I. MAYOR

**1. Fiscal Impact Statement from Urban Development.
**2. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor Presents January Award of Excellence to Jay Edmiston and Leroy Rosenthal.
**3. NEWS RELEASE. Internet Reality Show to Feature Lincoln.
**4. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler’s News Conference on Seeking Public Opinion on City Budget Outcomes, Tuesday, February 12, 2008 at 10:00 am in the Mayor’s Conference Room, 555 South 10th Street.
**5. NEWS RELEASE. City to Seek Public Input on Budget Priorities.
**6. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler Announcing Projects Funded This Year from the Lincoln Cares Program at a News Conference. February 14, 2008 at 10:15 am at Ager Indoor Play Center in Antelope Park.
**7. NEWS RELEASE. New Projects Announced for “Lincoln Cares” by Mayor Chris Beutler.

Received for Week of February 25, 2008

*1. NEWS RELEASE. Report Shows Increase in Employment Discrimination Complaints.
*2. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule for Week of February 16 Through February 22, 2008. (Distributed to Council Members on 02/15/08)
*3. NEWS RELEASE. Deadline Extended for Arts Awards Nominations.
*4. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler and NeighborWorks®Lincoln Officials News Conference. Thursday, February 21, 2008, 10:00 am at 555 South 10th Street.
*5. NEWS RELEASE. Uncle Same Jam 2008 to Again Feature Symphony at Oak Lake Park.
*6. NEWS RELEASE. NeighborWorks®Lincoln Urges Homeowners to Call for Help During National Home Ownership Month.

Received for Week of March 3, 2008

1. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler Announcing Administration Change at News Conference, Wednesday, February 27, 2007, 2:00 pm at 555 South 10th Street in the Mayor’s Conference Room.
2. NEWS RELEASE. Judge Hendry to Serve as City Attorney.
3. Snow/Traffic Conditions Report for Tuesday, February 26, 2008, 5:00 a.m.
4. NEWS RELEASE. Husker Baseball Fans Reminded of Detour Routes.

II. DIRECTORS

FINANCE DEPARTMENT/TREASURER Received for Week of March 3, 2008
   c) Net Sales Tax Collection, 2002-2003 Through 2007-2008; and  
   d) Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT
**1.** Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department Report for January, 2008.  
**2.** Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department Board of Health Minutes for December 11, 2007.

PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT
1. Mayor’s Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee Approval to Support Changes to the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Relating to Pedestrians and Bicycles.

PLANNING COMMISSION
**1.** Action by the Planning Commission, February 13, 2008.

Received for Week of February 25, 2008

Received for Week of March 3, 2008
1. Action by the Planning Commission, February 27, 2008.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION Received for Week of February 25, 2008

PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES Received for Week of February 25, 2008
*1. Water Main Project #700304. North Side of D Street; 9th - 12th Street  

Received for Week of March 3, 2008
1. ADVISORY. Sidewalk Repair Advisory. Project #702360.
URBAN DEVELOPMENT  Received for Week of February 25, 2008
*1. Antelope Valley R & D Corridor Public Meeting, February 28, 2008 at 7:00 pm at The Cornhusker Marriott Hotel, 333 South 13th Street, Lancaster Room.

III. CITY CLERK  Received for Week of February 25, 2008

IV. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE

JON CAMP  Received for Week of February 25, 2008
*1. Letter from Sharon D. Cook. Comments Regarding the Dead Man’s Run Watershed Project.

JONATHAN COOK  Received for Week of March 3, 2008
1. Request to Greg MacLean, Public Works & Utilities Director - RE: Snow Removal - (RFI#133 - 02/26/08)

DOUG EMERY
**1. Letter from Rose Dudley. Concerns over Restructuring the Creek in Taylor Park.
**2. Letter from Bob Bechtolt. Do Not Feel Deadman’s Run Flood Plan is Pressing.

Received for Week of March 3, 2008

ROBIN ESCHLIMAN  Received for Week of February 25, 2008
*1. Request to Greg MacLean, Public Works & Utilities Director; and Roger Figard, Public Works & Utilities Dept. - RE: SW 40th Bridge Project - (RFI#12 - 02/15/08)
SEE RESPONSE FROM ROGER FIGARD, PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES (02/21/08)
*2. Request to Lin Quenzer, Mayor's Office - RE: Graffiti Problem - (RFI#13 - 02/15/08)
*3. Request to Greg MacLean, Public Works & Utilities Director - RE: Dangerous Intersections Update - (RFI#14 - 02/15/08)

V. MISCELLANEOUS
**1. Correspondence from T. Misho. Suggestion for Environmental Impact on Earth Day.
**2. Correspondence Received through InterLine Action Center. Have LES Quit Advertising and Give Citizens a Rate Decrease. (Delivered to Council Members before Formal Meeting on 02/11/08)
**3. Email from Lois Poppe Thanking Council for Services and Decision Reached for the Current and Future Citizens of Lincoln. (Delivered to Council Members before Formal Meeting on 02/11/08)
**5. Email from J. Douglass Opposing LES Rate Hike.
**7. Correspondence Received Ms. Juarez.
Received for Week of February 25, 2008

*1. Email from Ted Scott. Comments and Web Address Regarding Impact Fees.
*2. Email from Roma Wieckhorst. Supporting LES Energy Conservation and Allocating $1 Million for Energy Efficiency.
*3. Email from Wilfred Marks. Need Solutions to Provide Elderly and Poor with Energy as LES Raises Electric 5.5% and Social Security May Receive 2.3% Increase.
*4. Email from Jerry Wolf. Reduce the City Budget by Replacing City Employee Retirement Program with a Different Plan.
*5. Letter and Photos Delivered to City Council. Reject Installing Sidewalk on Property at 2441 No. Main Street, Lincoln, NE. with Reasons and Photos to Reject. (Delivered to Council Members on 02/19/08)
*6. Correspondence from Gary Heusel through InterLinc Council Feedback. Does Time Warner have No Accountability for Not Providing Services for Which We Pay More Than Comparable Service in Omaha?
*7. Email from Johno. Where is Our Lw Enforcement With Examples of Offenders.
*8. Email from Marilyn McNabb. E. N. Thompson Lecturer States Lincoln Electric System Should Spend 4% to 5% of Budget on Energy Efficiency, with Web Address.
*10. Email from R. Scott Sandquist. Comments and Suggestions for Jail Location Saving Taxpayer Dollars.
*11. Letter from Wilderness Kennels, Henry and Judy Sader, on Bids Submitted to Handle City/County Stray Animals with Price Comparison and Newspaper Article. (Delivered to Council Members on 02/20/08)
*12. Email from Amy Rose Brt. Message on Climate Crisis with Suggestion for Earth Hour 2008 of Turning Off Lights for One Hour. Also Included are Websites for Climate Crisis Coalition and Earth Hour 2008.

Received for Week of March 3, 2008

1. Correspondence from Robert Ravenscroft on LES Sustainable Energy with Research on Global Warming Stabilization.
2. Article “Whistle-Free Zones Proliferate” from Harlan Layton. (Delivered to Council Members on 02/22/08)
3. Letter, and Photo, From Robert Peterson Regarding Snow Plow Damage to Yard and Unfair Policy Responses Received from The City of Lincoln.
4. Email from Allan Amsberry. Blighting Sections of the City.
5. Email from Ron and Becky Herms. Comments on Legislation to Prevent City Officials from Having Contracts with the City.
6. Correspondence from Tom Hardesty. Opposed to Charter Amendment for Not Allowing Council Members to do Contract Business with the City.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

** Held Over from 02/18/08
* Held Over from 02/25/08
Mayor Chris Beutler will announce a change in his administration at a news conference at 2 p.m. TODAY, Wednesday, February 27 in the Mayor’s Conference Room, 555 South 10th Street.
Mayor Chris Beutler today announced that Judge John Hendry, retired Chief Justice of the Nebraska Supreme Court, will serve as the next City Attorney for Lincoln. Judge Hendry is expected to join the City in April.

“The community is incredibly fortunate that Judge Hendry has agreed to re-enter public service as City Attorney,” said Mayor Beutler. “His eight years of service to the State as Chief Justice were marked by common sense, fairness and attention to detail. He brings a wealth of experience as a jurist, lawyer and manager to this new position. He will be a valuable part of the team that is moving Lincoln forward in a positive direction.

“I am grateful to Mayor Beutler for extending to me the opportunity to return to public service and enthusiastic about the challenges and possibilities this new aspect of public service offers,” said Judge Hendry. “The Mayor and City Council are committed to moving the City forward in a collaborative and positive fashion and I am eager to use my administrative and legal experiences in support of that effort.”

Judge Hendry served as Chief Justice from October 1998 through October 2006 and as a Lancaster County Court Judge for three years prior to his Nebraska Supreme Court appointment. He was in private practice for more than 20 years before serving as a judge. He taught a course in law office management last fall as an Adjunct Professor of Law at the University of Nebraska College of Law. He is a 1974 graduate of the College.

Beutler thanked Dana Roper, who is retiring. Roper served as City Attorney since 1999.

The City Attorney’s Office has a staff of 26. The office provides legal advice to the Mayor, City Council, departments, committees and commissions. The office also initiates and defends legal actions on behalf of the City.
CITY OF LINCOLN SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITIONS REPORT

A complete voice report is available at 441-7783. This number is for news media use only.

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center - 441-7644
Diane Gonzolas ? 421-1247, 525-1520

Date:  Tuesday, February 26, 2008
Time:  5 a.m.

Lincoln didn?t receive much snow with the recent storm, but rain has created some icy conditions. City crews have been out with 19 material spreaders all night, and arterial streets are in pretty good shape, but many side streets are slick this morning.

The Lincoln Police Department reports there were 93 accidents in the City yesterday, but there have been none since midnight.

Please stay informed on the status of snow operations in Lincoln. Additional information is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and in the Windstream phone directory. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
HUSKER BASEBALL FANS REMINDED OF DETOUR ROUTES

As the Husker baseball team prepares for its home opener Friday, February 29, fans are reminded of the detour routes being used during the construction of the new Harris Overpass.

Fans coming from the south or east should go west on Rosa Parks Way, north on Homestead Expressway (Highway 77/west bypass), east on West “O” Street and north on Sun Valley Boulevard. Fans entering Haymarket Park from the north on Sun Valley Boulevard are not affected by construction activity.

Public Works and Utilities crews will install message boards prior to Friday’s game and throughout the weekend to alert fans to the road closure and detour routes. Public Works and Utilities would also like to remind motorists that Charleston Street at 7th Street will be closed about 90 minutes prior to the start of the baseball game and also at the end of the game until traffic has cleared from the parking lots.

Fans also are urged to consider using the downtown and Haymarket parking garages and the pedestrian bridge that connects the ballpark to the historic Haymarket District.
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**CITY OF LINCOLN**
**GROSS SALES TAX COLLECTIONS**
**(WITH REFUNDS ADDED BACK IN)**
**2002-2003 THROUGH 2007-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$4,239,938</td>
<td>$4,453,875</td>
<td>$4,648,160</td>
<td>$4,630,210</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
<td>$4,573,597</td>
<td>-1.22%</td>
<td>$4,612,020</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$4,464,191</td>
<td>$4,670,587</td>
<td>$4,706,690</td>
<td>$4,823,369</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>$4,712,519</td>
<td>-2.30%</td>
<td>$5,052,950</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$4,407,744</td>
<td>$4,526,166</td>
<td>$4,687,792</td>
<td>$4,799,275</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>$4,658,480</td>
<td>-2.93%</td>
<td>$4,818,715</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$4,034,958</td>
<td>$4,314,111</td>
<td>$4,500,338</td>
<td>$4,511,403</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>$4,445,761</td>
<td>-1.46%</td>
<td>$4,753,456</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$4,046,633</td>
<td>$4,335,924</td>
<td>$4,264,010</td>
<td>$4,342,902</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>$4,554,634</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>$4,617,097</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$5,224,986</td>
<td>$5,531,405</td>
<td>$6,086,841</td>
<td>$5,797,893</td>
<td>-4.75%</td>
<td>$5,993,653</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>$5,596,617</td>
<td>-6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$4,076,943</td>
<td>$3,980,041</td>
<td>$4,158,874</td>
<td>$4,247,908</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>$4,125,074</td>
<td>-2.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$3,711,803</td>
<td>$3,889,388</td>
<td>$4,097,988</td>
<td>$3,991,159</td>
<td>-2.61%</td>
<td>$4,018,709</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$4,184,028</td>
<td>$4,602,788</td>
<td>$4,730,317</td>
<td>$4,543,369</td>
<td>-3.95%</td>
<td>$4,895,921</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$4,169,550</td>
<td>$4,599,245</td>
<td>$4,557,735</td>
<td>$4,539,614</td>
<td>-0.40%</td>
<td>$4,664,470</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$4,105,554</td>
<td>$4,391,257</td>
<td>$4,519,466</td>
<td>$4,655,061</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>$4,772,617</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$4,402,156</td>
<td>$4,893,438</td>
<td>$4,803,665</td>
<td>$4,991,723</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>$4,887,329</td>
<td>-2.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$51,068,484</td>
<td>$54,188,225</td>
<td>$55,761,877</td>
<td>$55,873,886</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>$56,302,764</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>$29,450,854</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>($48,531)</td>
<td>($69,997)</td>
<td>($135,858)</td>
<td>($80,882)</td>
<td>-40.47%</td>
<td>($27,350)</td>
<td>-66.19%</td>
<td>($90,282)</td>
<td>230.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>($64,605)</td>
<td>($110,193)</td>
<td>($165,219)</td>
<td>($358,866)</td>
<td>117.21%</td>
<td>($166,695)</td>
<td>-53.55%</td>
<td>($79,688)</td>
<td>-52.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>($134,088)</td>
<td>($219,454)</td>
<td>($101,531)</td>
<td>($173,972)</td>
<td>71.35%</td>
<td>($3,881)</td>
<td>-97.77%</td>
<td>($158,855)</td>
<td>3993.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>($177,459)</td>
<td>($390,445)</td>
<td>($325,510)</td>
<td>($6,319)</td>
<td>-98.06%</td>
<td>($175,440)</td>
<td>2676.56%</td>
<td>($29,848)</td>
<td>-82.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>($306,467)</td>
<td>($59,315)</td>
<td>($220,967)</td>
<td>($269,713)</td>
<td>22.06%</td>
<td>($84,287)</td>
<td>-68.75%</td>
<td>($26,308)</td>
<td>-68.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>($61,404)</td>
<td>($323,218)</td>
<td>($394,324)</td>
<td>($73,395)</td>
<td>-81.39%</td>
<td>($327,119)</td>
<td>345.70%</td>
<td>($489,939)</td>
<td>49.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>($17,601)</td>
<td>($22,759)</td>
<td>($99,240)</td>
<td>($165,869)</td>
<td>67.14%</td>
<td>($133,574)</td>
<td>-19.47%</td>
<td>($325,269)</td>
<td>143.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>($281,861)</td>
<td>($199,018)</td>
<td>($69,900)</td>
<td>($196,682)</td>
<td>181.38%</td>
<td>($130,611)</td>
<td>-33.59%</td>
<td>($130,611)</td>
<td>-33.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>($275,081)</td>
<td>($155,787)</td>
<td>($122,283)</td>
<td>($166,567)</td>
<td>36.21%</td>
<td>($381,653)</td>
<td>129.13%</td>
<td>($381,653)</td>
<td>129.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>($138,914)</td>
<td>($194,593)</td>
<td>($34,811)</td>
<td>($14,085)</td>
<td>-59.54%</td>
<td>($186,252)</td>
<td>1222.34%</td>
<td>($186,252)</td>
<td>1222.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>($563,339)</td>
<td>($42,086)</td>
<td>($162,998)</td>
<td>($39,492)</td>
<td>-75.77%</td>
<td>($155,825)</td>
<td>294.58%</td>
<td>($155,825)</td>
<td>294.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>($341,868)</td>
<td>($531,884)</td>
<td>($148,028)</td>
<td>($57,700)</td>
<td>-61.02%</td>
<td>($569,595)</td>
<td>887.17%</td>
<td>($1,200,190)</td>
<td>30.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>($2,411,218)</td>
<td>($2,318,751)</td>
<td>($1,980,668)</td>
<td>($1,603,541)</td>
<td>-19.04%</td>
<td>($2,342,280)</td>
<td>46.07%</td>
<td>($1,200,190)</td>
<td>30.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$4,191,407</td>
<td>$4,383,878</td>
<td>$4,512,303</td>
<td>$4,549,328</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>$4,546,247</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
<td>$4,521,738</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$4,399,587</td>
<td>$4,560,394</td>
<td>$4,541,471</td>
<td>$4,464,503</td>
<td>-1.69%</td>
<td>$4,545,825</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>$4,973,261</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$4,273,655</td>
<td>$4,306,712</td>
<td>$4,586,261</td>
<td>$4,625,303</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
<td>$4,654,599</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>$4,659,859</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$3,857,499</td>
<td>$3,923,666</td>
<td>$4,174,828</td>
<td>$4,505,085</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td>$4,270,321</td>
<td>-5.21%</td>
<td>$4,723,609</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$3,740,166</td>
<td>$4,276,609</td>
<td>$4,043,044</td>
<td>$4,073,189</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>$4,470,347</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
<td>$4,590,789</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$5,163,582</td>
<td>$5,208,187</td>
<td>$5,692,517</td>
<td>$5,724,498</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>$5,666,534</td>
<td>-1.01%</td>
<td>$5,106,677</td>
<td>-9.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$4,059,342</td>
<td>$3,957,283</td>
<td>$4,059,634</td>
<td>$4,082,038</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>$3,991,501</td>
<td>-2.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$3,429,942</td>
<td>$3,690,371</td>
<td>$4,028,088</td>
<td>$3,794,477</td>
<td>-5.80%</td>
<td>$3,888,098</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$3,908,947</td>
<td>$4,447,001</td>
<td>$4,608,034</td>
<td>$4,376,803</td>
<td>-5.02%</td>
<td>$4,514,268</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$4,030,637</td>
<td>$4,404,651</td>
<td>$4,522,924</td>
<td>$4,525,529</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>$4,478,219</td>
<td>-1.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$3,542,215</td>
<td>$4,349,171</td>
<td>$4,356,468</td>
<td>$4,615,569</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>$4,616,793</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$4,060,288</td>
<td>$4,361,554</td>
<td>$4,655,637</td>
<td>$4,934,023</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>$4,317,734</td>
<td>-12.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$48,657,267</td>
<td>$51,869,477</td>
<td>$53,781,209</td>
<td>$54,270,346</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>$53,960,485</td>
<td>-0.57%</td>
<td>$28,575,934</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to date vs. previous year
Actual Compared to
Projected Sales Tax Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007-08 PROJECTED</th>
<th>2007-08 ACTUAL</th>
<th>VARIANCE FROM PROJECTED</th>
<th>$ CHANGE FR. 06-07</th>
<th>% CHANGE FR. 06-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$4,547,456</td>
<td>$4,521,738</td>
<td>($25,718)</td>
<td>($24,509)</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$4,747,528</td>
<td>$4,973,261</td>
<td>$225,733</td>
<td>$427,436</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$4,747,528</td>
<td>$4,659,859</td>
<td>($87,669)</td>
<td>$5,261</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$4,418,533</td>
<td>$4,723,609</td>
<td>$305,076</td>
<td>$453,288</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$4,529,683</td>
<td>$4,590,789</td>
<td>$61,106</td>
<td>$120,442</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$5,752,343</td>
<td>$5,106,677</td>
<td>($645,666)</td>
<td>($559,857)</td>
<td>-9.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$4,189,288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$3,978,102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$4,617,219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$4,478,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$4,539,414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$4,845,078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$55,390,453</td>
<td>$28,575,933</td>
<td>($167,138)</td>
<td>$422,061</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual collections through the first six months of the fiscal year are .58% below projected collections.
OFFICE OF TREASURER, CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

JANUARY 23, 2008

TO: MAYOR CHRIS BEUTLER & CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: FINANCE DEPARTMENT / CITY TREASURER

SUBJECT: MONTHLY CITY CASH REPORT

The records of this office show me to be charged with City cash as follows at the close of business December 31, 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward</td>
<td>$218,945,087.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Total Debits December 1-31, 2007</td>
<td>$23,918,716.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Credits December 1-31, 2007</td>
<td>($31,823,735.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Balance on December 31, 2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>$211,040,067.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Bank Nebraska, N.A.</td>
<td>$5,698,679.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>($77,342.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank Credit Card Account</td>
<td>($5,991.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornhusker Bank</td>
<td>$3,291.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Bank</td>
<td>$59,620.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>$133,248.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate Bank</td>
<td>($15,028.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Short-Term Pool</td>
<td>$29,457,109.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Medium-Term Pool</td>
<td>$175,758,390.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Checks and Warrants</td>
<td>$28,090.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash on Hand December 31, 2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>$211,040,067.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I also hold as City Treasurer, securities in the amount of $23,314,224.99 representing authorized investments of the City’s funds.

ATTEST:

Melinda Jones, City Treasurer

Joan E. Ross, City Clerk
CITY OF LINCOLN - PLEDGED COLLATERAL STATEMENT  
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>MATURITY DATE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL FACE</th>
<th>CURRENT PAR</th>
<th>MARKET PRICE</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC FGLMC D67795</td>
<td>3128F7UU6</td>
<td>12/01/2006</td>
<td>$1,191,991.00</td>
<td>$29,880.37</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$30,518.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC GOLD POOL A61256</td>
<td>3128RMD3</td>
<td>11/01/2036</td>
<td>$3,168,920.00</td>
<td>$3,042,158.70</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>$3,064,604.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 254725</td>
<td>31371K4J7</td>
<td>05/01/2035</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$271,692.37</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>$261,708.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 254592</td>
<td>31371KV8</td>
<td>12/01/2032</td>
<td>$3,100,000.00</td>
<td>$1,454,431.59</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>$1,402,693.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FN ARM 303624</td>
<td>31373UPH4</td>
<td>07/01/2025</td>
<td>$1,600,000.00</td>
<td>$25,471.87</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$25,934.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3015 HF</td>
<td>31395tXN68</td>
<td>09/15/2035</td>
<td>$8,095,000.00</td>
<td>$5,002,314.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>$5,679,070.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 703944</td>
<td>31401CBM4</td>
<td>05/01/2033</td>
<td>$8,365,000.00</td>
<td>$4,081,551.35</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>$4,391,559.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FN ARM 725674</td>
<td>31402DFP0</td>
<td>07/01/2034</td>
<td>$7,285,000.00</td>
<td>$4,392,442.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>$4,296,333.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA POOL 725774</td>
<td>31402DJR2</td>
<td>09/01/2034</td>
<td>$8,500,000.00</td>
<td>$5,816,127.21</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>$5,599,118.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA POOL 761335</td>
<td>31403XY82</td>
<td>04/01/2019</td>
<td>$7,275,000.00</td>
<td>$4,287,558.28</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>$4,171,771.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 805211</td>
<td>31406BR85</td>
<td>01/01/2035</td>
<td>$3,520,000.00</td>
<td>$2,802,990.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>$2,614,674.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBANK NE</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$52,600,911.00</td>
<td>$33,206,618.01</td>
<td>$32,116,987.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2SF 3274 6.50%</td>
<td>36202DT76</td>
<td>08/20/2032</td>
<td>$30,800,000.00</td>
<td>$2,195,691.34</td>
<td>$2,300,338.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLS FARGO BANK NE</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$30,800,000.00</td>
<td>$2,195,691.34</td>
<td>$2,300,338.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.00</td>
<td>3133XAT56</td>
<td>03/10/2006</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.30%</td>
<td>3133XBNR2</td>
<td>04/18/2006</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.10%</td>
<td>3133X8DS5</td>
<td>10/13/2006</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.00%</td>
<td>3133X4NY3</td>
<td>06/25/2006</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 3.75%</td>
<td>3133MVNP4</td>
<td>02/06/2006</td>
<td>$833,333.33</td>
<td>$833,333.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNHUSKER BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$3,033,333.33</td>
<td>$3,033,333.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB STEP UP 2.4%</td>
<td>31339XUE2</td>
<td>01/09/2006</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB STEP UP 5.0%</td>
<td>3133X5C97</td>
<td>03/25/2011</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST GATE BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB DISCOUNT NOTE</td>
<td>31338TC3/001</td>
<td>02/15/2006</td>
<td>$22,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER ONE BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$22,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICE OF TREASURER, CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

FEBRUARY 21, 2008

TO: MAYOR CHRIS BEUTLER & CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: FINANCE DEPARTMENT / CITY TREASURER

SUBJECT: MONTHLY CITY CASH REPORT

The records of this office show me to be charged with City cash as follows at the close of business January 31, 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward</td>
<td>$ 211,040,067.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Total Debits January 1-31, 2008</td>
<td>$ 33,361,444.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Credits January 1-31, 2008</td>
<td>($36,753,047.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Balance on January 31, 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,648,464.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Bank Nebraska, N.A.</td>
<td>($6,261,954.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>($44,167.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank Credit Card Account</td>
<td>($19,304.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornhusker Bank</td>
<td>$5,338.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Bank</td>
<td>$31,382.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>$214,349.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate Bank</td>
<td>$43,011.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Short-Term Pool</td>
<td>$46,176,905.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Medium-Term Pool</td>
<td>$166,913,492.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Checks and Warrants</td>
<td>$589,410.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash on Hand January 31, 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,648,464.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I also hold as City Treasurer, securities in the amount of $23,315,111.89 representing authorized investments of the City’s funds.

**ATTEST:**

[Signature]

[Seal]

Melinda Jones, City Treasurer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>MATURITY DATE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL FACE</th>
<th>CURRENT PAR</th>
<th>MARKET PRICE</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC FGLMC D67795</td>
<td>3128F7UU6</td>
<td>12/01/2009</td>
<td>$1,191,991.00</td>
<td>$28,585.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$29,260.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC GOLD POOL A61256</td>
<td>3128KRMD3</td>
<td>11/01/2036</td>
<td>$3,168,920.00</td>
<td>$3,029,482.23</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$3,103,466.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 254725</td>
<td>31371K4J7</td>
<td>05/01/2033</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$269,691.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$269,152.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 254592</td>
<td>31371XXV8</td>
<td>12/01/2032</td>
<td>$3,100,000.00</td>
<td>$1,451,199.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$1,446,767.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNARM 303824</td>
<td>31373UPH4</td>
<td>07/01/2025</td>
<td>$1,600,000.00</td>
<td>$24,966.82</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>$25,680.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3015 HF</td>
<td>31395XN68</td>
<td>08/15/2035</td>
<td>$9,095,000.00</td>
<td>$7,002,314.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>$6,791,613.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 703944</td>
<td>31401CBM4</td>
<td>05/01/2033</td>
<td>$8,365,000.00</td>
<td>$4,017,091.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$4,009,049.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNARM 725674</td>
<td>31402DPF0</td>
<td>07/01/2034</td>
<td>$7,285,000.00</td>
<td>$4,382,918.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$4,400,687.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA POOL 725772</td>
<td>31402DJR2</td>
<td>09/01/2034</td>
<td>$8,500,000.00</td>
<td>$5,778,563.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$5,761,225.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA POOL 761335</td>
<td>31403XY82</td>
<td>04/01/2019</td>
<td>$7,275,000.00</td>
<td>$4,211,293.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$4,218,110.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 853211</td>
<td>31406BR85</td>
<td>01/01/2035</td>
<td>$3,520,000.00</td>
<td>$2,798,279.86</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>$2,723,359.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBANK NE</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$52,600,911.00</td>
<td>$32,994,386.67</td>
<td>$32,780,372.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2SF 3274 6.50%</td>
<td>36202DT76</td>
<td>08/20/2032</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
<td>$56,454.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,634.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLS FARGO BANK NE</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
<td>$56,454.42</td>
<td>$60,634.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.00</td>
<td>3133XAT56</td>
<td>03/10/2008</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.30%</td>
<td>3133XBNR2</td>
<td>04/18/2008</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.10%</td>
<td>3133X8SD5</td>
<td>10/13/2009</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.00%</td>
<td>3133X4NY3</td>
<td>06/25/2009</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 3.75%</td>
<td>3133MVNP4</td>
<td>02/06/2008</td>
<td>$833,333.33</td>
<td>$833,333.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNHUSKER BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$3,033,333.33</td>
<td>$3,033,333.33</td>
<td>$3,033,333.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB STEP UP 2.4%</td>
<td>31339XVE2</td>
<td>01/08/2009</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB STEP UP 5.0%</td>
<td>3133X5CG7</td>
<td>03/25/2011</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST GATE BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB DISCOUNT NOTE</td>
<td>313384TC3/001</td>
<td>02/15/2008</td>
<td>$22,000,000.00</td>
<td>$22,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER ONE BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$22,000,000.00</td>
<td>$22,000,000.00</td>
<td>$22,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 27, 2008

Mayor Chris Beutler
City of Lincoln
555 So. 10th St. Suite 208
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Mayor Beutler:

The Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee reviewed the changes being recommended to the sections of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan relating to Pedestrians and Bicycles and unanimously approved a motion to support those changes at the February 12, 2008 PBAC meeting. We encourage your support of these recommended changes as well as the support by the City Council as these revisions move forward this year.

Sincerely,

Beth Thacker, Chair
Mayor’s Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee

Cc: City Council
Planning – David Cary
*** ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION ***
February 27, 2008

NOTICE: The Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, February 27, 2008, at 1:00 p.m. in the City-Council Hearing Room, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St., Lincoln, Nebraska, on the following items. For more information, call the Planning Department, 441-7491.

** PLEASE NOTE: The Planning Commission action is final action on any item with a notation of “FINAL ACTION”. Any aggrieved person may appeal Final Action of the Planning Commission to the City Council by filing a Notice of Appeal with the City Clerk within 14 days following the action of the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission action on all other items is a recommendation to the City Council or County Board.

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2008

[Commissioners Larson and Moline absent]

Approval of minutes of the regular meeting held February 13, 2008. **APPROVED, 5-0 (Sunderman abstained; Taylor absent at time of vote; Larson and Moline absent)**

1. CONSENT AGENDA
   (Public Hearing and Action):

   CHANGE OF ZONE:

   1.1 Change of Zone No. 08006, amending Section 27.45.020 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to add churches as a permitted use in the H-4 General Commercial District; and repealing Section 27.45.020 of the Lincoln Municipal Code as hitherto existing.

   Staff recommendation: Approval
   Staff Planner: Brandon Garrett, 441-6373, bgarrett@lincoln.ne.gov
   Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL, 6-0 (Taylor, Moline and Larson absent).
   Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2008, 1:30 p.m.
CHANGE OF ZONE WITH RELATED ITEMS:

1.2a Change of Zone No. 08007, from AGR Agricultural Residential District to R-3 Residential District, on property generally located at S. 84th Street and Pine Lake Road.

Staff recommendation: Approval
Staff Planner: Brian Will, 441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL, 6-0 (Taylor, Moline and Larson absent).
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2008, 1:30 p.m.

1.2b Special Permit No. 08012, for a domiciliary care facility for approximately 57 residents, on property generally located at S. 84th Street and Pine Lake Road.

*** FINAL ACTION ***
Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Brian Will, 441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 11, 2008, 6-0 (Taylor, Moline and Larson absent).
Resolution No. PC-01103.

PERMITS:

1.3 Special Permit No. 08010, to allow a propane dispensing station on the northwest corner of the property generally located at S. 48th Street and Highway 2.

*** FINAL ACTION ***
Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Christy Eichorn, 441-7603, ceichorn@lincoln.ne.gov
Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 11, 2008, 6-0 (Taylor, Moline and Larson absent).
Resolution No. PC-01104.
PERMITS WITH RELATED ITEMS:

1.4a Special Permit No. 08013, for an early childhood care facility for up to 120 children, with requests to waive the location of the permitted sign to be shown at time of sign permits and to not require access to a collector street, on property generally located at S. 61st Street and Pine Lake Road. *** FINAL ACTION ***
   Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
   Staff Planner: Brian Will, 441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
   Removed from Consent Agenda and had public hearing.
   Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 13, 2008, as revised by staff on 2/27/08, 7-0 (Larson and Moline absent).
   Resolution No. PC-01105.

1.4b Special Permit No. 08014, for a private dance school for approximately 36 students, with waiver request to allow the location of the permitted sign to be shown at the time of the sign permits, on property generally located at S. 61st Street and Pine Lake Road. *** FINAL ACTION ***
   Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
   Staff Planner: Brian Will, 441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
   Removed from Consent Agenda and had public hearing.
   Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 13, 2008, as revised by staff on 2/27/08, 7-0 (Larson and Moline absent).
   Resolution No. PC-01106.

1.4c Preliminary Plat No. 08003, Tara Hill, for approximately 6 lots, on property generally located at S. 61st Street and Pine Lake Road. *** FINAL ACTION ***
   Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
   Staff Planner: Brian Will, 441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
   Removed from Consent Agenda and had public hearing.
   Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 13, 2008, 7-0 (Larson and Moline absent).
   Resolution No. PC-01107.

2. REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL: None
4. **PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION:**

**PERMITS:**

4.1 Special Permit No. 08011, for expansion of a nonconforming use, on property located at 1531 S. 19th Street and 1541 S. 19th Street.

*** FINAL ACTION ***

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Christy Eichorn, 441-7603, ceichorn@lincoln.ne.gov
Had public hearing.
Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 13, 2008, as revised by staff on 2/27/08, with the amendments requested by the applicant, 7-0 (Moline and Larson absent).
Resolution No. PC-01108.

**PLATS:**

4.2 Preliminary Plat No. 08002, Horizons View Addition, for approximately 29 lots, on property generally located at O’Malley Drive and Brummond Drive.

*** FINAL ACTION ***

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Christy Eichorn, 441-7603, ceichorn@lincoln.ne.gov
Had public hearing.
Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 13, 2008, 7-0 (Moline and Larson absent).
Resolution No. PC-01109.

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

4.3 Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 08001, to amend the 2030 Lincoln/Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan by adopting the Lincoln Wastewater Facilities Master Plan.

Staff recommendation: Approval
Staff Planner: Steve Henrichsen, 441-6374, shenrichsen@lincoln.ne.gov
Had public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL, as revised by staff on 2/27/08, 7-0 (Moline and Larson absent).
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2008, 1:30 p.m.
5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION:

MISCELLANEOUS:
5.1 Waiver No. 07009, to waive street paving, sidewalks and street trees, on property generally located at N. 36th Street and Q Street.

Staff recommendation: Denial
Staff Planner: Brandon Garrett, 441-6373, bgarrett@lincoln.ne.gov
Had continued public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: DENIAL, 7-0 (Moline and Larson absent).
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2008, 1:30 p.m.

MISCELLANEOUS WITH RELATED ITEMS:
5.2a Annexation No. 07004, to annex approximately 40 acres, generally located at N. 14th Street and Alvo Road.

Staff recommendation: Approval, subject to an Annexation Agreement
Staff Planner: Tom Cajka, 441-5662, tcajka@lincoln.ne.gov
Had continued public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL, subject to an Annexation Agreement, 7-0 (Moline and Larson absent).
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2008, 1:30 p.m.

5.2b Change of Zone No. 07062, from AG Agricultural District to R-3 Residential District, on property generally located at N. 14th Street and Alvo Road.

Staff recommendation: Approval
Staff Planner: Tom Cajka, 441-5662, tcajka@lincoln.ne.gov
Had continued public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL, 7-0 (Moline and Larson absent).
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2008, 1:30 p.m.

5.2c Preliminary Plat No. 07005, Kooser Addition, for one lot, generally located at N. 14th Street and Alvo Road.

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Tom Cajka, 441-5662, tcajka@lincoln.ne.gov
Had continued public hearing.
Planning Commission ‘final action’: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the revised staff report dated February 13, 2008, with amendments as requested by the applicant, 7-0 (Moline and Larson absent).
Resolution No. PC-01110.
AT THIS TIME, ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA, MAY DO SO

---

PENDING LIST:

1. Change of Zone No. 3321, requested by Michael T. Johnson, on behalf of West Gate, inc., from R-7 Residential District to B-4 Lincoln Center Business District, on property generally located at 1729 “M” Street.  
   (6-13-01: Planning Commission voted 6-0 to place on pending at the request of the applicant.)

2. Street and Alley Vacation No. 04013, to vacate all of the east-west alley in Block 65, Original Lincoln, bounded by 13th, 14th, "M" and "N" Streets, generally located at S. 13th Street & "M" Street.  
   (3-16-05: Planning Commission voted 9-0 to place on pending until completion of the Downtown Master Plan at the request of the applicant.)

3a. Change of Zone No. 06082, from AGR Agricultural Residential District to R-3 Residential District, on property generally located at SW 40th Street and West A Street.  
   (8-15-07: Planning Commission voted 8-0 to place on pending at the request of the applicant.)

3b. Preliminary Plat No. 06011, Woodland View 1st Addition, for 25 single family lots and 4 outlots, on property generally located at SW 40th Street and West A Street. The Planning Commission action on the plat is final, unless appealed to the City Council. The following waivers are also being requested: a) to allow sanitary sewer to run against the street grade and b) to allow sanitary sewer to be deeper than 15 feet. Any waiver requests that are recommended for denial by the Planning Department will be forwarded to the City Council for public hearing. If all waiver requests are recommended for approval, the Planning Commission action is final, unless appealed to the City Council.  
   ***FINAL ACTION***  
   (8-15-07: Planning Commission voted 8-0 to place on pending at the request of the applicant.)
Planning Dept. staff contacts:

Ray Hill, Development Review Manager 441-6371  rhill@lincoln.ne.gov
Steve Henrichsen, Special Projects Manager 441-6374  shenrichsen@lincoln.ne.gov
Mike Brienzo, Transportation Planner 441-6369  mbrienzo@lincoln.ne.gov
Tom Cajka, Planner 441-5662  tcajka@lincoln.ne.gov
David Cary, Transportation Planner 441-6364  dcary@lincoln.ne.gov
Mike DeKalb, Planner 441-6370  mdekalb@lincoln.ne.gov
Christy Eichorn, Planner 441-7603  ceichorn@lincoln.ne.gov
Brandon Garrett, Planner 441-6373  bgarrett@lincoln.ne.gov
Sara Hartzell, Planner 441-6372  shartzell@lincoln.ne.gov
Brian Will, Planner 441-6362  bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
Ed Zimmer, Historic Preservation Planner 441-6360  ezimmer@lincoln.ne.gov

*****
The Planning Commission meeting which is broadcast live at 1:00 p.m. every other Wednesday will be rebroadcast on Sundays at 1:00 p.m. on 5 City-TV, Cable Channel 5.

*****
The Planning Commission agenda may be accessed on the Internet at http://www.lincoln.ne.gov/city/plan/pcagenda/index.htm
SIDEWALK REPAIR ADVISORY

Project #702360

The City of Lincoln awarded a contract for sidewalk repair and curb ramp reconstruction last fall. The sidewalk repair work will be scheduled at various locations in the east portion of Downtown Lincoln from 16th Street to 27th Street, between ‘M’ Street and ‘R’ Street. This sidewalk repair contract includes sidewalk repair adjacent to or near your property or business. The contract for this work has been awarded to TCW Construction of Lincoln.

The contractor has resumed sidewalk repairs on this contract after suspending work during the winter season. The repair work will involve removal and replacement of marked sections of sidewalk. There will be some inconvenience to businesses and pedestrians in this area as sidewalk sections are removed and replaced and sidewalk locations are closed and barricaded to complete this work. Driveways may also be closed for short durations to complete work on sidewalk through the drive. The contractor will provide access to businesses during this work. We request the patience and cooperation of pedestrians and businesses in this area as the contractor progresses with this work.

This project is funded with funds budgeted in the City’s General Fund. The Public Works and Utilities Department will administer this contract. You may contact the Sidewalk Section at 441-7541 with any questions regarding the sidewalk areas designated for repair. Ron Edson with the Public Works and Utilities Department is the Project Manager for the construction work. Ron can be contacted at 525-9294. If you have any questions of the contractor, you may contact TCW Construction at 475-5030.

Harry Kroos
Engineering Services
441-7541
Tammy,  

Please share this with the other councilmembers  

Doug  

From: snyderpt@navix.net  
To: demery@lincoln.ne.gov  
CC: snyderpt@navix.net  
Subj: Change of zone - 70th & Van Dorn  

February 26, 2008  

Councilman Doug Emery  
City of Lincoln, City Council  
P.O. Box 82307  
Lincoln, NE 68501-2307  

Dear Councilman Emery:  

This letter is to summarize my statements made at the February 25, 2008, City Council meeting. As you know, I spoke in opposition to the change of zone #07061 application submitted by Steve Glenn of MGG Enterprises for a change of zone from B1 local business district to B2 and I also spoke in opposition to pre-existing use permit #07001A. As I expressed during two Planning Commission hearings and during the hearing before the City Council, I would be against the change in zoning that would decrease the parking stalls for Glenn’s True Value Hardware at 70th and Van Dorn Street. If you search the information from the City of Lincoln Planning Department and also testimony before the Planning Commission, you will see that this temporary tent that Mr. Glenn wishes to install on the north side of his building does not have the proper 20-foot setback in order to meet the regulations of building safety (See attached
email from Terry Kathe on 1/30/2008).

I would also like to correct the record on any false impressions that I did not try to work with Mr. Glenn on solutions. We were informed by the Planning Commission after the first testimony that Mr. Glenn, myself, and the Planning Department needed to work together on a new plan that would address some of the safety and city ordinance issues. Our first Planning Commission date was December 19, 2007. I did attempt to call Mr. Glenn several times between December 19, 2007, and the January 30, 2008, Planning Commission hearing. He finally responded at the end of the week on January 25, 2008, and we setup a meeting for the morning of January 28, 2008. I did take my clinical director, Scott McLean, with me for a meeting at the Glenn’s True Value Hardware store. Mr. Glenn refused to leave his office and refused to go out and look at the parking lot or the plan that he had presented to the Planning Commission, which included the proposed parking stalls. My employee and I had used an electric range finder several times to measure and predict where the temporary tent and the parking stalls might be set on the property of Glenn’s True Value. Mr. Glenn did admit later on that day that the drawing was inaccurate and that he would have it redone. Any comments that I have not been trying to work with Mr. Glenn on resolutions of this problem are in fact false.

Mr. Glenn’s solutions to the decrease in parking spaces include parking his employees across the street and engaging Silverhawk Investigators and Security to be at the property line from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday-Friday during April, May and June. Mr. Glenn also proposes that he will purchase a sign telling customers that they cannot park on Snyder Physical Therapy property without being towed. These three items would not resolve my concerns about the parking issue since Mr. Glenn has not followed through on many occasions on promised agreements. There would need to be someone that would police these three items and ensure that they are followed through in an efficient manner. I am a full-time practicing physical therapist and would not be available to, nor should I be expected to, monitor exceptions to a city ordinance if any of these three criteria were not met.

The other issue at hand is the fence that Mr. Glenn installed on the south side of Glenn’s True Value. At one time during the testimony on February 25, 2008, Mr. Steve Glenn did mention that he had received a city permit for the fence that surrounds his rental equipment. As you know, from the attached memo and from the attached report from the Planning Department, this is not allowed under either his current zoning or if he would acquire a B2 zoning. He did state that he had been led astray by the city since he was issued a permit for this enclosed area. I did call Building and Inspections today and found that he has not in fact applied for a permit. I also asked him about this permit at the time that he erected the fence this past summer, since one entire side of the fence is located on my property.

I want to emphasize that I am a small independent business owner and have been located at 70th and Van Dorn for 18 years and that in fact I am dealing with a large corporate hardware store better known as True Value. Their corporate semi trailer trucks come in and out of my property on a regular basis. It has always been my opinion that we have existing ordinances to protect the public, which includes public safety. There are many items involved in this presentation that do not provide protection to the public; of course, my major concern applies to my disabled clients but also to the safety of anyone who might be involved in carrying out general activities in my
surrounding business environment. I would hope that the City Council would follow the recommendation by the Planning Commission and deny these applications.

I hope you will give consideration to my concerns and deny both the change of zone and the pre-existing use permit.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Jayne L. Snyder, P.T., D.P.T.
JLS:ksp

Attachment

Jayne L. Snyder, PT, DPT
Snyder Physical Therapy, PC
2845 South 70th Street
Lincoln, NE 68506
(Ph) 402/489-1999
(Fx) 402/489-4153
snyderpt@navix.net

Delicious ideas to please the pickiest eaters. Watch the video on AOL Living.
Comment 1: Park One is zoned C-3 and a parking lot is not an allowed use. It is accessory to the use on premises. Leasing of parking off the property, outside the premises or non-joint parking is not allowed. B-2 only allows parking within 300 feet to be counted toward the requirement of minimum parking count.

Site Plan Comments:

a) Parking cannot be within 20 feet of the tent. Plan appears to show (estimated) 12-15 feet.

b) enclosure on south end of the building still shown. Does not meet setbacks to use abutting residential zoning.

Terry Kafie
Zoning Coordinator
Dept. of Building & Safety
Dear Council members,

I did not participate in the recent rate hearing related to LES "Sustainable Energy" policy and actions. However, I want to thank you for your reasonable, cautious approach to this highly politicized matter.

"Sustainable" energy production sounds great, but in reality is a goal that is, I fear, unattainable. Worse, the expense of chasing this ideal will damage LES customers.

I encourage you to resist the hysterical cries of those who justify the high cost by claiming that it will stop Global Warming. Human-induced climate change is increasingly being disproved by research. In fact, since 1998, global temperature has levelled off and a decline appears to have begun. Time will tell whether this trend continues, but past records show that global temperature was warmer 1000 years ago than it is now. In fact, we have been recovering from a "little ice age" for the last 400 years, with no "abnormal" warming occurring during the dramatic rise in atmospheric Carbon Dioxide over the last 50 years. The attached 8 page research paper documents this. If you are interested, I can provide you with links to more articles and research papers. Please don't believe "the science is settled"!

It is wise to conserve energy, and to use it as efficiently possible. If alternatives are, or can become economically competitive with conventional sources, they should be supported on their own merit. However, please do not make decisions based on the false idea that Lincoln can help stop Global Warming.

Thank you.

Robert O. Ravenscroft
3340 Potomac Dr.
Lincoln, NE 68516

402-328-8149

- 2000yr_temp.pdf
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ABSTRACT
A climatic reconstruction published in E&E (Loehle, 2007) is here corrected for various errors and data issues, with little change in the results. Standard errors and 95% confidence intervals are added. The Medieval Warming Period (MWP) was significantly warmer than the bimillennial average during most of the period 820 – 1040 AD. The Little Ice Age was significantly cooler than the average during most of 1440 – 1740 AD. The warmest tridecade of the MWP was warmer than the most recent tridecade, but not significantly so.

Keywords: anthropogenic climate impacts, historical climate trends, Medieval Warming Period, Little Ice Age, hockey stick model, time series

INTRODUCTION
Historical data provide a baseline for judging how anomalous recent climate changes are and for assessing the degree to which organisms are likely to be adversely affected by current or future warming. A recent reconstruction (Loehle, 2007) used data that largely excluded tree ring records to investigate the possible effect of proxy type on reconstruction outcome. Several errors in data handling in that report have come to light, leading to the need for this report, which corrects these errors. In addition, confidence intervals are now computed for more robust evaluation of the results.

METHODS
Loehle (2007) obtained data for long series that had been previously calibrated and converted to temperature by their respective authors. Essentially no tree ring data were used. After an extensive search, all data were used that had at least 20 dates over the 2000-year period. The series used were: GRIP borehole temperature (Dahl-Jensen et al., 1998); Conroy Lake pollen (Gajewski, 1988); Chesapeake Bay Mg/Ca (Cronin et
al., 2003); Sargasso Sea $^{18}$O (Keigwin, 1996); Caribbean Sea $^{18}$O (Nyberg et al., 2002); Lake Tsuolbmajavri diatoms (Korhola et al., 2000); Shihua Cave layer thickness (Tan et al., 2003); China composite (Yang et al., 2002) which does use tree ring width for two out of the eight series that are averaged to get the composite, or 1.4% of the total data input to the mean computed below; speleothem data from a South African cave (Holmgren et al., 1999); SST variations (warm season) off West Africa (deMenocal et al., 2000); SST from the southeast Atlantic (Farmer et al., 2005); SST reconstruction in the Norwegian Sea (Calvo et al., 2002); SST from two cores in the western tropical Pacific (Stott et al., 2004); mean temperature for North America based on pollen profiles (Viau et al., 2006); a phenology-based reconstruction from China (Ge et al., 2003); annual mean SST for northern Pacific site SSDP-102 (Latitude 34.9530, Longitude 128.8810) from Kim et al. (2004); and Spannagel Cave (Central Alps) stalagmite oxygen isotope data (Mangini et al., 2005). This gave a total of eighteen series (Fig. 1) with quite wide geographic coverage (including tropical) and based on multiple proxies. Many other series could not be used because they had too few dates within the 2000-year span or were not calibrated to temperature. In a few cases, data that were appropriate could not be obtained from authors. Whatever temperature calibration issues exist with these proxies are not common across the different proxies. The locations of the 18 series used are shown in Figure 1.

![Proxy Locations](image)

**Figure 1.** Map of study sites. Thanks to Mike Martin.
Four of the series (Calvo et al. 2002, deMenocal et al. 2000, Farmer et al. 2005, and Kim et al. 2004) were assumed by Loehle (2007) to be reported in ages relative to 2000, but in fact were implicitly relative to 1950. The previous study also used the proxy data column in Farmer et al. (2005) rather than the temperature column. Both these errors are corrected in the present note.

In addition, the present note treats the 18 series on a more uniform basis than in the original study. Data in each series have different degrees of temporal coverage. For example, the pollen-based reconstruction of Viau et al. (2006) has data at 100-year intervals, which is now assumed to represent 100 year intervals (rather than points, as in Loehle, 2007). Other sites had data at irregular intervals. This data is now interpolated to put all data on the same annual basis. In Loehle (2007), interpolation was not done, but some of the data had already been interpolated before they were obtained, making the data coverage inconsistent. In order to use data with non-annual coverage, some type of interpolation is necessary, especially when the different series do not line up in dating. This interpolation introduces some unknown error into the reconstruction but is incapable of falsely generating the major patterns seen in the results below. An updated version of the Holmgren data was obtained. Data on duplicate dates were averaged in a few of the series.

Data in each series (except Viau, because it already represents a known time interval) were smoothed with a 29-year running centered mean (previously called a 30 year running mean). This smoothing serves to emphasize long term climate patterns instead of short term variability. All data were then converted to anomalies by subtracting the mean of each series from that series. This was done instead of using a standardization date such as 1970 because series date intervals did not all line up or all extend to the same ending date. With only a single date over many decades and dating error, a short interval for determining a zero date for anomaly calculations is not valid. The mean of the eighteen anomaly series was then computed for the period 16 AD to 1980 AD. When missing values were encountered, means were computed for the sites having data. Note that the values do not represent annual values but rather are based on running means.

COMPUTATION OF CONFIDENCE INTERVALS
Standard errors and confidence intervals are somewhat complicated by the presence of cross-sectional heteroskedasticity (unequal variances) in the data. The variance about the global mean temperature of Calvo et al. (2002), for example, is almost 7 times as great as that of Viau et al. (2006). Because of this heteroskedasticity, conventional pointwise variance estimates will not have their customary $\chi^2$ distribution, and hence the Student t distribution (see e.g. Casella and Berger 2002) will not provide accurate critical values to form confidence intervals.

It is assumed here that

$$X_{jt} = \mu_j + e_{jt},$$

where $X_{jt}$ is the temperature reconstruction from proxy $j$ at time $t$ and $\mu_j$ is global mean
temperature at time $t$. The errors $\epsilon_{jt}$ are assumed to be normally distributed with mean 0 and proxy-specific variance $V_j$ and to be independent across proxies at each point in time. As in Loehle (2007), $\mu_t$ is estimated by the simple mean

$$m_t = \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_j X_{jt},$$

where the sum is taken over the $n_t$ proxies that are active at time $t$ ($n_t = 18$ for most dates). The variance of $m_t$ is therefore

$$\text{Var}(m_t) = \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_j V_j,$$

where again the sum is taken over the $n_t$ proxies that are active at time $t$.

The proxy-specific variances $V_j$ may be estimated over the time-series dimension, with a conservative adjustment for degrees of freedom, by

$$\hat{V}_j = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_i n_i (X_{io} - m_t)^2,$$

where the sum is now over the $N_j$ dates for which proxy $j$ is active. The heteroskedasticity-adjusted standard error of $m_t$ is then

$$s_t = \frac{1}{n_t} \left( \sum_j \hat{V}_j \right)^{1/2},$$

again taking the sum only over the $n_t$ proxies that are active at time $t$.

During 148 – 1425 AD all 18 proxies are active and $s_t$ is constant at 0.136 °C. The standard errors increase gradually as proxies drop out, rising to 0.178 °C in 1935 when only 11 proxies are still active. Although the $V_j$ are estimated with almost 2000 points in time, the 29-year running mean implies that effectively at most only about 60 of these are independent. Assuming approximately 60 degrees of freedom, the 95% confidence intervals in Figure 2 extend 2.00 $s_t$ above and below $m_t$.

The maintained assumption of cross-sectional independence of the errors is not unreasonable with the present data set, given the good geographical distribution of the proxies used. In studies with a substantially denser network of proxies, however, cross-sectional correlation would eventually become an important consideration.

**RESULTS**

The corrected point estimates of global temperature anomalies produced by taking the mean of the smoothed deviations are shown in Figure 2, together with 95% confidence
intervals. With the corrected dating, the number of series for which data is available drops from 11 to 8 in 1935, so that subsequent values of the reconstruction would be based on less than half the total number of series, and hence would have greatly decreased accuracy. Accordingly, the corrected estimates only run from 16 AD to 1935 AD, rather than to 1980 as in Loehle (2007).

The corrected estimates are very similar to the original results, showing quite coherent peaks. Note that the use of smoothed data (29-year running mean) and the existence of dating error in the series means that peaks and troughs are damped compared to annual data and are likely even damped compared to the true history (Loehle, 2005). Some of the input data were also integrated values or sampled at wide intervals. Thus it is not possible to compare recent annual data to this figure to ask about anomalous years or decades.

The corrected data continue to show the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) and Little Ice Age (LIA) quite clearly. The confidence intervals in Figure 2 indicate that the MWP was significantly warmer than the bimillennial average during most of approximately 820 – 1040 AD, at the 5% level (2-tailed). Likewise, the LIA was significantly cooler than the bimillennial average during most of approximately 1440-1740 AD.

The peak value of the MWP is 0.526 Deg C above the mean over the period (again as a 29 year mean, not annual, value). This is 0.412 Deg C above the last reported value at 1935 (which includes data through 1949) of 0.114 Deg C. The standard error
of the difference is 0.224 Deg C, so that the difference is significantly non-zero at the 10% level ($t = 1.84$). While instrumental data are not strictly comparable, the rise in 29 year-smoothed global data from NASA GISS (http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp) from 1935 to 1992 (with data from 1978 to 2006) is 0.34 Deg C. Even adding this rise to the 1935 reconstructed value, the MWP peak remains 0.07 Deg C above the end of the 20th Century values, though the difference is not significant.

The main significance of the results here is not the details of every wiggle, which are probably not reliable, but the overall picture of the 2000 year pattern showing the MWP and LIA timing and curve shapes. Future studies need to acquire more and better data to refine this picture.
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Whistle-free zones proliferate

Concerns remain despite initial indications that this practice is safe

"All I do is sit and cry! As the evening train goes by! I heard that lonesome whistle blow!" sing Hank Williams and Jimmy Davies in "I Heard that Lonesome Whistle Blues.

Williams and Davies would be in good company today, as more and more people push to create more quiet and peaceful communities by silencing train horns at grade crossings. A Federal Railroad Administration decision two years ago set guidelines for what additional crossing protection is needed in so-called "quiet zones" and, despite continued controversy, initial data show the rules are keeping accidents from spiking when trains horns cease. Though they can be costly, applications for new quiet zones show no signs of abating.

As of November 2007, there were a total of 393 quiet zones in the U.S. covering 2,999 crossings under the 2005 FRA rule. The zones can vary from just one silenced crossing to entire lines. For example, the whole 18-mile Greenbush commuter line of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority is a quiet zone. In the Chicago area, 419 crossings that had been declared quiet zones before the new rules went into effect have been grandfathered in. However, the FRA is reviewing the Chicago zones and will make a new determination on them soon.

Railroads cannot prohibit the establishment of a quiet zone, but they must play a role in establishing one. Railroad assistance is necessary for installation of the safety devices and to provide updated information for the National Grade Crossing Inventory. The FRA expects railroads to cooperate with local and state authorities for the installation of the grade crossing safety improvements. Union Pacific, for one, actively participates in quiet zone projects affecting its lines. UP representatives take part in diagnostic meetings and provide the necessary railroad information required to set up the zones.

Quiet zones must have grade crossing warning devices consisting of flashing lights, gates, and constant warning machinery and power-off indicators. Crossings must have an advance warning sign that advises motorists that horns are not sounded at the crossing. The minimum distance for a quiet zone is a half-mile in length, which could include one or several crossings.

Other safety measures that may be used in quiet zones include:
- Permanent or temporary closure of some crossings. This can mean full-time closure, or perhaps, closure only at night.
- Four-quadrant gate systems.
- Crossing gates with medians or traffic separators.
- Conversion of a two-way street to a one-way street.
- Wavisde horns used in place of locomotive horns.

To establish a quiet zone, local officials conduct a "diagnostic team review" of all grade crossings within the proposed quiet zone. This review must include both public and private crossings. Public crossings within the specified area must already have both flashing lights and gates before the process can start. The request then goes to the state transportation department, public utilities commission, or other governing body, and then to the FRA.

The FRA has assigned a risk index to every railroad crossing in the country that indicates the relative potential of vehicle-train collisions based on a variety of factors including historical data.

Before a quiet zone may be established, this risk index must be recalculated for each crossing, taking into account both the increased risk of banning horns and the decreased risk resulting from proposed "supplemental safety measures" to be added to each crossing. To get a quiet zone approved, the summary risk index for the zone must be determined and must not exceed the risk index with horns in use.

The FRA rule came about because it found the way quiet zones were being instituted before the rule was increasing collisions. Two FRA studies of grade crossing incidents that examined whistle bans in 1995 and 2000 concluded that "an average of 62 percent more collisions occurred at whistle ban crossings equipped..."
Gates in two quadrants can prevent accidents, but road users who want to get around them can do so easily, as one did recently in Shepherdstown, W.Va. Robert E. Grongo

with gates than at similar crossings across the nation without bars.”

And based on preliminary numbers, the new rules are having the desired effect. In recent Congressional testimony, FRA Deputy Administrator Clifford C. Eby said accidents at crossings in quiet zones occurred at a rate of 44 per year on average during the study period that included parts of 2005 and 2006. That compares favorably with the nationwide average of 50.3 annual collisions outside of quiet zones studied from 2000 through 2004.

Many engineers and conductors have mixed feelings about them. "As long as the crossings involved are fully protected with lights — preferably the full overhead package — and gates, I guess I'm OK with them," says one engineer with a Class I. Another Class I engineer agrees, but says he feels crossings in quiet zones in his district are inadequately protected. "They're riding on their laurels of not having hit anybody at these things, but it's coming," he says. However, when done properly, he says the quiet zones can be helpful, because engineers don't have to focus on blowing horns while still thinking about train handling and other issues they must deal with.

Communities that are calling for quiet zones must also bear the monetary costs associated with the designation, which can be expensive. A four-quadrant gate system costs between $300,000 and $500,000. A standard system runs from $185,000 to $400,000. Annual maintenance runs from $4,000 to $10,000. All of these costs are borne by the local government that's instituting the quiet zone. And liability for all grade-crossing accidents shifts from the railroad to the local government when a quiet zone is put in place.

This makes cost a significant factor for cities hoping to establish quiet zones, depending on how much work is needed. In Oceanside, Calif., the cost to silence horns is estimated at $7 million to $9 million for five railroad crossings that will need additional drop-down gates, new sidewalks, and special automatic swing gates for pedestrians. In Burlington, Iowa, the cost to create 10 quiet zones ranges from $200,000 to $1 million or higher for each crossing based on the measures cities officials decide to implement at each crossing. In some cases, communities can get funding assistance. For example, the Ohio Rail Development Commission administers a $15 million grade crossing safety program for the Ohio Department of Transportation using Federal Highway Administration funds to upgrade crossings.

Grants or no, communities are increasingly deciding quiet zones are money well spent. Hank Williams and Jimmy Davies, dry those tears. — Steve Gischinski
February 22, 2008

Dear Councilman Marvin,

I believe the City's snow removal efforts are quite good. The Journal Star's call for a policy review seems appropriate. Periodic review of public policy is always beneficial and usually results in productive fine-tuning. There is, however, another dimension of snow removal I wish to address.

So good is the City's snow removal that, without asking, a family can have a couple hundred feet of its front lawn also removed.

We bought a house to renovate a year ago and the next week a snow plow driver successfully peeled back nearly 24 inches of the entire length of our corner lot. I wrote the City and asked if some one could at least come and remove the huge clods now rolled over on remaining lawn.

Several weeks later I received an answer from the city saying, “Sorry.” He reminded us that the land from the sidewalk to the curb does belong to the city but the home owner is entirely responsible for the upkeep of the parking. The ripped up lawn became my problem.

The city effectively insulates itself from the careless plow driver who chews up major sections of lawn. An occasional mail box whacked and salt over the parking is understandable. A major ripping of the lawn is another matter. Lincoln's policy is unfair in these circumstances.

I hope the snow removal policy is reviewed and that consideration should be given to holding plow drivers responsible for tearing up lawn. I prefer something more than a slap on the wrist. How about requiring the driver to do the repairs?

Surely a snow plow driver ought be able to keep his plow where it belongs!

Robert Peterson
5521 Pawnee Street
Lincoln, NE 68506
402-483-1837
I'm wondering if you shouldn't take a look at us in the Colonial Hills area for blighting purposes. Our homes are built in the seventies and we also could use some tax increment money to do upgrades to our area. Matter of fact my home needs some real upgrades so it might sell better.

The hodgepodge way the city is being looked at and the tax revenues being given away when blighting occurs is disgraceful. If I didn't think you were honest; I'd think you are catering to the money people of our community and complying to their desires.

Growth of revenues is sometimes best approached by attracting businesses willing to pay (living wages) to employees.

When you focus on one neighborhood like is going on now, one of the things that you are doing is simply pushing that neighborhood's problem to other older neighborhoods of the city.

I know you don't need to respond to this and probably won't; however I'm not afraid to share my name.

Allan Amsberry
I urge you to oppose this poorly thought out attempt to restrict options and opportunities for our city. There are several people and levels of approval in the awarding of city contracts. A council person can not just give themselves a contract. It must be submitted for bid, meet all the requirements and pass muster with the approving authorities. I am not telling you anything that you shouldn’t know better than I.

The contract should have performance standards and consequences, as I believe Mr. Svoboda’s did; and I believe he was held to them.

This is as it should be. I don’t think anyone from EDM was on the Council, but apparently much was ignored and/or forgiven.

Contracts should be above board, reviewed, approved and done the same whether or not an official is connected to the company. If the process is open and fair, then it should not matter who it is submitted by. Why should we discourage our most successful business people with business and management horse sense from running for office by throwing a road block up. If you all had to recluse yourselves on any and all self interest items we would have no one to vote on snow removal, street maintenance, parks, libraries, electric or gas rates, taxes etc. etc since all of you might be affected by those things since you live in this city. Maybe you should pass a rule that requires all city council members to live in some other city in order to avoid any possible conflict of interest. I think you often vote the way you do because of built in wishes and desires that are at their core a personal conflict, but you vote for what you think is best and what best represents your constituents. Why deprive your constituents from what is best just because a public official has a business interest? The contract should be awarded to the best all around bidder.

This is an idea that at it’s core is inherently good intentioned and meant well (to show no impropriety), but would result in harming both city and Personal options. If you want to go on a witch hunt, there are bigger witches to hunt.
Thank you for your time and
Taking time to think this through

Ron and Becky Herms
RE/MAX Real Estate Group
1001 South 70th St  Suite 225
Lincoln, NE  68510
Ron's "Sell" 402-432-0804
Becky's "Sell" 402-432-6476

houses@SellingLincoln.com
www.SellingLincoln.com
Licensed to sell Real Estate in the State of Nebraska
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
General Council

Name: tom hardesty
Address: 6715 BLUERIDGE LN.
City: Lincoln, NE 68516
Phone: 402-423-6129
Fax: 402-434-2402
Email: thardesty@wellmanninc.com

Comment or Question:
I have been hearing of a charter amendment that the Mayor wants that would not allow council members from doing business with the city and any one wanting to run for city office could not if they are entered into a contract with the city.
This is nothing short of partison politics in my opinon. Do not let the short comings of a previous administration come into play and put us right back where we were a year ago.
The business community does not need the divisiveness we have had between us and the city coming back to us especially in these hard times we are in.

Thanks for the time and for your service.

Tom Hardesty (pres.)
Wellmann Heating and Air.
February 27, 2008

Mr. Dan Marvin
Lincoln City Councilman
555 S. 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

RE: Sidewalk request – West Lincoln, Block 16, Lots 1 through 7,
REFERENCE 25

Dear Mr. Marvin:

I am sorry I didn’t make it to the February 25th City Council meeting. The winter weather that evening made it impossible for me to get there. I am disabled with a bad back and knees and it would not have been safe for me to be out on slick sidewalks. I’m writing you a follow-up letter to respond to some of the remarks made at the Council meeting.

During the meeting, Mr. Kroos, the City’s sidewalk person, said the person who requested this sidewalk lived on Main Street. When I spoke with him several days before the meeting, he said the person lived on my block. Since there is only one other person on my block on Main Street, it is easy to figure out who is asking for the sidewalk.

This person has two teenagers, not young children. He said he wanted the sidewalk so his kids could ride their bikes. One of his teenagers has been driving for two or three years. The other teenager is at or near driving age too. I haven’t seen them riding bikes for years. Additionally, this person routinely parks vehicles and his boat so that the sidewalk in front of his home is blocked. I enclosed pictures showing the sidewalk in front of his home partially obstructed by his boat tow bar and his vehicles parked between the sidewalk and street. His children could not ride bikes in front of their own home because his own sidewalk is blocked.

I have lived at this location for 35 years and no one has ever complained before this one person about a lack of sidewalk. There are numerous blocks surrounding my property without sidewalk.

Mr. Kroos said at the Council meeting that sidewalks are put in when new homes are built. Several homes have been built around my property and they have not put in a sidewalk.

This is one of the oldest and lowest income areas of Lincoln. Years ago, I helped the neighborhood get grants so some sidewalks and paved streets could be put in the area. At that time, there wasn’t even pavement around the elementary school.

There are not sidewalks in the two blocks directly south of the elementary school and none on the west side of the block where the elementary school sits. I think it would be more important to put sidewalks on these blocks rather than on the little piece of land south of my home.

I have a well established blue grass lawn that would be destroyed if I had to put in a sidewalk.

Mr. Kroos said the sidewalk would not be expensive. It may not be expensive for him, but
it would be expensive for me. I am elderly, disabled, on Social Security and low income. Mr. Kroos said it would cost about $1,000.00 for the sidewalk. That is a tremendous amount of money to me. I can’t afford it and there are no grants.

I am asking you again to please reject this request to put sidewalk on my property. I’m told you will vote on this at the March 3rd City Council meeting. Thank you again for reading my letter and I would truly appreciate your rejection for this sidewalk on my property. I think it would be more of a hardship for me than the teenager who can’t ride a bike.

Sincerely,

Maxine Sturzenegger
2441 N. Main Street
Lincoln NE 68521
West Lincoln, Block 16, Lots 1 through 7,
Reference 25

Voting is Mar. 3, 2008 on this issue

photo Attached
The above picture shows how the person, who's asking me to put in sidewalk, parks his vehicles (and his truck too) and his metal boat tow bar over the sidewalk. These are parked there most of the time.

I don't think it would be safe for a child or anyone to ride a bike thru there, or run or even walk thru there.

This picture was taken within the last week.
I. MAYOR -

1. NEWS ADVISORY - RE: Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule Week of March 1 through March 7, 2008 - Schedule subject to change.

II. CITY CLERK - NONE

III. CORRESPONDENCE -

A. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE -

JON CAMP -

1. E-Mail from Mike Higgins - RE: Survey of Lincoln residents priorities.

2. E-Mail from Tom Wanser - RE: City Charter.


B. DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS - NONE

C. MISCELLANEOUS -


2. E-Mail from Alan Hersch - RE: Oppose the Proposed Charter Amendment.

3. E-Mail from Lynn Darling - RE: Conflict of interest issue.

4. E-Mail from Pat Eiche - RE: Glenn’s Hardware Store.

5. E-Mail from Virginia Wright - RE: Support charter amendment/conflict of interest.


8. E-Mail from Jerry Wolf - RE: Conflict of interest measure.
Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule
Week of March 1 through March 7, 2008
Schedule subject to change

Tuesday, March 4
- News conference - 1 p.m., topic and location to be announced
- “Choices” Gambling Awareness Month proclamation signing - 2:30 p.m., Mayor’s Conference Room, 555 S. 10th St.

Thursday, March 6
- News conference - 10 a.m., topic and location to be announced
- Environmental Task Force meeting - noon, Mayor’s Conference Room
- Leadership Lincoln Executive Series, remarks - 5 p.m., State Capitol Building, Warner Chamber
- Lincoln Independent Business Association Free Enterprise Celebration, dinner and annual awards celebration - 6 p.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 S. 13th St.
Distribute/copy for Monday distribution.

Jon Camp
Lincoln City Council
City Council Office: 441-7515
Haymarket Square Office: 474-1838

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Higgins <mthigs@neb.rr.com>
To: campjon@aol.com
Sent: Fri, 29 Feb 2008 1:03 pm
Subject: Survey of Lincoln residents

Jon,
I was fortunate to hear your radio interview this week about the proposed survey to determine Lincoln residents' priorities. I thought the interview was very timely with excellent questions and discussion. You may recall that I had a consulting company from 1983 through 2005. Our mission was to teach management how to focus on strategic priorities. I facilitated our concepts and techniques with over 700 management teams of both for profit companies as well as non-profit institutions throughout the United States, western Europe, and in Micronesia. Obviously, market research was prerequisite on most client projects. As a result I was involved in everything from creating the market research instrument through the final analysis and subsequent recommendations with every type of market research for nearly every demographic including many population centers. I do not believe a market research project to assist in setting city priorities would prove accurate or even relevant and I can assure you it would create many dangerous and negative results. It would give our city decision makers nothing more than an emotional, ill-informed response for the moment.
Respectfully, it is my opinion that voters placed the Mayor and City Council members in office because the voters had the confidence in their representatives' integrity and the intelligence to study the very comprehensive implications prerequisite to making difficult decisions. Your group has earned that responsibility. To turn that responsibility over to your constituents has many dangers to include:
(1) It would be precedent setting. A survey to gain constituent opinions on city priorities would result in an expectation/demand for a constituent survey for all future decisions with this level of importance and complexity.
(2) It could be disastrous. If the survey results establish priorities that are inconsistent with the least practical or are inconsistent with the Mayor's and Council's well informed set of priorities, which is very likely to happen, how will the Council be able to support the priorities that may prove very damaging to the city and its residents. In other words, if the City Council asks for the residents' input, will the Council have the option to ignore their response. If you want that option to ignore the results, why would the Council want to take the survey in the first place……unless
(3) the Council doesn't want to be responsible for the decision.

Thank you for taking time to review my opinion. You may distribute this correspondence to anyone you think will benefit from it and I will be available to speak at any time and any place if you think my input would be of value.

Gratefully, for your work in support of our great city,

Mike Higgins
1235 Piedmont Road
Lincoln, NE. 68510
402 489 1374
Share with officials.

Jon Camp
Lincoln City Council
City Council Office: 441-7515
Haymarket Square Office: 474-1838

-----Original Message-----
From: Tom Wanser <twanser@hamptonlots.com>
To: mayor@lincoln.ne.gov
Cc: jcamp@lincoln.ne.gov; demery@lincoln.ne.gov; jcook@lincoln.ne.gov; jspatz@lincoln.ne.gov; reschilman@lincoln.ne.gov; ksvoboda@lincoln.ne.gov; dmarvin@lincoln.ne.gov
Sent: Fri, 29 Feb 2008 11:56 am
Subject: City Charter

Mayor Beutler;

I have no idea the true genesis of the City Charter to limit the ability of certain citizens to run for a City office but I cannot begin to think of any reason to limit anyone from public office. Quite the contrary, we need ALL factions of our populace to be encouraged to run for office - THIS CHARTER NEEDS TO STOP NOW. Why create a problem where none exist?

We have had division within the City for some time now (created for political reasons) that you have, while in office, done a great job of reducing and/or eliminating, why in world would you want erase all that has been accomplished thus far?

Thank you for your consideration,

Tom Wanser
5929 Franklin Street
Lincoln, 68506

Supercharge your AIM. Get the AIM toolbar for your browser.
Tammy--distribute

Jon Camp
Lincoln City Council
City Council Office: 441-7515
Haymarket Square Office: 474-1838

-----Original Message-----
From: Marvin Souchek <MSOUCHEK@alltel.net>
To: jcamp@lincoln.ne.gov; demery@lincoln.ne.gov;jspatz@lincoln.ne.gov;
reschilman@lincoln.ne.gov; ksvoboda@lincoln.ne.gov; dmarvin@lincoln.ne.gov
Sent: Fri, 29 Feb 2008 9:39 am
Subject: FW: Proposed amendment to the Lincoln City Charter re the Anti-Business Regulation

From: Marvin Souchek [mailto:MSOUCHEK@alltel.net]
Sent: Friday, February 29, 2008 8:37 AM
To: Subject: Proposed amendment to the Lincoln City Charter re the Anti-Business Regulation

To: Lincoln City Council
From: A concerned Citizen:

If or when this insidious amendment passes, when will the next proposed amendment be offered to prohibit any Lincoln citizen from sitting on the City Council because they have a vested interest and may be "unethically minded" to further the cause of their own. Like widening a street that leads to their home, etc., or worse yet, by not allowing a widening of the street to improve traffic flow because it would decrease their homes value or may increase traffic noise, or trying to sneak one over the people, in collaboration with fellow City Council, by proposing a "green zone" near where they live. You know "green zones" have a tendency to increase home values in the immediate area. Now is that a conflict of interest?

Does this sound stupid?

Yes it does. The same way as it looks stupid, dumb, and without merit of the proposal at hand.

Our sitting judges recuse themselves when a case comes before them where there appears to be a conflict of interest or even has the appearance of a conflict of interest. That is what we have in place now and it should be sufficient to handle a situation when it comes up.
Why are we throwing out the possibility of improving services, contracts, projects, etc. by prohibiting successful business people their input into the decision making process. I am not saying that non-business people don't have valuable ideas. What I am saying is that successful business people would not be successful if they didn't know what worked. This proposal smells like input from the "intellectually educated" profession who seems to have the imbedded perception that every business person is fundamentally dishonest, lacks any integrity and is categorically someone you automatically distrust.

Marvin Souchek
The Lincoln Chamber of Commerce

Lincoln City Council Action Alert

Lincoln Chamber of Commerce Opposes Anti-Business Regulations

The Lincoln Chamber of Commerce will oppose a proposed amendment to the City's charter that unfairly restricts business owners rights and limits competition for city contracts. The proposed prohibition against business owners who've earned city contracts, marks a low point in Lincoln's recent history.

A complete copy of the proposed amendment can be found by clicking here: http://www.lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/agenda/2008/022508/08r64.pdf

The charter amendment will have a public hearing on Monday, March 3, 2008 during the regular meeting of the City Council.

The Lincoln Chamber opposes this amendment because we believe it:

1. Unfairly discriminate against business owners who wish to be involved in a possible leadership role in City government and who, at the same time, choose to compete for city
business.

1. Fails to address the root of ethical conduct issues through its misguided focus on business owners as presumptively unethical and unworthy of competing for city business and,

1. Prevents possible tax savings and could lead to a decline of quality by eliminating the most qualified and lowest bidder if that business happens to be directly or indirectly owned by an elected city official or department director.

Currently, the City's bidding process rewards the lowest and most qualified bidder with a city contract. If an elected official can provide that service, we believe the taxpayers of the city are entitled to that service at that cost.

Contact the Lincoln City Council and voice your concern by clicking the links below.

Please Carbon Copy Kyle Fischer at kfischer@lcoc.com with any communication you have with our elected officials regarding the proposed Charter Amendment.

Jon Camp: jcamp@lincoln.ne.gov
Doug Emery: demery@lincoln.ne.gov
Jonathan Cook: jcook@lincoln.ne.gov
John Spatz: jspatz@lincoln.ne.gov
Robin Eschilman: reschilman@lincoln.ne.gov
Ken Svoboda: ksvoboda@lincoln.ne.gov
Dan Marvin: dmarvin@lincoln.ne.gov

We look forward to supporting the Lincoln business community's interest at this public hearing.
For More Information Contact:
Kyle Fischer
402-436-2352
Public Policy Specialist
Lincoln Chamber of Commerce
Dear City Council members,

I urge you all to oppose, and not advance to a vote of the citizens, the proposed Charter Amendment which would prohibit City contracts with elected officials. You and other elected officials fill the much-needed and appreciated civic duty with many sacrifices involving family, business, and other matters. A public official serving the citizens for a defined term should not be punished by barring her/him from their normal business endeavors.

Please consider that the services provided by the elected official's firm might be the very best available for the job. If we bar them from bidding, we citizen/taxpayers would suffer by not getting the best price or service. I can also envision a time when a well-meaning public servant would have to interrupt a long-standing legitimate business relationship with the City, because of this ill-conceived provision. This is not fair. If the City Purchasing Dept and Legal Dept do their jobs, the contracts with all vendors will be on the up-and-up.

Please don't punish elected officials and citizens with this ill-conceived Charter Amendment. Thank you.

Alan Hersch
This change the mayor has asked for is badly needed. It is long over do. I am asking you to vote yes on this serious issue to remove all temptations. We ALL are temped when it comes to money and power. Thank you Lynn Darling -- Lincoln
As I watched the Council Meeting Last Monday and listened to Steve Glenn all I could think of was "Why did you open a hardware store at the location when you knew their was not adequate parking without infringing on his neighbor to the south "Synder Physical Therapy?" And then to think he wants to take space for a tent. I drive past that location several times a week and to have all that equipment stored behind that fence it is very unsightly. He should have considered all of that when he moved there, but it is obvious he really doesn't care if he infringes on his neighbors so long as customers can get to his store. I was appalled by his attitude and lack of consideration of his neighbors. Please consider all of this and vote "NO." When I heard he was moving from 70th and "A" to that location, with such little parking space, I couldn't believe it.

Sincerely, Pat Eiche
1591 West Manor Drive
Lincoln, NE 68506
402-488-9414
Dear Council Members:

A copy of Councilwoman Robin Eschliman's campaign supporters update has been brought to my attention. With that as the reference point, I would like to comment on some of her talking points and the idea of the amendment in general.

First, I remind Councilwoman Eschliman especially, and others as needed, that it is the responsibility of the Council to serve the publics' interests - health, welfare, and safety of the city and all its occupants.

From the beginning of her term, her interests have been to serve the private sector through LIBA and the Chamber of Commerce. She actually proposed, early in her term, to create a special council or unit to promote her business-only agenda - as if there were a shortage! Is that an example of conflict of interest, or at least deception of purpose for being on the City Council?

The concept of discrimination is nowhere to be found in this proposed amendment. There is no silencing of speech (Eschliman supporter update Item #3). Just because she perceives that business might not have its way with the city if this passes does not constitute discrimination. Conflict of interest refers to personal or financial gain that could come directly from one's vote. Simply having bills like the rest of the community does not mean a conflict of interest when voting on an LES issue. If Councilmember Eschliman were also an LES Board Member, she would be advised to check with an attorney about recusing herself.

In other words, it is another Eschliman reasoning-free update to her campaign supporters on why they should be against the proposal. I recommend that there be an informed discussion on this topic. If all I knew was from her message to supporters, that would be reason enough to support the amendment. It might be good to have a dictionary handy to check the meanings of terms being bandied about.

Overall, her position is obviously partisan, not public service. Hostility toward public employees expressed (Item #4). All employees should have due process rights in employment disputes - even in the private sector. Get Jon Camp out of office? (Item #6). Voters do that.

I think in general, that elected officials have enough to study and ponder to be effective representatives of the public interests and the complex relationships between public and private. Being a contractor with the city is an unnecessary clouding of the issues that can be resolved simply with the amendment. It's not just Republican business owners who get elected.

To all of you, thank you for your service.

Virginia K. Wright
814 Lyncrest Drive
Supercharge your AIM. Get the AIM toolbar for your browser.
Council Members,

This proposed change to the City Charter may have the right motivation but, it is not the right solution.

Yes, it is true, that with the status quo, it is possible for an elected official to pursue their own narrow self-interest over the broader interest of those they represent.

The good but, imperfect solution is the transparency of full disclosure and the simple act of officials recusing themselves from voting on matters that could create even the impression of something untoward.

The problem with the "potential of conflict of interest" argument is that there are many, many potential conflicts. To eliminate everyone with a potential conflict is to leave almost no one to run for office.

Beyond someone with a city contract, what do we do in the matter of a competitor of someone with a city contract? If the city has a contract with Pepsi could not an elected official who works for Coke have a potential conflict when it comes to the city's contract with Pepsi?

Should competitors of those who have city contracts be disqualified from running for an elected position?

Of course not.

Should city employees be disqualified from running for office?

Of course not.
Should someone in a real estate business that could benefit or be harmed by zoning or taxes be disqualified from running for office?

Of course not.

What about someone with the University or someone with the State Fair?

Should school teachers not be allowed to run for school board?

Of course not.

Nor should someone with a city contract be disqualified.

My fear is that in an effort to make something perfect..."to eliminate even the possibility of an impression of a conflict of interest"...an imperfect system, with somewhat decent safeguards, will become much worse.

After all, if it's negative appearances that we fear then let it be noted that this proposed change has indeed the potential to create a negative appearance.

Frankly, the negative appearance of an anti-business city.

Respectfully Submitted,

Doug Kasparek
I think you would be doing the city of Lincoln a terrible injustice if you were to exclude business men and women that have contracts with the city to run for office. You would certainly limit the pool of competent men and women from having the opportunity to serve our city. I urge you to vote against the bill when it comes up for vote. I know the public hearing is today and would love to be there to voice my opinion, but cannot make it. Please stop and think before you vote. I can't believe in a city this size it would be considered to exclude some of the most competent people this city has to offer.

Thank you, Pat Eiche
This proposal is completely crazy. By enacting this proposal, it would eliminate a lot of potentially good people from servicing on the council. If a council person has a contract with the City, I assume the contract was put out for bid and hopefully the best contract offer was approved. If the council person's contract was not fulfilled, then the company's contract should be terminated.

Also if a council person is abusing his or her powers, then the electorate will take care of that in the next election.

If you are going by there might be a potential conflict of interest, then we should eliminate any person who has a contract with the City, eliminate every person who works for a company that has a contract with the City, eliminate any person who works for or who has work for any type of governmental unit, whether that be state, county, city, University, public schools etc. And the reason because there MIGHT be a potential conflict of interest!!!!!! Almost any person who is elected to the council could be seen as having a potential conflict of interest on a variety of different issues. And again I am emphasizing we are doing this because there MIGHT be a conflict of interest.

Well who does that leave to run for the council?

Jerry Wolf