IN LIEU OF
DIRECTORS’ MEETING
Monday, January 28, 2019

I. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE

MAYORS OFFICE
1. Fiscal Impact Statement - Police/Communication Center dated November 30, 2018

PLANNING
1. Administrative Approvals from January 8, 2019 through January 14, 2019
2. Final Action dated January 24, 2019

FINANCE
1. Sales Tax Report reflecting November 2018 sales

II. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE
1. Proposed Sales Tax, opposition - Gary Powell
   Staff response provided by Rick Hoppe, Chief of Staff, Mayor’s Office
2. Request for an audit on current wheel tax - Bill Manning
   Staff response provided by Councilman Camp and Miki Esposito, Director, Transportation & Utilities
3. Proposed Sales Tax - Rosina Paolini
4. Charter Revision Committee - Jim Frohman
5. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Andy Smriga
6. Proposed Sales Tax, opposition - Mark Sutter
7. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Patrick Moran
8. Proposed Sales Tax - Charles R. Sadler
9. Proposed Sales Tax, opposition - Nolan Waak
10. Proposed Sales Tax, opposition - Tim Jonas
    Staff response provided by Councilman Camp
11. Proposed Sales Tax, opposition - Dale Sofley
12. Proposed Sales Tax, opposition - Jason Summers
13. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Mary Cox
15. Proposed Sales Tax - Tom Jurgens
17. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Paul S. Hoffman
18. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Bruce & Debra Pester
19. Request to ban gay cure therapies - Mikael Karadjov
20. Proposed Sales Tax, opposition - James Allstot
    Staff response provided by Councilman Camp
21. Proposed Lied Place Residences Redevelopment Project - Thomas C. Huston
22. Road and Sidewalk conditions NW Lincoln - Maria Alveraz
23. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Jane Peek

III. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS
See invitation list.

IV. ADJOURNMENT
Police would like to move a 3161 Communications Coordinator M03 to a 3123 Police Captain M06. The Communications Coordinator is vacant (due to retirement) so this is a perfect time to make the reclassification. We have had a Police Captain in this role for the past 14 months while the Communications Coordinator was working on several projects related to the radio system. This will not increase our FTEs just reclassify the FTE. While there is an increase in the cost of wages if you just compare the M06 to the M03, the current employee in the M03 position has been frozen at $52,296 due to the lower reclassification of the Communications Coordinator.

There will be an initial cost savings as the Captain in the position now whom we believe will stay is currently at M06 Step H $50.988 and a newly promoted Captain will most likely be at a lower step, which will also be a cost savings.

| FUTURE IMPACT: | ☐ Ongoing | ☐ Limited | Projected Completion Date |

### REVENUES GENERATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Yes ☐</th>
<th>No ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Current Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Next Fiscal Year Annualized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL (full time equivalents)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL (cost) business unit:</td>
<td>06014</td>
<td>06014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object code description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: 3161 Communications Coordinator</td>
<td>$108,776 (M03)</td>
<td>$108,776 (M03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: 3123 Police Captain</td>
<td>$106,055 (M06)</td>
<td>$106,055 (M06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES business unit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object code description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SERVICES &amp; CHARGES business unit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object code description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT business unit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object code description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE OF REVENUES: None

DIRECTOR: [Signature]  DATE: 11-30-2018
WHEN TO USE FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1. Requesting transfer of operating appropriations.
2. Requesting increase in personnel (full time equivalents) appropriations.
3. Requesting transfer of capital improvement appropriations.
4. Requesting operational change not authorized during the budget process.
5. Requesting appropriations based on receipt of additional funds from outside sources.
6. Requesting use of Contingency funds.

HOW TO USE FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

NEED: There should be a detailed explanation of why a change to the previously approved budget is necessary. If the change will have any impact beyond the current fiscal year, it should also be noted.

FUTURE IMPACT: One of the boxes should be checked. An example of an item with ongoing impact would be a request for additional fte authorization that will also be requested in upcoming budgets. This would necessitate filling out the "Next Fiscal Year Annualized" column. An example of an item with limited impact would be asking for authorization to use salary savings for the one time purchase of equipment. If "Projected Completion Date" applies, please fill in.

REVENUES GENERATED: Please note if the request will affect current and future revenues.

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES: These boxes should be marked yes or no. Some of the actions this form is used for (transfer of capital improvement appropriations, Contingency Funds) require a City Council ordinance.

PERSONNEL (full time equivalents): Please note the number of fte's the request involves, if applicable.

PERSONNEL (cost), SUPPLIES, OTHER SERVICES AND CHARGES, EQUIPMENT: All entries in these boxes must have the business unit, object code, and object code description along with the dollar amount. Negative amounts must be indicated by brackets.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES: This box should contain the sum of the dollar amounts in the various expenditure categories.

SOURCE OF REVENUES: This box should contain the name of the fund the action is required for.
### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

**DEPARTMENT/DIVISION**  PLANNING/LONG RANGE PLANNING  **DATE:** January 9, 2019

### NEED

The Planning Department staff are required to receive annual CEU’s through attending training in order to retain respective professional certifications, including GIS certifications and professional planner certifications. Most of these educational hours are obtained by staff through their attendance at local, regional, and national conferences. The purpose of this fiscal impact statement is to request to reallocate $4,000 in unexpended funds from Downtown Master Plan Consultant Services (11001.5628) to Schools and Conferences (11001.5728) to enable two department staff to attend the following national conferences:  
1) National American Planning Conference in San Francisco, April 13-16, 2019, estimated cost of $2,130; and  
2) ESRI User Conference in San Diego, CA, July 2019, estimated cost of $2,650.00.

### FUTURE IMPACT:

- **Ongoing**
- **Limited**
- **Projected Completion Date FY2018-19**

### REVENUES GENERATED

None

### LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Fiscal Year</td>
<td>No x</td>
<td>No x</td>
<td>No x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACT

**PERSONNEL (full time equivalents)**

**PERSONNEL (cost) business unit:**
- object code  
- description

**SUPPLIES business unit:**
- object code  
- description

**OTHER SERVICES & CHARGES business unit:**
- object code  
- description
- 11001.5628 Consultant Services/Downtown Master Plan: -$4,000.00
- 11001.5728 Schools and Conferences: +$4,000.00

**EQUIPMENT business unit:**
- object code  
- description

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**

$4,000.00

**SOURCE OF REVENUES**

General Fund

### DIRECTOR

[Signature]

**DATE**

1/9/19
WHEN TO USE FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1. Requesting transfer of operating appropriations.
2. Requesting increase in personnel (full time equivalents) appropriations.
3. Requesting transfer of capital improvement appropriations.
4. Requesting operational change not authorized during the budget process.
5. Requesting appropriations based on receipt of additional funds from outside sources.
6. Requesting use of Contingency funds.

HOW TO USE FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

NEED: There should be a detailed explanation of why a change to the previously approved budget is necessary. If the change will have any impact beyond the current fiscal year, it should also be noted.

FUTURE IMPACT: One of the boxes should be checked. An example of an item with ongoing impact would be a request for additional the authorization that will also be requested in upcoming budgets. This would necessitate filling out the "Next Fiscal Year Annualized" column. An example of an item with limited impact would be asking for authorization to use salary savings for the one time purchase of equipment. If "Projected Completion Date" applies, please fill in.

REVENUES GENERATED: Please note if the request will affect current and future revenues.

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES: These boxes should be marked yes or no. Some of the actions this form is used for (transfer of capital improvement appropriations, Contingency Funds) require a City Council ordinance.

PERSONNEL (full time equivalents): Please note the number of the request involves, if applicable.

PERSONNEL (cost), SUPPLIES, OTHER SERVICES AND CHARGES, EQUIPMENT: All entries in these boxes must have the business unit, object code, and object code description along with the dollar amount. Negative amounts must be indicated by brackets.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES: This box should contain the sum of the dollar amounts in the various expenditure categories.

SOURCE OF REVENUES: This box should contain the name of the fund the action is required for.
Memorandum

Date: January 15, 2018

To: City Clerk

From: Amy Huffman, Planning Dept.

Re: Administrative Approvals

cc: Planning Commission

Geri Rorabaugh, Planning Dept.

This is a list of the administrative approvals by the Planning Director from January 8, 2019 through January 14, 2019:

Administrative Amendment 18078, to Use Permit 17005, S. 70th and South, approved by the Planning Director on January 8, 2019, to revise the site plan and grading/drainage plan, generally located at S. 70th Street and South Street.

Administrative Amendment 18069, to Change of Zone 05054E, Prairie Village North PUD, approved by the Planning Director on January 11, 2019, to finalize location and size of neighborhood park and emergency access route for Lancaster Event Center, to clarify front yard setbacks for uses, and to update and correct residential table, generally located at Fremont Street and Tumbleweed Drive.

Administrative Amendment 18079, to Use Permit 99, Ridge Place, approved by the Planning Director on January 11, 2019, to remove a portion of the existing retail building, create smaller pad sites, and reduce setbacks along 27th Street, generally located at S. 27th Street and Pine Lake Road.
PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION
NOTIFICATION

TO: Mayor Chris Beutler
Lincoln City Council

FROM: Geri Rorabaugh, Planning

DATE: January 24, 2019

RE: Notice of final action by Planning Commission: January 23, 2019

Please be advised that on January 23, 2019, the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission adopted the following resolutions:

Resolution No. PC-01628, approving SPECIAL PERMIT 18050, for a special permit for reconstruction and expansion of a nonconforming building containing a dwelling unit and garage, with waivers to the side and rear yard setbacks and minimum parking, on property legally described as the west 40.63 feet of Lot 4 and the east 2/3 of Lot 5, Block 65, University Place, located in the NW 1/4 of Section 16-10-7, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, generally located at 5627 Madison Avenue.

The Planning Commission action on these applications is final, unless appealed to the City Council by filing a notice of appeal with the Planning Department 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. SP18050). The Resolution and Planning Department staff report are in the “Related Documents” under the application number.
Net Sales Tax

FY 18-19 Budget
FY17-18 Actual
FY18-19 Actual
# Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Projected 2018-19</th>
<th>Actual 2018-19</th>
<th>Variance 2018-19</th>
<th>Change from FR. 17-18</th>
<th>% Change from FR. 17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$6,569,175</td>
<td>$6,404,239</td>
<td>($164,936)</td>
<td>$115,741</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$6,833,888</td>
<td>$6,809,916</td>
<td>($23,972)</td>
<td>$29,385</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$6,798,484</td>
<td>$6,634,499</td>
<td>($163,985)</td>
<td>$97,668</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$6,475,120</td>
<td>$6,435,303</td>
<td>($39,817)</td>
<td>$110,642</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$6,461,284</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>($286,645)</td>
<td>$122,202</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$7,870,552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$6,097,570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$5,960,270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$7,101,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$6,661,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$6,684,576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$7,107,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$80,620,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,458,596</strong></td>
<td><strong>($679,355)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$475,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.49%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual collections for the fiscal year to date are 2.05% under projections for the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actual 2014-15</th>
<th>Actual 2015-16</th>
<th>Actual 2016-17</th>
<th>% CHG. FR. PRIOR YEAR</th>
<th>Actual 2017-18</th>
<th>% CHG. FR. PRIOR YEAR</th>
<th>Actual 2018-19</th>
<th>% CHG. FR. PRIOR YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$5,741,404</td>
<td>$6,041,963</td>
<td>$6,265,764</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>$6,386,734</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>$6,457,192</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$5,848,947</td>
<td>$6,089,519</td>
<td>$6,598,756</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
<td>$6,811,452</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>$6,817,440</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$5,873,441</td>
<td>$6,266,119</td>
<td>$6,471,721</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>$6,537,754</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>$6,637,486</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$5,737,783</td>
<td>$5,876,792</td>
<td>$6,128,386</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>$6,371,026</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>$6,493,888</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$5,525,231</td>
<td>$5,651,337</td>
<td>$6,285,444</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td>$6,432,363</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>$6,516,808</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$6,802,647</td>
<td>$7,137,154</td>
<td>$7,293,928</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>$7,459,132</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$5,396,268</td>
<td>$5,392,157</td>
<td>$5,521,761</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>$5,930,406</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$5,188,877</td>
<td>$5,426,539</td>
<td>$5,639,028</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>$5,618,037</td>
<td>-0.37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$6,348,190</td>
<td>$6,494,521</td>
<td>$6,708,815</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>$6,759,407</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$5,728,421</td>
<td>$6,030,654</td>
<td>$6,255,952</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>$6,325,718</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$5,841,882</td>
<td>$6,000,464</td>
<td>$6,440,709</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>$6,644,137</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$6,196,574</td>
<td>$6,657,168</td>
<td>$6,736,493</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>$6,770,977</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$70,229,665</td>
<td>$73,064,387</td>
<td>$76,346,757</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
<td>$78,047,143</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>$32,922,814</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>($44,232)</td>
<td>($105,779)</td>
<td>($217,212)</td>
<td>105.35%</td>
<td>($98,235)</td>
<td>-54.77%</td>
<td>($52,954)</td>
<td>-46.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>($191,059)</td>
<td>($94,343)</td>
<td>($31,712)</td>
<td>-66.39%</td>
<td>($30,920)</td>
<td>-2.50%</td>
<td>($7,524)</td>
<td>-75.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>($151,968)</td>
<td>($83,553)</td>
<td>($81,460)</td>
<td>-2.50%</td>
<td>($923)</td>
<td>-98.87%</td>
<td>($2,944)</td>
<td>218.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>($23,916)</td>
<td>($43,624)</td>
<td>($79,179)</td>
<td>81.50%</td>
<td>($46,365)</td>
<td>-41.44%</td>
<td>($58,585)</td>
<td>26.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>($277,201)</td>
<td>($98,310)</td>
<td>($294,431)</td>
<td>199.49%</td>
<td>($379,926)</td>
<td>29.04%</td>
<td>($342,169)</td>
<td>-9.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>($381,405)</td>
<td>($276,479)</td>
<td>($90,752)</td>
<td>-67.18%</td>
<td>($719)</td>
<td>-99.21%</td>
<td>($33,054)</td>
<td>4497.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>($69,314)</td>
<td>($39,620)</td>
<td>($92,105)</td>
<td>132.47%</td>
<td>($49,445)</td>
<td>-46.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>($79,747)</td>
<td>($75,796)</td>
<td>($29,707)</td>
<td>-60.81%</td>
<td>($41,280)</td>
<td>38.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>($72,554)</td>
<td>($105,297)</td>
<td>($67,726)</td>
<td>-35.68%</td>
<td>($91,272)</td>
<td>34.77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>($26,219)</td>
<td>($152,053)</td>
<td>($83,394)</td>
<td>-45.15%</td>
<td>($51,268)</td>
<td>-38.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>($40,332)</td>
<td>($55,289)</td>
<td>($1,932)</td>
<td>-96.51%</td>
<td>($347,486)</td>
<td>17885.82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>($10,119)</td>
<td>($312,528)</td>
<td>($17,202)</td>
<td>-94.50%</td>
<td>($96,471)</td>
<td>460.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>($1,368,066)</td>
<td>($1,442,671)</td>
<td>($1,086,812)</td>
<td>-24.67%</td>
<td>($1,234,310)</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
<td>($497,231)</td>
<td>-10.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CITY OF LINCOLN

## NET SALES TAX COLLECTIONS

### 2014-2015 THROUGH 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014-15</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2015-16</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2016-17</th>
<th>% CHG. FROM PRI. YEAR</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2017-18</th>
<th>% CHG. FROM PRIOR YEAR</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2018-19</th>
<th>% CHG. FROM PRIOR YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>$5,697,172</td>
<td>$5,936,184</td>
<td>$6,048,552</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>$6,288,498</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>$6,404,239</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>$5,657,888</td>
<td>$5,995,177</td>
<td>$6,567,045</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>$6,780,531</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>$6,809,916</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>$5,721,474</td>
<td>$6,182,565</td>
<td>$6,390,261</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>$6,536,831</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>$6,634,499</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>$5,713,868</td>
<td>$5,833,168</td>
<td>$6,049,207</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>$6,324,661</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>$6,435,303</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>$5,248,031</td>
<td>$5,553,027</td>
<td>$5,991,013</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>$6,052,437</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>$6,421,242</td>
<td>$6,860,675</td>
<td>$7,203,175</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td>$7,458,413</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$5,326,954</td>
<td>$5,352,537</td>
<td>$5,429,656</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>$5,880,960</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$5,109,130</td>
<td>$5,350,744</td>
<td>$5,609,320</td>
<td>4.83%</td>
<td>$5,576,757</td>
<td>-0.58%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$6,275,635</td>
<td>$6,389,224</td>
<td>$6,641,089</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>$6,668,135</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>$5,702,202</td>
<td>$5,878,601</td>
<td>$6,172,558</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>$6,274,450</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>$5,801,550</td>
<td>$5,945,175</td>
<td>$6,438,777</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>$6,296,651</td>
<td>-2.21%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>$6,186,455</td>
<td>$6,344,640</td>
<td>$6,719,292</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
<td>$6,674,506</td>
<td>-0.67%</td>
<td>$6,174,639</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$68,861,601</td>
<td>$71,621,717</td>
<td>$75,259,945</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>$76,812,830</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>$32,458,596</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to date vs. previous year
Mr Powell

I am Rick Hoppe, Mayor Beutler’s Chief of Staff

Thank you for writing to the Mayor and City Council on the sales tax for streets. I will attempt to answer your questions.

The timing of the election is a quirk in state law. In order to have the sales tax issue placed on a general election ballot, the resolution authorizing the election has to be submitted by September 1st. A similar deadline does not exist for primary elections. Since consensus on sales tax package was not achieved until early January, we could not have met that requirement and still held an election during the spring. The April election is the only option.

The wheel tax has never generated enough to meet the City’s street needs. We spend approximately $65 million on streets each year. The wheel tax only generates about $18 million per year. In order to generate the $13 million per year the quarter cent sales tax will bring in, the wheel tax would have to increase from $74 to $132. The wheel tax is limited by law to street spending.

I understand your concern about city employees who live outside the City. But unfortunately, those employees paying wheel tax is not a large revenue source. If you assume 15% of the City’s approximately 2,000 employees live outside the city limits and each had two cars, paying the City wheel tax would only generate about $44,000 a year.

That’s why the sales tax is a better option for street spending. About 30% of Lincoln’s sales tax is paid by people who live outside Lincoln, so under the proposed quarter sent plan, the very people you mention will pay for the streets they use.

If you have additional questions, please contact me.

R.

Gary Powell

Oh bye the way why not put it on the May ballot when there most likely will be more voters.
HUMMMMM

Gary Powell

On Tuesday, January 15, 2019, 7:05:53 PM CST, Gary Powell <garylpowell@yahoo.com> wrote:
See where you are considering adding 1/4 % to our sales tax for streets. Have several questions/concerns regarding this. As the City has grown in population this should have generated a lot more wheel tax to go for streets, has this money actually been going to streets or spent on other wishes and wants? You are aware that I have raised this question before about the large number of police and fire department employees who do not live in the City/yet are drawing a pay check from the City. I have been given the numbers of 28% of police and 45% of fire department employees do not live in the City. As the old saying goes, they are swimming in the pool without paying the dues. How much revenue would be generated if these employees were required to live in the City or at least pay City taxes. Also, how many other City employees do not live within the City? Yes, this was an issue in Omaha a few years back. The difference is those were not City employees they were targeting.

If this does go on the ballot, rest assured I will not be voting for it or for any candidate who does vote to put it on the ballot.

Thank you for your attention.

Gary L Powell
1910 N 76 ST
Lincoln NE 68505
(402) 464-6696
Councilman Camp,

Below is my response to Mr. Manning. Thank you for forwarding his email to me.

Sincerely,

Miki

Greetings Mr. Manning,

My name is Miki Esposito and I serve as Lincoln’s Director of Transportation and Utilities. I’m writing to respond to your questions below but also offer some clarification and background as well.

First, a 27-member Citizens’ Coalition, made up of community, neighborhood and business leaders, conducted a 5-month technical and financial review of transportation spending in Lincoln. They also evaluated 14 peer cities and scoured city policies, finances and plans. All of their work led them to conclude that the City of Lincoln has a $33 million annual gap in funding available to meet its transportation needs through 2040. Here is a link to their body of work as well as a record of the meetings held: [https://lincolnonthemove.com/](https://lincolnonthemove.com/)

Based upon the Coalition’s findings and to solve for the $33 million annual gap, the Coalition recommended that the City pursue a local option sales tax to help offset the gap. Why local option sales tax? Well, over 30% of sales tax generated is paid by non-residents visiting Lincoln and using our streets. A ¼ cent sales tax will cost an average household approximately $31 per year. Compare that to an equivalent Wheel Tax increase which would almost double the cost to a driver (from $74 to $132 per year). Also compare that to a comparable Property Tax increases which would add $117 per year to an average household.

Your question about the use of wheel tax is an important one. We generate about $18 million per year from the wheel tax. And, I assure you that all of the wheel taxes accumulated over my 8 years as Director has been appropriately spent only on transportation purposes. In fact the Lincoln Municipal Code is very prescriptive about how we spend wheel tax – follow this link to Section 3.20.220 of the code: [http://online.encodeplus.com/regs/lincoln-ne/doc-viewer.aspx#secid-6970](http://online.encodeplus.com/regs/lincoln-ne/doc-viewer.aspx#secid-6970).

By code, Wheel Tax can only be spent as follows:
Residential Streets - $2.8 M (14.86%)
Arterial Streets & New Growth - $6.6 M (35.14%)
Operations & Maintenance - $9.5 M (50%)

Therefore, 14.86% is used solely to rehabilitate residential streets – we usually do so with a 1-2 inch mill and asphalt overlay. 35.14% is used for major street construction projects, new growth projects, bridge rehab and construction. And finally, 50% of the wheel tax generated is used for Street Maintenance and Operations, such as pothole patching (we fill approximately 40,000/year!), Concrete Replacement, Street Sweeping, Traffic Signals and Signs Operations, Emergency Operations and Traffic Control, and Snow Removal.

I think what is tough for folks to remember is that Street Construction and Maintenance is really expensive. In order to rehab/resurface a residential street, it costs the city about $600,000 per lane mile. Reconstruction of an existing street is about $1.5 million per lane mile and in order to build a new street from scratch, it runs us about $12 million per mile for a new 4-lane arterial. Think for example the City’s share of the South Beltway - $50 million! That whole system is going to cost well over $300 million when fully built.

One of the most interesting things the Coalition found out during their review was that Lincoln’s street budget per lane mile is $2400 compared to the average of our peer cities who spend at least $10,000 to preserve and maintain streets. So, while we are incredibly grateful for the wheel tax contribution from our citizens, the Coalition discovered that we are falling further and further behind due to the overall expense of transportation infrastructure. And, we are battling 5-6% construction inflation each year. So – the longer we wait the more expensive it becomes.

So here is what we propose to do with the additional money from sales tax:

An additional $13 million is the minimum amount needed to:
- Maintain our arterial streets in good condition
- Make needed investments in our residential street backlog
- Continue to add new streets that grow our City.

We want to invest dollars now before our streets get worse and it costs our community a whole lot more money to reconstruct or rebuild them. We propose to concentrate most of the new dollars on residential streets where we can get the most bang for the buck. Remember that REHAB is about half the cost of RECONSTRUCTION ($600,000/lane mile versus $1.5 MM/lane mile). That way we can fix over 300 blocks of residential streets per year – quadrupling typical results. 4 times more rehab! That means after six years we could fix approximately 138 miles of residential streets across the City! With respect to our growing city, we’d be able to invest in major expansion projects such as, Yankee Hill Road (40th to 56th Street), South 40th Street (Yankee Hill to Rokeby), portions of S. 98th Street, 33rd and Cornhusker, Folsom Street in the SW area, or even W. Holdrege Street (west of NW 48th).

Finally, we would do all of this in a fair, transparent and mindful way where we have geographic parity – a fair distribution of projects across all quadrants of the city so that all areas of the city benefit from the sales tax booster shot. Strategic Coordination and Project Bundling – We will prioritize projects to maximize economies of scale and streamline our service delivery model. Where we align various street repairs and utility improvements to avoid repeat street closures as much as possible. And, most importantly we will submit an annual report to the Mayor & City Council with program oversight by a citizens advisory committee.
The sales tax proposal is meant to be a booster shot for our residential streets with about 25% of the funds dedicated to new growth projects. That way we can maintain them with low cost repairs in the future. Should you have any additional questions for me, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,
Miki

Miki Esposito, Director
Lincoln Transportation & Utilities
402.441.6173 / mesposito@lincoln.ne.gov

From: William Manning <arch12048@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:27 PM
To: Elizabeth D. Elliott <EElliott@lincoln.ne.gov>
Subject: Re: Quarter cent tax for roads

The City of Lincoln is proposing an increase in taxes under the guise of using that money to fix the streets. I pay a wheel tax when I license my vehicle. It was my understanding the wheel tax I pay funds street repair. How much wheel tax has been collected in the last five years? When has that wheel tax been spent on?

On the web pages of 10/11 TV, Channel 8 TV, and the Journal Star, there are poorly written stories about the City of Lincoln wanting to raise taxes to pay for the street. There is nothing in any of the stories about where the wheel tax the residents of Lincoln is spent. For all I know it could be spent on office furniture for the City Council, or it could have been spent on a fire truck.

I'm trying to find out how much wheel tax revenue has been generated and where it has gone.
Good morning to you all-
As I read the article re: sales tax hike, I wonder who is on the Coalition for Growth. After completing some research, I can find no information re: the advisory group. Please guide me to some resources. Appreciate your help.

*rosina
Last summer the Charter Revision Commission approved seven changes to the charter. The next step for these changes approved by the Charter Revision Commission is to be reviewed by the Council. Almost six months have passed and the Council has yet to review these changes. There is plenty of time for the Council to review these changes and consider adding them to either the April or May city election ballot.

The approved changes are listed below. Attached is a document with more details about the changes.

**Approved Addition to the Charter**

Article XI, Section 4 - Gender Neutral

**Approved for Removal from the Charter**

Article IV, Section 6. Bond of Councilman.
Article IV, Section 17. Citizens Aid in Law Enforcement.
Article VIII, Section 13b. Municipal Gasoline Station.
Article IX, Section 3f. Auditorium, Additional Bond Issue.

**Approved Change to Charter Language**

Article IX-A, Section 8. No Discrimination, Political Activities.

The Charter Revision Commission has done its job. It's time for the Council and Mayor to do your job. Many of you have made a point that charter changes should go through the Commission to be properly vetted. That has happened. It is now your duty to perform the review. Failure to perform this duty negates the purpose of the Commission and the hard work the members have done.

Please consider these changes for inclusion on one of the upcoming spring ballots.

Thank you

Jim Frohman
7335 Pioneers Blvd
Apt. 212
Article IV, Section 6 – This is the section that requires city council members to have a surety bond in the amount of $2,000 in order to serve. The Committee discussed that this provision is fairly useless in today’s world and should probably be removed if it is not required by state law.

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 15-307 requires council members for primary class cities (Lincoln) to have a bond in the favor of the city in the amount of $2,000.

*After discussion the Commission decided that this duplicates the State law and is not necessary.*

10-1 For removal.

Article IV, Section 17 - This section gives the Mayor and the chief of police the authority to draft any citizen to aid in the suppression of a riot or to help enforce any city ordinance with refusal to assist being punishable by a $100 fine.

The Committee recommended that this section be proposed for removal.

*One member wanted input from the police chief.*

10-1 For removal.

Article VIII, Section 13a – This section authorizes the City to establish a Municipal Coal and Fuel Yard.

The Committee recommended that this section be proposed for removal.

11-0 For removal.

Article VIII, Section 13b – This section authorizes the City to establish a Municipal Gas Station.

The Committee recommended that this section be proposed for removal.

11-0 For removal.

Article IX, Section 3f - This section authorizes the City to issue bonds not to exceed $1,500,000 for a city auditorium.

The Committee recommended that this section be proposed for removal.

11-0 For removal.
Article IX-A, Section 8 – This section forbids discrimination and limits the political activity of those in city service.

The Committee recommended the following change:

**No Discrimination, Political Activities.** No action affecting the employment status of an employee or applicant for a position in the city service, including appointment, promotion, demotion, suspension, or removal, shall be taken or withheld by reason of protected class status under federal, state, or city law or for reason of political opinion, the race, creed, color, or political opinions or affiliation of the affected person, except that no person shall be employed or retained in the city service who advocates or belongs to an organization that advocates the overthrow or change of our government by force or violence.

No person in the city service, on city time or with city resources, except elected officials, and members of election boards and unpaid advisory boards and commissions, shall engage in the following activities in connection with any city issue to be voted upon or any candidate to be nominated for, or elected to, any city political office:

1. Manage a campaign or be a member of a campaign committee for a candidate for nomination for or election to city office or for or against any city issue; provided, however, nothing herein shall prevent the dissemination of facts or information relating to a city issue by persons in the city service acting in their official capacity.
2. Circulate petitions for candidates for city office, although an employee may sign such a petition;
3. Wear campaign buttons or similar emblems, or distribute campaign literature, at work or in a city uniform or in the offices or buildings of the City of Lincoln.

**11-0 Approve changes.**

The Committee recommended a new section saying:

Article XI, Section 4 Gender Neutral

The language of this charter is intended to be gender neutral and should be interpreted as such.

**11-0 Approve new section.**
I am writing in regards to the Krueger Development building proposal to change the height allowance from 45' to 50' to enable the construction of two four-story mixed use buildings for mixed use in the Porter Ridge neighborhood. As a resident of Porter Ridge, I hope you will not allow this proposal. The original plan of 3 office sites is much more suitable.

As I drive across Lincoln, I see vacant retail space in so many of the "mixed use" buildings. This is clearly not a need. Additionally, that space is too small to accommodate so many additional residents and any apartment high rise will be an eyesore to the area and create additional congestion that will be problematic.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andy Smriga
City Council - Contact

Date: 1/16/2019 3:25:31 PM

name mark sutter
address 3320 north 68
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68507
email msutter@neb.rr.com

comments If you ran on lowering taxes, how about removing the city wheel tax? I remember when it started as $1 and now it is $75, a 75% increase. The tax was supposed to last for one year. Well guess what, the city found a cash cow instead
City Council - Contact

Date: 1/16/2019 3:56:18 PM

name: patrick moran
address: 2821 Sissel Rd
  city: Lincoln
  state: NE
  zip: 68516
email: patrick_a_moran@yahoo.com
comments: With respect to the proposed 4-story residential buildings proposed at 28th and Pine Lake (Porter Ridge, behind Starbucks), I would offer the following:

  Krueger Development does subpar work to begin with (I bought one of their houses as a second owner). They didn't until just this year complete the sidewalk along 28th where the 24-hour fitness place was. While Krueger obviously can make money on building a 4-story building, that is bait & switch as it was not part of the original zoning, and is especially unfair to the immediate residents (of which I am not). This will create a 'tower' of shoddy architecture what will dominate the area, not to mention increase traffic in an already overly busy area. While capitalism and growth are needed, this is too much for the area, will end up being an eyesore, and is completely unfair to the residents.
Charles R Sadler  
3910 La Salle  
Lincoln, NE 68516-1043  

crsadler04@yahoo.com  

Dear Council, I would support the 1/4 % sales tax, if we can get rid of that dam wheel tax. As far as I am concerned the wheel tax is a license to steal. The sales tax would make everyone pay including the city employees who live outside Lincoln. That is how I really feel....Thank You
Increasing taxes! Again! That is ridiculous. All I hear from city officials these days is “we need to increase funding for project XYZ so we want to add an additional tax”. Those additional taxes add up. Why do you have to increase taxes if the population is growing? More people = more money. Where is all the money going? Really, I want to know where or who is getting all the money.

 Increasing sales taxes will only run more businesses like Shopko out of business. All you will do is hurt LOCAL businesses by increasing sales taxes. Most online companies still don’t charge taxes even though it’s a law to do so. Maybe you should finally regulate them instead of hurting location companies and jobs?

 If more money was needed to maintain roads, maybe millions shouldn’t have been used to replace all the traffic lights with those blinking yellow arrows. Those lights have done nothing good for the city. All they have done is taught drivers to run red lights because they can just say “oh I thought it was going to change to a blinking yellow arrow”. Yes, I do know it was grant money used for the light, but grant money doesn’t come out of the air. It comes from TAXES.

 How many of you campaigned with “I’ll fight to hold the line on taxes”? I’m so tired of hearing that. I DON’T want you to hold the line. I want the line pushed BACK. We are OVER taxed NOW. Only bad will come if you keep increasing taxes. Look at history and what happened to every government that OVER taxed their people. There was a change of government. Think it can’t happen? Guess again.

 I’m tired of seeing a large portion of my paycheck or purchases go to taxes. We need less taxes and less government.
Mr. Jonas

Your email raises several good points.

There is no question that our streets and road have deteriorated, primarily due to lack of proper maintenance. I have argued for years that Lincoln needs to “seal the joints and cracks” in our concrete and asphalt streets to prevent water penetration, which subsequently leads to potholes and pavement failure. Further, I remain firmly convinced that the application of brine, especially without a good program to “seal joints and cracks”, has accelerated deterioration of streets.

Regarding the proposed sales tax, the proponents are committed to expending the funds for maintenance and at least 25% for new construction. Limitation on the use of funds is also included.

However, I fear that future mayors and City Council members will shift other street funds within the budget to achieve projects that are prohibited from the proposed sales tax revenues. A good example was cited by you regarding the wheel tax, which has been redirected under the guise of “transportation modes” to other applications, thereby reducing funds that should have been used for street maintenance. I am at a loss of an effective way to bind the hands of future mayors and Council members to focus on “streets” and not continue the path toward additional “complete streets” and other programs, which are expensive.

Again, thank you for your email.

Best reads,

Jon

JON A. CAMP
Lincoln City Council
200 Haymarket Square
808 P Street
P.O. Box 82307
Lincoln, NE  68501-2307

Office:  402.474.1838/402.474.1812
Fax:  402.474.1838
Cell:  402.560.1001

Email:  joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com
Hello Mr. Camp,

I would like to voice my concern with the tax increase being proposed/talked about for the roads. My concern is that the money raised will potentially be diverted to something else once it starts coming in. How will the taxpayers know how much is coming in and where/how it's being spent? Who will oversee this? How will it be reported? Will there be transparency for any taxpayer to see the income/expenses? I don't necessarily have a problem with the increase, my problem lies with being sure the money is being spent as it is intended - to improve the quality of the roads in Lincoln, NE. The "wheel tax" was implemented and the roads have not improved and I haven't been able to get any answers from the city on how the money is being spent. By the conditions of our roads, I'd guess all the money isn't being used for roads? The "wheel tax" continues to increase, but roads are rapidly deteriorating. Getting from one side of town to the other has always been an issue and nothing gets done to improve that. Any information you can provide on this subject would be appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you on this and finding out how I can get more information so I can become a more informed taxpayer.

Tim Jonas
7317 S 33rd Street
Lincoln, NE 68516

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail 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 e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.
From: Dale Softley <outlook_8E60C5722091B45A@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2019 11:31 AM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: Additional sales tax

It is my opinion street monies have not been spent wisely. No new funding until there are major changes in management. Can the public see where city monies are spent? How?

Thank You,
Dale Softley
1420 Kingston Rd.
Lincoln, NE
Send from Mail for Windows 10
As a member of your district I would like you to oppose the increase in the sales tax. In my opinion if the actual revenue generated by the tax is below the budgeted amount, we need to adjust the budget, not the tax.

Thank You

Jason Summers

Sent from my iPad
Dear Council Members,

I am a townhome owner in Porter Ridge. I am OPPOSED to the construction of a mixed use building proposed by Krueger Development at 29th and Pine Lake.

I feel that the city should enforce the original zoning to this site. How many times must we voice our disapproval? We have no problem having an office space. We oppose apartments being squeezed into this small plot of land. This would add a lot of traffic with 221 apartment units. This is directly across the street from a Daycare, which is very busy with drop-offs early morning and late afternoons. Also, it is less than 1/2 blk. from Starbucks. On 1-8-19 they served 955 customers, on 1-5-19 they served 1104 people. How will this area handle additional traffic? Along with Starbucks, there are additional restaurants. Cherry on Top, Chipotle, Noodles, Sportmans Haircut, Crave, Zoup, Petsmart......this is alot of traffic using the entrance off 29th street.

I urge you to drive by this proposed location. Would you want this in your backyard?

I trust that you will consider all this information, and represent the residents. This is NOT the location for Kruegers "mixed use" project.

Sincerely,

Mary Cox
Dear City Council and Planning Commission members,

The reason for our letter today is to respectfully ask you to deny the proposed amendment to Use Permit #100D and Special permit #1629I for Krueger Developments, Southwood Village mixed use building at South 27th St. & Pine Lake Rd.

As a concerned homeowner at 2834 Porter Ridge Road, we ask that you review the facts outlined and think of the grave consequences that this monstrous building will have on so many homeowners in the Porter Ridge area. As homeowners we have been dealing with the multiple attempts by Krueger (see below) to push the amendments and special permits needed for the apartment building since March 21, 2018.

In May of 2018, on a very busy graduation weekend we walked the entire Porter Ridge subdivision. We received over 225 signatures opposing this project, most of the people we talked to had no idea what was about to happen, some laughed... who would do that to their neighbors? that’ll look out of place, why would someone do that? We did find one person that was in favor of the project, one... and they were family of Krueger.

On May 9, 2018, the Planning Commission voted against the proposed amendments 6 to 1. After this unanimous vote to deny the 60’ height waiver from the current zoning permit of 35’, Krueger proceeded to the City Council on August 20, 2018 with another height waiver to 50’. It was passed by a vote of 4 to 3. The city council members that voted for this height waiver describe that it was a “very painful” decision for them to make, they didn’t want to, but felt that they had to vote for this.

The city council members that drove out to view the property, they voted against it. They said that the O3 zoning was in place for a reason and that a 4 story apartment is not “a compatible buffer” next to a residential area.

As the process continued the only option left for us as homeowners, was to write the mayor with our concerns and plea for a veto, and we did. We received an email from the Mayor, with his ruling, a mayoral veto. This was great news, or so we thought... but, the process STILL continued.

The next step in the process was going back to the City Council, to give them the opportunity for a “supermajority” override of the mayor's veto. We did this in September 2018.
As we waited in the City Council chamber, Bernie Shobe Chair of the City Council came down and visited with our group. He asked us if we were the Porter Ridge Community, we acknowledged. He stated that the City council had no intention of bringing this to a vote to override the mayor’s veto. He commended all of us for working so hard and for professionally presenting the facts.

He said “You can” fight City Hall, “Your voices were heard”, “The process works”.

He said, “We got it wrong”, “The mayor got it right”, “The mayor did the right thing by vetoing the councils vote”.

We respectfully ask that all of you review this information once again. Our question to all of you is, what has changed? As far as the homeowners are concerned, nothing...

On Dec. 8th we received a letter from the mayor informing us that he met with Krueger and that he felt the changes he was proposing was something that homeowners should look at. He said to work with the homeowners, to find some solutions.

On Dec. 12th we received a letter from Krueger requesting that we attend an informational meeting on Dec. 13th. Krueger only invited 17 of the 50 plus homeowners in the Porter Ridge area. When we asked him about it, he said “I only need to notify the people that are directly south to the property”. To this day I don’t think the rest of the association has been notified, if they have its been from the 17 homeowners. At first glance, this does not appear to be a good indication that he was going to work with the homeowners as the mayor requested?

At this meeting he showed us the plans and pictures for a 45’ medical office building. He stated that he could build this with no additional permits or waivers. He said it would have minimal landscaping, be closer to our homes and he would put a one way road directly behind the property with garbage dumpsters next to our property, his words.

As the homeowners we prefer this medical/office building verses a 4 story apartment building with no privacy. These apartments will look directly into our bedrooms, our living rooms, and onto our decks. Please remember we live in Nebraska, there is at least 6 months where all these trees have NO leaves! All the trees in world will not screen this building when they don’t have leaves on them. These residents would be looking into our homes 24x7.

He proceeded to tell us that the mayor and the city members wanted him to build the apartment building, (we’ve heard this 3 times now) and that he was permitted to resubmit “the same plan that the mayor had vetoed”. This is the plan that the city council did not even bring to a vote (per our conversation with Chair Person Shobe) to override the mayor’s veto.

So… we and the city planning commission get to go through this once again. His only changes to the plan were he was moving the air conditioners to the roof. We don’t feel this is much of an attempt on his part, to work with us. If fact, we feel the only reason he showed us the office medical plans was to talk about how bad he could possibly make it for us.

He told us, that to show the mayor that he was working with the homeowners, he was going to offer each of the 17 homeowners $1,000 for additional landscaping. That is an insult.

Now, he wants us, to pay for the screening to cover up his building?

Just the appearance of offering us financial compensation is very unsettling. Think about it.

He also offered the 17 homeowners access to the apartment’s pool and the clubhouse. With all due respect, take the average age of the people living on the north side of Porter Ridge Road and ask yourself, how many of these people would want to use this pool?

This seems like a “at any cost” desperation move.

The question is how many times must we go through this process? When does no, mean no? Within our Porter Ridge Association the majority of us are at an elderly age. It’s cruel that we must continue to ride this rollercoaster of emotions, wondering what is going to happen next, what’s about our homes, our quality of life, when will this stop?

Please put yourself in our shoes. Would you want your Grandmother, your Mother, or your Daughter have someone watch their every move from the next door apartment complex? Again, we are inviting you to
our home so you can see our prospective. We pay the taxes, and these are OUR HOMES. We don’t want a monolithic building stuck in our backyard, and neither would you!
The zoning was put in place to protect homeowners from situations just like this. How can this even have the appearance of being fair to homeowners? The only one that is benefiting from the 4 story apartment building is Krueger? And he needs everyone to re-write every rule, and ask for special permit, after special permit so he can get what he wants. What about us and what we want? He stated very clearly that he wanted/needed to build the 4 stories to make more income.
Please... try to understand our views.

You represent us,
You are to supposed to look out for “our” best interest, the community, not one individual.
You are to protect us, The zoning is to protect us, the decisions you make, we have to live with,
Don’t change this just for the benefit of one person, because the rest of us will all pay the price.
Thank you in advance for your time.

Respectfully,

Douglas & Marsha Gerlach
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City Council - Contact

Date: 1/20/2019 1:59:54 PM

name Tom Jurgens
address 1016 N 86th Street Ct
   city Lincoln
   state NE
   zip 68505
   email twjurgens@gmail.com

comments For me, the idea of a sales tax increase for street construction and maintenance is good with 2 conditions:
1. The new funds should be in ADDITION to the funds that would ordinarily be budgeted for those purposes. The new funds should not be a substitute for amounts that should already be in the budget.
2. The amount spent for new construction in new developments should be limited to no more than 25% of the total collected. We should not be expected to provide streets for developers who will profit from them.

Absent those 2 conditions, it would be difficult for me to be in favor of the increase to an already high tax burden.

Sales tax can be a very fair tax (absent the exemptions that are granted) in that everyone pays the same percent on purchases. However, it often becomes an additional burden on those who can afford it the least.
Hello. I am writing this email again in hopes that you will please vote AGAINST the “proposed apartment complex” by Krueger Development in the Porter Ridge neighborhood.

When I move to this townhouse/neighborhood area over 8 years ago, what brought me to this place was the friendly neighborhood area, and its closeness to area shopping and/or restaurants and open views from by back deck, except for possibly the view of rooftops from the business complex to the north of our neighborhood. The businesses that now reside along the south side of Pine Lake across from Shopko all the way to 29th Street were already in place and have not created any problems. If this proposed development is allowed, there will be much added traffic, noise, extra parked vehicles along 29th Street on a 24 hour by 7 day basis.

We as neighbors have bonded and taken pride in our peaceful, kid-friendly neighborhood which is clean and has relatively low traffic volumes. Imagine going out onto your patio or deck to enjoy a soothing breeze or have friends or family over for a cookout and outdoor games, only to have an overly tall building right behind your fence, with tenants in the apartments being able to watch your every move. Up to this time we have been fortunate to be able to open our windows and blinds to enjoy the outdoors. However, if this development is allowed, that privacy will go away forever. These tenants will be able to now look directly into our homes and yards. There probably also be issues with drainage from rain or snow & sump pumps into their roadways and parking lots from the properties or definite puddling/backup into our backyards.

As a current townhome owner in the Porter Ridge neighborhood, I am asking that you vote AGAINST this proposal by Kruger Development and keep our peaceful neighborhood in place. If you have the time, I am asking you to do a “drive by” to check out the inadequate and inappropriate location that they want to build these complexes in and ask yourself, “would you want this in your direct backyard?”

Thank you for taking the time to read by message and I hope that you give this serious thought before allowing it to take place. I’m sure this company can find a more suitable location for their proposed project.

M Jane Gettman
2840 Lawson Drive
Lincoln, NE 68516
Dear Members of Lincoln’s City Council and Planning Commission:

As my job will not permit me time to appear in person to address my deep concerns regarding the upcoming discussion—specifically, of the proposed amendment to Use Permit #100D and Special permit #1629l for Krueger Developments, Southwood Village mixed use building at South 27th Street & Pine Lake Road—I hope this letter will serve in my stead.

I will not address the historical, architectural, construction-related, or legislative specifics of Krueger Development’s determined and recurring effort to develop this location since at least two other citizens who are directly impacted by the proposed project have recently done so. (I would respectfully direct your close attention to correspondence which has been emailed to you by Douglas & Marsha Gerlach.) I addressed the Planning Commission with them in 2018, and like them and others gathered, spoke strongly against plans Krueger Development had for the above-mentioned location. The Gerlach’s letter provides in great detail their (as well as other effected residents) encounters—direct and otherwise—with Krueger Development. It paints what I believe is an accurate description of a company dead-set on squeezing an apartment complex onto this land anyway it can, irrespective of the immediate and long-term impact on the area—or, as importantly, those who residing close by a structure that provides no significant benefit or need to the surrounding community.

The Gerlachs, and others, have and continue to provide heartfelt verbal and written testament to their dismay, frustration, bewilderment, and lack of respect caused by the convoluted and insensitive actions Krueger Development has/is taking to have their way. And this despite a Mayoral veto that sensibly recognized this planned apartment building (in its varied iterations) for what it is:

The desire for profit over people’s quality of life.

Urban clutter that not only spoils the skyline and local environs, but also does so unnecessarily: There is no dearth of apartment buildings, some still under construction, in the area. You know this, we who live in the affected neighborhood know this, and certainly Krueger Development does as well.

A physical and civil insult to those who want nothing more than to live happily in, and pay their taxes dutifully for, the homes they have work hard buy and maintain. Where is the consideration for their much smaller, but no less important investments?

My perspective and contribution to being vehemently against Krueger Development’s proposed building plans do not come from being one of the many unfortunate citizens who will, by misfortune of their address, have a looming 4-story apartment building assaulting their views and their hosing values. However, I live at 7121 South 31st Place (comparatively close to the land under discussion) and have done so since 1997.
So, there is a *temporal* element to this discussion that I believe I am well qualified to point out. That is to say, the impact Krueger Development’s proposal would create over time. I have lived in Pine Lake neighborhood before there was a South Pointe, and can attest to the significant rise in traffic, noise, municipal vehicles (e.g. garbage trucks), and pedestrians over the years. Some of this is to be expected—the price of reasonable progress. But the addition of an apartment complex at South 27th Street & Pine Lake Road will, by virtue of its size and purpose, markedly increase the level and number of these factors.

I ask the members of the City Council and the Planning Committee to consider the proposed apartment building’s proximity to an elementary (Cavett), secondary (Scott), high school (Southwest) and large daycare center. Traffic to and from these buildings, morning and afternoons (as well as evening events in some cases), is already considerable…as are the number of neighborhood students walking to and from them. The numerous vehicles the proposed apartment complex adds to an already traffic-intensive area will be an undesirable mixture of noise, vehicle flow, and an increased chance of accidents in an immediate area populated by both young children *and* older adults. The previously proposed office/medical building would have at least created a marginal (at best) problem along these lines after traditional working hours.

I ask the members of the City Council and the Planning Committee to imagine the smell emanating from accumulated garbage (especially during warm weather) consistently generated by scores of tenants; and the early morning din of garbage trucks required to periodically haul it away. Containing both to the boundaries of the apartment property would be impossible…as would be neighbors not constantly being reminded of these environmental factors.

I ask the members of the City Council and the Planning Committee to imagine the additional light pollution the proposed parking lots (and individual living areas in this comparative monolith) would create from their necessary illumination.

But mostly, I ask the members of the City Council and the Planning Committee to consider what the “Good Life” and “Nebraska Nice” are meant to stand for on a neighborhood scale when a sense of commitment to foresight, fairness, empathy, beauty and safe places to live fall second to profit by any legal wrangling necessary.

Would it matter where you live? If so, it should where my many neighbors and I do.

Accordingly, I respectfully ask you to deny the proposed amendment to Use Permit #100 and Special Permit 1629l for Krueger Development’s Southwood Village project.

Thank you, in advance, for your consideration and service to the public.

Sincerely,

Paul S. Hoffman

dsethhoffman19@gmail.com
To All Who Should be concerned about the aforementioned subject (above):

We respectfully ask that you carefully read and consider our request to deny the Krueger Development proposal to build a mixed-use building at a property located on South 29th St. between Pine Lake Rd. and Porter Ridge Rd.

I have attached a letter with our concerns, observations, and questions.

Thank you

Bruce & Debra Pester
Sexual and gender minorities face still a lot of discrimination around the USA. The main preconception and quandary about minorities is that sexual or gender identity is a choice. This preconception is naturally a threat to mental welfare of sexual and gender minorities. There have been made several explorations that prove that sexual identity is a genetic feature and it is not chosen by themselves. For example the UN Committee Against Torture and several American and European medical and psychological organizations have condemned therapies that attempt to “cure” sexuality. According to experts attempts to “cure” sexuality has been linked to severe trauma and sometimes even suicide.

I would like to ask you when will gay cure therapies be banned by law in Lincoln? Such therapies have already been banned in many countries. The battle on this issue has continued for a long time and it is time the parliament finally put forward attempts to grant sexual and gender identity under the law regardless of sexual and gender identity like most of the Western world have already done.

Because values of individuals usually stabilise during adolescence it is important to increase knowledge about sexual and gender orientation in society for example through education. There could be taught in comprehensive schools around the USA for example that sexual orientation is genetic like for example eye colour and left-handedness and can not be changed. Homosexuality among many animal species but homophobia can be found among only one - us humans. In the end you can not and never change the biological facts. This could decrease preconceptions against sexual and gender minorities and increase tolerance in the country, please? Thank you!

There are several links underneath in which there are explorations and news considering sexuality as a genetic feature.

journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract;jsessionid=A18DB3585FB36817256FFA7F92093315.journals?aid=962

www.vocativ.com/312971/scientists-destroy-anti-gay-arguments-about-choice/
www.pinknews.co.uk/2014/11/22/are-you-born-gay-or-is-it-a-choice-scientists-might-have-found-the-answer/

With kind regards,

Mikael Karadjov
James:

I understand your thoughts on a County-wide wheel tax.

To enact a county-wide wheel tax requires coordination and approval of several of the County’s villages. The Lancaster County Board of Commissioners has found this to be challenging and burdensome.

One of the justifications for the proposed sales tax increase that will appear on the April 2019 primary ballot is that a sales tax would capture revenue from those who live outside Lincoln. However, there is no proposed decrease in the wheel taxes paid by City residents.

The wheel tax has been diverted over budgets proposed by mayors the last 20+ years. As a result, fewer wheel tax dollars go to street construction and maintenance. A concern I have heard from other constituents and taxpayers is whether the limitations on the proposed sales tax for “curb to curb” maintenance and improvements, would have an effect on increasing the allocation of wheel tax revenues and other federal and state aid for streets to other programs that are general classified under “transportation projects” such as “complete streets”, bike lanes and trails, and multi-modal transportation.

I hope this clarifies your questions.

Best regards,

Jon

JON A. CAMP
Lincoln City Council
200 Haymarket Square
808 P Street
P.O. Box 82307
Lincoln, NE 68501-2307

Office: 402.474.1838/402.474.1812
Fax: 402.474.1838
Cell: 402.560.1001

Email: joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com

From: Angela M. Birkett <ABirkett@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2019 10:33 AM
To: Jon Camp <joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com>
Subject: FW: InterLinc - Contact
From: WebForm [mailto:none@lincoln.ne.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2019 9:38 AM
To: Jon Camp <jcamp@lincoln.ne.gov>
Subject: InterLinc - Contact

City Council - Contact

Date: 1/23/2019 9:38:26 AM

name: James Allstot
address: 7641 Ringneck Dr
city: Lincoln
state: NE
zip: 68506
email: j.allstot@hotmail.com
comments: Sales tax hike

Have we looked into charging wheel tax on all the out of towers that work in Lincoln, they use our streets more than those who live here. I know several of them, they live in the bedroom communities around Lincoln work here and should pay wheel tax!
Jon:
The City Council will have 3 items on its meeting agenda for Monday, January 28th which will approve the Lied Place Residences Redevelopment Project, including the Redevelopment Agreement and Bond Ordinance. I contact you today to request your support for the project.

The request and project can be summarized as:

1. **Project:** The project is being located on the narrow footprint which was formerly occupied by the Applebee’s Restaurant which closed approximately 5 years ago. This project site was originally intended for a residential use when the parking garage across the street from the Lied Center was constructed over 24 years ago. The project will consist of a 20 story tower. A restaurant will be located on the first floor and office space will be located on floors 1-4. Floors 5-20 will be comprised of approximately 40 dwelling units. The project will be organized as a condominium so that each of the dwelling units can be purchased and owned by separate owners. The downtown area has a shortage of ownership opportunities for housing.

2. **Redevelopment Agreement:** The Redevelopment Agreement with Lied Place contemplates an investment by Lied Place, LLC of approximately $31 MM. The conservative approach to the “sizing” of the tax increment financing component of the project yields a TIF amount of $5 MM. The Redevelopment Agreement provides for the use of the TIF proceeds on customary and eligible TIF uses of:
   a. **Site Acquisition**;
   b. **Façade Enhancement** on the principal north elevation but also on the south, east and west elevations;
   c. **Streetscape** which will include the use of the southern-most lane of traffic for an expanded streetscape area which will include an outdoor dining area associated with the restaurant use on the first floor.

3. **Schedule:** If approved by the City Council at the 3rd reading/voting session on February 4th, Lied Place LLC would intend to commence with the demolition of the existing building in March, weather permitting and immediately proceed into the construction of the project. Construction completion is intended for Summer/Fall of 2021.

This project will have a dramatic impact on the skyline of downtown Lincoln. In addition, consistent with the stated goals of the 2018 Downtown Master Plan, this project brings additional opportunities for home ownership to the downtown area.

I would ask for your support of the project. I appreciate your consideration.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Tom
To whomever this may concern,

I wanted to bring to your attention the conditions of the roads and sidewalks around NW 4th, West Garber, West Belmont Ave area. I cannot speak for the rest of Lincoln but many of the roads here have not properly been cleared, and many of the sidewalks are thick with snow or patchy with ice. I understand that it is difficult to maintain throughout the winter but I feel this area is repeatedly overlooked following the snow.

Many children walk to and home from school – I walk my son to school at West Lincoln – and the walk becomes difficult, dangerous even, after it has snowed. As there is no transport available for children that live in the area (something I feel the city should consider for the safety of school children during these bitterly cold winter months), walking to school is their only option.

I would appreciate if you could take the time to look into my concerns.

Thank you,

Maria Alvarez
City Council - Contact
Date: 1/24/2019 2:02:03 PM

name: Jane Peek
address: 2841 Porter Ridge Road
city: Lincoln
state: NE
zip: 68516
email: jpeek45@gmail.com

comments: The Porter Ridge West Townhouse Association has led the charge for the entire Porter Ridge West Subdivision and surrounding area in fighting the construction of two four story mixed use buildings to be constructed abutting our properties. Commercial space on only half of the first floor sounds good but let's be clear these are simply four story apartment buildings.

When we purchased our properties we did our due diligence and researched the plans for the vacant property immediately to our north in the South Ridge Village Mall. The site plans available through the Planning Department's website indicated office/medical buildings. We decided this was acceptable and felt comfortable purchasing our homes.

Big Mistake!!

These office buildings have progressed from four 10,000 square foot buildings to three two-story buildings to two 45' high buildings and now they want two 50' mixed use (apartment) buildings. We don't want office/medical changed to mixed use. Developers can change their plans on a whim and the Planning Commission and the City Council are expected to go along. Surrounding property owners be damned.

Office buildings will afford us some privacy and some 'open' space, even if it is a parking lot. We understand the traffic that is associated with commercial enterprises, we have lived with it for years waiting for this property to be developed and know full well what to expect.

Mixed use is the new vogue. Officials like the idea of 'New Urbanism' and 'walk-ability' and will be shoving it down the throats of any property owners that abut any vacant land or property that is being redeveloped.

Mixed use should be on arterial streets, with sidewalks and in areas in need of housing, such as the old Valentinos, 48th and Holdredge, 48th and Leighton, the Haymarket. They should not be forced onto just any vacant piece of property in an established neighborhood close to shopping. Oh yes, they want reduced parking requirements because they will be "providing an environment for individuals to utilize city transportation as well as other alternate transportation other than automobiles. The demand for parking will be minimized." How ludicrous is that?
Zoning means nothing and site plans should not be relied upon when making decisions to purchase a home.

The Planning Commission denied the height increase twice, 6-1 and 7-0. The City Council approved it but only by 4-3. The Mayor vetoed this project in August because, per his press release, this project 'continues to create conflict with the adjacent residential townhomes'. Well let me tell you that the minimal changes that Mr Krueger has made has done nothing to reduce that conflict.

We will continue to protest this project with as much energy as we have put forth thus far. I hope we won't be facing a wall of windows looking down into our homes and changing our lives forever. If that is what we wanted we would move to a more urban or downtown area not live in a sub-urban area as we are in now. You hold our future in your hands.