I. CITY CLERK

II. CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE MAYOR & DIRECTORS TO COUNCIL

MAYOR
1. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor presents October Award of Excellence to Fire Apparatus Operator Nicholas Thill.
2. NEWS ADVISORY. Mayor Beutler will hold a news conference, Thursday, December 10, 10:00 am on the second floor of the County-City Building. (Sent to Council Members on Wednesday, December 9, 2009)
3. NEWS RELEASE. Health Care Task Force releases report.

CITIZENS INFORMATION CENTER
1. CITY OF LINCOLN snow/traffic condition report for December 6th, 6:30 p.m.
2. CITY OF LINCOLN snow/traffic condition report for December 7th, 11:00 a.m.
3. CITY OF LINCOLN snow/traffic condition report for December 7, 2009, 5:15 p.m.
4. CITY OF LINCOLN snow/traffic condition report for December 8, 2009, 11:45 a.m.
5. CITY OF LINCOLN snow/traffic condition report for December 8, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
6. CITY OF LINCOLN snow/traffic condition report for December 9, 2009, 11:30 a.m.
7. CITY OF LINCOLN snow/traffic condition report for December 10, 2009, 10:00 a.m.

DIRECTORS

FINANCE/TREASURER

LINCOLN LIBRARIES
2. Gaming tournament to be held at Walt Branch Library.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1. Administrative Amendment No. 09021 and Administrative Amendment No. 09073 approved by the Planning Director from December 1, 2009 thru December 7, 2009.
2. Letter to residents/owners regarding the proposed street name change for South 38th Street and 38th Street Court.
3. Marvin Krout, Planning Department Director, memo on Downtown Design Standards.

POLICE DEPARTMENT
1. Correspondence from Doug Brobst, Gold Smith Jewelers, on concerns with the upcoming
   Alarm Ordinance changes, with response from Chief Casady.
   1b. Chief Casady’s response to each concern on the Alarm Ordinance presented by Doug
       Brobst.

PUBLIC WORKS/STAR TRAN
1. Correspondence from Councilman Camp regarding constituent call regarding StarTran
   answering machines with Larry Worth, StarTran’s Transit Manager, reply on answering
   machine suggestions.
   1b. Message on StarTran answering service as their receptionist is currently unavailable.
   1c. Message on StarTran answering service after hours.

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

JON CAMP
1. Correspondence from Robert Hinman to his sister, Holly Schario, and Councilman Camp
   regarding cars being towed after Nebraska football game.
   1b. Letter to Abram Morales, owner of La Tapitia and parking lot, requesting discussed
       refund for towing be sent to his sister as it was her car from Robert L. Hinman.

IV. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS TO COUNCIL
1. Letter from Ronald E. Smith, Linweld, thanking Council for attention to the Lincoln
   Employers’ Coalition regarding the rate increase proposed by LES. (Each Council Member
   received an individual letter on December 4, 2009)
2. InterLinc correspondence from Janet Wheatley listing reasons why Lincoln is a very
   expensive city to live in when it comes to taxes.
3. Email from Michael Grover, Gulf Stream Funding/Amerifund Commercial Corporation,
   regarding lease back long term capital projects proposal. (Forward to Don Herz, Finance
   Director, and Vince Mejer, Purchasing Director on December 10, 2009)

V. ADJOURNMENT
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
555 South 10th Street, Lincoln, NE 68508, 441-7511, fax 441-7120

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: December 7, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

MAYOR PRESENTS OCTOBER AWARD OF EXCELLENCE

Mayor Chris Beutler today presented the Mayor’s Award of Excellence for October to Fire Apparatus Operator Nicholas Thill of Lincoln Fire and Rescue. The monthly award recognizes City employees who consistently 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.

Thill has worked for the City since September 1997. Fire Captain John Hibberd nominated him in the category of productivity for the way he took on the task of assembling personal lockers after additional employees were added at Station 8.

Captain Hibberd said Thill’s leadership on the project saved the City more than 24 hours of labor on the lockers. He organized the effort and lined up other employees to bring in tools. He also established an order of assembly that made the work flow smoothly. Captain Hibberd said Thill demonstrated his initiative and leadership skills. He also said Nick is a hard worker and a team player who takes pride in his job.

The other categories in which employees can be nominated are customer service, 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.
DATE: December 9, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831

Mayor Chris Beutler will discuss two topics at a new conference at 10 a.m. Thursday, December 10 in the Mayor’s Conference Room, second floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St.:

• Public Works and Utilities personnel will give an update on snow removal operations.

• The Mayor’s Blue Ribbon Task Force on the Healthcare Safety Net will release its final report.
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
555 South 10th Street, Lincoln, NE 68508, 441-7511, fax 441-7120

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: December 10, 2009
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 441-7831
                        Lori Seibel, Community Health Endowment, 436-5516
                        Su Eells, Task Force Coordinator, 499-5543

HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE RELEASES REPORT

A task force is recommending a strategic plan for the People’s Health Center, the coordination of paperwork and a system of patient advocates as steps to strengthen Lincoln’s health care safety net. Those are the priority recommendations of the Mayor’s Blue Ribbon Task Force on the Health Care Safety Net, which released its final report today.

Mayor Chris Beutler charged the Task Force with addressing the increasing number of uninsured individuals in Lincoln who rely on “safety net” providers, such as community health centers, free clinics, hospitals, other nonprofit organizations, private physicians and local government.

“Our goal is to make sure the uninsured and low-income families in our community have access to quality health care,” Beutler said. “It’s important for the health of the entire community that these services be provided in a coordinated and cost-efficient manner so that the system is sustainable. I want to thank the members of the task force for taking the first step in this difficult challenge.”

The Mayor released the report at a news conference accompanied by Kim Russel, President/CEO of BryanLGH Health System, who served as Chair of the Task Force, and Dr. Bob Rauner, MD, a member of the Task Force and incoming President of the Nebraska Academy of Family Physicians.

“Since April, the Task Force has diligently examined our community’s safety net,” said Russel. “We have looked to other communities for ‘lessons learned,’ heard from national safety net experts, and had intense, sometimes difficult, conversations about the strengths, shortcomings and opportunities for Lincoln’s existing safety net system. I am proud of the work of the task force, and sincerely thank the members for their hard work.”

The final report, available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov, details 23 recommendations to improve Lincoln’s healthcare safety net. The task force said the development of a strategic plan for the People’s Health Center would look at increasing its capacity by relocating and/or expanding to satellite clinics. The second priority is to explore ways to integrate eligibility assessment, form preparation, and the collection of supporting documentation. The development of a hub of patient advocates would help uninsured individuals navigate the health and human services system.

- more -
Other recommendations involve strategies related to medical homes; safety net efficiencies and enhancements; volunteers; information technology; prevention, wellness, and health education; resource development; and implementation.

A second phase of the study focused on implementing the task force recommendations is under way. “We will again be calling on the people of Lincoln to work together to make these recommendations a reality for our community,” Beutler said.

For further information on the report or the work of the task force, contact Su Eells at 499-5543 or su.eells@tendotravel.com.

- 30 -
Senate health care debate stalls FY 2010 budget progress. With the consideration of comprehensive health care legislation expected to take up time on the Senate floor up to the Christmas holiday, the congressional leadership is beginning to discuss how best to wrap up the FY 2010 federal budget.

Seven of the twelve FY 2010 appropriations bills have yet to be signed into law, and talk of wrapping those measures into an “omnibus” package has picked up momentum. House and Senate appropriators had high hopes earlier this year that they would be able to consider each spending bill individually for the first time in many years, but slow progress in the Senate -- where the minority has more tools at their disposal than their House counterparts -- has once again scuttled those plans.

Other items that may be included in the omnibus spending bill include extension of some expiring provisions of the Patriot Act, relief for physicians from a 21 percent reduction in Medicare reimbursements, and an increase in the federal debt limit. The package may also include a permanent extension of the federal estate tax, which is scheduled to be eliminated in 2010 but reinstated in 2011. The House approved a measure to extend the tax at a 45 percent rate on estates with a per person exemption of up to $3.5 million.

Meanwhile, work has picked up on the idea of some kind of effort to address the nation’s rising unemployment. Some House committee chairs have started to rally behind a $100 billion infrastructure package (see related story below), as well as proposals for additional assistance to small businesses, a plan for the federal government to hire directly for public works projects, and perhaps fiscal assistance to state and local governments to reduce layoffs.

President Obama held a “jobs summit” at the White House this week that included representatives of industries, state and local governments, unions, and academics. The White House has kept its plans for a jobs initiative close to the vest, but the President may have tipped his hand at a breakout session during the summit when he touted energy efficiency and weatherization as areas of interest.

The President is expected to announce his plan next Tuesday at a speech at the Brookings Institution. The House hopes to take up legislation by Christmas, while the Senate is looking to consider a jobs bill in January.

Next week, the Senate will continue considering amendments to the health care bill, while the House will take up comprehensive financial regulation legislation that includes provisions relating to credit card companies, credit rating firms, and financial advisors.

Oberstar promotes new jobs bill. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee (T&I) Chairman James Oberstar (D-MN) this week outlined his proposal to invest about $100 billion in transportation infrastructure over two years as part of a job-creation package being considered by the House of Representatives. This funding, Oberstar said, would come from the general fund, and would not be offset, putting him at immediate odds with the House leadership.

At the press conference to release a new survey conducted by the American...
Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Oberstar reiterated his case for increased transportation spending as a sure means to create jobs quickly. The new AASHTO survey suggests that states have more than 9,500 transportation projects worth $69.5 billion that could be started within 120 days of government funding. A similar survey released by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) highlights $15 billion in public transportation capital projects that are also ready to go.

T&I Highways and Transit Subcommittee Chairman Peter DeFazio (D-OR) indicated his support for the proposal, and echoed Oberstar’s lack of concern about paying for the proposal, suggesting he would be willing to bond or borrow, but also did not dismiss offsetting the costs. DeFazio has also said that it is his hope that the highway and transit funding from a new jobs bill would be used for larger, long-term projects, as opposed to road repaving that has been prevalent with stimulus funding. Oberstar’s proposal comes on the heels of the announcement by House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-MD) that House consideration of any jobs measure could slip to January, given the short amount of time remaining to Congress to complete its work this year.

Chairman Barbara Boxer (D-CA) of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee (EPW) indicated that the Senate would also begin work on a new jobs package in January, and suggested the possibility of using untapped funds from the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) as a means of paying for it. The top Republican on the House T&I Committee, Rep. John Mica of Florida, has also proposed using TARP funds or unused stimulus funds from the American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA) to offset the cost of a jobs bill.

Meanwhile, as part of the jobs summit held at the White House on December 3, officials from state and local governments, the transportation industry, and union representatives met in a breakout session to discuss infrastructure spending and job creation. President Obama joined them and told the room that he is concerned about the lack of long-term impact that “shovel ready” infrastructure projects provide. His administration, he said, has been struggling all year between “stimulus” initiatives that give a quick boost to the economy and longer-term projects that are more transformative and lasting down the road. The President also suggested that long-term infrastructure projects are a tough sell for the American public, because the benefits are not immediately realized.

Finally, with the authorization for programs at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) set to expire at the end of the year, Congress is gearing up for yet another extension as agreement in Congress over the direction of a long-term reauthorization remains difficult to achieve. The House passed its version of a multi-year reauthorization of the FAA (HR 915) in May and the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee approved its portion of the Senate’s bill (S 1451), in July. However, the Senate Finance Committee has yet to consider the revenue title.

The most likely vehicle for a short-term extension of FA programs is an end-of-the-year omnibus appropriations bill to fund government operations in FY 2010 (see related story above).

**WATER RESOURCES**

CEQ issues proposed principle and guidelines for federal water resources projects. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued “Proposed National Objectives, Principles and Standards for Water and Related Resources Implementation,” also known as the Principles and Guidelines, this week. The much-anticipated document, which would govern the development of federally-funded water resources projects, now goes to the National Academy of Sciences for a one-year review. In addition, CEQ will accept public comments on the proposal through March 3, 2010.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 mandated an update to the Principles and Guidelines as part of congressional efforts to reform the Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps initially assumed the task of updating the Principles and Guidelines and issued a proposal for public comment late last year. However, pressure from congressional reform advocates and environmental groups and the change in Administration trumped that document and led to the document that CEQ issued this week.

The CEQ proposal would make a number of changes to the Principles and Guidelines, which were last revised in 1983, with the overarching purpose of balancing environmental and economic development goals, increasing the transparency of the project development process and avoiding the unwise use of floodplains. Specifically, the proposal:

- Would expand the Principles and Guidelines beyond the Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Natural Resources Conservation Service and Tennessee Valley Authority to all federal agencies;
- Includes 13 broad planning principles and standards to guide federal agencies as they develop water resources projects, and
- Outlines a detailed planning process, including alternatives analysis, for federal agencies to follow as they plan water resources projects.

The alternatives analysis process would have to consider a non-build alternative and a non-structural alternative and would have to identify the most environmentally preferable alternative, even if the analysis did identify the environmentally preferable alternative as the best overall option. In addition to environmental effects, the alternatives analysis would have to evaluate the potential monetary, social, public safety, urban and community, health, displacement and environmental justice effects of proposed projects.

A copy of the CEQ Principles and Guidance can be found at: [http://tiny.cc/FyBoD](http://tiny.cc/FyBoD)

Comments are due March 3, 2010, are limited to 5,000 characters and must be filed electronically at: [http://tiny.cc/DE9ca](http://tiny.cc/DE9ca)
STIMULUS WATCH
Weekly update on stimulus activities.

Department of Justice
The Office of Justice Programs will host a webinar on Section 1512(c) recipient reporting requirements on December 17, 2009 from 2-3:30 pm EST. The webinar will provide additional guidance for all ARRA grant recipients on calculating jobs data and troubleshooting report submissions. Registration is required by December 15, 2009 at:
http://tiny.cc/WeHfp.
A recorded version of the webinar will be made available on the DOJ Recovery Act Web site following the webinar:

The COPS Office launched an online training and information portal designed to help COPS Hiring and Recovery Program (CHRP) grantees comply with program rules as they spend award funds to hire new officers or rehire officers laid off for financial reasons:

Department of Labor
Secretary Hilda Solis released a statement regarding the relationship of jobs created or saved by ARRA to the most recent unemployment numbers:
http://tiny.cc/83FPv.

GRANTS AND NOTICES

Department of Transportation
DOT announced the availability of $280 million to fund innovative bus and bus facility projects and urban circulator projects. This is the first batch of funding by the Obama Administration for its Livability Initiative, a joint venture of DOT, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Environmental Protection Agency. The Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) will select projects based on livability, sustainability, economic development, and leveraging public investments. FTA will publish notices of funding availability for the “Urban Circulator Grants” and the “Bus Livability Projects” next week:
To view DOT’s press release, go to:
http://tiny.cc/LKvHo
CITY OF LINCOLN
SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITION REPORT

NO VOICE REPORT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME.

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center -  441-7644
Diane Gonzolas -  525-1520

Date: December 6, 2009
Time: 6:30 p.m.

The City will begin snow removal operations about 7:30 p.m. tonight with about 60 plows covering arterials and snow emergency routes.

City crews have been busy since about noon today, when material spreading began at intersections and on bridges. After about two hours, material spreading operations moved to arterials and snow emergency routes.

Parking bans are not in effect. Motorists are advised to drive with caution.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln. Additional information is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and in the blue pages of your Windstream phone directory. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.

- 30 -
CITY OF LINCOLN
SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITION REPORT

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center -- 441-7644
Citizen Information Center -- 441-7547

Date: December 7, 2009
Time: 11 a.m.

City snow operations wrapped up plowing and sanding efforts on all major arterial routes at about 8 a.m. today. Crews are currently cleaning up areas where drifting has occurred as well as continuing to plow and spread material around schools. Other problem areas will be addressed throughout the remainder of the day. Street operations staff are also working to prepare for more snowfall expected in the next 24 to 48 hours.

The snow removal operations effort began at about 7:30 p.m. Sunday with about 60 plows covering the city’s major arterials and snow emergency routes.

Parking bans are not in effect. Motorists are advised to continue to drive with caution.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln. Additional information is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and on pages 48 and 49 in the blue pages of your Windstream phone directory. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
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CITY OF LINCOLN
SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITION REPORT

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center - 441-7644
Diane Gonzolas - 525-1520 (MEDIA USE ONLY)

Date: December 7, 2009
Time: 5:15 p.m.

Mayor Chris Beutler has declared a snow emergency for the City of Lincoln. It will take effect at 8 a.m. Tuesday, December 8. A snow emergency means parking is banned on emergency snow routes, bus routes and other major arterial streets. A map showing these routes can be found on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and in the blue pages of the Windstream phone directory. The ban will remain in effect until further notice.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
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CITY OF LINCOLN
SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITION REPORT

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center -- 441-7644
Citizen Information Center -- 441-7547

Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2009
Time: 11:45 a.m.

A snow emergency is currently in effect for the city of Lincoln. A snow emergency means parking is banned on emergency snow routes, bus routes and other major arterial streets. A map showing these routes can be found on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and pages 48 and 49 in the blue pages of the Windstream phone directory. The snow emergency parking ban will remain in effect until further notice.

About 85 plows and sanders are currently working on city streets as the steady snowfall continues.

Lincoln Police Department (LPD) reports a total of 8 accidents since midnight. LPD urges motorists to continue to drive with caution, allowing for a safe distance between your car and other drivers.

StarTran reports that buses are running about 10 minutes behind schedule.

Again, the city of Lincoln is currently in a snow emergency. A snow emergency means parking is banned on emergency snow routes, bus routes and other major arterial streets. A map showing these routes can be found on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and in the blue pages of the Windstream phone directory. The snow emergency parking ban will remain in effect until further notice.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln. Additional information is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and on pages 48 and 49 in the blue pages of your Windstream phone directory. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
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CITY OF LINCOLN
SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITION REPORT

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center -- 441-7644
Citizen Information Center -- 441-7547

Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2009
Time: 3:30 p.m.

A snow emergency continues to be in effect for the city of Lincoln. A snow emergency means parking is banned on emergency snow routes, bus routes and other major arterial streets. A map showing these routes can be found on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and page 49 in the blue pages of the Windstream phone directory. The snow emergency parking ban will remain in effect until further notice.

About 90 plows and sanders are currently working on city streets as the steady snowfall continues. Public Works street crews will continue plowing and sanding efforts throughout the evening and into the early morning hours.

Lincoln Police Department (LPD) reports a total of 17 accidents since midnight. LPD urges motorists to continue to drive with caution, allowing for a safe distance between your car and other drivers.

StarTran reports that buses are experiencing problems navigating city streets and running as much as 30 minutes behind schedule.

Again, the city of Lincoln is currently in a snow emergency. A snow emergency means parking is banned on emergency snow routes, bus routes and other major arterial streets. A map showing these routes can be found on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and in the blue pages of the Windstream phone directory. The snow emergency parking ban will remain in effect until further notice.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln. Additional information is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and on pages 48 and 49 in the blue pages of your Windstream phone directory. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
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RESIDENTIAL PARKING BAN

Mayor Chris Beutler has announced that a residential parking ban will go into effect at **12:01 a.m. Thursday, December 10.** At that time, parking will be banned on the even-numbered sides of the street in all residential areas. The residential parking ban is tentatively scheduled to switch to the odd-numbered sides of the street at **6 p.m. Thursday, December 10.**

Mayor Beutler also has announced that the snow emergency parking ban for Lincoln will be lifted at **4 p.m. today (Wednesday, December 9).** Where allowed, parking will again be available on snow emergency routes, major arterial streets and bus routes after this time.

Public Works officials are asking citizens to move their vehicles off of residential streets as soon as possible as street crews may begin work in residential areas prior to the residential parking ban taking effect.

Lincoln Police Department reports that there have not been a high number of weather-related accidents today. Motorists are urged to allow for extra time to reach their destination and to continue to exercise caution while driving at all times.

StarTran reports that buses are currently having difficulty making their way along bus routes in residential areas. Buses running along snow emergency routes and major arterials are generally running on time. Some routes in residential areas are not being attempted at this time. If StarTran riders observe that the residential road hasn’t been plowed where they normally board their bus, they need to make their way to a bus stop along a major arterial street.

Lincoln Fire & Rescue is requesting citizens assist them by removing snow from around fire hydrants if residents have a fire hydrant on their property or near their home. This will help Lincoln Fire & Rescue locate hydrants and allow for the hookup of fire hoses in an emergency.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln. Additional information is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and on pages 48 and 49 in the blue pages of your Windstream phone directory. If you have questions, you may call the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
CITY OF LINCOLN
SNOW/TRAFFIC CONDITION REPORT

For more information:
Public Works Snow Center -- 441-7644
Citizen Information Center -- 441-7547

Date: Thursday, December 10, 2009
Time: 10 a.m.

RESIDENTIAL PARKING BAN SWITCHES SIDES

Mayor Chris Beutler has announced that the residential parking ban will change at 6 p.m.
tonight (Thursday, December 10). At that time, parking will be banned on the odd-numbered
sides of the street in all residential areas. Parking will again be permitted on the even sides.

Street crews will continue with cleanup work today on the even-numbered side of residential
streets prior to making the switch to the odd sides at 6 p.m.

Please stay informed on traffic conditions and the status of snow operations in Lincoln.
Additional information is available on the City Web site at lincoln.ne.gov and on pages 48 and
49 in the blue pages of your Windstream phone directory. If you have questions, you may call
the Public Works Snow Center at 441-7644.
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OFFICE OF TREASURER, CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

DECEMBER 3, 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 October 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward</td>
<td>$179,595,660.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Total Debits October 1-31, 2009</td>
<td>$26,881,577.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Total Credits October 1-31, 2009</td>
<td>($31,617,300.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Balance on October 31, 2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>$174,859,937.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Bank Nebraska, N.A.</td>
<td>($1,999,109.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank</td>
<td>($207,733.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo Bank Credit Card Account</td>
<td>($43,650.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornhusker Bank</td>
<td>$22,208.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Bank</td>
<td>$131,498.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>$644,700.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate Bank</td>
<td>$45,550.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Short-Term Pool</td>
<td>$40,853,791.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idle Funds - Medium-Term Pool</td>
<td>$134,764,238.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Checks and Warrants</td>
<td>$648,441.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash on Hand October 31, 2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>$174,859,937.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I also hold as City Treasurer, securities in the amount of $23,689,089.93 representing authorized investments of the City’s funds.

**ATTEST:**

[Signature]

Melinda J. Jones, City Treasurer

[Signature]

Joan E. Ross, City Clerk
# CITY OF LINCOLN - PLEDGED COLLATERAL STATEMENT
## AS OF OCTOBER 31, 2009

<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 GOLD POOL A61256</td>
<td>3128KRMD3</td>
<td>11/01/2036</td>
<td>$3,718,920.00</td>
<td>$3,000,479.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>$3,198,970.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA FNCL 254725</td>
<td>31371K4J7</td>
<td>05/01/2033</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$202,386.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>$210,183.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USBANK NE</strong></td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,218,920.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,202,866.07</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,409,153.46</strong></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>FFCB 5.45%</td>
<td>31331XNG3</td>
<td>02/05/2014</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORNHUSKER BANK</strong></td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,500,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,500,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB LOC 16747</td>
<td>12/10/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST GATE BANK</strong></td>
<td>TOTAL PLEDGED</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,000,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:  December 8, 2009 
CONTACT:  Vicki Wood, Youth Services Supervisor 
PHONE:  402-441-8565 
E-MAIL:  v.wood@lincolnlibraries.org

Gere Branch Library Offers Parent-Child Book Group

First through third graders and their reading partners are invited to join a monthly book group at Gere Branch Library.  This group is modeled after Lincoln City Libraries’ popular summer book groups. Selected books are read at home then discussed at the next meeting.

The group will meet at Gere Branch Library, 2400 S. 56th Street, on the second Monday of every month starting January 11th, from 6:30 - 7:15. To sign up, please call Gere Branch Library at  441-8560.

Barbara Hansen
Administrative Aide
Lincoln City Libraries
402-441-8512
Gaming Tournament to be held at Walt Branch Library

Teens are invited to participate in a Mario Kart BRAWL tournament – Tuesday, December 15, from 3:30-5:00 p.m. at Walt Branch Library, 6701 S. 14th Street. Come show your skills playing against other teens for PRIZES! Open to anyone in grades 6-12. No pre-registration required!

For information call the Walt Branch Library, 441-4460.

Barbara Hansen
Administrative Aide
Lincoln City Libraries
402-441-8512

Have you read the 2009 One Book - One Lincoln title "People of the Book" by Geraldine Brooks?
Pick your copy up at the library today.
Memorandum

Date: December 8, 2009

To: City Clerk

From: Teresa, Planning Dept.

Re: site plans and applications

cc: Jean Preister

This is a list of the Administrative Amendments that were approved by the Planning Director from December 1, 2009 thru December 7, 2009:

**Administrative Amendment No. 09021** to Change of Zone No. 06075, Wilderness Commons Planned Unit Development, approved by the Planning Director on December 2, 2009, requested by Engineering Design Consultants, LLC., to:

A. Change the land use on certain lots as shown on the site plan;
B. Expand the allowable square feet in the PUD by 20,000 sq. ft. from 600,000 sq. ft. to 620,000 sq. ft.;
C. Reduce the number of lots in Block 2 from 14 to 6;
D. Add S. 39th St. as a private roadway;
E. Add Edelweiss Ct. as a right-in, right-out, on to S. 40th St.;
F. Revise the site layout and various site notes;
G. Increase the height from 40 feet to 55 feet in the interior of the PUD, excluding lots on the perimeter, on property generally located on the southwest corner of 40th St. and Yankee Hill Rd.

**Administrative Amendment No. 09073** to Special Permit No. 1988, approved by the Planning Director on December 4, 2009, requested by Hausmann Construction, Inc., to:

A. Transfer the 30 unassigned dwelling units to Lot 3, Tamarin Ridge 1st Addition, to bring the total multi-family dwelling units permitted on this lot to 190;
B. Clarify Note #1 under Community Unit Plan General Notes on building height, on property generally located at 7400 Jacob Creek Dr.
December 4, 2009

Dear Resident/Owner
38th Street Circle
Lincoln, NE 68510

RE: Proposed Street Name Change for South 38th Street and 38th Street Court

This letter is to notify you that City staff are holding a neighborhood meeting to discuss and answer questions regarding the re-addressing and proposed street re-naming for South 38th Street and 38th Street Court. The meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 15, 2009 at 6:00-7:30 p.m. in the Gymnasium at Randolph Elementary School located at 1024 South 37th Street. You can enter the gymnasium through the main doors located on either the east or west sides of the building.

A letter was sent by the City’s Department of Building and Safety a few weeks ago notifying you of a pending address change for your residence. Additionally however, for the re-addressing to occur, that portion of South 38th Street north of F Street along with 38th Street Court both must be renamed. City staff is proposing that both the portion of South 38th Street north of F Street along with 38th Street Court be renamed to South 38th Street Court. A map of the affected area is attached for your review.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide an opportunity for residents and/or property owners to ask any questions they may have about the readdressing and proposed street re-naming. The street name change must be approved by Lincoln’s City Council to take effect, and you will be notified by a separate mailing of the public hearing to consider the change before the Council at that time as well.

If you any questions, please contact Brian Will at 441-6362, or at bwill@lincoln.ne.gov with the Lincoln/Lancaster Planning Department.
Last year in August, the City Council approved special building design standards for new construction and exterior alterations in the downtown and Antelope Valley. The Downtown Master Plan had proposed that such standards be prepared and enacted. Organizations such as Downtown Lincoln Association, the Chamber, and the local chapter of architects supported the proposal that was adopted last year as a way to encourage high quality development that will protect the value of the significant investments being made by the City and private sector in this part of the city.

Along with their approval, the Council requested that staff submit a report on our experience with implementing the standards after a year of experience. Ed Zimmer on our staff has prepared the attached report, which summarizes the projects we have reviewed under the new design standards. Development activity in downtown and Antelope Valley was limited over the past year, and so the standards have not been thoroughly tested. Generally, we think the standards and the process have worked well during this period, but the report does indicate some areas for possible amendments in the future.

We will continue to evaluate these standards as they are applied in the future, and report as warranted to the various boards and organizations which have taken an interest in how this is working.

Marvin S. Krout, Director
Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department
555 South 10th Street, Room 213
Lincoln, NE 68510
402-441-6366
In adopting the Lincoln Downtown Design Standards (LDDS/LMC 3.76) in September 2008, the City Council requested a report on their implementation after the first year.

Building activity in the Sept. 2008-November 2009 period has been impeded by overall economic conditions, so only a handful of projects have been reviewed under the new design standards, as discussed below. Staff has offered advice on or courtesy reviews of a small number of additional projects that have not progressed to the point of seeking building permits. Prior to formal application, developers of those projects typically request and are extended confidentiality.

The projects reviewed in 2008 and 2009 were remodelings or additions to existing buildings, except for the Assurity and Archrival buildings.

The remodeling of the former Eastern Ambulance building at S. 9th and Rosa Parks Way was in process when the Standards were adopted. Staff reviewed it for “practice” in applying the standards and found that it would have qualified for administrative approval of a substantial remodeling by adding durable brick cladding to the street facades (east and south) and by introducing additional windows on the east façade.
Kaplan University: The Kaplan extension had been designed and approved by the Nebraska Capitol Environs Commission before the LDDS were enacted, but a change of zone to O-1 and a “value engineering” of the approved design brought the project back to the Commission and subject to the new standards. The proposed changes met the Design Standards and met with Commission approval, except for a detail on the south façade. The Commission requested and the applicant agreed to a change in materials to introduce a brick base near the south entrance/student plaza, meeting the DDS requirement for durable materials at ground level. The addition has been completed as approved.
In December 2008, designs were reviewed for a substantial remodeling of the former “Barker Printing” building at 13th & K Streets for Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

The redesign retained ample windows and introduced durable ceramic tile over existing stucco finishes. The project met the Design Standards and was approved administratively.
Walker Tire at S. 9th and M Streets sought a building permit for a utilitarian extension on the west side. The project qualified as a minor remodeling and met the design standards as it did not impact a street façade and did “not cause greater deviation from these Design Standards than currently exists.”
A building permit was sought for the **Shinn Building** at 126 N. 16th in early 2009, converting it to residential units. The proposed work included reopening the blocked windows and introducing a grade-level entrance.

This “major remodeling” was approved administratively as meeting the LDDS.

The remodeling of the former P. O. Pears building as **“Red 9”** at 322 S. 9th Street involved few material changes to the building exterior. The corner of the parcel at 9th and M Street would not have meet the screening requirements of the Design Standards if it had stayed a gravel parking area but its development as a fenced beer garden does not deviate from any standard. The grasses planted outside the fence are not required but enhance the pedestrian experience.
An initial courtesy review early in the design process for the renovation of the former Kirk Motors building at 18th & O Streets into the new home of “N Street Liquors” raised a question of blocking up the large show room windows. An alternative solution retaining the windows and creating “window boxes” for display behind each one met the Design Standards, earning administrative approval of the design.

This project raised a question about State energy improvement requirements and whether the Downtown Design Standards conflict with State regulations.

The current energy regulations apparently allow state officials little or no discretion in applying the requirements to renovation projects, despite the inherent energy savings in reusing rather than replacing existing structures. The huge windows on a building like “Kirk Motors” require other upgrades such as extra roof insulation to achieve the required scores, that might be more expensive than simply reducing the size or number of windows. This review was rendered more complicated by the current arrangement of assigning review to the State and enforcement to City building officials. Unifying the review and enforcement at the City level might expedite local projects. The handsome renovation of this building for N Street Liquors demonstrates what can be achieved under current codes.
The only new buildings reviewed in the first year of the Downtown Design Standards were the office building and parking structure for Assurity bounded by 19th and 21st Streets, Q and R Streets. As a public-private redevelopment project, the design was already subject to advisory design review by the Urban Design Committee. The LDDS review was incorporated into that existing review process.

The office building is positioned on the east side of the parcel with well-developed facades addressing Union Plaza park.

The site is campus-like and the Downtown Design Standard recognize this possibility by allowing greater flexibility of positioning buildings east of 19th Street/Antelope Valley Parkway. West of the Parkway, buildings are to be “built-to” their front property line. “East Downtown”/Antelope Valley was intended to offer some larger campuses near to but not in the Downtown Core and the Assurity project is just such an opportunity.
The office building’s main entrance is oriented westward, toward the interior of the campus and the parking structure on the west side. Urban Design Committee received a preliminary presentation on March 4, 2009 and offered suggestions regarding the parking structure and the pedestrian connection to Q Street. The project was approved as meeting the intent of the LDDS on April 1, 2009.

Assurity Parking Garage, Antelope Valley Parkway façade (west), as presented and approved April 1, 2009.
The design meets most of the Downtown Design Standards for its location as it is “built to” the front property line, has ample transparency on the ground floor, and locates parking to the rear. The recessed first floor is permitted as the location is not one of the key retail streets (P Street and N. 21st Streets).

However, concrete block is not permitted as a primary façade material and therefore the design does not qualify for administrative approval. The applicant’s options include modifying the material choice or appealing the design to the Urban Design Committee.

**Archrival, 330 S. 9th St.**

Archrival has applied for a building permit for a new structure at 330 S. 9th Street, currently a parking lot in the “Color Court” complex. The process on this application is on-going.

The proposed structure has a recessed storefront at the first floor, a band-window at the second, and concrete block as the primary material of the facades. On the principal, 9th St. façade, the upper portion of the wall would incorporate a “scatter” of glass blocks, so some light would penetrate the wall.
The NeighborWorks Lincoln office and condominiums at 23rd and P Streets is not located in the B-4 and O-1 zones subject to the LDDS, but those standards are included as guidelines for review in the PUD (Planned Unit Development) authorizing this project.

The NeighborWorks Lincoln office and condominiums at 23rd and P Streets is not located in the B-4 and O-1 zones subject to the LDDS, but those standards are included as guidelines for review in the PUD (Planned Unit Development) authorizing this project.

The project includes the agency’s office and rental commercial space on the ground floor and residences above. The design proposed brick cladding for the ground floor and “cement-board” lap siding on the residential upper floors, to differentiate the uses and provide a transition between downtown and the residences on the rest of the block. Exercising his authority specified in the PUD, the Planning Director accepted the lap siding on this design—a material not allowed in the B-4 and O-1 districts under the LDDS.

The wind turbines which are a prominent part of this building’s design cannot meet the LDDS requirement that rooftop mechanical equipment be screened with architectural materials consistent with the overall design, nor are they regarded as “necessary mechanical appurtenances” under the zoning code. Planning staff proposed that the turbines would be acceptable if well-integrated into the original design as clearly “purposeful” features. The applicant accepted that condition and the project designers will offer details to show the turbines’ placement and support structures as “purposeful” elements of the design. Energy devices such as wind turbines and solar collectors may need to be more explicitly addressed in both the zoning code and the Downtown Design Standards.
SUMMARY

Only a handful of projects were built in the B-4 and O-1 districts of Downtown and Antelope Valley this year, so the Lincoln Downtown Design Standards have not been very thoroughly tested. Nine projects were reviewed and approved, some with slight modifications to meet standards. The Archrival building has not been approved, pending resolution of the façade material (concrete block). The multiple paths to approval (administrative, Planning Director, Urban Design Committee/Capitol Environs Commission) were helpful in expediting the review and approval of diverse projects that ranged from modest additions or remodels to new construction estimated at over $40 million. No project was appealed to City Council.

Areas for improvement of the standards may include

• screening of outdoor uses in addition to parking lots, and
• specific language to address wind turbines, solar collectors, and other mechanical appurtenances that cannot or should not be screened in the manner that cooling towers or similar HVAC equipment should be screened,
• continued attention to materials, so as not to disadvantage innovative projects. For instance, applicants might be offered the option of an alternative design review process by one of the citizen design boards—Urban Design Committee, Historic Preservation Commission, or Nebr. Capitol Environs Commission—under a descriptive set of design goals, in lieu of the current administrative process of review under the current prescriptive set of design standards. In effect, that option is available now as an appeal from a negative finding by staff, but a more positive option might be to go directly to a design board with an innovative project.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Zimmer, Planning Dept.
November 25, 2009
Mr. Brobst: I have answered your questions, as best I can. I thought the easiest way to do so was to write my responses below each of your questions in a different font style, and this is all contained in the attached document. Please feel free to contact me if I can be of further assistance. The City Council Office asked me to respond on the Council’s behalf, as well.

Best regards,

Tom Casady
Chief of Police
Lincoln Police Department
575 S. 10th Street
Lincoln, NE  68508
402.441.7237
mailto:tcasady@lincoln.ne.gov

From: Mary Brobst [mailto:mjbrobst@windstream.net]
Sent: Saturday, December 05, 2009 2:21 PM
To: LPD304@CJIS.LINCOLN.NE.GOV
Subject: Alarm Ordinance

Concerning the upcoming Alarm Ordinance changes, this is the letter that was sent to all city council members:

Attn: Members of Lincoln City Council and Chief Tom Cassady

Re: Ordinance 09-151 Emergency Alarms

As a local business owner and user of an alarm system, I would like to address issues with parts of the proposed ordinance changes to municipal codes, and ask other questions I feel are pertinent to the proposed changes. Whereas the council feels that the cost of responding to the alarm calls are excessively expensive to the local police department, it needs to:

A) Require permits that previously have not been needed to handle alarm systems
B) Reduce the number of allowable false alarms that are not paid for by the users
C) Increase the amount of penalty the user pays for false alarms
D) Create a bureaucratic Board previously unneeded
E) Establish penalties for non-compliance
F) Increase legalese and additional unnecessary pages to the municipal code

Please help me to understand and sort out these issues and questions.
1) Can Chief Cassady provide statistics related to:

   A. The number of total alarm calls in Lincoln and breakdown to:
      1. Businesses
      2. Residence/Individuals
      3. City-Public Offices
   B. Can he attribute the number of false alarms to each of the above?
   C. Provide costs and time estimated to respond to alarm calls in relation to total officer shift times
   D. Show a formula used to establish false alarm fees and permit fees
   E. Show permit costs and false alarm fees in comparable cities
   F. Show where this enormous amount of money would be used
   G. Explain how a permit fee will reduce false alarms

2) What is the purpose of the Alarm Review Board. This sounds like unnecessary beaurocracy. Will these people be paid? How often does the board meet? Will they have access to sensitive information concerning alarm systems, business owners and homeowners with alarm systems? If Chief Cassady can reinstate permits as stated on pg 16 line 3-9, why the Review Board?

3) What are the circumstances under which a permit would be denied, revoked or suspended? You have an entire appeal process in place without defining any indications. Who writes this stuff? Pg 14, line 25-26, pages 15 & 16.

4) Do these changes to the ordinance propose to create a position of Official City Alarm Permit Contractor? pg 16

5) Why such a short notification period by the city to alarm users and alarm businesses? This doesn't allow for out-of-town or out of country times when people are gone on vacation or business trips. US Congress just dealt with the credit card companies for the same type of practice. Pg 16, line 13-21

6) Why are motor vehicle alarms, city-public office alarms and fire alarms excluded from these ordinance changes? Do Police responses to these systems take less time? Are they better systems?

7) If someone wants an alarm that is not monitored and doesn't request Police response why is it included in alarm user definition?

8) Does a cell phone, computer, or land line qualify as an alarm system as defined in pg 3, line 9-17? If I notify 911 of a fire or call Police because someone is being assaulted, would I be fined for not registering or obtaining a permit for my phone or computer?

9) As set forth in appeals procedure, pg 14, line 24, pg 15 and pg 16, line 1-2, would this process possibly increase the burden on the local judicial system?

My wife and I have done business in Lincoln for 27 years. We have used an alarm system the entire time with minimal false alarms. We have never paid a permit fee and never a false alarm fee that I am aware of. These changes seem to be a blatant grab for money to help fill city coffers. Where would these permit fees go? Possibly extra officers to answer these false alarms or to
general funds to be spent willy nilly! The cost of doing business is high enough, business owners don't need more permits and fees. If there are habitual false alarms by selected parties let them pay an increased amount to the police department for their time! An ordinance change like this is not about improving the system in place, it's about greed pure and simple! I would propose the council postpone these ordinance changes and get more public input. These changes would amount to quite a bit of money. I for one would like to have more information before these changes are made.

Respectfully

Doug Brobst
Gold Smith Jewelers

www.GoldSmithJewelers-NE.com
Attn: Members of Lincoln City Council and Chief Tom Cassady

Re: Ordinance 09-151  Emergency Alarms

As a local business owner and user of an alarm system, I would like to address issues with parts of the proposed ordinance changes to municipal codes, and ask other questions I feel are pertinent to the proposed changes. Whereas the council feels that the cost of responding to the alarm calls are excessively expensive to the local police department, it needs to:

A) Require permits that previously have not been needed to handle alarm systems
B) Reduce the number of allowable false alarms that are not paid for by the users
C) Increase the amount of penalty the user pays for false alarms
D) Create a bureaucratic Board previously unneeded
E) Establish penalties for non-compliance
F) Increase legalese and additional unnecessary pages to the municipal code

Please help me to understand and sort out these issues and questions.

1) Can Chief Cassady provide statistics related to:

   A. The number of total alarm calls in Lincoln and breakdown to:
      1. Businesses 1,990
      2. Residence/Individuals 786
      3. City-Public Offices 19 City/County, 8 State, 22 Federal

   B. Can he attribute the number of false alarms to each of the above?

   All the above are as of Midnight yesterday, December 6, 2009.

   C. Provide costs and time estimated to respond to alarm calls in relation to total officer shift times.

   Each alarm results in the dispatch of a minimum of two officers, and I would estimate that approximately 1.25 person hours of time is involved.

   D. Show a formula used to establish false alarm fees and permit fees
When I was asked by the City Law Department to provide some basis for determining the cost of responding to an alarm, I took the total budget of the police department and divided by the total number of dispatched events. I believe the Law Department wanted to make sure that the fees charged could be justified by the actual costs. This year, the police department’s budget is $35,106.030. By the end of the year, we will have responded to about 128,000 events.

E. Show permit costs and false alarm fees in comparable cities

I am unaware of any source for this data, other than a survey. The registration fee proposed is the same as Omaha. Omaha allows one free false alarm annually. The second and third alarms incur a $100 fee. The fourth and subsequent alarms result in a $250 fee. From my own conversations with other police chiefs over the years, I believe this is fairly typical, and that Lincoln is below the average on our fines, and above average on our no-charge false alarm threshold.

F. Show where this enormous amount of money would be used

I would estimate that this ordinance would result annually in about $100,000 in new revenue to the City, which would all go into the General Fund. None of these funds are earmarked for a specific use.

G. Explain how a permit fee will reduce false alarms

The permit fee would help to defray the cost of managing and administering the false alarm program, and to defray the cost of responding to false alarms.

2) What is the purpose of the Alarm Review Board. This sounds like unnecessary bureaucracy. Will these people be paid? How often does the board meet? Will they have access to sensitive information concerning alarm systems, business owners and homeowners with alarm systems? If Chief
Cassady can reinstate permits as stated on pg 16 line 3-9, why the Review Board?

As stated in the ordinance, the board exists to hear appeals from persons who have received denials, suspensions, revocations, or fee notices with which they disagree. The members would receive no compensation. The board would set its own meeting schedule, presumably based on the number of appeals. I believe Omaha’s appeal board meets monthly. Lincoln has some similar appeal boards that deal with other issues, established in ordinance. Taxi licenses and peddlers permits are the two I serve on, and these meet on an “as needed” basis, when appeals are filed. I would imagine that whether the alarm appeals board meets on a regular basis or schedules based on individual appeals will depend on how many appeals are filed. The members of the board would only receive information about the alarm system if that information was provided by the person filing the appeal.

Reinstatement of a revoked permit by the Chief of Police is discretionary even in the absence of an appeal, if the person or business meets the requirements outlined. Although I did not draft this, it appears to be a provision intended to allow for a speedy reinstatement without the need for an appeal in those circumstances where the alarm owner or business has taken care of the issues that led to the revocation.

3) What are the circumstances under which a permit would be denied, revoked or suspended? You have an entire appeal process in place without defining any indications. Who writes this stuff? Pg 14, line 25-26, pages 15 & 16.

That is up to the appeal board. It appears that this was intentionally left rather open ended, so that the board could make its own determinations on what they feel is good cause. This ordinance was drafted by lawyers in the City Law Department.
4) Do these changes to the ordinance propose to create a position of Official City Alarm Permit Contractor? pg 16

No, but it would be my intention, if this ordinance passes, to outsource the registration process and accounts receivable to a private firm selected on a competitive basis.

5) Why such a short notification period by the city to alarm users and alarm businesses? This doesn't allow for out-of-town or out of country times when people are gone on vacation or business trips. US Congress just dealt with the credit card companies for the same type of practice. Pg 16, line 13-21

This part of the ordinance simply establishes the presumption that the alarm businesses and alarm owners have been notified three days after a first-class mailing. Laws that include some kind of notification typically have a definition of what constitutes notice, and when that notice is deemed to have taken place. The appeal may be filed within 10 days after notice, and the fee itself is due within 90 days of notice.

6) Why are motor vehicle alarms, city-public office alarms and fire alarms excluded from these ordinance changes? Do Police responses to these systems take less time? Are they better systems?

This was a decision that I assume was made by the introducer, based on the specific issues he was interested in addressing. The preamble describes the issues the introducer is addressing with this proposed legislation.

7) If someone wants an alarm that is not monitored and doesn't request Police response why is it included in alarm user definition?

I cannot tell you what the introducer had in mind, but from my perspective, even a local audible alarm, when it is activated, may result in a police dispatch. The owner may just wish to scare off an intruder, but when other people hear the alarm, a 911 call is likely.
8) Does a cell phone, computer, or land line qualify as an alarm system as defined in pg 3, line 9-17? If I notify 911 of a fire or call Police because someone is being assaulted, would I be fined for not registering or obtaining a permit for my phone or computer?

No.

9) As set forth in appeals procedure, pg 14, line 24, pg 15 and pg 16, line 1-2, would this process possibly increase the burden on the local judicial system?

I think this is unlikely, based on the experience of other cities. I believe that the appeal process will minimize the likelihood that any of these cases proceed to court. Under Lincoln’s current ordinance, all false alarm violations are criminal court cases.

My wife and I have done business in Lincoln for 27 years. We have used an alarm system the entire time with minimal false alarms. We have never paid a permit fee and never a false alarm fee that I am aware of. These changes seem to be a blatant grab for money to help fill city coffers. Where would these permit fees go? Possibly extra officers to answer these false alarms or to general funds to be spent willy nilly! The cost of doing business is high enough, business owners don’t need more permits and fees. If there are habitual false alarms by selected parties let them pay an increased amount to the police department for their time! An ordinance change like this is not about improving the system in place, it’s about greed pure and simple! I would propose the council postpone these ordinance changes and get more public input. These changes would amount to quite a bit of money. I for one would like to have more information before these changes are made.

Respectfully

Doug Brobst
Gold Smith Jewelers
Kitty,

Here is the response that we are planned on sending. Does the information you gave me yesterday, change the second to last paragraph where Larry says "office hours" message can be easily revised to comply with Mr. Feyerherm's comments........office hours, and then option for direct connection to the operator, who could respond to route/schedule requests followed by other information now on tape? If not, please add the information that you gave me. If it does change it, please revise.

Thanks

I have followed up on the phone messages utilized by StarTran, as follows:

During 7:30A-4:30P - weekday "office hours", patrons calling the designated 476-1234 StarTran Information Line receive one of the three following responses:

1. The staff receptionist answers the phone, and provides information requested by the caller, or
2. If the staff receptionist is already on the information line, the caller hears a message to "please hold," and then the receptionist picks up when available.
3. If the staff receptionist is gone for an extended period (lunch, vacation, ill, and from 7:30-8:00A), the caller hears a 60-90 second informational/promotional message with the option of pushing "0" for route information at the end of the taped message (sample message attached). Then the contracted answering service representative gives route/schedule and other information as requested, or refers to specific StarTran staff person.

After hours (4:30P-7:30A) on weekdays and on weekends (Saturday & Sunday), the caller hears a message that StarTran Offices are closed, followed by an informational/promotional message (sample message attached).

In this regard........
Mr. Feyerherm likely hears the third option under the "office hours" description above, as the receptionist was at a medical appointment yesterday morning, or he called between 7:30-8:00A.

- StarTran previously offered 24-hour/7 days per week route/schedule information by the receptionist staff person and the contracted service. Such informational services were reduced to only being offered during "office hours" as a result of budget reductions.
- StarTran will be offering a "trip planner" service in conjunction with the AVL Program. The "trip planner" designs are underway, paid by current ARRA "Stimulus" program funding. When implemented, the "trip planner" will provide route/schedule information by computer (no need for personal interaction) 24/7.

Specific to Mr. Feyerherms' concerns/suggestions ...
Mr. Feyerherm is objecting to having to listen to the 60-90 second taped informational/promotional message before being afforded the opportunity to "press 0" to speak to an operator to receive route/schedule information. His objection is acknowledged, as he was apparently not interested in the taped information, and specifically wanted only route/schedule information, which was received. This method has been utilized since December, 2003, with no recalled complaints other than Mr. Feyerherm's. Staff have, however, been advised by callers that they preferred the current
"tape first, operator second" order, as they were inquiring regarding the initial taped information, and did not need to speak to the operator. So, it just depends on one's needs. The "office hours" message can be easily revised to comply with Mr. Feyerherm's comments........office hours, and then option for direct connection to the operator, who could respond to route/schedule requests followed by other information now on tape.

Per J. Camp's suggestion, what do other departments do for their taped messages? Should there be a consistent city-wide policy?

Larry

From: Jon Camp [mailto:JonCamp@lincolnhaymarket.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2009 9:14 AM
To: Larry D. Worth
Cc: Mayor; ronfeyerherm@yahoo.com
Subject: Ron Feyerherm Suggestions

Larry:

Forgive me for directing this to you on my personal email address, but I am trying to save time.

I received a telephone call from Ron Feyerherm a few minutes ago, during which he offered some constructive suggestions for your telephone answering message. He had encountered some car trouble and was seeking route information and became frustrated with (1) the confusion of your 24-hour message regarding "office closed" time periods and also the need to continue listening for approximately 90 seconds to go through the complete message.

His suggestions are:

1. Can a quick statement be made on office hours, followed by
2. Short messages like "press 1 for schedule, press 2 for Y, press 3 for Z, or press 0 for other information/operator".

Thanks for your attention to this matter. Perhaps City-wide we should also review other departments to see how telephone messages can be kept concise for the benefit of the citizens who are making inquiries.

Best regards,

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

Security is mostly superstition. It does not exist in nature, nor do the children of men as a whole experience it.
This is the StarTran answering service as their receptionist is currently unavailable.

The best way to get to and from each home football game is by taking StarTran’s “Big Red Express.” This service is available from the following five lots: Southeast Community College at 88th & “O” Streets, Holmes Lake at 70th & Normal, Westfield Shoppingtown Gateway at 61st & “O” Streets, North Star High School- 6 blocks east of N. 27th & Folkways Blvd., and SouthPointe Pavilions at 27th & Pine Lake Road. Cost if $4.00 each way/$8.00 roundtrip. Service begins 2 hours prior to kickoff and returns immediately after the game.

StarTran office hours are Monday thru Friday, 8:00-4:30. Bus fare is $1.75, children 4 and under are FREE, elderly and disabled (with proper ID) is 85 cents.

If your income is under 200% of poverty guidelines, you may qualify for low income bus passes, ask to see if you are eligible or check out the Ride for $7.50 on our website for more information.

Lost and found can be checked and claimed at the StarTran office during normal business office hours of 8:00-4:30, Monday thru Friday. Buses run every day Monday thru Saturday, with the exception of, New Year’s Day, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day and Christmas Day.

All schedules and routes are in printable format, on the City’s website, which is startran.lincoln.ne.gov.

If you still need route information at this time, please dial 0 and the answering service operator will try to assist you. Thank you for using StarTran and remember, “Get On Board.”
The StarTran office is closed at this time. Regular office hours are Monday thru Friday, 8a.m. to 4:30p.m.

The best way to get to and from each home football game is by taking StarTran’s “Big Red Express.” This service is available from the following five lots: Southeast Community College at 88th & “O” Streets, Holmes Lake at 70th & Normal, Westfield Shoppingtown Gateway at 61st & “O” Streets, North Star High School- 6 blocks east of N. 27th & Folkways Blvd., and SouthPointe Pavilions at 27th & Pine Lake Road. Cost if $4.00 each way/$8.00 roundtrip. Service begins 2 hours prior to kickoff and returns immediately after the game.

If your income is under 200% of poverty guidelines, you may qualify for low income bus passes, ask to see if you are eligible or check out the Ride for $7.50 on our website for more information.

All routes and schedule information is available on the City’s website, which is startran. lincoln.ne.gov. Thank you for using StarTran and, remember, Get On Board!
Letter from Bob Hinman regarding "Towgate"!

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

Security is mostly superstition. It does not exist in nature, nor do the children of men as a whole experience it.

Avoiding danger in the long run is no safer than outright exposure. Life is either a daring adventure or it is nothing.

- Helen Keller

Holly, here is a copy of the letter I sent to a Mr. Abram Morales, owner of the La Tapitia store in Lincoln. I want to thank Jon Camp for all of his hard work in following up on this incident for us and for some of the other people who had their cars towed that night. Let me know when you receive the check so that I can follow through with Jon and Abram Morales that this matter has been settled.

Bob

December 8, 2009

Mr. Abram Morales
C/O La Tapitia
1037 L Street
Dear Mr. Morales:

My family parked our car on your lot on November 7, 2009 as your employees had a sign out for football parking for a fee of $10.00. This issue has been discussed between you and City Councilman, Jon Camp. This was during the Oklahoma vs. Nebraska football game. The game ended at around 10:50pm and by the time the stadium cleared out and we walked back to your lot, almost all of the cars in the lot had been towed off it. The towing company was the most obnoxious and rude bunch of people that we had ever met and of course demanded cash from all of the owners of the cars. Many of the owners where from out of town and were forced to find an ATM machine to get the $125.00 that the towing company were charging. We feel that these actions left a black mark on the city of Lincoln and in fact it cost the city a lot of money for all of the 911 calls and officers being dispatched to your lot and the tow companies lot to find out what all the complaints were about.

Mr. Morales, in your conversation with Councilman Camp, and my conversation with him later, he indicated that you would do the right thing and refund our towing cost back to us. I would appreciate it if you could send a check in the amount of $125.00 to Ms. Hollis Schario in Overland Park Kansas. She is my sister and it was her car that was towed. Her address is:

Ms. Hollis Schario
10705 West 25th Place
Overland Park KS 66213

Thank you for stepping up and doing what is right in this matter.

Robert L. Hinman
Maineville, OH 45039

cc. Jon Camp Lincoln City Council

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.426 / Virus Database: 270.14.97/2550 - Release Date: 12/08/09 19:54:00
December 8, 2009

Mr. Abram Morales  
c/o La Tapitia  
1037 L Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Mr. Morales:

My family parked our car on your lot on November 7, 2009 as your employees had a sign out for football parking for a fee of $10.00. This issue has been discussed between you and City Councilman, Jon Camp. This was during the Oklahoma vs. Nebraska football game. The game ended at around 10:50pm and by the time the stadium cleared out and we walked back to your lot, almost all of the cars in the lot had been towed off it. The towing company was the most obnoxious and rude bunch of people that we had ever met and of course demanded cash from all of the owners of the cars. Many of the owners where from out of town and were forced to find an ATM machine to get the $125.00 that the towing company were charging. We feel that these actions left a black mark on the city of Lincoln and in fact it cost the city a lot of money for all of the 911 calls and officers being dispatched to your lot and the tow companies lot to find out what all the complaints were about.

Mr. Morales, in your conversation with Councilman Camp, and my conversation with him later, he indicated that you would do the right thing and refund our towing cost back to us. I would appreciate it if you could send a check in the amount of $125.00 to Ms. Hollis Schario in Overland Park Kansas. She is my sister and it was her car that was towed. Her address is:

Ms. Hollis Schario  
10705 West 25th Place  
Overland Park KS 66213

Thank you for stepping up and doing what is right in this matter.

Robert L. Hinman  
Maineville, OH 45039

cc. Jon Camp Lincoln City Council
December 2, 2009

City Council Chairman Doug Emery  
City Council District 1  
County-City Building  
555 S. 10th Street  
Lincoln, NE 68508

Dear Chairman Emery:

I am writing to thank you for all the time you spent listening to concerns raised by the Lincoln Employers' coalition with regard to the rate increase proposed by LES. The action you took to reduce the increase to 2.4% indicates how seriously you take your role in establishing those rates and in listening to the concerns of the public, as well as large industrial users. Our goal, as we conveyed to you, is to make Lincoln an attractive location for industrial growth and new industries, both of which bring jobs to the fine city you represent.

If there is ever any information we can provide you about industry in Lincoln, please don't hesitate to call.

Thanks again for your consideration and action.

Sincerely,

Ronald E. Smith

cc:  Bob Caldwell  
     Andy Pollock

RES/1kg
From: WebForm [none@lincoln.ne.gov]
Sent: Saturday, December 05, 2009 3:31 PM
To: Tammy J. Grammer
Subject: InterLinc: Council Feedback

InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name: Janet Wheatley
Address: 1000 Smoky Hill Rd
City: Lincoln, NE, 68520

Phone: 
Fax: 
Email: jwheatley1@earthlink.net

Comment or Question:
I received my 2009 Real Estate Tax Statement today and my valuation went up almost $10,000 from last year and my annual taxes up $160. My home is getting older, I contested the valuation when they came out. No matter, $160 is never what the papers and council report to be the increase, because each portion or the real estate taxes is ONLY an increase of what seems to be reported as $2 or something small.

Lincoln is a VERY expensive city to live in when it comes to taxes. My Real Estate taxes are $272/per month. Then I pay more for wheel tax, sales tax and gas taxes to live in this city. I pay more for wheel tax than I pay to license my car (old car because it is hard to buy a new car these days). Ridiculous in this economy. My pay has not gone up. This is not a town to retire in. Who can afford it?
I'm not happy and I needed to tell someone.
I represent Amerifund Commercial Corp, we perform Municipal Bond lease financing and have developed a lease back financing structure for communities that may not be able to avail themselves to General Operating Bonds or alternatives to bank financing.

Amerifund has been in business as a lender for over twenty five years. Our group can purchase your properties, or projects, lease them back, with ownership transferring to the municipality upon completion of lease requirements. There is a growing interest in this type of structure among smaller communities.

We recently contacted your municipality in regards to lease back purchasing for existing buildings owned by the municipality. With the continued revenue issues experienced by many communities lease back financing can be a solution for future long term capital projects.

Most of the response, received has been in regards to financing for new construction buildings. We can offer up to thirty year amortization lease back program, typical Bond lease terms are twenty years or less, we structure the lease terms to fit the needs of the community debt service as well as the scope of project. We can provide Bond lease financing for Office buildings, Judicial Centers, and Courthouses, Police, and Fire Stations, as well as maintenance, and warehouse facilities.

One hundred percent of the construction hard and soft costs can be included in these Finance structures as well as the construction interest. We issue a Bond and staggered series of bank drafts to cover the draw schedules of even the largest projects.

Our lease programs meet Federal Accounting Standards Board requirements for treatment as an operating lease and as such, are exempted from long term debt calculation. State and local provisions can differ we recommend you check with your accounting and legal departments. This exemption can be a valuable tool to ensure that your Municipalities debt to revenue ratios do not negatively impact your credit ratings from the major agencies.

Our lease back programs can be bought out at a future date should needs and requirements of your municipality change.

If you have an interest in more information or would like a quote for a specific transaction please let us know.

Respectfully

Michael Grover
Gulf Stream Funding / Amerifund Commercial Corp
8521 Leesburg Pike Suite 4 302
Vienna Virginia 22182
703 639 0785 Office  240 498 3142  Direct  mgrover@gulfstreamfunding.com