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I am **VERY opposed** to creation of another taxing authority to address the school safety requirement. The last thing needed is another bureaucracy with authority to levy taxes. The “promises” of Bliemeister/Beutler that taxes will not be increased are the empty rhetoric of politicians attempting to use a crisis to create another revenue source. We know the future - tax increases without accountability.

I urge you to resist this crass response to a national tragedy.

Also, I’ve heard little consideration of the most effective policy to increase school safety, i.e., allowing school staff members to carry a weapon if they so choose. If the real objective is school safety, this seems a major oversight.
City Council - Contact

Date: 4/6/2018 12:25:06 PM

name: Jillian Carter
address: 316 North 28th Street, Apt. 1
city: Lincoln
state: NE
zip: 68503
e-mail: Willokimom@hotmail.com
comments: I would like to let you all know that I am strongly against more armed officers in LPS schools. I am the mother of 4 LPS students, and worry greatly about my children's safety. That said, I believe police officers, especially armed officers, do more to detract from children's safety than they do to deter crimes. For one, it feeds into the school-to-prison pipeline, which is inherently biased towards kids of color and kids with disabilities. I firmly believe that most LPS parents, students, and constituents do not want more armed officers in our schools. I hope you will take our feelings and concerns into account. Thank you.
From: Thomas C. Huston <thuston@clinewilliams.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 07, 2018 2:58 PM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: FW: Lincoln Sports Facility Redevelopment Agreement

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Jon:

I represent the Lincoln Sports Facility, LLC on its redevelopment project proposed for SW 14th Plaza off of West “O” Street. The Lincoln city council approved the Amendment to the Redevelopment Agreement and the Change of Zone/ Special Permit on March 19th. The Redevelopment Agreement, Bond Ordinance and the CIP Amendment are on the council’s agenda for Monday April 9th. I thought I would provide you with a summary of the project prior to the public hearing.

1. **Redeveloper:** Lincoln Sports Facility, LLC is comprised of members who include a Manzitto Company, a Hampton Company, Supreme Court Basketball (operated by Matt Cumro) and Volleyball Club of Nebraska (operated by Maggie Griffin). Both Supreme Court Basketball and Volleyball Club operating the leagues and teams involved in youth basketball and volleyball and need this type of facility to facilitate the present demand and future growth;

2. **Redevelopment Project:** The project consists of two phases:
   a. **Phase I:** is comprised of the 78,500 square foot structure which will house 12 volleyball courts and 8 basketball courts, used non-concurrently. The investment into this facility will be approximately $10,000,000 and seeks tax increment financing of $870,000 to fund eligible costs of site acquisition, site preparation including grading, landscaping and some façade enhancements. It is intended that the construction of the project will proceed quickly this Spring; and
   b. **Phase II:** is comprised of an approximately 20,000 retail/flex building involving an investment of approximately $3,000,000. We seek tax increment financing of $430,000 for this Phase II project which is likely a 2019 construction but can be accelerated. It is intended that this building will house uses which are complementary to the sports complex.

3. **Redevelopment Agreement:** The agreement is fairly standard to other projects with a few special provisions:
   - The agreement obligates the redeveloper to obtain a **traffic study** to examine potential traffic improvements to the intersection at West 14th and West “O” Street. The Agreement contemplates that a new turn lane may be helpful to accommodate the traffic which will be generated; and
• The project was reviewed by the Urban Design Committee on April 3. The Redeveloper has agreed to take a look at 4 design issues and return to the UDC on May 1. The four issues which will be revisited include: a) the north façade of the sports facility; b) the landscape plan; c) the parking lot and building lighting; and d) the loading/garbage treatment for the retail building. The Motion to Amend permits the Mayor to make the final approval of the design after the UDC meeting on May 1.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks for your time. See you Monday.

Tom
It has come to my attention that the JPA program includes funding for more SRO in the middle schools. There has been a rise in public interest because of Parents United for school security. The community forum was a rouse to agitate the community and that became clear at the meeting last night at Lincoln High. This is evident on the Facebook page comments by Kory Reiman and by his responses and actions at this meeting. I do not want to put labels on this organization but indications lead me to believe this organization is pro gun with NRA affiliation with racist tendencies. It is more disturbing that Mr. Reiman and his followers have had a private meeting with Councilman Roy Christensen and the Mayor. These meeting can be interpreted as an underhanded way of influencing public policy and programs to further an agenda that is not necessary in the best interest of the entire Lincoln community.

One conflict in point of disagreement is the placement of additional SRO in our schools. One of the most important comment and question last night was the research and data to justify the money spent on additional SRO. We have had a period of time with SRO followed by a period without SRO because of the recession. The differences in arrest and effectiveness would be determined by comparing this data. Chief Bliemeister was going to respond with that data. This data is important to best determine where money should be placed. My desire is the money spent on SRO should be redirected into the JPA programs directly at the community centers not more police officers. In addition, another point of disagreement is public funds being used for SRO in private schools. This is another misguided way for this Kory Reiman group to interject their support for private schools and the diversion of public funds into private school as with the voucher debate.

Another issue is the increase of property tax to put more guns in schools. I object to this notion. The children, teachers and property owners are not the problem and should not be burdened with paying for the problem of guns. The Guns are the problem and as such the burden to a gun problem should be placed on the gun industry. Consider a tax on ammunition and gun sales and shooting ranges. The gun industry in Lincoln thinks bullet proof backpacks are the answer. This is outrageous to suggest that additional gun hardware is the solution which would also increase income to the industry that is creating the problem of guns.

Sensible gun laws are needed. This is evident in a recent arrest regarding a person with a loaded AR15 along with Drugs in a home with children having access to both. I am pleased the city council has made a stand against pump stocks but going forward the decisions regarding guns in the safety in this community and in our schools needs to be carefully considered and backed by evidence and research data. I advocate for no hurried and rash decisions being made because an ambitious Kory Reiman decided it was an opportune time to take advantage of the heightened outrage from the Florida Parkland shootings. The name of his organization was even changed just to forward his agenda and position.

I am a supportive of our police department and our public schools and our Mayor. We have a great city with leadership that seeks to provide Lincoln with community building and positive initiatives. That is why solving a gun problem with more guns is not the answer. Please consider my comments as we are at a critical time in our history that the decisions we make today will have a long effect on our schools and this community. A misstep can be detrimental.

Thank you

Donna Roller
2000 Twin Ridge Rd
Hello, my name is Ann Fintel and I am a resident of Lincoln, a taxpayer and mother of two children at LPS. I am writing in regards to the JPA and the proposed SRO's in our middle schools. Data shows that SRO's do NOT prevent school shootings. When schools are staffed with SRO's the rate of student arrests increases, especially children of color and disabled children. This does nothing but put more children into the penal system which is unethical and punishes children because this country has allowed the NRA to set policy that benefits them instead of setting policy that benefits the greater good. Let us not forget that the SRO at Parkland did NOTHING to stop the shooter and the SRO's were not able to prevent the Columbine Massacre. You know what would have prevented these massacres? People not having access to semi automatic rifles. I STRONGLY OPPOSE paying for guns in schools when guns are the problem and the cause of school shootings! I would prefer that the Lincoln City Council passes more common sense gun laws such as banning semi automatic rifles, requiring gun owners to store guns unloaded and locked separately from ammunition and prosecute people when they leave their guns unlocked and a child or criminal takes it.

I also need to mention my disappointment with the Mayor and Lincoln City Council bowing down to a small group of parents without getting the opinions of all parents in the district. The group "Parents United for School Security" is a very small group and should NOT be able to demand and set policy for an entire school district and city! I am willing to bet if you surveyed all the parents and teachers in the district, the majority would NOT want more guns in the schools. Why must we have militarized schools which will only benefit the NRA and gun manufacturers and not benefit our children?

I encourage you to look at the data that shows that SRO's in middle schools will NOT address the actual problem which is SEMI AUTOMATIC RIFLES! As you all know, these allow the shooter to hurt and kill hundreds of people in a matter of minutes. This is the problem! What about when a child is not at school, how will the SRO benefit him/her? We have to worry about assault rifles and shootings all the time, not just at school. Concerts, malls, sporting events, movies, Lied shows, etc., spending money on SRO's in middle schools will NOT solve the problem.

Please, NO SRO's in middle schools, no tax dollars for guns!

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Ann Fintel
6100 Consentino Ct.
Lincoln, NE 68526
402-304-1449
Hi:
I have been a local taxpayer for over 30 years. My sons attended Beattie, Irving, Lincoln Southwest, and currently Lincoln High. My sons are African American. Discrimination because of their race was very evident at Southeast. Increasing SROs in middle schools is just assuaging fear mongerers but not actually solving the problem. When you banned bump stocks in Lincoln, you made a decisive step in the right direction. Compliments. Please stay the course. "Parents United" does not speak for a majority, certainly not for me. Listen to the students, please. They do not want teachers armed. They don’t care for more SROs. They want the gun problem fixed. NOW.
Concernedly yours,
Christina Brantner
Dear Council members,

I represent GNS/Discount City Liquor, which has a parking waiver request on the Council agenda for Monday (Item 4a). Since it is a little out of the ordinary, I thought I would give a quick explanation.

Discount City has operated an off-sale liquor store at S.48th and Highway 2 for years. They had an opportunity to expand into space vacated by a drive-thru bank, and decided to offer tasting of craft beer and wine in a 200 sq. ft area. Because they want to charge for the tasting, it required a Class C on-sale license, which required a special permit under 27.63.680, and the special permit required meeting current parking, which would be 1 space for every 100 sq. ft of floor area. The Class C license covers the whole premises that comprises 5760 sq. ft., and that would mean 58 new spaces, which are simply unavailable. So, we are requesting the waiver in light of the fact that this will remain essentially what it was, a liquor store, but with a little area for tasting. Planning has recommended approval of the waiver.

I would be happy to field any questions, or answer them at the hearing, whichever works for you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Austin
Good Morning Mr. Arnold,

I apologize for not getting a response back to in a more timely manner. I received notification from the Mayor’s office this morning that they are currently finishing up the proposed School Safety JPA Agreement and will brief Council later this week and then release it publicly. A representative from the Mayor’s office will send an electronic copy to you by early next week.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Thank you,

Angie Birkett
Office Coordinator
Lincoln City Council
555 South 10th St., Ste 111
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone 402-441-6867
Fax 402-441-6533
abirkett@lincoln.ne.gov
I attended the town hall meeting last night. Where can I get a copy of the proposed School Safety JPA agreement?

Thank you,
John Arnold
Dear City Council Members and School Board Members,

As a taxpayer, I agree 100% with Council Member Lamm's recommendation that you forget forming another JPA to fund the hiring of school resource officers. As she so clearly stated, there is no lack of funds available within the current LPS budget, especially with the bump up of revenues from recent property valuations, and the city can work it into its own budget, as well: "We don't need another entity that lacks transparency, increases bureaucracy." I am in complete agreement. The formation of this new JPA may not immediately affect property tax rates, due to the proposed juggling that will introduce it, but it leaves an avenue open for future abuse of the taxpayer as the levy is found to be "insufficient" and so on. I am opposed to any "new agency" to collect property taxes.

I am also opposed to the other items the "new JPA" would be utilized for as a funding stream: Community Learning Centers, social workers in the schools and mental health services for students. As Lamm and School Board Member Schulte said, and I agree, all of those can be funded from the current revenue and budget processes. There is no need for a new JPA to be formed, and I am very much opposed to such an action. As Lamm said, there is a need to be good stewards of the tax dollars you already have control over.

Thank you for your time and attention,
Nancy Carr