I. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE
   URBAN DEVELOPMENT
   1. Street & Alley Vacation No. 18002

FINANCE DEPARTMENT
   1. July 2018 Sales Tax Report reflecting May 2018 sales

II. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE
   1. Biennial (Two-Year) Budget - Jim Frohman
   2. SouthPointe Pavilions Parking Garage Project - Joe Johnson
      Staff response provided by Angie Birkett, City Council Secretary
   3. Pershing site for Central Library - Curt Denker
   4. Pershing site for Central Library - Edward Bates
   5. Pershing site for Central Library - Jessica Greenwald
   6. 14th & Warlick project - Robb Crouch
   7. Pershing site for Central Library - Barbara Jacobson
   8. Pershing site for Central Library - Kathleen Green
   9. Pershing site for Central Library - Susan Vanneman
  10. Central Library - Bev Westerberg
  11. Proposed Sale of Sharp Building Garage - Robin Eschliman
  12. Pershing site for Central Library - Jane Renner Hood
  13. Health Hazard - Lewis Lawson
      Staff response provided by Councilman Eskridge
  14. Proposed PACE - Moni Usasz
A request has been made to vacate a portion of West "B" Street, East of SW 17th Street, adjacent to the property known as 1601 W "B" Street which is at the east end of the platted street. When viewed by the writer, the street itself does not physically exist and consists of grass and a car was parked at the entrance to what would be West "B" adjacent to SW 17th Street. There is no delineation between platted lots or street in the area. The applicant owns both sides of the area to be vacated and is incorporating this parcel into a new subdivision plat. This area is in the floodplain and an established wetlands areas and because of this there will be a need to retain a conservation easement over the entire area to be vacated. The addition of this area to the owner's holdings will help reduce the amount of grading affecting the established wetlands in the vicinity.

According to staff comments, there are no water, sewer or electrical lines in the area and as previously mentioned a conservation easement with specific language has been requested for any transfer documents.

The area to be vacated is approximately 65 x 40 feet in size and includes 2,587.25 square feet and is zoned R-2. As such, it is expected that any purchaser would only be willing to pay a nominal amount for assemblage as the piece is unbuildable on its own. The writer has knowledge of developable land values in the area at approximately $2.50 per square foot. With the imposition of the conservation easement and the wetlands implication, 10% of the underlying value is considered appropriate. The calculation for the area to be vacated is as follows:

\[ 2,587.25 \text{ sq ft} \times 2.50 \times 10\% = 646.81, \text{ called } 650.00 \]

Therefore, if the area is to be vacated, it is recommended that the area be sold to the applicant for $650.00.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle R. Backemeyer
Real Estate & Relocation Assistance Agent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Projected 2017-18</th>
<th>Actual 2017-18</th>
<th>Variance FROM Projected 2016-17</th>
<th>$ Change FR. 16-17</th>
<th>% Change FR. 16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$6,241,848</td>
<td>$6,288,498</td>
<td>$46,650</td>
<td>$239,946</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$6,515,645</td>
<td>$6,780,531</td>
<td>$264,886</td>
<td>$213,486</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$6,482,909</td>
<td>$6,536,831</td>
<td>$53,922</td>
<td>$146,570</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$6,202,974</td>
<td>$6,324,661</td>
<td>$121,687</td>
<td>$275,454</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$6,197,601</td>
<td>$6,052,437</td>
<td>($145,164)</td>
<td>$61,142</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$7,579,660</td>
<td>$7,458,413</td>
<td>($121,247)</td>
<td>$255,238</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$5,939,416</td>
<td>$5,880,960</td>
<td>($58,456)</td>
<td>$451,304</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$5,770,028</td>
<td>$5,576,757</td>
<td>($193,271)</td>
<td>($32,563)</td>
<td>-0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$6,890,278</td>
<td>$6,668,135</td>
<td>($222,143)</td>
<td>$27,046</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$6,451,042</td>
<td>$6,274,450</td>
<td>($176,592)</td>
<td>$101,892</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$6,419,310</td>
<td>$6,296,651</td>
<td>($122,659)</td>
<td>($142,126)</td>
<td>-2.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$6,836,893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$77,527,604</td>
<td>$70,138,324</td>
<td>($552,387)</td>
<td>$1,597,671</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual collections for the fiscal year to date are 0.8% under projections for the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actual 2013-14</th>
<th>Actual 2014-15</th>
<th>Actual 2015-16</th>
<th>% CHG.</th>
<th>Actual 2016-17</th>
<th>% CHG.</th>
<th>Actual 2017-18</th>
<th>% CHG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$5,431,071</td>
<td>$5,741,404</td>
<td>$6,041,963</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td>$6,265,764</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>$6,386,734</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$5,740,406</td>
<td>$5,848,947</td>
<td>$6,089,519</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>$6,598,756</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
<td>$6,811,452</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$5,729,609</td>
<td>$5,873,441</td>
<td>$6,266,119</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
<td>$6,471,721</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>$6,537,754</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$5,401,140</td>
<td>$5,737,783</td>
<td>$5,876,792</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>$6,128,386</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>$6,371,026</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$5,562,529</td>
<td>$5,525,231</td>
<td>$5,651,337</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>$6,285,444</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td>$6,432,363</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$6,570,418</td>
<td>$6,802,647</td>
<td>$7,137,154</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
<td>$7,293,928</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>$7,459,132</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$5,304,048</td>
<td>$5,396,268</td>
<td>$5,392,157</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
<td>$5,521,761</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>$5,930,406</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$5,214,537</td>
<td>$5,188,877</td>
<td>$5,426,539</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
<td>$5,639,028</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>$5,618,037</td>
<td>-0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$5,642,139</td>
<td>$6,348,190</td>
<td>$6,494,521</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>$6,708,815</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>$6,759,407</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$5,635,827</td>
<td>$5,728,421</td>
<td>$6,030,654</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>$6,255,952</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>$6,325,718</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$5,654,660</td>
<td>$5,841,882</td>
<td>$6,000,464</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td>$6,440,709</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>$6,644,137</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$5,921,577</td>
<td>$6,196,574</td>
<td>$6,657,168</td>
<td>7.43%</td>
<td>$6,736,493</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$67,807,961</td>
<td>$70,229,665</td>
<td>$73,064,387</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>$76,346,757</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
<td>$71,276,166</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CITY OF LINCOLN
### SALES TAX REFUNDS
#### 2013-2014 THROUGH 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>($80,176)</td>
<td>($44,232)</td>
<td>($105,779)</td>
<td>139.15%</td>
<td>($217,212)</td>
<td>($98,235)</td>
<td>-54.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>($96,046)</td>
<td>($191,059)</td>
<td>($94,343)</td>
<td>-50.62%</td>
<td>($31,712)</td>
<td>($30,920)</td>
<td>-2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>($15,001)</td>
<td>($151,968)</td>
<td>($83,553)</td>
<td>-45.02%</td>
<td>($81,460)</td>
<td>($923)</td>
<td>-98.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>($18,536)</td>
<td>($23,916)</td>
<td>($43,624)</td>
<td>82.41%</td>
<td>($79,179)</td>
<td>($46,365)</td>
<td>-41.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>($603,295)</td>
<td>($277,201)</td>
<td>($98,310)</td>
<td>-64.53%</td>
<td>($294,431)</td>
<td>($379,926)</td>
<td>29.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>($58,173)</td>
<td>($381,405)</td>
<td>($276,479)</td>
<td>-27.51%</td>
<td>($90,752)</td>
<td>($719)</td>
<td>-99.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>($169,963)</td>
<td>($69,314)</td>
<td>($39,620)</td>
<td>-42.84%</td>
<td>($92,105)</td>
<td>($49,445)</td>
<td>-46.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>($81,416)</td>
<td>($79,747)</td>
<td>($75,796)</td>
<td>-4.95%</td>
<td>($29,707)</td>
<td>($41,280)</td>
<td>38.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>($43,775)</td>
<td>($72,554)</td>
<td>($105,297)</td>
<td>45.13%</td>
<td>($67,726)</td>
<td>($91,272)</td>
<td>34.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>($81,809)</td>
<td>($26,219)</td>
<td>($152,053)</td>
<td>479.93%</td>
<td>($83,394)</td>
<td>($51,268)</td>
<td>-38.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>($116,801)</td>
<td>($40,332)</td>
<td>($55,289)</td>
<td>37.08%</td>
<td>($1,932)</td>
<td>($347,486)</td>
<td>17885.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>($49,577)</td>
<td>($10,119)</td>
<td>($312,528)</td>
<td>2988.53%</td>
<td>($17,202)</td>
<td>($96,471)</td>
<td>460.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>($1,414,568)</td>
<td>($1,368,066)</td>
<td>($1,442,671)</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>($1,086,812)</td>
<td>($1,234,310)</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Year to date vs. previous year*
CITY OF LINCOLN
NET SALES TAX COLLECTIONS
2013-2014 THROUGH 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2013-14</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014-15</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2015-16</th>
<th>% CHG. FROM PR. YEAR</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016-17</th>
<th>% CHG. FROM PR. YEAR</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2017-18</th>
<th>% CHG. FROM PRIOR YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$5,350,895</td>
<td>$5,697,172</td>
<td>$5,936,184</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>$6,048,552</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>$6,288,498</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$5,644,359</td>
<td>$5,657,888</td>
<td>$5,995,177</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
<td>$6,567,045</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>$6,780,531</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$5,714,609</td>
<td>$5,721,474</td>
<td>$6,182,565</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
<td>$6,390,261</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>$6,536,831</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$5,382,604</td>
<td>$5,713,868</td>
<td>$5,833,168</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>$6,049,207</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>$6,324,661</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$4,959,233</td>
<td>$5,248,031</td>
<td>$5,553,027</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>$5,991,013</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>$6,052,437</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$6,512,245</td>
<td>$6,421,242</td>
<td>$6,860,675</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>$7,203,175</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td>$7,458,413</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$5,134,084</td>
<td>$5,326,954</td>
<td>$5,352,537</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>$5,429,656</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>$5,880,960</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$5,133,122</td>
<td>$5,109,130</td>
<td>$5,350,744</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
<td>$5,609,320</td>
<td>4.83%</td>
<td>$5,576,757</td>
<td>-0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$5,598,363</td>
<td>$6,275,635</td>
<td>$6,389,224</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>$6,641,089</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>$6,668,135</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$5,554,017</td>
<td>$5,702,202</td>
<td>$5,878,601</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>$6,172,558</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>$6,274,450</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$5,537,859</td>
<td>$5,801,550</td>
<td>$5,945,175</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>$6,438,777</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>$6,296,651</td>
<td>-2.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$5,872,000</td>
<td>$6,186,455</td>
<td>$6,344,640</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>$6,719,292</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
<td>$70,138,324</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$66,393,390</td>
<td>$68,861,601</td>
<td>$71,621,717</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>$75,259,945</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>$70,138,324</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Jim Frohman <jimfrohman@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Roy A. Christensen; Jane Raybould; Jon Camp; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird;
Cyndi Lamm; Bennie R. Shobe
Cc: Mayor; Jeff R. Kirkpatrick
Subject: Charter Revision Commission Changes and Additions

The Charter Revision Commission has approved and forwarded the removal of five sections, changes to one section, and a new section for you to review and consider for inclusion on the November ballot. I support the recommendations of the Charter Revision Commission.

There are two suggested changes that the Commission decided not to present to the Council that I believe deserve your attention. The first is what I believe to be a noncontroversial change to the budget language of the Charter and the second is to remove a section allowing the City to compete with private and non-profits in the market place. Please consider adding these changes to the November ballot.

The Council has been presented with two conflicting legal opinions, one by the current City Attorney and the second by a former City Attorney. The conflict is about whether the Charter is clear on changing the budget in the second year of the biennial budget. I proposed to the Commission a straightforward solution to resolve this conflict and I would like for you to consider adding it to the November ballot. The Commission turned down the request when a couple members suggested that this issue was resolved by the court decision about the levy. That was a misinterpretation of that decision. The unclear language in the Charter has not be clarified and the conflicting opinions are still in play.

My suggestion below makes it very clear that a super majority of the Council can make changes in the second year of the biennial budget. Note that it is a super majority. This is new but is in keeping with comments and concerns raised about making changes without having the full hearing process that happens during the initial biennial budgeting process. The change also makes it clear that the Mayor has veto powers over the budget changes. This suggestion is a clarification and strengthening of the current process and should eliminate the issue for future budget cycles.

Amend the Charter.

ARTICLE IX

FINANCE AND TAXATION

Sec. 26a. Biennial (Two-Year) Budget.
Paragraph four.
After a biennial budget is adopted, neither the mayor nor the council can adopt a new annual budget in the second year of the biennial period unless seventy five percent (75%) of the council approve changes to the second year of the biennial period. The mayor may approve or veto the changes to the second year of the biennial period. A vote of seventy five percent (75%) of the council is required to override a mayoral veto of changes to the second year of a biennial budget. The power to amend or revise the biennial budget shall be as provided in Article IX, Section 27 of this charter. (Amendment of November 2, 2010).

Sec. 27. Appropriations.
Paragraph three.
The council shall not make any appropriation in addition to those authorized in the annual budget, except that it may authorize emergency appropriations in the event of an emergency threatening serious loss of life, health, or property in the community.

The second change I would like for the Council to consider is the removal of the section that allows the City to establish a public market. The Commission originally approved the removal, but the subcommittee decided to keep the section and the final Commission vote agreed with the subcommittee. The reason for keeping the section was that it may be needed to allow for a local food market in Pershing, if Pershing remains a City property. I believe that to be a misunderstanding of the powers of the City. The City could lease space for a private or non-profit to run a market in Pershing without the Public Market section. The Public Market section allows the City to create, run, and profit from a market.

The City should not be in competition with private or non-profit organizations. The Public Market section lets the City become a direct competitor with private and non-profit organizations. I don’t believe that this section has ever been used. I don’t believe that this section is needed for action that the City may take in the future. It should be removed from the Charter.

Remove from Charter.

ARTICLE VIII
STREETS, PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, PUBLIC UTILITIES, SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

Sec. 13. Public Market. The city council may by ordinance purchase grounds for, and erect and establish, market houses and market places and regulate and govern the same, and prescribe the fees to be charged persons for stalls therein; provided, the revenue so derived shall be applied: First, to the payment of the salaries of the officers appointed to take charge of said market; second, to the payment of repairs of the market house; and third, to the payment of the cost of erecting said market house. After all salaries, repairs and costs of construction have been paid, the surplus, if any remaining, shall be disposed of as the council shall direct. The city council may contract with any person or persons, or association of persons, companies or corporations for the erection and regulation of said market house and market place on such terms and conditions as the council may prescribe and raise all necessary revenue therefor as herein provided; and locate market houses and market places and buildings aforesaid on any street, alley, or public ground, or any land purchased for such purpose; and provide for the erection of all other useful and necessary buildings for the use of the city and for the protection and safety of all property owned by the city; provided, any such improvement, costing in the aggregate a sum greater than five hundred dollars, shall not be authorized until the ordinance providing therefor shall be first submitted to and ratified by a majority of the legal voters thereof.

Thank you for your service and for your attention.

Jim Frohman
7335 Pioneers Blvd
Apt. 212
Lincoln, NE 68506
402.617.2484
jimfrohman@outlook.com
Ms Birkett!

Thank you! Now I get it. Not sure I agree with it, but I get it!

BTW, I think you are serving the council very professionally. You are speaking for the council members and explaining things in a non-partisan way! Sort of a Joe Friday “just the facts” way and that is impressive. I am learning from you and Matt Olberding I sincerely thank you!

Joe

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!


Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions.

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

---

From: Joe Johnson, Jr [mailto:jwjjr@inebraska.com]
Sent: Friday, July 20, 2018 12:09 AM
To: Council Packet <CouncilPacket@Lincoln.ne.gov>
Subject: FW: Great Story on Sheels

What is going on? Why is the city paying for a parking garage at South Pointe? That is private property! Is this a cover-up for the mayor who wants a fourth term?

Joe Johnson, Jr.
2800 Woods Blvd, No 908
Lincoln, NE 68502-5844
402-560-1202

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!

---

From: Joe Johnson, Jr [mailto:jwjjr@inebraska.com]
Sent: 20 July, 2018 0:01
To: 'Dave O'
Cc: 'Matt Olberding' ; Oped LJS (oped@journalstar.com)
Subject: RE: Great Story on Sheels
Explain this to me! Why is the city paying for a parking garage at South Pointe? There is supposed to be an aquarium and a Ferris wheel at the new Sheel’s at SP. How did this happen? Olberding has not explained this part! Did the Council approve this?

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!

From: Dave O [mailto:daoco@yahoo.com]
Sent: 19 July, 2018 9:38
To: Joe Johnson, Jr <jwjjr@inebraska.com>
Subject: Re: Great Story on Sheels

Actually the taxpayers are funding it through the 1% occupation tax levied on all purchases at South Pointe except for food and movie tickets which already have their own occupation tax levies. Huge aquarium in the new store.

From: "Joe Johnson, Jr" <jwjjr@inebraska.com>
To: 'Matt Olberding' <MOlberding@journalstar.com>
Cc: Lee Stanard <lstanard@neb.rr.com>; Dave Oenbring <daoco@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2018 9:45 PM
Subject: RE: Great Story on Sheels

Matt! Thank you, I suspect you are right in that $85 million for the new store plus $15 million makes $100 million! But are you serious? The CITY is building a parking garage? On private property! That’s outrageous! Worse than TIF! Sorta like letting Pershing sit, unsold! Yikes! I appreciate your clarification! Although I am disappointed that Beutler & Company, who want a fourth term, are funding a parking garage at South Pointe! Grrr! Did the council approve this? Again, thanks for the clarification! Not good news! Still, the Sheel’s investment rocks! Retail is tough these days and it speaks well of Lincoln and Sheel’s that this much is being invested! Joe

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!

From: Matt Olberding [mailto:MOlberding@journalstar.com]
Sent: 16 July, 2018 8:38
To: Joe Johnson, Jr <jwjjr@inebraska.com>
Subject: RE: Great Story on Sheels

Joe:

The Scheels store itself is projected to cost $85 million, and I believe that’s total cost, not just construction cost. I thought I had that number in the story, but apparently not. The city also plans to build a parking garage on the site of the old Scheels, which is estimated to cost $15 million to $20 million. So the entire cost of the project tops $100 million, but not just the Scheels store itself. Hope that answers your question.

Matt Olberding
Business reporter/editor | Lincoln Journal Star
402.473.2647
Really enjoyed your story on Sheels in Saturday’s paper! I was on an adventure to buy a ream of paper for my printer at South Pointe Friday afternoon and was stunned to see just how large the new Sheels is! And then, that night, I caught an intro to a story on 10/11 that suggested that the new store was costing about $100 million. That has to set a record for Lincoln, Nebraska! But as you described the atrium, the Ferris wheel and the aquarium – there was no mention of the total construction cost. Is it really $100 million!????? That is an amazing investment in Lincoln. Is it true? Thanks for your cogent writing!

Joe Johnson, Jr.
2800 Woods Blvd, No 908
Lincoln, NE 68502-5844
402-560-1202

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!
Matt!

Thank you! I don't like what is happening but I certainly appreciate you taking the time to explain! Angela Birkett at the Council office has been equally forthcoming!

Joe

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!

-----Original Message-----
From: Matt Olberding [mailto:MOlberding@journalstar.com]
Sent: 20 July, 2018 6:17
To: Joe Johnson, Jr <jwjjr@inebraska.com>
Subject: Re: Great Story on Sheels

No cover-up, Joe. It's been reported on extensively, and the City Council approved the additional 1% sales tax at SouthPointe to pay for the garage. So if you think about it, rather than being paid for by all city taxpayers, it's really being paid for by SouthPointe shoppers, including those from out of town.

Here's a couple of previous articles about the occupation tax:


Matt Olberding
Assistant business editor
Lincoln Journal Star
(402)473-2647
molberding@journalstar.com
To: City Council  
Subject: FW: Great Story on Sheels

What is going on? Why is the city paying for a parking garage at South Pointe? That is private property! Is this a cover-up for the mayor who wants a fourth term?

Joe Johnson, Jr.  
2800 Woods Blvd, No 908  
Lincoln, NE 68502-5844  
402-560-1202

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!

From: Joe Johnson, Jr [mailto:jwjjr@inebraska.com]  
Sent: 20 July, 2018 0:01  
To: 'Dave O' <daoco@yahoo.com>  
Cc: 'Matt Olberding' <MOlberding@journalstar.com>; Oped LJS (oped@journalstar.com) <oped@journalstar.com>  
Subject: RE: Great Story on Sheels

Explain this to me! Why is the city paying for a parking garage at South Pointe? There is supposed to be an aquarium and a Ferris wheel at the new Sheel’s at SP. How did this happen? Olberding has not explained this part! Did the Council approve this?

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!

From: Dave O [mailto:daoco@yahoo.com]  
Sent: 19 July, 2018 9:38  
To: Joe Johnson, Jr <jwjjr@inebraska.com>  
Subject: Re: Great Story on Sheels

Actually the taxpayers are funding it through the 1% occupation tax levied on all purchases at South Pointe except for food and movie tickets which already have their own occupation tax levies. Huge aquarium in the new store.

From: "Joe Johnson, Jr" <jwjjr@inebraska.com>  
To: 'Matt Olberding' <MOlberding@journalstar.com>  
Cc: Lee Stanard <lstanard@neb.rr.com>; Dave Oenbring <daoco@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2018 9:45 PM  
Subject: RE: Great Story on Sheels

Matt! Thank you, I suspect you are right in that $85 million for the new store plus $15 million makes $100 million! But are you serious? The CITY is building a parking garage? On private property! That’s outrageous! Worse than TIF! Sorta like letting Pershing sit, unsold! Yikes! I appreciate your clarification! Although I am disappointed that Beutler & Company, who want a fourth term, are funding a parking garage at South Pointe! Grrr! Did the council approve this? Again, thanks for the clarification! Not good news! Still, the Sheel’s investment rocks! Retail is tough these days and it speaks well of Lincoln and Sheel’s that this much is being invested! Joe

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!
Joe:

The Scheels store itself is projected to cost $85 million, and I believe that’s total cost, not just construction cost. I thought I had that number in the story, but apparently not. The city also plans to build a parking garage on the site of the old Scheels, which is estimated to cost $15 million to $20 million. So the entire cost of the project tops $100 million, but not just the Scheels store itself. Hope that answers your question.

Matt Olberding
Business reporter/editor | Lincoln Journal Star
402.473.2647
800.742.7315
molberding@journalstar.com

Joe Johnson, Jr.
2800 Woods Blvd, No 908
Lincoln, NE 68502-5844
402-560-1202

If you forward this email, please remember to delete all references to me -- including email, snail mail, name and phone! Many thanks!
City Council,

I am a currently on the Foundation for Lincoln City Libraries trustee board and have served as President. I am in favor of the Pershing site for the location of a new central library. It would make total sense to welcome a partner on the site with a new library that would potentially share the same library values. You would think the new site could help enhance the growth that is moving forward to the east of the Pershing site and even help tie the east Telegraph growth in with the downtown area.

Sincerely,

Curt Denker
Market President
Pershing site = new central library

Edward A Bates, Shareholder
Strain Slattery Barkley & Co., CPA’s. P.C.
7130 S 29th Suite F
Lincoln, NE 68516
402.420.7300
402.420.7302 (fax)

This message is confidential and may be privileged. It is intended for the addressee(s) only. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the addressee, any disclosure or copying of the contents of this e-mail or any action taken (or not taken) in reliance on it is unauthorized and may be unlawful. If you are not an addressee, please inform the sender immediately.
Dear Members of the Lincoln City Council,

I am strongly in support of proceeding with plans for a new library in Downtown Lincoln. There are piles of data showing the significant economic, cultural and educational impact of libraries – much of which I am sure you have already been briefed about. Libraries are an anchor in every community or neighborhood where they are located, and reflect the opportunity and access that we as Lincolniters, along with our city government, are proud to steward for all our citizens.

In addition: I request that you support the Library Board’s recommendation that the Pershing site be the location of the next Central Library. It is cost effective and is an ideal location for another strong public/private development which will benefit us all.

Best regards,
Jessica Greenwald

Jessica Greenwald, CIC | Vice President
jessicagreenwald@insproins.com | p 402.484.4894 | f 402.484.3934
PO Box 6847 | 4000 Pine Lake Road | Lincoln NE, 68506
www.INSPROins.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT
This Email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.
City Council Members:

I have lived in Lincoln for most of my life and much of this time in south neighborhoods. I have witnessed the dramatic increase in auto traffic across the southern area of our city, including the area of Old Cheney, South 14th Street and Warlick Road where I pass nearly every day.

We cannot even think of delaying the project to help improve the high congestion in this area. I appreciate the thoughtful work and study that has gone into its preparation, and it's time to move forward with the winning design.

The south beltway project is also of key importance. It is something that should have been planned and implemented many years ago, as Highway 2 is at maximum capacity and is becoming more congested and dangerous every day.

Thank you for your service to our great city.

Best regards,
Robb Crouch

4316 Hallcliffe Road
Lincoln, NE 68516-2145
402-304-3085
Lincoln City Council Members - I am writing in support of a new downtown city library. We are in need of new modern library that has the many features that libraries need in today’s world to serve the variety of needs for our citizens. It would seem that the Pershing site would be ideal for a new library. I understand that there are people that would like to develop it to put the property on the tax rolls but it would seem that this site could be used for both purposes. The site has sat empty for a number of years and is not on the tax roll. If we have to purchase another site for the new library this is an additional cost that we would not need to incur. It seems like this would be a win for the people of Lincoln. Thank you for your consideration. Barbara Jacobson
City Council - Contact

Date: 7/20/2018 5:11:58 PM

name: Kathleen K Green
address: 3901 S 32nd PL
city: Lincoln
state: NE
zip: 68502
email: kkgreen7@gmail.com

comments: We are fortunate in Lincoln to have good libraries, but many of the physical structures need to be updated and the downtown library must be replaced. The downtown library is an important resource and serves not only the businesses that surround it, but some of the most diverse, underprivileged, and needy families in the city. Libraries and can help & support immigrants learn English and find jobs. They can help with technology. The Pershing site is the best place to have a downtown library. Easily accessible. A state of the art library would also be a draw for visitors to our Capital. Quotes from other sources that convey my thoughts - "Libraries give people the opportunity to find jobs, explore medical research, experience new ideas, get lost in wonderful stories, while at the same time providing a sense of place for gathering." "Libraries play a key role in financially strengthening local community. They provide a work space for telecommuters, supply free internet access for people looking for employment opportunities, and offer job and interview training for those in need." "In helping individual community members financially succeed in their lives and small businesses, libraries help entire communities succeed at boosting their economy and growing their local wealth."

Please take the time to read more at www.bustle.com/p/7-reasons-libraries-are-essential-now-more-than-ever-43901

Those are some of the reasons many communities, including Omaha, are investing in new libraries. Cedar Rapids, Little Rock, AK, Norfolk, VA, & San Antonio, TX have been recognized as building some of the BEST new libraries - www.businessinsider.com/the-best-6-new-libraries-in-america-2015-4

I appreciate you taking the time to research the importance of libraries in a community.

Now is the TIME to act on replacing the downtown library and the Pershing site is the PLACE.

Thank you, Kathleen Green
Council Members:

Please enhance our community by voting for the Pershing site for a new central library. This location is ideal geographically for a central library serving surrounding neighborhoods, the city center and the branch libraries of the system. A library is a reflection of the quality of life in a city. Keep Lincoln moving in the right direction, make the Pershing site a central library!

Thank you,
Susan Vanneman
Bev Westerberg
5915 Bartholomew Circle
Lincoln, NE 68512
bwester5915@gmail.com

Realizing all of have very difficult decisions to make, I would like all council members to remember the importance of a viable main library for a major city. Keep Lincoln great!

Thank you.

Bev Westerberg
Angela M. Birkett

From: Robin Eschliman <robin@ecrproperty.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 21, 2018 10:51 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Sale of Sharp building garage

Dear City Council Members:

I have read the purchase contract and wondered why the seller and buyer of the 1318 M Street parking garage are leaving blank the part about how many stalls are to remain priority for the seller’s tenants? Hopefully the City Council is not going to approve a document with those numbers remaining blank? The seller could say that most or all of the parking stalls are to remain top priority for his tenants. And if that is the case, of what benefit is the parking garage to the City of Lincoln? All you would be is a financing mechanism for someone who would like to raise some cash. You wouldn’t be solving a parking problem for the citizens of Lincoln.

Other than a handful of private businesses, most of the other remaining occupants in this neighborhood are state employees. I know we all want to play nice, but why is the City buying a parking garage to solve a State problem?

It is amazing that you have $4 million to purchase a private sector parking garage, when your overall trend has been to privatize parking services. I’m curious about your source of funds. It would seem $4 million could be used to buy many small buildings around the downtown area, tear them down, and turn them into parking lots for citizens to park when they shop, work, or live in densely populated areas. Being willing to do that would have a lot more impact on community development in our core than concentrating all those funds into one block.

At this point, since none of us knows what we don’t know, this sounds like a bad idea. I’d be happy to invite someone to come on our Grow Lincoln show and discuss this and explain the reasons for this purchase.

Robin Eschliman, CCIM, President
Eschliman Commercial Real Estate
Grow Lincoln radio and television shows
402.420.3239 | robin@ecrproperty.com | www.ecrproperty.com
By Appt: 4435 O Street Ste. 111 | By mail: 2865 O’Hanlon Suite 101, Lincoln, NE 68516
Glad to note progress Councilmen Camp and Eskridge are making on a resolution to Mayor Beutler for use of Pershing block for a combination of a new Central Library plus other prospective tenants. That will be so beneficial to our future and the increasing numbers of people we serve. Thank you for your service to Lincoln's future!

Jane Renner Hood
Hello,

I’m writing you to inform you of a huge health hazard that is on Kingsley street. At the end further away from burton road there is a tree that had grown and pushed the path up so high it’s a health hazard and as the lights go off it increases the likely ness of an accident happening. Last night my 61 year old father was walking down and couldn’t see it because of the lights being out and fell face first into the pavement causing him a huge cut on his nose and eye (photos attached). We are contemplating legal action as this should never have been neglected enough to get as bad as it is.
Mr. Lawson,
Thank you for contacting us about your father’s accident. Please let us know the exact location so we can contact LES to get the light fixed and Public Works to get the sidewalk addressed.
I am very sorry for your dad's injury.

Carl

Carl B. Eskridge

Lincoln City Council
District 4 (Central and NW Lincoln)
Dear Mr. Camp,

I am excited about the opportunities available to the City through PACE and am so pleased that Roy Christensen is pursuing its implementation in the City Council. This program lowers individual or business energy costs and cuts greenhouse gas emissions. A win-win for all of us.

I’m concerned about climate change and this is an important action the city can take. PACE has enjoyed bipartisan support in over 34 states. Bipartisan approaches to problems are more durable and longer lasting. I look forward to seeing Council members work together to provide businesses in the city with this loan program.

PACE has been designed to be supported by Republicans and Democrats. The loans are not from government funds; local businesses benefit, if they choose to participate; it promotes energy conservation and saves money.

Moni Usasz

3340 S. 31

Lincoln, NE 68502