IN LIEU OF
DIRECTORS’ MEETING
MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2013

I. CITY CLERK

II. MAYOR
1. NEWS RELEASE. Mayor presents November Award of Excellence to Kristen Humphrey, Senior Engineer in the Engineering Services Division of Public Works and Utilities.
2. NEWS ADVISORY. The three members of the West Haymarket Joint Public Agency will host a news conference on Wednesday, December 11, 2013, 555 S. 10th, Room 303, to discuss future financing of the Pinnacle Bank Arena.
3. NEWS RELEASE. JPA proposal calls for early payment of arena debt.
4. NEWS RELEASE. Public invited to Open House on Roper Park Stream Stability Project.
5. NEWS RELEASE. Section of So. 14th Street to close Monday for rail repair.

III. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE

HEALTH DEPARTMENT
2. Lincoln - Lancaster County Health Department meeting minutes of November 12, 2013.

PARKS AND RECREATION
1. Parks and Recreation Advisory Board meeting agenda for December 12, 2013.
   a) Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Meeting minutes of November 14, 2013.
   b) Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Action Item Fact Sheet.

PLANNING COMMISSION

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1. Administrative approvals by the Planning Director from December 3, 2013 through December 9, 2013.

IV. COUNCIL MEMBERS

V. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS
1. Correspondence from Russell Miller stating why the infrastructure rate Impact Fees must be raised. Oppose the Impact Fee freeze.
2. Letter from the Woods Park Neighborhood Association in strong support of the proposed amendment to the Woods Park Master Plan. A new, well-designed permanent tennis structure will enhance the lives of all residents.
MAYOR PRESENTS NOVEMBER AWARD OF EXCELLENCE

Mayor Chris Beutler today presented the Mayor’s Award of Excellence for November to Kristen Humphrey, a Senior Engineer in the Engineering Services Division of the Public Works and Utilities Department. The monthly award recognizes City employees who consistently provide exemplary service and work that demonstrates personal commitment to the City. The award was presented at the beginning of today’s City Council meeting.

Humphrey has worked for the City since 2004. City Engineer Roger Figard, Assistant City Engineer Randy Hoskins and Engineering Services Manager Thomas Shafer nominated her in the categories of customer relations, loss prevention and productivity for her work on two separate audits of the Antelope Valley Project.

Humphrey has been the Antelope Valley Project Manager since 2008. Her nominators said taking over a project of this magnitude while it’s already under way is a challenging task, but Humphrey has done an admirable job in bringing it to successful completion.

The Antelope Valley Project is one of the largest in City history, and it’s also been one of the most scrutinized. The first audit by the State found no wrongdoing. The second audit by federal authorities began in 2010. After the initial review, it appeared that more than $29 million spent on the project might not be eligible for federal reimbursement. If that was the case, the City would have to find the additional local dollars to pay for the project.

Humphrey dug into records to find the documentation the federal government was requesting. Her task was more difficult because those records dated back to 1995, 13 years before she was involved in the project. The nominators said her “dogged and seemingly endless efforts” produced documents that proved the City had spent the federal funds appropriately. On top of that, she was able to show that the City was eligible for an additional $3.1 million in federal reimbursement. Humphrey has estimated that she spent about 1,400 hours on the two audits.

The other categories in which employees can be nominated are valor and safety. Consideration also may be given to nominations that demonstrate self-initiated accomplishments or those completed outside of the nominee’s job description. All City employees are eligible for the Mayor’s Award of Excellence except for elected and appointed officials.

-more-
Individuals or teams can be nominated by supervisors, peers, subordinates and the general public. Nomination forms are available at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: personnel) or from department heads, employee bulletin boards or the Personnel Department, which oversees the awards program.

All nominations are considered by the Mayor’s Award of Excellence Committee, which includes a representative with each union and a non-union representative appointed by the Mayor. Award winners receive a $50 gift certificate, a day off with pay and a plaque. All monthly winners and nominees are eligible to receive the annual award, which comes with a $250 gift certificate, two days off with pay and a plaque.
DATE: December 10, 2013
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 402-441-7831

The three members of the West Haymarket Joint Public Agency (JPA) – Mayor Chris Beutler, NU Regent Tim Clare and City Council member Doug Emery – will discuss future financing of the Pinnacle Bank Arena at a new conference at 10 a.m. Wednesday, December 11 in Room 303, third floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street.
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
555 South 10th Street, Lincoln, NE 68508, 402-441-7511

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: December 11, 2013
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Diane Gonzolas, Citizen Information Center, 402-441-7831
Steve Hubka, Finance Director, 402-441-7698

JPA PROPOSAL CALLS FOR EARLY PAYMENT OF ARENA DEBT

The members of the West Haymarket Joint Public Agency (JPA) today announced a plan to save taxpayer dollars through early payment of the bonds issued for the Pinnacle Bank Arena. The plan is part of a proposed financial model and policy that addresses the financial future of the JPA. The three-member board – Mayor Chris Beutler, NU Regent Tim Clare and City Council member Doug Emery – issued its sixth and final series of bonds last week.

“The JPA has always been careful and conservative in its financial planning,” said Beutler, JPA Chair. “As a result, the arena is not just financially secure – we now have a plan to pay off the arena bonds early. That means our ‘on time and on budget’ arena will cost us even less than we originally planned.”

Beutler said the City’s excellent credit rating and a period of historically low interest rates have resulted in saving taxpayers millions of dollars on the arena bond issues. The $353.5 million in bonds have a blended interest rate of 3.786 percent. Compared to the projected interest rate of 5 percent, the interest savings until 2021 is $4.3 million annually, and the approximate savings over the life of the bonds is $100 million.

City Finance Director Steve Hubka and former Finance Director Don Herz worked with the JPA to develop the proposed financial model and policy. The Mayor said it incorporates the JPA’s desire to identify a portion of the JPA’s cash balance to be used for early payment of the bond debt once the bonds become eligible for early retirement. The early payment, he said, will result in additional savings on interest.

This proposed financial model and policy will be on the JPA’s agenda for the December 19 meeting for public comment and adoption. The meeting begins at 3 p.m. and will be held in the City Council Chambers, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street.

More information is available at lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: West Haymarket JPA) and PinnacleBankArena.com.
PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES DEPARTMENT  
Watershed Management, 555 S. 10th St., Suite 203, Lincoln, NE 68508, 402-441-7548

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: December 11, 2013  
FOR MORE INFORMATION: Ed Kouma, Watershed Management, 402-441-7018

PUBLIC INVITED TO OPEN HOUSE ON  
ROPER PARK STREAM STABILITY PROJECT  
Project affects park near N. 3rd and Fairfield streets

The public is invited to an open house Tuesday, December 17 on the Roper Park Stream Stability Project. The informal meeting is from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at Oak Lake Evangelical Free Church, 3300 N. 1st St.

The proposed project to improve water quality and public safety in Roper Park includes bank stabilization, bridge abutment protection, channel reshaping, stream bank stabilization, vegetative buffers along the creek and establishment of bioretention areas.

Those who attend will have the opportunity to view concept drawings and preliminary plans. Participants may meet with project team members from the City and the design consultant, EA Engineering, Science and Technology, Inc.

The project is funded through the 2012 stormwater bond issue. Construction is expected to occur in late 2014.

For more information on the project, visit lincoln.ne.gov (keyword: projects), then Stormwater/Water Quality Projects, then 2012 Bond Issue.
SECTION OF S. 14TH TO CLOSE MONDAY FOR RAIL REPAIR
_Roadway expected to reopen Tuesday afternoon_

Beginning at about 9 a.m. Monday, December 16, S. 14th Street from Highway 2 south to Pioneers Boulevard will close for rail crossing and track repair. The intersections of S. 14th with Highway 2 and Pioneers Boulevard will remain open, and access for local businesses will be maintained. Burlington Northern Sante Fe (BNSF) expects to complete the work by Tuesday afternoon.

The detour route is Highway 2, 27th Street and Old Cheney Road. Motorists are advised to plan ahead and consider alternate north-south routes by using the Highway 77 Bypass with intersections at Van Dorn Street, Old Cheney Road and Warlick Boulevard. Message boards are currently in place to advise motorists of the road closure. Messages will be revised to include suggested detour routes during the closure.

More information on road and lane closures is available at lincoln.ne.gov.

- 30 -
DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

- The Health Director, Division Managers and Board of Health members Stark, Lester, and Petersen attended the Site Visit and Tour of the Capital Humane Society’s Pieloch Adoption Center on November 20th. Bob Downey and staff provided a tour of the facility and an overview of the services they provide.

- The Health Director continues to meet with community health leaders regarding expansion of services in the community.

- The Health Director attended the Tabitha Foundation Board of Directors Retreat and monthly meeting.

- The Health Director met with the Mayor’s Office and other City officials to preview the recommendations for the Solid Waste Management Plan 2040. The Solid Waste Management Plan Advisory Committee developed the document to provide guidance for solid waste issues for the next 30 years.

- The Health Director attended a site visit of the Many Nations Counseling Center. The Center receives funding from the Community Health Endowment. The Health Director serves on the Community Health Endowment Board of Trustees and the Funding Committee.

- The Health Director and EPH Supervisors met with NDEQ Director Mike Linder and his senior managers to discuss/review program information.

- The Health Director and key staff met with Lincoln Fire and Rescue management staff on issues of interest to both Departments.

- Employee of the Month – Barbara Martinez – Community Health Services

ANIMAL CONTROL

Animal Control Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep-Oct 11</th>
<th>Sep-Oct 12</th>
<th>Sep-Oct 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pet Licenses Sold</td>
<td>8423</td>
<td>10005</td>
<td>9956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Dispatched</td>
<td>4198</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>4275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>4523</td>
<td>4199</td>
<td>4618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Animals Impounded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Court Citations Issued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warnings/Defects Issued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bite Cases Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attack Cases Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dogs Declared (PPD, DD,V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Animal Neglect Investigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Injured Animal Rescue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife Removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dead Animal Pickup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>497</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lost and Found Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>479</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phone Calls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8567</td>
<td>9602</td>
<td>8018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Response Time (in mins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff continue to update and work on the Animal Control Emergency Preparedness Plan.

- Six staff are completing the Incident Command System online training required by the National Incident Management System (NIMS). Eight staff have completed all the online requirements. Most of the additional work at this time is focused on assessing capacity (both internal and external) regarding possible roles and responsibilities Animal Control would need to assume in the event of a disaster or emergency. Eventually the Health Department Animal Control Plan will compliment the Lancaster County Emergency Operations Plan and serve as a resource to all incident command operations.

- The Animal Control Advisory Committee met on November 19th. Sgt. Brian Agnew is the new representative from the Lincoln Police Department. The Committee heard a short presentation on the Lincoln Animal Ambassadors spay neuter program. They were also updated on the Emergency Preparedness activities and the Animal Control Ordinances that the Lincoln City Council recently adopted. There was some discussion the two dog park runs in Lincoln, one east of 70th street across from Holmes Lake and another at Oak Lake.

- Staff are in the process of filling two positions. One is for an Animal Control Officer I and another is for a full time dispatcher. Interviews for the officer should start in December and interviews for the dispatcher should be completed in January.

- Officers are following up with owners of potentially dangerous and dangerous dogs to assure compliance with the responsibilities and duties of owning a potentially dangerous or dangerous dog.
- A positive trend continues regarding the number of dogs and cats being impounded at the Capital Humane Society. This trend can be attributed to different circumstances; however the increased trend on pet licensing has helped. Officers are able to get licensed pet back to their owners before they end up in the shelter.

- Animal Control staff and staff from the Capital Humane Society continue to meet twice monthly. These meetings have proved productive and help keep lines of communication open. The Animal Control Division has located an Animal Control officer at the Capital Humane Society. The officer is based out of the Park Street Shelter; receives and goes out on dispatched calls and assists customers that come into the shelter that may be there because Animal Control has had previous contact with them or their pet.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

HEALTH INSURANCE MARKETPLACE

- The overall goal of the Community Health Services Division is to connect vulnerable people to a source of health care. Although vulnerability can have several meanings, being poor and uninsured is one of the main barriers to accessing health care. One-quarter (25%) of uninsured adults in the United States go without needed health care each year due to cost. Studies have shown that the uninsured, compared to those with insurance (private or public health insurance):
  (a) are less likely to receive preventive care, recommended screenings, and health care for major health conditions and chronic disease,
  (b) are at higher risk for preventable hospitalizations and for missed diagnoses of serious health conditions, and
  (c) have significantly higher mortality rates.

- This month, thirty (30) CHS staff and volunteers began training to enroll the uninsured in the Health Insurance Marketplace. LLCHD is a Certified Application Counselor Designated Organization (CDO) under contract with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Staff and volunteers will become Certified Application Counselors (CACs). CAC training includes protection of personally identifiable information, Nebraska Medicaid eligibility and application training, and federal, on-line training in the Health Insurance Marketplace through CMS. Total training time is approximately 8 hours.

- Working with community safety-net partners, staff and volunteers will assist the poor and uninsured to apply for health insurance through the Health Insurance Marketplace, Nebraska Medicaid, General Assistance, the People’s Health Center, and Health 360/Lancaster County Medical Society. Denial of assistance is sometimes a prerequisite for assistance in another safety net program.
DENTAL HEALTH & NUTRITION

WIC and the Government Shutdown

- WIC services continued without interruption at the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department WIC Program and in Nebraska. The only change was that participants who might normally be issued two months of (bi-monthly) vouchers were only given one month of vouchers. That changed occurred for about 2 weeks in October. Those participants are scheduled to come back during the month of November. Typically about 1600 participants are given bi-monthly vouchers at the LLCHD WIC Program each month.

Dental Health

- The month of October has been one of the dental clinic’s most productive months, with 639 patients being provided 1046 patient visits. Of the total clients seen, 58% were children and 56% were enrolled in Medicaid. Of the total clients seen, 69 clients were provided 127 patient visits during Thursday evening clinic, with 97% children and 64% enrolled in Medicaid.

- The 58% of children seen in the dental clinic during October compares to 52.9% of children seen in the dental clinic during FY 13 and to our overall goal of increasing the percentage of children seen to 55% as a performance measure for assuring access to dental homes for our most vulnerable populations.
Community outreach activities included site visits by staff to Hamlow, Rousseau and Elliott Elementary schools for school based dental screenings. The school based dental screenings targets those children that have not reported dental visits in the past 12 months. Upon completion of screenings, children are provided referral information for accessing dental homes in our community.

ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

Water Quality Private Water Wells

Goals (Purpose)
- Protect human health by preventing waterborne illness through protecting groundwater from contamination and sampling/testing water from wells.

Water Quality Indicator
- Ensure all private wells used for potable water are tested annually for bacterial and Nitrate contamination and well owners/users are notified of the results within 7 days.

Strategies/Methods (What we do)
- educate well owners on protecting groundwater from contamination
- investigate suspected waterborne illnesses
- issue permits
- conduct annual inspections and take water samples from potable wells within the city limits
- conduct inspections and take water samples from new or repaired wells within the 3-mile limit
- assure proper decommissioning of wells
- take enforcement actions

Funding/Source (1)

User Fees; City General Fund/County General Fund (63/37 split)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With Supervisory &amp; Clerical Support Costs</th>
<th>Direct Field Costs w/o Supervisory or Clerical Support Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>$69,286 (69%)</td>
<td>$69,286 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City General Fund</td>
<td>$20,658 (20%)</td>
<td>$3,961 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County General Fund</td>
<td>$11,407 (11%)</td>
<td>$2,326 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Direct Costs | $100,121 | $75,573

Water Well Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permits Issued</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>604*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Samples</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% + Coliform</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68 wells;16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% + E. coli</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10 wells;2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &gt;= 10 ppm Nitrate</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22 wells;6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 534 annual/renewal water well permits were issued in the City; 65 permits were issued for newly drilled wells within the city or 3-mile limit; and 5 repair permits were issued. (BPRA001 data from 11/22/13)

Comparison

- In FY13, 16% of water wells were found to have coliform bacteria, indicating contamination issues, 2% had E. coli, indicating fecal contamination, and 6% had Nitrate levels which posed a known public health risk (>10mg/L). These data are consistent with past years, but somewhat on the high side. Contamination can be affected by weather conditions; heavy rainfall/runoff tends to increase contamination levels; drought conditions may result in less contamination.

Description

- Local ordinance requires all domestic wells (drinking water, irrigation, etc.) within the city and all newly drilled wells within the 3-mile limit to hold a permit. In FY13, the permit fee for a newly drilled well was $195 and the annual permit fee for a well in the City limits was $110. Over 50% of the wells in the City are used for drinking water, and the majority of the rest are used for irrigation. All domestic wells in the City that are used for drinking water are inspected and tested for bacteria and Nitrate contamination annually. Each of the newly drilled potable water wells within the 3 mile limit were inspected and sampled for bacteria and Nitrate. Water is one of the most common carriers of disease causing organisms and chemicals which present health risks. When properties with private wells are annexed into the city, the owners are allowed by right to retain their water well and not connect to the Lincoln Water System. Annexations increase the number of people required to obtain a city well permit.

Partnerships & Efficiencies

- Health works closely with DHHS and LPSNRD on groundwater issues. Health works closely with Planning on newly annexed areas to assure that people know how the well ordinance applies. A geographically referenced database has been created and Accela
HEALTH DATA & EVALUATION

- So far there is very little flu showing up locally and only a few regions or states in the country that have had enough cases to indicate to the CDC that they have local or regional spread of flu in their area. I’m sure you receive Tim Timmons’ weekly update on local flu and RSV activity in addition to a state and national summary. (If you don’t please let us know.) However, if you wish to know more about the national flu situation or activity in another state, you may find it interesting to go to http://www.cdc.gov/flu/weekly/ and find out additional information about circulating strains, regional and state rates around the country, antiviral resistance, etc.

Fortunately, it appears that this year’s flu vaccines are a good match for the flu types that are showing up in the country so if you’ve been vaccinated you should have a good chance of protection. If you haven’t been vaccinated there is no better time than the present since it will take two weeks to develop immunity and during the holidays your chances of being exposed increase a great deal due to the many family and social interactions.

- Perhaps you’ve noticed men who have grown a moustache or beard in November. Television hosts, doctors, professionals and blue-collar workers have been spotted with facial hair this month. A local appliance store has even been offering prizes for the best moustache. So what is the reason for No-Shave November (or “Movember”) efforts?

It’s kind of a fun way to focus attention on men’s health issues. The mission is to “change the face of men’s health.” So, when someone asks about his facial hair a man is supposed to indicate that the growth is to bring awareness to men’s health issues, especially cancers when many people lose their hair during treatment, and also to raise money for research into diseases and conditions affecting men.

Some men wearing facial hair focus only on male-specific issues, such as prostate cancer (1,216 NE cases in 2010; 6,424 from 2006-10) or testicular cancer. Other no-shave backers include colorectal cancer rates and screening. (The American Cancer Society would appreciate a donation of the money saved from not shaving for the month). The real issue is cancer in general. Cancer is a disease affecting both genders and it has been the leading cause of death in Lancaster County since 1999, and the state since 2009. However, many people do not realize that men have a higher incidence of virtually every major non-gender specific cancers except thyroid cancer and the lifetime risk of cancer is one in two (50%) for males versus one in three for females. For example the table below shows 2006 to 2010 Nebraska cancer cases and rates by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer Site</th>
<th>Male Number</th>
<th>Male—Age Adjusted Rate</th>
<th>Female Number</th>
<th>Female—Age Adjusted Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And that’s just the start of the discussion about disease rates, conditions and health behaviors where men compare unfavorably with women: heart disease rate and onset age, COPD, fruit and vegetable consumption, smoking, binge drinking, obesity, unintentional injuries, preventive screenings. These differences reflect enough disparities to make men’s health a relevant topic of discussion.

**HEALTH PROMOTION & OUTREACH**

**Early Development Network**

- Two EDN Services Coordinators have completed training to become certified trainers in Routines Based Interview/Assessment (RBI). Over the next year, these two services coordinators will train EDN services coordinators and Lincoln Public Schools staff on the Routines Based Interview. This approach uses a family’s daily routine to incorporate the outcomes on which they would like to focus for their family and their child with special needs. The results of the assessment are recorded in the child’s IFSP (Individualized Family Service Plan) or IEP (Individualized Education Plan). Every family has some type of a daily routine making it easier for a family to explain their goals and needs based on their daily lives in their natural environment. The RBI is typically done in conjunction with the IFSP. Either the primary provider from LPS or the services coordinator can lead the RBI with the family. The following paragraph further describes Routines Based Interviews/Assessment.

- According to research, “routines based assessment in the child’s natural environment sets the stage for family guided, developmentally appropriate intervention. Routines based assessment accommodates the preferences of the family by encouraging them to identify the routines and activities most appropriate for and preferred by the child. Multiple
domains (motor, communication, social, cognitive, self-help) can be addressed in a single routine or activity providing opportunities for collaboration on assessment and later, intervention among team members. Most importantly family members and caregivers can participate with the child in the assessment simply by demonstrating their routines, interactions, and everyday learning opportunities.”

**Injury Prevention**

- Staff conducted a Fire Safe Landlord Training for 17 landlords representing 409 living units. In addition to the fire prevention information for landlords to share with their tenants, each landlord receives five smoke detectors. City departments that collaborate to bring this training to landlords include LLCHD, LFR, Building and Safety, and the Stronger Safer Neighborhoods project through LPD.

- Staff co-taught with Aging Partners the series of Stepping On Classes for older adults at Lincoln Medical Education Partnership. Fourteen older adults took advantage of this training to gain “hands-on” experience in fall prevention. Among the topics presented are balance, strength training, assessment of medications, assessment of living quarters, and vision impairments. Stepping On Classes are being offered at multiple sites in the community including senior living centers. Health data shows that one in three adults 65 and older fall each year. These classes are in response to the injury prevention priority identified in the Community Health Improvement Plan and are funded through a Community Health Endowment grant to Aging Partners.

- Staff conducted two Nebraska Safe Kids Child Care Transportation trainings in the past month for 16 child care center employees who transport children. These trainings evolved in response to the DHHS enhanced child care regulations. It is a requirement that all child care center staff who transport children attend this 3 hour training.

**INFORMATION & FISCAL MANAGEMENT**

- FY 2013 and 1st Quarter FY 2014 Fiscal Review meetings with the Management Team of each Division have begun. The purpose of the meeting is to review significant fiscal activity in the past quarter, identify likely concerns or issues for the new fiscal year and discuss potential issues for the next budget cycle.

- The Division Manager joined staff from Douglas County Health Department, the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, and the Nebraska Health Information Initiative (health information exchange) to report to the Nebraska Health Council regarding local public health interactions with health information exchange.
I. ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Board of Health was called to order at 5:00 PM by Heidi Stark at the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department. Members Present: Alan Doster, Doug Emery, Karla Lester, Jacqulyn Miller, Michelle Petersen, Marcia White, Brittany Behrens (ex-officio), Tim Sieh (ex-officio) and Heidi Stark. Roma Amundson arrived at 5:06 PM

Members Absent: Trish Owen (ex-officio).

Staff Present: Judy Halstead, Charlotte Burke, Steve Frederick, Steve Beal, Scott Holmes, Andrea Haberman, Chris Schroeder, Renee Massie and Elaine Severe.

Others Present: Craig Strong and Hunter White.

Mr. Strong and Mr. White from Boy Scout Troop 49 were introduced. Mr. White is attending a government meeting as a requirement to receive his citizenship and government badge.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Stark asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Agenda.

Motion: Moved by Dr. Lester that the Agenda be approved as mailed. Second by Dr. Miller. Motion carried by acclamation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Stark asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Minutes. Ms. Halstead stated there was one minor correction – “Dr. Michelle Petersen was introduced as the new member of the Board of Health. Dr. Petersen was recommended for appointment by the Lancaster County Medical Society.”

Motion: Moved by Dr. Petersen that the October 8, 2013 Minutes be approved as amended. Second by Ms. White. Motion carried by acclamation.

III. PUBLIC SESSION

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

A. Health Director Update

Ms. Halstead stated the Mayor’s Office is recommending Mike Tavlin for
appointment to the Board of Health replacing Dr. Ed Schneider. The appointment will be forwarded to the Lincoln City Council and Lancaster County Commissioners for approval. Mr. Tavlin is the CFO for Speedway and has served on many boards/committees in the community. Ms. White will resign from the Board of Health in December as she is now employed by the Community Health Endowment. The Mayor’s Office will recommend a replacement for Ms. White.

Ms. Halstead stated staff will provide an update on the permitting for the Haymarket/Arena area establishments at the December meeting. Ms. Halstead stated staff are beginning budget discussions for the biennial budget for 2014-16.

Ms. Halstead stated the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFFS) indicators are in the Department Report. Overall, we are pleased with the results but still have work to do. The BRFSS compares Lancaster County to Nebraska and the USA as a whole. Areas of concern continue to be tobacco use by adults and binge drinking. Dr. Doster stated binge drinking could be higher in Lancaster County because of the college population.

Dr. Lester asked for additional information on the Food Package Averages for the WIC Program. Ms. Halstead stated the amounts vary for pregnant women, children and infants. Infants receive the highest amount. The “Food Packages” are the dollar amount of their WIC checks provided to the client that they purchase toward their nutrition for the month.

IV. CURRENT BUSINESS (Action items)

A. Board of Health Community Site Visits

Ms. Halstead stated the Board of Health elected to tour various entities in the community. The Board toured the UNL Veterinary Diagnostic Center in September and is scheduled to visit the Capital Humane Society Pieloch Adoption Center on November 20th. She asked whether the Board wished to continue the site visits. Board members stated the visits are helpful and agreed to reduce the number of visits to once every three month. Future locations include the EduCare Center, Lincoln Fire & Rescue, the People’s Health Center and the UNL Student Health Center. Members agreed to tour the EduCare Center in February, 2014.

V. CURRENT BUSINESS (Information Items)

A. Health Insurance Marketplace: “Local Outreach & Enrollment Efforts”

Ms. Haberman provided a presentation on the Health Insurance Marketplace. She reviewed the goals and the local strategies. Local partners meet on a regular basis to share information and resources about the Affordable Care Act, the Marketplace and Nebraska Medicaid. It is estimated there are 35,000 plus uninsured adults in Lancaster County. She stated the Health Department’s role is to serve as Certified
Application Counselors as part of our services to the poor and uninsured in our community. Volunteers are needed and will be used for special outreach events in our community. Key points include: 1) qualified health plans on the Exchange are NOT Medicaid products; 2) individuals who cannot afford health insurance will not have to pay tax penalties; 3) individuals who are currently insured through employer paid benefits should stay away from the Marketplace; 4) pre-existing conditions are excluded; 5) no more lifetime limits, annual limits, or higher rates for women; and 6) extension of dependent coverage. Ms. Haberman will continue to provide updates to the Board of Health.

B. PhotoVoices Project

Ms. Massie provided a presentation on the PhotoVoice Project. She stated the project is used to get youth to assume responsibility for identifying tobacco-related concerns in their neighborhood. The project promotes conversation and focuses on tobacco use and its impact on the health of their neighborhood. The youth took photographs that reflect their concerns about tobacco and how it affects their neighborhood and community. The youth wrote their own thoughts and tell stories about what the photographs mean to them. Staff have taken the photograph display to various sites in Lincoln and Lancaster County, i.e., Salvation Army Backpack Giveaway Program, Salvation Army Small Fry Basketball Program and the Malone Center. Staff will also take the displays to the schools in the County and City and work with them to promote the project in their schools.

C. Complete Streets

Mr. Schroeder provided a presentation on the Complete Streets Program. Complete Streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities should be able to safely move along and across a Complete Street. Highlights of the presentation included: public health benefits and safety benefits including reducing the risk of obesity; reducing the number of bicycle and pedestrian injuries, reducing the risk of diabetes, high blood pressure and meeting the minimum daily physical activity requirement and improved air quality. He stated the complete streets policies are intended to ensure the entire right-of-way is planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to provide safe access for all users. Mayor Beutler signed the Complete Streets Executive Order on September 12, 2013 and it included department signatures from Public Works and Utilities, Planning, Health, Building & Safety, Parks & Recreation and Urban Development. The Executive Order and Administrative Regulation will support and encourage the design and operation of a transportation system that is safe and convenient for all users, develop inter-departmental coordination and review standards and policies for compliance. Mr. Schroeder stated the Health Department’s role will be providing support and assistance during the early design state of street projects.

VI. FUTURE BUSINESS
Increases in permitting the West Haymarket & Arena Area.

Ms. Amundson asked that Binge Drinking be added to the agenda. She would like to see alcohol use/abuse as a priority for the Board of Health.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting – December 10, 2013 - 5:00 PM

Capital Humane Society Pieloch Adoption Center site visit - Wednesday, November 20, 2013 - 11:30 AM - 12:30 PM.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 PM.

Elaine Severe
Recording Secretary

Jacquelyn Miller
Vice-President
NOTICE OF ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

TO: Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, Mayor, City Council, City Clerk, Media
FROM: Lynn Johnson, Director, Lincoln Parks & Recreation Department
MEETING DATE: December 12, 2013
LOCATION: 2740 “A” Street – Parks & Recreation Dept. (Large Conference Room)
TIME: 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.
CHAIR: Anne Pagel

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Recognition of ‘Open Meetings Act’

3. Approval of Minutes: * November 14, 2013

4. Comments from Public for Items Not Listed on the Agenda

5. Committee Reports:
   A. Fees & Facilities Committee – Susan Deitchler (Chair) 488-4224
      * Approving a Guidance Statement for development of parking and sports fields in the southern portion of Sampson Park by Midget Football
   
   B. Futures Committee – Bob Ripley (Chair) 471-0419 or 488-5131
      * Adoption of Parks & Recreation 10-Year Facilities Plan
      * Recommendation regarding naming of the new shooting sports facility at Boosalis Park
      * Approving an Amendment to Rules and Regulations regarding Inscribed Paver, Bricks, Tiles, and Plaques to be placed in Parks & Public Garden Areas regarding Inscriptions in languages other than English

   C. Golf Report
      * Rounds and Revenue Report
      * Status report regarding Lincoln City Golf Program Sustainability Study

   D. Executive Committee – Anne Pagel (Chair) 402-540-9194
      * Election of Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Officers
      * Monthly Meeting Time for PRAB

6. Staff Report
   * Fundraising Report by Susan Larsen Rodenburg and Danielle Conrad

7. Announcements:
   * Possibly a Party in the Parks event in Union Plaza in December

Happy Holidays from Lincoln Parks & Recreation Staff!
We look forward to working with you in 2014!

* Denotes Action Items
Members Present:
Bradley Brandt  Molly Brummond  Jonathan Cook  Jim Crook  Susan Deitchler
Anne Pagel  Bob Ripley  Jeff Schwebke  Joe Tidball

Members Absent:
Justin Carlson  Larry Hudkins  Todd Fitzgerald  Peter Levitov
Cleo Mullison  Kelly O’Hanlon  Kathi Wieskamp

Staff Members Present:
Lynn Johnson, Director
Jerry Shorney, Park Operations Superintendent
Sandy Myers, Recreation & Athletics
Dale Hardy, Golf Administrator
Nicole Fleck-Tooze, Special Projects Admin.
Angela Chesnut, Executive Secretary

Recognition of ‘Open Meetings Act’:  As per law, Chairperson Anne Pagel announced that
the Board follows the regulations of the Open Meetings Act, as posted, and called the meeting to
order.

Anne introduced and welcomed new Board member Bradley Brandt, who shared information
about himself.

Discussion was held regarding a change to the Board meeting times as previously discussed.
Chairman Pagel added the item to the agenda under Executive Committee Report.

* APPROVAL OF MINUTES:  There were no changes, additions, or corrections to the minutes
of the October 10, 2013 minutes.  Minutes were approved by unanimous vote of members
present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS (other than those listed on the current Agenda):
None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

* Fees & Facilities Committee – Susan Deitchler (Chair) 488-4224
Susan brought forward a recommendation regarding a request by Community Crops to establish
an urban garden in Peter Pan Park.  Nicole Fleck-Tooze discussed the location of the proposed
garden on the west edge of Peter Pan Park with a size of approximately 13,000 square feet.
This would be the first formal proposal to establish an urban garden in a City park, with
Community Crops conducting neighborhood outreach and public meetings regarding the site.  A
water connection will need to be in place, with Community Crops working on funding.
Representatives from Community Crops noted that through various community and
Neighborhood Association meetings, they have received nothing but positive feedback.  They
discussed individual plot sizes and the application process for those interested. If the Board votes to approve the recommendation, the next step would be development of a one year agreement with Community Crops for approval by the Mayor, with a future potential for a multi-year agreement to be approved by the City Council.

Susan Deitchler presented the recommendation from the Fees & Facilities Committee to approve the request by Community Crops to establish an urban garden in Peter Pan Park. *Motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote of all members present.*

**Futures Committee – Bob Ripley (Chair) 471-0419 or 488-5131**
Lynn Johnson discussed the public open house regarding the Parks & Recreation 10-Year Plan that was held on November 12th, which was well attended during the entire 4:30 – 6:30 p.m. time frame. There were a number of suggestions and a lot of interest from those in attendance. It was also noted that the survey is available on the department website, with approximately 300 completed at this time. The survey will close on November 21st. There will be a review by the Futures Committee, with a final recommendation of the 10-Year Plan to the full Board at the December meeting.

**Golf Report – Golf Administrator Dale Hardy**
Dale Hardy reported on the first two months of the fiscal year, providing copies of five year rounds and revenue comparisons. Bob Ripley asked about expenditures over the five year period, to compare expenses vs. revenue. Dale did note that expenses are currently less now than last year, and agreed to provide a five year comparison in future reports. Lynn added that the clubhouses typically stay open until the end of December, in order to provide for membership sales during the gift giving season. Seasonal staff are maintained until weather determines they are no longer needed. A graph was also provided regarding rounds, and it was noted that with the current winter rate specials, there has been an increase in rounds by non-members.

Dale reported that the Point of Sale (POS) program is in the process of being upgraded, which will also add a second terminal at each clubhouse. A new website is being proposed, with a determination to be made whether it will be done by the Department or outsourced. Discussion was also conveyed regarding the possibility of converting Ager into a learning center with the PGA and USGA. The proposed center would train in grip, stance, aim, golf etiquette, cart operation, etc., and would potentially focus on youth, women, seniors, and new golfers of any age.

New membership and pass rates were proposed (attached to minutes), with green fee increases to be proposed after the first of the year. It was noted that the membership and pass rates are equivalent to 26% of the overall golf revenue. Jonathan Cook questioned how the rates were determined, with Dale indicating that they were from the recommendation of the National Golf Foundation as a result of the sustainability study. Lynn Johnson also informed that the determination for making the change at this time was due to holiday purchases, and the desire to maintain a universal rate for all memberships for the new year. It was noted that the last increase of any fees was three years ago. Statistical information was discussed, as well as the potential for losing some memberships while possibly gaining new. The NGF made numerous comparisons during the sustainability study. Designation of the age for senior rates was also recommended by NGF to be incrementally increased to age 65, which is currently at age 55 for City courses – reduced from age 62 five years ago.

Action was delayed to follow the sustainability study status report.
**Golf Sustainability Study Status Report**

Lynn Johnson informed the members that the Golf Advisory Committee is continuing to work through discussion of the recommendations from the NGF report. A detailed infrastructure inventory was conducted with a projected life expectancy and cost associated in order to determine capital improvement costs, which equated to in excess of $600,000 annually to maintain existing facilities in good repair, including irrigation system upgrades, new roofs and floor coverings, repair of cart paths, and routine building repairs. Based on current average rounds, a $4.00 increase in revenue per round would be needed in order to cover the entire $600,000. Challenges are finding the resources to fund the CIP, as well as reimburse the general fund for the $800,000 deficit from the Golf fund. Current revenue is covering only annual operating costs. It was earlier anticipated that the Golf Advisory Committee would have a recommendation for the PRAB in December, which is now questionable. The Committee continues to work on the NGF recommendations and modifications that may be above those recommendations. A community meeting is being proposed for January, as a formatted presentation and then broken down into discussion groups with targeted questions. After the community meeting, a recommendation from the Golf Advisory committee is anticipated to come before the PRAB possibly in January.

The proposed membership and pass rate increases do not include fee increases, which will be brought forward in January. Jonathan Cook commented that the program must be sustainable and the golf enterprise should not be subsidized, also reminding of large general fund needs for the Parks 10-year plan. Group discussion was held regarding various other local courses as well as the national market. Brad Brandt added that one major need is an investment in additional marketing for the golf program.

As recommended by the Golf Advisory Committee, the proposed new fee schedule for membership and pass rates as proposed, with an understanding that there may be additional changes when green fee rates are proposed in the future, **the motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote of all members present.**

**Executive Committee – Anne Pagel (Chair) 540-9194**

Chair Pagel officially appointed Board member Brad Brandt to fill a PRAB vacancy and serve on the Golf Advisory Committee.

The regular meeting time for the PRAB was revisited. Susan Deitchler asked that this be considered seriously, as current 4:00 p.m. meetings routinely tend to begin late due to waiting on members to arrive for a quorum. In addition, if beginning at 4:30 p.m., that would mean a later ending time for those with children utilizing child care. Molly Brummond offered that a 4:30 p.m. start would require her to leave earlier due to child care. Others in attendance did not indicate a preference. Following additional discussion it was determined that members will be polled by e-mail to request preferences for meeting time beginning at 4:00 p.m., 4:15 p.m., or 4:30 p.m., with a final decision to be made at the December Board meeting.

**STAFF REPORT:**

Sandy Myers provided an overview of programs and facilities serving Lincoln’s diverse population, highlighting Parks & Recreation focus on needs of all participants, activity diversity, and economic and cultural diversity, giving numerous examples of each. Members were
provided with information and charts (attached to minutes) showing the vast diversity from age, ability, culture, and various amenities provided.

As requested at the November meeting, Sandy Myers also provided a presentation regarding the 2013 swimming pool operations attendance and revenue information. Attendance was down, notably due to the cool weather early in the season. Admission revenue was down nearly $83,000 from the prior year, as well as concession revenue with vending machine revenue not included. Lynn Johnson stated that per contract the vendor should provide the vending machine information by location. Sandy agreed to obtain that information and make it available to the members with the next Board meeting packet. Comparison of expenses to revenue for 2013 was 71% recovery, with 2012 a record year at 82%. In conjunction with preparation of the biannual budget, a 25¢ admission increase has been proposed for the 2014 season. Other information was presented and discussed regarding safety statistics, special programs, aquatics staff, and individual pool costs per swim.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.
Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action Item Fact Sheet

Meeting Date: December 12, 2013

Request: Approving a Guidance Statement for development of parking and sports fields in the southern portion of Sampson Park by Midget Football.

Discussion: Midget Football operates football fields and associated facilities in the western portion of Sherman Field (westerly of Sherman Field) under an operating agreement with the City. Representatives of the organization have expressed a desire to develop additional parking and access, and additional sports fields in the southern portion of Sampson Park. The sports fields would initially be used as warm-up space by teams before games, but could be further developed as game fields if there is need in the future. The funding for the proposed improvements is anticipated to be secured through private fundraising. The proposed guidance statement (please see Attachment A) provides direction for additional planning activities and coordination of fundraising activities with the Lincoln Parks Foundation.

Conformance with Adopted Plans and Guidelines: Development and adoption of a guidance statement is consistent with the guidelines for fundraising by an allied organization.

Staff Recommendation: Approve.

Committee Discussion and Recommendation: Approve.

Committee: Fees & Facilities
Chair: Susan Deitchler

Date: 

Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action:
Guidance Statement regarding Proposal from Midget Football for Parking, Pedestrian Access and Practice Field Improvements at Sampson Park
Discussion Draft: November 21, 2013    LKJ

The Lincoln Midget Football organization is proposing to expand the area of use in Sampson Park south of Sherman Field and make phased improvements over time to include:

- a new access drive from Park Boulevard,
- additional rock-surfaced parking,
- a pedestrian crossing and a vehicular/pedestrian crossing over the drainage channel that bisects the site to provide access between the activity areas in the northern and southern portions of the park, and
- development of additional sports field space with the initial emphasis being warm-up space, but with the vision one or more of the fields could be converted to game fields as need warrants in the future.

Standing Bear Park is located east of Sampson Park on the east side of Park Boulevard. A master planning effort is proposed for this site by the Parks and Recreation Department (LPR) with an emphasis on upgrading the sports fields, eliminating the loop drive, creating parking on the west end of the park, and possibly new play equipment for children. Sawyer Snell Park is located north of Sampson Park on the north side of South Street. Lawn areas in Sawyer Snell Park are used as temporary parking areas for activities on the Midget Football Fields in Sampson Park. A master planning effort is also proposed by LPR to consider placement of sports fields, access drives, parking areas and associated site improvements. The master planning efforts for Standing Bear Park and Sawyer Snell Park should be coordinating with master planning for the southern portion of Sampson Park to allow for shared parking and coordinated use of sports fields.

Sherman Field and the current Midget Football Fields are watered utilizing potable water from Lincoln Water System. The City and Midget Football should explore joint development of an irrigation well for the current and proposed sports fields. It is anticipated that an irrigation well would pay for itself over time due to reduce costs for purchasing water.

It is anticipated that Lincoln Midget Football will engage in fundraising for the proposed improvements to the southern portion of Sampson Park. Organization and implementation of a fundraising campaign should be in accord with the adopted Guidelines for Fundraising by an Allied Organization. Pursuant to these guidelines, the Lincoln Parks Foundation (LPF) will be the fiscal sponsor for the anticipated fundraising campaign. Lincoln Midget Football should coordinate with LPF to conduct a capital campaign feasibility study to guide timing and structuring of a capital campaign. This feasibility study should be initiated upon completion and approval of the master plan and related cost estimate for the initial phase of proposed improvements.

Next steps in the process will be as follows:

- Finalize a master plan for the southern portion of Sampson Park in coordination with the master planning effort by LPR for Standing Bear Park.

- Prepare a phasing plan and cost estimate for proposed initial phase.

- Determine the amount of an endowment needed for future repair and replacement costs associated with the initial improvements in cooperation with LPR staff.

- Secure approval from the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board for the master plan, and moving forward with a fundraising campaign.

- Effectuate an agreement with LPF for organization and implementation of a fundraising campaign.
Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action Item Fact Sheet

Meeting Date: December 12, 2013

**Request:** Adoption of the Parks and Recreation 10-Year Facilities Plan

**Discussion:** The Parks and Recreation 10-year Facilities Plan is intended to provide guidance regarding investments in parks and recreation infrastructure over the next decade. The proposed plan includes repair and replacement of existing facilities, and development of new facilities to serve the growing population in our community. The plan is organized by quadrant of the City. Projects of a general nature or that address the entire system are listed under “Administration”. Projects that may involve fundraising campaigns are also identified and prioritized. (Please see the attached document.)

The initial version of the plan was developed through a series of meetings with the Futures Committee of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. Citizens had the opportunity to provide direction regarding expectations of the condition of facilities through an on-line survey. More than 800 citizens participated in the on-line survey, and provided numerous comments and suggestions. In addition, a public open house was conducted regarding the draft plan and about 45 citizens attended. The information from the survey and open house will be used to assist in prioritizing expenditures.

The 10-Year Facilities Plan will be preparation of the capital improvement program. It is also anticipated that the plan will be a living document with updates every two years.

**Conformance with Adopted Plans and Guidelines:** Pursuant to Chapter 12.04 of the Lincoln Municipal Code, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board is to act in an advisory capacity to the Mayor, the City Council, and the Parks and Recreation Director regarding parks and recreation facilities and programs, including development of strategic plans.

**Staff Recommendation:** Approve.

Committee Discussion and Recommendation: Approve.

**Committee:** Futures Committee

**Chair:** Bob Ripley

**Date:**

Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action:
### 10-Year Plan Public Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Actual Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>59.02%</td>
<td>57.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12.27%</td>
<td>23.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>22.36%</td>
<td>22.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>56.29%</td>
<td>56.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>22.36%</td>
<td>9.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>48.59%</td>
<td>44.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>22.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>16.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>48.47%</td>
<td>48.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>13.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Public Pools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>18.53%</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44.05%</td>
<td>39.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>19.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Community Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>45.89%</td>
<td>42.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>13.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>24.17%</td>
<td>12.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>50.06%</td>
<td>41.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
<td>20.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>7.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10-Year Plan Public Survey Results

The first priority for spending should be repair and replacement of existing facilities and improvements.

- Strongly Agree - 33.50%
- Agree - 36.81%
- Neutral - 9.57%
- Disagree - 2.82%
- Strongly Disagree - 1.23%

New facilities should be built in developing areas of the community to serve new residents.

- Strongly Agree - 13.50%
- Agree - 35.83%
- Neutral - 22.70%
- Disagree - 8.71%
- Strongly Disagree - 3.44%

The community should invest in new community facilities that not only serve Lincoln residents, but that also bring visitors to Lincoln.

- Strongly Agree - 18.77%
- Agree - 29.08%
- Neutral - 20.74%
- Disagree - 10.31%
- Strongly Disagree - 5.03%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
<th>523,800.0</th>
<th>520,470.0</th>
<th>548,710.0</th>
<th>524,630.0</th>
<th>525,830.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBO</td>
<td>831,690.0</td>
<td>842,970.0</td>
<td>894,630.0</td>
<td>839,030.0</td>
<td>839,230.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBZ</td>
<td>255,000.0</td>
<td>255,000.0</td>
<td>255,000.0</td>
<td>255,000.0</td>
<td>255,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBO</td>
<td>150,000.0</td>
<td>150,000.0</td>
<td>150,000.0</td>
<td>150,000.0</td>
<td>150,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBO</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBO</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBO</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
<td>100,000.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The FY 10 Year Plan includes only projects that are not shown in the Municipal Operating Budget.
- Estimated costs represent projected costs as of May 2023.
- This plan is subject to change and may not include all priorities.
- The total cost does not include the Estimated Cost Summary for the 10-Year Plan.

**Priority Summary:**
- Property C Projects (27)
- Property B Projects (8)
- Property A Projects (25)

**Estimated Cost Summary by Priority:**
- Administration (523,800.0)
- Southeast District (831,690.0)
- Northwest District (250,000.0)
- Northeast District (150,000.0)
- Other Projects (250,000.0)

**Estimated Cost Summary by Park District:**
- Southeast District (523,800.0)
- Northwest District (520,470.0)
- Other Projects (548,710.0)
- Estimated Cost Summary (524,630.0)

**Estimated Cost Summary by Category:**
- Total by Priority Function
- Other Projects
- Replacement
- Repairs
- New Facilities

**Estimated Total Cost Over 10-Year Period (27 Projects):**
- Priority C Projects (27)
- Priority B Projects (8)
- Priority A Projects (25)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Neighborhood Parks</th>
<th>Estimated Cost ($M)</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Impact Fees</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Playfield Improvements - Kingdom's Source</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>コミュニティ成長のための存在が</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Waterfront Park Development - Co-located with New Elementary School</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>$5.700</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>$5.400</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pools</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recreation Centers</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other Facilities</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>すべて</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost Totals for the Northwest Quadrant</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional to Northwest Park District Maintenance Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$96.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Art Park Pool Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Art Park Pool Bathhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Benson Park Parking Lot and Access Drives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Benson Park Bathhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of All Park Recreation Center at Arnold Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Benson Recreation Center HVAC System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Connections to Innovation Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$149.20</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Landmark Trail - North 4th to North 27th Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation Acquisition and Restoration of Saline Wetland Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Park - Lynn Creek Channel Bank Stabilization &amp; Wetland Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak lake Park - Renovation of Northwest Playfield at Oak Lake Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park Tournament Sports Complex (Youth Basketball)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground renovations - lake view, linden, highlands, schwartzkopf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Area Lifeguards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park Development Co-located with School Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park Development Co-located with Ross Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground at Dowling Lake Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground at Dowling Lake Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRaFT Parks and Recreation 10 Year Plan**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost (in $000)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>Addition to Southwest Park District Maintenance Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Recreation Center - Recreation Center, including gym, ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>Recreation Center - Recreation Center, including gym, ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Recreation Center - Recreation Center, including gym, ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>TRails / trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost (Total) for the Southeast Quadrant</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500.0</td>
<td>Southwest Parks Board of Directors meeting room renovation and expansion, community park renovation, and parking improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5200.0</td>
<td>Construction of new community center at South Park and expansion of existing recreation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200.0</td>
<td>Recreational facility improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information**

- Community Center/Recreation Center
- Construction of new community center at South Park and expansion of existing recreation facilities.
- Recreational facility improvements.
- Transportation improvements to access community center.
- New retail development.

**Southwest Quadrant**

- Estimated Cost (Total) for the Southwest Quadrant:
- 3500.0
- 5200.0
- 2200.0

**Northwood Park**

- Proposed construction of new community center.
- Recreational facility improvements.
- Transportation improvements to access community center.

**Southwest Parks Board of Directors meeting room renovation and expansion**

- Southwest Parks Board of Directors meeting room renovation and expansion.
- Community park renovation.
- Parking improvements.

**Property**

- 11/22/13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost (Total) for Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Reports &amp; Regularization Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$600.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Projects/Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/Replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adминистation Priority**

**Draft Parks and Recreation 10 Year Plan**

11/22/13
Meeting Date: December 12, 2013

Request: Recommendation regarding naming of the new shooting sports facility at Boosalis Park.

Discussion: A new indoor shooting sports facility is being constructed in Boosalis Park as a cooperative effort of the Nebraska Game & Parks Commission (NGPC) and the City of Lincoln. The facility is being constructed on City parkland consistent with a master plan developed for Boosalis Park, and will be owned by the City. NGPC is responsible for securing funding for the new building, and will manage the building and related programming under an agreement between the City and State. NGPC has requested that the City consider naming the new indoor shooting sports facility as follows:

1. Naming of the building as “NEBRASKALand Outdoor Education Center” or “Nebraska Game and Parks Outdoor Education Center”.

2. Naming of the indoor archery range space within the building as “Easton Foundation Archery Range” in recognition of grant funding support for construction of the building.

Conformance with Adopted Plans and Guidelines: Proposed naming of the building and indoor archery range are consistent with naming guidelines for facilities in recognition of the Parks & Recreation Facilities Naming Policy.

Staff Recommendation: Approve.

Committee Discussion and Recommendation: Approve name of facility to be selected from the options presented.

Committee: Futures Committee

Chair: Bob Ripley

Date: __________________

Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action:
Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action Item Fact Sheet

Meeting Date: December 12, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Request:</strong> Amendment to Rules and Regulations regarding Inscribed Paver, Bricks, Tiles and Plaques to be Placed in Parks and Public Garden Areas regarding inscriptions in languages other than English.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Discussion:</strong> The Rules and Regulations regarding Inscribed Paver, Bricks, Tiles and Plaques to be Placed in Parks and Public Garden Areas were adopted in January, 2009 after review and recommendation by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. The intent of establishing these rules was to provide guidance regarding inscriptions allowed on sponsored pavers and tiles to be placed in public park areas. The original version of the rules and regulations did not address inscriptions in languages other than English. The proposed amendment states that inscriptions may be in languages other than English provided that they are in conformance with the guidelines regarding content. (Please see attachment with proposed amendment in bold text.) A donor proposing an inscription in a non-English language will be requested to submit a translation into the English language. Department staff may recommend consideration of alternative text or format if there is concern that letters or symbols may not be effectively rendered through the inscription process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conformance with Adopted Plans and Guidelines:</strong> The proposed amendment establishes a process of review of inscriptions in languages other than English. The guidelines regarding content are the same for all languages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Staff Recommendation:</strong> Approve.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Committee Discussion and Recommendation: Approve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee: Futures Committee</th>
<th>Chair: Bob Ripley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date: ________________

Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action:
Rules and Regulations regarding Inscribed Pavers, Bricks, Tiles and Plaques to be Placed in Parks and Public Garden Areas.

The City of Lincoln Parks and Recreation Department provides a number of opportunities for inscribed bricks, pavers and plaques to be placed on publicly owned and managed parkland. Examples of such opportunities include inscribed pavers in Sunken Gardens and in the Hamann Rose Garden at Antelope Park, inscribed bricks in the Veterans Memorial Garden, inscribed stonewall tiles in Union Plaza, and bronze plaques associated with donated park improvements such as benches and drinking fountains. Donors propose the wording that they would like have placed on the pavers, bricks and plaques. Pavers, bricks and plaques become the property of the City of Lincoln, and as such, the Parks and Recreation Department has the responsibility to review and approve wording to assure that it meets acceptable standards. By allowing inscribed pavers, bricks and plaques, the City of Lincoln is not intending to create a public forum with no restrictions on the wording included, but rather is intending to create a limited forum for inscribed pavers, pavers and inscribed bricks only under certain stated restrictions.

Inscriptions on pavers, bricks, tiles and bronze plaques to be placed in parks and public garden areas are intended to be a tribute to a person or persons. Inscriptions shall typically include the name(s) of the honoree(s), and may include a brief message of tribute or remembrance. Inscriptions may include the name of a business or commercial enterprise when a business is being recognized for a donation or service to the community. The inscription may not include a slogan, logo, or wording that would be considered by the average person to be advertising.

Inscriptions may be in languages other than English. A donor proposing an inscription in a non-English language will be requested to provide the text for the proposed inscription, and a translation into the English language. The content of non-English language inscriptions must be in compliance with other guidelines. Parks and Recreation Department staff may seek assistance in verifying the translation. Some letters, characters and symbols of non-English languages may not be suited to the process of sand-blasted inscription in concrete pavers or stone. Staff may recommend consideration of alternative text or format if there is concern that letters, characters or symbols may not be effectively rendered through the sandblast inscription process.

Inscriptions on bricks and panels at the Veterans memorial garden are intended to be a tribute to a veteran of the United States military service, or to the member of an immediate family of a veteran. Inscriptions shall typically include the name of the honoree, and may include rank, service unit and years of service.

In all instances, inscriptions may not include reference to race, religion, color, deity, ethnic heritage, sexual orientation, disability status, or political affiliation.
Meeting Date: December 12, 2013

Request: Presentation of a slate of officers for election to serve as Chair and Vice-Chair in 2014.

Discussion: The by-laws of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board state that the officers of the Board are to be elected during the December meeting of each year. The slate of officers proposed by the nominating committee appointed by Chair Pagel is as follows:

- Chair – Peter Levitov
- Vice-Chair – Todd Fitzgerald

Conformance with Adopted Plans and Guidelines: Election of officers is consistent with the by-laws of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board.

Staff Recommendation:

Committee Discussion and Recommendation: Approve.

Committee: Nominating Committee
Chair:

Date: ________________

Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Action:
# 2013 Swimming Pool Operations Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference as percent of last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Heights</td>
<td>11,392</td>
<td>9,969</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>11,499</td>
<td>12,303</td>
<td>9,662</td>
<td>(2,521) 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>9,168</td>
<td>15,539</td>
<td>14,370</td>
<td>17,675</td>
<td>13,688</td>
<td>(3,987) 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>13,574</td>
<td>9,905</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td>10,085</td>
<td>11,167</td>
<td>10,465</td>
<td>(682) 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>22,875</td>
<td>21,362</td>
<td>16,463</td>
<td>25,662</td>
<td>23,885</td>
<td>18,470</td>
<td>(5,415) 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>36,763</td>
<td>29,638</td>
<td>30,211</td>
<td>28,811</td>
<td>28,427</td>
<td>21,142</td>
<td>(7,285) 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvingdale</td>
<td>17,704</td>
<td>17,274</td>
<td>18,016</td>
<td>21,462</td>
<td>22,833</td>
<td>20,513</td>
<td>(2,320) 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Heights</td>
<td>11,616</td>
<td>9,064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>71,527</td>
<td>59,257</td>
<td>68,351</td>
<td>65,184</td>
<td>70,426</td>
<td>52,307</td>
<td>(18,119) 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>34,813</td>
<td>23,627</td>
<td>31,266</td>
<td>29,431</td>
<td>32,711</td>
<td>22,679</td>
<td>(10,032) 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>33,351</td>
<td>42,070</td>
<td>47,132</td>
<td>40,938</td>
<td>48,970</td>
<td>30,985</td>
<td>(8,985) 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>266,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>231,334</strong></td>
<td><strong>252,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>248,042</strong></td>
<td><strong>268,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,951</strong></td>
<td><strong>(59,446)</strong> 78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Subsidized Swims
(of the above listed total swims, these were provided at a reduced or free rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference as percent of total swims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ Value of Subsidy</td>
<td>$21,410</td>
<td>$21,354</td>
<td>$21,669</td>
<td>$21,120</td>
<td>$27,140</td>
<td>$25,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Admission Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neigh Pools</th>
<th>2008 and 2010</th>
<th>2011 and 2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Fee</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neigh Pools</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Fee</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Gate Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference as percent of last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Office</td>
<td>35,973</td>
<td>21,344</td>
<td>20,594</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>21,675</td>
<td>23,642</td>
<td>1,967 109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Heights</td>
<td>21,435</td>
<td>19,068</td>
<td>18,042</td>
<td>22,864</td>
<td>26,869</td>
<td>21,430</td>
<td>(5,559) 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>20,991</td>
<td>18,954</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>32,414</td>
<td>33,477</td>
<td>28,254</td>
<td>(5,223) 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>19,655</td>
<td>16,967</td>
<td>21,112</td>
<td>23,481</td>
<td>23,156</td>
<td>16,153</td>
<td>(5,005) 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>40,612</td>
<td>34,225</td>
<td>34,672</td>
<td>40,424</td>
<td>41,065</td>
<td>36,820</td>
<td>(4,265) 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>75,045</td>
<td>72,852</td>
<td>70,666</td>
<td>83,506</td>
<td>83,224</td>
<td>78,134</td>
<td>(5,090) 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvingdale</td>
<td>33,644</td>
<td>26,268</td>
<td>30,565</td>
<td>38,051</td>
<td>50,433</td>
<td>46,162</td>
<td>(4,271) 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Heights</td>
<td>15,417</td>
<td>14,154</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>209,950</td>
<td>190,212</td>
<td>208,277</td>
<td>210,397</td>
<td>237,307</td>
<td>200,769</td>
<td>(36,538) 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>73,010</td>
<td>58,260</td>
<td>66,758</td>
<td>70,950</td>
<td>79,421</td>
<td>68,670</td>
<td>(10,751) 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>67,150</td>
<td>80,338</td>
<td>91,341</td>
<td>90,459</td>
<td>102,233</td>
<td>94,041</td>
<td>(8,192) 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>613,282</strong></td>
<td><strong>554,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>595,277</strong></td>
<td><strong>634,851</strong></td>
<td><strong>816,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>516,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>(32,927)</strong> 88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Concession Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference as percent of last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>13,320</td>
<td>11,501</td>
<td>15,094</td>
<td>11,612</td>
<td>11,171</td>
<td>9,626</td>
<td>(1,545) 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>57,950</td>
<td>43,854</td>
<td>49,454</td>
<td>48,108</td>
<td>50,538</td>
<td>30,619</td>
<td>(10,919) 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>14,576</td>
<td>9,968</td>
<td>11,506</td>
<td>11,545</td>
<td>13,933</td>
<td>10,349</td>
<td>(3,544) 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>18,004</td>
<td>24,065</td>
<td>22,465</td>
<td>24,465</td>
<td>17,945</td>
<td>(6,500) 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pools and Admin</td>
<td>8,893</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>5,815</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>(918) 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,159</strong></td>
<td><strong>195,465</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,715</strong></td>
<td><strong>195,352</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>(23,513)</strong> 78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenses to Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference as percent of last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$643,839</td>
<td>$704,770</td>
<td>$734,566</td>
<td>$804,954</td>
<td>$896,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recreation Expenses</td>
<td>$1,012,636</td>
<td>$1,008,034</td>
<td>$1,007,477</td>
<td>$980,848</td>
<td>$974,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Expenses Recovered</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1
Safety Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rescue/Saves</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 44 (22%) were swimming saves; 16 (24%) were wading saves and 7 (10%) were reaching
- 15 (22%) swim saves covered a distance of at least 15 ft
- 36 (54%) of the saves involved a child 2 to 8 years old
- Average age of victim was 7.55 years old
- Most common reasons for saves were water to deep (54), water slide incident (6), fear (7)
- Pools with the most saves were SCS (26), Woods (15), Ballard (8)
- 1 Save for every 3,119 visits
- There were 6-911 calls:
  - 5 Transferred: 3 child hit head (fall on cement, swam into wall, diving board); adult strained back, staff fainted
  - 1 Refused Transport: Staff dizziness/ill

Pool Closures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather (# days)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed early</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed all day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mech./Chemical</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Fecal Accidents</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* these closures ranged from a few hours to a full day
** these closures ranged from 30 minutes to a full day

Special Programming

- Night Splash: 9 locations: 1,117 participants
- Swim Lesson Registrations: 657 total P & R (608), Nebraska Aquatics (49)
- Daycare Water Safety Training: 23 Daycare Groups (222 staff and 560 children)
- Swim/Dive Team Registrations: 711 for Swim Team and 124 for Dive Team
- Competitive Swim/Dive Team: 6 clubs with 7,750 attendances
- Family Night Swims: 86 offered, 941 families, 3,994 patrons, 6 pools
- Junior Lifeguard Class: Eden-10 youth; Belmont 7 youth

Rentals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pools with most rentals: Eden (32), Irving (31), UNI (25)

Admission Reimbursed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced or Free rate offered to groups</th>
<th>273 youth</th>
<th>Salvation Army, Malone, Elliott CLC, Culler CLC, Cedar at Carol Youkum Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>$3,643 value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Swims exchanged with the YMCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1,476 youth</th>
<th>343 adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lincoln Cares Scholarship Program

| $3,960       |

Admission Donated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPIN Free Swim Program</th>
<th>1,034 youth</th>
<th>311 adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>$5,096 value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of Donated Admissions

| $5,807 |

Aquatics Staff

| Total # Staff | 285 | 255 | 236 | 225 | 235 | 242 |

61% returning staff

Cost Per Swim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gate</th>
<th>Concession</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>Cost (Profit)</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Cost (Profit) Per Swim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Heights</td>
<td>21,430</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>22,191</td>
<td>68,548</td>
<td>46,357</td>
<td>9,662</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>29,254</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>28,834</td>
<td>55,718</td>
<td>25,584</td>
<td>13,666</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>16,153</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>16,813</td>
<td>56,494</td>
<td>37,681</td>
<td>10,485</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>36,820</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>37,562</td>
<td>65,376</td>
<td>27,814</td>
<td>18,470</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>79,134</td>
<td>9,626</td>
<td>87,760</td>
<td>101,871</td>
<td>14,111</td>
<td>21,142</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvingdale</td>
<td>45,162</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>47,315</td>
<td>71,346</td>
<td>24,031</td>
<td>20,513</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>200,769</td>
<td>39,619</td>
<td>240,388</td>
<td>199,824</td>
<td>40,764</td>
<td>52,307</td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>68,670</td>
<td>10,349</td>
<td>79,019</td>
<td>128,055</td>
<td>46,036</td>
<td>22,679</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>94,041</td>
<td>17,945</td>
<td>111,986</td>
<td>168,401</td>
<td>56,415</td>
<td>36,965</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>592,433</td>
<td>82,450</td>
<td>674,883</td>
<td>815,433</td>
<td>240,564</td>
<td>200,951</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTICE: The Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, December 11, 2013, at 1:00 p.m., in Hearing Room 112 on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St., Lincoln, Nebraska, on the following items. For more information, call the Planning Department, (402) 441-7491.

The Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission will meet on Wednesday, December 11, 2013, from 11:30 a.m. - 12:45 p.m. in Room 113 of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St., Lincoln, Nebraska, for a “Joint Meeting of the reFORM Design Standards and Zoning Barriers Subcommittees”.

**PLEASE NOTE:** The Planning Commission action is final action on any item with a notation of “FINAL ACTION”. Any aggrieved person may appeal Final Action of the Planning Commission to the City Council or County Board by filing a Notice of Appeal with the City Clerk or County Clerk within 14 days following the action of the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission action on all other items is a recommendation to the City Council or County Board.

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2013

[All members present]

Approval of minutes of the regular meeting held November 27, 2013. **APPROVED, 6-0 (Cornelius, Scheer and Lust abstained)**

1. REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL: None

2. PUBLIC HEARING AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION:

   COMPREHENSIVE PLAN WITH RELATED ITEMS:

   2.1a Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 13003, to amend the 2040 Lincoln-Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan to modify the City's existing theater policy regarding the size and location of movie theater complexes by deleting text from Pages 3, 4, and 10, Chapter 5.

   **Staff recommendation: Denial**

   **Staff Planner: Brian Will, 402-441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov**

   WITHDRAWN by the Applicant at public hearing.
2.1b Text Amendment No. 13014, amending Section 27.63.630 to allow by special permit in the B-5 zoning district theater complexes located outside a 6.5-mile radius from the center of the intersection of 13th and O Streets to have more than six screens; and repealing Section 27.63.630 of the Lincoln Municipal Code as hitherto existing.

Staff recommendation: Denial
Staff Planner: Brian Will, 402-441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
Withdrawn by the Applicant at public hearing.

CHANGE OF ZONE:

2.2 Change of Zone No. 13026, the "21st and N Mixed Use Development Planned Unit Development (PUD)", for a change of zone from B-4 Lincoln Center Business District to B-4 Lincoln Center Business District PUD, on property generally located southeast of the intersection of 21st and N Streets; for a Planned Unit Development District designation of said property; and for approval of a development plan which proposes modifications to the Zoning Ordinance, Land Subdivision Ordinance and Design Standards to allow 93 dwelling units and approximately 10,000 square feet of commercial floor area on the underlying B-4 zoned area.

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Paul Barnes, 402-441-6372, pbarnes@lincoln.ne.gov
Had public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated November 26, 2013, as amended by staff memo dated December 11, 2013, and as further amended by applicant's Motion to Amend dated December 11, 2013, 9-0.
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, January 13, 2014, at 3:00 p.m.

2.3 Change of Zone No. 13027, to designate the Muny Building as a Historic Landmark, on property located in Antelope Park south of 23rd and N Streets.

Staff recommendation: Approval
Staff Planner: Ed Zimmer, 402-441-6360, ezimmer@lincoln.ne.gov
Had public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL, 9-0.
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, January 13, 2014, at 3:00 p.m.

PERMITS:

2.4 Special Permit No. 1665B, an amendment to the Van Dorn Meadows 1st Addition Community Unit Plan, to waive the requirement for a pedestrian easement when the block length exceeds 1,000 ft., on property generally located at S. 72nd Street and Van Dorn Street. *** FINAL ACTION ***

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Brian Will, 402-441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
Had public hearing.
Planning Commission “final action”: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated November 22, 2013, 9-0.
Resolution No. PC-01374.
2.5 Use Permit No. 13011, to allow a grocery store and future pad site development for a total of 50,200 square feet of floor area, including a request to reduce the front yard setback along N. 84th Street, 'O' Street, Russwood Parkway and College Park Drive, on property generally located at the northwest corner of N. 84th Street and "O" Street.

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Paul Barnes, 402-441-6372, pbarnes@lincoln.ne.gov

Had public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated November 26, 2013, as amended on December 11, 2013, 9-0.
Public Hearing before City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, January 13, 2014, at 3:00 p.m.

3. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION:
(See 11-27-2013 agenda for staff reports on the following items.)

TEXT AMENDMENT WITH RELATED ITEMS:

3.1a County Text Amendment No. 13013, amending the Lancaster County Zoning Resolution, by amending Articles 2, 4 and 13 to allow solid waste disposal sites and solid waste processing facilities, such as compost plants and incinerators, as special permitted uses in the AG Agricultural District of Lancaster County, Nebraska.

Staff recommendation: Approval
Staff Planner: Sara Hartzell, 402-441-6371, shartzell@lincoln.ne.gov

Had continued public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated November 14, 2013, as amended on December 10, 2013, 9-0.
Scheduling of Public Hearing before the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners pending.

3.1b County Special Permit No. 13051, to allow a solid waste processing facility, on property generally located at 13000 Pella Road.

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval
Staff Planner: Sara Hartzell, 402-441-6371, shartzell@lincoln.ne.gov

Had continued public hearing.
Planning Commission recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated November 14, 2013, as amended on December 10, 2013, 9-0.
Scheduling of Public Hearing before the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners pending.
NOTE: The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is Wednesday, January 8, 2014. The regular meeting scheduled for December 25, 2013, has been canceled.

Adjournment

PENDING LIST:

1. Change of Zone No. 13015, from AGR Agricultural District to R-1 Residential District, on property generally located at Frontier Road and Highway 2 (6061 and 6101 Frontier Road).
   *(10-16-13: Planning Commission voted 8-0 to continue public hearing on April 16, 2014, at the applicant’s request)*

2. Street & Alley Vacation No. 06007, to vacate Pine Ridge Lane west of the west line of Westshore Drive, at approximately Highway 2 and Ashbrook Drive.
   *(11-27-13: Planning Commission voted 6-0 to continue public hearing on January 22, 2014, at the applicant’s request)*

3. Administrative Amendment No. 13075 to Special Permit No. 07041, Fox Trail Estates Community Unit Plan, to reduce the side yard setback from 60 feet to 10 feet on the north side of Outlot D in the Fox Trail Estates Community Unit Plan, on property generally located at SW. 56th Street and W. Old Cheney Road.
   *(appealed by the applicant) ***FINAL ACTION***
   *(11-27-13: Planning Commission voted 6-0 to continue public hearing on January 8, 2014, at the applicant’s request)*
Planning Dept. staff contacts:

Stephen Henrichsen, Development Review Manager . 402-441-6374 . . . shenrichsen@lincoln.ne.gov
David Cary, Long Range Planning Manager ........... 402-441-6364 . . .. dcary@lincoln.ne.gov
Paul Barnes, Planner .................................... 402-441-6372 . . pbarnes@lincoln.ne.gov
Michael Brienzo, Transportation Planner ............. 402-441-6369 . . . mbrienzo@lincoln.ne.gov
Tom Cajka, Planner ...................................... 402-441-5662 . . tcajka@lincoln.ne.gov
Christy Eichorn, Planner ................................ 402-441-7603 . . . ceichorn@lincoln.ne.gov
Brandon Garrett, Planner ............................... 402-441-6373 . . bgarrett@lincoln.ne.gov
Stacey Groshong Hageman, Planner ...................... 402-441-6361 . slhageman@lincoln.ne.gov
Sara Hartzell, Planner ...................................... 402-441-6371 . shartzell@lincoln.ne.gov
David Pesnichak, Transportation Planner ............... 402-441-6363 . dpesnichak@lincoln.ne.gov
Brian Will, Planner ........................................ 402-441-6362 . bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
Ed Zimmer, Historic Preservation Planner ............. 402-441-6360 . ezimmer@lincoln.ne.gov

* * * * *

The Planning Commission meeting which is broadcast live at 1:00 p.m. every other Wednesday will be rebroadcast on Sundays at 1:00 p.m. on 5 City TV, Cable Channel 5.

* * * * *

The Planning Commission agenda may be accessed on the Internet at http://www.lincoln.ne.gov/city/plan/pcagenda/index.htm
PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION
NOTIFICATION

TO : Mayor Chris Beutler
     Lincoln City Council

FROM : Jean Preister, Planning

DATE : December 12, 2013

RE : Notice of final action by Planning Commission: December 11, 2013

Please be advised that on December 11, 2013, the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission adopted the following resolution:

Resolution No. PC-01374, approving Special Permit No. 1665B, with conditions, requested by Chateau Development, LLC, for authority to amend the Van Dorn Meadows 1st Addition Community Unit Plan to waive the requirement for a pedestrian way and construction of a sidewalk in the pedestrian way when a block exceeds 1,000 feet in length as required by § 26.23.125 and § 26.23.095 of the Lincoln Municipal Code, on property generally located at South 72nd Street and Van Dorn Street.

The Planning Commission action is final, unless appealed to the City Council by filing a notice of appeal with the City Clerk within 14 days of the action by the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission Resolution may be accessed on the internet at www.lincoln.ne.gov (Keyword = PATS). Use the “Search Selection” screen and search by application number (i.e. SP1665B). The Resolution and Planning Department staff report are in the “Related Documents” under the application number.

Q:\shared\wp\jlu\2013 ccnotice\121113
Memorandum

Date: December 10, 2013
To: City Clerk
From: Teresa McKinstry, Planning Dept.
Re: Administrative Approvals
cc: Jean Preister

This is a list of the administrative approvals by the Planning Director from December 3, 2013 through December 9, 2013:

**Administrative Amendment No. 13064** to Special Permit No. 11001, Eastmark Community Unit Plan, approved by the Planning Director on December 4, 2013, requested by Olsson Associates, to revise the site plan to relocate the five lots from the south portion of the development to the north portion, on property generally located near S. 98th St. and Old Cheney Rd.

**Administrative Amendment No. 13076** to Special Permit No. 1013J, Lincoln Trade Center, approved by the Planning Director on December 4, 2013, requested by Krueger Development, to revise the site plan to: 1 - revise the layout for the restaurant; 2 - delete the provision which excluded drive-through restaurants; and 3 - adjust the perimeter setback on the north and east to 20 feet, on property generally located near S. 56th St. and Old Cheney Rd.
From: Russell Miller [mailto:neb31340@windstream.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 2:46 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: oppose impact fee freeze

11 Dec. 2013

Russell Miller
341 S. 52
Lincoln, NE 68510

Lincoln City Council

Subject : Oppose Impact fee freeze

Dear Council,

In the Water Dept.  CIP budget for fiscal year 2012-13 $3.8 million and year 2011-12 $3.86 million were budgeted for water mains replacement. This 2 year total of $7.66 million replaced approximately 155 blocks ( or approximately 13 miles). Therefore, at today’s prices it is costing approximately $589,000 per replacement mile.

It is stated in the Lincoln Water System Master Plan Update ( http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/pworks/water/mplan/2007/pdf/presentation.pdf ) pages 14 & 15, that Lincoln has 45 miles of 100 year old mains and 115 miles of 80-100 year old mains.

It is generally recognized that water main life expectancy is approximately 100 years. That indicates that Lincoln has a 45 mile replacement bill that is due NOW for a cost of 26.5 million dollars (at today’s dollars).

To replace 8 miles per year will cost $4.7 million per year and it will take 6 years to accomplish that necessary task. And then the 80-100 year mains will be attaining the 100 year life span.

The replacement main money for the past 2 years came from utility revenues (our water bills) of $1 million and revenue bonds (backed by our water bills) of $6.68 million.

During the same time period $3.77 million was spent for projects providing water to Lincoln’s growth areas. Utility revenues provided $1.92 million and impact fees provided $1.8 million.
WHERE WILL THE $4.7 MILLION PER YEAR COME FROM TO REPLACE THE 100 YEAR OLD MAINS?

It is obvious that using the current financing model will not work because there is a limit to the revenue bonds that can be issued at the current water fee rate. However, the Council has approved water fee increases totaling over 50% since 2003.

To sustain the current new growth infrastructure rate Impact Fees must be raised. Furthermore, the water portion of the impact fee rate must be raised to 50% of actual City cost.

To do otherwise is a vote for no growth OR a vote against established neighborhoods’ infrastructure. and your electorate.

Thank You,
Russell Miller
Woods Park Neighborhood Association
Lincoln, Nebraska

Letter of Support

8 October 2013

To Whom it May Concern,

The Woods Park Neighborhood Association (WPNA) has been apprised of the intent of the Friends of Woods Tennis (FOWT) nonprofit organization to replace the “bubble” enclosures at the Woods Park Tennis Complex with a permanent structure that will be only slightly larger than the current structures but which will allow for additional indoor tennis courts.

The “bubbles” were erected many years ago as “temporary” enclosures. Many residents of the Woods Park Neighborhood have long felt that these structures need to be replaced, not merely because of their age and increasing frailty, but also because they do not match the aesthetic style of the area or of other facilities in the park. Furthermore, residents were originally promised that the bubbles would be inflated only during cold winter months; instead they have been left up permanently for over 20 years.

Mr. Kevin Heim, manager of the tennis complex, has met with the WPNA Board of Directors numerous times over several years to discuss the layout and architectural design plans for the proposed permanent structure, the fund-raising needs, and the impact on the surrounding area of Woods Park. He has listened to our concerns and recommendations and has informed us that every attempt will be made to develop a permanent structure that will blend in with the rest of the park and the neighborhood and that will be an asset to the community as well as for local tennis players.

WPNA is a strong supporter of projects that will enhance Woods Park and provide a safe and enjoyable environment for all our residents. In the past WPNA has strongly opposed several projects that restricted public usage of the park or negatively impacted the surrounding residential areas. But based on the plans we have seen to date and the excellent work that Mr. Heim has done in opening up the Woods Park Tennis Center to greater use by all Lincoln residents, including a summer program for students, WPNA is happy to add our support for the proposed permanent structure project. We believe that a new, well-designed permanent tennis structure will enhance the lives of all residents in our neighborhood, visitors to the park, and the entire Lincoln Community.

[Signature]

Randall B. Smith
President
Woods Park Neighborhood Association
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II. MAYOR & DIRECTORS’ CORRESPONDENCE

MAYOR
1. Mayor Beutler’s public schedule for the week of December 14, 2013 through December 20, 2013.

III. DIRECTORS

WEST HAYMARKET JOINT PUBLIC AGENCY
1. The West Haymarket JPA will meet on Thursday, December 19, 2013, 555 S. 10th, Council Chambers, 3:00 p.m. Agenda and attachments are online at http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/finance/account/jpamtgs.htm

PARKS AND RECREATION
1. Ten-Year Plan Public Survey Results.
2. Ten-Year Plan Public Survey Comments by Neighborhood, Community and Regional Parks. (Complete comments on file in City Council Office, 61 pages)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

IV. COUNCIL MEMBERS

JON CAMP
1. Randy Smejdir email. Waived impact fees since 2007 needs to end as a “favored” exemption for home builders and developers.
2. Nancy Packard. Strongly believes impact fees should be sufficient to provide for the infrastructure of new dwellings and business.
3. Dr. Carmen H. Grant. Requesting support for the proposed changes to the Master Plan for Woods Park.

JONATHAN COOK
1. Gary Zellweger correspondence stating he is definitely against eliminating impact fees assessed to help pay for water and waste water systems, and funding through higher rates.
2. Richard Bagby email urging Council to remove the freeze on impact fees immediately. Other citizens should not be paying for new growth infrastructure miles away from their neighborhoods.
3. Andy Schadwinkel stating we can’t forget to improve existing infrastructure instead of always subsidizing the new. Don’t understand why the impact fees freeze would be continued this year.
4. Tracy Sanford. Do not freeze impact fees for developers. Do not put on the back of hardworking taxpayers.
6. Berwyn Jones, PhD. There is no reason to subsidize developers’ impact fees. Do not give them an “entitlement”.

7. Jodi Delozier. Not happy with impact fees being shifted from developers to taxpayers. It makes sense that new development pays for new streets and water/electrical lines.

8. Cathy Beecham. Do not vote to freeze the impact fees at the City Council hearing. Think freezing impact fees contrary to what we are trying to do with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

LEIRION GAYLOR BAIRD
1. Patrick Rowan. With the economy coming back the freeze on impact fees should end.

2. Petition from 36 Lincoln residents listing reasons to stop the impact fees freeze.

V. CORRESPONDENCE FROM CITIZENS
1. Downtown Lincoln Association letter expressing support for the redevelopment agreement between Lincoln and the Argent Group for construction of the proposed Block 68 Project.

2. Letter from B. Schuknecht regarding a refund for a hobby permit.
   a) Correspondence from the City Clerk stating rules applying to permit or other licenses.

3. Lincoln Electric System Administrative Board meeting agenda for Friday, December 20, 2013. Full agenda and support materials on-line.

4. Mike Valenta InterLinc correspondence stating he does not wish to pay increased rates on any service due to impact fees. Also wish the City Council could influence the School Board to separate the Career Academy on the proposed bond issue.

5. Peggy Struwe, President of the Hawley Neighborhood Association, in support of impact fees and hoping Council will vote to continue with the impact fees not being paid by the other neighborhoods in Lincoln.

6. Dennis Mathias in support of impact fees being paid by the investors in new construction not Lincoln residents.

7. Richard Bagby urging Council to remove the freeze on impact fees immediately, stating the needs in older neighborhoods.

8. Andrea Faas opposing freezing impact fees. Too expensive for City taxpayers to foot the bill.

9. Ed Patterson. Restore impact fees to their former real dollar value.

10. Andy Beecham. The rationale for a impact fees freeze is no longer clear. Makes sense to start adjusting impact fees for inflation once again.

11. E. Wayne Boles. Urge City Council to get the impact fees back on track. Insufficient impact fees for serving new development which postpone needed public works for established neighborhoods is an example of disorderly growth.

12. Patte Newman. It is time to not only un-freeze impact fees, but raise them to a level more appropriate to cover actual costs of growth on the edge.

13. Joe Hampton. The use of Assessment Districts before enabled developers to pay for standard-size infrastructure. The developer was responsible, the City would amortize the debt for continued growth, which was over what the developers would be obligated to pay.


15. Seth Felton. Support lifting the impact fees freeze and pegging the impact fee rate to inflation. Oppose raising water rates to pay for impact fees.

16. Matt Schaefer, Everett Neighborhood Association President. Impact fees should not be frozen for another year, but the infrastructure needed for new construction growth should largely be financed by developers and homebuyers who live on the outskirts of the City.
Mayor Beutler’s Public Schedule
Week of December 14 through 20, 2013
Schedule subject to change

Saturday, December 14
• Habitat for Humanity holiday luncheon - 11:30 a.m., Talent Plus, One Talent Plus Way

Tuesday, December 17
• KLIN - 8:10 a.m.
• Corrections Joint Public Agency (JPA) - 9 a.m., room 113, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St.

Wednesday, December 18
• Recognition reception for Nebraska’s Centennial Mall campaign cabinet, remarks - 7:30 a.m., Lincoln Parks Foundation, 2740 “A” St.

Thursday, December 19
• News conference (topic to be announced) - 10 a.m., Northeast Senior Center, 6310 Platte (Havelock)
• West Haymarket JPA - 3 p.m., Council Chambers, County-City Building

Friday, December 20
• KFOR (previously recorded) - 12:30 p.m.
Subject: West Haymarket JPA Meeting December 19, 2013

The West Haymarket Joint Public Agency will meet on Thursday, December 19, 2013 at 3:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers Room 112.

Agenda and attachments are online at http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/finance/account/jpa-mtgs.htm

Pam Gadeken
ADMINISTRATIVE AIDE II
CITY PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES | 555 So. 10TH, SUITE 203 | LINCOLN, NE 68508
P 402-441-7558 | F 402-441-8609 | pgadeken@lincoln.ne.gov
10-Year Plan Public Survey Results

The first priority for spending should be repair and replacement of existing facilities and improvements.

- Strongly Agree - 33.50%
- Agree - 36.81%
- Neutral - 9.57%
- Disagree - 2.82%
- Strongly Disagree - 1.23%

New facilities should be built in developing areas of the community to serve new residents.

- Strongly Agree - 13.50%
- Agree - 35.83%
- Neutral - 22.70%
- Disagree - 8.71%
- Strongly Disagree - 3.44%

The community should invest in new community facilities that not only serve Lincoln residents, but that also bring visitors to Lincoln.

- Strongly Agree - 18.77%
- Agree - 29.08%
- Neutral - 20.74%
- Disagree - 10.31%
- Strongly Disagree - 5.03%
Historic Preservation Commission

The City of Lincoln Historic Preservation Commission will hold a public meeting on Thursday, **December 19, 2013**. The meeting will convene at **1:30 p.m.** in Room 214 in Development Services Center, 2nd floor, **County-City Building**, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska, to consider the following agenda. For more information, contact the Planning Department at (402) 441-7491.

**AGENDA**  
**December 19, 2013**

1. Approval of meeting record of HPC meeting of November 21, 2013.

2. Opportunity for persons with limited time or with an item not appearing on the agenda to address the Commission.

**HEARING AND ACTION**

3. Application by Nebraska Neon Sign Company on behalf of Pure Fitness for a Certificate of Appropriateness for work at 6038 Havelock Avenue in the Havelock Avenue Landmark District.

4. Nomination to the National Register of Historic Places of Lincoln Haymarket Historic District.

**DISCUSSION**

5. Staff Report & Misc.

The Historic Preservation Commission agenda may be accessed on the Internet at [http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/plan/boards/hpc/hpc.htm](http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/plan/boards/hpc/hpc.htm)

For further information on Historic Preservation in Lincoln, visit [http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/plan/long/hp/hp.htm](http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/plan/long/hp/hp.htm)
Mr Camp, I believe waived fees since 2007 needs to end as a "favored" exemption for home builders and developers. It is time entities pay their fair share.

Sent from my iPad
Hello Councilman Camp:

I am Nancy Packard, retired teacher from Hastings Nebraska, 5-year home-owner in my capital city! I am fortunate and happy to be living in Lincoln. I built a new home in an old neighborhood about 5 years ago. I did not question the impact fees due to my earlier experience:

After living in an older part of Hastings for 25 years, my husband and I built a home in a development beyond city limits. We came to learn that the developer shortchanged our road, for it was narrow, and sloppily prepared. Very early, holes appeared on the street just beyond the driveways. Those were patched and larger holes appeared and continue to appear. No sidewalks were built. Someday, when that area is annexed, all residents will have to pay for our developer's lack of concern for the larger community.

Among the reasons I moved to Lincoln is 'O' Street, the Universities and our Capital. I did not move here because of the outlying areas. Although the newer areas contribute to Lincoln, they are not its draw. I strongly believe that Impact fees should be sufficient to provide for the infrastructure of new dwellings and business.

Nancy Packard
3037 Sewell ST
Lincoln NE 68502-4148
Good evening, Councilman Camp:

As President of Friends of Woods Tennis (FOWT), I am writing to request your support next week for the proposed changes to the Master Plan for Woods Park. The proposed changes will not only enhance the neighborhood with its pleasing appearance, but offer a far greater range of services to the community for years to come.

Throughout the planning process we have taken much care to include the needs of both the Witherbee and Woods Park Neighborhood Associations who, I am happy to report, are both on board with the endeavor. And...at the Nebraska Tennis Association Awards Banquet recently held in Lincoln, tennis enthusiasts from across the state also voiced their support for the FOWT proposal....and wished us well.

Wishing you and your family a Merry Christmas, enjoyable holidays & a wonderful 2014!

Sincerely,

Dr. Carmen H. Grant

Carmen Grant
drdoctor2002@aol.com
Hello Councilman Cook,

I am definitely against eliminating impact fees assessed to help pay for water and waste water systems, and funding these needs through higher rates. I don't believe builders and developers are hurting. Look at all the construction happening in Lincoln recently. The builders and developers are never satisfied, and always want a bigger piece of the pie. Some might say they are greedy. The size of the pie has been shrinking in recent years, and I don't think they should be in charge of the bakery.

There are many basic services in our city that have been cut or reduced. A number of older neighborhoods are not healthy, and because they can't be bulldozed and replaced with gigantic construction projects, the developers have little interest in them. People choose to live in these neighborhoods for various reasons, many of them can't afford to live in the suburbs. They should not have to pay higher rates to subsidize developers building $200,000 homes in the suburbs.

Thanks for listening,
Gary Zellweger
2610 C Street
Hello Mr. Cook,

I urge you to remove the freeze on impact fees immediately. The construction economy is back. The business economy is back. Not only should the freeze be lifted, it should be increased to make up for ground lost to inflation. Impact fees were and are a good idea. An idea that should be allowed to function as it was intended.

As a resident in a 60+ year old neighborhood I should NOT be paying for infrastructure for new growth 10 miles away from my home. My sidewalk needs repair, my water main needs replacement, my park playground doesn't meet current standards, and the asphalt topping on the streets is disintegrating throughout my neighborhood. I DO NOT want to pay extra for new homes to be built in the Stevens Creek watershed. I want my neighborhood fixed.

Sincerely,

Richard Bagby

Richard Bagby
389 S 47th
Lincoln, NE 68510
402-488-8567
Mr. Cook, I read in the Journal Star today about the City Council's public hearing tomorrow on impact fees.

I don't fully understand why impact fees have been frozen since 2007, particularly when it comes to new home construction, and I don't understand why the freeze would be continued this year. I drive my car and ride my bike on Van Dorn on a crumbling street surface between 40th and 48th. In other words, we can't forget to improve existing infrastructure instead of always subsidizing the new.

Please allow the impact fee freeze to end this year.

Thanks,

Andy Schadwinkel
2771 S. 39th Street
Lincoln, NE 68506
Hi City Councilman Mr. Cook,

I am a resident in your district and want to urge you to *not freeze* impact fees for developers. These bills will need to get paid somehow. Please do not let it be on the back of hardworking taxpayers who do not reap the financial gain from these developments in a manner the developers do.

Thank you.
Tracy Sanford
2829 S. 24th St.

---

tracy sanford // 402.430.3969 // tracymanford@mac.com
From: Nancy Packard <nmpackard@gmail.com>
Subject: impact fees
Date: December 16, 2013 10:31:01 AM CST
To: <jcook@lincoln.ne.gov>

Hello Councilman Cook:

I am Nancy Packard, retired teacher from Hastings Nebraska, 5-year home-owner in my capital city! I am fortunate and happy to be living in Lincoln. I built a new home in an old neighborhood about 5 years ago. I did not question the impact fees due to my earlier experience:

After living in an older part of Hastings for 25 years, my husband and I built a home in a development beyond city limits. We came to learn that the developer shortchanged our road, for it was narrow, and sloppily prepared. Very early, holes appeared on the street just beyond the driveways. Those were patched and larger holes appeared and continue to appear. No sidewalks were built. Someday, when that area is annexed, all residents will have to pay for our developer's lack of concern for the larger community.

Among the reasons I moved to Lincoln is 'O' Street, the Universities and our Capital. I did not move here because of the outlying areas. Although the newer areas contribute to Lincoln, they are not its draw. I strongly believe that Impact fees should be sufficient to provide for the infrastructure of new dwellings and business.

Nancy Packard
3037 Sewell ST
Lincoln NE 68502-4148
From: Berwyn Jones <berwynjones@windstream.net>  
Subject: Impact fees  
Date: December 16, 2013 9:38:30 AM CST  
To: <jcook@lincoln.ne.gov>

I see no reason why I should be forced to subsidize developers' impact fees. These are the same people who rage about "makers and takers" and yet they are the biggest takers of all. Let them pay for what they get. I don't want to give them an "entitlement."

Berwyn Jones, PhD  
6220 Andrew Ct  
Lincoln, NE 68512  
berwynjones@windstream.net
From: Jodi Delozier <jodidelozier@gmail.com>
Subject: Impact fees
Date: December 16, 2013 11:44:06 AM CST
To: <jcook@lincoln.ne.gov>

Councilman Cook,

When my husband and I moved to Lincoln 14 years ago, we decided to build a home in southwest Lincoln. Over the years I have watched as our property taxes climbed, utilities increased and various other little fees were added on to our bills (occupation tax, telecommunications tax, fuel surcharges, etc). I am not happy about the possibility of impact fees being shifted away from developers to taxpayers. As I see it, if an individual wants to live in a new development, they should pay for the expansion of roads, water lines, and anything else required to complete a neighborhood. Obviously, the builders pass on these impact fees to new homeowners as part of the total cost of building, and as far as I can tell, this has not been hampering the expansion of new development in Lincoln. If just makes sense that new development pays for new streets and water/electrical lines. If the cost of building is unaffordable to someone, there are plenty of homes within the city of Lincoln. One positive of these impact fees, is its ability to contain urban sprawl which can be detrimental to a city if left unchecked. I love the fact that Lincoln has that small-town feel and want our city planners to keep the intercity vibrant, clean, and safe.

In the Sunday LJS article, it mentioned the possibility of property taxes being reduced due to the additional dollars brought in by increasing the tax base with new development. Who actually believes that? I have yet to see my property taxes go down and do not foresee this happening anytime soon - regardless of how many new homes are built.

I hope that the Council will support current homeowners who already pay more than enough to live in Lincoln. I truly think the developers can appropriately absorb the cost of any impact fee.

Jodi Delozier
Hi Jonathan,

I just wanted to drop you a note and ask you not to vote to freeze Impact Fees at the City Council Hearing tonight. I am very concerned that we are asking citizens to pay for development at the edges of the city through increases in their water rates. We constantly hear from the business community that Lincoln needs to keep rates low to attract new businesses. I think it is contrary to this thinking to ask all citizens to pay for infrastructure in newly developed areas. Water rates should be used to pay to replace our aging infrastructure. I believe that if someone wants to develop in an area with no infrastructure, it is reasonable to expect them to pay for the costs of extending services to their area. I do not think these costs should be passed on to all Lincoln residents.

In addition, I think freezing Impact Fees is contrary to what we are trying to do with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The plan suggests that we should be encouraging development and infill in areas already serviced by infrastructure. This saves money and keeps existing areas strong. I believe that freezing Impact Fees will have the opposite effect.

Please do not vote to freeze Impact Fees.

Thanks very much for your time. Feel free to give me a call if you have any questions.

-Cathy Beecham
402-802-2536
This is a no brainier. Economy is back. The freeze should end.

Patrick Rowan  
Assistant Coach  
University of Nebraska  
402-580-0541
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Koebenick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68521</td>
<td>I believe it is time to increase the impact fees. The city of Lincoln should not be passing on the costs of new growth to our established neighborhoods, many of which have deteriorating infrastructure that continues to be neglected. It's time to quit cowering before the home builders and realtors. The freeze on impact fees is 2 years past being remotely justifiable and this new proposal to spike our water rates is truly an outrage. For those who want to avoid impact fees, there are plenty of existing neighborhoods that would thrive with redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Michaelis</td>
<td>1331 G St #108N</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Paige</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>1000 S 21st St</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J MARK SCHWARTZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>2301 SOUTH 62ND ST, LINCOLN NE 68506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Tetherow</td>
<td>3118 Shirley Ct</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68507</td>
<td>Sloughing off fees for new development onto the people living in older neighborhoods is, to me, criminal. Our taxes should go to maintaining existing streets and fixing the current infrastructure and not enabling the more monied so they can save on their new fancy homes. If they want a new house then they should pay ALL the costs for that new house, maybe then we can have our street plowed once in a while...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Pauley</td>
<td>1631 J Street</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68508</td>
<td>Please support impact fees! Show that you actually care about the working poor and middle class! It's obvious that if a person can afford to build a new house in a newly developed area they can certainly afford the impact fees!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>Domitoff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68502</td>
<td>Impact fees are an important way for Lincoln to fund the smart growth that makes our city unique and provides a high quality of life for our citizens. The freeze in fees during the recession was wise - continuing this subsidy to developers when the economic environment in Lincoln is bright is not. We need to make sure that we continue to support balanced growth in Lincoln and that developers are paying the fair cost of extending infrastructure to support their profit making developments. An increase in impact fee rates is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>1940 C</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68502</td>
<td>Dear Mayor and City Council, Impact fees are important to a vibrant and strong community. I was surprised to hear that some of these fees have been frozen. This perhaps made sense during the economic downturn but that is not the case today. I trust you'll make the right decision and begin collecting these impact fees immediately. Thank you for your leadership, DNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>2350 South 34th St</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68506</td>
<td>It is not fair for the taxpayers to pick up the additional cost of providing additional funds for paying for infrastructure costs for new developments. There are still homes on gravel streets, poor roads, sidewalks in bad condition, Water rates are already high. Maintaining the inner city in good condition is more important than area growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Hruza</td>
<td>2501 Sheridan Blvd</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>8639 Ridge Hollow Dr</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68526</td>
<td>Please vote to stop the freeze of impact fees. Developers should consider this part of their bottom line, and will subsequently pass it on to the builders/homeowners who choose to become part of their development. The economic principle of supply &amp; demand will equalize. Taxpayers do not need to falsely prop up this portion of the economic development of our city...our resources are needed more urgently in other areas right now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Lauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Let's not privatize the profits and socialize the losses, make developers pay their own impact fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Ager</td>
<td>3901 S 27 St, #22</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68502</td>
<td>Please vote against freezing impact fees. Individuals who maintain and choose to purchase homes in developed neighborhoods are forced to pick up the added costs that are a result of impact fees. Please vote 'No' to freezing impact fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Dahl</td>
<td>1901 S 24 St</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Linc68510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Dimitoff</td>
<td>656 Sparagus Street</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>68502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Lytle</td>
<td>2857 Porte Ridge Road</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Kari Atkins</td>
<td>8011 Cooper Avenue</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Abby Swatsworth</td>
<td>1433 S 14th St</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Kory Reiman</td>
<td>3100 S 54</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Lois Haupt</td>
<td>4212 Knox St</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Tessa Foreman</td>
<td>1729 S. 9th Street</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Matthew Weger</td>
<td>2124 Y St. Flat 201</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Anthony Merritt</td>
<td>1835 St. James Rd</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Richard Nobi</td>
<td>2600 Rathbone Road</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Kerry Eddy</td>
<td>2715 S 16th Street</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>David Steffen</td>
<td>7221 Woody Creek Lane</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Jon Rehm</td>
<td>4816 OLD CREEK ROAD LINCOLN, NE 68516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Kurt Elder</td>
<td>335 N 8th St</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee petition</td>
<td>Robert Hinrichs</td>
<td>2310 Smith Street</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is time to increase the impact fees. The contractors and developers should certainly pay their fair share of the fees.

To make sure that Lincoln keeps funding for essential city services, we must ask developers to pay a reasonably increased impact fee. When costs go up it is only fair that fees should go up. Out city is very desirable because we are safe and have great libraries, parks, pools, etc. People are still going to develop. I encourage you to think of the long-term financial health of Lincoln by increasing the fees.

"Unfreeze" the impact fees. New developments should carry more of the cost than they have.

Please allow Impact Fees to rise with inflation rather than freezing them (again).

Home builders should be required to pay impact fees. The burden of building a new home on the outskirts of town should not be placed on those of us who can't afford to build a new home on the outskirts of town.

I support impact fees as a fair and appropriate assessment of the costs of home ownership. Homeowners in older and existing neighborhoods must continually bear the increasing cost of continued maintenance for utility connections and sidewalk maintenance, often at or beyond the cost of new services while providing value in maintaining and preventing declining value and condition of core areas of Lincoln. It is right and equitable that new construction do the same. Impact fees are a fair distribution of the cost of providing services to all of Lincoln's citizens and the increase in Impact Fees should reflect the continually increasing expense that all Lincoln tax-payers bear every day.

Please unfreeze the impact fees - developers and those who buy their houses should pay for their expansion. I don't want to subsidize new housing - it's not fair and it encourages unreasonable growth. They shouldn't be able to externalize the costs of their private enterprise to the public.

I support asking developers to pay impact fees to cover some of the development infrastructure cost of the new neighborhoods. Last city I lived in Fargo ND had 10-12% in special assessments on new lots to cover this. It doesn't make sense for existing city to subsidize development of properties that complete with ours for value and there is inherent subsidy already in the treatment plant, well fields etc. that we all connect to. Many of the newer homes are larger and bigger than ever and thus they can figure out a way to make it work maybe by moderating home sizes. These infrastructure cost are real and related to the properties. Giving them a huge subsidy for the new house distorts the markets.

I support Councilwoman Gaylor Baird in her effort to have builders pay their fair share for city infrastructure.

It is time to accept the reality that costs go up, and have the parties receiving the benefits pay their fair share, rather than putting the costs of development on the backs of the rest of us.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact fee petition</th>
<th>Pet</th>
<th>Anderson</th>
<th>1500 South 11th St</th>
<th>Lincoln NE 68502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mayor Beutler and City Council - Everett Neighborhood Association endorsed the Neighborhood Plan for Action, therefore, supports Impact Fees. I don't want to make Impact an issue of old versus new, but there is only so much money to go around. It's interesting that the city sees growth as important to maintain, but maintaining existing infrastructure takes a back burner—over and over again. It's as if the city doesn't realize that it collects a great deal of taxes from existing neighborhoods, if they are not maintained, property values drop. In reading Sunday's LJS, it appears if the impact fees were 'unfrozen' a person building a new home would pay $3,000 more for a total of $13,000. If impact fees were only intended to cover 10% of the cost of new infrastructure, let's see how that would work, we've never given it a chance. I also must express my dismay in the choice of committee members—not very diversified. I believe these are the same old, same old who have served on this committee over the years. No wonder the conclusion is to eliminate impact fees—this group has been saying this since they were first discussed. Since people in established neighborhoods also pay impact fees—where are they represented? PLEASE ENFORCE IMPACT FEES AS THEY WERE INTENDED, DO NOT FREEZE AND CERTAINLY DO NOT ELIMINATE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact fee petition</th>
<th>Shawn</th>
<th>Ryba</th>
<th>4411 N. Park Boulevard</th>
<th>Lincoln NE 68521</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stop the freeze on impact fees. Stop subsidizing developers. Increase impact fees to an appropriate level, so that developers are paying their fair share! I am a tax payer who supports new development, but I also supports a balanced and fair approach to investing in existing infrastructure and growth. Make developers pay their fair share and stop kicking the can down the road to tax payers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact fee petition</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Narvason</th>
<th>1729 C St.</th>
<th>Lincoln NE 68502</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please have developers pay for expanding city services to their developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact fee petition</th>
<th>Anthony</th>
<th>Merritt</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact fee petition</th>
<th>Stacie</th>
<th>Walton</th>
<th>8317 South 57th Street</th>
<th>Lincoln NE 68516</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 12, 2013

Mr. Carl Eskridge, Chairman
Ms Leirion Gaylor Baird
Mr. Jon Camp
Mr. Roy Christiansen
Mr. Jonathan Cook
Mr. Doug Emery
Mr. Trent Fellers

Lincoln City Council
555 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NE  68508

RE:  Block 68 Project

Dear City Council Members:

The Downtown Lincoln Association (“DLA”) wishes to express support for the redevelopment agreement between the City of Lincoln and the Argent Group for construction of the proposed Block 68 Project (the block south of the Gold’s building) located in downtown Lincoln. The Block 68 Project will significantly contribute to the ever-increasing demand for mixed-use and residential opportunities downtown in a manner consistent with the Downtown Master Plan.

The redevelopment plan presented achieves many of the primary objectives outlined in the Master Plan and adds significant development potential on a downtown block long under-utilized. When completed, the Block 68 project will offer critically-needed parking, retail activity and residential housing located in the core of downtown Lincoln. These uses are certainly three of the highest priority objectives of the Downtown Master Plan.

The DLA would like to compliment the thoughtful design plan presented for its consideration of such amenities as underground parking, the off-street loading zone, a solution advantageous for businesses on the block, and an awareness of the importance of streetscape to the overall presence of the development on the downtown area.

The DLA is pleased that the redevelopment team has embraced the N Street bike path as an asset to their development. Further, DLA would encourage the developer to maintain an uninterrupted path between 10th and 11th Street as currently shown in the proposal with no vehicular access.

The Board of Directors of the DLA unanimously supports the completion of the Block 68 Project and respectfully urges you to approve this development as a progressive step in addressing the multi-faceted demands of our growing downtown community and in providing a critical component to fueling future economic vitality. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and for your continued support of downtown Lincoln.
Sincerely,

Terry Uland, President
Downtown Lincoln Association

C.J. Thoma, Chairman
Downtown Lincoln Association

c:  Chris Beutler, Mayor, City of Lincoln  
    Dave Landis, Director, Urban Development Department  
    Dallas McGee, Assistant Director, Urban Development Department
Lincoln City Council
555 So. 10th St.
Lincoln NE 68508

5 Dec. 2013

Dear Council Members:

I’m writing to request a $50 refund for a hobby permit that Lincoln police negligently forced me to buy for my car, stored on private property in Lincoln, in a private storage lot, off of a private street. I explained to the nice policeman the storage situation. But he insisted I move it, garage it, or buy a hobby permit.

The city is responsible for this instance of police negligence. Police were wrong ordering me to buy a permit. Only later I learned I’m covered under an exemption in ordinance 10.42.110. You might urge police to study the exceptions.

Speak with Councilman Carl Eskridge, who I asked to investigate my complaint against the police in October. He kindly did and reported that my car was indeed exempt, but said he couldn’t request a refund for me. He said I shouldn’t have paid it, but I couldn’t risk a fine, fees, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, that the city may foist on me.

By the way, I’ve talked with other individuals apparently in similar situations. They told me terrible stories about police trespassing on private property to snoop for car owners to cite, demanding they buy these … these permits. Seems like a clever little scam to enrich schools.

Frankly I’m curious about home much dough police are pickpocketing from ignorant property owners who may have a qualifying exception. Seems like a bad law, or bad enforcement. You city leaders might inquire yourselves.

I’ve spoken with Jeffrey Kirkpatrick, a sub city attorney, about a refund. So … here I am.

Kindly send the $50 to the address below. Enclosed are copies of the permit, and the warning citation that nice police stuck on my car window, along with a yellow Junk Car Ordinance pamphlet. (It’s not a junk car. It runs. I’d license and drive it, but I can’t afford gasoline. I bicycle and ride Startrans to work.)

Sincerely,

/[Signature]
B. Schuknecht

5901 Wolff Lane
Lincoln NE
68521

cc: Jeffrey Kickpatrick.
The City of Lincoln
Junk Car Ordinance
Addressing Unregistered, Wrecked or Junked Vehicles
LINCOLN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Permit #: H-1318
Licensor: SCHUNKENBROTH, B.
Address: 901 WOLFF LN, LINCOLN, NE 68521

Conditions: 1986 CHRYSLER LE BARON: CBH4852EN63268 -

Type of License/Permit: HOBBYST

ISSUING OFFICER

Amount Paid: $50.00
Date Paid: 10/4/2013
Expiration Date: 10/4/2014

WARNING: NO APPEARANCE, FINE, OR OTHER ACTION IS REQUIRED OF YOU.

1. SPEEDING 11. LIGHTS NO LEFT NO RT NO REAR
2. TRAFFIC SIGNAL 12. EXHAUST/MUFFLER
3. STOP SIGN 13. NO PROOF OF INSURANCE
4. NEGLIGENCE DRIVING 14. NO VALID REGISTRATION
5. IMPROPER TURNS 15. NO PROOF OF OWNERSHIP
6. FROZEN VEHICLE 16. SEAT BELT VIOLATION
7. NO LICENSE PLATE 17. FAIL TO SIGNAL
8. NO OPERATOR'S LICENSE
9. PARKING
10. OTHER

METER VIOLATION

OTHER PARKING

PARK/OBST TRANSPORT FIRE LANE
PARKED BETWEEN SIDEWALK AND CURB (CITY ROW)
TWENTY-FOUR HOUR PARKING
INTERFERE WITH USE OF STREET
METER VIOLATION
PARKED WITHIN 25 FEET OF INTERSECTION
PARKED WITHIN 25 FEET OF STOP SIGN
BLOCKING BUS ZONE
OBSTRUCT PRIVATE DRIVEWAY
OBSTRUCT CROSSWALK
HANDICAPPED PARKING
Oversize vehicle/residential
Parked within 15 feet of fire hydrant
Snow emergency: bus route, arterial street
Snow emergency residential
Defective muffler
Improper registration

$10.00
Mr. Schuknecht appeared in our office, made application & was issued a permit. The Code does not allow for refunds. This is no different than any other license or permit individuals may apply for & then decide they either don’t want it or don’t need it. There are still costs involved for administering the permit.

If you have any questions, please let me know!

Teresa J. Meier  
City Clerk  
555 S. 10th St.  
Lincoln NE 68508  
Phone: (402) 441-7438 / Fax: (402) 441-8325
AGENDA
LES ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
Friday, December 20, 2013 – 9:30 A.M.
LES Board Room
1040 “O” Street

9:30 A.M.
1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes of the November 15, 2013 Regular Meeting of the LES Administrative Board

3. Comments from Customers

4. Committee Reports
   A. Report of Nominating Committee - 2014 Board Officers
   B. Operations & Power Supply Committee
   C. Personnel & Organization Committee
      *1. Amendment to LES Employees’ Retirement Plan – LES Resolution 2013-12
      *2. Amendment to LES Deferred Compensation Plan – LES Resolution 2013-13
   D. Finance & Audit Committee
      *1. Recommendation of Transfer to Rate Stabilization Fund for 2013 – LES Resolution 2013-14
   E. Legislation & Governmental Affairs Committee
      1. Approval of 2014 Legislative Guidelines
   F. Labor Negotiations Committee
      *2. Approval of Agreement LES & IBEW 1536 – LES Resolution 2013-15

5. Administrator & CEO Reports
   A. Review of Six-Month Claims
   B. 2014 State Legislative Outlook

6. Chief Operating Officer’s Reports
   A. Report on 2013 Sustainable Energy Program (SEP) and 2014 SEP Programs
   B. LES Wind Projects Update

7. Other Business
   A. Monthly Financial and Power Supply Reports
   B. Miscellaneous Information

8. Adjournment

* Denotes Action Items

Next Regular Administrative Board meeting Friday, January 17, 2014.
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
  General Council

Name:         Mike Valenta
Address:      6125 Sunrise Rd
City:         Lincoln, NE  68510
Phone:        
Fax:           
Email:        mjlenta@hotmail.com

Comment or Question:
  Impact Fees- As to the article in Sunday's paper. As a resident I do not wish to myself and
others have to pay increased rates on any services so another can conduct their business, or
home purchase by spreading expense to others. There should also be not freeze or delay, for
the same reasons. The point about new growth bringing in new tax revenue and such, fails also
to mention the burdens such as increased traffic, congestion, pollution, strain on utilities,
police and fire protection, school crowding, road service,etc. that will increase cost to
city.

Career Academy-I also would like to say at this time, that this applies to the idea of the
Career Academy which I wish the Council could influence School Board to separate this issue
on the proposed bond issue. Here is another example of how others can get a start to a
secondary education at the expense of others who own property and pay taxes. Residents have
been very supportive of our schools, but this is going above cost to others, especially when
others have, and do burden these cost in life themselves. I also feel other options could of
been explored by the school board (and I told them) that the existing schools could be
utilized during summer with cost of desired programs to operate being paid by individuals
themselves. Which would also express the courses of interest they wish to see provided that
they are most interested in.

Thank you
My name is Peggy Struwe and I am the president of the Hawley Neighborhood Assoc. in the Malone area. I have lived in the area for 20 years.

For many years the older neighborhoods paid for all the new infrastructure for new neighborhoods through taxes and our own utility bills. A number of years ago, the older neighborhood representatives got together and were able to persuade the city to implement impact fees for new development so they would share the cost of building new. We felt that if a person was going to build a new business or a new house they could afford to pay the impact fees to help fund the infrastructure. The impact fees have been frozen for a number of years, but now builders are trying to go back to the time before impact fees and have all of us pay for the infrastructure for their development. Please do not allow this to happen.

I support impact fees and hope you will vote to continue the impact fees too.
Mary M. Meyer

From: vanborkum@gmail.com on behalf of Dennis Mathias [dennis@mathiaslink.com]
Sent: Sunday, December 15, 2013 5:00 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Impact fees

It would seem that often home owners need to readdress an issue that is thought to have been taken care of. That's the case with impact fees. Years ago it was decided that new construction could pay for its own infrastructure improvements and that established home owners would not have to subsidize their investments.

But now I hear this is NOT the case and builders--actually investors--are going back to the time before impact fees and again we, the established home owners and business owners are paying for it once more.

You and I both know this is unfair and that the stability of the established neighborhoods and businesses will be adversely affected.

Impact fees will either be paid by me..or be paid by the investors in new construction who will make a lot of money on my back.
Please get them off. Please consider supporting impact fees.

--

Dennis Mathias, WØQR
545 North 26th St.
Lincoln, NE 68503
Voice:402-432-2220

The contents of this e-mail communication, including any attached files, may contain confidential and/or proprietary information between the sender and the addressee(s). If you received this communication in error, please delete this message (including any attachments) and notify the sender promptly. If you are not the designated recipient of this message, misuse or redistribution of this content is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.
Hello all,
I urge you to remove the freeze on impact fees immediately. The construction economy is back. The business economy is back. Not only should the freeze be lifted, it should be increased to make up for ground lost to inflation. Impact fees were and are a good idea. An idea that should be allowed to function as it was intended.

As a resident in a 60+ year old neighborhood I should NOT be paying for infrastructure for new growth 10 miles away from my home. My sidewalk needs repair, my water main needs replacement, my park playground doesn't meet current standards, and the asphalt topping on the streets is disintegrating throughout my neighborhood. I DO NOT want to pay extra for new homes to be built in the Stevens Creek watershed. I want my neighborhood fixed.

Sincerely,

Richard Bagby

Richard Bagby
389 S 47th
Lincoln, NE 68510
402-488-8567
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for General Council

Name: Andrea Faas
Address: 1830 Rancho Rd
City: Lincoln, NE68502
Phone: 402-570-1229
Fax: 
Email: Andeacade@yahoo.com

Comment or Question:
I think if the city is going to continue to grow outside of developed areas. Those who are building in those areas most pay their share for the creation of services there. It is too expensive for the city tax payers to foot that bill. If someone can afford to build they should also contribute to the burden they are putting on the rest of us!
Dear Fellow Lincolnites, and any Reps left on the City Council in favor of ‘freezing’ IMPACT FEES for yet another year:

For those of you who have pension plans with a small or no COLA (Cost Of Living Adjustment), unless you are a mathematician or statistician, the impact of the resulting exponential decline, in the real purchasing power of your pension income, doesn’t really register. And of course that is exactly why this route is so often taken by astute financial planners attempting to get companies out from under their contractual pension obligations to employees.

Similarly, CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES, wishing to placate major campaign contributors among development interests, over the past 7 years of invisible inflation induced, REAL DOLLAR CUTS in IMPACT FEES,

- Could have voted to end IMPACT FEES directly, with explicitly stated dollar or percentage cuts. But this would have energized a large base of voters who have become aware of the impact of forced core city subsidization of suburban (dumb growth) sprawl. Why incur that backlash, when they
- Could, and in fact did, accomplish the same thing by
  - letting inflation of infrastructure construction and maintenance costs surge forward each year, while
  - holding IMPACT FEES at the same fixed nominal dollar amounts, without political consequence to themselves as elected representatives?

Thank you for your consideration of this matter

Ed Patterson
Malone Neighborhood

PS: If you are reading this, and it p’s you off that

- 120 year old sewer and water mains are going without maintenance in the core city while
- taxes and fees on core city property are diverted to more chrome plating on a suburban developer’s pickup truck/chariot, ...

by all means do show up at CITY COUNCIL Monday, 12/16/2013, (tomorrow night) at 5:30 PM to share your thoughts with proponents of the scam.
InterLinc: City Council Feedback for
    General Council

Name:     Andy Beecham
Address:  3024 Stratford Av
City:     Lincoln, NE, 68502

Phone: Fax: Email:

Comment or Question:
I believe it makes sense to start adjusting impact fees for inflation once again. The rationale for a freeze is no longer clear.

Freezing impact fees during the economic downturn was prudent. Today, however, the housing industry has largely recovered. The City has issued more home building permits through November of 2013 than it issued in all of 2007.
Dear friends,

Thank you for your service.

The Impact Fees issue before the Lincoln City Council is only part of a larger issue, i.e., The Lincoln Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan for Orderly and Sustainable Growth.

If my memory is correct, the esteemed Cecil Steward, Dean Emeritus, UNL College of Architecture, Founder of The Joslyn Institute and past member of the Lincoln Lancaster County Planning Commission, predicts that Lincoln will eventually extend to the edges of Lancaster County and have more population than Omaha, because Omaha has nowhere else to grow.

The Lancaster County land speculators would have more credibility if they collectively participated in the planning for orderly and sustainable growth. Bragging about circumventing the Plan is unbecoming.

The last thing the future Lincoln needs is a deteriorating core, surrounded by haphazard placement of new homes and acreages, with expensive non-connecting roads, water mains and sewer lines and jumbled electrical lines. Deliberately ignoring the Plan and incurring unnecessary government expense is an example of un-sustainability.

Insufficient impact fees for servicing new development, which postpone needed public works for established neighborhoods is an example of disorderly growth.

When capitalism attempts to take advantage of citizens who are not wealthy, elected officials in our Republic have an obligation to fulfill the trust placed in them by the citizens.

When capitalism becomes uncaring, one wonders if this is the result of fear, greed or a lust for power.

If any upper income buyer of a new home has ever said, "I wish to pay my fair share of the government expenses so that I'm not taking advantage of my fellow citizens," it would be refreshing, indeed.

Lincoln is on track to keep growing at the rate of 1% per year, creating both revenue and expenses, so the argument that impact fees will retard growth is mute. For some of us, the growth rate is not a plus, because we're not adjusting quickly enough to the challenges.

Providing new streets and utilities increases the value of the new homes. Since the fees are going to be passed on to the new home buyers and can be included in long-term mortgages, I urge City government to get the impact fees back on track.

Sincerely,

E. Wayne Boles
128 N. 13th St., # 506
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402) 450-4523
To Lincoln City Councilmembers:
I would like to add my voice to those individuals who believe that it is time to lift the freeze on impact fees.

When impact fees were proposed, it was made clear that the amounts proposed for streets, water, sewer and parks was not anywhere near the actual cost for growth for new developments. City leaders made the right decision to freeze the fees over several years of economic uncertainty. However, it is time to move forward.

The Mayor's Impact Fee Task Force from 2008/09 recommended this: 2. Maintain the current policy of annual pre-approved inflationary increases to all Impact Fees. If any pre-approved inflationary increases are overridden due to unfavorable economic conditions, the Mayor and City Council should consider recapturing the lost revenues in future years as conditions improve to avoid falling behind inflationary trends.

Base water fees increased from $.88 in 2003 to $1.34 in 2012 for the entire community - a 40% increase. The amount of this increase used to build new growth lines ($9.8 m) exceeded the amount spent to replace the existing aging infrastructure ($6.8 m for updating 1,170 miles of water lines) in the built environment. Adding to that - the $26.4 m from revenue bonds for new growth lines vs $17.1 m from revenue bonds used for necessary replacement of existing water lines - shows that the bulk of funding was spent on new development and not updating older areas. In neighborhoods where density exceeds the capacity of outdated mains - this is plain and simply a public safety issue - with reduced pressure for adequate fire service. (Case in point - the fire at Lincoln Poultry years ago.)

It is time to not only un-freeze impact fees, but to raise them to a level more appropriate to cover actual costs of growth on the edge. Lincoln should be moving forward, not falling backward.

Updating of water and sewer infrastructure in older neighborhoods should not fall to the pathetic level that the backlog of more noticeable sidewalk infrastructure has become for Lincoln residents. Maintenance of existing community resources should be the first priority for utility fees and tax dollars.

Patte Newman
Good afternoon, Mary.

Will you have this read into the record at this evening’s Council meeting, please?

Thank you.

Joe Hampton

Mayor and City Council members,

Does Lincoln wish to grow or die?

The viability of a city is dependent upon growth. If growth stops, a community stagnates, withers, and dies. You need only look to communities in out-state Nebraska and across our country for reinforcement of this notion.

Why further a policy that inhibits the positive momentum Lincoln has built over the past few years and upon which it should continually be capitalizing? There are alternative methods to afford growth; they existed until a period of time in the 1970’s. The use of Assessment Districts enabled developers to pay for standard-size infrastructure: water, sewer, and roads. The developer was totally responsible and the city would amortize the debt for that continuing growth, which would be over and above what the developers would be obligated to pay. That is the pattern by which Lincoln was enabled to grow into the viable city it is today.

The viability of a community is dependent upon growth. Won’t you please enable Lincoln to continue to grow as the vibrant, thriving community we know it to be?

Sincerely,

Joe Hampton
Dear Council Member,

Please stop subsidizing the developer impact fees. It is unfair to require us taxpayers to cover the impact fees. Please remove the freeze on impact fees and raise them to current inflation levels.

Thank you,
---Judy Johnson

--
Judy Johnson
218 S 29th St
Lincoln, NE 68510
402-435-8946
judylj@inebraska.com
Dear Mayor Beutler and Councilman Emery,

I read in the paper the other day that there is a hearing scheduled for tonight regarding whether to lift the freeze on impact fees, which was imposed in 2007, for new residential developments. I also read that there are proposals from developers to keep the freeze intact and to raise water rates to make up the difference.

I support lifting the freeze on impact fees and pegging the impact fee rate to inflation. I oppose raising water rates to pay for impact fees.

I understand that growth in Lincoln is important and benefits us all by expanding the tax base, but I do not think it's fair for people in existing neighborhoods to pay more and more of the bill for these new developments. Those choosing to buy in new developments, and the developers themselves, should incur a fair share of the cost as well.

Yours,

Seth Felton
140 N. 31st St.
Lincoln, NE 68503
Members of the City Council –

Everett Neighborhood endorsed the Neighborhood Plan for Action and supports impact fees. We read with concern in the Journal Star that the City Council may consider reducing impact fees and transferring the revenue burden to all water and sewer rate payers. We would urge the Council to reject such a one sided proposal and consider appointing a group with more diverse representation to come up with solutions to this ongoing debate. Additionally, impact fees should not be frozen for yet another year. Lincoln is experiencing great growth and the infrastructure needed for that growth should largely be financed by developers and homebuyers who choose to live on the outskirts of our city.

Sincerely,

Matt Schaefer
President
Everett Neighborhood Association
(402) 318-1881
schaefer@MuellerRobak.com