I. MAYOR
1. NEWS RELEASE. Reservations Due Friday for Mayor’s Arts Awards.
3. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor Announces Winners of Annual Water Conservation Art Contest.
4. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor Calls for Voluntary Water Conservation.
5. NEWS RELEASE. Lincoln Water, Wastewater Utilities Rate High in National Survey.
6. NEWS RELEASE. City Receives Two Awards for Workplace Safety.
7. NEWS RELEASE. Results Announced for Clean Your Files Week.

II. DIRECTORS

FINANCE/BUDGET DEPARTMENT
1. May Sales Tax Reports:
   (a) Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections;
   (b) Gross Sales Tax Collections (With Refunds Added Back In) 2002-2003 Through 2007-2008;
   (c) Sales Tax Refunds 2002-2003 Through 2007-2008; and

FINANCE/TREASURER'S OFFICE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
2. Reply to Susan Schultz Regarding Special Permit 08015.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION

PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES
1. Memorandum from Greg MacLean, Public Works/Utilities Director. 2006 Crash Report for the City of Lincoln, Nebraska. (Report Copies Distributed to Council Members. Copy on File in City Council Office)

III. CITY CLERK
IV. COUNCIL REQUESTS/CORRESPONDENCE

V. MISCELLANEOUS
1. Email from Shannon McGovern. Examples Given for Funding New Jail with Racing Facility.
2. Letter from Judy Halstead, Lincoln Action Program. Resignation of Executive Director Sue Hinrichs. (Delivered to Council Members, 05/19/08, a.m., Prior to Meetings)
3. InterLinc Correspondence from Kaylene Martin Regarding Before and After School, and Other Programs, Being Eliminated.
4. InterLinc Correspondence from George Buckner. Have Option of Receiving or Declining to Receive Phone Books.

VI. ADJOURNMENT
Reservations are due Friday, May 23 for the 30th annual Mayor’s Arts Awards to be presented the evening of Tuesday, June 3, 2008 at the Lied Center for Performing Arts. The event is produced by the Lincoln Arts Council (LAC), and the presenting sponsor is Union Bank.

The event begins with a reception at 5:30 p.m., and the awards presentation will begin at 7 p.m. Tickets for the event are $50, and reservations are required. Checks can be sent to LAC at 920 “O” Street, Lincoln, NE 68508. More information is available by calling 434-ARTS (2787) or on the LAC Web site at www.artscene.org.

The honorees:

- **El Dia de los Muertos (Day of the Dead) at Sheldon**, Mayor’s Choice
- **The Nebraska Repertory Theatre**, Arts Organization Award
- **Roger Bruhn**, Artistic Achievement Award for Visual Arts
- **Angel M. Geller** and **Benito Sanchez**, Artistic Achievement Award for Youth
- **Becky Van de Bogart**, Artistic Achievement Award for Performing Arts
- **John Scofield**, Gladys Lux Education Award
- **Douglas Campbell**, Heart of the Arts Award
- **Mike Seacrest**, Halcyon Allsman Benefactor of the Arts Award
- **The Train**, Outstanding Event Award
- **Paul A. Olson**, Literary Heritage Award
- **The Sawmill Building**, Larry Enersen Urban Design Award
- **James M. Cook**, Oliva Family “Arts for Kids” Award

The Mayor’s Arts Awards ceremony also will include a tribute to those members of the Lincoln arts community who have died since the last awards ceremony in June 2007. Names may be submitted to LAC.
Mayor Chris Beutler will be joined by Lincoln Water System (LWS) officials, Lincoln Wastewater System (LWWS) officials and members of the Mayor’s Water Conservation Task Force at a news conference at 10 a.m. Thursday, May 22 at the LWS well house in Antelope Park, northeast of the Auld Rec Center, 3140 Sumner.

Topics will include:

- Winners of the Mayor’s Water Conservation Task Force’s annual poster contest for fifth-graders.
- The status of the City’s water supply and conservation efforts as the summer approaches.
- The results of a national effectiveness and efficiency survey in which both LWS and LWWS participated.

In case of inclement weather, the news conference will be moved to the nearby park shelter located south of the well house and north of the Veterans Memorial Garden.
MAYOR ANNOUNCES WINNERS OF ANNUAL WATER CONSERVATION ART CONTEST

Mayor Chris Beutler today announced the winners of the annual water conservation busboard contest. Lincoln fifth-graders participated in the art contest, sponsored by the Mayor’s Water Conservation Task Force. The winning entry was submitted by Jazmyn Coleman from Hawthorne Elementary School. Her artwork will be displayed on two StarTran busboards for two months and on a billboard for one year.

“This contest is one of the ways the Water Conservation Task Force educates the community about the importance of protecting our natural resources,” said Mayor Beutler. “Through this art project, the students learn what they can do to conserve water, lessons we hope they will share with the rest of their families. The busboards and billboard remind the public that we all have a role to play in water conservation.”

Second place was awarded to Jacob Hotovy, who is home schooled. The third-place winner was Morgan Swope of Morley Elementary. Honorable mention awards were presented to Dominic Nguyen, Hawthorne Elementary; Erik Pawlowski, Cavett Elementary; Tierra Beard, Kahoa Elementary; Travis Henninger, Holmes Elementary; Jeff Gabell, North American Martyrs Catholic School; Trenton Rohde, Cavett Elementary; and Austin Bretting, North American Martyrs Catholic School.
MAYOR CALLS FOR VOLUNTARY WATER CONSERVATION

Mayor Chris Beutler today encouraged Lincoln residents to voluntarily conserve outdoor water this summer by following the designated day schedule for outdoor watering.

“Fortunately, we are in good shape as we begin the season,” said Mayor Beutler. “We’ve had good precipitation in the winter and spring, and temperatures have been slightly below normal. The aquifer is full, and river flows are slightly above normal. At the same time, we need to remember that conditions in other parts of the state impact our water supply. People in western Nebraska especially need some good rains.”

Because summer weather is unpredictable, Beutler said its important to practice water conservation all summer. The City instituted the designated day schedule five years ago.

- Properties with street addresses ending in even numbers, including zero, are asked to voluntarily limit outdoor water use (watering lawns and washing vehicles) to Wednesdays, Fridays and Sundays.
- Properties with addresses ending in odd numbers are asked to voluntarily limit outdoor watering to Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays.
- Those property owners with more than one street address at the same location can choose either daily schedule and notify the Lincoln Water System (LWS) of their decision.
- Those with automatic lawn irrigation systems are encouraged to set them to follow the designated watering days system.

Jerry Obrist, LWS Utilities Coordinator, said the use of designated days helps to level the daily usage of water throughout the week. He also said the City’s water fees are structured to encourage conservation. The more water you use, the higher the rate. The price is $1.13 per unit for the first eight units (about 6,000 gallons). The price increases to $1.59 per unit for the next 15 units (11,250 gallons). It increases again to $2.48 per unit for every 750 gallons above 15 units.

A complete description of water rates and the City’s Water Management Plan are available on the City Web site, lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: water).

-more-
In addition to following the designated day system, the Mayor’s Water Conservation Task Force recommends that citizens:

- water during the cool part of the day;
- install a rain sensor device on automatic sprinklers;
- not water when it is windy;
- adjust sprinklers to water only the lawn, and not the sidewalk or street;
- use a broom, not a hose and water, for outdoor cleaning; and
- wash your car with a pail of soapy water, using the hose only to rinse the car.

More information on water conservation is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: conserve).
Mayor Chris Beutler today announced that the Water and Wastewater divisions of the City Public Works and Utilities Department received high marks in a recent survey of 180 comparable utilities from around the nation. Beutler said citizens can be proud of how well the utilities scored in the 2007 American Water Works Association/Water Environment Federation Benchmarking Survey.

“Providing quality water and wastewater services is a priority for the health of our citizens and the growth of our City,” said Mayor Beutler. “At the same time, residents expect these services to be provided at a reasonable cost. The survey shows that our systems are both effective and efficient, and I commend the City staff who work hard every day to provide these services.”

Of the communities surveyed, the median cost for 10 units (7,500 gallons) of water as well as wastewater service was $53 per month. In Lincoln, the cost was $29 per month. Nick McElvain, Operations Support Manager for the Lincoln Water System (LWS), said the division’s own surveys of other local and regional communities also show Lincoln’s rates to be very competitive.

“It’s important to note that the size of the City’s water and wastewater systems has grown 25 to 30 percent in the last 12 years,” said Beutler. “Our divisions have been able to manage the growth and maintain the systems without adding additional employees.”

One of the key efficiency categories measured in the survey was the number of customer accounts per employee. LWS has 658 accounts per employee compared to the national median of 456. The Lincoln Wastewater System (LWWS) has 766 accounts per employee, compared to a national median of 555. Lincoln has fewer employees per customer than two-thirds of the utilities surveyed.

“I’m pleased to see how efficient our utility operating divisions are,” said Public Works and Utilities Director Greg MacLean. “Many communities are faced with the need to hold down their costs by delaying infrastructure renewal and rehabilitation projects. That’s a short-sighted approach that can often result in ‘pay me now or pay me later’ outcomes.”

-more-
Lincoln scored in the top 10 to 15 percent on the benchmarks for infrastructure renewal and replacement. “Lincoln has done an excellent job of balancing the capital expenditures necessary to provide service to new growth areas of the community with the need for maintenance programs to replace aging infrastructure,” said MacLean.

The City of Lincoln owns and maintains more than 11.5 million feet (2,200 miles) of water and wastewater mains, some of which are more than 100 years old. It would cost more than $12 billion to replace these facilities. MacLean said Public Works is developing an asset management program using Lincoln’s geographic information system, which will be used to analyze and prioritize maintenance and replacement programs in the future.

The survey also highlighted a few areas for the City to improve, such as an increased focus on preventative maintenance and a greater emphasis on employee safety programs.

This is the first year the City has been included in the survey, but MacLean said LWS and LWWS will continue to participate on an on-going basis as an essential part of the department’s ongoing efforts to improve service.

More information on the benchmarking survey, LWS or LWWS is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: public works). The public also can call LWS at 441-7571 or LWWS at 441-7961.
CITY RECEIVES TWO AWARDS FOR WORKPLACE SAFETY

The City of Lincoln recently received two awards in recognition of its outstanding workplace safety program:

- The City received an “Award of Honor with Distinction” from the National Safety Council, Greater Omaha Chapter May 15. The award was presented for outstanding occupational health program results and achievement for 10 consecutive years. The presentation was made at the Safety Council’s Safety and Health Summit in Omaha.

- The City received a 2007 Peak Performance Award at the Nebraska Safety Council Conference and Exposition in Lincoln April 10. The award was presented in recognition of the City’s outstanding record in the areas of injury prevention and safety policies and practices.

“Safety is a win-win solution,” said Bill Kostner, Risk Manager for the City of Lincoln. “It results in safe and healthy employees, who come to work and go home daily without being injured. They know their employer cares about their welfare and are therefore more productive. Everyone wins when you have a safe workplace.”

- 30 -
The City Recycling Office reports that 23 businesses and organizations combined to recycle more than 58,000 pounds of paper during Clean Your Files Week from April 20 through April 26. The total represents an environmental savings of 496 trees, 87 cubic yards of landfill space and more than 204,000 gallons of water.

In the nine years that the City of Lincoln has sponsored Clean Your Files Week, participating organizations have recycled close to 386,000 pounds of paper. The event encourages organizations and individuals to support Earth Day by recycling office paper. The effort benefits the citizens of Lincoln and the environment by conserving resources and reducing the amount of material entering the Bluff Road Landfill.

The top recycling organizations for Clean Your Files Week 2008 are:

- Lincoln East High School in the “schools” category. East High students collected 3,225 pounds of paper (more than two pounds of paper per student).
- Pegler Sysco in the “private business” category. Workers there collected 10,515 pounds of paper or 87 pounds of paper per employee.
- The Lincoln Area Agency on Aging in the “local government” category. Workers there collected 1,960 pounds of paper (51 pounds of paper per employee).
- Ameritas Life Insurance Corporation, which collected the largest amount of paper of any organization participating in the event. Ameritas collected about 17,560 pounds of paper. This is the fifth year that they have recycled the most paper.

Clean Your Files Week is organized by Recycling at Work, a campaign of the National Office Paper Recycling Project, a public-private partnership managed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, with assistance from Clean Your Files Week national sponsors. Local sponsors include the City of Lincoln, Midland Recycling, the Lincoln Public Schools and WasteCap of Nebraska.

For more information on the City recycling program, contact the Recycling Hotline at 441-8215 or visit the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: recycle).
BUDGET
Tough road ahead for war supplemental. Both the House and Senate considered a FY 2008 supplemental appropriations bill for overseas military operations this week, but competing versions in the House and Senate and the threat of a Presidential veto will make for difficult negotiations next week.

House leaders used an unusual method of bringing the supplemental to the floor as three separate amendments. The first amendment would provide $162.5 billion through the spring of 2009 to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; the second would provide a set of war policy provisions, including a goal to withdraw combat troops from Iraq by the end of 2009, and the third would include a program to expand educational benefits for veterans, extend unemployment benefits, and prevent implementation of Bush Administration Medicaid regulations.

During floor debate, the House actually rejected the first amendment that provides funding for the war, by a vote of 141-149. Most House Republicans decided to vote “present” on the amendment to protest the Democrats’ handling of the bill, and so a majority of anti-war Democrats provided the votes to defeat the amendment. The other two amendments were approved, mostly along party lines. While the House GOP efforts clearly took House Democrats by surprise, the move was purely symbolic, as the Senate version of the supplemental is expected to include the war funding.

In that regard, the Senate Appropriations Committee cleared its supplemental measure for floor consideration next week. It includes a number of differences with the House bill, as Senators chose to add a number of unrelated policy and funding provisions to the measure. Most notably, an amendment to add $1 billion to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) was approved by the panel. Other provisions of the Senate bill not in the House measure include: $490 million in additional funds for the Justice Department Byrne State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance program; $451 million for the Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief Program; $275 million for food safety programs; $400 million for rural schools, and $1.2 billion for federal science research initiatives.

Congressional leadership had hoped to send a supplemental to the President prior to adjourning for their Memorial Day recess at the end of next week, but the differences in the bills might be too much to reconcile in that short time. Further complicating matters is the threat by the President to veto any supplemental that includes non-military items.

PUBLIC SAFETY
Public safety collective bargaining measure still pending in the Senate. Legislation (HR 980) that would mandate that states and local governments allow collective bargaining for their police, fire, and emergency medical services employees appeared to be heading toward approval in the Senate this week when an unrelated amendment derailed the measure.

Senate Republicans had been holding up consideration of the bill ever since the measure was easily approved by the House last summer, but the landscape changed earlier this week when 18 Republicans (many facing re-election in November) joined Democrats in voting to proceed with debate on the bill. It had been believed that once the bill was brought up in the Senate it would be approved, as Senators would not want to vote against politically powerful police and fire
unions on an issue that they have identified as a priority this year. Bill sponsors were also boosted by the presence of hundreds of police officers in Washington for National Police Week.

However, bill sponsors were caught off-guard on Wednesday with an amendment by Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) that would provide an expansion of educational benefits to veterans. Democrats prefer what they believe to be a more generous version of that bill sponsored by Senator James Webb (D-VA) and voted to table the Graham amendment, effectively defeating the proposal. Presidential politics has also played a role in this high profile issue, as Senator Barack Obama (D-IL) has been critical recently of Senator John McCain’s (R-AZ) support of the “less generous” Graham bill.

After tabling the Graham amendment, Senate leaders had hoped to hold a vote today to cut off debate on the collective bargaining bill and approve it, but it became clear late Thursday that there were not 60 votes necessary to cut off a Republican filibuster. While no one has made public claims, it may be that Republicans opposed to the collective bargaining bill now believe that the defeat of the Graham amendment has provided them with sufficient political cover to oppose HR 980.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) reported on Thursday that bill sponsors were working on a compromise version of the HR 980 that could be considered next week.

**TAXES**

House committee approves legislation to extend expiring tax credits, create new energy tax breaks. The House Ways and Means Committee approved legislation (HR 6042) this week that would provide one-year extensions for a number of popular tax credits that expired at the end of 2007, while also providing tax incentives to encourage use of, and investment in, alternative energy sources.

In keeping with House Democratic policy, the $57 billion legislation would be fully offset by a provision to prevent certain executives and hedge fund managers from deferring compensation by using offshore arrangements, as well as language to delay implementation of rules that give multinational corporations more flexibility in how they allocate interest expenses. The bill does not include a “patch” to prevent an additional 21 million taxpayers from paying the alternative minimum tax (AMT) in 2008.

Among the popular “extenders” in the bill are the research and development tax credit; the deduction for state sales taxes in states with no income tax, the deduction for qualified educational expenses, and the tax credit for expensing Brownfields remediation costs. The measure would also expand the child care tax credit for some low-income families in 2008.

The energy provisions in the bill include a new category of tax credit bonds to finance state and local programs designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; $2 billion in new clean renewable energy bonds (CREB) for the financing of facilities that generate renewable energy; an extension of the renewable energy production tax credit, and tax credits for the purchase of plug-in vehicles, home and business energy efficiency measures, and green building and sustainable design.

The extenders and energy tax package have been considered in both the House and Senate on various occasions over the last few months, but have not become law as they have been caught up in disagreements over how to handle the AMT patch and the proposed offsets. HR 6042 is expected to be considered on the House floor next week.

**TRANSPORTATION**

House panel clears public transit measure. The House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee approved the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act of 2008 (HR 6052) by voice vote this week. The bill would authorize $1.7 billion over two years for grants to public transit agencies, if the agencies agree to use the funds for fare reductions or the expansion of services.

According to the American Public Transit Association (APTA), transit ridership nationally has reached 10.3 billion trips in 2007, a 32 percent increase from 1995, amounting to almost 4 million gallons of gasoline saved per day. APTA also estimates that households can save an average of $6,251 per year by choosing public transit over an automobile. T&I Committee Chairman James Oberstar had these statistics in mind when he introduced HR 6052 as a tool to address the steep increases in gasoline prices.

The bill would authorize an additional $750 million annually in FY 2008 and FY 2009 for the rural transit formula program. While the funds would be distributed using the current formulas for the programs, use of the funds would be restricted to efforts that would result in either reduced fares for riders or increased transit services. In addition, no local match would be required.

The bill would also increase the federal share of the cost of clean fuel and alternative fuel transit projects from 90 percent to 100 percent; extend the transit benefits enjoyed by federal employees in the Washington, DC area to all federal employees throughout the United States, and increase the federal share for parking garage structures at the end of fixed guideway lines to 100 percent.

HR 6052 does not provide for any revenue offsetting the spending in the bill, and thus runs afoul of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Democrats in the House. While it is possible the bill could be called up for consideration by the full House at any time, its future remains very doubtful for this year.

**WATER & WASTEWATER**

House panel approves three water and wastewater bills. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee voted this week to send three water-related bills to the House floor.

HR 2452 would require all wastewater utilities to monitor and report the occurrence of raw sewage spills. Dubbed the Raw Sewage Community Right to Know Act, the bill would require all...
publicly-owned wastewater utilities to implement and use a technology to monitor the occurrence of sanitary and combined sewer overflows. The bill would further require that all publicly-owned wastewater utilities must:

- Notify the public within 24 hours of an overflow;
- Immediately notify public health authorities of an overflow;
- Report the overflow to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or its state counterpart within 24 hours;
- Report to EPA or its state counterpart within 5 days on the magnitude, duration and suspected cause of the overflow, the steps being taken or planned to reduce, eliminate and prevent a recurrence of the overflow and the steps being taken or planned to mitigate the impact of the overflow;
- Report all overflows to the EPA or its state equivalent in its monthly discharge monitoring report, and
- Provide a yearly report to EPA or its state equivalent detailing the location, duration and volume of each overflow occurring in the previous year and the responses that the wastewater utility has taken or is planning to mitigate and prevent future overflows at each reported overflow site.

The bill would also authorize the use of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund to purchase and install sanitary and combined sewer overflow monitoring systems and to cover the cost of monitoring and reporting those overflows.

HR 135 would establish the 21st Century Water Commission charged with studying and reporting on the nation’s 50-year water needs and how to meet them. The President would appoint five members of the Commission and the Speaker of the House and the Senate Majority Leader would appoint another two each. The bill would require the Commission to provide the President and Congress a report on its progress every six months and to issue a final report within three years.

HR 5770 would authorize $1.5 million for the National Academy of Sciences to complete a study on the impact of climate change on watersheds, water supply and water quality.

All three bills now head to the House floor, though the House will probably not consider then until after the Memorial Day recess. The Senate has yet to take action on any similar bills.

**UPDATES**

Congress completes action on farm bill; Senate sends flood-insurance bill to conference; Senate negotiations continue on housing bill. Congress took action this week on several items covered in previous issues of the Washington Report.

**Farm Bill**

The House and Senate both voted to send the President a $300 billion, five-year bill (HR 2419) to reauthorize agriculture, rural development and nutrition programs. The House and Senate approved the bill by votes of 318-106 and 81-15, respectively. Both margins are more than sufficient to override President Bush’s expected veto of the bill. (See the May 9 Washington Report for details on HR 2419.)

**Flood Insurance**

The Senate voted 92-6 to send legislation (HR 3121) to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program to a House-Senate Conference Committee. Like the House-passed version of the bill, the Senate-passed version would forgive a $17.5 billion debt the flood insurance program owed to the federal treasury. Unlike the House-passed bill, the Senate measure would not expand the program to cover wind damage. The bill would also authorize $2 billion to update flood maps. (See the May 9 Washington Report for details on HR 3121.)

**Housing/Foreclosure**

Senators Christopher Dodd (D-CT) and Richard Shelby (R-AL), the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, continued negotiations this week on legislation to overhaul the regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and on the Senate response to the House-passed comprehensive housing and foreclosure prevention bill (HR 3221). (See the April 11, April 25, May 2 and May 9 issues of the Washington Report for details on HR 3221 and other housing bills.)

**GRANT OPPORTUNITIES**

**Department of Justice**

The U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) is accepting applications for the Secure Our Schools (SOS) grant program. Funds are available to help law enforcement agencies work to improve security in schools. Awards can be used to purchase security equipment, to perform security assessments, to conduct training for staff and students, or to improve communication methods between local law enforcement agencies and schools. There is a 50 percent local match requirement and approximately $13 million is available for this competitive program. Applications are due June 13, 2008. For more information, please see:


**Department of Justice**

The U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is accepting applications for the FY 2008 Gang Prevention Coordination Assistance Program grants. The purpose of this program is to increase and
improve coordination between federal, state, and local resources. Funding will be provided for communities to implement anti-gang strategies such as primary prevention, secondary prevention, gang enforcement, and gang intervention. There is $2.4 million available, 12 expected awards, and a maximum of $200,000 per award. There is no required cost share or match. Applications are due June 13, 2008. For more information, please see: http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2008/Gang.pdf.

Department of Justice
DOJ is accepting applications for the Weed and Seed Community Program for FY 2009. The initial focus (“Weed”) looks to control crime by involving law enforcement and community policing. The “Seed” part focuses on community revitalization involving prevention, intervention, and neighborhood restoration. Eligible communities must have a persistently high level of serious violent crime and have not previously been approved for a Weed and Seed site. The DOJ will award applicants up to $1 million over a 5-year period. A 25 percent non-federal match is required of all recipients. All final applications are due September 9, 2008. For more detailed information, please see: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ccdo/funding/CCDO_FY09_WeedandSeedCompetitiveSolicitation.pdf.

Department of Homeland Security
DHS will begin accepting applications, May 27, 2008 for the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grant program. DHS will award funding to assist with fire department staffing and deployment capabilities. SAFER provides funding for two types of activities: hiring firefighters and the recruitment and retention of volunteer firefighters. Priority will be given to applicants with a formal recruitment/retention plan, a plan to meet staffing standards, and/or a plan that has regional impact. This year there is approximately $190 million available for allocation and there is no local match required. The deadline for all applications is June 27, 2008. http://www.firegrantsupport.com/docs/2008SAFERguidance.pdf
# Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</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>$4,096,136</td>
<td>($93,152)</td>
<td>$104,635</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$3,978,102</td>
<td>$4,118,712</td>
<td>$140,610</td>
<td>$230,614</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$4,617,219</td>
<td>$4,730,837</td>
<td>$113,618</td>
<td>$216,569</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$4,478,281</td>
<td>$4,539,414</td>
<td>($61,133)</td>
<td>($51,133)</td>
<td>-1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</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>$41,521,619</td>
<td>($6,061)</td>
<td>$973,879</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual collections through the first nine months of the fiscal year are .015% below projected 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>$4,239,938</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>$4,421,405</td>
<td>7.18%</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>$4,227,476</td>
<td>5.19%</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>$4,753,366</td>
<td>-2.91%</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>$4,227,476</td>
<td>-6.91%</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>$4,753,366</td>
<td>-2.91%</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>$4,753,366</td>
<td>-2.91%</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>$42,853,101</td>
<td>2.08%</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>($108,764)</td>
<td>-16.73%</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>($22,529)</td>
<td>-94.10%</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>($136,308)</td>
<td>-26.82%</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></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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>($1,467,792)</td>
<td>-9.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to date vs. previous year
<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>$4,096,136</td>
<td>2.62%</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>$4,118,712</td>
<td>5.93%</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>$4,730,837</td>
<td>4.80%</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>$4,118,712</td>
<td>-2.40%</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>$4,317,734</td>
<td>-12.49%</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>$4,152,169</td>
<td>2.40%</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>$41,521,619</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFFICE OF TREASURER, CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

MAY 20, 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 April 30, 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward</td>
<td>$200,733,356.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Total Debits April 1-30, 2008</td>
<td>$46,027,005.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Credits April 1-30, 2008</td>
<td>($30,623,496.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Balance on April 30, 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>$216,136,865.48</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>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Bank Nebraska, N.A.</td>
<td>($1,643,204.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>($73,100.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank Credit Card Account</td>
<td>$28,043.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornhusker Bank</td>
<td>$62,458.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Bank</td>
<td>$94,738.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>$404,046.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate Bank</td>
<td>$49,701.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Short-Term Pool</td>
<td>$60,792,758.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Medium-Term Pool</td>
<td>$155,805,828.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Checks and Warrants</td>
<td>$615,594.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash on Hand April 30, 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>$216,136,865.48</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 $23,289,042.48 representing authorized investments of the City’s funds.

ATTEST:

[Signature]

Melinda J. Jones, City Treasurer
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor’s Capital Improvements Advisory Committee
    Mayor Chris Beutler
    Rick Hoppe, Trish Owen
    Marvin Krout, Kent Morgan, Sara Hartzell
    Don Herz, Steve Hubka
    Greg MacLean

FROM: Jean Preister, Planning

DATE: May 20, 2008

SUBJECT: FY 2008-2014 Capital Improvements Program

cc: City Council
    Mike Brienzo, Planning
    Lynn Johnson, Parks & Recreation
    John Hendry, City Attorney
    Larry Worth, StarTran
    David Landis, Urban Development
    Niles Ford, Fire Department
    Tom Lorenz, Pershing Center

I hereby respectfully submit for your information the Minutes of the Special Public Hearing held by the Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Commission on May 14, 2008, on the FY 2008/09 - 2013/14 City of Lincoln Capital Improvements Program and the FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program.

On May 14, 2008, the Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendations and voted 8-0 to find the proposed CIP to be in full or general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. (The testimony submitted by Coby Mach on behalf of LiBA is attached to the Minutes.)

On May 14, 2008, the Planning Commission also voted 8-0 to forward a recommendation for consideration by the Mayor and City Council as follows:
Motion made by Essexes, seconded by Cornelius and carried 8-0, to recommend that the Mayor and City Council consider moving the Parks & Recreation Department Project #0481: Porter Park Parking Lot, to the first year (2008-09) and pay with impact fees, subject to a determination by the City Law Department as to whether impact fees can be used for this improvement.

On May 14, 2008, the Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendations and voted 8-0 to find the proposed TIP to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, with the corrected maps submitted by Mike Brienzo at the public hearing on May 14, 2008 (attached).

These minutes will be approved by the Planning Commission at their regular meeting on June 4, 2008.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please feel free to contact me at 441-6365.

Enclosures

I:\pc\minutes\2008\CIPMinutes to CIAC
Meeting Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW EDITION
OF THE CITY OF LINCOLN'S DRAFT
SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM
FY 2008/09 - 2013/14

and

THE DRAFT FY2009-2014 TRANSPORTATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE
LINCOLN METROPOLITAN AREA.

PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: May 14, 2008

Members present: Francis, Sunderman, Taylor, Esseks, Larson, Cornelius, Gaylord Baird and Carroll.

Ex Parte Communications: None.

Sara Hartzell of Planning staff explained that this public hearing is on two separate but related items:

1. The Planning Commission Review Edition of the City's 6-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP); and

2. The Lincoln Metropolitan Area 6-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

As specified in the City Charter, the role of the Planning Commission in the CIP and TIP process is to determine if the capital projects being requested by the various City and County departments are in conformance with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

According to the Charter, City Council ordinances and resolutions dealing with capital improvements cannot be acted upon until a finding of Plan conformity has been made by the Planning Commission and/or the Planning Department. However, the Charter does NOT prohibit the City Council from approving capital projects which are not in conformance with the Plan; but only that a finding of conformity needs to be established.

In the Project Summary for each department's project, Planning staff has provided the Commission with a recommended finding of conformity. As in past years, the staff has employed a four-tiered approach to the conformity finding. A project can be determined to be within one of the following categories:

In Conformance With Plan
Generally Conforms with Plan
Not In Plan
Not In Conformance with Plan
This year all of the projects have found to be “In Conformance” or “Generally in Conformance” with the Plan.

Following Planning Commission action on the CIP, the Planning Commission recommendations will be forwarded to the Mayor for incorporation into the City Council Edition of the CIP. This edition of the CIP will be issued in conjunction with the City’s Operating Budget -- tentatively targeted for release sometime in late June. The Council will have a hearing on both the Operating and Capital Budgets in August, with approval of both budgets typically occurring in late August -- the City’s 2008-2009 Fiscal Year begins on September 1st of this year.

As a reminder, the City Council does not approve the CIP; the first year of the CIP becomes the Capital Budget. No formal action is taken on the remaining five years, although it is part of their discussion of the capital improvement needs.

The Planning Commission Review Edition of the CIP, and all subsequent editions, are available on the Internet, at the City of Lincoln’s website --

<http://www.lincoln.ne.gov>  (KEYWORD = CIP)

The Chair then commenced to call the individual department CIP’s for public hearing:

**Building and Safety:** Bill Moody, Chief Fire Inspector, Bureau of Fire Prevention, made the presentation for a digital x-ray system and a Morton steel building. There was no other testimony.

**Finance Department: Communications:** No one testified.

**Finance Department: Pershing Auditorium:** Tom Lorenz, General Manager of Pershing Center gave the presentation for continued refurbishing of existing infrastructure and to purchase relevant equipment in order to adequately serve the needs of the city and county. It is conceivable that Pershing will continue to be called upon as an active public facility for many years. These improvements will allow Pershing to be maintained as a safe and efficient facility. There was no other testimony.

**Fire and Rescue:** John Huff made the presentation for six projects, including automatic vehicle locator; replacement of four aerial pumpers; replacement of fire station #12 at 84th & South Street; station #15 generally between Superior and I-80; education training service campus; and station #16 in the extreme south part of Lincoln. Esseks inquired about whether or not we have reached a period where there is a significant percentage of calls that cannot be answered in terms of response times for fire and emergency medical. Huff stated that the longer a fire goes unattended the greater the loss; and the longer a medical response, the more likely that they will not survive. Everything that Fire & Rescue does is written by response time. They have not added a
facility since 1995. Fire & Rescue struggles every day to respond in a timely fashion to all calls, using every efficiency they can. It is a challenge.

There was no other testimony.

**Libraries:** Carol Connor, the Director of Libraries, made the presentation for replacement of the roof at Bethany Branch and replacement of the headquarters at Bennett Martin. There was no other testimony.

**Lincoln Electric System:** Dan Pudenz, Vice President in charge of engineering, gave the presentation and highlights of the LES 6-year CIP for just under 258 million dollars: The Walter Scott Energy Center in Council Bluffs came on line this year; looking to add just under 12,000 customers in the next six years, bringing us to the equivalent of adding the city of Fremont; continue to have joint planning sessions with Norris, which have been very successful. There was no other testimony.

**Aging:** June Pederson, Director of Lincoln Area Agency on Aging, gave the presentation for a new active senior center in Northeast Lincoln in future years. There was no other testimony.

**Police:** Sara Hartzell of Planning staff presented the Police CIP request for a K9 training facility, garage maintenance and repair facility and a Team Assembly Station in the southern part of the city. There was no other testimony.

**Urban Development:** David Landis, the Director of Urban Development, made the presentation of the Urban Development CIP requests, including two general fund projects this year: $100,000 for a retail program to entice retail in Downtown and tree replacement program downtown in the amount of $110,000. There are three projects using CDBG funds. A revenue bond is listed for next year for the creation of a parking garage. Government obligation bonds will be used for Haymarket Redevelopment.

There are about 13 TIF projects, including 10th & Military; 19th & K; Antelope Valley; South Street parking lot; home ownership in 19th & Washington area; 48th & O on the north side; Concorde/Bank of the West redevelopment in downtown (O Street with multi-purpose and condo regime); Havelock revitalization; North 56th and Arbor Road redevelopment; older business district revitalization with general funds starting next year; University Place revitalization at 48th & Madison; Van Dorn Redevelopment; Earl Carter and Cold Storage on West O.

**Other testimony**

1. **Rick Krueger** posed questions and made some comments. What happens to the allocated dollars if the projects do not come forward, e.g. last year Catalyst One was shown in 6-year funding and it does not show up this year.
He is in favor of the older business district revitalization projects.

He wonders why the West Haymarket redevelopment is shown in this year’s CIP even though we have not voted on it yet. Is this a requirement? Are we presently spending any Urban Development dollars on this project?

With regard to money not spent or projects not coming forward, Landis stated that the projects still exist and are under negotiation. They will keep that allocation until the project is completed. He assured that the money is not reallocated and that they do not try to spend it a second time.

The West Haymarket project does appear in this year’s CIP because the projected timeline for a vote of the people to authorize the use of bonds will be in 2009. If the public says yes, we would want to bond as quickly as possible. He did not know whether it is required to be shown by charter or ordinance, but it appears for the purpose of fair notice as to what we intend to do.

Eseks noted that the Planning Commission’s formal role is to decide whether a proposed expense is in conformance with the general Comprehensive Plan. If a project turns out to be not worth carrying out, what happens to the money? Landis observed that Steve Hubka in the City Budget Office knows where the money is allocated and if a project occurs and we do not spend all of the money, the budget office makes the adjustment. It does not sit there forever.

**Parks & Recreation:** JJ Yost of the Parks & Recreation Department presented the Parks CIP showing multiple funding sources consisting of general revenue, keno funds, athletic fees, impact fees and other financing such as grants and private donations. The major effort is certainly the development of Union Plaza (Antelope Valley park development), which is the new park being constructed along the Antelope Creek Waterway between O and R and 21\(^{st}\) and 22\(^{nd}\), consisting of both city funding for the basic park development, and private donations for the park enhancements and the long term care. The short term financing will be repaid with keno funds. Lincoln Parks Foundation, in cooperation with Vision 2015, is conducting a private fund-raising campaign.

There is a need for about 1.3 million dollars annually for repair and replacements to maintain the existing park infrastructure. With increasing demands on general revenue funds, the proposed CIP for this upcoming year and over the next several years is simply an amount to address priority repair and replacements in order to keep the facilities open to the public. There is a need to work toward a strategy of ongoing funding to support the repair and replacement of facilities. Keno funding generates approx one million per year towards the parks budget.
Meeting Minutes

In keeping with the Comprehensive Plan for new growth, Parks is proposing the use of impact fees for the development of one or two neighborhood parks per year and one-half to one mile of new trails per year.

Other testimony

1. Rick Krueger pointed out that it has been 10 years since he deeded Porter Park to the City on South 27th. This past year, 27th got improved and Tamarin Road became a 4-way intersection. A soccer field was graded out next to 27th Street with an access point and place for parking. He requested that the Porter Park parking lot be moved up to the first year and show it as impact fee funding. We want to see kids playing on that soccer field that was graded a decade ago. Presently, the best information he has is that there is $1,335,000 in impact fee funding. He believes impact fee funding can be used on parks throughout the city. This is in District 7. He would like to see the public and the neighbors in Porter Ridge be able to use that park. He estimated that the improvement to gravel/rock the parking lot would be $25,000 to $30,000. We don’t need any active play areas.

JJ Yost advised that the Porter Park project is shown in year 2010-11 at $65,000, which is an estimate at this point, for a crushed rock parking lot with some curbing and fencing along the graded soccer field. We have not designed that parking lot to know whether the $65,000 is correct. As far as the use of impact fees, impact fees are for the development of new neighborhood parks and trails. Porter Park is classified as a neighborhood park, but by definition they typically do not have off-street parking. We would have to talk with the Law Department to determine whether construction of a parking lot is a defensible use of the impact fees. We do have a sufficient balance in Zone 7 to cover that expense, but we also try to project our new park development that comes along with growth areas. He would have to take a look at the bigger picture if we use those funds now.

Public Works & Utilities: Greg McLean, Director of Public Works & Utilities, presented the CIP for the various divisions of Public Works & Utilities. The CIP is developed to serve the existing community; it exists to serve the approved annexation agreements and the Comprehensive Plan as a whole. It also includes careful long term planning for all the different systems in Public Works.

StarTran: The CIP for Startran is a little over $1,000,000, the majority being phased funding for bus systems in 2010-11 because there are 15 buses that will exceed their federal life.

Streets and Highways: This year’s CIP will allow for a lot of major projects, including the Antelope Valley area, with 4.5 million coming from wheel tax. The CIP will partially fund the ongoing activities on a day-to-day basis including traffic signals, modification, safety improvements, etc. 1/4 million is associated with the South Beltway, with construction and completion multiple years out. All of the projects are included which serve the Comprehensive Plan; however, they do not have adequate funding to serve and be in full
compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Thus, there will be projects identified and shown as unfunded. There is a shortfall in traffic signalization and zero in arterial rehabilitation.

**Watershed Management:** Anticipate 13 million dollar bond issue in November of 2010.

**Street Maintenance:** Three projects.

**Water Supply & Distribution:** The 6-year CIP is almost 110,000 million, with the first year being 20.5 million. Includes replacement of existing ozone system at Ashland; initiation of new horizontal collector well in Ashland; multi-year project to expand the transmission capacity from Ashland to Lincoln; other water distribution mains total about 1.7 million with six year total of 31 million dollars. Six-year total for water main replacements is 20 million. This year’s budget is 2.8 million.

**Wastewater:** First year is just shy of 17.5 million; 6-year total is 102 million. Included in this year’s budget is about 4 million for Theresa Street and the Northeast Wastewater Treatment Plant facilities; 1.1 million for replacement of existing collectors; trunk sewer projects make up the balance at 12.2 million. New trunk sewer projects will meet the requirements of the annexation agreements on the northwest and east side of town.

**Solid Waste:** Total for year one is 5.6 million, including the Bluff Road liner installation and one million for a potential gas collection project in the first year. It is more of a placeholder than anything.

**Other Testimony:**

1. **Coby Mach of the Lincoln Independent Business Association** raised a question about the 15 new buses. Is the 12 years a minimum number of years we are required to keep the buses running on the streets, or is that a maximum number of years?

MacLean explained that the federal life refers to the projected life span of the bus. The City uses 35’ heavy duty buses. The 12-year life span is the point when the cost of maintenance and equipment exceeds the tipping point. The City buses are very well maintained to extend the life as long as possible. We do exceed the national average and federal recommended standards. The 12 years is more of a guide.

2. **Rick Krueger** noted that in some of the Antelope Valley projects, it appears that there is some money coming through Public Works through the traffic component to fund some planning of parks and urban development. Why is that? What projects are actually being built with impact fee dollars?

Krueger objects to the use of the component of the wheel tax that is for new construction being used in Antelope Valley. The history of the new construction wheel tax was when
Johanns was the Mayor, at which time the wheel tax was increased to do certain projects generally in the south and east part of Lincoln. That portion was going to be segregated for “new construction”, primarily for converting county roads to either two or four lane cross-sections. There have not been any new wheel tax dollars spent in the new growth areas of the city. The new wheel tax portion over the next six years is projected to be 33 million dollars. If you take that money and you put it with the impact fee dollars, there would be a chance to develop some four-lane arterials in the growth areas of the city. It appears that everything is going other places. There are no streets and highways projected for new growth areas of the city. We need to get back into balance, e.g. 33 million of the new wheel tax would do the better part of nine miles of four-lane road anywhere in the city. This is the reason we are having some problems in the development and construction industry of our city because over the last number of years we have gotten out of balance. He wants to at least get some money put into these new areas.

MacLean’s response was that there is a $50,000 line item in the Urban Development CIP to cover some of the transportation-related planning elements coming out of the redevelopment of Antelope Valley.

With regard to the impact fee question, MacLean is currently aware of two projects that are impact fee funded, i.e. N.W. 56th Street north of the Interstate, and 98th Street from Pine Lake Road to Old Cheney Road. Impact fees are spent in the districts in which they are collected.

Relating to the wheel tax issue for new construction, MacLean acknowledged that a big chunk has been allocated for Antelope Valley, and he believes strongly that Antelope Valley is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. It does need to be funded and the wheel tax has been chosen for that funding. Krueger makes a good point about coming back into balance, but MacLean suggested that can happen after the completion of Antelope Valley. In fact, he thinks it will shift naturally. He is interested about combining the wheel tax with impact fees. The Mayor just completed some work with a task force on road standards which changes the phasing of construction of the roads in the perimeter. That will come into play as well to maximize the ability to build roads in the new areas.

Esseks inquired whether the statute or city ordinance provides where the wheel tax proceeds can be spent. MacLean stated that “new construction” is the designation, and that has been interpreted by some to be in new areas of town. In the case of Antelope Valley, he would consider a new bridge in Antelope Valley to be “new construction”. This is the way we have been doing it for the last 4-5 years.

There was then a discussion about where the wheel tax is allocated. Tom Shafer, Design and Construction Manager for Engineering Services, suggested that a history of the wheel tax can be found on the city’s Web site. There are four components: 1) wheel tax for new construction – not put to geographic area; 2) snow removal component; 3) residential rehabilitation - streets not designated arterial with speed limit of 25-30 or less; and 4) wheel
tax residual - used for any component of Public Works in maintaining and constructing new roads. No part goes directly to the schools.

**Draft FY2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Mike Brienzo of Planning staff** presented the proposed TIP, which is brought forward with the CIP for joint public review since there is an overlap in the projects. The City streets and StarTran projects are included in the TIP. The TIP is developed annually to satisfy requirements to use federal funds on projects. It becomes a document to oversee or coordinate the construction and funding of those projects in Lancaster County. It is a 6-year document with the first four years identified as priorities. Projects included in this document are those seeking federal funds. It also includes funds for pedestrian and trails.

Brienzo submitted some corrected maps for the state element of the TIP.

The state identified a funding shortfall for project #20 (US 34 Lincoln East) so it fell out of the programming year and will be programmed beyond 2014.

Brienzo explained that the Planning Commission is the review body for conformity with the Comprehensive Plan.

**Other testimony on the CIP/TIP as a whole:**

1. **Coby Mach appeared on behalf of the Lincoln Independent Business Association,** and acknowledged that the Planning Commission’s purpose is to determine conformity with the Comprehensive Plan and not necessarily to recommend or to deny specific line item budget details; however, LIBA wants to be on record at this time and the areas of concern are as follows:

With respect to StarTran and the request for 15 new buses, LIBA is concerned because with the rising fuel costs and marginal ridership, is the City tying its hands unnecessarily? Are 15 full-size buses really necessary? Do we need to replace the handivans now or can it wait? How many handivans do we intend to purchase? Do we know the details surrounding the depreciation life of these vehicles?

With regard to Parks & Recreation, LIBA recognizes that trails, bridges and other neighborhood amenities need to be maintained. However, the Comprehensive Plan seems to indicate that there should be a park for every one square mile of residential property. Is this a realistic venture we should continue to pursue? Can we afford it? Would we be better off creating expansive parks that are perhaps easier to maintain and take fewer personnel, thus reducing expenditures but maintaining a park system of which we can be proud?

Mach then discussed LIBA’s concerns about Pershing Center. LIBA would recommend holding the $46,000 allocation until we know the results of the 2009 arena bond vote.
With respect to the Automatic Vehicle Locators requested by Fire & Rescue, LIBA suggests that this purchase be delayed one year unless Chief Ford indicates that the AVL’s are necessary for safety purposes or unless this purchase is helpful in reorganization and efficiencies in the Department.

Mach noted that the Landfill Gas Control System requested by Public Works is not currently required by any federal regulation and must only be installed if emissions exceed the threshold set forth. LIBA wants to know whether Bluff Road exceeds the allowable emission threshold, and why are we spending 2.7 million if there is not a federal requirement to do so?

Mach also expressed concern about this version of the CIP not being on the City Web site in sufficient time for review by the public.

**PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW EDITION OF THE CITY OF LINCOLN’S DRAFT SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR FY 2008/09 THROUGH 2013/14.**

**ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION:**

May 14, 2008

Taylor moved approval of staff recommendation of a finding of full or general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Esseks.

Esseks made a motion to amend to move Project # 0481 of the Parks & Recreation CIP, the Porter Park Parking lot, to the 2008-09 fiscal year, provided discussion with the City’s Law Department indicates that impact fees can be used, seconded by Francis.

Esseks noted that it has been 10 years, it looks like a very modest project, and to make that park fully useful he thinks the expenditure is justified.

Cornelius asked for a point of order in that he did not believe it to be the Planning Commission’s role to adjust specific line items. Marvin Krout, Director of Planning, believes the easiest thing is to keep the two issues separate. The Planning Commission should vote on the finding of conformity and then could make a recommendation to the City Council by separate vote on specific line items. Typically, the Planning Commission has not made formal motions and taken votes on specific line items, but there is nothing that prohibits it. It is direction and advice to the City Council when they review the first year as part of their capital budget.

Esseks withdrew the motion to amend, and Francis, who had seconded the motion, agreed.
Carroll commented that the staff has worked very hard to come up with these documents. It is very difficult. He does not know why the Web site was not updated. He is sure it will be corrected. It is important to approve the issue of conformity.

Motion for a finding of full or general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan carried 8-0: Francis, Sunderman, Taylor, Esseks, Larson, Cornelius, Gaylor Baird and Carroll voting ‘yes’.

THE DRAFT FY2009-14 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: May 14, 2008

Larson moved a finding of conformance, seconded by Francis and carried 8-0: Francis, Sunderman, Taylor, Esseks, Larson, Cornelius, Gaylor Baird and Carroll voting ‘yes’.

Additional recommendation: Motion was then made by Esseks, seconded by Cornelius and carried 8-0, to recommend that the Mayor and City Council consider moving the Parks & Recreation Department Project #0481: Porter Park Parking Lot, to the first year (2008-09) and pay with impact fees, subject to a determination by the City Law Department as to whether impact fees can be used for this improvement.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Note: These minutes will not be formally approved by the Planning Commission until their regular meeting on Wednesday, June 4, 2008.

Q:\pc\minutes\2008\pcm0514.08 CPAR and CIP
To: City Planning Commission  
From: LIBA Board of Directors  
Date: May 14, 2008  
Re: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Budget

Before we propose our budget recommendations to you, we would like to acknowledge that we understand your purpose here is to determine whether the projects before you are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, not to recommend or deny specific line-item budget details. However, because we are aware these projects will likely come before the City Council during its budget public hearings, we would like to be on the record as soon as possible.

We also know that Planning Commission Staff has found that most, if not all, of the programs are in full or general compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. However, we have identified some areas that concern us. They are as follows:

- **StarTran:** We found that StarTran is requesting numerous (15) full-size and (unknown) handivans be replaced over the next several years. We recognize that federal dollars and requirements are attached to this money, but we are concerned that with rising fuel costs and marginal ridership, the City may be tying its hands unnecessarily. We need to ask ourselves: Are 15 full-size buses really necessary? Do we need to replace the handivans now or can it wait? How many handivans do we intend to purchase? Do we know the details surrounding the depreciation life of these vehicles and what really are the federal requirements?

- **Park and Recreation:** Contrary to popular belief, we are not all about cutting funding to Parks. We recognize that trails, bridges, and other neighborhood amenities need to be maintained. However, what we question here is the philosophy behind the Comprehensive Plan itself. The Comprehensive Plan seems to indicate that there should be a park for every 1 square mile of residential property. Is this a realistic venture we should continue to pursue? Can we afford it? Would we be better off creating expansive parks that are perhaps easier to maintain and take fewer personnel, thus reducing expenditures but maintaining a park system we can be proud of?

- **Pershing Auditorium:** Currently, $46,000 is allocated to the Pershing Center for 2008-09. We recommend holding that funding until we see the results of the 2009 arena bond vote. Unless of course this funding is needed for emergency repairs that could result in potential harm to personnel or significant structural damage.
Automatic Vehicle Locators: We offer this purchase be delayed one year unless Chief Ford indicates that the AVLs are necessary for safety purposes. We also recognize that he may find the AVLs helpful in his efforts to reorganize and find efficiencies within his department. As such, we would respect his request to keep these items in the budget.

Landfill Gas Control System: According to the CIP budget, this System would address potential landfill odor issues, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and provide a renewable energy resource. The description continues to read that this System is not currently required by any federal regulation and must only be installed if emissions exceed the threshold set forth. So, we ask the following: Is the Bluff Road Landfill exceeding the allowable emission threshold? And, why are we spending a $2.7M if there is not a federal requirement to do so?

Unfortunately, as we were preparing for today’s presentation, we were displeased to learn that the City had not updated its website with current information. A memo from the Planning Department and a letter from the Planning Director were updated, however, the budget requests were not. We were working from the 2007-08 final CIP budget information, which was posted on the City’s website until 11am yesterday morning. The Lincoln City Council had been given a draft of the 2008-09 CIP budget on May 2nd. Why was this information not immediately posted to the City website? We not only find this process frustrating, but find it disingenuous when City staff and officials encourage civic participation and then don’t provide accurate information.

However, we do appreciate the opportunity to present just a few of our concerns and thank you for time and commitment to the process.
## 2009-2014 LINCOLN CITY/LANCASTER COUNTY, NEBRASKA
### TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT (Location &amp; Distance) (IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION)</th>
<th>2008-09 FS</th>
<th>2009-10 FS</th>
<th>2010-11 FS</th>
<th>2011-12 FS</th>
<th>2012-13 FS</th>
<th>2013-14 FS</th>
<th>TOTAL FOR SIX YEARS (000's)</th>
<th>COMP PLAN CONFORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Nebraska</td>
<td>3,450.0 NE</td>
<td>3,790.0 NE</td>
<td>4,170.0 NE</td>
<td>4,590.0 NE</td>
<td>5,050.0 NE</td>
<td>5,550.0 NE</td>
<td>26,600.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,450.0</td>
<td>3,790.0</td>
<td>4,170.0</td>
<td>4,590.0</td>
<td>5,050.0</td>
<td>5,550.0</td>
<td>26,600.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funding</td>
<td>3,450.0</td>
<td>3,790.0</td>
<td>4,170.0</td>
<td>4,590.0</td>
<td>5,050.0</td>
<td>5,550.0</td>
<td>26,600.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STATE FEDERAL AID SYSTEM</td>
<td>3,450.0</td>
<td>3,790.0</td>
<td>4,170.0</td>
<td>4,590.0</td>
<td>5,050.0</td>
<td>5,550.0</td>
<td>26,600.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program assumptions:**

Based upon NDOR Highway Program maintenance costs for FY-2004 thru FY-2007 in District 1 and factored for the Lincoln MPO planning area (Lancaster County) based on the percentage of State Highway (including Spurs, and Links) lane-miles for locations in Lancaster County divided by the total...
### 2009-2014 Lincoln City/Lancaster County, Nebraska
#### Transportation Improvement Program

**Agency:** Lancaster County  
**Division:** County Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16,418.4</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>16,422.8</td>
<td>17,612.1</td>
<td>17,854.5</td>
<td>18,472.0</td>
<td>19,245.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,416.4</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>16,422.8</td>
<td>17,612.1</td>
<td>17,854.5</td>
<td>18,472.0</td>
<td>19,245.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Six Years (2008-2014):** 106,033.0

### Operations & Maintenance Funding Source Summary

**Lancaster County**

Operations & Maintenance of the County and Federal Aid System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16,418.4</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>16,422.8</td>
<td>17,612.1</td>
<td>17,854.5</td>
<td>18,472.0</td>
<td>19,245.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,416.4</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>16,422.8</td>
<td>17,612.1</td>
<td>17,854.5</td>
<td>18,472.0</td>
<td>19,245.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total County Funds:** 106,033.0

**Program Assumptions:**
Program funds are estimates based upon the fiscal year 2007-08 budget and inflated at a 3% rate per year for future years.
**2009-2014 LINCOLN CITY/LANCASTER COUNTY, NEBRASKA**

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**AGENCY:** City of Lincoln: Public Works & Utilities  
**DIVISION:** Streets & Highways / Traffic Engineering

### OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE FUNDING SOURCE SUMMARY

**City of Lincoln**

**Street Maintenance Operations Division**
- Administration Services
- Drainage
- Sanitation
- Snow & Ice Removal
- Street & Highways

**Engineering Services Division: Traffic Engineering**
- Traffic Operations & Maintenance
  - (signs, signals and pavement markings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>2008-09 FS</th>
<th>2009-10 FS</th>
<th>2010-11 FS</th>
<th>2011-12 FS</th>
<th>2012-13 FS</th>
<th>2013-14 FS</th>
<th>TOTAL FOR SIX YEARS (000$)</th>
<th>COMP PLAN CONFORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>677.8 GR</td>
<td></td>
<td>698.1 GR</td>
<td>719.1 GR</td>
<td>740.7 GR</td>
<td>762.0 GR</td>
<td>785.8 GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755.0 GR</td>
<td></td>
<td>777.7 GR</td>
<td>801.0 GR</td>
<td>825.0 GR</td>
<td>849.8 GR</td>
<td>875.3 GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824.6 SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>880.2 GR</td>
<td>906.8 GR</td>
<td>933.8 GR</td>
<td>961.9 GR</td>
<td>1000.7 GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,697.7 SR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,943.4 GR</td>
<td>3,031.7 GR</td>
<td>3,122.7 GR</td>
<td>3,216.4 GR</td>
<td>3,312.9 GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,775.5 SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,978.8 GR</td>
<td>7,183.1 GR</td>
<td>7,403.8 GR</td>
<td>7,525.9 GR</td>
<td>7,654.7 GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,382.2</td>
<td>13,763.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,176.0</td>
<td>14,401.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,039.3</td>
<td>15,490.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,432.2</td>
<td>56,432.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CITY FUNDS**
- GR (General Revenue) [city funds]
- SC (Street Construction Funds) [federal, state & local funds]
- SR (Snow Removal Funds) [city funds]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,874.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,960.5</td>
<td>3,049.5</td>
<td>3,140.9</td>
<td>3,235.2</td>
<td>3,332.2</td>
<td>18,592.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,930.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,859.0</td>
<td>8,094.8</td>
<td>8,337.8</td>
<td>8,567.7</td>
<td>8,845.4</td>
<td>49,204.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,857.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,943.4</td>
<td>3,031.7</td>
<td>3,122.7</td>
<td>3,216.4</td>
<td>3,312.9</td>
<td>18,484.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,382.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,763.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,176.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,039.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,432.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Assumptions:**
- Program funds are estimates based upon the fiscal year 2007-08 budget and inflated at a 3% rate per year for future years.
Dear Ms. Schultz:

Thank you for submitting your comments, which have now become part of the record on this application. A copy is being provided to the City Council Members for their consideration. On May 19th, the City Council placed this application on their pending list, with no specific date for bringing it back onto the agenda. I am also providing a copy of your comments to the applicant.

The staff is scheduled to meet with various stakeholders and interested parties regarding soil mining policies on Thursday, May 29th, beginning at 3:00 p.m. in Room 206 of the County-City Building.

--Jean Preister, Administrative Officer
City-County Planning Department
441-6365

Susan Schultz <sschultz50@windstream.net>

To whom it may concern,

I have visited with Mike DeKalb about the proposed permit over the phone as well as members of the Emerald SID. I am very opposed to this without extensive research being conducted on the effect of moving that much dirt on the ground water, highway safety, and air pollution. I believe that there would also be some health issues with that much dust in the air, also trucks in and out of that drive, that will be very dangerous for drivers of Hwy 6. That area was very dangerous for a tractor getting in and out years ago. I plan on attending the next meeting on May 29th, Rm 206 at 3pm. Please contact me if the time and date differ. I will also be speaking for myself as well as Donald Piening who owns land just to the west of me.

Susan Schultz
7300 W. O St
Lincoln, Ne 68528
Ph. 742-6044

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.
PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION
NOTIFICATION

TO : Mayor Chris Beutler
     Lincoln City Council

FROM : Jean Preister, Planning

DATE : May 22, 2008

RE : Preliminary Plat No. 08004 - Superior Crescent Addition
     (N. 35th Street and Superior Street)
     Resolution No. PC-01121

The Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission took the following action at their regular meeting on Wednesday, May 21, 2008:

Motion made by Cornelius, seconded by Francis, to approve Preliminary Plat No. 08004, Superior Crescent Addition, with conditions, requested by Robert and Victoria Rokeby, for ten lots, one outlot for open space and one outlot for a private roadway, together with a request to waive the City of Lincoln Design Standards requiring storm water detention and sanitary sewer depths not less than 9', on property generally located at N. 35th Street and Superior Street.

Motion for approval, with conditions, carried 8-0: Esseks, Cornelius, Larson, Taylor, Carroll, Francis, Sunderman and Gaylor Baird voting ‘yes’.

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

On May 21, 2008, the Planning Commission also voted 8-0 to recommend approval of the associated Annexation No. 08003, annexing approximately 63.13 acres, more or less, and Change of Zone No. 08019 from R-3 Residential to H-3 Highway Commercial, which are scheduled for public hearing before the Lincoln City Council on Monday, June 9, 2008, at 1:30 p.m.

Attachment
cc: Building & Safety
    Rick Peo, City Attorney
    Public Works
    Robert Dean, RD Engineering, 6801 Crooked Creek Drive, 68516
    Robert and Victoria Rokeby, 150 Jackson Cove Crescent, Eureka Springs, AR 72631
    Larry Schmieding, 8101 N. 1st Street, 68531
    Ted Ericson, 4130 N. 42nd Street Circle, 68504
    Charlie Humble, 301 S. 13th Street, Suite 400, 68508

\shared\wp\jul\2008 ccnotice.pp\pp.08004
RESOLUTION NO. PC-01121

WHEREAS, Robert and Victoria Rokeby and Larry Schmieding have submitted the preliminary plat of Superior Crescent Addition for acceptance and approval together with a request to waive the City of Lincoln Design Standards requiring storm water detention and sanitary sewer depths not less than 9' on property generally located at N. 35th Street and Superior Street; and

WHEREAS, the requested waivers to City of Lincoln Design Standards have been administratively approved; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Director has recommended conditional approval of said preliminary plat.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission that the preliminary plat of Superior Crescent Addition, generally located at N. 35th Street and Superior Street, as submitted by Robert and Victoria Rokeby and Larry Schmieding is hereby accepted and approved, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. After the subdivider completes the following instructions and submits the documents and plans and 6 copies to the Planning Department office, the preliminary plat will be signed by the Chair of the Planning Commission certifying approval: (NOTE: These documents and plans are required by ordinance or design standards.)

a. Revise the preliminary plat as follows:

i. Show the existing trees or tree masses on the site plan and indicate which are to remain or to be removed.

ii. Rename the private roadway in Outlot A.

iii. Rename “35th Circle” as “N. 35th Circle”.
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iv. Show the bike trail on the site plan through Outlot B with a 20' easement as requested by the Parks Department.

v. Number the sheet for the preliminary plat “1 of 2” and “2 of 2”.

vi. Add a note to the site plan that private lots can be used for turnaround.

vii. Add a note to the site plan that vehicular access is relinquished from Lots 1, 2, 3, and Outlot B to Superior Street.

viii. Revise General Note #13 to state “EXCEPT AS NOTED”.

ix. Add the following statement to General Note #25: “THE SIDEWALKS SHALL BE LOCATED NO LESS THAN 9.5' FROM BACK OF CURB.” Correct the spelling of “THICK” in the second sentence.

x. Revise General Note #27 to indicate that the street trees are located in the 9.5’ space between the curb and sidewalk.

xi. Correct the legal descriptions to match the dimensions on the site plan as indicated by the County Surveyor.

xii. Revise the label for the easement over Outlot A to state “64' PUBLIC ACCESS AND UTILITY EASEMENT”.

xiii. Show the existing wetlands in Outlot B.

xiv. Show an additional ten feet of right of way along Superior Street adjacent to this plat to attain the standard 60’ wide right of way (from centerline).

xv. Show a right turn lane with additional right of way in Superior Street at N. 35th Street.

b. Provide satisfactory documentation that the extension of N. 35th Street has been approved by the adjacent property owner to facilitate the street extensions necessary for this plat.

2. Finished floor elevations, elevated at least one foot above the 100 year floodplain, must be provided on the final plat for this development.

3. The City Council approves associated request:

a. Change of Zone #08019.

b. Annexation #08003.
4. Final Plats will be approved by the Planning Director after:

a. The required improvements are completed or a surety is posted to guarantee the completion of the public streets, private roadway improvements, sidewalks, sanitary sewer system, water system, drainage facilities, land preparation and grading, sediment and erosions control measures, drainageway improvements, street lights, street trees, and street name signs. A cash contribution to the City in lieu of a bond, escrow, or security agreement may be furnished for street trees on a final plat with 10 or fewer lots.

b. The subdivider has signed an agreement that binds the subdivider, its successors and assigns:

i. to complete the street paving of public streets, shown on the final plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

ii. to complete the paving of the private roadway in Outlot A shown on the final plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

iii. to complete the installation of sidewalks along both sides of N. 35th Street, N. 35th Circle, and the private roadway in Outlot A as shown on the final plat within four (4) years following the approval of this final plat.

iv. to complete the installation of sidewalks along Superior Street as shown on the final plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

v. to complete the public water distribution system to serve this plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

vi. to complete the public wastewater collection system to serve this plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

vii. to complete the enclosed private drainage facilities shown on the approved drainage study to serve this plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

viii. to complete the enclosed private drainage facilities shown on the approved drainage study to serve this plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

ix. to complete land preparation including open drainageway improvements to serve this plat prior to the installation of utilities and improvements but not more than two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.
x. to complete the installation of public street lights along N. 35th Street and N. 35th Circle within this plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

xi. to complete the installation of private street lights along the private roadway in Outlot A within this plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

xii. to complete the planting of the street trees along N. 35th Street, N. 35th Circle, and the private roadway in Outlot A within this plat within four (4) years following the approval of this final plat.

xiii. to complete the planting of the street trees along Superior Street as shown on the final plat within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

xiv. to complete the installation of the street name signs within two (2) years following the approval of this final plat.

xv. to complete the installation of the permanent markers prior to construction on or conveyance of any lot in the plat.

xvi. to timely complete any other public or private improvement or facility required by Chapter 26.23 (Development Standards) of the Land Subdivision Ordinance which have not been waived but which inadvertently may have been omitted from the above list of required improvements.

xvii. to submit to the Director of Public Works a plan showing proposed measures to control sedimentation and erosion and the proposed method to temporarily stabilize all graded land for approval.

xviii. to comply with the provisions of the Land Preparation and Grading requirements of the Land Subdivision Ordinance.

xix. to complete the public and private improvements shown on the preliminary plat.

xx. to keep taxes and special assessments on the outlots from becoming delinquent.

xxi. to maintain the outlots and private improvements in a condition as near as practical to the original construction on a permanent and continuous basis.

xxii. to maintain the street trees along the private roadways on a permanent and continuous basis.
xxiii. to maintain and supervise the private facilities which have common use or benefit in a condition as near as practical to the original construction on a permanent and continuous basis, and to recognize that there may be additional maintenance issues or costs associated with providing for the proper functioning of storm water detention/retention facilities as they were designed and constructed within the development and that these are the responsibility of the land owner.

xxiv. to retain ownership of and the right of entry to the outlots in order to perform the above-described maintenance of the outlots and private improvements on a permanent and continuous basis. However, Subdivider may be relieved and discharged of such maintenance obligations upon creating in writing a permanent and continuous association of property owners who would be responsible for said permanent and continuous maintenance subject to the following conditions:

1. Subdivider shall not be relieved of Subdivider’s maintenance obligation for each specific private improvement until a registered professional engineer or nurseryman who supervised the installation of said private improvement has certified to the City that the improvement has been installed in accordance with approved plans.

2. The maintenance agreements are incorporated into covenants and restrictions in deeds to the subdivided property and the documents creating the association and the restrictive covenants have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and filed of record with the Register of Deeds.

xxv. to inform all purchasers and users of land located within the 100 year floodplain that said land is located within the 100 year floodplain and that the grading of the lots and outlots shall be in conformance with the grading plan approved with the Superior Crescent Addition Preliminary Plat #08004 or as amended by the Director of Planning. The volume of fill material brought into each lot and outlot from outside the floodplain shall not exceed that shown on the approved grading plan accompanying the preliminary plat.

xxvi. to protect the trees that are indicated to remain during construction and development.

xxvii. to relinquish the right of direct vehicular access from Lots 1, 2, 3, and Outlot B to Superior Street.
c. The full width of N. 35th Street has been deeded and/or dedicated to the City.

d. The full width of Superior Street has been deeded and/or dedicated to the City.

DATED this 21st day of May, 2008.

ATTEST:

Eugene W. Costello
Chair

Approved as to Form & Legality:

[Signature]
Chief Assistant City Attorney
Preliminary Plat #08004 & Change of Zone # 08019
Superior Crescent
N 35th & Superior St

Zoning:

R-1 to R-8 Residential District
AG Agricultural District
AGR Agricultural Residential District
O-1 Office District
O-2 Suburban Office District
O-3 Office Park District
R-T Residential Transition District
B-1 Local Business District
B-2 Planned Neighborhood Business District
B-3 Commercial District
B-4 Lincoln Center Business District
B-5 Planned Regional Business District
H-1 Interstate Commercial District
H-2 Highway Business District
H-3 Highway Commercial District
H-4 General Commercial District
I-1 Industrial District
I-2 Industrial Park District
I-3 Employment Center District
P Public Use District

One Square Mile
Sec. 6 T10N R7E

Area of Application
R-3 to H-3

2007 aerial

(Fletcher Ave)

Superior St

City Limit Jurisdiction
TO: Mayor Chris Beutler  
Lincoln City Council

FROM: Jean Preister, Planning

DATE: May 22, 2008

RE: Comprehensive Plan Conformance No. 08009  
(Permanent Conservation Easement - S.W. 12th Street and W. Denton Road)  
Resolution No. PC-01120

The Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission took the following action at their regular meeting on Wednesday, May 21, 2008:

Motion made by Taylor, seconded by Francis, to find the proposed conveyance of a permanent conservation easement by Cardwell Reserve Homeowner’s Association, Inc. to the City of Lincoln and the Lower Platte South NRD, to preserve the Cardwell Branch floodplain and floodway for flood storage and other beneficial functions of the floodplain over approximately 31.48 acres generally located at S.W. 12th Street and W. Denton Road, to be in conformance with the 2030 Lincoln-Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan.

Motion for a finding of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan carried 8-0: Cornelius, Taylor, Gaylor Baird, Larson, Sunderman, Francis, Esseks and Carroll voting ‘yes’.

A resolution approving the proposed Conservation Easement Agreement is scheduled for public hearing before the City Council on Monday, June 9, 2008, at 1:30 p.m.

Attachment

cc: Building & Safety  
Rick Peo, Chief Assistant City Attorney  
Greg MacLean, Director of Public Works & Utilities  
Nicole Fleck-Tooze, Public Works & Utilities, Watershed Management  
Glenn Johnson, Lower Platte South NRD, P.O. Box 83581, 68501  
Cardwell Reserve Homeowner’s Association, Inc., 3700 S. 14th Street, 68502
RESOLUTION NO. PC-01120

Comprehensive Plan Conformity No. 08009

WHEREAS, Cardwell Reserve Homeowner's Association, Inc. has offered to
convey to the City of Lincoln and the Lower Platte South NRD a permanent conservation
easement over approximately 31.48 acres of property to preserve the Cardwell Branch
floodplain and floodway for flood storage and other beneficial functions of the floodplain over an
area generally located at S.W. 12th Street and W. Denton Road and legally described on
Attachment “A” attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, the City of Lincoln and the Lower Platte South NRD are authorized
to accept and hold conservation easements under the terms of the Conservation and
Preservation Easement Act (Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 76-2,111 to 76,2,118); and

WHEREAS, the Director of Planning has submitted a request designated as
Comprehensive Plan Conformity No. 08009 to find the proposed acquisition of permanent
conservation easement by the City of Lincoln and the Lower Platte South NRD to be in
conformity with the Comprehensive Plan.

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

That Cardwell Reserve Homeowner’s Association, Inc.'s offer and the City of
Lincoln and the Lower Platte South NRD’s acceptance of a permanent conservation easement
to preserve the floodplain storage and to restrict the development on the property described
above be and the same is hereby found to be in conformance with the Lincoln City/Lancaster
County Comprehensive Plan.

The foregoing Resolution was approved by the Lincoln City-Lancaster County
Planning Commission on this 21st day of May, 2008.

ATTEST:

/S/ Original signed by
Eugene Carroll
Chair

Approved as to Form & Legality:

Chief Assistant City Attorney
37.31 acres, more or less, in the South Part of Outlots A and B, Cardwell Reserve Addition, located in the Northeast Quarter of Section 21, Township 9 North, Range 6 East of the 6th P.M., Lancaster County, Nebraska

including the portions thereof referred to herein as the "Easement Area"; the Easement Area is more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the East Half Section Corner of said Section 21, thence North 89° 35' 51" West a distance of 59.89 feet; thence North 89° 58' 27" West a distance of 211.81 feet along the north side of Outlot A, Foroman Ridge 4th Addition to the Point of Beginning; thence North 56° 55' 00" West a distance of 120.64 feet; thence North 19° 02' 20" West a distance of 77.48 feet; thence North 03° 54' 10" East a distance of 87.90 feet; thence North 22° 50' 12" West a distance of 55.14 feet; thence North 21° 37' 47" East a distance of 51.82 feet; thence North 55° 13' 20" West a distance of 99.75 feet; thence North 48° 48' 51" West a distance of 72.58 feet; thence South 88° 15' 51" West a distance of 75.14 feet; thence North 75° 34' 45" West a distance of 164.49 feet; thence North 30° 15' 23" West a distance of 94.85 feet; thence North 45° 00' 00" West a distance of 90.12 feet; thence South 43° 57' 30" West a distance of 88.52 feet; thence North 88° 05' 27" West a distance of 68.31 feet; thence North 12° 48' 15" West a distance of 102.69 feet; thence North 67° 37' 12" West a distance of 83.68 feet; thence South 87° 59' 26" West a distance of 259.61 feet; thence South 10° 43' 30" East a distance of 175.52 feet; thence South 21° 33' 14" West a distance of 84.61 feet; thence South 07° 07' 03" East a distance of 85.99 feet; thence South 22° 45' 56" East a distance of 39.81 feet; thence South 42° 01' 02" East a distance of 87.01 feet; thence South 68° 29' 11" East a distance of 87.02 feet; thence South 79° 11' 27" East a distance of 39.35 feet; thence South 25° 03' 24" East a distance of 218.17 feet; thence North 89° 53' 31" West a distance of 256.75 feet; thence North 00° 28' 48" West a distance of 135.97 feet; thence North 88° 25' 45" West a distance of 193.34 feet; thence North 53° 47' 17" West a distance of 96.58 feet; thence North 45° 56' 25" West a distance of 31.76 feet; thence North 59° 10' 20" West a distance of 55.85 feet; thence North 81° 23' 45" West a distance of 70.52 feet; thence North 65° 04' 45" West a distance of 202.22 feet; thence North 68° 45' 58" West a distance of 115.02 feet; thence North 83° 31' 32" West a distance of 121.49 feet; thence South 89° 57' 57" West a distance of 139.96 feet; thence North 81° 17' 44" West a distance of 87.33 feet; thence South 66° 37' 46" West a distance of 65.86 feet; thence South 04° 30' 09" East a distance of 133.33 feet; thence South 16° 19' 51" West a distance of 264.83 feet; thence North 89° 53' 31" West a distance of 149.24 feet; thence North 00° 39' 32" West a distance of 771.36 feet; thence North 78° 13' 17" East a distance of 122.08 feet; thence South 85° 41' 30" East a distance of 118.92 feet; thence North 88° 27' 35" East a distance of 262.08 feet; thence South 40° 53' 55" East a distance of 133.48 feet; thence North 54° 26' 26" East a distance of 237.04 feet; thence South 52° 05' 51" East a distance of 274.89 feet; thence North 51° 17' 03" East a distance of 315.96 feet; thence North 84° 45' 06" East a distance of 250.15 feet; thence North 74° 44' 47" East a distance of 42.51 feet; thence North 77° 21' 19" East a distance of 51.24 feet; thence North 80° 19' 50" East a distance of 51.24 feet;
thence North 86° 16' 52" East a distance of 51.24 feet; thence North 89° 15' 22" East a distance of 51.24 feet; thence South 87° 46' 30" East a distance of 51.02 feet; thence South 86° 13' 17" East a distance of 31.75 feet; thence South 85° 08' 06" East a distance of 93.48 feet; thence South 83° 32' 13" East a distance of 90.77 feet; thence South 84° 06' 47" East a distance of 34.64 feet; thence South 86° 50' 32" East a distance of 47.83 feet; thence South 90° 00' 00" East a distance of 47.83 feet; thence North 86° 50' 32" East a distance of 47.83 feet; thence North 83° 43' 29" East a distance of 46.61 feet; thence North 81° 19' 41" East a distance of 14.64 feet; thence North 78° 21' 11" East a distance of 36.15 feet; thence North 74° 07' 04" East a distance of 36.15 feet; thence North 69° 52' 56" East a distance of 36.15 feet; thence North 65° 38' 49" East a distance of 36.15 feet; thence North 61° 24' 42" East a distance of 36.15 feet; thence North 57° 10' 35" East a distance of 36.15 feet; thence North 52° 56' 28" East a distance of 36.39 feet; thence North 50° 25' 38" East a distance of 93.54 feet; thence South 00° 19' 22" East a distance of 940.45 feet; thence North 89° 59' 57" West a distance of 88.88 feet; thence South 28° 43' 45" West a distance of 103.18 feet; thence South 59° 56' 29" West a distance of 83.74 feet to the Point of Beginning.
The Engineering Services Division of my department conducts an annual study of crashes at intersections located within the City. The primary purpose of this study is to identify problem locations where appropriate improvements can help improve safety, security and operations of our existing multi-modal transportation system.

Generally, an effective Transportation Safety Improvement Program helps promote economic vitality through reduced insurance costs, health care costs and loss of human resources. During the year 2006, the monetary loss due to the 7,584 crashes reported in Lincoln was estimated at $185 million. Our records indicate that the total number of crashes in Lincoln have remained relatively stable over the last 20 years, even though the daily vehicle-miles traveled (DVMT), since 1985 to 2006 has nearly doubled from an average of 2.25 million to 4.39 million miles per day.

Traditionally, my department has used this annual crash report as a tool to aggressively pursue Federal Safety Funds for safety improvements. As a result, the City has received nearly $6.0 million in Federal Safety Funds to implement eleven safety improvement projects over the last 10 years. Without these Federal funds (which normally pay for 80% of a project cost), it would have been a major challenge to implement and maintain our safety improvement program with only our limited local funds.

The attached Executive Summary of the 2006 Crash Report, provides an overview of the process and results of this key component of Lincoln’s Transportation Safety Improvement Program. Lincoln’s comprehensive program addresses Engineering, Enforcement, and Education. My staff and I are prepared to make presentations to you or to any community organization that holds an interested in learning more about traffic safety in Lincoln.

Thank you.
How to fund Lancaster County projects with tourism dollars.

Example #1:

Bruton Smith's new 60 million dollar drag racing facility next to Lowes Motor Speeday which is also next to Concord Mills Shopping Mall, one of the largest shopping Malls in the Carolina's.

Note the first photo with a housing subdivision adjacent to the proposed track that was just approved. A National event is scheduled for this coming September.

The sound that people hear from these types of facilities a few times out of the year. Is the sound of Money rolling into there community and they love it!

http://www.nhra.com/content/news/28943.htm
May 16, 2008

Tammy Grammer
City Council Office
555 S. 10th, Room 111
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Tammy Grammer,

The Lincoln Action Program Board of Directors has regretfully accepted the resignation of Executive Director Sue Hinrichs. Ms. Hinrichs served Lincoln Action Program for 16 years, the past three as executive director. The Board of Directors appreciates Ms. Hinrichs’ many significant contributions to the agency and wishes her success in her future endeavors. In response to her resignation, the Board is now forming a search committee to identify and hire a new executive director as soon as possible.

In the meantime, the Board has appointed Aaron Bowen as Interim Executive Director while Lincoln Action Program seeks a permanent replacement. Mr. Bowen has been with the agency for three years and has served for the past year as Lincoln Action Program’s Chief Operating Officer. The Board is confident in Mr. Bowen’s ability to lead the organization during this time of transition.

In no way does this alter Lincoln Action Program’s dedication and commitment to serving the low-income population of Lancaster and Saunders Counties. For more than 43 years, Lincoln Action Program has vigorously addressed the causes of poverty in our communities, making them safer and stronger for all our families. The agency will maintain its commitment, services, and normal operations during the search for a new executive director. We will work diligently to maintain the quality level of service you’ve come to expect from us for more than four decades.

Please feel free to contact either Aaron at 471-4515, or me at 441-4603, with any questions. We will continue to update you as necessary as we move forward in the search process. Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,

Judy Halstead
Lincoln Action Program Board President
Name: Kaylene Martin  
Address: 401 South 84th  
City: Lincoln, NE 68510  
Phone: 4024886388  
Email: lenkayl@alltel.net

Comment or Question:  
I am very unhappy to see the mayor wants to take away the before and after school and other programs. This is a big mistake. Why are we punishing the children of our city who happen to be low income. This is going to promote latch key children and create problems which are needless. Why not find other areas to eliminate rather than the ones that provide for the children of our great city. It seems to me that whenever money is an issue the low and middle income people suffer the most. These people are working to provide for their children and need the resources to help give their children a good start in life.

Thank you for your attention to my concern.
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
   General Council

Name:     George Buckner
Address:  3468 NEERPARK DRIVE
City:     Lincoln, NE   68506-4527
Phone:    402-430-4228
Fax:       Email:    george.buckner.hjyt@statefarm.com

Comment or Question:
My thoughts on all of the telephone books that are placed onto city residents
doorsteps. It is my opinion that there should be a city law created that
allows a resident to 'opt' out of having several (unwanted and unneeded)
telephone books placed on our doorsteps each year. I should have the option
of requesting or declining receiving this book. Since they wish to decline my
request to have my name included in their book (I only have a cell phone and
since I do not have a 'land' line, they will not add my name to the listing.
If they can decline my request to be included, why do I not have the right to
decline their unwanted services??