I. CITY CLERK

II. CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE MAYOR & DIRECTORS TO COUNCIL

MAYOR
*1. NEWS RELEASE. Date changed for open house on street projects. Now set for Monday, August 3, 2009 at Mickle Middle School, 2500 N. 67th Street.
*2. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor issues statement on Council budget votes.
4. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler will discuss the City’s labor union contracts at a news conference on Thursday, July 30, 2009, 10:00 am in the Mayor’s Conference Room, 555 South 10th Street.
5. NEWS REPORT. Mayor commends employee unions for cooperation.

DIRECTORS

FINANCE/BUDGET
*1. Memo from Steve Hubka, Budget Officer, regarding July sales tax reports reflecting May activity:
   a) Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections;
   b) Gross Sales Tax Collections (With Refunds Added Back In) 2003-2004 through 2008-2009;
   c) Sales Tax Refunds 2003-2004 through 2008-2009; and
*2. Memo from Sherry Wolf-Drabal regarding status in Mayor’s budget of positions held in the hiring freeze.
   1. Fiscal Year 2008-09 - requisitions for hiring review; requisitions; on hold- to be rated; on hold-sent for interviews; and hold.
   3. Information related to vacancy/turnover savings included in the last two City budgets.

FINANCE/TREASURER
1. Monthly City cash report.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT
1. NEWS RELEASE. Livewell challenge helps people move more and lose weight.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1. July 2009 City Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting cancelled
PUBLIC WORKS/STAR TRAN
1. Letter to Ms. Jean Ford from Larry Worth, Transit Manager, thanking her for correspondence describing the exemplary performances of several StarTran staff. (Ms. Ford’s letter is attached and also listed under Miscellaneous #20) (Council Members received individual copies of Director Worth’s letter on July 28, 2009)

URBAN DEVELOPMENT
1. Memorandum from Urban Development Director, David Landis, regarding 2240 Q Street. (Distributed to Council Members before the meeting on July 27, 2009)

III. COUNCIL RFI’S & CITIZENS CORRESPONDENCE TO INDIVIDUAL COUNCIL MEMBERS

JON CAMP
*1. Letter and article from Rosina Paolini. Do not charge an admission fee to the Pioneer Nature Center.
*2. Reply to Ty Westover in regards to his email on the proposed telecom tax.
*3. Request to Greg MacLean, Public Works & Utilities Director - RE: 9th and Harrison Traffic Warning Device. (RFI #90 - 07-22-09)
*4. Request to Mike Lang, Economic Development Coordinator, and Fred Hoke, Building and Safety Department Director, on research done to investigate Development Service Centers in other cities.
*5. Correspondence to Lynn Johnson, Parks and Rec Director, and Steve Hubka, Budget Officer, regarding the Crawford Trust.
*6. Correspondence to John Cripe, Classification and Compensation Manager, regarding matrix for union contracts, and reply from John Cripe.
7. Message from Bryan VanDeun. No Phone Tax. Put the savings policy back.
8. Correspondence from, and reply to, Tom Hanthorn, concerning the telecom occupation tax.
9. Email from Kent Peterson. Just because there is a revenue shortfall from year to year the response cannot be to raise taxes.
10. Email from Jon Camp to Mayor Chris Beutler asking if his name has been sent to the City Council for approval to continue service as a Public Building Commission representative.
11. Correspondence to Fire Chief Ford from Councilman Camp regarding ambulance rate increases and LRF call breakdown.
12. Councilman Camp’s email to City Council regarding the letter of support for LES Smart Grid Application with correspondence from Lincoln Electric System and Councilman Emery.
13. Email to Sherrie A. Meints with questions on the proposed ambulance rate increases.

JONATHAN COOK
*1. Correspondence from Sue and Ron Samson regarding not charging fees for the Pioneers Park Nature Center with possible funding ideas and a thank you for supporting the neighborhood libraries and swimming pools.
2. Two letters from Keith Herbster, and copy of JP Lauterbach letter, concerning the new pool area at the Cooper YMCA.
IV. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS TO COUNCIL

1. Email from Gene Herzberg. Do not do the telecom tax increase. Cut spending and don’t raise taxes.

2. Email from Sherm Bastron on being charged an Occupation Tax at the North 48th Street transfer station.

3. Email from Emily Levine. Saddened by recent proposal to begin charging to enter the Chet Ager Nature Center at Pioneer Park.

4. Email from Dennis Spickelmeier. Spending money to replace one of the newest roads in Lincoln, West Van Dorn Street, when we need a true bypass around Lincoln.

5. Correspondence from Jeff Hebb. Eliminate the telecom tax increase and continue the vacancy budgeting.

6. Email from Mike Friend regarding the cell phone tax.

7. Email from Bill Budler urging Council not to increase the telecom tax.

8. Email from Mark Brondor, on vacancy savings and tax. Find a middle ground and reduce the proposed increase.

9. Correspondence from Renee Tewes. Now is a poor time to increase taxes on businesses.

10. Email from Betty Cummings. Agree with LIBA’s solution of eliminating the tax increase and continue vacancy budgeting.


12. Email from Mary Jo Bousek. Do not add another tax to our telephone bills, or any other asset. Use the personal vacancy savings.

13. Jodi Delozier email. Urge Council to make reductions within the budget before considering any tax increases.

14. Email from Deb Bell regarding the proposed telecom tax increase. There are other ways to pay our obligations rather than increasing taxes.

15. Email from Monte Froehlich. Seriously consider using the vacancy savings and not increasing taxes.

16. Email from Carolyn Groth. Do not vote for the Mayor’s proposed cell/land line phone tax increase.

17. Email from Jeff Sneller. No phone tax increase.

18. Email from Kent Thompson. Consider tax decreases. Prioritize services by greatest need.


20. Letter from Jean Ford thanking Star Tran and all who put great efforts into helping make city transportation such an effective viable source for those who need, rely, and prefer, the bus system.

21. Email from Marge Schlitt. Disturbed about possibly paying an entry fee to the Pioneer Park Nature Center.

22. Email from Terry Kreifels. Consider removing the increased taxes on telecom services proposed in the mayor’s new budget. Construction is already struggling due to impact fees we have implemented in recent years.

23. Email from Roy Christensen. Use common sense and use the vacancy accounting method. No more tax increases.

24. Email from Nancy Muehling. Eliminate the new tax on our phone/call bills. Urge using the vacancy budgeting.
25. InterLinc correspondence from Kathleen Bousquet regarding loose running dogs, including a pit bull, in the neighborhood.

26. Email from James Brown. Use LIBA’s solution to eliminate the telephone tax increase and continue the tradition of vacancy budgeting.

27. Email from Sandra Lab. Vote no to increasing fees/taxes on phones. We are the highest State in the nation with fees and taxes on phones, both landlines and cell phones.

V. ADJOURNMENT

* Held Over from July 27, 2009
DATE: July 29, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

Mayor Chris Beutler will discuss the City's labor union contracts at a news conference at 10 a.m. Thursday, July 30 in the Mayor's Conference Room, 555 S. 10th St.
MAYOR COMMENDS EMPLOYEE UNIONS FOR COOPERATION

Average salary increase lowest in last 40 years

Mayor Chris Beutler today thanked City employee bargaining units for working with the City to hold the line on expenses during tough economic times. The salary increase represented by the union agreements for 2009 averages less than one percent. According to the State Department of Labor, the average salary increase in the Lincoln area from the first quarter of 2008 to the same period of 2009 was 1.9 percent.

The Mayor said he has asked City employees to make some sacrifices for all three of the budgets he has developed. “In previous years, I have asked them to pay higher deductibles on their health insurance,” Beutler said. “In my first set of contract negotiations, I asked them to accept less than what they were entitled to by State law, and I made the same request this year. In each case, City employees have demonstrated to me that they have the public's interest at heart. They've worked with us, compromised where they could, and found solutions that recognized the budget challenges faced by taxpayers.”

The bargaining units and their proposed settlements are:
- LCEA - Lincoln City Employees Association - 1.28 percent salary increase
- PAGE - Public Association of Government Employees - 1.75 percent salary increase
- ATU - Amalgamated Transit Union - 1.85 percent increase
- IAFF - International Association of Firefighters - no salary increase, but will receive benefit changes equal to less than .5 percent of salary
- LPU - Lincoln Police Union - 1.25 percent salary increase
- E class - unrepresented (similar to LCEA) - 1.28 percent salary increase
- X class - excluded (similar to PAGE) - 1.75 percent salary increase
- M class - managers (were E class until 1990) - still being negotiated.

The City Council approved the contracts for LCEA, PAGE and ATU July 27, but the Council delayed action on the M class contract. Negotiations have been completed with IAFF and LPU, and those contracts will go to the Council soon.

Beutler said City employees have been asked to do more with less for a number of years. His budgets have reduced the City workforce by more than six percent, while the City has continued to grow. “It the productivity and commitment of our City employees that have allowed my Administration to undertake major re-organizations that have saved taxpayers millions of dollars,” Beutler said. “They are the reason I was able to offer a budget for next year that increased by only .04 percent.”
CONGRESS

Congress marches closer to lengthy summer recess. Congressional leaders appeared ready to shelve floor consideration of health care reform legislation until after each chamber’s summer recess, clearing the way for the break to begin on July 31 for the House and on August 7 for the Senate.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) announced yesterday that he believed the complex health care reform issue would be better served by delaying floor debate until September. Meanwhile, House leaders are continuing to negotiate with moderate Democrats in an effort to secure enough votes to approve a package currently moving through the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Some Members are pressing for a vote prior to the recess, in order to be able to tout major accomplishments with their constituents over the break, but it remains to be seen as to whether enough “Blue Dog” Democrats can be swayed.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) announced yesterday that he believed the complex health care reform issue would be better served by delaying floor debate until September. Meanwhile, House leaders are continuing to negotiate with moderate Democrats in an effort to secure enough votes to approve a package currently moving through the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Some Members are pressing for a vote prior to the recess, in order to be able to tout major accomplishments with their constituents over the break, but it remains to be seen as to whether enough “Blue Dog” Democrats can be swayed.

The other Obama Administration priority – climate change – will also have to wait until September for some clarity. While the House approved a sweeping measure to regulate greenhouse gas emissions last month, Senate Democrats are divided on the issue, and leadership will use August and September to try to craft some consensus. Ultimately, the matter may have to wait until next year, particularly if the White House decides to use most of its political capital on health care.

Meanwhile, the House this week approved two more (Transportation-HUD; Labor-HHS-Education) of its FY 2010 appropriations bills, and with approval of the Defense Department bill next week, will make its goal of approving all twelve FY 2010 spending bills prior to recess. The Senate, on the other hand, has been making progress in the Appropriations Committee, but will likely only manage to approve two measures (Energy and Water Development and possibly Military Construction) on the floor over the next two weeks, at best.

The Senate is also expected to dispense with the nomination of U.S. Appeals Court Judge Sonia Sotomayor to the United States Supreme Court, in the Judiciary Committee on July 28 and on the Senate floor the week of August 3.

Congress is scheduled to return from its summer recess on September 8.

TRANSPORTATION

House approves FY 2010 DOT bill; Senate committees take up SAFETEA-LU extension. The House this week approved its version of a FY 2010 spending bill for the Department of Transportation, while two Senate committees approved an 18-month extension of the law governing federal surface transportation programs (SAFETEA-LU) that is set to expire on September 30.

The House appropriations bill would provide $76 billion to the Department of Transportation, a 12.7 percent increase over FY 2009. The major beneficiary of that increase would be the high-speed rail program, which would receive $4 billion. Up to $2 billion of the high-speed rail funding is authorized for transfer into a National Infrastructure Bank, should one be created prior to the end of FY 2010. The House measure also includes $150 million for the Obama Administration’s “Sustainable Communities Initiative,” which is designed to promote the coordination of housing, transportation, and environmental concerns. Additional details on the FY 2010 DOT spending bill may be found in the June 17 Washington Report.
Meanwhile, the Senate Banking (with jurisdiction over transit) and Commerce (safety programs) Committees approved legislation this week to extend SAFETEA-LU for 18-months beyond its September 30 expiration date. This approach is favored by the White House, but opposed by Chairman James Oberstar (D-MN) of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

House leaders continue to push for a full six-year, $500 billion surface transportation authorization bill, and Chairman Oberstar has threatened to allow transportation programs to expire, rather than approve any extensions of current transportation policy. He has softened his stance somewhat in recent weeks in favor of a short extension (Senate Banking Chairman Chris Dodd would favor a six-month extension), but a House-Senate conference would be contentious.

Finally, Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) this week presented a plan to transfer a total $26.8 billion in General Funds to the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) in order to keep it from running out of money over an 18-month extension period. In declining to offset the spending, Baucus maintains that $19.5 billion of this sum is reimbursement for lost interest that should have been earned by the HTF over the last decade, but was instead transferred to the General Fund. The White House proposed a similar transfer but asked Congress to offset the expenditure.

Chairman Baucus said he hopes to move the bill forward in the next week, prior to the August recess.

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

Senate turns back concealed weapons amendment. The Senate narrowly defeated a floor amendment to a Defense Department reauthorization bill this week that would have allowed licensed gun owners with valid concealed weapons permits to carry those weapons across state lines.

The vote on the amendment was 58-39, with 60 votes necessary for passage. Twenty Democrats, including Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), voted for the amendment, while two Republicans (Richard Lugar of Indiana and George Voinovich of Ohio – former Mayors of Indianapolis and Cleveland, respectively) voted against the proposal.

The vote was a rare victory for gun control advocates, who have been unsuccessful thus far in persuading Democrats from western and rural “swing” districts to support curbs and checks on gun ownership. The House Financial Services Committee recently approved an amendment to an assisted housing bill that would prevent public housing agencies from banning guns in public housing, and efforts to renew a ban on assault weapons has not gained momentum.

Local government organizations such as the U.S. Conference of Mayors opposed the amendment, as did most major law enforcement organizations.

**HOUSING & CD**

House clears HUD spending measure. The House cleared the FY 2010 Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) appropriations bill this week. The bill would provide $47 billion for HUD in FY 2010, a 13 percent increase over FY 2009. Almost all programs of interest to local governments would see funding increases over FY 2009 levels, not including the stimulus.

In particularly good news for local governments, the bill would provide $4.167 billion for CDBG formula grants, an increase of $525 million. Funding for CDBG formula grants peaked in FY 2001 and declined precipitously in the following years. Even the 14.4 percent funding increase proposed for FY 2010 would still leave the program short of its FY 2001 funding peak of $4.409 billion. The total for CDBG in FY 2010, including set-asides and formula grants, would be $4.6 billion in the House bill.

CDBG’s sister program – HOME -- would receive, $2 billion, a $175 million or 9.3 percent increase over FY 2009. The bill also includes $150 million for the Sustainable Communities Initiative, a new HUD-Department of Transportation joint program proposed by the Administration that is designed to spur and assist regional efforts to better coordinate housing, transportation and energy policies.

Other highlights of the House-passed bill include (with comparison to FY 2009 levels in parentheses):
- $26.948 billion for Section 8 (+ $2.873 billion),
- $2.5 billion for Public Housing Capital (+ $50 million),
- $4.8 billion for Public Housing Operating (+ $345 million),
- $250 million for Public Housing HOPE VI (+ $130 million),
- $350 million for Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (+ $40 million),
- $1.85 billion for Homeless Assistance Grants (+ $173 million),
- $1 billion for Section 202 Elderly Housing (+ $235 million),
- $350 million for Section 811 Disabled Housing (+ $100 million),

The Senate Appropriations Committee is tentatively scheduled to consider its version of the bill next week.

**JOB TRAINING**

House approves Labor Department spending. The House approved the FY 2010 Department of Labor Appropriations bill today. The $731 billion bill, which also funds the Department of Education, the Department of Health and Human Services, is the largest of the 11 annual appropriations bills.

Overall, the bill would provide $13.3 billion to the Labor Department, $846 million above the FY 2009 level excluding the stimulus. A large chunk of that increase would go to the Employment and Training Administration for core federal job training programs (comparison to FY 2009 in parentheses):
- $862 million for Adult Job Training (same),
- $924 million for Youth Job Training (same),
- $1.399 billion for Dislocated Workers (+ $57 million)
$100 million for Youthbuild (+$30 million),
$108 million for Ex-Offender Reintegration (same) and
$1.705 billion for Job Corps (+ $21 million).

The bill also includes $65 million for competitive grants to prepare workers for jobs in health care and $50 million for competitive grants to train workers for “Green Jobs.”

HUMAN SERVICES
House clears HHS spending bill. The House approved the FY 2010 Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Appropriations bill today.

Overall, the bill would fund HHS at $73.7 billion, $7.4 billion more than the FY 2009 level, not including the stimulus. In general, programs of interest to local government would fare well. Big winners include the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which would receive $5.1 billion, the same as FY 2009 (including a supplemental appropriation) but double the FY 2008 level, and Head Start, which would receive $7.234 billion, a $122 million increase from FY 2009.

Other highlights include (with comparison to FY 2009 in parentheses):

- $2.190 billion for Community Health Centers (same)
- $105 million for Healthy Start (+ $3m)
- $2.292 billion for Ryan White AIDS Programs (+ $54 million)
- $715 million for Refugee & Entrant Assistance (+ $82 million)
- $2.127 billion for the Child Care Block Grant (same)
- $1.7 billion for the Social Services Block Grant (same)
- $700 million for the Community Services Block Grant (same)
- $1.531 billion for the Administration on Aging (+ $37m).

At the Education Department, the bill would provide a $50 million increase to $1.181 billion for 21st Century Learning Centers, which provide school districts with funding for after-school programs. The bill would also provide a modest $1 million increase to $276 million to the Institute for Museum and Library Services.

The Senate Appropriations Committee is tentatively scheduled to take up the bill next week.

STIMULUS WATCH
Weekly update on stimulus activities.

Department of Education
The $4.35 billion Race to the Top program was announced. Only States will be eligible for this competitive grant program to support education reform and innovation in classrooms, but governors must work in strong partnership with mayors and cities in order to qualify for this funding:

Department of Energy
The National Energy Technology Laboratory issued guidance for the Local Energy Assurance Planning Initiative. This initiative focuses on developing or refining plans to integrate new energy portfolios such as Smart Grid technology into energy assurance and emergency preparedness plans. A total of $10.5 million will be awarded and applications are due October 8, 2009:

Department of Labor
DOL announced $220 million in grant funding for projects that provide training and placement services to help workers pursue careers within high growth and emerging industries such as health care. Applications are due October 5, 2009:

Department of the Treasury
Treasury provided an update on issuances of the Build America Bonds program. State-by-state bond issuance data can be found at:

Federal Transit Administration
FTA is hosting three one-hour webinars July 27-29, 2009 on the ARRA Section 1201 (c) reporting process. No pre-registration is required, but there is limited capacity for each session. Information on how to participate:

Office of Management and Budget
Webcasts and corresponding presentations for each of the OMB webinars on reporting held this week:

GRANTS & NOTICES

National End. for the Humanities
NEH is accepting applications to the Digital Humanities Start-Up Grants program. Funding will be granted for the planning or initial stages of digital initiatives in any area of the humanities. The deadline for applications is October 6, 2009:

National Institute of Standards and Technology
NIST is holding a free two-day public workshop on Smart Grid interoperability standards on August 3–4, 2009, in the Washington, DC area. Information on how to view the opening and closing plenary session webcasts and how to join the breakout session teleconferences will be posted on the NIST Web site at:
http://www.nist.gov/smartgrid/.

Tony Hawk Foundation
The Tony Hawk Foundation will be accepting applications for the Summer 2009 Skatepark Grants beginning on August 15, 2009. The principal focus of these grants is to encourage and facilitate the design, development, construction, and operation of new skateboard parks and facilities located in low-income communities in the United States. The maximum grant award is $25,000 and applications are due by October 1, 2009:
http://www.tonyhawkfoundation.org/grant_application.asp.
Attached is a list of vacancy/turnover savings amounts that have been in the last two budgets.

The amounts shown are reductions in budgeted amounts for personnel only and do not reflect actual amounts saved. Budgeting vacancy turnover savings has been used in three budgets beginning in 2006-2007. The two years shown represent the two of the three years and were directly from the 2008-2009 budget book. Departments have struggled in different ways to live within the budgeted amounts. In two of the three years there were hiring freezes that left positions open, causing difficulty in getting work performed but also allowed flexibility in reducing budgets. There were retirement incentives in two of the three years that forced departments to cover retirement payouts, not only the incentive portion but also what would have been paid upon retirement without the extra incentive. In the 2008-2009 budget resolution it was necessary to transfer $270,066 of appropriations into budgets so departments could meet their obligations after being under-budgeted plus paying the retirement payouts. Keep in mind, as I tried to explain at the June 17th budget work session, that the retirement incentive has an initial cost but long term benefits. These include having a less expensive employee for a number of years, and creating open positions, some of which were eliminated in recent budgets. There was also the elimination of 115 FTE’s during this period. The last few years have hardly been normal and budgeting amounts of vacancy/turnover savings that are reasonable and workable is difficult to say the least.

You will also see that for 2007-2008 the City Council eliminated the salary savings for LPD. Being the largest budget, it was approximately $225,000, or roughly equivalent to four police officers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Review</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>3,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>4,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>3,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>2,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Treasurer</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>2,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Communications</td>
<td>16,610</td>
<td>17,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>3,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire &amp; Rescue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>4,718</td>
<td>5,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>147,157</td>
<td>149,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint.</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>2,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>5,845</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Health Serv.</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>10,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director's Office</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>2,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Pub. Health</td>
<td>9,209</td>
<td>9,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Data &amp; Eval.</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Promotion &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>2,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. &amp; Fisc. Mgmt.</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>1,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,979</td>
<td>19,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>3,634</td>
<td>3,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. &amp; Grounds</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Serv.</td>
<td>24,221</td>
<td>24,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Serv.</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>6,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging/Admin.</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>2,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging/Com. Act. &amp; Serv.</td>
<td>8,219</td>
<td>7,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging/Personal &amp; Family Serv.</td>
<td>5,775</td>
<td>5,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>5,192</td>
<td>5,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks &amp; Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Parks/Admin.</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>3,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry/Heavy Equip.</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>4,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Maint.</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>4,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Dist.</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Dist.</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>2,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Dist.</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Dist.</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>7,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design, Constr.</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>2,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>10,459</td>
<td>9,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>2,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td>4,892</td>
<td>5,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>2,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Review</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. Tech. Serv.</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>2,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Plan.</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>2,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148,415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In FY 07-08, $217,911 of vacancy/Turnover savings was proposed in the Mayor’s Budget but eliminated by the Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Works &amp; Util.</th>
<th>City Share</th>
<th>City Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Serv./Eng. Rev.</td>
<td>40,193</td>
<td>39,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Eng.</td>
<td>9,419</td>
<td>9,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt.</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>2,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StarTran</td>
<td>42,609</td>
<td>42,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Maint./Admin. Serv.</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>1,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Maint./Drainage</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>4,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Dev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Dev.</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com. Dev./N. 27th St.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehab.</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>2,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.I.A.</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>3,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.I.A. Board Support</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAX FUNDED TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>488,990</td>
<td>719,273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Public Works & Util.                          |           |            |
| Solid Waste                                  | 12,534    | 12,949     |
| WW/Collection                                | 11,938    | 12,190     |
| WW/NE Treatment                              | 5,568     | 5,872      |
| WW/Sanitary Eng.                             | 10,717    | 11,156     |
| WW/Theresa St.                               | 13,767    | 13,543     |
| WW/Business Office                           | 4,889     | 4,835      |
| Water/Ashland Production                     | 14,130    | 14,735     |
| Water/Lincoln Production                     | 5,852     | 6,083      |
| Water/Transmission & Dist.                   | 16,904    | 16,499     |
| Water/Business Office                        | 7,596     | 7,621      |
| Water/Operations Support                     | 7,478     | 7,854      |
| Watershed/Mgmt.                              | 3,878     | 3,825      |
| **NON-TAX FUNDED TOTAL**                     | 115,251   | 117,162    |
OFFICE OF TREASURER, CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

JULY 28, 2009

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 June 30, 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward</td>
<td>$176,951,722.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Total Debits June 1-30, 2009</td>
<td>$28,740,601.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Credits June 1-30, 2009</td>
<td>($35,747,357.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash Balance on June 30, 2009: $169,944,966.48

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>$418,534.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>($67,107.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank Credit Card Account</td>
<td>($92,372.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornhusker Bank</td>
<td>$2,685.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Bank</td>
<td>$11,314.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>$274,680.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate Bank</td>
<td>$12,736.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Short-Term Pool</td>
<td>$48,383,373.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Medium-Term Pool</td>
<td>$120,969,821.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Checks and Warrants</td>
<td>$31,300.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cash on Hand June 30, 2009: $169,944,966.48

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 $22,704,449.94 representing authorized investments of the City's funds.

ATTEST:

[Signature]

Joan E. Ross, City Clerk

[Signature]

Melinda J. Jones, City Treasurer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>MATURITY DATE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL FACE</th>
<th>CURRENT PAR</th>
<th>MARKET PRICE</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC FGLMC D67795</td>
<td>3128F7UU6</td>
<td>12/01/2009</td>
<td>$1,191,991.00</td>
<td>$4,232.81</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$4,322.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC GOLD POO. A61256</td>
<td>3128KRMD3</td>
<td>11/01/2036</td>
<td>$3,718,920.00</td>
<td>$3,062,526.48</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$3,226,720.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 254725</td>
<td>31371K4J7</td>
<td>05/01/2033</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$217,625.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$222,947.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNARM 303824</td>
<td>31373UPH4</td>
<td>07/01/2025</td>
<td>$1,600,000.00</td>
<td>$18,425.25</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$18,735.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 701282</td>
<td>31400YCT1</td>
<td>05/01/2033</td>
<td>$16,102,576.00</td>
<td>$8,566,852.81</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>$6,730,251.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBANK NE</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$23,113,487.00</td>
<td>$9,891,664.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,202,976.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 5.0%</td>
<td>3133XMEH0</td>
<td>04/04/2013</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.5%</td>
<td>3133XNKG3</td>
<td>12/10/2013</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB 4.30%</td>
<td>31339XRRQ5</td>
<td>04/16/2012</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNHUSKER BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$2,500,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB LOC 16747</td>
<td>12/10/2009</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST GATE BANK</td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:  July 30, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION:  Lisa Henning, 441-8049
                        Spencer Kerl, 441-4683

LIVEWELL CHALLENGE HELPS PEOPLE MOVE MORE & LOSE WEIGHT

Fifteen Nebraska companies worked on improving their health by participating in the LiveWell Challenge during June and July. The 4-week incentive program focused on increasing physical activity with full and half triathlons, and also had a challenge that encouraged healthy weight loss. Participants meeting health goals were entered into a prize drawing. Over 30 prizes, nearing $1,300 in value were donated and will be awarded to participants entered into the drawing. The grand prize is season tickets to the 2009 Husker Football. The presentation of this prize will be on Friday, July 31st at 11:00 a.m. at BryanLGH Medical Center Plaza, 1600 S. 48th.

The LiveWell Challenge is offered by WorkWell, Inc. WorkWell, Inc. is a nonprofit organization that is housed and co-sponsored by the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department. WorkWell has been dedicated to promoting wellness in the worksite through networking and education for more than 20 years. For more information about the LiveWell Challenge or developing a worksite wellness program, contact Lisa Henning at 441-8049, or Spencer Kerl at 441-4683.
From: Michele M. Abendroth
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2009 1:16 PM
To: 'gdkrieser@yahoo.com'; 'ghancock@naifmarealty.com'; 'rkzelka1@unl.edu';
'Timdfrancis@aol.com'; Jean Preister; Kent R. Morgan; Michele L. Williamson; Steve S.
Henrichsen; Terry A. Kathe; Tonya L. Peters
Subject: City Board of Zoning Appeals - July 2009 Meeting Cancelled

The July 2009 City Board of Zoning Appeals meeting has been cancelled as no applications were received prior to the deadline.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call the Planning Department at 441-7491.

Michele Abendroth
Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Department
555 South 10th Street, Suite 213
Lincoln, NE 68508
402-441-6164
July 28, 2009

Ms. Jean Ford
4241 N 61st St
Lincoln NE 68507

Dear Ms. Ford:

Thank you for your July 23, 2009 correspondence in which you described the exemplary performances of several StarTran staff to transfer you onto the Havelock bus, and thus safely home, on July 18th. Staff can be pretty creative in assisting passengers to where they want to travel on the StarTran system, and I am glad that they were able to help. We will attempt to identify the staff who assisted you, and will be sure they are aware of your appreciation.

Thank you also for your kind words as to the professionalism of the StarTran drivers, and you particular commendation of “Gib”. I will pass along your comments to him through our driver recognition program.

You have apparently noticed some of the features of our newly-implemented Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) system, including the electronic route/schedule information signs at several downtown locations and at Westfield Mall. I’m glad you are finding them to be helpful in “navigating” the StarTran system. We are still refining the AVL program, and will be adding more passenger-friendly features, including a “trip planner” function. Watch for announcements over the next several months as these additional features become available.

Yes, there has been serious consideration of a potential commuter passenger train service between Lincoln and Omaha. A feasibility study of such a service was carried out by the Nebraska Department of Roads, which found that the cost was higher than would justify such a commuter train service. I would note that Eppley Express (1-800-888-9793) operates a private van service between Lincoln and Omaha each day, with multiple trips some days. While this service travels to the airports of both cities, it also services locations near the airports that are likely serviced by StarTran and Metro Area Transit.

Again, thank you for your letter, and, of course, thank you for utilizing StarTran services.

Sincerely,

Larry D Worth
Transit Manager

cc: Mayor Chris Beutler
City Council Members
July 23, 2009

Larry Worth  
Director  
Star Tran  
710 J Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508  

Dear Mr. Worth,

I want to thank you for the attention, time, and effort you obviously give to the operations of the bus system. As do so many other people, I use the bus regularly.

I would like to say that there are more drivers than not who conduct themselves with professionalism and sincere care for the passengers. I do not know many of their names, but one I do know and is over-due for commendation is “Gib.” He used to drive the Havelock route earlier this year. He is exceptional. He genuinely cares and it is a tribute to the City that you hire such quality people.

I also appreciate the updates of schedules as posted downtown on the overhead screens, as well as the signs that indicate which side of 11th and “N” busses depart. These technical improvements bring a sense of security, in that when such attention given at this level occurs, it is a reflection that such care for citizens is being focused effectively at other levels of local government. No one does everything right all the time, but certainly we are open to checking out what works and what doesn’t and make adjustments accordingly while staying focused on what matters most. People are our greatest asset.

Specifically, however, I am writing to thank you for the exemplary help I received most recently, but certainly not exclusively. Saturday, July 18, I was on the last route of the day, coming from West A (51) and transferring downtown to Havelock (41). Engrossed in a book, I failed to get off the 51 at the downtown stop. I happened to look up when the bus was just north of Cornhusker Hwy and 11th Street. When I stopped the driver to ask what I should do, he was polite, and caring, and helpful - (a HUGE plus when otherwise a little panicked and no other way to get home!). After he made calls to help intervene, I followed his instructions and caught the Belmont on its way to north Wal-Mart. That was the best way for me to transfer to Havelock. Yet,
according to the schedule for Belmont and Havelock routes, neither crosses paths in time. Your great Belmont driver, however, had received the message from the 51 bus and quickly and with much care, thought out how to work the situation so that I could catch the Havelock. Without altering their routes in any way, she helped me get to the Havelock without the Havelock having to wait any length of time other than for me to cross the light at Superior. Amazing to me, the care the drivers gave, when it was my mistake. I know what it is like to miss a bus and have to walk the distance; yet, with the care and quick thinking of each of those drivers, I made it safely home.

I want to thank you and all of those who put the kinds of efforts and help into making city transportation such an effective viable source for those of us who not only need and rely on the bus system, but for those of us who prefer it.

I am also wondering (and hoping) if there is in the making, any possibility of having a “trans-railway” mode of transport, connecting Lincoln to Omaha.

Thank you again,

Jean Ford

Cc: City Council Members
    Mayor Chris Beutler
MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council Members
FROM: David Landis, Urban Development
RE: 2240 Q Street
DATE: July 27, 2009

This memo summarizes my verbal report on the Public Building Commission’s use of the structure at 2240 Q.

1. There is no lease between the City and the Public Building Commission for the property; it is a voluntary arrangement at no cost.

2. The day of the initial surplus hearing, I contacted Don Killeen, Building Administrator. He was aware of the situation and knew that at some future time the space would need to be vacated.

3. NeighborWorks would like to use the structure for storage. The structure now houses about 300 square feet of a carpenter shop for the Public Building Commission.

4. There is no immediate demand or compulsion to move the carpenter shop under any existing agreements. The Public Building Commission is willing to move on finding an acceptable alternative. That search is on.

5. The City will eventually need to vacate the property since it is not consistent with the national objectives of the CDBG program, which funded the purchase of the property. However, since the land is in a flood plain, HUD has not yet expressed concern about this temporary use which we have reported to them on an annual basis since taking over the property.

6. In conclusion, the Public Building Commission, NeighborWorks and Urban Development are aware of the situation. An alternative site will solve the problem. We are looking for that site.
Please put in Directors’ packet.

John, what the heck are you guys thinking? NO PHONE TAX. Put the savings policy back. What unmitigated hogwash. Bryan  PS  See Thom Jefferson below!!!!!!!!

---

Bryan J. Van Deun, EdD, CAE
1732 Pinedale Ave.
Lincoln, NE 68506
402/484-8042 H
402/617-8416 C
"A government big enough to give you everything you want is strong enough to take everything you have."
-Thomas Jefferson
Tom:

Thanks for your email concerning the telecom occupation tax.

While I was unsuccessful at my first attempts this past Monday to remove the increase in the telecom tax, I did hear some encouraging words from my colleagues that they will be thinking about "reducing this increase" prior to final adoption of the budget.

Messages like yours are being received from many citizens who also recognize the need for fiscal restraint at this time.

Best regards,

Jon

From: Tom Hanthorn [tomhanthorn@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 4:49 PM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: Council members

In these hard times, I am incredulous that you are considering adding to an already excessive tax. My cell telephone bill is close to 25% taxes, and my landlines are also excessively taxed.

Communication is the key to effective business management, so adding to an already overtaxed necessity is just wrong. I respectfully request that the city council find another method to raised the required revenue.

Tom Hanthorn
InsureLinc
402-477-9350
402-477-0710 Fax
tomhanthorn@gmail.com
Kent:

Your message was well-stated. . . “do more with less”.

Jon

From: KENT PETERSON [eaglekap@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 10:46 AM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: proposed budget

July 23, 2009

Dear City Council Member Camp,

Greetings. As a Lincoln resident that both lives and works as a business operator in Lincoln, appreciate the difficult task that your job entails. You have to make difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions, especially in difficult economic times. I want to be as brief as I can to respect your time, but my fear is that if you don’t personally hear from Lincolnites regarding the proposed budget you might assume all are in agreement with items before your Council.

First, I want to say that I feel that the City should conduct its’ finances as any business does in difficult economic times, “do more with less”. Just because there is a revenue shortfall from year to year, the response cannot be to raise taxes. There are valuable entities like police and fire protection that certainly cannot be lessoned, but I believe most Lincolnites are ready to “do without” some city services to avoid paying additional taxes. We are making due without some products at home (cable package, health club memberships, land lines, etc.) we have enjoyed in the past just to make ends meet today.

Increasing taxes in order to make up for the revenue shortfall would be like my business levying a surcharge to customers on top of what they fairly paying for my services today. In today’s economy this is not possible, as I am already behind 15% in revenue from last year. The only way we have maintained equitable profitability has been to eliminate positions/jobs, take away some customer amenities and “do more with less”. A further tax on my business communications cost would mean further job/cost cutting. Not to mention how this might affect attracting businesses Lincoln. Raising taxes starts a cycle of reduced spending, jobs, revenues, etc. and increased burden on all of us.

Realizing that government can raise my personal and business tax expense with the stroke of a pen, I urge you to not do so! I don’t think I am alone in the attitude that I am willing to endure personal sacrifices, in what I receive from the City in non-essential services in order to keep my taxes down. Thank you for your time!

I am always available to discuss these points further and plan to be at the public hearing August 10th.

Sincerely,
Kent Peterson
Kent A. Peterson
8430 Hollynn Lane #110
Lincoln, NE 68512
Cell-651-270-8507

Windows Live™ Hotmail®: Search, add, and share the web’s latest sports videos. Check it out.
Mayor Beutler:

I have asked Milo Mumgaard and Rick Hoppe to communicate my desire to continue service as a City Council representative on the Public Building Commission. To date, I have had no response.

Would you please confirm that you will send my name to the City Council for approval?

My background and experience in development and building restoration uniquely qualifies me to represent the City Council and City on the Public Building Commission. During my 10 years on the Commission, I have both gained perspective of the long term planning needs of the County and City and have participated in ensuring projects were handled in a fiscally responsible manner.

Thank you,

Jon

JON A. CAMP  
Haymarket Square/CH, Ltd.  
200 Haymarket Square  
808 P Street  
P.O. Box 82307  
Lincoln, NE  68501-2307  

Office:  402.474.1838  
Fax:  402.474.1838  
Cell:  402.560.1001  

Email:  joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com  

If opportunity doesn't knock, build a door.  
~Milton Berle  

ec:  Lincoln City Council
Chief Ford:

I noticed we have proposed ambulance fee increases. Would you please summarize the percentage increases and the rationale for proposing increases?

In view of the economical challenges we all face, how about considering the following:

1. Live with existing ambulances a few more years
2. Purchase vans for ambulance use in the future and save $30-$40,000 per vehicle (and operating costs)
3. Revise procedures for the Quick Response Team to save on the LFR budget
   a. The idea we have discussed on sending fewer firefighters at the time of initial call
   b. Use smaller vehicles for QRT
   c. Identify repeat users of the system and take affirmative steps to minimize repetitive calls that tax the system

During the budget hearing on LFR I inquired about the number of calls/responses by LFR. I believe you mentioned 2,000 fire calls and 20,000 medical calls. I also asked for a breakdown of the types of fires that were involved for each fire call. To the best of my knowledge, I have not received any information on my request.

Would you please provide statistics on the last several years for each category of response--fire or medical and quantify/identify false responses/alarms, types of requests for service, etc. PLEASE use your existing statistics as similar information was provided to me many years ago from records LFR maintains. If necessary, please feel free to call me to discuss an easy format in which this information can be furnished. I truly do not want to create extra work. . .only get the information I am confident you already have compiled.

Thanks,

Jon
Council Colleagues:

The LES application sounds promising. I do have concerns of making such an application if LES (its ratepayers) is not prepared to pay the remaining $34 million. While Shelley is correct that LES is not obligated, one would hope that all applicants are genuine in their intentions so that unnecessary reviews and expenses are not incurred in this process by the federal authorities nor LES and other applicants.

Can LES provide an estimate of “savings” this project would provide to offset local expense?

I am reminded of President Ronald Reagan’s quotation:

Accepting a government grant with its accompanying rules is like marrying a girl and finding out her entire family is moving in with you before the honeymoon.

Subject to my comments (and President Reagan’s), it makes sense to support the application.

Have a great weekend.

Jon

JON A. CAMP
Haymarket Square/CH, Ltd.
200 Haymarket Square
808 P Street
P.O. Box 82307
Lincoln, NE 68501-2307

Office: 402.474.1838
Fax: 402.474.1838
Cell: 402.560.1001

Email: joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com

If opportunity doesn’t knock, build a door.

~Milton Berle

Please see Shelley’s request. Please let me know if you would be comfortable with me writing a letter of support, on behalf of the council, to put in the packet. This packet will be submitted before our next organizational meeting so I will
need email approval IF you think it is okay. This does NOT obligate anyone to anything but LES wants to see if they can get government funds to help with their pursuit of this project.

Thanks

Doug Emery

From: demery@lincoln.ne.gov
To: dougemerypm@aol.com
Subj: FW: Letter of Support for LES Smart Grid Application

From: SSahling@les.com
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2009 11:05 AM
To: Doug Emery
Subject: Letter of Support for LES Smart Grid Application

Doug,

As I indicated during our phone conversation, LES is applying for a Department of Energy Smart Grid Investment Grant. LES' smart grid proposal would be to pursue advanced meter infrastructure (AMI) at a cost of about $67 million. The DOE grant program has potential to fund approximately half of this cost. It is important to note that the application does not commit LES to any expenditures. The investment decision would come if we are awarded a grant from DOE which we are hoping to know by October so any investment decision could be incorporated into the LES budget. The attached letter would indicate the Lincoln City Council's support for LES' application for a grant. We are hoping to have our packet ready for submittal by July 31, including letters of support from the City Council, the Mayor, the LES Administrative Board, and others. We are requesting the City Council's support for this grant application by executing the attached letter of support. Thanks for your consideration of this matter.

Shelley

(See attached file: City Council Smart Grid Grant Letter.docx)

Shelley R. Sahling-Zart
Vice President & Assistant Counsel
Lincoln Electric System
Ph. (402) 473-3204
Fax (402) 475-9759

NOTE: This electronic message and attachment(s), if any, contains information which is intended solely for the designated recipient(s). Unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution, or other use of the contents of this message or attachment(s), in whole or in part, is prohibited without the express authorization of the author of this message.

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.
Sherry:

I reviewed the materials appended to Resolution 09R-135, which will be introduced July 27, 2009, requesting ambulance rate increases. Please provide answers to the following questions:

1. What is the current balance owed by the EMS Enterprise Fund to the City?

2. Please provide information on the proposed budget item for the EMS Enterprise Fund for $60,000 for a “lease/purchase” of 2 more ambulances.
   
   a. What is the proposed lease term?
   b. The assumed interest rate?
   c. The total price per vehicle?
   d. Will these be the same vehicle type and manufacturer as the current 11 ambulances LRF has?

3. Please provide the mileage on each of the current 11 ambulances--identify per ambulance please.

4. The materials attached to the Resolution project and increase $123,919 in gross charges with a resulting approximate $36,642 in additional revenue.

   Please explain these calculations. For example, although your rates in the past have projected certain total gross charges, because of insurance and Medicare reimbursement shortfalls, you have not netted those project total gross charges.

   a. Are you saying that the $123,919 reduction to $36,642 is totally due to this loss of reimbursements?

5. What is the projected amount of increased wages/compensation/benefit costs for personnel in the EMS Enterprise Fund?

6. What is the current rate for the category “Standby: Fire Apparatus”? You are asking for a rate increase to $137.

Thank you for providing this information as soon as possible. If you need to consult with other individuals who assisted in providing this information, please share my questions with them. You are also welcome to call me.

Jon
July 22, 2008

Jonathan Cook
City Council
555 So. 10
Lincoln, NE 68505

Dear Sir:

Enclosed you will find two copies of letters concerning the new pool area at Cooper YMCA. One is a letter received from J P Lauterbach, informing me of tree planting on the berm.

The second letter is one that I wrote to Barb Bitten listing my concerns about noise and visual pollution in the neighborhood.

I am especially unhappy that the outdoor pool was positioned so close to my home. It is about one hundred fifty feet from our house, closer than any of my neighbors. In checking with the City officials, I find that there is no provision for denying a building permit for city or private club pools built so close to an existing rural type development, or to any other established neighborhood.

I have also contacted the Health Department on the noise factor. They are monitoring the situation, but said it is hard to do because noise is not constant, and shrillness is difficult to determine.

It would seem prudent that somewhere, either in an amended city ordinance, or in a new ordinance, that there be some restrictions put on noise and visual pollution in an existing neighborhood. This situation may not come up again, however, as citizens of Lincoln, my wife and I did not have a choice as to where the pool would be built.

Sincerely,

Keith Herbster
1201 Mockingbird Ln N
Lincoln, NE 68512
Mr. Herbster,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us on Tuesday, May 19th. As we discussed, we will be consulting with Campbell’s Nursery to add trees and landscaping in an effort to improve the site plan and aesthetics of the outdoor pool at the Cooper YMCA.

A result of this effort could also be improved blockage of both site lines and sound barrier.

You have previously expressed concerns about these areas and I wanted to let you know, in writing, the steps we are going to take to address them. Once these steps are completed, we feel that this issue will be resolved.

Thank you,

JF Lauterbach
District Executive Director
Cooper/Fallbrook YMCA

Cc: Barb Bettin
   President/CEO- Lincoln YMCA
July 22, 2008

Barbara Betten  
President/CEO-Lincoln YMCA  
570 Fallbrook Drive  
Suite 210  
Lincoln, NE 68521

Re: Outdoor swimming pool @ Cooper YMCA

I appreciate that small trees have been planted to replace the older and larger trees originally planted on the berm. Usually it takes 6-10 years for the trees to grow to the height of those removed. Until then, little visual barriers are present, with the end result of a loss of original privacy.

In addition to the sound of the air-conditioning units on the building, noise from the swimming pool continues to intrude upon the peacefulness of the neighborhood. The shrillness of voices carries easily to the neighborhood. On days when the pool is crowded, the noise level is very high. A recent call to the YMCA indicated that pool capacity was up to 300, more than we were initially told. Most days we are exposed to a minimum of eight hours of noise. Weekends are especially noisy. We do not always hear sentences, but words can be identified along with the whistle of the lifeguard. These words/whistles are not some constants, but the other noise is. Even with our house well insulated, the noise penetrates into the living room and bedroom. Companies we have had (from California and Kansas) have commented on the level of the noise, also saying that the shrillness of voices is heard in the bedroom downstairs.

The YMCA’s pool is closer to our house than any of our next door neighbor’s, with visibility from the pool area to the front yard of the home. At times we have seen an individual watching us from the step area of the deck. It is a little discerning when this happens.

When a business moves into a well-established rural type neighborhood, air and noise pollution occurs, in addition to the removal of more mature trees. It would seem that this pollution should be of primary concern, and major efforts taken so that the business does not infringe upon the privacy of the existing neighboring homes.

When the YMCA building was originally built, we asked that a berm be built to control noise and pollution. Trees were also planted on top of the berm to assist with the pollution control. I also suggested that a noise barrier be placed on the roof to deaden the sound of roof units. This was not deemed necessary by the YMCA.
At this time, the construction of the stairs and part of the sun deck are as high or nearly as high as the original berm. This defeats the purpose of the berm.

There are no plans in the future for paving the road, and certainly no plans to participate in the cost of paving the road. Placement of the pool in a different location might have prevented roadway dust to the pool area.

In JP's letter, he stated that "once these steps (planting of trees and landscaping) are completed, we feel that this issue will be resolved." As the trees grow older, this would help in the esthetics of the site, but nothing is or has been done to alleviate noise, and at the present I feel the issue is not resolved.

I am anxious to learn what action is planned that would result in pollution relief to the neighborhood. After you have decided on action, I would like to suggest that you, my wife and I meet together to see what plan of action will be taken that will be acceptable to all of us. I appreciate your willingness to listen to me, and to keep me informed on what is being done at the Y.

Sincerely,

Keith Herbster

cc: Jonathan Cook
July 23, 2009

Larry Worth
Director
Star Tran
710 J Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Mr. Worth,

I want to thank you for the attention, time, and effort you obviously give to the operations of the bus system. As do so many other people, I use the bus regularly.

I would like to say that there are more drivers than not who conduct themselves with professionalism and sincere care for the passengers. I do not know many of their names, but one I do know and is over-due for commendation is "Gib." He used to drive the Havelock route earlier this year. He is exceptional. He genuinely cares and it is a tribute to the City that you hire such quality people.

I also appreciate the updates of schedules as posted downtown on the overhead screens, as well as the signs that indicate which side of 11th and "N" busses depart. These technical improvements bring a sense of security, in that when such attention given at this level occurs, it is a reflection that such care for citizens is being focused effectively at other levels of local government. No one does everything right all the time, but certainly we are open to checking out what works and what doesn’t and make adjustments accordingly while staying focused on what matters most. People are our greatest asset.

Specifically, however, I am writing to thank you for the exemplary help I received most recently, but certainly not exclusively. Saturday, July 18, I was on the last route of the day, coming from West A (51) and transferring downtown to Havelock (41). Engrossed in a book, I failed to get off the 51 at the downtown stop. I happened to look up when the bus was just north of Cornhusker Hwy and 11th Street. When I stopped the driver to ask what I should do, he was polite, and caring, and helpful - (a HUGE plus when otherwise a little panicked and no other way to get home!). After he made calls to help intervene, I followed his instructions and caught the Belmont on its way to north Wal-Mart. That was the best way for me to transfer to Havelock. Yet,
according to the schedule for Belmont and Havelock routes, neither crosses paths in time. Your great Belmont driver, however, had received the message from the 51 bus and quickly and with much care, thought out how to work the situation so that I could catch the Havelock. Without altering their routes in any way, she helped me get to the Havelock without the Havelock having to wait any length of time other than for me to cross the light at Superior. Amazing to me, the care the drivers gave, when it was my mistake. I know what it is like to miss a bus and have to walk the distance; yet, with the care and quick thinking of each of those drivers, I made it safely home.

I want to thank you and all of those who put the kinds of efforts and help into making city transportation such an effective viable source for those of us who not only need and rely on the bus system, but for those of us who prefer it.

I am also wondering (and hoping) if there is in the making, any possibility of having a “trans-railway” mode of transport, connecting Lincoln to Omaha.

Thank you again,

Jean Ford

Cc: City Council Members
    Mayor Chris Beutler
Doug Emery:

The Mayor has proposed in the 2009-10 City Budget a telecom tax increase, which would increase the rate on both my private cell and land line from 5.5% to 6.0%.

I think the council / city should review other alternatives. For example, why doesn't the City take the opportunity to stop using a 5-year-old accounting policy that recognizes the savings realized when the City has job vacancies and turnovers. These "Vacancy Savings" occur when someone leaves. Until that position is filled, the City saves money because it is not paying for that position. In addition, the new hire often starts at a lower wage/salary, resulting in additional savings. I suggest that the City eliminate the tax increase, and continue the tradition of vacancy budgeting.

Cut Spending - don't raise taxes!! Cut Spending ...

Gene Herzberg,
410 Cottonwood Drive
Lincoln, NE 68510-4302
I was wondering why we are spending a lot of money to replace one of the newest roads in Lincoln that as far as I can tell has nothing wrong with it, West Van Dorn Street between 9th and the bypass. When we need a true bypass around Lincoln so the trucks trying to access Highway 2 to Nebraska City do not have to go through town. There needs to be a true freeway bypass with no intersections with stop lights which is so dangerous for truck traffic.

Dennis Spickelmier
Nebraska Book Co.
e-mail: denniss@nebook.com
phone: 800-869-0366
From: Hebb, Jeff M. [Jeff.Hebb@ExpressPros.com]
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2009 1:25 PM
To: Tammy J. Grammer
Subject: Solution-Telecom Tax

Dear City Council,

A solution would be to eliminate the telecom tax increase, and continue the tradition of vacancy budgeting.

Jeff Hebb, Owner
Express Employment Professionals
4955 O Street, Suite C
Lincoln, NE 68510
Ph 402 420-5800
Fax 402 489-5858
Cell 402 314-4551
Email jeff.hebb@ExpressPros.com
www.ExpressPros.com
Respecting People. Impacting Business.SM
Lincoln City Council Members,

Speaking strictly as a private citizen and on behalf of my wife Melanie (not speaking for or acting in any way as representative of the non-profit organization that happens to be my employer), we appreciate anything that can be done to hold the line on local spending and taxes, especially given the challenging financial climate and unfunded spending gushing out of control from Washington, DC. It strikes our family of 6 that spends about $160 a month (and also happens to be trying to launch a small business) or so on cell phone coverage that any increase to this recurring monthly tax is a bad one given that we are already at or near the tops in the country in this regard, not the most business or family friendly positioning. As such, we ask the City Council to strongly consider, as a viable and common sense option, the following generated by the LIBA organization to balance the city budget:

The City has the opportunity to stop using a 5-year-old accounting policy that recognizes the savings realized when the City has job vacancies and turnovers. These "Vacancy Savings" occur when someone leaves. Until that position is filled, the City saves money because it is not paying for that position. In addition, the new hire often starts at a lower wage/salary, resulting in additional savings. LIBA's solution would be to eliminate the tax increase, and continue the tradition of vacancy budgeting.

The issue to us is not only the roughly $12 a year it would save us but more importantly the precedent it sets for future tax increases (rarely do they ever get rolled back) and the far less than ideal positioning comparatively of the city in terms of what is now almost a basic utility cost for most people and businesses.

Thank you for your collective desire and efforts to wisely steward the City of Lincoln and its people.

Respectfully Yours,

Mike Friend
4011 S 82 St Circle
Lincoln, NE
The tax burden on Lincoln businesses is already a financial burden. I urge you to NOT increase the telcom tax!

Bill Budler

Made in the Shade
Outdoor Living Center
1742 N. 48th St.
Lincoln, NE 68504
(402) 441-9950 office
(402) 474-7012 fax

www.ForYourDeck.com
I watched with interest the council meeting where this issue was discussed. From my perspective, this one is about as easy as they come. Find a middle ground and reduce the proposed increase. Vacancy does result in real dollars being saved and is a viable part of the budgeting process.

Mark J. Bronder
Managing Director
Grubb & Ellis Pacific Realty
300 N 44th St., Ste 100, Lincoln, NE 68503
Main: 402.467.1234 ● Cell: 402.610.1215 ● Fax: 402.467.3456
mbronder@gepacificrealty.com
www.gepacificrealty.com

Independently owned and operated
Right now is a poor time to increase taxes on businesses. The phone tax increase is not a good idea. Please vote against this. Small business is already struggling enough without increasing taxes.

Renee Tewes, Midwest Physical Therapy and LIBA member
I agree with Liba's suggestion.

LIBA has a solution that does not have any effect on City services. The City has the opportunity to stop using a 5-year-old accounting policy that recognizes the savings realized when the City has job vacancies and turnovers. These "Vacancy Savings" occur when someone leaves. Until that position is filled, the City saves money because it is not paying for that position. In addition, the new hire often starts at a lower wage/salary, resulting in additional savings. LIBA's solution would be to eliminate the tax increase, and continue the tradition of vacancy budgeting.

Thanks,

Betty Cummings
All Needs Computer & Mailing Services, Inc.
8100 South 13th
Lincoln, NE 68512
phone: 402-421-1083
fax: 402-421-6557

"2006 Outstanding Women-Owned Business of the Year"
I am sending you this message to express my concern about the proposed increase in the Telecom tax. I am amazed at the amount of tax on each phone bill I receive and I do not want this amount to increase.

I would encourage you to continue using vacancy budgeting instead and eliminate the tax increase.

Thank you for your consideration.

Luke Mitchell
Mortgage Officer

Cornhusker Bank
63rd & Hwy 2
Lincoln, NE  68516

Direct:  402.434.2224
Fax:    402.434.2229
Toll Free:  877.837.4481

luke.mitchell@cornhuskerbank.com
www.CornhuskerBank.com

NOTICE: CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

This message may contain information that is confidential and subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient and have received the e-mail in error, please disregard and do not open attachments, if any. This serves as notice that you are to delete this message and attachments, immediately. Use of the information in any manner, dissemination, distribution, forwarding, printing or copying of the message and any attached files is strictly prohibited. Please note that the views or opinions presented in this e-mail are solely those of the author. The recipient should check for the presence of viruses. We accept no liability for any damage caused by any virus that may be transmitted by this e-mail.
Please, each of you, don't add another tax to our telephone bills - or any other asset. Use the personnel vacancy savings to make up the $400,000 deficit in the budget.

Mary Jo Bousek
City Council Board,

I urge you to make reductions within the city budget before considering any tax increases (i.e. telecome tax increase proposed by Councilman Carrol). We need to have a Council who can live within its means. If there is not enough money in the budget to fund a new program, city position, or pet project, then it doesn't get approved. The city needs to tighten its belt just like the rest of us. I don't want our city to turn into another Omaha which taxes it citizens without regard. Looking forward to some fiscal conservatism which seemed to be the mantra of those running this past year.

Jodi Delozier
I wanted to voice my opinion on the proposed Telecom Tax Increase. I believe there are other ways in paying our obligations rather than increasing taxes.

I lost my job in October 2008 and was forced to restructure my spending habits. For 8 months, I could not find a job in Lincoln Nebraska so at the ripe old age of 54 years old, I had to switch careers from a Secondary Market Account Executive position for the last 28 years, to a Realtor. After attending the classes and taking the Nebraska Real Estate Commission test, I was able to start as a Realtor in May 2009.

I feel that we, as a Community, also need to restructure instead of raising taxes whenever additional funds are needed.

I think LIBA has a great solution to this issue and support LIBA’s solution. See below:

LIBA has a solution that does not have any effect on City services. The City has the opportunity to stop using a 5-year-old accounting policy that recognizes the savings realized when the City has job vacancies and turnovers. These "Vacancy Savings" occur when someone leaves. Until that position is filled, the City saves money because it is not paying for that position. In addition, the new hire often starts at a lower wage/salary, resulting in additional savings. LIBA’s solution would be to eliminate the tax increase, and continue the tradition of vacancy budgeting.

Thank you.

Deb Bell
Realtor ®
Home Real Estate - Pine Lake Office
7211 South 27th Street
Lincoln, Ne 68512
Cellular: 402-601-1615
www.DebBell.HomeRealEstate.com
Dear City Council Members:

I understand Doug Emery’s comment about taxes never being popular. However, I believe this Council needs to set a precedence about raising taxes of any kind and focus on where to save, not spend. We are one of Nebraska’s few communities that actually has not been declining significantly, but we need to be prepared for that and have a longer vision of how to be financially healthy as a community. It’s not by increasing taxes.

Specifically, I like the idea about using “vacancy savings” and would ask that it be seriously considered.

Thank you.
Monte

Monte Froehlich, CCIM, SIOR, SEC
US Property, President
The Grand Manse
129 N 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508 USA
402-875-9101 Direct
402-476-4616 Fax
402-202-1776 Cell
monte@usproperty.biz
www.grandmanse.com
very much against this tax increase. all the city has to do is follow its "job vacancy" policy and account for the salary decrease and then the lower entry level position for new hires. this should solve the problem and avoid the telecom tax increase. jim johnson
I have just become aware of the mayor's proposed cell/land line phone tax increase from 5.5% to 6.0%. I am totally opposed to more taxes. As a senior citizen, my costs continue to increase, however, my income is fixed. Surely, there are other ways the City can eliminate waste and useless spending that is occurring daily.

Our phone taxes are ridiculous as it is.

I hope the Mayor and those of you on the Council will listen to the citizens. Obviously, my voting decisions will be based on the manner in which my representatives vote to protect me and to eliminate waste.

Carolyn Groth
5939 Franklin
Lincoln, NE 68506
No! That’s as in HELL NO!

Jeff Sneller
1711 NO. 62nd
Lincoln
Would you please consider tax decreases? Everything is going down, as well as real wages – except for government union’s! Please start prioritizing services by greatest need as opposed to we have funded this for years and therefore it is a right. Sorry everyone needs to go on a budget diet – mostly government. Thanks Kent Thompson
Respected City Council Members;
I recently learned that you have proposed a tax increase on phone lines for the city of Lincoln. I want to urge you to consider LIBAs proposal of using "vacancy savings" instead of raising taxes. I work with low-income people in the Lincoln area, and know from experience that many can hardly afford phone service as it is. Since the ability to get a job, make appointments, or even acquire transportation depends on having a phone, increasing taxes on phone service would add additional stress on individuals and families who are already struggling.
Raising taxes is always bad for the economy; please consider any other alternative available. Karissa Vieth
July 23, 2009

Larry Worth
Director
Star Tran
710 J Street
Lincoln, NE  68508

Dear Mr. Worth,

I want to thank you for the attention, time, and effort you obviously give to the operations of the bus system. As do so many other people, I use the bus regularly.

I would like to say that there are more drivers than not who conduct themselves with professionalism and sincere care for the passengers. I do not know many of their names, but one I do know and is over-due for commendation is “Gib.” He used to drive the Havelock route earlier this year. He is exceptional. He genuinely cares and it is a tribute to the City that you hire such quality people.

I also appreciate the updates of schedules as posted downtown on the overhead screens, as well as the signs that indicate which side of 11th and “N” busses depart. These technical improvements bring a sense of security, in that when such attention given at this level occurs, it is a reflection that such care for citizens is being focused effectively at other levels of local government. No one does everything right all the time, but certainly we are open to checking out what works and what doesn’t and make adjustments accordingly while staying focused on what matters most. People are our greatest asset.

Specifically, however, I am writing to thank you for the exemplary help I received most recently, but certainly not exclusively. Saturday, July 18, I was on the last route of the day, coming from West A (51) and transferring downtown to Havelock (41). Engrossed in a book, I failed to get off the 51 at the downtown stop. I happened to look up when the bus was just north of Cornhusker Hwy and 11th Street. When I stopped the driver to ask what I should do, he was polite, and caring, and helpful - (a HUGE plus when otherwise a little panicked and no other way to get home!). After he made calls to help intervene, I followed his instructions and caught the Belmont on its way to north Wal-Mart. That was the best way for me to transfer to Havelock. Yet,
according to the schedule for Belmont and Havelock routes, neither crosses paths in time. Your great Belmont driver, however, had received the message from the 51 bus and quickly and with much care, thought out how to work the situation so that I could catch the Havelock. Without altering their routes in any way, she helped me get to the Havelock without the Havelock having to wait any length of time other than for me to cross the light at Superior. Amazing to me, the care the drivers gave, when it was my mistake. I know what it is like to miss a bus and have to walk the distance; yet, with the care and quick thinking of each of those drivers, I made it safely home.

I want to thank you and all of those who put the kinds of efforts and help into making city transportation such an effective viable source for those of us who not only need and rely on the bus system, but for those of us who prefer it.

I am also wondering (and hoping) if there is in the making, any possibility of having a “trans-railway” mode of transport, connecting Lincoln to Omaha.

Thank you again,

Jean Ford

Cc: City Council Members
    Mayor Chris Beutler
Dear City Council,

I would like to add my voice to the many people who are very disturbed about the idea that we, the citizens of Lincoln, and the many people from other parts of the country who visit Lincoln, should have to pay an entry fee to the Pioneer Park Nature Center.

I agree that it is reasonable to charge a small fee for special programs offered by the Nature Center, but NOT to charge for just viewing the bison and elk, walk the trails, and see the exhibits in the Chet Ager and Prairie Buildings!

I hope that the collective wisdom of the City Council and the Mayor are willing to raise the taxes of ALL the people of Lincoln just a FEW DOLLARS to avoid this fee and several other of the proposed cuts and increased fees facing you.

It is time! It is the right thing to do. Please do it.

Thanks!

Marge Schlitt
2600 C Street (02)
Dear council members,

Please consider removing the increased taxes on telecom services proposed in the mayor's new budget. As a business owner with a large number of cell phones I do not need another increase in costs in the current economic climate. I would urge you to find another means of increasing city funds or find more budget cuts to meet current needs. The construction industry is already struggling in this city from the lack of new housing starts due to the impact fees we have implemented in recent years.

Thank you

Terry Kreifels
President
Action Plumbing and Heating Inc.
Please use some common sense and use the vacancy accounting method. No more tax increases! A higher and higher percentage of overall individual incomes is dedicated to government funding. At some point we must agree that government cannot be all things to all people. We must set a limit on how much in terms of a percentage of our incomes that government can and should cost.

Roy Christensen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Nancy Muehling [<a href="mailto:nm@lincolnhabitat.org">nm@lincolnhabitat.org</a>]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>Monday, July 27, 2009 10:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Tammy J. Grammer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please eliminate the new tax on our phone/cell bills. Please urge the "vacancy" budgeting. Nancy Muehling
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
General Council

Name:    Kathleen Bousquet
Address:  2611 sw 12 th st
City:    Lincoln, NE 68522
Phone:   402 742 5139
Fax:      
Email:    pkbousquet@yahoo.com

Comment or Question:
I live in SW Lincoln, in a neighborhood with a lot of small children. We have recently had some people move into a neighbor's house. They have 4 dogs that run around the neighborhood and one is a pit bull. Animal control has been notified several times and have come out to their house but the animals continue to run free in the neighborhood. I want my children to be able to play outside without having to be worried about being attacked by a dog. I feel at a loss of what we are suppose to do to keep our children safe.
I am apposed to the city increasing any taxes at a time when Lincolnites are reducing their own expenditures. The Lincoln city council needs to be reducing the size of local government not increasing the intrusion into the freedoms and liberties of its citizens.

LIBA has a proposal that will help with this shortage.

LIBA has a solution that does not have any effect on City services. The City has the opportunity to stop using a 5-year-old accounting policy that recognizes the savings realized when the City has job vacancies and turnovers. These "Vacancy Savings" occur when someone leaves. Until that position is filled, the City saves money because it is not paying for that position. In addition, the new hire often starts at a lower wage/salary, resulting in additional savings. LIBA's solution would be to eliminate the tax increase, and continue the tradition of vacancy budgeting.
I am asking all of you to vote a big "NO" to increasing the fees/taxes on phones that is proposed by the mayor. First, this is a hardship for low income families and phones are a necessity, not a luxury in this day and age. 2nd, we already are the highest in the nation (yes, I said nation) with fees and taxes on phones, both landlines and cellphones. Let's figure out a better way than this. Again, please vote a big no to this. Thankyou! Sandra Lab
ADDENDUM
TO
DIRECTORS’ AGENDA
MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2009

I. CITY CLERK - None

II. CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE MAYOR & DIRECTORS TO COUNCIL -

MAYOR -

1. NEWS ADVISORY - RE: Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule Week of August 1st through August 7, 2009 - Schedule subject to change.

2. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Load Limits Posted For Bridge.

DIRECTORS - None

III. COUNCIL RFI’S & CITIZENS CORRESPONDENCE TO INDIVIDUAL COUNCIL MEMBERS - None

IV. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS TO COUNCIL - None
DATE: July 31, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

Mayor Beutler's Public Schedule
Week of August 1 through 7, 2009
Schedule subject to change

Tuesday, August 4
- City-County Common meeting - 8:30 a.m., Room 113, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St.

Wednesday, August 5
- LPS New Teacher Breakfast, remarks - 7:30 a.m., Embassy Suites, 1040 “P” St.
- Lancaster County Fair opening day luncheon - noon, Nebraska Lottery Entertainment Tent, Lancaster Event Center, 4100 N. 84th St.

Thursday, August 6
- KFOR Morning Show - 7:45 a.m.
LOAD LIMITS POSTED FOR BRIDGE

Load limits will be posted early next week for the eastbound bridge at 33rd Street and Sheridan Boulevard. The change follows a recent routine inspection and load rating of the structure.

The new posted load limits are:

- 17 tons for Type 3 trucks
- 26 tons for Type 3S2 trucks
- 33 tons for Type 3-3 trucks.

The City Public Works and Utilities Department inspects bridges in the City every two years on a rotating basis.

For more information, contact Erika Nunes in the Public Works and Utilities Department, 441-5675.

- 30 -