IN LIEU OF
DIRECTORS’ MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2009

I. CITY CLERK

II. CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE MAYOR & DIRECTORS TO COUNCIL

MAYOR
1. Mayor presents August Award of Excellence to Police Officer Jeffrey Urkevich, and his partner, K-9 officer, Jake.
2. NEWS RELEASE. Free tour of historic Everett neighborhood offered.
3. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler will hold a news conference on Thursday, September 24, 2009 in the City Council Chambers, 555 So. 10th Street, to discuss progress in cleaning up graffiti. (Forwarded to Council Members on September 23, 2009)
4. NEWS RELEASE. Graffiti program has high impact, low cost.
5. NEWS RELEASE. Fire Station 8 temporarily closed.

DIRECTORS

FINANCE/BUDGET
1. Memo from Steve Hubka, Budget Officer, on the September sales tax reports reflecting activity for July:
   a) Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections;
   b) Gross Sales Tax Collections (with refunds added back in), 2004-2005 through 2009-2010;
   c) Sales Tax Refunds, 2004-2005 through 2009-2010; and

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

III. COUNCIL RFI’S AND CITIZEN CORRESPONDENCE TO INDIVIDUAL COUNCIL MEMBERS

IV. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS TO COUNCIL
1. Emina Osmanovic email, through Kim Wands, in support of the Easterday program, not wanting the program to end.
2. Correspondence from Dr. K. Wands strongly supporting the Easterday Day program.
3. Email from Jodi Delozier commenting on the firefighters proposed contract.

V. ADJOURNMENT
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MAYOR PRESENTS AUGUST AWARD OF EXCELLENCE

Mayor Chris Beutler today presented the Mayor's Award of Excellence for August to K-9 officer Jake and his partner, Police Officer Jeffrey Urkevich. The monthly award recognizes City employees who provide exemplary service and work that demonstrates personal commitment to the City. The award was presented at the beginning of today's City Council meeting.

Urkevich has been with the Lincoln Police Department since 1997, and he and Jake have been partners since 2006. Detective Jim Breen nominated the team in the category of productivity for their work in a recent string of robberies and sexual assaults. The evidence collected by the team has led to an arrest, and the cases are pending. Breen said Urkevich has developed a close working relationship with Jake and does an excellent job of controlling the dog as they search for evidence.

The other categories in which employees can be nominated are customer relations, loss prevention, safety and valor. Consideration also may be given to nominations that demonstrate self-initiated accomplishments or those completed outside of the nominee's job description.

All City employees are eligible for the Mayor's Award of Excellence except for elected and appointed officials. Individuals or teams can be nominated by supervisors, peers, subordinates and the general public. Nomination forms are available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: personnel) or from department heads, employee bulletin boards or the Personnel Department, which oversees the awards program.

All nominations are reviewed by the Mayor's Award of Excellence Committee, which includes a representative with each union and a non-union representative appointed by the Mayor. Award winners receive a $100 U.S. savings bond, a day off with pay and a plaque. Monthly winners are eligible to receive the annual award, which comes with a $500 U.S. savings bond, two days off with pay and a plaque.
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FREE TOUR OF HISTORIC EVERETT NEIGHBORHOOD OFFERED

The public is invited to take a walking tour of the historic Everett Neighborhood the evening of Thursday, September 24. The walking tour will begin at 6:30 p.m. at the F. M. Hall mansion at 11th and “D” streets and will feature some of Lincoln's oldest residences in an area that has been described as Lincoln's “first neighborhood.”

“Everett has unmatched variety of historic housing types,” said City Historic Preservation Planner Ed Zimmer, who will lead the tour. “We'll see Queen Anne mansions and tidy bungalows, historic apartments and one of Lincoln's very few French Second Empire houses.” The tour also will include Everett Elementary and historic churches of the Germans from Russia and the African American community. Several neighborhood properties are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Sharon Johnson of the Everett Neighborhood Association Board said the group created the tour to help showcase what they love about their neighborhood. “This is a way to celebrate the hard work of so many who have contributed to improving the livability of our neighborhood,” Johnson said. “All of Lincoln needs the opportunity to come visit while enjoying a fall evening learning about the historic neighborhood homes.”

Jon Carlson, Mayoral Aide for the Stronger Safer Neighborhoods Initiative, said the City and NeighborWorks have been investing resources in Everett and surrounding neighborhoods for the past year as part of a larger effort to improve neighborhoods. “The walking tour helps highlight why families choose the Everett neighborhood as a great place to live and work,” Carlson said. “Along with lovely historic homes, it's close to downtown with good schools and convenient neighborhood shops.”

The tour will return to the F. M. Hall mansion for light refreshments from Ruby and Cordelia's Fine Tea Room and ice cream from Zesto's. Participants should wear comfortable shoes and be able to walk the mile involved. For more information, contact Sharon Johnson at 432-3942 or Pat Anderson-Sifuentes at 617-1580 or panderson@nwlincoln.org.
Mayor Chris Beutler will discuss the City's progress in cleaning up graffiti at a news conference at 10 a.m. Thursday, September 24 in the City Council Chambers, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St.
Mayor Chris Beutler said the City's new approach to graffiti cleanup has resulted in 85 percent of the graffiti being removed at just 6 percent of the previously estimated cost. Since the City's Graffiti Prevention Coordinator began working in June, 277 of the 326 reported cases of graffiti have been cleared.

“Graffiti invites more vandalism and crime by sending a message that no one cares about the neighborhood. It's a blight on our entire community,” Mayor Beutler said. “Cleaning up graffiti can be costly, and that's why efforts like this are so important. Finding fast, effective and cost-efficient ways to remove graffiti is a priority for our efforts to revitalize neighborhoods.”

Under the City's graffiti ordinance passed in 2006, property owners are required to remove graffiti within 15 days of being notified by the City. If that deadline is not met, the City can remove the graffiti at the expense of the property owner. Those who don't reimburse the City face a lien on their property, but the owner does not have to clear the debt until the property sells.

Under the new process, the Graffiti Prevention Coordinator sends a letter and postage-paid reply card to victims of graffiti. The letter explains the negative impact of graffiti, encourages removal of the graffiti in 24 to 48 hours and offers the assistance of volunteer groups. William Carver with Keep Lincoln and Lancaster County Beautiful (KLLCB) has been coordinating the Graffiti Prevention Program since June. Of the 49 cases currently unresolved, 30 were reported less than two weeks ago.

The new process came out of the Mayor's Stronger Safer Neighborhoods Initiative based on an idea from one of its partner groups, the Lincoln Policy Network. Mayoral Aide Jon Carlson, who manages the Initiative, said funding graffiti cleanup has been very difficult in tight budget times. He said the cost of funding City graffiti removal was estimated at $408,000 a year. The program headed by Carver is budgeted for $25,000 a year.
“We are very pleased with the success the program has been able to achieve in just a few months,” Carlson said. “Graffiti often is an indicator crime for more serious problems. The current program is having a significant impact on crime reduction and neighborhood quality of life for a relatively low cost.”

“I think the new program has been very effective in helping improve properties and the neighborhoods,” said David Anderson, a board member of the Real Estate Owners and Managers Association. “Removing graffiti quickly is a key to keeping buildings safe and attractive places that people will want to live in.”

To report graffiti, contact Carver at 441-4690 or wcarver@lincoln.ne.gov. Graffiti also can be reported on the City online ACTION center at lincoln.ne.gov. KLLCB is affiliated with Keep America Beautiful, which has a mission to engage individuals to take greater responsibility for improving their community environments.
NEWS RELEASE

LINCOLN FIRE AND RESCUE
1801 "Q" Street, Lincoln, NE 68508, 441-8350, fax 441-7098

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: September 24, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Chief Niles Ford, Lincoln Fire and Rescue, 441-7363

FIRE STATION 8 TEMPORARILY CLOSED

Lincoln Fire and Rescue (LFR) has temporarily closed Station 8 at 17th and Van Dorn streets while repairs are made on the heating and cooling system. Fire Chief Niles Ford said the station was closed Monday because of a foul odor. After initial repairs were begun, leaks were discovered from at least two different locations, including the station's restroom. Personnel and equipment have been relocated to Station 1, 18th and "Q" streets, and Station 4, 27th St. and Old Cheney Road, in order to maintain a productive response time. Ford said Station 8 will reopen as soon as it is safe for firefighters to return. Station 8 was built in 1958.
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Senate moves on health care. The much-anticipated unveiling of a health care proposal by Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) occurred this week, and Baucus has pledged to move the bill through his committee and onto the Senate floor by the end of the month. See related story below.

Meanwhile, activity on the Senate floor focused on the FY 2010 appropriations bill for programs at the Departments of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Transportation. Approval yesterday of that measure marked the fifth of the twelve annual spending bills to be passed by the Senate. The House approved all of its versions prior to the August recess. Next up on the floor is the Department of Interior appropriations bill, which also covers the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Approved in the House this week was legislation (HR 3221) that would make significant changes to the college student financial aid lending industry. The measure follows a suggestion by President Obama in his budget proposal earlier this year that would have the federal government, as opposed to the current system of private lenders, serve as originators of Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL). The Congressional Budget Office estimates the move would save about $87 billion over the next decade. Supporters also maintain that the move will allow money previously spent on lender fees to be directed to students. Opponents believe that the lending industry would lose about 35,000 to 50,000 jobs if lenders were reduced to just servicing loans.

Next week, more spending bills will be taken up on the Senate floor, as leaders there look to clear as many measures for House-Senate conference committees prior to the October 1 start of FY 2010. In the meantime, House and Senate leaders are preparing to consider a Continuing Resolution (CR) to keep government operations running in the absence of passage of the annual spending bills. In all likelihood, a short-term CR will be needed for all 12 bills.

HEALTH CARE
Baucus unveils long awaited health care bill. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) unveiled legislation to overhaul the nation’s health care system. At this point, the Baucus bill has no Republican support, but as the bill is considered in committee, negotiations among Members may change that present reality.

The centerpiece of the Baucus bill is a mandate that most Americans under age 65 acquire health insurance either through their employer, a government plan (such as SCHIP or Medicaid) or individually. The bill would expand Medicaid to cover individuals and families up to 133 percent of the poverty level and would provide tax credits to businesses and low- and middle-income individuals and families to offset the health insurance costs.

The Baucus bill does not include a so-called public option or government-run health insurance plan that would compete with private insurers. Instead, the Baucus bill calls for the creation of nonprofit, consumer-owned cooperatives.

Other highlights of the Baucus bill include expansion of preventive care and wellness programs for Medicare recipients and the removal of barriers to such care for Medicare recipients. The Baucus bill does not address general wellness and prevention programs, which are largely under the purview of the HELP Committee. As outlined in the July 17 Washington Report, both HR 3200 and the
HELP committee bill would authorize considerable funds for such programs, including grants to local governments, as well as considerable funds to improve and expand community health centers and to bolster education and training for health sciences professions.

The Baucus bill would use a combination of new taxes and Medicare reforms to meet the Administration’s goal of making health care reform deficit neutral.

The Finance Committee will likely need at least a week and perhaps two weeks to complete its work on the Baucus bill. After that, the Senate leadership will need to decide how to combine it with the HELP Committee bill to create a vehicle for the full Senate to consider. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) has said that the Senate will likely take up health care reform legislation in October and to that end he has expedited efforts to complete work on FY 2010 appropriations bills (see related stories).

CLIMATE CHANGE
Obama Administration proposes new fuel efficiency standards; will review Bush-era smog rules. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) this week published proposed regulations governing fuel efficiency for new cars and trucks sold in the United States. In addition, the agency announced that over the next year it will reconsider federal smog standards issued in 2008.

The move on fuel efficiency represents the first major effort by the Obama Administration to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The President has also urged Congress to send him comprehensive climate change legislation as soon as possible, although that matter has been overshadowed by the health care reform debate. While the House approved its version of a climate change bill earlier this year, Senate leaders this week signaled that the Senate may not act on a measure until next year.

Currently, new cars must average 27.5 miles per gallon (mpg), while light trucks must average 23.1 mpg. Under the new rules, new cars and trucks will have to increase that average incrementally each year in order to reach 35.5 mpg in 2016.

EPA claims that the proposed regulations would save 1.8 billion gallons of oil between 2012 and 2016, and prevent greenhouse-gas equivalent of 42 million cars. Auto manufacturers indicated it could cost their industry $60 billion over the next few years, but there was no significant opposition to the new rules.

The proposed rule, which will be subject to a 60-day public comment period, can be found on the EPA website here: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/regulations/ghg-preamble-reg.pdf

In a related event, EPA also announced this week that it would reconsider 2008 standards governing ground-level ozone (more commonly known as smog) to ensure that they are scientifically sound and protective of human health. In March 2008, the Bush Administration implemented the current smog rules, but they were criticized by the environmental community as not stringent enough. Reportedly, stricter curbs on smog proposed by government scientific advisors were reportedly scaled back by the White House budget office, which was concerned about the cost of the new rules on businesses.

According to the EPA, the reconsideration of the rules affects both the “primary” ozone standard, designed to protect public health, and the “secondary” standard, designed to protect the environment. The agency will base the reconsideration on the scientific and technical records used in the March 2008 review, which included more than 1,700 scientific studies. EPA expects to issue a proposed rule on the matter in December, with a goal to finalize the new regulations in August 2010.

Most observers believe that the Obama Administration has proposed these rule changes in part to remind Senators that the White House will do all it can to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the absence of federal legislation on the matter.

HOUSING AND CD
Senate approves FY 2010 HUD spending. The Senate approved its version of a FY 2010 appropriations bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development this week.

Formula grants under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program at HUD would receive $3.99 billion in FY 2010 under the Senate bill, an increase of $350 million from FY 2009, but less than the $4.17 billion approved by the House for FY 2010. The Senate would also allocate $1.825 billion for the HOME program, the same level as FY 2009 and $175 million less than the House recommendation for FY 2010.

Other HUD programs would be funded in the Senate bill as follows:

- $26.2 billion for Section 8 (+$2 billion from FY 2009, same as House in FY 2010)
- $1.875 billion for homeless assistance grants (+$200 million FY09; +$25 million House)
- $785 million for elderly housing (+$20 million FY09; -$215 million House)
- $265 million for disabled housing (+$15 million FY09; -$85 million House)
- $320 million for Housing for Persons with AIDS (+$10 million FY09; +$10 million House)

The Senate bill also includes $250 million for a new Choice Neighborhoods program, an Obama Administration recommendation that would take the place of the HOPE VI program. Like HOPE VI, the new initiative would continue to focus on improving public housing, but also address better access to schools, transportation, jobs and other services. Since the program has not been officially authorized, the House chose to simply fund HOPE VI at $250 million.

The Senate bill would also fund a new Sustainable Communities program at $150 million, as a set-aside within the CDBG program. Also an Obama proposal, the initiative would operate jointly with the Department of Transportation and the Environmental Protection Agency to promote integrated
housing and transportation planning efforts on both the regional and local level. The House also included $150 million for this effort.

The bill will next be considered in a House-Senate conference committee to reconcile differences in the two measures.

TRANSPORTATION

Senate completes work on FY 2010 Transportation appropriations bill. The Senate passed the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (HR 3288) on Thursday, by a vote of 73-25. The spending measure is now ready to go to conference, since the House passed the bill on July 23.

Senators approved an amendment to the bill that would rescind $1.5 billion in the transportation bill for Amtrak until the agency allows “the secure transportation of firearms.” Currently, Amtrak does not allow riders to keep guns in checked, secured baggage, as airlines do.

Overall, the bill provides $76 billion for DOT, about the same as the House-passed bill. The Senate measure would provide $42.5 billion to the Federal Highway Administration, $10.48 billion for the Federal Transit Administration, $16 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration and $5.7 billion for the Federal Railroad Administration. This is more than 10 percent higher than current year levels.

The Senate bill includes $1.2 billion for high-speed rail, much lower than the House level of $4 billion. The House bill would allow $2 billion of the high-speed rail funds to be transferred to a national infrastructure bank if one is authorized before the spending bill’s expiration on September 30, 2010. The Senate bill does not include funding for the infrastructure bank, creating a $1.1 billion grant program that would fund large scale transportation projects but through a different mechanism than the infrastructure bank.

Meanwhile, the Senate is also expected to consider a bill in the near future that would extend current surface transportation policy for an additional 18 months. The current transportation authorization, SAFETEA-LU (P.L. 109-59), expires at the end of September. The draft measure, which has been marked up and approved by three Senate committees, would cost $1.5 billion and extend SAFETEA-LU through March 31, 2011. The bill also includes a provision that would transfer almost $20 billion from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund.

If enacted, this bill would be the third time in a little over a year that Congress has had to shore up the Trust Fund with general funds. Payments from the Trust Fund are far outpacing revenue receipts, threatening to bankrupt the Trust Fund if no action is taken.

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee announced that they are preparing a three-month extension of SAFETEA-LU that will be marked up next week. Committee Chairman Jim Oberstar (D-MN) has been a strong supporter of passing a comprehensive rewrite of the highway and transit law by September 30, calling the White House and Senate “irresponsible” for supporting an 18 month extension. The Obama Administration has stated that it will not support a gas tax increase in the current economy.

Finally, a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reauthorization bill is not expected to come to the Senate floor this year. Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee Chairman John Rockefeller (D-WV) made the announcement yesterday that a short-term extension of current FAA policy and spending authority will likely be approved before the end of the fiscal year on September 30. The Commerce Committee approved a two-year bill ($1451) July 21 but left out the most contentious items, such as increasing passenger facility charges (PFCs), which are needed to fund airport improvements. The Senate Bill would maintain the current $4.50 PFC while the House bill would boost the fee to $7.

The FAA has been operating under stopgap extensions since 2007. The House of Representatives approved a multi-year reauthorization measure (HR 915) in May and has been reluctant to support extensions, including short-term ones, continuing to press for a longer-term, full FAA reauthorization.

STIMULUS WATCH
Weekly update on stimulus activities.

Department of Commerce
The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has created a database of all NTIA Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP) submitted applications:

Department of Energy
DOE released a Request for Information (RFI) on its $450 million “Retrofit Ramp-Up” program, the competitive portion of the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG). Please note this is not a notice of funding availability.

EECBG formula grants totaling over $354 million were awarded in 22 states. All of the formula funding under this program should be obligated by the end of this month. Awards to date can be found at:

Department of Housing and Urban Development
HUD has opened an e-mail account for HUD-specific ARRA reporting questions. The help service can be contacted at: ReportingHelp@hud.gov.

Department of Justice
All ARRA grants managed by the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) are in the process of being awarded on a rolling basis and are expected to be made by September 30, 2009. To view awards granted, see:
http://www.ojp.gov/recovery/awards.htm

DOJ hosted a webinar on ARRA reporting on September 10, 2009. Following the webinar, program staff from COPS and OJP did a live Q&A session for 45 minutes. Webinar archived at:
Department of Transportation
The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is hosting 3 webinars next week on Section 1512 reporting requirements for FTA award grantees. Dates, times and information on how to join the webinars can be found at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/index_9440_10541.html.

Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board
The Board strongly encourages all recipients of ARRA funds who have not yet registered at www.federalreporting.gov to do so immediately, as reporting begins on October 1 through October 10.

An updated version of www.recovery.gov will be launched at the end of this month ahead of the October 10 reporting deadline. This is to allow time for users to become familiar with the website’s new features.

A schedule for displaying recipient data on www.recovery.gov is posted at: http://tiny.cc/kXbl5.

GRANTS AND NOTICES

Department of Health and Human Services
The Health Resources and Services Administration is accepting applications for the Ryan White Part A HIV Emergency Relief Grant Program. Grant funds should be used for primary medical care, access to antiretroviral therapies, and other support services. The deadline for applications is October 30, 2009: http://tiny.cc/z8sBx

Department of Homeland Security
DHS has posted the FY 2009 Fire Prevention and Safety (FP&S) Grants Program Guidance. The primary goal of this competitive grant program is to target high-risk populations and eligible activities include smoke alarm installation, fire prevention and public safety education campaigns, juvenile fire setter interventions, media campaigns, and arson prevention and awareness programs. An applicant can submit a request for up to $1 million. Applications must be received by October 23, 2009: www.firegrantsupport.com/fps/guidance/

Department of Housing and Urban Development
HUD issued a request for comments on ending the “hold harmless” policy in calculating income limits under the Section 8 program. Comments must be submitted by October 14, 2009: http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2009/pdf/E9-22077.pdf.
Attached are the September sales tax reports reflecting activity for July. As you’ll see, we made our projection for September. That projection is scaled back from amounts projected for the same month of 2008. You might also note a couple of other pieces of information. As we might expect, gross collections were less than the prior year (July 2009 to July of 2008). Also, refunds were much less than the same month last year. That allowed our net collections to show an increase. Next month we might see a temporary boost from the Cash for Clunkers program.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actual 2009-10</th>
<th>Projected 2009-10</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>$ Change FR. 08-09</th>
<th>% Change FR. 08-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$4,549,255</td>
<td>$4,703,478</td>
<td>$154,223</td>
<td>$326,002</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$4,721,659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$4,716,098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$4,449,149</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$4,554,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$5,672,665</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$4,248,937</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$4,059,848</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$4,666,045</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$4,532,571</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$4,593,746</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$4,849,573</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,614,362</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,703,478</strong></td>
<td><strong>$154,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>$326,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.45%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual collections through September are 3.39% above projections for the 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>$4,648,160</td>
<td>$4,630,210</td>
<td>$4,573,597</td>
<td>$4,612,020</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>$4,812,555</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>$4,703,478</td>
<td>-2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$4,706,690</td>
<td>$4,823,369</td>
<td>$4,712,519</td>
<td>$5,052,950</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>$4,845,000</td>
<td>-4.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$4,687,792</td>
<td>$4,799,275</td>
<td>$4,658,480</td>
<td>$4,818,715</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
<td>$4,937,998</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$4,500,338</td>
<td>$4,511,403</td>
<td>$4,445,761</td>
<td>$4,753,456</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td>$4,545,947</td>
<td>-4.37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$4,264,010</td>
<td>$4,342,902</td>
<td>$4,554,634</td>
<td>$4,617,097</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>$4,465,270</td>
<td>-3.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$6,086,841</td>
<td>$5,797,893</td>
<td>$5,993,653</td>
<td>$5,596,617</td>
<td>-6.62%</td>
<td>$5,775,594</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$4,158,874</td>
<td>$4,247,908</td>
<td>$4,125,074</td>
<td>$4,421,405</td>
<td>7.18%</td>
<td>$4,258,773</td>
<td>-3.68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$4,097,988</td>
<td>$3,991,159</td>
<td>$4,018,709</td>
<td>$4,227,476</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
<td>$4,119,617</td>
<td>-2.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$4,730,317</td>
<td>$4,543,369</td>
<td>$4,895,921</td>
<td>$4,753,366</td>
<td>-2.91%</td>
<td>$4,744,089</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$4,557,735</td>
<td>$4,539,614</td>
<td>$4,664,470</td>
<td>$4,859,251</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
<td>$4,624,054</td>
<td>-4.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$4,519,466</td>
<td>$4,655,061</td>
<td>$4,772,617</td>
<td>$4,983,976</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>$4,501,197</td>
<td>-9.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$4,803,665</td>
<td>$4,991,723</td>
<td>$4,887,329</td>
<td>$5,026,702</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>$4,856,331</td>
<td>-3.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$55,761,877</td>
<td>$55,873,886</td>
<td>$56,302,764</td>
<td>$57,723,030</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>$56,486,425</td>
<td>-2.14%</td>
<td>$4,703,478</td>
<td>-2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>($135,858)</td>
<td>($80,882)</td>
<td>($27,350)</td>
<td>($90,282)</td>
<td>230.10%</td>
<td>($435,079)</td>
<td>381.91%</td>
<td>($100,061)</td>
<td>-77.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>($165,219)</td>
<td>($358,866)</td>
<td>($166,695)</td>
<td>($79,688)</td>
<td>-52.19%</td>
<td>($108,925)</td>
<td>36.69%</td>
<td>($95,246)</td>
<td>-12.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>($101,531)</td>
<td>($173,972)</td>
<td>($3,881)</td>
<td>($158,855)</td>
<td>3993.08%</td>
<td>($86,760)</td>
<td>-45.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>($325,510)</td>
<td>($6,319)</td>
<td>($175,440)</td>
<td>($29,848)</td>
<td>-82.99%</td>
<td>($209,674)</td>
<td>602.47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>($220,967)</td>
<td>($269,713)</td>
<td>($84,287)</td>
<td>($26,308)</td>
<td>-68.79%</td>
<td>($256,270)</td>
<td>874.13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>($394,324)</td>
<td>($73,395)</td>
<td>($327,119)</td>
<td>($489,939)</td>
<td>49.77%</td>
<td>($83,713)</td>
<td>-82.91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>($99,240)</td>
<td>($165,869)</td>
<td>($133,574)</td>
<td>($325,269)</td>
<td>143.51%</td>
<td>($73,785)</td>
<td>-77.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>($69,900)</td>
<td>($196,682)</td>
<td>($130,611)</td>
<td>($108,764)</td>
<td>-16.73%</td>
<td>($70,988)</td>
<td>-34.73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>($122,283)</td>
<td>($166,567)</td>
<td>($381,653)</td>
<td>($22,529)</td>
<td>-94.10%</td>
<td>($117,201)</td>
<td>420.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>($34,811)</td>
<td>($14,085)</td>
<td>($186,252)</td>
<td>($136,308)</td>
<td>-26.82%</td>
<td>($444,973)</td>
<td>226.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>($162,998)</td>
<td>($39,492)</td>
<td>($155,825)</td>
<td>($478,184)</td>
<td>206.87%</td>
<td>($331,804)</td>
<td>-30.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>($148,028)</td>
<td>($57,700)</td>
<td>($569,595)</td>
<td>($43,759)</td>
<td>-92.32%</td>
<td>($11,878)</td>
<td>-72.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>($1,980,668)</td>
<td>($1,603,541)</td>
<td>($2,342,280)</td>
<td>($1,989,734)</td>
<td>-15.05%</td>
<td>($2,231,050)</td>
<td>12.13%</td>
<td>($195,307)</td>
<td>-64.10%</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>$4,512,303</td>
<td>$4,549,328</td>
<td>$4,546,247</td>
<td>$4,521,738</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
<td>$4,377,476</td>
<td>-3.19%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$4,541,471</td>
<td>$4,464,503</td>
<td>$4,545,825</td>
<td>$4,973,261</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>$4,736,074</td>
<td>-4.77%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$4,586,261</td>
<td>$4,625,303</td>
<td>$4,654,599</td>
<td>$4,659,859</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>$4,851,237</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$4,174,828</td>
<td>$4,505,085</td>
<td>$4,270,321</td>
<td>$4,723,609</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>$4,336,273</td>
<td>-8.20%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$4,043,044</td>
<td>$4,073,189</td>
<td>$4,470,347</td>
<td>$4,590,789</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>$4,209,000</td>
<td>-8.32%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$5,692,517</td>
<td>$5,724,498</td>
<td>$5,666,534</td>
<td>$5,106,677</td>
<td>-9.88%</td>
<td>$5,691,881</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$4,059,634</td>
<td>$4,082,038</td>
<td>$3,991,501</td>
<td>$4,096,136</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>$4,184,988</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$4,028,088</td>
<td>$3,794,477</td>
<td>$3,888,098</td>
<td>$4,118,712</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
<td>$4,048,629</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$4,608,034</td>
<td>$4,376,803</td>
<td>$4,514,268</td>
<td>$4,730,837</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>$4,626,889</td>
<td>-2.20%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$4,522,924</td>
<td>$4,525,529</td>
<td>$4,478,219</td>
<td>$4,722,943</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>$4,179,081</td>
<td>-11.52%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$4,356,468</td>
<td>$4,615,569</td>
<td>$4,615,793</td>
<td>$4,505,792</td>
<td>-2.40%</td>
<td>$4,169,394</td>
<td>-7.47%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$4,655,637</td>
<td>$4,934,023</td>
<td>$4,317,734</td>
<td>$4,982,944</td>
<td>15.41%</td>
<td>$4,844,454</td>
<td>-2.78%</td>
<td>$4,603,417</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,781,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,270,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,960,485</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,733,297</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,255,376</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2.65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,603,417</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.16%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Year to date vs. previous year*
Annexation by Final Plat
Effective: August 6, 2009
.30 Acres
Easterday is a great program. I do not want this program to end. Ermina Osmanovic
Dear Council Members

I am writing this letter to strongly support the Easterday Day program.

This program is unique and provides stimulating and positive experiences for the clients involved. If the program ended there would be nothing of the same quality to take its place.

The families served and the professionals that serve them choose Lincoln as a community to live because of programs like these. Losing these individuals from your city would adversely affect businesses and city revenues. Additionally many forward thinking businesses and individuals are not going to settle or invest in a city which does not place taking care of its most disadvantaged citizens as a high priority.

Closing the program would lead to negative consequences such as (a) client deterioration, (b) increased costs for state and federal programs, (c) lost jobs and work hours for family of clients, and (d) less safeguards of client’s well being. I have spent a great deal of time with clients since they have heard of the possibility of this program ending and the hours of tears and suffering have been very difficult to witness.

In addition the programs end would also result in increased use of police, ambulance, and paramedic services by clients and their families (911 calls are very expensive).

Thank you for considering these concerns

Dr. K Wands
City Council Members,

Yesterday I heard Koby Mach on KLIN 1400 discuss some of the fine print within the firefighter's new contract. I was appalled at the concessions that would be given to this group of individuals. This is not to say that I do not appreciate the danger of their job, BUT giving in to these demands is very irresponsible of our City leaders. I urge each of you to carefully review this 50-something contract and to look carefully at what they are requesting. Their medical insurance program is premium (much better than mine) and it looks like the city will be bearing the brunt of it. Considering these tough financial times, I cannot imagine why a City Council member would even consider approving this contract. Remember, you do represent the citizens of Lincoln - not the Firefighter's Union. Thank-you. I will definitely be watching how each member votes on this.

Jodi Delozier
ADDENDUM
TO
DIRECTORS’ AGENDA
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2009

I. CITY CLERK - None

II. CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE MAYOR & DIRECTORS TO COUNCIL -

MAYOR -


2. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Fire Station 8 Temporarily Closed (Forward to Council on 09/24/09).

3. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Mayor Invites Public To State Of The City Address.

4. NEWS RELEASE - RE: Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule Week of September 26 through October 2, 2009 - Schedule subject to change.

DIRECTORS - None

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

JON CAMP -

1. Request to Fire Chief Niles Ford - RE: Request for Federal Stimulus Funding for a new North Lincoln Fire Station (RFI#91 - 09/28/09)

2. E-Mails - RE: 6401 South Street.


4. E-Mails to Trish Owen with response from Trish Owen and Dan Marvin - RE: West Haymarket.

5. E-Mail to Trish Owen with response from Trish Owen - RE: City Attorney candidate.
IV. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS TO COUNCIL -

1. E-Mail from Lincoln Haymarket Development Corporation - RE: Downtown Master & Block 68 Proposal - In favor of any proposed project that will enhance the Haymarket.

2. E-Mail from Kay Graber - RE: The Development Plan for the 10th - 11th M-N block - stay away from it!

3. E-Mail from Teal Gardner - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

4. E-Mail from Sandra Gallentine - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

5. E-Mail from David Zaritzky Brown - RE: Lincoln Center Redevelopment Plan - Vote against allowing this nonconforming plan to somehow conform.

6. E-Mail from Stacie Walton - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

7. E-Mail from Corrina Bohlke - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

8. E-Mail from Susan Bockrath - RE: Vote against proposed redevelopment plan.

9. E-Mail from Nana Smith - RE: Urge you remain true to the master plan that includes park blocks when considering the Block 68 redevelopment project.

10. E-Mail from Shaun Vanneman - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

11. E-Mail from Tate Johnson - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.
12. E-Mail from Clover Frederick - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

13. E-Mail from Jennifer Carter - RE: Vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.


15. E-Mail from Charles Hull - RE: Vote no Block 68 Redevelopment proposal as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

16. E-Mail from Khara Plicanic - RE: Vote against the proposal for Block 68 as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

17. E-Mail from John & Kris Bergmeyer - RE: Vote against the proposal for Block 68 as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

18. E-Mail from Karen Taylor - RE: Vote against the proposal for Block 68 as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

19. E-Mail from Jane Griffin - RE: Vote against the proposal for Block 68 as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

20. E-Mail from Jeanne Hevener - RE: Vote against the proposal for Block 68 as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

21. E-Mail from Brian Ardinger - RE: Vote against the proposal for Block 68 as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

22. E-Mail from Judy Greenwald - RE: Vote against the proposal for Block 68 as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

23. E-Mail from Bradley Walker - RE: Opposed to the current proposals on Block 68.

24. E-Mail from Jeffrey Greenwald - RE: Vote against on Block 68 redevelopment proposal.

25. E-Mail from Matthew Hardin Wood, M.D. - RE: Vote against the redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown.

26. E-Mail from Dara Mlinek - RE: Vote against Redevelopment of Block 68.
27. E-Mail from Liz Ring - RE: Vote against Redevelopment of Block 68.

28. E-Mail from Nanne Olds - RE: Vote NO on redevelopment proposal for Block 68.

29. E-Mail from Jessica Greenwald - RE: Vote against authorization of any redevelopment for the downtown area that does not conform to the Master Plan.
Please note the new date.

You are invited to attend the
State of the City Message
by
Mayor Chris Beutler

*** Thursday, October 1, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.***
in the Council Chambers
County-City Building
555 South 10th Street

Refreshments will be served immediately following the address outside the Mayor’s Office.

If you have questions, please call the Mayor’s office at 441-7511.

***PLEASE NOTE THE CHANGE OF DATE***
FIRE STATION 8 TEMPORARILY CLOSED

Lincoln Fire and Rescue (LFR) has temporarily closed Station 8 at 17th and Van Dorn streets while repairs are made on the heating and cooling system. Fire Chief Niles Ford said the station was closed Monday because of a foul odor. After initial repairs were begun, leaks were discovered from at least two different locations, including the station's restroom. Personnel and equipment have been relocated to Station 1, 18th and “Q” streets, and Station 4, 27th St. and Old Cheney Road, in order to maintain a productive response time. Ford said Station 8 will reopen as soon as it is safe for firefighters to return. Station 8 was built in 1958.
Mayor Chris Beutler will deliver his State of the City address at 10 a.m. Thursday, October 1 in the City Council Chambers, 555 South 10th Street. The public is invited to attend the speech. It also will be carried live on 5 CITY-TV, the government access cable channel, and on the City Web site, lincoln.ne.gov.

The public also is invited to a reception immediately following the speech just outside the Mayor's Office on the second floor of the County-City Building.

Free public parking is available in the lot north of the County-City Building, across “K” Street.
DATE: September 25, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

Mayor Beutler's Public Schedule
Week of September 26 through October 2, 2009
Schedule subject to change

Saturday, September 26
• Lincoln Arts Festival breakfast, select “Mayor's Choice” award - 9:30 a.m., SouthPointe Pavilions, 27th and Pine Lake Road (near Barnes and Noble Booksellers)

Sunday, September 27
• Nebraska High School Sports Hall of Fame Induction Ceremony - 1:30 p.m., Lied Center for the Performing Arts, 301 N. 12th St.

Wednesday, September 30
• Visit to Carriage Glen retirement community, remarks - 6:15 p.m., 7005 Shamrock Road

Thursday, October 1
• State of the City Address - 10 a.m., Council Chambers, County-City Building, public reception follows on second-floor mezzanine
Jim:

I am addressing the house at 6401 South Street. Suzanne Lintz said she called you this morning with new information that the front door to this house is now “wide open.” As you probably know from the file on this property as well as the email exchange (see below), this is an irritant and hazard to the neighborhood.

With an open door, this house is now an attractive nuisance to children and homeless individuals and could result in personal injuries and/or a fire hazard to the neighborhood.

Please take action. Lincoln cannot continue to have absentee landlords inflict their lack of reasonable maintenance and attention to their properties on the neighboring residents.

Thank you in advance. Please feel to visit with others who have previously reviewed this matter and to suggest ideas for legislation that will give the City some teeth to prevent these situations. My constituents find it rather odd that the response from the City is that “its hands are tied”.

Jon

More information received.

I confirmed with Nicole Fleck-Tooze and Ben Higgins at Public Works that there were no soil erosion issues that are enforceable at this time. I also confirmed with the environmental section of the Health Department that a nuisance letter was sent to the homeowner regarding standing water and litter on September 4th.

Chris, thank you very much.
From: Chris J. Connolly  
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2009 10:06 AM  
To: John V. Hendry; Tonya L. Peters  
Cc: Jon Camp; Jocelyn W. Golden  
Subject: RE: 6401 South Street  

John: I've talked with John Boies at B & S and he tells me the PRT apparently released the property as being in compliance on 5/28/09. I'll try to gather some more information and get back to Councilman Camp about what is happening now.

Christopher J. Connolly  
Assistant City Attorney  
City Attorney's Office  
555 South 10th Street, Suite 300  
Lincoln, NE 68508  
Telephone: 402-441-7281  
Fax: 402-441-8812  

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use, review, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy this e-mail, any attachments, and all copies thereof. Thank you.

From: John V. Hendry  
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2009 9:28 AM  
To: Chris J. Connolly; Tonya L. Peters  
Cc: Jon Camp  
Subject: FW: 6401 South Street  

Would the two of you visit and determine who you feel is best to respond to this inquiry from Councilman Camp on behalf of the Law Department and then please do so. Thank you very much.

From: Jon Camp  
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2009 4:16 PM  
To: Bruce D. Dart; Nicole F. Tooze; Norm H. Agena  
Cc: Lin Quenzer; sklintz@windstream.net; John V. Hendry  
Subject: 6401 South Street  

Ladies and Gentlemen:

A single family home at 6401 South Street has been an eye-sore for many years. It is unoccupied and at one time a few years ago appeared to be a candidate by the new owner, Mr. Earl Foreman, for renovation. Unfortunately minor attempts have been made, including a new roof on the garage's sagging rafters, stripping the soil, and parking construction related equipment.

I can personally attest to this situation as I drive by at least 2 times daily and live two block from the property.

I was called by Suzanne Lintz, who is the President of Heritage Pines Homeowners' Association, which is adjacent to this property. As Lin Quenzer will attest, Suzanne has made numerous inquiries to have attention focused on remedying this property's neglect.
With the Hartley neighborhood property in the news and a few other circumstances surrounding the South Street property, I ask that each of you look at this situation for possible remedies such as (1) condemnation, (2) health hazards, (3) environmental concerns to Lincoln’s creeks, and/or (4) failure to pay taxes.

I have included Nicole Fleck-Tooze because the vegetation was stripped by a Bobcat and exposed soil to the weather and subsequently has run-off into a drainage culvert and into Antelope Creek.

Norm Agena is on this email because 2008 real estate taxes are outstanding for both first and second half payment, according to the Internet website.

Bruce Dart is included for obvious health reasons. There may be damaging termite infestation and raccoons are reported there.

Here is the City/County Assessor website:


Suzanne is being copied on this email as well as Lin Quenzer.

Thanks to all in advance for assistance in promptly and administratively feasibly resolving this situation.

As a final note, with other situations in Lincoln, are there reasonable legislative measures the Lincoln City Council can implement to assist neighborhoods resolve matters like these? While I shy away from too much government regulation, perhaps we can establish some “speedier” methods to resolve neighborhood problems and reduce administrative time and expense for everyone. Judge John Hendry is copied on this email for this reason.

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
Last week at the Pre Council you coordinated, I asked for specific figures on the goals of the “Cleaner Greener Lincoln Campaign”. To date I have received no response.

You will recall I asked for the goals on a per capita basis of carbon savings. I believe you stated an overall goal of a 7% reduction from 1990 levels, but that it was adjusted on a per capita basis for population growth. Please specifically identify:

1. the numbers for 1990 overall,
2. the per capita numbers for 1990,
3. the current overall levels,
4. the current per capita levels,
5. the population figures being used for 1990
6. the population figures being used for 2009, and
7. the desired per capita goal.

Thank you,

Jon
Councilman Camp: Thank you very much for the note. Indeed, we have taken the opportunity from your information request last week to look into how we can best pull together into one place information on local greenhouse gas emissions and per capita goals, for not only the Council's reference, but also for anyone interested. We put together a meeting with environmental health staff on Friday to review the local greenhouse gas emissions numbers and to insure we all are using the same estimates and assumptions. We are now preparing the information very similar to the form you've requested, and will forward that to you, by the latest, Tuesday afternoon. We also expect that we will have this information online to be very accessible to the public in the months to come as we work on carbon emission reductions across the community.

My apologies on not getting back to you sooner about when the information you requested would be ready and available. I hope the information is useful, and please let me know anytime how I can be helpful.

Milo Mumgaard, J.D.
Senior Policy Aide for Sustainability
City of Lincoln Mayor's Office
555 S. 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402) 441-6875 office
(402) 430-1699 cell
mmumgaard@lincoln.ne.gov

From: Jon Camp
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 11:33 AM
To: Milo D. Mumgaard
Cc: Tammy J. Grammer; Doug Emery; Jayne L. Snyder; John Spatz; Adam A. Hornung; Jonathan A. Cook; Eugene W. Carroll; Mayor
Subject: Information requested

Milo:

Last week at the Pre Council you coordinated, I asked for specific figures on the goals of the "Cleaner Greener Lincoln Campaign". To date I have received no response.

You will recall I asked for the goals on a per capita basis of carbon savings. I believe you stated an overall goal of a 7% reduction from 1990 levels, but that it was adjusted on a per capita basis for population growth. Please specifically identify:

1. the numbers for 1990 overall,
2. the per capita numbers for 1990,
3. the current overall levels,
4. the current per capita levels,
5. the population figures being used for 1990
6. the population figures being used for 2009, and
7. the desired per capita goal.

Thank you,

Jon
Trish:

Last Friday at the meeting I attended with Jayne Snyder and Jonathan Cook, Jayne requested (and I agreed) that Dan Marvin email us copies of all of the documents he discussed so that Council members could read more fully the volumes of information.

Dan indicated he would send us PDFs when he returned to his office.

I have received nothing as of today and would appreciate your assistance in getting these materials to us ASAP. I am addressing this email to you as I am not sure if Dan has an email on the City's internet system.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Jon
Thank you Jon, I see that you included Dan on this email as well. I'll follow up with Dan today on this issue.

Trish

Trish Owen, MPA
Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of the Mayor
555 S. 10th Street, Suite 208
Lincoln, NE 68508

(402) 441-7511 (Office)
(402) 430-3390 (Cellular)
(402) 441-7120 (Fax)

Trish:

Last Friday at the meeting I attended with Jayne Snyder and Jonathan Cook, Jayne requested (and I agreed) that Dan Marvin email us copies of all of the documents he discussed so that Council members could read more fully the volumes of information.

Dan indicated he would send us PDFs when he returned to his office.

I have received nothing as of today and would appreciate your assistance in getting these materials to us ASAP. I am addressing this email to you as I am not sure if Dan has an email on the City's internet system.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Jon
Jon

I have tried to call you today. I said that I would like to convert some of the documents to PDF and that I would do that this week. I spoke to Jayne Snyder over the weekend and reiterated that this information is non-public, and it should stay that way.

I will send you a report on the PARS IDP and the Fiscal Impact Report this week.

In the future I would like you to call me directly or to send me e-mail, passive aggressive is not how I work.

Dan
Trish:

Would you please provide information on the proposed financial terms for the candidate for the City Attorney's position?

Please also provide information on the existing financial terms.

Thank you,

Jon
Thank you Jon. Actually I will forward this request over to Rick Hoppe who handles the budget issues for this office.

Thanks-Trish

Trish Owen, MPA
Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of the Mayor
555 S. 10th Street, Suite 208
Lincoln, NE 68508

(402) 441-7511 (Office)
(402) 430-3390 (Cellular)
(402) 441-7120 (Fax)

Trish:

Would you please provide information on the proposed financial terms for the candidate for the City Attorney's position?

Please also provide information on the existing financial terms.

Thank you,

Jon
Dave Landis;

Urban Development:

The Lincoln Haymarket Development Corporation is in favor of any proposed project that will enhance the Haymarket. We support continued growth and vitalization of our existing area as well as expansion to our southern borders.

While the Block 68 proposal is an exciting plan, one of our concerns is to maintain the “green pathway” into the Haymarket. We vigorously support the Downtown Master Plan and the potential for a "green" urban link that extends from Antelope Creek to the south Haymarket. The LHDC feels strongly that this link be continuous and designed in a way to promote healthy lifestyles, easy access across the city, and creates an inviting entry and exit from the Haymarket area.

Another concern would be providing adequate parking for any project in that area. A planned parking structure would serve to activate the area and to increase development.

LHDC would like to review all amendments made to this plan after Monday's City Council meeting before making any official statement on this project.

Sincerely,

Lincoln Haymarket Development Corporation

Mail from Digital ISP Group Inc
Re the development plan for the 10th-to-11th M-to-N block: this one smells to high heaven. Stay away from it! The master plan's in place for a good reason--it's in the city's best long-term interests--don't start fudging.

Kay Graber
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city. Please represent those of us who ask to be represented with your votes!

Sincerely,
Teal Gardner
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

I urge you to please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

My family makes an effort to spend our time and money in downtown Lincoln and think our community’s efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I also believe that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Sandra Gallentine
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

I’m very concerned about the article I read yesterday in the LJS and the vote you are about to take today. I’m very excited about Lincoln’s future and having lived in a number of beautiful cities – Toronto/San Francisco/Palo Alto (and not so beautiful Mississauga; Windsor) it is easy to understand and value city planning. Windsor and Mississauga would be great examples of cities that lacked a master plan or shared vision – in Windsor there’s actually a beautiful botanical garden and across the street is a landfill site. Place’s like Palo Alto and Menlo Park have vibrant downtowns that are great for pedestrians and very beautiful.

In creating a Master Plan a shared vision has emerged and that vision is meant to ultimately revitalize the downtown core. I feel that we should not dismiss this vision by permitting this developer to not comply with the plan. It would be a farce to suggest they are in fact complying with the plan.

Please vote against allowing this nonconforming plan to somehow conform. Let’s go back to the drawing board and get this developer onside to either do what the plan requires or seek other development opportunities for that piece of land.

I know you’ll recognize the importance of this issue to the future of Lincoln’s growth.

Best regards,

David

David Zaritzky Brown
Managing Partner
Brown Immigration Law, LLC
2885 Laurel St., Suite 101
Lincoln, NE, 68502-5145
www.brownimmigrationlaw.com

p. 402 328-9899
f. 866 829-5824
e. dbrown@brownimmigrationlaw.com

* Serving your best and brightest *

ABOUT THIS E-MAIL: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Stacie Walton
8317 South 57th Street
Lincoln, NE 68516
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,
Corrina Bohlke
1951 Park Ave
Lincoln NE 68502
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Bockrath
2310 Sheridan Blvd.
Lincoln, NE 68502
sbockrath@neb.rr.com
Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to urge you remain true to the master plan that includes park blocks when considering the Block 68 redevelopment project today. Those park blocks are very important to the vision of the master plan and if you give them up for this project it seems unlikely future development will include them because developers will know we’re not serious about that requirement. The master plan contains great vision for a future Lincoln downtown redevelopment and we all need to stay true to it and not back off, even in a recession. To do otherwise also wouldn't be fair to developers who have worked the master plan requirements into their plans to date. It sounds to me from reading the newspaper coverage that we need to send this developer back to the drawing board to come up with a way to include the park block concept in his plan. Thanks for your time,

Nana Smith

Nana G. H. Smith
nghsmith@nebraska.edu
2221 Sheridan Blvd.
Lincoln, Nebraska 68502
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Shaun Vanneman
3190 Sheridan Blvd.
Lincoln, NE
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Tate Johnson
Military Account Manager
Six Points, Inc.
SDB Native American Owned
402-476-9191 office
402-730-4221 cell

"A setback is just a setup for a comeback"
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Until the developers give a specific plan to include important greenspace, please vote **against** the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown. It does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

Sincerely,

Clover Frederick
7345 Beaver Creek Ln
Lincoln, NE 68516

******************************************************************************
Clover Frederick, director
nonprofit marketing network
clover@nmn-online.org
402-416-8255
www.nmn-online.org

Join the nmn group on LinkedIn.com!
******************************************************************************
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

My understanding is that the new plan, which has been proposed without many details, would not include the intended blocks of parks to connect the Haymarket with Antelope Valley. It continues to astound me that we would even consider to spend millions of our tax dollars on a plan without specifics and one that does not comply with the Downtown Master Plan that the community has spent a good deal of time (and tax dollars) on already.

There are excellent reasons to include the quality of life measures, like the park blocks, in the plans for downtown. Most major business men, including Michael Bloomberg, note that businesses will come to an area not on the basis of some marginal tax rate difference alone. But rather will come to strong communities with strong infrastructure and things to offer families so that they know their workforce will stay and be invested in that community. The Downtown Master Plan as conceived does just that and it should not be dismissed.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing. I do not want my tax dollars spent in this way.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Carter
1708 Pawnee Street
Lincoln, NE 68502
Thursday, September 24, 2009

Doug Emery
555 S 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

RE: Lincoln Fire & Rescue Labor Contract

Dear Councilman Emery:

I am a 30+ year resident of Lincoln and I have own a couple of very small businesses here in Lincoln. I employ four full time employees and a couple of part-time employees.

I am growing increasingly concerned about the ongoing issues, and there have been many in the past 15 years, with the Department. It has been one conflict after another, through the past five or six city administrations. The issues continue to plague this city, and I might add, quite unlike other major city departments.

I have begun to research some of these things and it seems that there is something untoward going on with this department. It is not isolated to one or two issues. But it seems to be gaining momentum and it is quietly taking on some very unseemly political overtones.

In the current contract the unseemliness continues. The information that I have been able to locate appears to increase more and more benefits for LFR. It is unconscionable that Mayor Beutler could in fact negotiate the staffing requirements, and it is equally unconscionable that the council would approve the current contract that is to be voted on next Monday.

We taxpayers cannot afford increases in health care benefits, especially when LFR receives more than 95% premium payment for the employee and upwards of 75% for family. The private sector cannot come close to this, and I cannot afford to do that for LFR either. Further, removing or modifying the requirement that a fire fighter possess a valid driver’s license. Please. If this job is as important as we all think it is, this is a minimum standard and should not be adjusted.

There is a lot more in this contract that is highly objectionable to those of us who are paying the tab, but neither you nor I have the time to look at this individually with a couple hundred thousand residents.

We, the citizens, placed you in office to do the people’s business; please do not approve the contract as it is currently proposed. I would appreciate some response from you or your office.

Donald P. Friesen
5911 Abigail Drive
Phone (402) 730-3511
Don@h-hsa.com

"Automotive Service You Can Trust!"
Dear members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Charles Hull
Partner, Director of Creative Services
Archrival

720 O Street
Lincoln NE 68508
September 28, 2009

Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote ***AGAINST*** the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln’s Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community’s efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Khara Plicanic

Cheers,

khara plicanic
photographer

(402) 617-7688

http://www.kabloomstudios.com
khara@kabloomstudios.com

KaBloom Studios
811 Peach Street
Lincoln, NE 68502
To: Honorable Members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment plan for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with the Downtown Master Plan. The efforts and tax dollars expended to develop the Master Plan should not be dismissed to allow this nonconforming project.

We feel the developer needs to provide a more specific plan, and one which adheres to the Master Plan, before the project can qualify for TIF dollars.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the City.

John and Kris Bergmeyer
2843 South 24th Street
Lincoln, NE 68502
476-4315
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Karen Taylor
5530 S. 96th Place
Lincoln, NE 68526
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

I am urging you to vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Jane Griffin

3245 S 30th Street

Lincoln, NE 68502
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,

Jeanne M. Hevener
3161 Kleckner Ct.
Lincoln, NE 68503
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan. The intent of the Plan is to create a strong and continuous pedestrian connection along "M" Street from the Haymarket to Antelope Valley. The park blocks as a concept will provide the necessary amenity to support and encourage high density market rate housing downtown while creating value for the development and added quality of life for residents. If the Block 68 developer doesn't set aside space for the parks blocks, it is assured that no future developer will, effectively killing this signature piece of the Downtown Master Plan.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,
Brian Ardinger
9416 Oakville Road
Lincoln, NE 68526
Dear City Council Members,
I write to urge you to vote against the proposed redevelopment project for Block 68 in our city center. It is IMPERATIVE that we, as a community, understand that our current decisions have LONG TERM impact and act accordingly. The value of green space has never been more apparent, even in our largely rural state of Nebraska. The value it imparts to our community is perhaps not as easy to calculate as a short term development project, but as I am certain you know, the bike trails and parks have created a quality of life here that attracts interest and new residents. Our city center has suffered in the past, but the Antelope Redevelopment Project has sought to bring new life. The Downtown Master Plan extends this energy westward and create a continuity that is visionary. We MUST give significant consideration to these kinds of decisions and the impact they will have on succeeding generations. LEAVE IT GREEN, PLEASE.
Judy Greenwald
3455 West Pershing Road
68502
As a Lincoln resident and downtown professional, I would like to express my opposition to the current proposals before the council regarding Block 68. I believe the Master Plan laid out a tremendous vision for the City of Lincoln and for downtown Lincoln. This is NOT the time to veer from that vision. Just because a thing can be done does not mean it should be done – and the current proposal neither fit the Development Plan NOR provides sufficient benefit to warrant tossing aside our game plan at this point.

As a business owner and vocal advocate for venture creation in Lincoln, one might think the “pro-business” outcome would be to allow the proposal to move forward. But that view is short-sighted and over-simplistic and I hope it is not the view that guides the Council in this case. The best way to achieve a thriving business community in downtown is to develop the area with a combination of green space, common use and commercial property that serves a wider purpose, rather than the narrow objectives of the current proposal. It is critical that we create bonds between workers, dwellers and the community in downtown, and the best expression of that is the current master plan. While some variances will inevitably made, the primary driver of our decision-making needs to remain on focusing our resources on the plan and critical initiatives in it. It is much too early in the game to make such a fundamental departure from the use plan of this property.

I encourage you to reject the Block 68 Redevelopment proposal and recommit our city to the path laid out in the Master Plan.

Bradley Walker
1800 High Street
Lincoln, NE 68502

--

Bradley K. Walker
President and CEO,
nanonation.inc
301 South 13th Street
Suite 700
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

(402) 323-6260 direct
(402) 770-6266 cell
(402) 323-6268 fax

bkw@nanonation.net
I think that the Master Plan for downtown Lincoln will be permanently compromised if the Council moves forward on amending the current plan. For this and other obvious reasons please do not support this effort to change the master plan.

Jeffrey C. Greenwald  
President/CEO  
INSPRO Insurance  
1919 S. 40th St., Suite 104  
P.O. Box 6847  
Lincoln, NE 68506  

(402) 484-4868 - Direct Phone  
(402) 483-4500 - Main Phone  
(402) 483-7977 - Fax  
Email: jgreenwald@insproins.com  
Website: http://www.insproins.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT  
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.
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown.

Voting for the plan would dismiss the time and tax dollars spent on a workable downtown master plan and do considerable damage to future development efforts in downtown Lincoln.

Do the wise thing. Vote NO.

Thank you for your consideration of this and your service to Lincoln.

Sincerely,

Matthew Hardin Wood, M.D.
2829 South 24th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote against the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown, as it does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan. I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily. I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing. Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,
Dara Mlinek
5501 Grouse Place
Lincoln, NE 68516
Sent from my BlackBerry Smartphone provided by Alltel
I am writing you as a private citizen who cares about our city's future. Please vote *against* the proposed amendment to the Lincoln Center Redevelopment Plan for the Block 68 Redevelopment Project.

http://www.journalstar.com/news/local/article_eb510c32-ab0d-11de-b727-001cc4c002e0.html

The Block 68 redevelopment project *does not conform* to our Downtown Master Plan which has as a key element a future series of parks blocks along "M" Street. The intent of the Plan is to create a strong and continuous east/west pedestrian connection along "M" Street from the Haymarket to Antelope Valley. The park blocks as a concept will provide the necessary amenity to support and encourage high density market rate housing downtown while creating value for the development and added quality of life for residents. If the Block 68 developer doesn't set aside space for the parks blocks, it is assured that no future developer will, effectively killing this signature piece of the Downtown Master Plan.

For the sake of the citizens and civic organizations who helped to create the Downtown Master Plan, for the sake of current developers who are abiding by it, for the sake of maintaining high standards for downtown development, and for the sake of future generations of Lincolnnites who are counting on you to think about the long-term vision for our community, please vote against this!

Liz Ring

402-261-6328
Dear honorable members of the Lincoln City Council,

Please vote NO on the proposed redevelopment proposal for Block 68 downtown. This proposal does not comply with Lincoln's Downtown Master Plan, a plan that has been compiled with so much thought and vision, a plan that will make Lincoln a better place for ALL of its citizens.

I think our community's efforts and tax dollars expended on the Downtown Master Plan should not be dismissed so readily.

I believe strongly that we need a more specific plan from the developer before this project is allowed to move forward and to receive millions in government financing.

Thank you for your consideration and your service to our city.

Sincerely,
Nanne Olds
Dear Council Members:

I strongly urge the city council to vote against authorization of any redevelopment for the downtown area that does not conform to the Master Plan. The Master Plan is meant to promote a vibrant downtown and preserve the qualities we look for in a thriving economic center and efforts to push through any alternative plans undermine its value. Making an exception creates a slippery slope in the event that future development proposals deviate from the Master Plan which has been adopted by the community.

Yours sincerely,

Jessica Greenwald