IN LIEU OF
DIRECTORS’ MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2011

I. CITY CLERK

II. MAYOR
1. NEWS RELEASE. 911 Center to demonstrate call simulator, June 22, 2011 at 1:30 p.m., at the F Street Recreation Center.

III. DIRECTORS

CITY LIBRARIES
1. NEWS RELEASE. Library Board of Trustees vacancy announced.

PARKS AND RECREATION
1. Neighborhood Park mini grants still available for volunteers.
   a) Mini-grant program information and application.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1. Nebraska Capitol Environs Commission June meeting cancelled.
3. Administrative Amendment No. 11020 to Use Permit No. 150B, Appian Way Regional Shopping Center Phase II, approved by the Planning Director on June 15, 2011.

PLANNING COMMISSION
1. Revised Planning Commission Special Public Hearing minutes held on the CIP/TIP on May 25, 2011.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT/
HOUSING REHAB & REAL ESTATE DIVISION
1. Street and alley vacation No. 11006. Pine Lake Road east of South 84th Street.

IV. COUNCIL MEMBERS

JON CAMP
1. Councilman Camp’s concerns on the proposed language for the Dangerous Building Code sent to City Attorney Rod Confer.
   a) Reply from City Attorney Confer.

V. MISCELLANEOUS - None

VI. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS
1. Email from Marguerite Young stating her opposition to a strip club on O Street.
2. Correspondence from Allan Amsberry on the use of TIF for the University Credit Union project.
3. Telephone message from Paula Nicholls encouraging Council to proceed with the widening of Old Cheney Road using the engineers plan/Plan A.
4. Letter from Peter S. Levitov stating why the Lincoln City Libraries should remain open seven days a week, with no reduced hours. (Individual letter sent to each Council Member)
5. Downtown Lincoln Association letter to the Lincoln City Council voicing strong opposition to the recently approved application for the Viper Room/Drunken Monkey to operate in the greater downtown area. received

VII. ADJOURNMENT
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: June 22, 2011
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Julie Righter, Communications Manager, 402-441-7252

911 CENTER TO DEMONSTRATE CALL SIMULATOR

The Lincoln Emergency Communications/911 Center will demonstrate its 911 Call Simulator at 1:30 today at the “F” Street Recreation Center, 1225 “F” Street. A 911 Emergency Services Dispatcher will use the simulator to teach children and adults what they need to know and what they should do in case of an emergency.

A grant from the Community Health Endowment funded the purchase of the device from Retina Systems Inc.

Those wanting to schedule demonstrations at community or neighborhood events can contact Julie Righter, 911 Communications Manager, at jrighter@lincoln.ne.gov or 402-441-7252. More information on Lincoln’s 911 Center is available on the City website at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: 911). More information on the simulator is available at 911interactivesimulator.com.
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LIBRARY BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Vacancy Announced

The Library Board of Trustees of Lincoln City Libraries seeks a candidate to fill an upcoming vacancy on the Library Board. One seven-year appointment (2011-2018) is available due to the completion of a member’s seven-year term.

The Board of Trustees of the Lincoln City Libraries is a seven member administrative board appointed by the Lincoln City Council. It is the trustee’s obligation to work toward improvement in library services through well-trained staff and efficient use of funds, to support adequate funding for library services, and to promote the best possible use of all library resources. The mission of Lincoln City Libraries is to foster the power of reading and provide open access to all forms of information to enrich people’s lives every day.

Interested individuals should send a letter of interest along with a completed Board Appointment Information form to library@lincolnlibraries.org - or mail to Candidate Search, Lincoln City Libraries, 136 S 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68508. The Board Appointment Information form is available from the Director’s Office by calling 402-441-8512 or by printing a copy from the library’s website, http://www.lincolnlibraries.org/board/boardappointmentinfo.pdf. Deadline for submission of materials is Wednesday, July 13, 2011.

After review the Library Board will forward information from all interested individuals to the City Council along with any recommendations the Library Board may have.

Library Board members must be residents of Lincoln.

###

Barbara Hansen
Administrative Aide
Lincoln City Libraries
402-441-8512
June 15, 2011 Media Release

Contact: Danielle Conrad, Lincoln Parks Foundation (402-441-8258) or director@lincolnparks.org

**Neighborhood Park Mini Grants Still Available for Volunteers**

The Lincoln Parks Foundation's Board of Directors announced that the deadline for Neighborhood Park Mini Grants has been extended. Mini grants are perfect for neighborhood associations, service clubs, youth groups, and others. Awards will be distributed until program resources are depleted. A good example of an approved mini grant was featured in the Lincoln Journal Star this week. A group of neighbors have committed volunteer efforts to mowing Rudge Memorial Park and taking care of other maintenance tasks. The Lincoln Parks Foundation is providing financial assistance for gas and other supplies.

Lincoln is the proud home of 125 neighborhood parks and 128 miles of trails which are important to our strong quality of life. Families and individuals of every age and from each section of our City’s diverse neighborhood tapestry enjoy spending time in our beautiful public spaces for entertainment, recreation, and wellness. The mini-grant program was established to encourage volunteer efforts within the park and recreation system. Participants will receive recognition and will be invited to enjoy an end of the season volunteer appreciation party. Mini grants are made possible thanks to the generosity of our private donors and the Friends of Lincoln Parks.

To learn more about program and access application forms please visit [www.lincolnparks.org](http://www.lincolnparks.org) or call 402-441-8258.
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Mini-Grant Program Information & Application

Program Overview:

Lincoln is the proud home of 125 neighborhood parks and 128 miles of trails which are important to our strong quality of life. Families and individuals of every age and from each section of our City’s diverse neighborhood tapestry enjoy spending time in our beautiful public spaces for entertainment, recreation, and wellness. The Lincoln Parks Foundation has made a commitment to providing mini-grants for distribution in 2011 to support enhancements in neighborhood parks and along trails.

Program Purpose & Grant Eligibility:

The mini-grant program was established to incentivize new and expand existing volunteer efforts within the park and recreation system. Neighborhood associations, businesses, civic groups, youth groups, running clubs, and any other group or individual who participates in the ‘Adopt a Landscape’ program will be eligible to apply for mini-grants. ‘Adopt a Landscape’ materials are included. In addition to mini-grant eligibility ‘Adopt A Landscape’ participants will also be recognized on our website and in other publications and will be invited to enjoy an end of the season volunteer appreciation party compliments of the Lincoln Parks Foundation.

Project Eligibility:

Mini-grants will fund projects on a list of identified enhancements complied by the Lincoln Parks & Recreation Department or project ideas that are submitted by ‘Adopt a Landscape’ participants. All grants must enhance existing neighborhood parks and trails. Additional project ideas must identify the following information in order to be considered: Contact information, Project Location, Brief description of project including cost estimate, Description of who will complete the project with relevant timeline, and how enhancements will be documented. (Mini-Grant Application Attached)

Application Period:

Applicants must submit a grant application to the Lincoln Parks Foundation at any time in 2011. Awards will be made to qualifying projects until grant resources have been expended.
Mini Grant Application

Group, Business, or Individual Name:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Contact Name: _____________________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________________

City, State, Zip: ____________________________________________________________________

Phone: ____________________________

Email: ____________________________

Adopt a Landscape Participant: _____ Yes    _____ No

Project Location:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Project Description:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________
Project Cost Estimate: _______________________

Timeline: _________________________________

Work Plan:
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Other Information:
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

*Approved grants will be subject to an accounting of funds at the conclusion of each project. Simply save your receipts and send copies to the Lincoln Parks Foundation, 2740 A Street, Lincoln NE 68502. Thank you!
The June 2011 Nebraska Capitol Environs Commission meeting has been cancelled due to a lack of agenda items.

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

Michele Abendroth  
Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Department  
555 South 10th Street, Suite 213  
Lincoln, NE 68508  
402-441-6164
Annexation by Final Plat
The Woodlands at Yankee Hill 3rd Addition
S 84th St & Yankee Hill Blvd
Effective:  June 16, 2011
16.72 Acres
Memorandum

Date:  June 21, 2011
To:  City Clerk
From:  Teresa McKinstry, Planning Dept.
Re:  Administrative Approvals
cc:  Jean Preister

This is a list of the Administrative Approvals that were approved by the Planning Director from June 14, 2011 thru June 20, 2011:

Administrative Amendment No. 11020 to Use Permit No. 150B, Appian Way Regional Shopping Center Phase II, approved by the Planning Director on June 15, 2011, requested by Tallgrass Development, LLC., to revise the Land Use Table for Lot 3, Block 2, to show the allocated floor area as automobile sales and amending the trip generation calculations accordingly, on property located on the 8800 block of Amber Hill Court.
To: Mayor's Capital Improvements Advisory Committee

Attached please find the revised Minutes of the Planning Commission Special Public Hearing held on the CIP/TIP on May 25, 2011. At the request of one of the Planning Commission members, the Urban Development Department discussion is now basically verbatim and can be found beginning at the bottom of page 4 through page 9.

These revised minutes were approved by the Planning Commission at their regular meeting on June 15, 2011.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

--Jean Preister, Administrative Officer
Planning Department
402-441-6365
MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, May 25, 2011, 1:00 p.m., City Council Chambers, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Leirion Gaylord Baird, Michael Cornelius, Dick Esseks, Wendy Francis, Roger Larson, Jeanelle Lust, Lynn Sunderman and Tommy Taylor (Jim Partington absent); David Cary, Michael Brienza, Sara Hartzell and Jean Preister of the Planning Department; other Departmental representatives; media and interested citizens.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Special Public Hearing on the City of Lincoln’s draft six year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for FY 2011/2012 - 2016/2017 and the draft FY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Lincoln and Lancaster County area (Lincoln MPO)

Chair Lynn Sunderman called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the back of the room.

This is a special public hearing on the City’s six-year Capital Improvements Program and FY2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program for the Lincoln Metropolitan Area (MPO).

THE PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW EDITION OF THE CITY OF LINCOLN DRAFT SIX YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP) FOR FY 2011/12 - 2016/17.

PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: May 25, 2011

Members present: Larson, Esseks, Cornelius, Taylor, Francis, Gaylord Baird, Lust and Sunderman (Partington absent).

Ex parte communications: None.

Staff presentation: David Cary of Planning staff provided a brief overview. The Capital Improvements Program (CIP), provides a multi-year list of proposed capital expenditures for the City and is one of the most important responsibilities of municipal government. This program attempts to set funding strategies not only for the next fiscal budget year, but also to project future needs for major construction projects and land acquisition. The City
constantly looks ahead to consider how we will improve major items such as roads, utilities, police facilities, fire facilities, parks, libraries and other community buildings for the people of Lincoln. Capital expenditures are viewed not only in the context of how much the new project will cost, but also what impact the project will have on the City's operating budget. Capital improvements are projects that generally have a useful life of fifteen or more years that maintain, upgrade or replace public infrastructure and public service providing facilities.

The CIP is not intended to be an all-inclusive inventory of the City of Lincoln's capital needs for the upcoming six years. It is a document that outlines planned capital improvements given available financial resources.

The Lincoln City Charter assigns responsibility for assembling the City's annual six-year CIP to the City's Planning Department. This process involves coordinating the assessment of the City's capital needs across more than a dozen different departments and agencies. Each City department assesses its capital needs and creates an improvement program for a six-year period. The individual capital project requests are submitted to the Planning Department and assembled into a single document that becomes the CIP. Each program is evaluated for conformity with the City-County Comprehensive Plan along with the most recent funding projections and revenue calculations.

Lincoln's six-year CIP is updated annually, beginning in the winter, when City departments prepare their proposed capital improvement program. The Mayor's Capital Improvements Advisory Committee (CIAC) guides the development of the document. A great deal of effort and work is done by dozens of staff members across city departments to develop this program and their efforts are appreciated.

Per the City Charter, the CIP is reviewed for conformity with the 2030 City-County Comprehensive Plan by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission makes a recommendation as to conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and this recommendation, along with public testimony, is passed on to the Mayor and City Council for consideration in budget discussions over the summer. Year one of the CIP becomes the Capital Budget for fiscal year 2011/12.

Cary then proceeded to provide a brief overview for each department as follows, and department representatives were available to answer questions.

**FINANCE:**  Communications
The proposed Communications/911 CIP includes two projects designed to enhance operations over the six-year period, including a 800 MHz Trunked Radio System upgrade and a mobile Communications Command Post to provide support in the field. The radio upgrade project is part of a proposed Public Safety Bond Issue planned to go before voters in FY 12/13, and the mobile command post is part of a proposed Public Safety Bond Issue scheduled in FY 16/17.
There was no other public testimony.

**FINANCE: Pershing Auditorium**
Pershing Auditorium’s proposed capital improvements program includes General Revenue funds for the continued minimal maintenance of the Auditorium during the first three years of the program. A bond issue was approved by the voters of the community in May 2010, to build a new arena facility in the Haymarket area. With this approval, the long-term use of the Pershing Center is up for discussion, but in the near-term, Pershing Auditorium will still need to be operational as an arena venue and maintained in a safe and operable condition for several years before the new arena is available for use.

There was no other public testimony.

**FIRE & RESCUE**
Lincoln Fire and Rescue Department’s proposed CIP submittal includes four projects. These projects involve one new fire station, a relocated fire station, a replaced third station, and a general use fire station modifications and repairs project. All projects are proposed to be part of Public Safety Bond Issues planned to go before voters in FY 14/15 and FY 16/17 respectively.

Esseks stated that he would like the audience and the viewing public to know that the Planning Commission did receive a briefing on various parts of the CIP last week, at which time the Commissioners were able to ask questions. This would explain the reason for there being a lack of questions from the Planning Commissioners during this hearing.

**LINCOLN CITY LIBRARIES**
The Lincoln City Libraries program includes six projects in the six-year CIP. The largest single project is the proposed replacement of the Bennett Martin Library in FY 2016/17. This project is proposed for a combination of a general obligation (GO) bond issue and other financing likely to include private fund-raising. Using General Revenue funding, needed heating/cooling and HVAC projects in Bennett Martin Library are slated for FY 12/13, as is a geothermal conversion project at Gere Library. Anderson Branch Library is slated for new HVAC improvements in FY 13/14 using General Revenue funds. Bethany Branch Library is slated for a roof replacement in 14/15, also using General Revenue.

Taylor wondered whether the plan is that the current Bennett Martin Library would be relocated to the Pershing Auditorium. Cary stated that there is ongoing discussion and there will be a study specifically about that topic. There has been consideration of Pershing Auditorium but no decision has been made on that location.

Gaylor Baird sought confirmation that the expenses projected for 2011/12 to renovate Bennett Martin are actually necessary to maintain the building prior to a potential sale. Cary indicated that they are very much needed projects to gain efficiencies for the building
over the longer term, regardless of who is owning the building or the use. If sold, the improvements would be required to be done before the sale.

There was no other public testimony.

**LINCOLN ELECTRIC SYSTEM**
The Lincoln Electric System’s proposed $292.7 million capital program embodies a substantial investment in electrical power supply and distribution for the community over the six-year period. The program plans for 11,000 new customers and an addition of 47 megawatts of power over the six-year period. Underground distribution, with the majority going to new residential and commercial development, new transformers and meters, and power supply, including LES’s investment in the Laramie River Station and new base load generation startup costs for a future plant, account for the largest portions of the program.

There was no other public testimony.

**POLICE DEPARTMENT**
The proposed capital program for the Police Department involves five projects — relocation of the LPD K9 Training Facility, a study for a new Team Assembly Station in south Lincoln and construction of that facility, and a master plan for a new LPD Garage-Maintenance & Repair Facility and construction of that facility. The first project is shown in FY 11/12 using Other Financing to relocate the existing K-9 facility. The LPD Garage-Maintenance & Repair Facility Phase I and II is slated to be part of a Public Safety Bond Issue in FY 14/15. The LPD Team Assembly Station Phase I and II is slated to be part of a Public Safety Bond Issue in FY 16/17.

Esseks inquired about the “other financing” category. Cary explained that that has been a carryover for many years to continue to identify the need for a new canine training facility. The “other financing” is intended to be in grant form — when that funding is made available that project would move forward.

There was no other public testimony.

**URBAN DEVELOPMENT**
The Urban Development Department’s proposed CIP includes twelve projects totaling $18.5 million over the six-year period. The funding for the program consists of Community Improvement Financing (or Tax Increment Financing), Community Development Block Grants, Revenue Bonds, City General Revenue funds, Service Charges, and Other Financing in the form of private financing. Public parking program projects, which were formerly part of the Public Works and Utilities CIP, are a major portion of Urban Development’s CIP.
Notable projects included in the Urban Development CIP are the Civic Plaza project at 13th and P Streets, the Centennial Mall reconstruction project, a Wayfinding Signage project, and a Parking Meters replacement project.

Gaylor Baird inquired about the recommendation for the credit card meters as opposed to leaving them as they are today. David Landis, Director of Urban Development, stated that in the CIP there is a move from our existing meters to one of two options that are out there that are upgrades and make use of technology. One of them is something that looks like what we have now but is capable of being swiped with a credit card, and it would cover two stalls. The other alternative that we have examined is a multi-space meter in two or three places in a block that will cover six, eight or ten stalls, and you would get a sticker and go back and put it on your window for the amount of time. Both of those have advantages and values to them. They are distinctly different for cost purposes.

The ones that we are looking at and hope to be able to achieve are at a rate of about $400 to $600 essentially per stall, and the larger ones that handle a larger area and allow you to get rid of a lot of parking meters because that’s one of the virtues of them, are between $6,000 and $8,000. One of the virtues is that we are moving to a cashless society and lots of people use credit cards. It is convenient and it’s quick. You don’t have to run in and get quarters and come back. And that convenience produces, almost always, card swipers who use usually the maximum on the meter. So, the use of credit card technology improves the amount that the consumer is likely to buy at a time and, for that reason, the payback on these mechanisms, both of them, are relatively quick. The take on a meter goes up because of the convenience that people are buying. One of the downsides is that it requires that you pay for the service fee necessary to use the credit card and that will have to come out of the cost of this as well. In either capacity, we will have fewer parking meters than what we have now, at least visually. And secondly, we should have a greater convenience for people that are going to use Downtown parking.

The reason we like one more than the other: First, the cost per stall is lower with one (the one that only meters two stalls rather than six or eight). The second reason is because parking meters are increasingly complex and they go down and have to be repaired. The place where a single monitor makes very good sense is when you have ten or twelve stalls that it services. But there are lots of Downtown streets that have four stalls. Now it is $8,000 for four stalls. But if you are in those ten or twelve stall situations and the machine goes down, the revenue recovery for all twelve stalls is impinged until you can get it repaired. Both of them are good choices. Both of them would be better than what we have, we think. Of the two, we have asked for the single stall option because we think it’s better, not the least of which is because there isn’t another user in the State of Nebraska, and Lincoln is a high tourist – not from the rest of the country so much – but Nebraska users, and it will be a significant change when they come to a block that doesn’t have a parking meter in it – at least in the way that they see it. We think there is a good chance that they will park and say, "my goodness, Lincoln has moved to no parking - that’s great!!" And then they didn’t see this new technology halfway down the block that they are
supposed to walk to, swipe a card, get a sticker and put it in their car. It will take a learning curve for our outstate guests. Out of state might well be familiar because there are a lot of large cities that use these. But, for that variety of reasons, we are contemplating the use of one of those two technologies. And of the two, we think one of them is at least a better fit for Lincoln right now than the other.

Gaylor Baird feels that there might be a little discrepancy in the cost of those multi-space meters because she spoke with Dallas (McGee) earlier today and he said $5,000. Ken Smith, Parking Manager, indicated that depending upon which options you get with that – there are a variety of different options – and typically what we see it could be from $6,000 to $8,000 on the high side, to be conservative. And really the trend – why the multi-space – is because they offer the credit card option to those cities that had larger on-street rates. The single space meters just didn’t have that communication issue and now they have finally gotten to that point. Cities like Boston and San Francisco have actually gone back to the single space meter or using a variety or hybrid approach to their parking. So now that the single space meters have the technology to do the credit card swipes, they offer that additional functionality for payments for the higher rates.

Gaylor Baird asked what kind of costs are associated with installing the single space meter with the credit card technology on many more meters than you would use if you have a multi-space. Smith stated that on the single space meter there are usually roughly about two different housings and most all your vendors try to fit those two housings into there, so it’s a matter of just basically pulling out the unit that’s in there and putting in a new one, depending that you have all the communications and all the other items set up already. Gaylor Baird asked, is that factored into the cost of them, or is that an additional cost to install? Smith stated that the install is factored in. It would be kind of a combination between the vendor and staff.

Larson inquired as to the number of parking meters that we have in the downtown. Smith stated that there are currently roughly 3800 meters, and the approach here was to look at it in phases, maybe look in the core area for improving the technology, then moving those meters out to the outlying area – so it is kind of a phased approach.

Larson confirmed that they are talking about the single meter approach. Does that mean every space will have a meter of its own or will there still be the double situations that we have now? Smith stated that there are a couple different ways you can do it. You don’t want to be writing parking tickets so the less misuse or the more – I guess having a meter for every single space is inherent – you know that if you pull in there you have to pay the meter. So that is at least my recommendation from Operations and that is what I would shoot for, but there are other options we needed to explore.

Lust asked how energy is provided to the parking meters – is it solar or do we have to hook all of these new meters up to the grid? Smith stated that the meters operate on solar and
then on cloudy days it would be on battery backup. There are little solar grids in the domes that operate the meter.

Larson confirmed that they are talking about a phased-in approach, so you wouldn’t do all of this in one year. Smith recommends to do the core area, which is near the University where we have a lot of students and turnover as well as moving to the south within that basically 10th to 14th Street range.

Larson recalled that Landis stated that the typical parker will buy more time with a credit card. What technology is there that somebody just ahead of you bought two hours and there is still an hour left? Landis stated that that is what we have now. In answer to the question of Commissioner Gaylor Baird – this is one of the options that is available. An option available at higher cost is that when you move out of the stall, you read the absence of the car and go back to zero. But to do that, you pay more when you buy that kind of a meter. Now, with the multi-space meter, that does not apply because what you get is a sticker that you put on your window. And here – and it’s a virtue, I think – if you leave that stall, you’ve bought two hours of time but you leave that stall after an hour, you still have an hour of downtown parking. So if you go someplace else, the sticker will be good for that second hour. So that’s a virtue in that case. If we wanted to, we could buy a meter that would read when somebody left, go to zero and the next parker would pay for the parking that they use. But, if you buy in advance and don’t use all of your meter, there is still an option for the next driver which exists today, and it would exist in the cheaper form of a slide technology as well.

Smith stated that there are also operational issues on the back side of that, too, not only just eliminating the cash, but occupancy sensors give us information for operations – we know if someone has parked there or not; we can send you studies – it just gives us a better managed system if we have that information. He sees it as an addendum – the meter is the first option with an addendum if we have enough money left over, let’s go for the occupancy sensors.

Larson asked about the revenue from parking meters. Landis stated that it is not a general fund. This goes to the parking fund. The parking fund makes a contribution to the general fund. Smith stated that the meter money and the off-street facilities all goes to the parking fund, and then there is a contribution back to the general fund. Landis clarified that it goes to the parking fund but there is a general fund impact because we make a contribution out of that fund to the general fund. Larson presumed that there is also some that goes into the parking bond fund. Smith advised that calculation works best if we pull all the funds to the parking fund, then we do our calculation on the bond ratios and then the contributions. Landis clarified that they get a significant amount of parking meter revenue to help us pay for the parking system. We get revenues from our garages, but we also get revenue from parking meters to help us with paying off the bonds to build the garages and to buy more parking meters, etc. That’s different than parking tickets. There the money goes to the general fund. It doesn’t come to the parking fund, and it goes to the schools. So there is
a difference between parking meters and parking tickets as to the distribution of revenue.

Taylor inquired about the service fee for the credit card. What percentage will the parking go up as opposed to what it is now? Landis took this opportunity to make an early pitch. Without regard to the parking meters, and not occasioned by the purchase of the parking meters, the City of Lincoln is underselling its parking and it has a system that is the opposite of the rational approach that parking theorists (and there are such things) would tell you how to operate a system. And the reason is, the theorists would tell you to make the highest priced parking that which is most convenient because people will pay for convenience, which means that the meter directly in front of the store is the most convenient parking you can get, which is why people circle blocks over and over again looking for that convenient parking. What we have in Lincoln is a system in which our garages are at a dollar an hour and our on-street parking is cheaper than that. We are selling the most convenient parking for the lowest possible price and therefore encouraging people to not search the garage, not go to the place where we cluster them up and use their money to help pay off bonds, but to have them search for the bargain of on-street parking. So whether we did parking meter changes or not, there is a structural imbalance in the way that we are handling parking in the City of Lincoln at the moment and he would guess that the public loves it that way and would be very, very unhappy to approach the rational approach. But if you were to do a rational approach of charging for value, you would have the garages cheaper than on-street parking, which is the reverse of what we do. It would be rational to make that change whether we did this or not.

But, Taylor pointed out that right now the first hour is free. Landis agreed and there are two implications of that he wants to share. First, use of the garages have gone up significantly – 28,000 more users in the first three months of the year than in the previous years, and the revenues are either steady or a little bit higher. And the reason is people like the convenience to go to the parking, park there and then stay a second hour and pay for the second hour. So we have gained usage. More people are using the garages and our revenues have not suffered for that. That is true. But if you wanted to maximize that, you change the on-street parking costs. And there are cities that have zoning systems and different prices – very sophisticated systems like that.

Francis inquired as to the cost to maintain the current parking meters and their life expectancy and how long it takes to repair a meter if one goes down. Smith stated that they have recently consolidated all of their services which include enforcement, violations bureau and on-street system collections and maintenance, and we are still kind of in the early stages of analyzing that information. We are kind of working through those numbers right now to try to establish what the cost is to write a ticket. When we know what our ticket cost is, then we can evaluate that number that we need to give back to the state which goes to the school system. That is kind of what we're looking at at this time.
Landis pointed out that one of the things they have done since Urban Development took over the parking meters – is that inside the parking meters that we have now is a data source of its utilization. It has never been collected before because it has been seen as a law enforcement matter. Are you over time or not? Now that it’s a parking function and it is part of a system of downtown, we have been able to look at the utilization of parking meters. What they have told us is that 10-minute meters are the least used; 30-minutes are the next least used; 60-minutes are the next; and 90 and so-on. In other words, people will buy what they can. The 10-minute meters people have a tendency to use and try to beat the system and get back. We don’t recover so people use them, but we don’t get money off of them. Same thing with 30-minutes. One of things that we have done by looking at that data on our current meters, is identify a couple of hundred meters that we could lengthen the time that the meters have on them that people could buy when they bought their parking. What we’ve had is an improvement of about $6,000/month with exactly the same 3600 meters by lengthening the time the under-utilized meters would allow you to buy at the time and people would feed meters and we get more utilization. Utilization may be the same but they are paying for it rather than not paying for it. And that money comes to the bond-supported fund, which we think is a really good idea as a structural system so we can get more off-street parking.

Larson referred to when he was on the Downtown Lincoln Association. We were partially responsible for using the differential between on-street parking and garage parking to force more utilization of garages, and he thinks that worked. But Landis is saying it’s out of balance again.

Sunderman then sought to bring the discussion back to the issue of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

There was no other public testimony.

**PARKS AND RECREATION**

Proposed capital improvements to the City’s parks and recreation system are projected to cost $50 million over the six-year period. Athletic fees, General Obligation (GO) bonds, general revenue, Keno funds, Transportation Enhancement funds, impact fees, tennis fees, and the Parks & Rec repair/replacement fund account for the majority of funds programmed for the CIP. Funds from private sources are also being shown for a substantial portion of the six-year improvement program. A general obligation (GO) “Quality of Life Bond Issue” request amounting to $19.9 million is planned for FY 14/15 for various improvements to the Parks & Recreation system.

There was no other public testimony.
PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES

StarTran
StarTran’s six-year, $9.1 million proposed capital improvement program is funded largely through Federal transportation funding with $7.6 million in funds, with the balance coming from City general revenue funds and special reserves. The largest single capital item is the accumulation of funds for replacement of 20 buses in FY 15/16. No General Revenue funds are programmed in the first year of this year’s CIP.

There was no other public testimony.

Streets and Highways
The Streets and Highways capital program proposed by Public Works & Utilities identifies a program totaling $150.4 million over the six-year programming period, a decrease of approximately $5 million from last year’s CIP. These projects range from resurfacing projects to pedestrian facilities to system management programs to the construction of major new roadway facilities.

With the adoption of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan in November of 2006, a list and map of specific street projects were included as part of the Plan. The “Streets and Highways” CIP submittal has been closely coordinated with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan which was used in determining Comprehensive Plan conformity. The 2040 update of the Comprehensive Plan, and with it the Long Range Transportation Plan, is underway. Changes in the priorities of the transportation plan are likely. These changes, once formally adopted into the new 2040 Comprehensive Plan, will need to be acknowledged in the capital programming beginning with the 2012/2013 CIP next year.

A variety of Federal, State and City revenues are utilized to fund the Streets and Highways program, including impact fees that began in 2003, City Wheel Tax revenues, and Federal transportation funds. The Public Works & Utilities Department anticipates a decrease in Highway Allocation Funding (State gas tax revenues) over the next six years that will ultimately reduce the City’s ability to meet the needs of the transportation system.

At this time, some of the on-going traffic signal, arterial and residential street rehabilitation, new street, trail rehabilitation, new trail, and sidewalk rehabilitation projects are not being funded to their full need in all 6 years. In particular, the referenced goal in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan to fund the sidewalk rehabilitation program annually to meet the stated goals of the Pedestrian Facilities ADA Transition Plan is not being met in the proposed CIP.

The notable projects in the first year of the program include arterial and residential street rehabilitation, the Southwest 40th Viaduct project, North 14th Street widening from Superior to Alvo, Traffic Optimization and Management Program projects, Safety and Operation
Improvement Program projects, Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair Program projects, and impact fee funding for various arterial street projects within impact fee districts.

Esseks began to discuss the sidewalk maintenance program. How will the $500,000 in the first year be spent – will it be on an as needed basis, whole blocks, problem areas? Cary stated that there is a full blown program employed by Public Works to manage the needs for repair of sidewalks. As part of the update of the Comprehensive Plan, there are many needs beyond the $500,000. There is a program set up to identify the specific areas and where to concentrate their efforts, and based on the age of the sidewalks, in general. Where there are sidewalks that are dangerous with children and elderly people walking on them who face some real risks and dangers, Esseks is hopeful that Public Works will go in there and fix those dangerous situations. Cary pointed out that part of that program is on a complaint basis as well and Public Works will assess the condition of the sidewalk segment. Thomas Shafer, Manager of Design and Construction, confirmed that they do work off a complaint basis first; then known places of disrepair; and then curb ramps for the ADA transition plan. If we have money left over, we identify neighborhoods for more concentrated efforts.

Cornelius reiterated that the amount specified in the CIP is insufficient to meet the needs of the community. Yet the Comprehensive Plan is pretty specific about sidewalks being a priority, stating that they should receive consistent maintenance. This amount is the same as last year – consistent in under-funding. Cornelius indicated that every year, he tends toward wanting to find that the Comprehensive Plan is not in conformance with the budget, but that is not something that you can address when you try to build this budget using the amount allocated. The Comprehensive Plan is put together through a public process, and to a great extent, the community dictates what we put in the Plan. In the case of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, regular and consistent maintenance of sidewalks is specified and we consistently fail to meet that. Cornelius is unsure how to reflect that in the findings on the CIP. It seems like there is a disconnect in what we want and ask for and what we are willing to pay for. He is hopeful that the 2040 Comprehensive Plan finds a way to make that more consistent and reconnect.

Lust agreed with Cornelius. It is a real concern that we are out of compliance with ADA. Secondly, at the briefing, a program was mentioned where a private landowner could contribute or arrange for repair of their sidewalks. How would someone go about doing that? Shafer suggested that Public Works should be contacted or go to the Web site and use “sidewalk” as the keyword. There is a pamphlet which provides information on this program. A contact would be made with Public Works. Public Works would inspect the location, make sure the sidewalk is a public sidewalk, determine that the sidewalk does have disrepair, and then would be willing to accept the fixed cost assigned. The City generally gets a majority of the cost but not 100%, depending on the contracting and who does the work. We do have that capped.
Larson pointed out that available revenue must be factored in when these budgets are prepared. He assumes that involves some guesswork. Cary stated that it is much less guesswork for the first year than for the future years. We are working on a more refined listing in the new Plan.

Larson wondered whether a volunteer to pay for their own sidewalk could be a block long association of homeowners. Shafer did not know why that couldn’t be done, but he does not believe that has been experienced. They usually work with individual property owners. There have been situations where two property owners have each individually requested reimbursement and then found one contractor.

Gaylor Baird noted that the funding goes down in 2014/15. Shafer explained that the gas tax is looking very flat or even declining. Street maintenance costs continue to go up. Something has to give. It is not just sidewalks that goes down. There are other programs such as signal replacement that go down. Our arterial and residential street maintenance is as underfunded as sidewalks, and that program goes down, too.

Sunderman asked Shafer to discuss sidewalk and street maintenance dollars that are available. Shafer stated that increasing costs – price of oil, labor costs – continue to increase. The cost of doing business is going up and revenues are staying very flat, e.g. we are not under any federal transportation bill right now. That is an unknown that takes away from the ability to do projects.

Public Testimony

1. **Russell Miller**, 341 S. 52nd, referred to the street portion of the proposed CIP budget starting in September 2011. The money for residential street rehabilitation (code 0183) in the amount of $1.154 million comes from the wheel tax. Under the least costly circumstance, it costs $105,000/mile to rehab a residential street. But if curb and gutters need to be replaced, the cost can be $160,000 - $170,000/mile. Thus Lincoln can only rehab approximately 10 miles per year. When you realistically consider the necessity of replacing curbs and gutters, we would only be able to rehab 7 miles per year. Approximately 170 miles of Lincoln’s streets are rated poor or fair, which means they should be rehabilitated or replaced very soon. Miller recommended that the City rehab a minimum of 15 miles of residential streets per year. This could be funded by reapportioning the wheel tax. The money removed from the wheel tax construction fund and residual fund could be made up by increasing impact fees, which have not been adjusted for inflation since 2007. We need to spend more money on rehabilitating our streets by increasing impact fees.

Esseks asked how Miller came up with the 15 miles/year. Miller stated that he just doubled what is being done now. If we have 100 miles of streets that need to be repaired today, 10 miles or 7 miles is not going to work. 15 miles won’t do it either but we’ll get closer. We need to do a minimum of 10-15 miles per year.
Francis inquired why Miller targeted raising the impact fees as opposed to property taxes. Miller’s response was that traditionally, streets have come out of wheel tax and gas tax. A lot of the wheel tax money is going toward new road construction, which is the consequence of Lincoln’s growth. Lincoln’s growth should pay for more of it. Most of the wheel tax money comes from people that live in the non-fringe area. In his opinion it is reasonable to expect that money to be used to repair our streets.

Gaylor Baird observed that Miller’s concerns are shared by a number of people in the community and this group, along with a number of citizens serving on the LPlan 2040 Advisory Committee (LPAC) who have been looking at the issue of maintenance costs and roads. There is an interest in starting a shift towards funding maintenance at greater levels.

2. Terry Schwimmer, 3724 NW 57th, in Green Prairie Heights, discussed NW 48th Street, the future widening of which he understands is again being re-prioritized and delayed or funded to a much lesser degree. NW 48th has many different subdivisions utilizing it – Arnold Heights, Olympic Heights, Oak Hills, Green Prairie Heights, Ashley Heights, Hall Heights, Cardinal Heights, Hartland Northwest, View Pointe West and Hidden Acres. The area has been growing. These developments have been paying impact fees and property taxes. NW 48th also serves Duncan Aviation, Kawasaki, and many other factories in the area. Schwimmer moved to Lincoln in 1992, and ever since then he has heard about NW 48th being widened. Yet every year it is a moving target.

Esseks asked what part of NW 48th Street needs to be improved. Schwimmer suggested at the very least, the area from West Adams Street down to just north of the Interstate. When you come off the Interstate and go north you have two lanes that abruptly go into one lane and it becomes pretty constricted. And that is an area where there is more of the development. You could go all the way to Hwy 34.

Larson inquired whether NW 48th eventually turns into a four-lane thoroughfare. Schwimmer stated that it is only four-lane down near the Interstate. We keep hearing about four-lane, but it doesn’t happen.

Cary clarified that in this proposed CIP, there is a new program that has been identified this year in advance of the new LRTP, i.e. the LRTP Priority Project Program. In that program, the NW 48th project description does point from O Street to Adams for widening to four lanes. We would have enough funding for that project in years five and six. It has been identified as a need. In addition, in the current work on the new Comprehensive Plan, that segment is a very highly prioritized project. Cary assured that it has not been forgotten. The funding is the trick, but at this point in time we still have a place-holder in years five and six of the six-year program.
Francis expressed appreciation to Schwimmer for coming and testifying about this street. She is familiar with that area and there has been a lot of growth in the last 10 years and a lot of business growth in the last couple years.

At this point in the meeting, the **FY 2012-2015 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)** was called.

**Mike Brienzo** of the Planning Department and staff for the MPO element presented the proposed TIP. The TIP is a programming document that lists projects for the purpose of funding with federal program funds. The TIP covers any project within Lancaster County that is seeking federal funding and is developed cooperatively with any transit agency or organization seeking funds for a project, including NDOR, Lancaster County, City, StarTran and federal transit administration programs. It also includes the Airport Authority and a listing of transportation enhancement projects by various organizations, including the City, NRD, Game and Parks, and one project for the City of Hickman.

The TIP is a four-year document that schedules projects in terms of their priority. They are all fiscally constrained and it is an effort to obligate those federal funds to these projects. Any major changes would require an amendment to this document. The TIP is a listing of projects that come from the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, which includes the current Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The TIP must go through public review and is recommended to the Planning Commission. This year’s TIP comes with a staff recommendation of general conformance with the transportation plan in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. From here, the recommendation and findings will go to the MPO Officials Committee and then to the state to be appropriated with the state program.

There was no other public testimony.

The discussion then returned to David Cary on the Public Works and Utilities CIP.

**Watershed Management**

The proposed Watershed Management CIP contains approximately $34.5 million in improvements over the six year period. The passage of three general obligation (GO) bond issues (in FY 2012/13, FY 2014/15, and FY 2016/17) would constitute the bulk of the funding for these improvements. The remaining watershed management projects are proposed to be funded through State/Federal Funds and Other Financing. These projects include water quality projects, stream rehabilitation on Parks property, floodplain/floodprone engineering and projects, urban storm drainage projects, implementation of Watershed Master Plan projects, and the continued development of Comprehensive Watershed Master Plans.

There was no other public testimony.
Street Maintenance Operations

Sunderman noted that the Southeast District Shop Addition continues to be carried over due to lack of funding.

There was no other public testimony.

Water Supply and Distribution
The proposed Lincoln Water System CIP contains approximately $61.3 million in water supply, treatment, storage and distribution improvements over the six-year period. This is a lower total amount compared to last year’s CIP. Included in this year’s submittal are projects intended to enhance water services to the existing City, while others will serve developing areas of Lincoln. The CIP has been prepared based upon information and recommendations contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and Lincoln Water System Facilities Master Plan. Funding sources for projects include community improvement financing (TIF), revenue bonds, utility revenues, and impact fees. This proposed CIP assumes a 5% revenue increase in water utility revenues in FY 2011/2012. It should be noted that a comprehensive rate study of the City’s utilities is underway and the findings of that study will be discussed later this year.

Continued in this year’s program is general programming of projects intended to serve growth in the community. Specific programming of funding for these projects will be identified as planning and need become more apparent in future years. At this time, $4.5 million in Impact Fees, Utility Revenue, and Revenue Bond funding has been programmed for a list of potential projects that total $27.8 million in costs. To help meet the continuing growing need to replace the aging water main system, the Selected Main Replacement program is funded in FY 11/12 at $4.86 million and at $23.32 million over the 6 years of the program. Similarly, the Infrastructure Rehab program that funds needed maintenance of Water System facilities is funded at $2.14 million in the first year and $8.18 over the 6 years of the program. Specific developer commitments are funded in the program per annexation agreement requirements.

There was no other public testimony.

Wastewater
The proposed Lincoln Wastewater CIP contains approximately $61.7 million in projects, encompassing both the Theresa Street and Northeast Treatment Plants, construction of new sanitary sewer mains, and the selective replacement of existing mains over the six-year period. This amount is lower than last year’s program by about $5 million. The CIP has been prepared based on information and recommendations contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and the adopted Lincoln Wastewater Facilities Master Plan. Funding
sources for projects include community improvement financing (TIF), revenue bonds, utility revenues, and impact fees. This proposed CIP assumes a 5% revenue increase in wastewater utility revenues in FY 2011/2012. It should be noted that a comprehensive rate study of the City’s utilities is underway and the findings of that study will be discussed later this year.

Continued in this year’s program is more general programming of projects intended to serve growth in the community. Specific funding for projects will be identified as planning and need become more apparent in future years. At this time, $3 million in impact fees and utility revenues have been programmed for a list of potential projects that total $27.4 million in costs. To help meet the continuing growing need to replace and repair the aging wastewater equipment, facilities, and collectors, the Selected Repair/Replacement of Wastewater Facilities/Collectors program is funded at $14.4 million over the 6 years of the program. Of note is the funding of construction of Phase III and Phase IV of the Stevens Creek trunk sewer down to 98th and O Street in the first 3 years of the program. Also, specific developer commitments are funded in the program per annexation agreement requirements.

There was no other public testimony.

**Solid Waste Operations**

Proposed capital improvements for the Solid Waste Operations program include projects related to the Bluff Road Sanitary Landfill, the North 48th Street Landfill and Transfer Station, and the Solid Waste Management System. The CIP totals approximately $25 million over the six-year period which is a decrease from last year.

Notable projects include liner and leachate collection systems for new phases and final caps for older phases of the Bluff Road landfill, development of a landfill gas collection and utilization system, expansion of recycling facilities, consideration for park development for the N 48th Street landfill after closure, and closure of the North 48th Street landfill.

Esseks inquired about the landfill gas utilization system being “voluntarily” constructed. **Gary Brandt** of Solid Waste Operations, explained that the word “voluntary” is used because it is not imposed by a regulatory requirement. We are proceeding forward with a collection system and utilization system to utilize the gas in advance as opposed to being forced regulatorily to do that. The utilization would be either through looking in the community for those that could do a direct use of that gas, or look at the possibility of a use by an entity in the city or someone else for generation of electricity. There is some wasting of energy in that regard if it is not fully utilized.

There was no other public testimony.
CITY OF LINCOLN’S DRAFT SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR FY2011/12 - 2016/17.
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: May 25, 2011

Taylor moved to find the draft CIP to be in full or general conformance with the 2030 Lincoln-Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Francis.

Cornelius thanked the members of city staff for being here today and expressed appreciation for the availability of information at the briefing last week. It was very helpful in getting through this. He reiterated his concern that while it seems that each of the items that were presented is in full or general compliance, in the abstract, it seems as though we have a gulf between the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the funding to achieve those goals in all cases.

Sunderman agreed. The Comprehensive Plan is a community based document with public input. But the budget is also a public based type document. The City Council is looking for all sorts of input in various ways from the public on how to pay for these programs. There is definitely a disconnect in what we want and what we can pay for. We somehow need to narrow that gap.

Larson agreed with Sunderman. As the gentleman promoting NW 48th Street pointed out, projects just seem to be moving targets as we delay and defer. Somehow or another, society needs to look at these things differently and somehow close that gap that is restricting our desires or increasing our willingness to pay. It is a serious problem here as well as in our whole country. Also, Larson wonders how much of our funds are being expended for duplication of approvals, etc., and how to go about eliminating any duplication.

Gaylor Baird observed that costs are very crucial to these discussions. She does not want to maintain the thought that people can’t adapt to changes. She is confident in our community and thinks people can and will adapt to change.

Motion for a finding of full or general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan carried 8-0: Esseks, Francis, Cornelius, Gaylor Baird, Taylor, Larson, Lust and Sunderman voting ‘yes’; Partington absent.
DRAFT FY2012-2015
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM
FOR THE LINCOLN AND LANCASTER COUNTY AREA
(LINCOLN MPO).
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: May 25, 2011

Francis moved a finding of general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Taylor and carried 8-0: Esseks, Francis, Cornelius, Gaylord Baird, Taylor, Larson, Lust and Sunderman voting 'yes'; Partington absent.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.
A request has been made to vacate the north half of the former Pine Lake Road right-of-way extending eastward from 84th Street. The area was viewed and while the old roadway profile is visible, it appears to simply be a part of the surrounding property. The area to be vacated is approximately 1.06 acres in size. The Planning Department has indicated there is one utility (Windstream) located within the area to be vacated and a permanent easement for it should be retained.

While a long, narrow strip like this will have little value, in and of itself, it can add value to the abutting property once assembled and may take on the value of the abutting property. The adjoining property, while zoned AGR, will in all likelihood be re-zoned to a higher use. Based on the probability of a higher use and considering its somewhat long, narrow shape, it is estimated to have a value of $5.00 per square foot. While the vacated street may take on this value, it is estimated an abutting purchaser would not pay 100% of the value they hoped to derive from the assemblage. Also to be considered is the cost of relocating the telephone cable located within the area to be vacated. This cost is estimated at approximately $31,500. Considering there is only the one utility to contend with and the fact the additional street right-of-way would help lessen the long, narrow profile of the abutting property, it is estimated an abutting property owner might pay 50% to 60% of the assembled value of the abutting land value once it is assembled. As such, a value of $130,000.00 is considered appropriate for the area to be vacated.

Therefore, it is recommended if the street right-of-way be vacated it be sold to the abutting property owner for $130,000.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Clinton W. Thomas
Certified General Appraiser #990023
Concerns I wish to voice about the proposed language for the “Dangerous Building Code” include:

1. Page 5, line 22 changes the 60 days’ notice for owners to address a dangerous building to be “such reasonable time as shall be determined by the Building Official”. It seems that this clause leaves too much discretion the Official or his superiors and ignores the concept of due process. Perhaps 30 days is a reasonable timeline in lieu of 60 days, rather than a vague decision by one individual.

2. Page 6, Line 12 changes the right of appeal timeline from ten days to a timeline set forth by the Official. Again, I question due process left to the discretion of the Official or his superiors. I think 10 days is reasonable time to assess a decision and respond.

3. Page 7, Line 20 states the owner shall have the right to appeal any order…except for emergencies set forth by the mayor. Given this seems to be in response to the fire along O Street earlier this year, it appears the Mayor would have declared an emergency and taken over demolition of both buildings, at the cost of the owners.

   First of all, is closing half of O Street the equivalent of an “Emergency”?

   Secondly, this could have undoubtedly resulted in rash bids costing the building owners much more money than perhaps spent otherwise. Furthermore, it neglects the time necessary to perhaps preserve these buildings rather than quickly tearing buildings down. This clause seems to be the foremost example of ignoring our public rights for DUE PROCESS! Furthermore, this is an opportunity for a Mayor to potentially use an unfortunate situation for political gain. At a minimum, the determination of an “emergency” should be the decision of more than one person…perhaps City Council or as I suggested at the Public Hearing, perhaps a group of at least 3 qualified individuals and/or their official designees in the event of an absence. If the City Council (or provision for a formal hearing) the owner would be afforded an opportunity to address the Council/Group rather than simply be advised of the unilateral action of the mayor.

   Lastly, an owner should be afforded an opportunity for due process, therefore, an appeal should always be an option.

Let’s take a “breather” and get input from qualified individuals, such as architects and contractors and insurance advisors, who could offer input on possible contingencies or practical considerations. I would like to propose a 3-month review of the proposed legislation with the interim time period used to obtain input.
Jon,

We'll discuss these issues with Building and Safety and get back to you this week.

Rodney M. Confer
City Attorney

---

From: Jon Camp [mailto:JonCamp@lincolnhaymarket.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 12:43 PM
To: Rodney M. Confer
Cc: Mary M. Meyer
Subject: Dangerous Building Code Legislation

Rod:

Please see the attachment (I will also copy it below) of my thoughts on this legislation. I hope the City Council will agree to a 3-month breather to obtain input.

Jon

---

Concerns I wish to voice about the proposed language for the “Dangerous Building Code” include:

---

“The American Republic will endure until the day Congress discovers that it can bribe the public with the public's money”

~ Alexis de Tocqueville (French Historian and Political scientist. 1805-1859)

Check our reception and event venues at:

http://www.facebook.com/pages/Apothecary-Lofts-Ridnour-Room/17317579938032

Concerns I wish to voice about the proposed language for the “Dangerous Building Code” include:
to: all members of the city council
re: strip club on O Street

Action: please do not allow. As others have said:

The center of Lincoln should not have this kind of business in the midst of the children's museum and other activities for young people as well as fine apartments in downtown buildings. In my opinion, this marginal kind of activity should not be in our fine downtown.

It saddens me that strip clubs exist at all because the young women who perform are demeaning themselves.

Marguerrite Young
3500 Faulkner Drive
Lincoln, NE 68516
telephone 402-327-8190
Dear Council Members,

I write this as a concerned tax payer living in and supporting the City of Lincoln. I do not understand why it is necessary to use TIF funds for the University Credit Union and the Neumann Center Fraternity.

With the Antelope Valley Project, the city has bought a lot of property that now sets empty. I do not understand the reasoning to buy a piece of occupied property and need to give TIF incentive funding. Our university has been a major benefactor of the Antelope Valley project and doesn't need more support of this nature. Also most credit unions operate as non profits so I question if they even pay real estate taxes. Does this one?

As it relates to the Neumann Center Fraternity, we need to understand the separation of church and state. We all understand how easily it would be for the facility to add a sanctuary and become a tax exempt facility especially after they've operated the 15 years to benefit from the TIF dollars.

I encourage the council to disallow this funding to both the University Credit Union and the Neumann Center. With all of the presently available property in the Antelope Valley Project around the University I see no reason to spend more of the limited revenues of our city.

You need to ask your constituents their feelings on this matter.

We already are being ask to volunteer for park care and are being told that we do not have sufficient funds to support the libraries of the community that help to educate our children. The Mayor tells us that vital services will suffer due to lack of resources, which we know a vast majority are from Real Estate taxes.

Please vote to not approve this situation. This does not benefit the vast amount of Lincoln residents and vacant land is available if the University Credit Union needs a new building.

Allan Amsberry
2030 Pinedale Ave.
Lincoln, Ne 68506
Telephone message:
06.22.11

Councilman Doug Emery
Councilman Jon Camp

Paula Nicholls, South 80th Street, Lincoln, NE

Encourage City Council to go ahead with the widening of Old Cheney Road using Plan A, the Engineers Plan.

We have only one time to do and let’s do it right.

Sorry for the six to ten residents who will lose land but this will benefit over 300 residents, and others.
Hon. Eugene Carroll  
Lincoln City Council  
555 South 10th Street  
Lincoln Nebraska 68508

Dear Councilman Carroll,

I write as a Lincoln resident for almost 40 years, a parent of three children who were raised and schooled in Lincoln, a former member of the Lincoln Libraries Board of Trustees and a former President of the Library Board for two years.

In brief, reducing library hours (and thus library services) would be a short-sighted approach to the City’s fiscal dilemma. By closing each of the libraries one day a week, the City Council would deprive our children one of the best public resources our society provides to them as young citizens. Seeing six year-olds “dive” into books is a thrilling experience, knowing that they are seeking knowledge and growth that will serve them throughout their lifetimes. Observing, the various library parking lots in the evenings and on weekends clearly suggests the high value placed on our libraries by senior citizens, adults and late teens as well as children transported there by their families. Looking at the usage of the libraries’ business resources, music collections, audio-tapes and periodicals (as well as books) demonstrates that the Lincoln community relies on its libraries as it does no other civic entity.

In my term on the Library Board, Lincoln mayors regularly asked the libraries to prepare a budget at less than 100% of current expenditures - - - and in every instance a wise City Council stood firmly behind our citizens and found a way to restore the proposed cuts. Rather than be penny-wise and dollar-foolish, you have the opportunity to step up and keep all Lincolnites well-served by retaining seven-day-a-week access at each of our library branches.

Thank you.

Peter S. Levitov
June 22, 2011

Mr. Eugene Carroll, Chairman
Mr. Jon Camp
Mr. Jonathan Cook
Mr. Doug Emery
Mr. Carl Eskridge
Mr. Adam Hornung
Ms. Jayne Snyder
Lincoln City Council
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE  68508

RE: Application for Relocation of Black Bear Enterprises LLC
dba The Viper Room /Drunken Monkey
to 1211 O Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

Dear City Council Members:

The Downtown Lincoln Association (“DLA”) wishes to emphatically express our strong opposition to the recently approved application for the Viper Room/Drunken Monkey to operate a sexually-oriented live entertainment business in the greater downtown area. We strongly urge you to reconsider your June 13, 2011 City Council vote and send a very clear message that this type of business is not a welcome addition to our clean, safe and inviting downtown community.

In a uniquely successful and collaborative effort, the private sector, together with the City of Lincoln, downtown residents and the educational community, have invested an immeasurable amount of time, energy and capital to create a visionary and thriving downtown Lincoln. It is imperative that this investment be protected from activity that detracts from and is counter-productive to the long-term vitality of downtown. As received by the DLA, the immediate and significant outpouring of opposition from DLA constituents and ratepayers to this issue has been unparalleled in comparison to any other downtown-related issue in recent memory. This opposition is testament to the value and importance patrons place on maintaining a downtown that serves as an inviting hub for business commerce and a respectable environment to live, learn and enjoy a diverse array of quality entertainment.

In addition to registering our opposition, we wish to inform you the DLA has already committed to work diligently with the proper authorities to amend City ordinances in an effort to ensure in the future such businesses cannot become a part of the greater downtown business climate.

We again urge you to work toward preserving and protecting the integrity of downtown Lincoln by reconsidering your earlier vote. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this request
to deny this application and for your continued support of a clean, safe and inviting downtown Lincoln.

Sincerely,

Terry Uland, President     Ed Swotek, Chairman
Downtown Lincoln Association    Downtown Lincoln Association

C:          Chris Beutler, Mayor, City of Lincoln
            Tom Casady, Public Safety Director, City of Lincoln
            Dave Landis, Director, Urban Development Department
            Dallas McGee, Assistant Director, Urban Development Department
I. CITY CLERK

II. CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE MAYOR & DIRECTORS

MAYOR
1. NEWS RELEASE. Public invited to “Uncle Sam Jam 2011”.
2. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor Beutler’s public schedule for the week of June 25, 2011 through July 1, 2011.

III. DIRECTORS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1. Notice and agenda for the Joint Meeting of Historic Preservation Commission and Urban Design Committee to be held on Tuesday, June 28, 2011 at 8:00 a.m.
2. Letter from Eunice M. Cernohlavek regarding Special Permit No. 11013, appeal of Roger Schwisow from the conditional approval for soil excavation.

IV. COUNCIL MEMBERS

JON CAMP
1. City Attorney Confer’s reply to Councilman Camp regarding the dangerous building code legislation. Councilman Camp’s concerns attached.
2. Councilman Camp’s thanks to City Attorney Confer for the consideration of a possible two-week delay on the dangerous building code legislation.

CARL ESKRIDGE
1. Letter from the Lincoln Housing Authority giving reasons not to close Fire Station #11, located at 3401 N.W. Luke. Do not balance the City’s budget by endangering the safety of Lincoln’s young citizens.

V. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS TO COUNCIL
1. Email from Bob and Vicki Rokeby encouraging Council to vote in favor of creating the Havelock Business Improvement District.
2. Correspondence from Glenn and Peggy Shorney asking Council to consider keeping the swimming pools open with reasons, and questions, to do so.
3. Email from Brother Ben Leypoldt writing on transportation issues Lincoln faces for the disabled.

VI. INVITATIONS
See invitation list.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: June 24, 2011
FOR MORE INFORMATION:
    David Norris, Citizen Information Center, 402-441-7547 (after June 28)
    Jerry Shorney, Parks and Recreation, 402-441-8259

PUBLIC INVITED TO “UNCLE SAM JAM 2011”

Mayor Chris Beutler today invited area residents to the City’s annual Uncle Sam Jam Independence Day celebration at Oak Lake Park Saturday, July 2. Activities will begin at 1 p.m., and the fireworks show will begin promptly at 10 p.m.

The fireworks are again sponsored by Pepsi-Cola and presented by Zambelli Internationale. The show will be choreographed to music provided by Broadcast House/NRG Media, and broadcast on its four radio stations - B107.3 FM, Froggy 98.1 FM, 105.3 Wow FM and KLIN 1400 AM. Music in the park will be provided by the FROGGY 98.1 FM boom box. The \textit{Lincoln Journal Star} also is a partner in the celebration.

“We have a great day planned, and I want to thank our sponsors as well as City staff for keeping this annual tradition alive in Lincoln,” said Mayor Beutler. “Moving the Uncle Sam Jam from July 4th to the 2nd holds down City expenses and allows families to enjoy the public event Saturday as well as private family celebrations on Monday.”

The City Parks and Recreation Department will provide free family activities from 1 to 8 p.m., including canoeing, disc golf, volleyball, bocce ball, croquet, horseshoes, carnival games, bingo, three-legged and potato races, box hockey and the “NEOS” interactive game. Food and concessions will be available beginning at 1 p.m. in the main parking lot. VFW Post 3606 will conduct a flag-lowering ceremony at 8:30 p.m.

Parking is available at Oak Lake Park and in the Pfizer grass field at N.W. 4th and Cornhusker. No baseball games are scheduled, so parking also is available in the Haymarket Park lots, which can be accessed from 10th and Charleston. Attendees are encouraged to arrive early to avoid traffic delays.

A special $3 event fee will be offered beginning at 1 p.m. at two downtown garages – Haymarket Garage at 9th and “Q” streets and Que Place Garage at 11th and “Q” streets. Handi-Van service is available for those eligible, and reservations can be made through the normal procedure by calling StarTran at 441-7109.

-more-
StarTran will provide free public shuttle bus service from 5 to 11 p.m. between the main entrance at Oak Lake Park and these locations:

- Haymarket Parking Garage, 9th and “Q”
- Gold’s bus stop, 11th and “O”
- County-City building complex - northeast corner of 9th and “H” and southeast corner of 9th and “K” (Free parking is available in two lots – one bounded by 9th, 10th, “G” and “H” and one bounded by 9th, 10th, “K” and “L”.)

In case of inclement weather, the fireworks display and the accompanying radio broadcasts will be rescheduled to Sunday, July 3. If family activities also are cancelled on Saturday, most of them will be rescheduled to Sunday as well.

Fireworks other than those used in the Zambelli show are prohibited in the park during the celebration. City ordinance allows the sale and use of permissible fireworks in the City only from 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. July 3 and from 8 a.m. to 11:59 p.m. July 4 of each year. The City has a permit for its display on July 2.

The Red Cross will have first aid available. Alcohol is prohibited in the park. All pets are required to wear a leash in the park, and residents are discouraged from bringing pets to the park during the fireworks display.

More information on the day’s events is available on the City website at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: uncle sam jam).
Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule
June 25 - July 1, 2010
Schedule subject to change

Saturday, June 25
• Present Mayor’s Award for Literacy Achievement, remarks - 11:30 a.m., First Plymouth Congregational Church, 20th and “D” streets, Pilgrim Hall (west side)

Tuesday, June 28
• Meeting of the Urban Design Committee and Historic Preservation Commission - 8 a.m., Room 113, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St.
• Corrections Joint Public Agency (JPA) - 9 a.m., City Council Chambers, County-City Building
• KFOR interview - aired at 12:30 p.m. (pre-recorded)

Wednesday, June 29
• Seward Rotary Club lunch, remarks - noon, Jones National Bank, 203 S. 6th St., Seward
• Young Professionals Group, remarks - 3 p.m., Cornhusker Marriott, 333 S. 13th St.

Thursday, June 30
• KFOR interview - 7:45 a.m.
• Meals on Wheels delivery - 11:15 a.m., details to be announced
Notice is hereby given that a special joint meeting of the URBAN DESIGN COMMITTEE and the HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION will be held on Tuesday, June 28, 2011, 8 a.m., in Room 113, 1st Floor, County/City Building.

For more information, please contact the Lincoln City/Lancaster County Planning Department, 441-7491.

AGENDA
June 28, 2011

1. Discussion with Mayor Chris Beutler of recommendations for West Haymarket Arena design.

TO:  
Mike Dekalb, City Planning Commission  
All Members of the City Council

DATE:  Agenda Regular City Council Meeting Monday, June 27, 2011 at 5:30 PM

SUBJECT:  49) 11R-154 Special Permit No. 11013 – Appeal of Roger A. Schwisow from the conditional approval for soil excavation (In particular the commencement date and hours of operation) on property located northwest of N.W. 56th Street and West O Street.

FROM:
Eunice M. Cernohlavek  
Landowner across the street from soil mining operation  
6205 West “O” Street  
Lincoln, NE 69528  
402-475-8636

In regards to the above Special Permit and having been instrumental in helping to develop the current rules and regulations of soil mining, I attended and spoke at the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission on June 15, 2011. At that time I voiced my concerns of dust, noise, etc., things that go on with a soil mining operation. Prior to the meeting, Roger Schwisow had called me and promised to be a good neighbor and keep all the nuisances of soil mining to a workable endeavor for us. He promised to have a water tank ready and available for the dust issues and also a street sweeper to keep West “O” as clean as possible and still maintain his business. To date he has kept his word and though there was one day when the NW wind blew and the dust was hanging around and heavy in my yard. I am real concerned as stated in the June 15th meeting of heavy dust when the temperatures reach the mid and upper 90’s and above and no breeze to blow it away. My llamas are right off of West “O” pasture and would have to eat the dust on the grass, etc. This may pose a health issue for them as well as for my household and me. My concerns are with the times which Roger would like to alter to mining around the clock Monday thru Sunday. I would like Sunday to be a “freedom from noise, light, dust, day”. I realize that he has a schedule to meet with the Haymarket Arena, which is the current contract he is working with. I also am aware that soil mining at night will pose a new set of problems with lights as well as the noise of trucks and moving earth equipment. I would please ask that the lights be aimed away from West “O” and my home and into the field. This ensures safety for night drivers on West “O” so they are not blinded by them and so I have a fairly unlit area in which to sleep. Also I would like this permit to be all inclusive for only the Haymarket Arena project and not a blanket permit for other projects that require soil, and may be in the planning stages unknown to anyone but Roger.

Again, I am encouraged by Roger’s determination to keep me informed and by his use of the sweeper and water wagon and by his promises to make life as livable for me under the circumstances and yet meet his requirements of a business. I trust that will continue.

Thanks for you considerations of my requests and concerns.

Sincerely yours,

Eunice M. Cernohlavek

cc. Mike Dekalb  
Karen Kurbis, 17500 N 84th St., Lincoln, NE 68517
Dear Jon:

In response to your e-mail and the discussion at the Council hearing, we have drafted some amendments to the proposed legislation.

As discussed at the Council meeting, instead of the Mayor alone making the decision on when an emergency exists requiring immediate action, the amendment will provide for the decision to be made jointly by the Council Chair and the Mayor after consultation with the City Attorney's office.

A second amendment will require the Director of Building and Safety to consult with the City Attorney in situations where it is believed the appeal time needs to be less than seven days, before making that determination.

It is my understanding that you have discussed delaying this matter with the Mayor’s staff. I believe the administration believes we need to have this additional protection for the City now and would prefer not to delay this legislation.

The City Attorney's staff is certainly in agreement that due process must be afforded in these matters and we believe the legislation does that. In a dire emergency, however, it is also necessary to protect the public and the law recognizes that it may be necessary to adopt emergency measures to deal with emergency situations. Therefore we do not require the Fire Department to obtain a court order before breaking out windows to fight a fire, or require the police to get a search warrant before breaking down a door to prevent a crime that they know is in progress.

As Chris Connolly explained during the public hearing this legislation is designed only for emergencies requiring expedited or immediate measures. These would be situations in which life and limb are in immediate peril, or potentially extensive or irreparable damage to public or private property make it necessary to take action without delay. That was not the situation with the Romantix fire, as Chris explained at the meeting. Although there was a possibility of collapse the danger was under control and contained, and this situation would not have required the measures in the pending legislation to protect the public or the City.

Even though the Romantix fire would not have required these types of measures, however, it did cause Building and Safety and other responsible City officials to recognize that emergencies could occur in the future in which waiting to remove dangerous conditions may result in unnecessarily endangering lives or property. This legislation is designed to give the City the ability to take the actions that may be required to avoid death, injury or needless destruction of public and private property in those situations.

I hope this addresses your concerns, but if not please let Chris or me know.

Rod
Rodney M. Confer
City Attorney

---

From: Jon Camp [mailto:JonCamp@lincolnhaymarket.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2011 12:43 PM
To: Rodney M. Confer
Cc: Mary M. Meyer
Subject: Dangerous Building Code Legislation

Rod:

Please see the attachment (I will also copy it below) of my thoughts on this legislation. I hope the City Council will agree to a 3-month breather to obtain input.
Concerns I wish to voice about the proposed language for the “Dangerous Building Code” include:

1. Page 5, line 22 changes the 60 days’ notice for owners to address a dangerous building to be “such reasonable time as shall be determined by the Building Official”. It seems that this clause leaves too much discretion the Official or his superiors and ignores the concept of due process. Perhaps 30 days is a reasonable timeline in lieu of 60 days, rather than a vague decision by one individual.

2. Page 6, Line 12 changes the right of appeal timeline from ten days to a timeline set forth by the Official. Again, I question due process left to the discretion of the Official or his superiors. I think 10 days is reasonable time to assess a decision and respond.

3. Page 7, Line 20 states the owner shall have the right to appeal any order…except for emergencies set forth by the mayor. Given this seems to be in response to the fire along O Street earlier this year, it appears the Mayor would have declared an emergency and taken over demolition of both buildings, at the cost of the owners.

First of all, is closing half of O Street the equivalent of an “Emergency”?

Secondly, this could have undoubtedly resulted in rash bids costing the building owners much more money than perhaps spent otherwise. Furthermore, it neglects the time necessary to perhaps preserve these buildings rather than quickly tearing buildings down. This clause seems to be the foremost example of ignoring our public rights for DUE PROCESS! Furthermore, this is an opportunity for a Mayor to potentially use an unfortunate situation for political gain. At a minimum, the determination of an “emergency” should be the decision of more than one person...perhaps City Council or as I suggested at the Public Hearing, perhaps a group of at least 3 qualified individuals and/or their official designees in the event of an absence. If the City Council (or provision for a formal hearing) the owner would be afforded an opportunity to address the Council/Group rather than simply be advised of the unilateral action of the mayor.

Lastly, an owner should be afforded an opportunity for due process, therefore, an appeal should always be an option.
Let’s take a “breather” and get input from qualified individuals, such as architects and contractors and insurance advisors, who could offer input on possible contingencies or practical considerations. I would like to propose a 3-month review of the proposed legislation with the interim time period used to obtain input.
Mary M. Meyer

Subject: Dangerous Building Code Legislation

From: Jon Camp [mailto:JonCamp@lincolnhaymarket.com]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 12:07 PM
To: Rodney M. Confer
Cc: Mary M. Meyer; Eugene W. Carroll; R. Adam Hornung; Jayne L. Snyder; Doug Emery (Dougemerypm@aol.com) (Dougemerypm@aol.com); 'jcookcc@aol.com' (jcookcc@aol.com); Carl B. Eskridge; Rick D. Hoppe
Subject: RE: Dangerous Building Code Legislation

Rod:

Thanks for your response and amendments.

As I advised Rick Hoppe, I will be out of town on City Council business starting tomorrow through late Wednesday—thus, I will miss the Monday meeting. I had asked Rick for a 2 week delay so I could share the amendment proposals with a few individuals who expressed concerns. I believe the amendments will provide comfort to those property owners, but would appreciate the time to forward the amendments to them for their input.

At this stage, I will have to leave matters to you and my CC colleagues.

Thank you for consideration of a 2-week delay.

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

“The American Republic will endure until the day Congress discovers that it can bribe the public with the public's money”

~ Alexis de Tocqueville (French Historian and Political scientist. 1805-1859)

Check our reception and event venues at:

http://www.facebook.com/pages/Apothecary-Lofts-Ridnour-Room/173175799380032
June 23, 2011

Chris Beutler
Mayor of Lincoln
City of Lincoln-Lancaster County Building
555 South 10th Street, Suite 301
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Dear Mayor Beutler:

The Lincoln Housing Authority wishes to convey to you and the members of the City Council, the Housing Authority’s grave concerns about the budget proposal to close Fire Station #11, located at 3401 N.W. Luke. This station currently serves the Arnold Heights neighborhood. We understand that with the closure of Fire Station #11, response time for requests for emergency service would be increased by an average of 4-5 minutes to a total response time of 9-10 minutes per call.

Most of the housing the Lincoln Housing Authority owns in Arnold Heights is occupied by families with young children. A difference of five minutes in response time to a call about a fire in a house occupied by young children, who may not be able to flee without assistance, could negatively impact the safety of those residents. It could be the difference between life and death.

We noticed that an examination of the 2008 Lincoln Fire & Rescue service call maps posted on the City of Lincoln’s web site appear to indicate that the greater Arnold Heights area has the same percentage of requests for service per population as most of the remainder of the city with the exception of the central core. Although we appreciate the City’s financial constraints we do not believe the City’s budget should be balanced by endangering the safety of Lincoln’s youngest citizens.

Sincerely,

Larry G. Potratz
Executive Director

cc: Carl Eskridge
Dear Council Members,

We encourage your vote in favor of creating the Havelock Business Improvement District.

We have been business and property owners in Havelock since 1971. We were actively involved in the improvements through the Urban Development Dept. of the 1980's that created the street landscaping and public parking lot. One issue that we as business owners faced was how to maintain the street scape and parking lot. Since that time, maintenance has been funded by the Havelock Business Association through donations, fund raisers and dues, all voluntary efforts. This has resulted in the cost being unequally shared amongst all who benefit from the service.

The request to create the BID will allow for proper maintenance which will enhance the area and spread the cost to all who benefit. We look forward to your support.

Sincerely,

Bob and Vicki Rokeby
Mary M. Meyer

From: The Shorney's [gshorney@inebraska.com]
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2011 10:33 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Budget cutting swimming pools

Dear Council Members,

When we read the newspaper article about cutting 5 of the City swimming pools, we were heartbroken that our budget is so bad that this is one of the areas under consideration for cuts.

As the article pointed out, the pool in Airpark is the only one for the children in that area. They could not possibly bike to another pool easily. This pool needs to remain in service. Part of the bottom line is whether the approximately 76,000 children these pools service will be able to get to other pools.

One question to ask if the 5 pools are cut, what will that do to the maximum number allowed in the existing pools? Will they reach maximum numbers and not accommodate all who want to swim? We have seen lines waiting to get into Eden pool on hot days.

Overall, we think this is a service that is expected by our City, and we do not want any of these 5 pools cut from the neighborhoods that they service.

Even though we like our parks all mowed off, we would rather see them partially mowed as this year, or wait a few more days to be mowed and keep the pools open.

Thanks for considering to keep the pools open--

Glenn and Peggy Shorney, 4331 Antelope Creek Road
Dear Council Member

I'm writing to discuss the transportation issues we have in Lincoln for the disabled. Currently disabled persons are limited to Handivan which only runs until 6:30pm. Transport Plus runs after 6:30pm but both services are booked daily and then many people are without any transportation resource. The League of Human Dignity gives cab vouchers for groceries. Medical vouchers a person is now only able to receive two a month from DHHS. Acess2Care transportation which is new to us is still only able to assist with the medical vouchers only. It makes it very difficult to have a social life, and attend social gatherings. It is first come first serve as a rule and lines and transportation get bogged down. People are left without because there is just not enough transportation.

I don’t have a clear resolution except to suggest state government and our community to offer more support in this area for the disabled. I would like to see transportation services be able to be accessed online for those persons who cannot speak and use computers as their speaking tool other than TDD lines. Being able to reserve transportation and utilize technology is streamlining things but also very helpful for persons with disabilities but we still need more vehicles to transport people.

I am hoping I can offer some assistance in this area. Please let me know you received this email if you could. Thank you for yr time.

Sincerely,

Ben
Brother Ben Leypoldt
Director of Flashpoint Ventures,
Brother Ben's Weddings,
Brother Ben's Church

cell (402)613-0967 or Fax number (402)620-3599
(preferred) e-mail ben.leypoldt@gmail.com
brotherben@livingonyourown.org
website is TheWorldOfBen.info