annual Gross Income. If a new law is not passed, these tax incentives will expire at year end.

Many landowners and conservation organizations are hoping the tax benefits will be extended, because under the old rules, it was nearly impossible to use up a large deduction if the landowner had a modest income. A bipartisan effort is underway in
Congress to make the new rules permanent, starting with a bill introduced in January by Senate Finance Committee Chair Max Baucus (D-MT) and cosponsored by Finance Committee Ranking Member Charles Grassley (R-IA). Congressmen Mike Thompson (D-CA) and Dave Camp (R-MI) have introduced similar legislation in the House and the proposal has support from the Bush Administration as well.

“Conservation easements work,” said Rep. Camp. “Without this land preservation tool, some of the nation’s most pristine environmental and agricultural properties would have been lost to commercial development. For the sake of future generations, we need to make this new law permanent and continue to encourage land conservation.”

“America’s agricultural lands and open spaces are being swallowed up by development at an alarming rate,” said Rep. Thompson. “Conservation easements are slowing that trend, but it can take time for landowners to implement them. By making this law permanent, we are ensuring a consistent and stable tax policy for landowners who protect their property from development.”

Private conservation agreements have proven to be a valuable tool for protecting land. When landowners donate these voluntary agreements, they protect resources important to the public by giving up future development rights, but they still retain ownership and management of the land. According to a recent census by the Land Trust Alliance, private lands protected by local and state land trusts through permanent conservation agreements have risen 148% from 2,514,566 acres in 2000, to 6,245,969 acres in 2005. Additional acres have been protected by national land trusts like the Nature Conservancy.

The new law has probably had some effect on landowner interest in conservation easements in Nebraska, reports Dave Sands, Executive Director of the Nebraska Land Trust. “In the first six months of 2007, we’ve had as many landowner inquiries as in all of 2006 combined,” he said. “Much of this is simply due to increased landowner awareness, but some of the interest is definitely driven by the new tax incentive.”

Sands also offered a word of advice to landowners who intend to pursue a tax deduction for a donated easement. “Qualified appraisals are used to determine the easement’s value and they will be held to a very high standard,” he explained, “so it is essential to hire an appraiser that has experience or education in this area.”

“Above all,” Sands continued, “a landowner must be 100% sure that they want to see their farm, ranch, historic site, or wildlife habitat protected from development forever.” “It can take many years for a landowner to reach this decision but for those who have, there has never been a better time to donate a conservation easement on their land.”

The informational meeting at the Roca Village Hall on August 23 is being sponsored by the Nebraska Land Trust and the Friends of Wilderness Park. Landowners who would like more information on the meeting, conservation easements, and the tax benefits are encouraged to call the Nebraska Land Trust at (402) 438-5263.

###
Dear City Council,

Thank you for your service.

I noticed in the paper this a.m. about Pershing decisions of which I was not aware.

Pershing is a concern of mine as it seems it is busy every week-end which I am sure also brings in money to the merchants. My biggest concern is I am wondering where these smaller groups will go as the arena will be too big and costly, I am sure.

The Oakridge Boys would be one example--they had a crowd of 2500--too big for the Lied Center. It does not seem appropriate to ask for any tax dollars for a new arena when we are not meeting our "needs" as police officers.

Best regards,

Deanna McClintick
August 6, 2007

City of Lincoln Council
565 South 10th Street
Room 111
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Dear Madams and Gentlemen:

Please see the attached which expresses my concerns.
August 6, 2007

Honorable Chris Beutler
Mayor of Lincoln
565 South 10th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Dear Sir:

After reading in our local newspaper concerning the closing of Dawes and Saratoga schools I was more than upset I was incensed. Why was I incensed - everytime there is a need to save taxpayer money it is to close or remove something in areas where a large majority of Lincoln's low income persons live. I have been to Dawes School many times to attend various events and was always impressed by the intelligence and abilities of the students. If the reason for closing Dawes and Saratoga Schools is due to lack of students why can't some of the "elite" persons children be bussed to one or other of these fine schools or would it lower them too much to be known to attend these schools. It is very upsetting to me that children of low income parents are placed on a lower rank than the children of high income parents who live and go to schools on the southside of Lincoln.

I believe the closing of these schools in wrong, wrong and should not be done or even considered to/the right thing to do.

One other item being considered is the closing of Kuklin swimming pool. The children in and around this pool should have the right to summer fun as well as children in other areas of Lincoln. Many of these children have no means of transportation to go to some other swimming pool. Seems to me that Kuklin was repaired not too long ago so to me the repairs were a large waste of taxpayer money. Please keep Kuklin Pool open.

I would be very happy to discuss these matters with you personally. You name the time and place and I will be there.

Very truly yours,

Marta Paxton

6721 L Street
Apt. 316
466-3178

PS: In the alternative of a personal meeting, may I at least be given a return letter. Thank you.
What is happening? Why are the lives of women not important enough to merit support from this city? Inequities in salaries, education and health care need to be addressed. Support for battered women, victims of violent attack and systematic abuse are essential to the wellbeing of the community. Nebraska has been one of the areas I had considered for retirement.
Dear Council,

I grew up in the midwest, South Dakota, and have always been proud of the good common sense that our prairie heritage gives us. So it makes no sense to me at all that you would vote to defund the Women’s Commission? I could understand it if you were able to announce that there was no need for it because: half of the city council is composed of women; half of the state legislature is composed of women; half of the Federal Congress is composed of women; half of the Fortune 500 officers and directors on boards are women; you get the idea. That day has not arrived. Rwanda has more representation in its parliament than any country in the world with 48%. A democracy is all about representation. Women and girls are under-represented in every area of public discourse.

Please do not defund your commission.

Sincerely, Ellen Snortland, author of “Beauty Bites Beast”, and writer for Ms. Magazine
Dear Councilmembers:

I was horrified to learn that you have terminated the Women's Commission. Instead of moving forward to ensure that men and women are treated fairly, you have taken a giant step backward. This is truly a sad day for Lincoln City, the state of Nebraska and for our country.

R. Chanon
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name:       Mel Antrim
Address:    6201 Normal Blvd.
City:       Lincoln, NE  68506

Phone:
Fax:
Email:      scriptrmel@aol.com

Comment or Question:

Regarding ending Sr. Health Services --- Take some time. Visit personally. Get first hand information. Know for sure what you are doing. Are you cutting in the right place?
I'm 76 years old and have only infrequently used Sr. Health, but the times I've been there and actually seen for myself the needs fulfilled, leads me to ask you not to eliminate these very needed services.
ADDENDUM TO DIRECTORS’ AGENDA
MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 2007

I. MAYOR -

1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: City Earns Gold Medal From ComputerWorld-Lincoln praised for use of mobile devices.

2. NEWS ADVISORY - RE: Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule Week of August 11 through 17, 2007-Schedule subject to change.

3. NEWS RELEASE - RE: 10TH Street Viaduct From Charleston To “R” Street To Close Wednesday - Oak Creek Bridge at 14th and Saunders to reopen Tuesday.


II. CITY CLERK - NONE

III. CORRESPONDENCE -

A. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE -

JON CAMP

1. E-Mail from Dave Bode - RE: Thank you for your service to city taxpayers - Budget cuts.

B. DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS -

HEALTH

1. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Hot Weather Alert.

C. MISCELLANEOUS -

1. E-Mail from Sarah Bauman - RE: Budget topic.

2. E-Mail from Pat Henry - RE: Agency on Aging.

3. E-Mail from Roma L. Niel, member, Business & Professional Women of America, Needles, CA - RE: Please reconsider your vote to decommission the Women Funding.

5. E-Mail from Jan Ekeler, RN, BSN - RE: Lifetime Health Program.

6. E-Mail from Ria Severance - RE: Please reconsider to fund the Women’s Commission.

7. E-Mail from Renee G. Koel, Ph.D. - RE: Please reconsider to fund the Women’s Commission.

8. E-Mail & Attached Letter from Mary Roseberry-Brown - RE: Thank you for your unanimous vote 08/08/07 to remove the $5.6 million, “Southwest Wastewater Facility Improvements” item from the CIP proposed budget for 2007/08-2012/2013.
Mayor Chris Beutler has announced that the City of Lincoln has been awarded the prestigious Laureate Gold Medal by the Computerworld Honors Program. The City earned the award for its development of software applications that can be accessed from Internet-enabled mobile devices by citizens and government workers in the field.

Lincoln was nominated for the honor by the Palm Corporation for the work of the Information Services Division in delivering real-time information to mobile devices such as Treo Smartphones. Information that can be accessed by mobile devices from InterLinc, the City-County Web site, includes animal tag look-up, street finder with maps, traffic cameras, polling places, property tax information and parcel maps with aerial photos. The Web site address is lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: mobile).

“For years, our Information Services Division has been a leader in helping us deliver timely and cost-efficient information to the citizens of Lincoln and Lancaster County in a customer-friendly way,” said Mayor Beutler. “We can all take pride in fact that the City is being recognized nationally and internationally for keeping up with technology advances to better serve the public.”

Computerworld is a technology management magazine and online service (www.computerworld.com). Each year, the top 100 Chairmen and CEOs of global technology companies nominate individuals and organizations from around the world for information technology applications that promote positive social and economic progress. The achievements honored are preserved and protected in national archives and at more than 350 universities, museums and research institutions throughout the world.

“Each laureate selected for this honor understands the importance of using one’s resources and technical prowess to benefit one’s fellow man,” said Bob Carrigan, Chairman of the Computerworld Honors Program Committee.

Information Services Systems Coordinator Terry Lowe accepted the award on behalf of the City and County at the 19th Annual Laureate Medal Ceremony in June in Washington D.C.
Date: August 10, 2007
Contact: David Norris, Citizen Information Center, 441-7547

Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule
Week of August 11 through 17, 2007
Schedule subject to change

Saturday, August 11
• Lincoln Area Agency on Aging RSVP volunteer recognition, remarks - 10:30 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott Hotel, 333 S. 13th St.

Monday, August 13
• Mayor’s Award of Excellence presentation - 1:30 p.m., Council Chambers, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St.

Tuesday, August 14
• KFOR “Lincoln Live” - 12:30 p.m., Three Eagles Communications, 3800 Cornhusker Hwy.

Wednesday, August 15
• Lincoln Chamber of Commerce Celebrate Business 2007 luncheon, remarks - 11:30 a.m., Cornhusker Marriott Hotel
• Cotner Center 25th Anniversary of conversion of “old” Bethany School - 6:30 p.m., 1540 N. Cotner Blvd.

Thursday, August 16
• News Conference - 10 a.m., topic and location to be determined
• Mayor’s Committee for International Friendship 40th Anniversary dinner, remarks - 6 p.m., UNL East Campus Union (Great Plains room)

Friday, August 17
• Ribbon-cutting for renovations at south Wal-Mart, remarks - 7:30 a.m., 8700 Andermatt Dr.
Beginning at 9 a.m. Wednesday, August 15, the 10th Street Viaduct from Charleston to “R” streets will close to vehicular traffic for paving repair. The viaduct is expected to reopen the next day (Thursday, August 16) at 6 a.m.

During this brief road closure, southbound traffic on 10th Street will be detoured to 14th Street on Military Road, then south on 14th Street to Salt Creek Roadway, then west to 9th Street. Northbound traffic on 10th Street will be detoured to 14th Street on Salt Creek Roadway, then north to Military Road, then west to 10th Street.

In conjunction with this paving project, the Oak Creek Bridge at North 14th and Saunders Avenue is tentatively scheduled to reopen to vehicular traffic at 3 p.m. Tuesday, August 14. The Oak Creek Bridge had been closed since Wednesday, July 18 for resurfacing.

For more information on City road construction projects, check the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: projects).
Mayor Chris Beutler today said traffic safety improvements have led to a decrease in crashes in Lincoln. Beutler and the City Public Works and Utilities Department today released the results of the 2005 crash study for the City. The City experienced 8,539 crashes in 2005, the lowest number since 1992. Despite an increase in population and vehicle miles traveled, the number of crashes in the City has not increased.

Beutler released the study at a news conference at the roundabout at 33rd Street and Sheridan Boulevard. The Federal Highway Administration is submitting the project for the 2007 National Roadway Safety Awards. (See attached letter.)

“Over the last 20 years, the number of vehicle miles traveled every day in Lincoln has gone from 2.18 million to 4.27 million, but the number of crashes has remained flat,” said Mayor Beutler.

“The annual crash study shows us that the traffic safety improvements that have been implemented are making a difference in reducing injuries and saving lives. The study also gives us the data we need to decide where our limited resources can best be used in the future.”

The following table shows the City crash statistics over time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>4,211</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>5,728</td>
<td>5,048</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>5,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reportable*</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,539</td>
<td>9,044</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>9,283</td>
<td>9,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-reportable crashes are those in which no one was killed or injured and the estimated cost of damage is less than $975 (2005). That number has been adjusted through the years for inflation.

The number of vehicle/bicycle crashes has decreased from 166 in 1985 to 115 in 2005. The number of vehicle/pedestrian crashes has decreased from 130 in 1985 to 81 in 2005.
The estimated monetary loss to the public as a result of all crashes in 2005 is $180 million. That reflects wage loss, medical and administrative expenses and property damage and is based on conservative estimates of the National Safety Council.

Public Works and Utilities Director Karl Fredrickson said the City has had a Traffic Safety Improvement Program since 1979, which focuses on engineering, education, enforcement and evaluation.

“If the number of crashes had increased at the same rate as vehicle miles traveled, the City would have seen nearly 8,000 more accidents in 2005 and nearly $87 million more in monetary loss,” said Fredrickson. “Our safety improvements have definitely made a big difference, but the best crash prevention is always a responsible driver who obeys the traffic laws and drives defensively.”

Fredrickson said the City aggressively seeks federal funds for safety projects. Since 1997, the City has obtained more than $4 million for 11 separate safety projects.

“Before and after” studies were conducted at 12 high-crash intersections to estimate the effectiveness of safety improvements. Crashes decreased more than 80 percent at seven of the intersections. The study showed a net annual benefit of $3.5 million and that the benefits of reducing crashes exceed implementation costs at a majority of locations.

Fredrickson said another finding is that adding more traffic controls does not always result in crash reduction. Below are the average numbers of 2005 crashes for three types of intersections:

- Intersection of two arterial streets with a traffic signal - 11.8 crashes
- Intersection of two arterial streets with a stop sign - 2.8 crashes
- Intersection of two local streets with no control device - 1.2 crashes

The most common type of crash was rear-end collisions, which accounted for nearly 31 percent of all crashes. The major intersections with the most number of crashes in 2005 were:

- 48th and “O” Streets (improvements completed in fall 2006)
- 56th Street and Highway 2 (part of the Highway 2 Corridor Study)
- 40th Street and Pine Lake Road (now open to four-way traffic)
- 27th and “O” streets (improvements implemented in July 2004)
- 70th and “A” streets

The entire 2005 crash study is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: crash05).
for Council

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

-----Original Message-----
From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
To: Jon Camp <jcamp@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Tue, 7 Aug 2007 12:43 am
Subject: InterLinc: Council Feedback

InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
      Jon Camp

Name: Dave Bode
Address: 260 Cottonwood Dr
City: Lincoln, NE, 68510
Phone: (402) 817-8790
Fax:
Email: dbode@neb.rr.com

Comment or Question:

Dear Mr. Camp,
Thank You for your service to city taxpayers. I regret that you have to take the kind of verbal abuse that you do from your fellow council members. I found it hard to believe that Mr. Cook and Mr. Marvin would talk about public safety in regards to the LFD budget. They lack credibility in light of the fact that a fire station closed at 33'rd and Holderidge last year for a week and I didn't a word either one of them about public safety being endangered. I remember fire officials at the time assuring the citizens that public safety wouldn't notice a drop off, other stations would cover thier district and not a word from Ms. Newman, Mr. Cook, Mr Marvin or Ms McRoy. My only question this year is why is it still open if closing it last year wasn't a threat to public
I watched the council meeting last night about the budget and I have to say that merely playing a schell game of moving money from one bloated department to another bloated department is not a cut but a scam so please continue the good fight and CUT them budget not rearrange it. As a life long Lincolnite (born hear, raised hear, schooled hear) I have to tell you that Lincolns future is bleak at best. Declining sales taxes, declining Keno receipts, declining cars sales tax's, declining new home starts, stagnant/declining existing home sales and the only new employer in town is paying a whooping 13.00 per hour (26,000.00 per year). This city is spending a billion dollars on "P" street redevelopment, 300,000,000.00 on a undersized arena in an area of town that is clogged and without parking now but it refuses to spend money on a safe way to drive from one end of the city to another... to build a modern freeway system would be a real improvement to public safety. We have as taxpayers dumped more money into downtown Lincoln in the last 30 years than any other city that I know of and got nothing out of it except another "plan"... Centrum, Atrum, Block 43, Old Fed building, and skywalks to empty office buildings. The list continues while the city's infrastructure has been neglected... stop it already, there is more to Lincoln than downtown! Invest in Lincoln's future and build a freeway/beltway...yes both of them! Develop a business/industrial park. My future (as I'm unemployeed at this time) will probably take me to Omaha... the jobs are there, you can travel the length of the city in 20 minutes (Greater... Omaha 800,000 people... Greater Lincoln 240,000 people... 25 minutes to anywhere driving in Lincoln), there's things to do and the cost of living is 13% less than Lincoln. You can redevelop Lincoln in the image of Boulder Co, Portland Or, Madison Wi and Berkley Ca if you want but the tax base for funding this city
is eroding quicker than you realize. Keep up the good fight...I defend you when city politics come up in conversation. As for Lincoln...well if I live in Omaha next year at this time I'll probably come down to play your golf courses...as it's about the only thing Lincoln has going for it now.
Good Luck
Dave Bode
260 Cottonwood Dr.

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at AOL.com.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: August 10, 2007
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Brian Baker, 441-8046
                                Mike Heyl, 441-3889

HOT WEATHER ALERT

The extended forecast for temperatures to reach into the mid- to upper 90 degree range has placed the City of Lincoln into a hot weather alert. These temperatures, combined with extremely high relative humidity levels, will make work and play outside dangerous and possibly life-threatening for young children, older adults, and people with chronic illnesses such as respiratory disease and heart conditions.

The Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department encourages everyone to become familiar with the signs of heat-related illness and to practice preventive measures to reduce their chance for heat cramps, heat exhaustion, and heat stroke.

People suffer heat-related illness when the body’s temperature rises and precautions are not taken to prevent it, said Brian Baker, a Health Educator with the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department. With sports camps, athletic events, band camps, and vacations taking place during this heat advisory, basic preventive measures should be followed. These measures include:

• Drink plenty of water. Individuals should increase their fluid intake by drinking 2-4 eight ounce glasses of water each hour during strenuous physical activity.

• Stay out of the direct heat of the sun as much as possible and stay in a cool environment whenever possible. Avoid being outside during the peak sun hours of 10 a.m. until 4 p.m. each day. Schedule outdoor activity carefully.

• Wear appropriate clothing and sun screen. Choose light-weight, loose-fitting, light-colored clothing and wear a broad-brimmed hat to shade the head. Select a sun screen SPF of at least 15, preferably a 30, to protect your skin from the ultra-violet rays of the sun.

• Never leave children and/or pets in a vehicle with the windows rolled up.

• Adjust to the environment slowly, pace your physical activity, STOP any activity and get into a cool area away from the direct heat of the sun if you become lightheaded, confused, weak,
or faint.

- more -

• Avoid alcohol, caffeine, or lots of sugar as these promote fluid loss.

• Avoid heavy meals and hot foods as they add heat to your body.

• If you do not have air conditioning or a cool place to be, consider going to a library, a movie theater, shopping mall, or other air-conditioned public location.

“Sweating is the body’s natural mechanism to control body temperature. Under some conditions, sweating is not enough to cool the body, causing a person’s body temperature to rise rapidly,” says Bruce Dart, Health Director. “Both air temperature and humidity affect the body’s ability to cool itself during hot weather. When the humidity is high, sweat will not evaporate as quickly, thus preventing the body from releasing heat quickly” Dart added.

Symptoms of heat stress include clammy, sweaty skin, light-headedness, weakness, and nausea. Victims of heat exhaustion should be treated by moving them to a cooler area and by removing restrictive clothing. If conscious, individuals with heat exhaustion can be given cold water to drink. Salt tablets, unless under a doctor’s orders, should be avoided. Plenty of rest will help the victim.

Heat Stroke is a more serious condition and should be treated as a medical emergency. Symptoms include hot skin, body temperatures above 103 degrees Fahrenheit, rapid breathing and pulse, incoherent behavior, mental confusion, convulsions, or unconsciousness. Victims of heat stroke need to be moved to a cool place and medical assistance should be summoned immediately.
Dear Council members,

Thank you for the time, thought and work you put in for our city and citizens. I would like to voice an opinion.

This morning on the Channel 8 local news there was an interview with a 64 year old woman who was carping about if "They" close the Belmont Sr. Center she would have no place to go everyday to hang out with her "family". I did not sense that she was homeless or special needs. The camera honed in on a real dump of a place with tables of seated "seniors" playing cards.

I am 63 and my husband is 65. We both are actively engaged in life. He still teaches and researches full time at UNL. I am an artist and LPS mentor very part time. We both volunteer on boards to include NSNA, Open Harvest, Spring Creek Prairie, etc. So, it is hard for me to comprehend how someone is so bored or cannot afford to hang out at one of our beautiful public Libraries, go to one of many neighborhood coffee houses, diners or cafes to hang out and play cards, or even the recreation centers. I would rather have seen my tax money go to the LPD, Fire Department, Libraries, Parks and Rec. This attitude and institution is not one I would support.

I know you have painfully set the budget. It is set. But, next year, I hope that you will reconsider. I would have come to say something when the seniors protested, but until I saw today's news, I did not have an idea. The center that serves meals to elderly low income people probably is a different scenario, and I probably would support keeping it in the budget.

Sorry to have been so wordy.
Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Sarah Bauman
Then I could not spell “Lincoln”.

From: Pat Henry [mailto:phenery@neb.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2007 4:16 PM
To: 'council@lincoln.ne.gov'
Subject: FW: Agency on Aging

I am looking bad in this process—but I will keep trying. Pat Henry

From: Pat Henry [mailto:phenery@neb.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2007 3:54 PM
To: 'gov'
Subject: Agency on Aging

I sent the e-mail I promised on Monday, and I find today that it came back. I hope this reaches you.

I recognize the budget process is over, and I do appreciate that you have restored some of the funding for this segment of the population. I do not believe the subject of this letter to the Mayor should be set aside until the next budget process. It is obvious that the financial benefits of these programs accrue largely to the State while the quality of life benefits are gained by the residents of Lincoln. We should share this cost with the State, and perhaps now is the time to begin discussions in this direction. Please do not wait until the Legislature convenes in January, and if you need assistance in this matter, I am certain that help can be found.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you on Monday, and if you have any questions, please contact me.
Pat Henry.

- Agency on Aging.docx
Please reconsider your vote to decommission the Women Funding.

Respectfully

Roma L. Niel, member
Business & Professional Women of America
1617 W Collins Street
Needles, CA 92363
760-326-3156
horo@citlink.net
My I sincerely thank you for postponing the waste water treatment proposal through Wilderness Park. All life in that area thanks you too. Now, to stay on top of some VERY poor management in the Public Works Department. Get honest with the taxpayer and yourselves, there is a serious corruption problem!!

Lynn Darling
Dear Council Members,

I am extending my gratitude to you for allowing Lifetime Health to continue serving our seniors. I have been the nurse for this program for 16+ years and have witnessed countless examples of the positive health and welfare benefits that our participants have received. I truly believe that programs such as Lifetime Health empower older adults to make better lifestyle choices that indeed improve the quality of their lives and also prevent or postpone disease onset that eventually place a financial burden on all citizens. Again, Thank You!

Sincerely,

Jan Ekeler RN BSN
Dear Gentlepersons:

Please reconsider your decision to defund the Women's Commission, and support this commission with your vote to fund. The impact on women and on families is devastating. Please care about your community, our women, our families.

Thank you,

Ria Severance

Ria Severance, LMFT24650 - www.execdev.org
Office: 626-441-3963 Cell: 626-354-4334
1910 Huntington Drive, South Pasadena, CA 91030

Regarding Confidentiality: Please use caution as email is not a confidential medium and cannot be expected to be confidential. If you elect to call the cell, I will be glad to hear from you although we may need to reschedule a time to talk if I am not free to speak confidentially. I do look forward to our communicating!
To Whom It May Concern,

It has come to my attention that your City Council has disbanded The Commission on Women. We find that Lincoln is misguided in dismantling the Commission. More women are in the labor force experiencing a variety of issues which can only be resolved through a Commission: child care, harassment, differential pay, to name a few. Please reconsider your decision.

Renee G. Koel, PH.D.
TO:
City Council Members
555 S. 10th Street
Lincoln, NE68508

FROM:
Mary Roseberry-Brown
1423 F Street
Lincoln, NE68508
Phone 477-8282
August 10, 2007

RE: Thank you

Dear Members of the Lincoln City Council:

Thank you for your unanimous vote August 8, 2007 to remove the $5.6 Million, “Southwest Wastewater Facility Improvements” item from the CIP proposed budget for 2007/08-2012/2013. It is reassuring to know that the City Council is working to safeguard public process. The unbiased, comprehensive study of Lincoln’s sewage capabilities and management options should be completed and approved by appropriate public bodies before any such item ever is considered for insertion into the CIP.

Please continue to be proactive in watching over this issue. For your assistance in the matter, I think you will find the attached August 12, 2006, Friends of Wilderness Park letter to the City Council helpful. It has suggestions as to what would constitute a good unbiased, comprehensive study of Lincoln’s sewage situation.

Sincerely,

Mary Roseberry-Brown
President, Friends of Wilderness Park

Attachment

Got a little couch potato?
Check out fun [summer activities for kids](#).
Letter to City Council 12 Aug 06.doc
FROM:
Mary Roseberry-Brown
President, Friends of Wilderness Park
1423 F Street
Lincoln, NE  68508
August 12, 2006

TO:
Lincoln City Council Members

Re:  Proposed Southwest Sewage Plant (Public Utilities Wastewater Proposal – Project 15) in the 2006/07-2011/12 Capital Improvement Program

Dear City Council Members:

A Hearty Thank You

Thank you so much for your unanimous decision on August 9, 2006 to change the item in the Capital Improvement Program related to a southwest sewage plant from funding for site acquisition to funding for study. Through your decision, we believe you made a wise policy choice that is likely to benefit Lincoln’s citizens in the long term as well as protect and conserve our financial, environmental, and natural resources.

We also thank you for your responsiveness to the concerns voiced by Friends of Wilderness Park and other citizens who have serious misgivings regarding the effort the City has been making to site a third sewage plant without adequate study and demonstrated need. We recognize that competent, thorough, and unbiased study of sewage management options for the City of Lincoln will require commitment of significant resources – both human and financial. Toward that end, we offer the following suggestions and observations. We also stand ready to provide the City Council input on this project whenever it is desired.

For your information and reference, attached are transcripts we prepared of relevant excerpts of the August 7th City Council hearing and August 9th City Council meeting containing some of the testimony and discussion regarding this item in the CIP. You may find the transcripts useful in your further consideration of this matter.

Explicit City Council Direction and Oversight Is Needed Regarding the Study

We think that the City Council as a whole needs to give explicit direction regarding the parameters and features of the study. We agree with Council Chairwoman Patte Newman that it is important that the Council define exactly what it is doing (August 9 Transcript, p. 6, lines 165-166). The Council should also give explicit guidance regarding the qualifications and attributes of the entities that carry out the study. Otherwise, we see the likelihood that the funds appropriated by the City Council for the study will not be spent as the Council intended.
The study should look at several options for handling Lincoln’s future sewage management needs without bias in favor of a third sewage plant, as Councilmen Dan Marvin and Jonathan Cook indicated (August 9 Transcript, p. 7, lines 206-208; p. 8, lines 219-224; p. 12, lines 365-367; p. 13, line 368). Reviewing all the City Council members’ comments together, it is clear to us that the City Council is in consensus that the CIP appropriation should fund a competent, fair, and thorough study of a variety of sewage management options.

Notwithstanding your unanimous decision that funds be appropriated for a sewage study rather than for land acquisition, we have a significant concern that without explicit direction from the City Council the study will not adequately compile and independently analyze current, relevant data and information regarding several sewage management strategies. We noted that Public Utilities Administrator Steve Masters maintained at the August 7th hearing that an additional sewage treatment plant must be in Lincoln’s future in order for Lincoln to grow (August 7 Transcript, p. 1, lines 20-21; p. 2, lines 34-36; p. 3, lines 71-73). He stated this unequivocal view even though the PW&U Department has acknowledged that there are no studies to support this assertion. Furthermore, at the August 7th hearing Mr. Masters merely agreed to continue the process currently underway with the PW&U Department’s consulting engineers to locate a facility in southwest Lincoln – a process that includes “a form of an economic evaluation” (August 7 Transcript, p. 1, lines 13-16).

We also noted that at the August 9th City Council Meeting, PW&U Director Karl Fredrickson reiterated Mr. Masters’ previous commitment to continue the process already underway (August 9 Transcript, p. 1, lines 29-30). He, like Mr. Masters, implied that a site needed to be acquired now in order for Lincoln to grow (August 9 Transcript, p. 2, lines 35-45). Moreover, after suggesting that the CIP line item appropriation be amended to replace “acquisition and option” with “study”, Mr. Fredrickson indicated that his department could use the money to “continue” their processes (August 9 Transcript, p. 7, lines 192-193). We are concerned that members of the PW&U staff intend to use the newly-appropriated study funds to continue to get a third sewage plant sited and, absent explicit direction and diligent oversight, analysis of other sewage management options will either be ignored or inadequately examined.

Therefore, by this letter we want to clarify and reiterate our request that the study be a comprehensive, even-handed, and independent cost-benefit analysis of a reasonable array of sewage management options for Lincoln. We believe that it will save all parties time and effort, thus maximizing the use of resources, and avoid confusion if the City Council gives specific direction regarding the study. The item now amended to “Southwest Treatment Plant Site Study” needs to examine several options and not be allowed to devolve into a study that is too narrow or one that merely justifies the PW&U Department’s existing desire for a third sewage plant located in southwest Lincoln. If the City Council properly defines and outlines what the study should entail then follows up with attentive oversight, this potentially significant expenditure of dollars can yield valuable analysis that can guide Lincoln’s sewage future. Competent analysis of
appropriate scope will also likely yield a significant savings of City resources far into the future.

We are aware of existing City contracts with engineering firms that are being administered by the Wastewater Division of the PW&U Department that are for the purpose of getting a third sewage treatment plant sited in southwest Lincoln. One or more of these contracts is currently being renegotiated. In light of the City Council’s action on August 9th, we recommend that future expenditure of City money for those siting efforts should not be agreed to at this time.

**Competent Cost-Benefit Analysis of Sewage Management Options for the City of Lincoln**

**Overall Goal**

As enunciated through public testimony and input, the overall goal for a study is for a competent, thorough, and unbiased analysis of the effects, costs, and benefits of a variety of sewage management options for the City of Lincoln which extend at least fifty years into the future. Through its discussion and vote on August 9th, the City Council appears to agree with this goal.

Such a study will, in turn, allow identification of what appears to be the best sewage management strategy (or combination of strategies) for Lincoln’s long-term future needs. The best strategy or combination of strategies will balance the City’s sewage management responsibilities with preservation of environmental and natural resources as well as urban, historic, and cultural qualities at a manageable cost long term.

**Update of Lincoln’s Wastewater Facilities Master Plan**

We recommend that, as an initial component of the study, Lincoln’s Wastewater Facilities Master Plan be updated. This update should include at least the following:

- The present and potential future capacities of Lincoln’s sewer system for collection and treatment need to be determined. This includes the capacities of the Theresa Street plant and the Northeast plant as well as an accurate analysis of the capacities of all existing and proposed sewer trunk systems (in both normal and surcharged conditions).

- The potential service areas of the two existing sewage plants need to be determined and correlated to the potential limits of Lincoln’s future growth.

- The capacity of the plants needs to be based on current data regarding peak flow events and take into account the City efforts during the past decade to reduce infiltration and inflow into the sewer system.
Components and Features of a Competent Cost-Benefit Analysis

A competent cost-benefit analysis should be comprehensive and detailed, including environmental analysis which takes account of anticipated regulatory requirements. Analysis should be conducted regarding a reasonable variety of sewage management options (or combinations of options). For each option, financial costs for engineering, construction, operation, and long-term (at least fifty years into the future) maintenance (including costs for labor) should be examined. Each option should be examined in light of specifically identified needs that the City of Lincoln is likely to experience in the future.

For each strategy or option, we recommend that the study examine the direct and indirect costs, benefits, and effects upon people (adults and children), animals (including wildlife) and fish, including the following aspects:

- Financial issues
- Environmental issues
- Natural resource issues, including protection, conservation, and current uses of Salt Creek
- Ecological issues
- Health issues
- Commitments of resources and energy, including any irreversible and irrevocable commitments
- Cultural qualities
- Urban qualities, and
- Historic qualities.

We suggest that options (examined singly and in combination, as appropriate) include:

- Expansion of the Northeast and/or Theresa Street plants, including potential conversion to use as a regional facility
- An aggressive water conservation program
- Acceleration of the City’s program to prevent and reduce infiltration and inflow into the sewer system, including repair of leaky pipes and replacement of old manhole covers with redesigned manhole covers
- Implementation of a new sump pump ordinance and building code standards requiring that when sump pumps are installed, piping to drain the pump outside the building must be installed
- Additional methods to attenuate flow, and
- Construction, operation, and maintenance of an additional sewage plant.

We recommend that the study consider options using conveyance that incorporates lift stations and pumping stations as well as gravity-fed lines. In addition, we suggest that the study should include thorough and detailed analysis of several piping options in conjunction with each strategy or combination of strategies, as applicable.

The analysis, in our view, should identify potential capabilities and needs oriented to discrete timeframes. Thus, the analysis should identify when existing capacities or
systems are expected to be deficient and specifically when improvements and/or new capabilities are likely to be needed and why.

We recommend that the cost-benefit analysis take into account:

▪ The relative size of drainage basins,
▪ The relative dilution capacity in Salt Creek at several locations going progressively further into the upper reaches of the basin, and
▪ The potential stringency of discharge permits where there is less dilution capacity, and the related effects, costs, and benefits.

As a part of the study, we suggest that comparative information and data should be obtained and analyzed from other municipalities in the United States and in Europe which operate sewage systems.

Who Should Conduct the Cost-Benefit Analysis

We recommend that the study should be carried out by properly accredited water and wastewater systems engineers with demonstrated experience. They should work in consultation with urban planners and with persons qualified and with demonstrated experience in conducting environmental analysis.

In addition, those hired to conduct the cost-benefit analysis should have no interests that might conflict with their ability to provide a completely independent perspective. Therefore, the engineering firms that have been involved in siting a third sewage plant in Lincoln should not be involved in this comprehensive study of a variety of sewage management options. At a minimum, these firms have a built-in bias and a strong tendency to justify their earlier work for the City while continuing to move in the same direction as previously.

The Public Process

We appreciate the statements by City Council members at the August 9th meeting that indicated sensitivity to and recognition of the importance of a proper public process. We strongly agree.

With respect to the comprehensive cost-benefit analysis regarding sewage management options for Lincoln, it is important that the public process be completely open. In addition, it is important that members of the public have the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the study process by being able to participate from an informed posture. Therefore, we request:

▪ All meetings that relate to or discuss the study or any aspect of the study should be open to the public.
▪ The time, date, and location of all such meetings should receive adequate public notice prior to each meeting.
• Copies of written drafts of the study (or any portion of the study) and any other supplemental materials should be available to the public at least two weeks prior to any public meeting or public hearing where the information is discussed.

• All relevant documents should be posted on a web site and also be available in a designated information repository (with generous hours) as soon as the documents are created or received by the City and/or any of its related contractors.

**Conclusion**

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these important matters. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need more information or would like to discuss any of these issues.

We appreciate very much your public service and your willingness to work with commitment and creativity for Lincoln’s future. We look forward to your continued openness and responsiveness to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Mary Roseberry-Brown
President, Friends of Wilderness Park

Attachments (2)