IN LIEU OF
DIRECTORS’ MEETING
ADDENDUM
Monday, May 20, 2019

I. MAYORS OFFICE

II. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE
    1. 2018 Complete Streets Annual Report

FINANCE
   2. May Sales Tax Report reflecting March 2019 sales

III. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE
    1. City Council meeting ordinance - Cheryl Mayer
    2. Proposed Rental Ordinance - Maureen Hutfless
    3. Proposed Rental Ordinance - Russ E. Pinyan
    4. Recycling - Trenton Goldsmith
    5. Claim Against the City - Katie Kaiser
    6. Proposed Rental Ordinance - Tucker I Pinyan
    7. Proposed Rental Ordinance - Yursa Kassam
    8. Proposed Rental Ordinance - Ruth Peters
    9. Proposed Rental Ordinance - William McGowen
   10. Proposed Rental Ordinance - Lee Todd
   11. Proposed Rental Ordinance - Lynn Fisher
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION: Urban Development/Economic Opportunity

DATE: 5/07/19

NEED
Urban Development is working to document all streetscape amenities installed in downtown, West Haymarket, N 27th, N 48th, South Street, Havelock, College View, West O and S 11th Street areas. This intern would assist in locating, photographing, preparing descriptions and documenting brands of all assets. We anticipate an average of 20 hours per week during the summer at a maximum of $5,000.

FUTURE IMPACT:
☐ Ongoing
☐ Limited  Projected Completion Date August 31, 2019

REVENUES GENERATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGISLATIVE CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERSONNEL (full time equivalents)

PERSONNEL (cost) business unit: 13001.5021 Financial Analyst
object code   description 13005.5021 Para-Professional
($5,000)

SUPPLIES business unit:
object code   description

OTHER SERVICES & CHARGES business unit:
object code   description

EQUIPMENT business unit:
object code   description

TOTAL EXPENDITURES
- 0 -  - 0 -

SOURCE OF REVENUES  Existing appropriations

DIRECTOR  David Smith
DATE  5/07/2019
FINANCE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Availability of Appropriations: Yes □ Yes □

BUDGET OFFICER

PURCHASING AGENT

FINANCE DIRECTOR

DATE 5/14/19

APPROVED: Yes □ Yes □

MAYOR

DATE 5/14/19

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 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.
Purpose and Background

On September 12, 2013, Mayor Beutler signed Executive Order (EO) No. 086476 and Administrative Regulation (AR) No. 35 establishing a policy for the development of Complete Streets. This EO/AR was also endorsed by the Urban Development Department, Lincoln Transportation and Utilities Department, Planning Department, Parks and Recreation Department, Health Department and the Building and Safety Department.

According to the EO/AR, the Planning Department, in conjunction with other departments, is responsible to provide Mayor Beutler, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PBAC) and the StarTran Advisory Board with an annual report. Specifically, the EO/AR states:

The Planning Department, in conjunction with all City departments, shall provide an Annual Report to the Mayor, Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee and StarTran Advisory Board which outlines the progress made toward implementing this policy. The Annual Report may include the review of all current street standard plans, guides, regulations and standard drawings, and the identification of barriers to the development of Complete Streets.

The purpose of the annual report is to update the Mayor, PBAC and the StarTran Advisory Board as to the work Staff is doing to implement the EO/AR. This annual report covers the efforts undertaken by the Implementation Team during 2018.
Complete Streets are public and private streets that include some combination of appropriate infrastructure as determined by the surrounding context, that accommodate all modes of transportation, including private vehicles, public transportation, walking, ADA accessibility, and bicycling.

**Implementation Team**

*Coordinator:*  
*Kellee Van Bruggen (Planning Dept.)*

Lincoln Transportation and Utilities: Thomas Shafer, Lonnie Burklund/Mark Lutjeharmsg
Parks and Recreation: Sara Hartzell
StarTran: Brian Praeuner
Planning: David Cary/Paul Barnes, Steve Henrichsen
Urban Development: Wynn Hjermstad
Health: Mike Heyl, Chris Schroeder
Building and Safety: Terry Kathe
Lincoln Police Department: Captain Jason Stille/Captain Donald Scheinost

**Work Tasks / Accomplishments**

**Complete Streets Implementation Team Meetings**

During 2018, the Complete Streets Committee held a total of eight meetings to discuss current and ongoing projects which have been outlined in this annual report. An agenda is determined based on upcoming projects from various city departments and other issues that have a complete streets component that warrant a discussion. Meetings were held on the following days during 2018:

- Wednesday, January 24th
- Friday, April 27th
- Wednesday, May 30th
- Wednesday, June 27th
- Thursday, August 30th
- Tuesday, September 18th
- Monday, November 26th
- Thursday, December 13th

**Downtown Master Plan**

The Downtown Master Plan was an effort that was undertaken during 2018 between the City of Lincoln and Downtown Lincoln Association. The kick-off was held at the end of February with a steering committee, working group discussions, and a look at global trends. The process was finished in late 2018 with the approval of the Downtown Master Plan by City Council action.

**Bicycle Parking**

The Complete Streets Committee provided $10,000 to fund a bike rack request program. The Committee is currently reviewing other cities criteria for requests and will evaluate the best way for organizations to apply.
Gap Analysis

A Gap Analysis Study was completed in January 2015 in order to understand available information affecting the implementation of Complete Streets. A copy of this Gap Analysis Study can be found on the City of Lincoln’s website at: http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/plan/reports/GapAnalysis.pdf. The gap analysis is a snapshot of the current transportation network and outlines where gaps (i.e. gaps in sidewalks, trails, transit, etc.) in the system are currently located. In conjunction with developing the written study, an online and interactive map was launched. The map is a tool for the committee as it can be updated as projects are completed, new data becomes available, or new gaps are identified. In 2019, the tool will be updated to include the proposed on-street bicycle network as defined in the Lincoln Bike Plan. The map will continue to be updated with various projects and needs that come through the committee and used in future project discussions.

Online Gap Analysis Tool
Trail Counters

Partnership for a Healthy Lincoln (PHL) approached the City about additional funding that could be used for equipment purchase. The City partnered with PHL and Great Plains Trails Network (GPTN) to purchase one mobile counter and four permanent counters. The mobile counter was purchased in the fall of 2015. The mobile trail counter is intended to be used for special events (i.e. Streets Alive, etc.) and weeklong counts along the trails network that are not currently served by permanent counters. The four permanent counters were added to the system in 2017, bringing the total number of permanent counters on the trail system to five.

- The Rock Island Trail Counter was installed and has been recording users since July 2014. In 2018, the Rock Island Trail Counter recorded 235,623 users.
- The Billy Wolff Trail Counter was installed and has been recording users since August 2017. In 2018, the Billy Wolff Trail Counter recorded 252,717 users.
- The Helen Boosalis Trail Counter was installed and has been recording users since October 2017. In 2018, the Helen Boosalis Trail Counter recorded 104,483 users.
- The MoPac West Trail Counter was installed in August 2017. In 2018, the MoPac West Trail Counter was under maintenance between May and October. The rest of the year, the counter recorded 28,495 users.
- The MoPac East Trail Counter was installed in August 2017. In 2018, the MoPac East Trail Counter was under maintenance from May through December. The rest of the year, the counter recorded 16,163 users.

2018 Trail Usage

![Bar Chart showing trail usage by month for Rock Island, Billy Wolff, Helen Boosalis, MoPac West, and MoPac East trails in 2018.](chart.png)

- Rock Island
- Billy Wolff
- Helen Boosalis
- MoPac West
- MoPac East
In addition to the trail counters, the City also monitors usage of the N Street Cycle Track. The counter along N Street at the midblock of 12th and 13th recorded 24,658 cyclists in from September through December, averaging out to 202 users per day. The counter was under maintenance between January and August.

**On-Street Bicycle Facilities Plan (Lincoln Bike Plan)**

The Planning Department along with members of the Complete Streets Committee prepared a Request for Proposals (RFP) in 2017 to develop an On-Street Bicycle Facilities Plan. Some committee members participated in the scoring and interview process to hire a consultant to develop the plan. The Complete Streets Committee served as the Technical Advisory Committee for the plan development. The Technical Advisory Committee met a total of seven times. Meetings were held on the following days during 2018:

- Thursday, March 22nd
- Thursday, April 19th
- Wednesday, May 23rd
- Tuesday, July 24th
- Thursday, August 23rd
- Thursday, September 13th
- Thursday, October 11th

Several Complete Streets Committee members attended and assisted with the two public open house events throughout the process and reviewed all materials. The Lincoln Bike Plan was completed and approved in February 2019.

**Project Selection**

The Fiscal Year 2016/17 – 2021/22 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) included a budget item for Pedestrian and Bicycle Capital Program. In each programmed year, $50,000 has been appropriated for “Complete Streets” type projects bringing the six year total to $300,000 for projects that fit within the Complete Streets scope. The projects considered by the committee included:

- Trail/Neighborhood Sidewalk Connections to Neighborhoods
- On-Street Bicycle Facilities Plan
- Bike Rack Request Program
- Data Bike
- Trail Counters
- Bike Route Signage
- Development of a comprehensive bike parking map
- Transit enhancements including ADA pads and links to sidewalks

The Complete Streets Committee provided funding to install a sidewalk connection in the Fox Hollow neighborhood from Holmes Park Road to the Billy Wolff Trail, purchase of a mobile counter, and $10,000 towards setting up a bike
rack request program. The remainder of funds was set-aside to use toward future on-street bike projects.

Bike Share

In September 2014, the Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Department hosted a Bike Share workshop for local stakeholders. Since the workshop, efforts to fund a bike share program, including submitting a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding request through the Nebraska Department of Roads and meetings with possible stakeholders have taken place. The Planning Department was awarded the CMAQ funds of $600,000 in March 2015 and have worked with various city staff and the Nebraska Department of Roads on moving forward with the project. Planning staff has worked with local groups and businesses to provide the matching funds for the CMAQ grant as well as future operational and maintenance costs through sponsorship of the program. All of the matching funds have been acquired and the first year of operational/maintenance funds have been acquired (total of $373,334). The City hosted a set of public meetings in January and February 2018 before the system installation. The program was officially launched in April 2018. Regular updates and discussion on the status of the bike share project have been held and will continue to be held at Complete Streets Committee meetings. During 2018, bike share had over 28,000 rides in the first calendar year.

Motorized Scooter Sharing Program

The Complete Streets Committee started discussions on how scooter sharing companies are working/operating in other communities and invited Ben Turner, with Heartland Bike Share to discuss e-bikes and scooters. The committee was also invited to test out both e-bikes and scooters at BikeLNK headquarters.

Project Review

Each representative on the Implementation Team is responsible for identifying projects within their department and in the development stages that should be reviewed by the Complete Streets team. This review identifies Complete Streets applications which had been applied to Lincoln Transportation and Utilities, StarTran, and Parks and Recreation 2018 projects. To note, outside of the Complete Streets Committee, Lincoln Transportation and Utilities invites departmental review of projects through their monthly coordination meetings and site plans are made available electronically for comment and review. Many of these projects, while not formally reviewed by the Complete Streets Implementation Team, did receive review by staff that included Complete Streets considerations and applications in the final design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Complete Streets Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Racks</td>
<td>Bike Rack Request Program</td>
<td>Complete Streets funded project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Counters</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>Discuss enhancing the trail counting system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Bike Plan (On-Street Bicycle Facilities Plan)</td>
<td>City-wide plan</td>
<td>Discuss the development of the On-Street Bicycle Facilities Plan with assistance from a consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Hollow Trail Connector</td>
<td>Holmes Park Rd and Billy Wolff Trail</td>
<td>Complete Streets funded project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West A Project</td>
<td>Phase A: SW 23rd Street east of Folsom; Phase B: end of Phase A west to city limits</td>
<td>Discuss design of West A project and pedestrian, transit, and bicycle amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for a Healthy Lincoln CDC Grant</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>Discuss project ideas that could be incorporated into the grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized Scooters Sharing Program</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>Discuss how motorized scooter sharing programs work in other cities and how Lincoln should handle. Coordination was discussed with University of Nebraska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North 33rd &amp; Cornhusker Subarea Plan and Cornhusker Highway Corridor Enhancement Plan</td>
<td>33rd and Cornhusker</td>
<td>Discuss subarea plan and corridor enhancement plan and how pedestrian and bicycle traffic will be able to access the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets Policy</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>Discuss developing a more formal policy that follows the Smart Growth America Complete Street Policy recommendations for the City of Lincoln.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 Priority Work Items

The following items are expected to be addressed by the Complete Streets Committee in 2019:

- Review applicable 2019 design year infrastructure projects for Complete Streets opportunities as well as review what was built in the past construction year. Continue to identify projects under design and at an appropriate stage to review as well as to create a record of review. Such identification will include the Complete Streets concepts applied to the specific project, those which are not applied and why.

- Project selection, implementation, and evaluation of the Complete Streets funded projects.

- Continue to refine the project identification and review process based on experience. The goal is further refinement of the Gap Analysis to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the process as well as to promote Complete Streets projects and concepts. All updates should be reflected in the maintenance of the Gap Analysis tool.

- Continue to examine plans, City policies and other guidance for Complete Streets conformance, including the Lincoln Standard Plans.

- Track implementation of projects using Complete Streets funding in CIP process.

- Discuss need for additional funds for Complete Streets projects and research how additional funding may allow for additional or larger scale projects in advance of next Capital Improvement Program budget cycle.

- Track state level legislative efforts applicable to Complete Streets.

- Review the existing Complete Streets Policy and update if necessary.

- Continue working on the bike rack request program including determining how to apply for assistance and how the general administration of the program would be carried out.

- Discuss scooter programs regionally and possibility of pilot project in Lincoln.

- Discuss the need for bicycle parking standards.

- Review bus stop phasing plan.

- Educate newly elected officials about Complete Streets and the committee’s work.

- Review and discuss the Downtown Traffic Study.

- Discuss implementation of the Lincoln Bike Plan.
## Actual Compared to Projected Sales Tax Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>$7,353,053</td>
<td>($517,499)</td>
<td>($105,360)</td>
<td>-1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>$6,097,570</td>
<td>$5,941,323</td>
<td>($156,247)</td>
<td>$60,363</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>$5,960,270</td>
<td>$5,555,244</td>
<td>($405,026)</td>
<td>($21,513)</td>
<td>-0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>$7,101,054</td>
<td>$6,582,001</td>
<td>($519,053)</td>
<td>($86,134)</td>
<td>-1.29%</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>$80,620,335</td>
<td>$57,890,217</td>
<td>($2,277,180)</td>
<td>$322,994</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual collections for the fiscal year to date are 3.78% under projections for the year.
## CITY OF LINCOLN
### GROSS SALES TAX COLLECTIONS (WITH REFUNDS ADDED BACK IN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>$7,386,107</td>
<td>-0.98%</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>$5,981,967</td>
<td>0.87%</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>$5,586,708</td>
<td>-0.56%</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>$6,623,556</td>
<td>-2.01%</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>$58,501,152</td>
<td>0.33%</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>($40,643)</td>
<td>-17.80%</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>($31,464)</td>
<td>-23.78%</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>($41,555)</td>
<td>-54.47%</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>($13,186)</td>
<td>-74.28%</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>($624,079)</td>
<td>-21.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>2014-15 ACTUAL</td>
<td>2015-16 ACTUAL</td>
<td>2016-17 ACTUAL</td>
<td>% CHG. FROM PR. YEAR</td>
<td>2017-18 ACTUAL</td>
<td>% CHG. FROM PRIOR YEAR</td>
<td>2018-19 ACTUAL</td>
<td>% CHG. FROM PRIOR YEAR</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>$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>$7,353,053</td>
<td>-1.41%</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>$5,941,323</td>
<td>1.03%</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>$5,555,244</td>
<td>-0.39%</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>$6,582,001</td>
<td>-1.29%</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></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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>$57,890,217</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Councilman Camp,

I listened to the rebroadcast of the May 13 City Council meeting, and realized that Councilwomen Gaylor Baird commented that she did not understand about all the countries I had mentioned in my testimony. Since the other council members may not understand either, I would like to explain.

The Geist Power Distribution Unit (PDU – a really big power strip for data centers) contains computer boards to monitor the power status of the unit. As such, it requires Geist to test for excess emissions to verify the PDU will not interfere with wireless products or systems, such as wifi or emergency radios.

Geist sells these PDUs globally, not just in the US. Many countries have safety and EMC requirements that we must prove we meet in order to place the country mark on the label. The countries/regions that Geist sells PDUs in that require proof of EMC, provided by valid EMC test reports from NCEE, include:

**Country or Region Required Mark**

- USA FCC statement
- Europe CE mark
- Australia & New Zealand RCM Mark
- Russia, Belarus & Kazakhstan EAC
- Morocco C-mark
- Gulf states; Saudi Arabia, UAE, etc G-mark

The country mark is a requirement for PDUs to pass through customs in that country. For some countries there is significant cost to Geist to have their Compliance Agency review the safety & EMC reports prior to granting certification for the mark.

If the NCEE address stays as Cattle Drive, NCEE will have to be recertified and their current reports for Geist will be invalid; thus, any certification marks that we have received approval for since Jan 27 based on their reports would also be invalid. So we would have to remove the mark from our product until NCEE has been recertified and they have provided new EMC reports with a valid address. That would cause embarrassment to Geist to have to explain to our customers that we are stopping shipment on their orders as the PDUs carry invalid certifications. It would also have both time and cost impacts to Geist to redo those certifications.

Therefore, I urge you to vote yes to the ordinance to rename Cattle Drive to Discovery Drive between West Highland Boulevard and Research Drive.

Regards,

Cheryl Mayer  
Compliance Manager, Global rPDU  
IT & Edge Infrastructure
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CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed and may contain confidential and privileged information protected by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of the e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete all copies from your system.
Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 6:20 PM
To: Cyndi Lamm; Jon Camp; Jane Raybould; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Roy A. Christensen; Bennie R. Shobe
Subject: InterLinc - Contact

City Council - Contact

Date : 5/17/2019 6:20:18 PM

name  Maureen Hutfless
address  5334 R Street Apt. 10
    city  Lincoln
    state  NE
    zip  68504
    email  emkay@windstream.net

comments  I have been renting apartments in Lincoln (as a tenant) for 40 years and have just become aware of the Lincoln City Council’s proposal regarding apartment inspections. I believe that much or most of the renting public is not aware of this proposal, and we need to be provided better information so we can weigh in on this. Please do not act in haste on a proposal affecting thousands of Lincolniters based on the artificial deadline of anyone's council term ending; the council and public need time to carefully consider all the ramifications of this. I'm not clear on the exact provisions of the proposal, but am opposed to measures that would trigger strangers (inspectors) intrusively coming into my home when I'm not having problems. (And it should go without saying that mass inspections would be overkill and a huge waste of city resources.) I'm also not happy about anything that would ultimately result in higher rents. It seems that the situation could best be addressed by effectively acting upon problems reported by specific tenants and having mechanisms in place to ensure no retaliation against those tenants. (I have to add, if there is that much concern about housing conditions and violations, then we should inspect ALL housing, and not just target rental properties.) I appreciate the council's thoughtful consideration of this, and thank you very much for your time and attention.

IP: 108.167.47.4
Form: https://www.lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; WOW64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/74.0.3729.157 Safari/537.36
From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2019 11:35 AM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: InterLinc - Contact

City Council - Contact

Date: 5/18/2019 11:34:40 AM

name Russ e Pinyan
address 2041 Hedge Apple Ct
      city Lincoln
      state NE
      zip 68521
      email rusnjep@hotmail.com
comments Mr. Camp,

I am voicing my opposition to the proposed rental registration ordinance currently under discussion by the city council. My wife and I are owners of 4 rentals here in Lincoln and we have invested most of our life savings into their purchase and upkeep. We work very hard to keep them in good shape not only to be fair to our renters, but because we are competing with other landlords for renters "business".

Assessing fees to license our properties is an expense that we have not added into the amount that we charge for monthly rent and in the end will only cause us to raise those rents. Landlords with a large number of rentals may be able to absorb the new cost, but for a small operator, we will have to increase and this may cause us to be uncompetitive with similar properties.

Please vote "no" to this new ordinance. In the end, competition is what makes for better rentals, not government regulation. Using foresight, one can see that some people will be forced out of the rental business not only due to the "one time fee" (hard to believe it will not be made an annual fee since larger buildings already have annual licensing fees), but because of the potential for inspections to result in more costs.

Please focus on the properties that become problems, not those that have been made good homes for renters.

Respectfully,
Russ Pinyan

IP: 104.218.66.29
Form: https://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/64.0.3282.140 Safari/537.36 Edge/18.17763
City Council - Contact

Date: 5/18/2019 2:17:58 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>Trenton Goldsmith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>address</td>
<td>2811 Fox Hollow Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zip</td>
<td>68506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aircoryell1981@gmail.com">aircoryell1981@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

comments: Two articles to read (highly researched and sited through various studies) on the adverse effects and often bloated "positives" of mandatory recycling. If you represent the city of Lincoln, you are required to read this. It is your duty as a public servant.


fee.org/articles/america-finally-admits-recycling-doesn-t-work/

Thank you for doing your job as required by your oath.
Good Afternoon,

I have received your reply to my claim and wish to give a reply back since I will be unable to attend the meeting on June 3rd at 3pm and this was listed as an alternative action in the letter.

It was mentioned that my claim may be denied because the Street Maintenance records indicated the pothole referenced in my claim was not reported prior to the date of the damage that was done to my vehicle physically (which in turn created a significant dent in my finances). However, I did use the UPLNK app to report the pothole to encourage action and while doing so I noticed other citizens flagged the same area with a pothole note. I even mentioned it in my report, (see record of my notes in my attachment).

I would like to encourage you or someone else with the ability to do so, to check the reports made through the UPLNK app in that area with the dates and times of their reports for that area that happened prior to mine to see if there had been enough notice to fix it. It was to my understanding that this was what the app was for, to give notice to the street department so they could know where there were areas that needed fixing. I don’t have the ability to look at other’s reports to check times of the reports via the app myself (if I could, I would certainly do so) but someone has got to be able to see those and could see how far out flags had been put up for this pothole.

I appreciate your help in this matter and look forward to your reply.

Thanks,

Katie Kaiser
I see others have flagged the area but I hit a pothole in this area before turning onto Old Cheney going to work the morning of 3/5/19 around 6:40am. The damage done split my axle and caught my front passenger tire on fire. If this hasn’t been addressed already this
City Council - Contact

Date: 5/18/2019 10:32:15 PM

name: Tucker I Pinyan
address: 2041 Hedge Apple Ct.
city: Lincoln
state: NE
zip: 68521
e-mail: tucker.i.pinyan@gmail.com

comments: Mr. Camp,

I am asking that you oppose ordinance 19-52 when it comes to a vote.

I believe that this ordinance puts unnecessary burden and costs onto the landlord. I also believe that it will potentially raise the rents in Lincoln. If costs for landlords of one and two unit buildings are increased, they will raise rents. This will open the door for larger units to raise their rents.

Sincerely,
Tucker Pinyan
HI,

I spake to me lanlord and he said no new leasee to my and others we rent rooms on house livein with lanlord, he said no more because of new law with you. He said he no want to be bothered with inspections. PLeeae help i like here pay 350 month please no pass law I can't pay more somewher new.

Yusra
City Council - Contact

Date: 5/19/2019 7:40:45 PM

name: RUTH PETERS
address: PO BOX 609
city: Henderson
state: NE
zip: 68371
email: rpeters@hreengineering.com
comments: REGARDING VOTE ON ORDINANCE 19-52

Vote NO to Ordinance 19-52 in it's present form.

I do not oppose the registering/compilation of a list of landlord/rental properties and their contact information. With a list of all landlords, it would be possible to educate all landlords on the requirement of handing out the Building and Safety brochure A GUIDE TO LANDLORD AND TENANT RESPONSIBILITIES and remind landlords of their responsibility.

I do oppose the inspection of properties as outlined in the ordinance. Requiring inspection of all property that has no complaints against it due to the trigger “if 2 other properties owned by the same landlord...” is an invasion of the privacy of the other tenants.

Address the property of a complaint lodged on a property and only that property, meaning a single unit in a multi-unit building is something I support. To require the entire building to be inspected after 2 units is the invasion of the remainder units.

The City of Lincoln already has a complaint process in place.

COMPLAINT PROCEDURE:
1. Contact your landlord. If no action - then:
2. Call Building and Safety at 402-441-7785.
3. A City Housing Inspector will visit your home.
4. Inspector will determine if violation exists.
5. Repair deadline will be set.

I feel this is being railroaded through by tenant groups and not given complete consideration to landlords and tenants. I belong to REOMA and our group is continually discussing landlording and being good landlords.

Tenants have a complaint and resolution process to follow now. We don’t need to add the cost of inspections. If passed, the same tenants that are complaining will face higher rents due to added costs.
Vote NO.

Ruth Peters
property owner
City Council - Contact

Date: 5/20/2019 11:44:58 AM

name: William McGowen
address: 3120 S 72nd st # 167
city: Lincoln
state: NE
zip: 68506
email: The.Mage.William@gmail.com

comments: I have been a tenant in Lincoln since the mid 80’s. Right now, I am in my 9th year of a lease in a 2 bed 1 bath apartment. Never had a problem with this landlord.

At the same time, I own a few rentals, and am working to build that portfolio. All the properties are larger than where I live, and have more bathrooms. I have rented to tenants that make more money than I do.

In my time as a tenant I have had both good and bad landlords. I have lived in well and poorly taken care of properties. I never did call anyone about the bad ones, we simply moved out. One time I intentionally chose a bad property because the rent was cheap so we could dig ourselves out of debt. That crappy property is partly why I can own property.

But right now, it seems like I should be wearing a top hat and a cape while "twirling my mustache", as if we are some caricature of the evil landlord instead of real people trying to run businesses. We see the tenants as our customers, and we need to take care of them, or they will go elsewhere.

While I fully admit there are horrible landlords, there are also horrible tenants. But the system is designed to protect the tenant, not the Landlord. They get the benefit of the city, the laws. We have to follow specific rules or we get fined, while the tenant simply quits paying rent. They are supposed to fear retaliation, but if they retaliate it can cost us a lot of money. I had one tenant leave me with $2,000 worth of damage, and that doesn’t include the cost of evicting her.

I inherited this tenant from a bad management company, along with another vindictive tenant in the other side of the duplex. The other tenant called about a leak, and damage to her property. I called a plumber, and a repairman to fix the damage. She canceled the plumber and called the city to complain. I later found out she intentionally caused the damage thinking she didn’t have to pay rent as long as there was damage. The reason she canceled the plumber was because he would have seen that there wasn’t any leak.

Side note, the inspector was great. Absolutely professional, and fair. Although the tenant was refusing to let him in to inspect the repairs.

Ass I said before, this is a business. The tenants are our customers. Just like there are some bad landlords,
there are bad tenants, but both are the exception to the rule. We want the tenants to live in our properties forever. Not only does it cost us money if they move out, we are not making money the time there is no tenant in the property, but still pay the mortgage. We need to take care of our good tenants.

The slum model of real estate is one of short-term gain at the cost of the long term. That property is an investment and any intelligent investor wants to take care of it. Small problems can turn into big ones. A property not taken care of will decline in value. Then you can’t get a decent rent out of it, cutting your income, and forcing the landlord to relax rules, letting in worse tenants who do further damage to the property.

Supposedly the tenants are “afraid” to call the city, but I am unsure how this helps that problem when it is in the minds of the tenants. But at the same time, I know landlords who are afraid. They fear their tenant will retaliate. They fear the tenant will use the rules against them. I know of some who are getting out of the business. I just purchased a rental that I am fixing up and selling to homeowners. This might just become the new business model because if landlords are selling their properties the flippers will be buying.

When it comes to registering property owners and landlords, I am reminded that we also register sex offenders. It’s like I am a criminal just for owning rental property.

BTW, if you want to know the name of that rental company (that I would never use,) just ask your inspectors. They are fully aware of who and what they are. No list is needed there.

Do not approve 19-52.

William McGowen
Dear City Council Members,

I would like to suggest to Lincoln's City Council two overall points that are important to the issue of Landlords and Tenants. First that while the “violation” rate is miniscule, a task force comprised of private (as opposed to public) landlord agencies currently operating in Lincoln is the most effective and cost-efficient way to deal “problem landlords.” This strategy is by definition not costing the public hundreds of thousands of dollars for new employees and it allows for a targeted approach to zero in on “problem landlords.” Second: it is vitally important that violations are categorized as either Landlord-caused or Tenant-caused. Both points are discussed below in more detail.

1. **By The Numbers:** Is there really a problem? If one compares the ratio of violations to properties “the problem” is very small. City’s numbers 2018: 40,000 properties that are 3 plexes or larger, plus approximately an additional 10,000 single family rental homes and duplexes. 768 violations of which approx 148 were owner occupied. Leaving 620 “violations” in rentals 620/50,000 = 1.24%

2. **By The Numbers:** If we assume 40,000 properties with 3 units or more this equals a minimum of = 120,000 units plus an additional 10,000 units (assuming these are all single family which they are not.. some are duplexes) = 130,000 units. 620 violations/130,000 = 0.47% VIOLATION RATE.

3. City representatives have said: “All violations are assigned to the property.” (and hence to the owner). How many of these 2018 violations are the results of Tenant's actions? City has not determined this critically important number. If punitive inspection triggers are to be imposed upon Landlords, is this a fair and equitable application of the Law under the 5th and 14th amendments? Or for that matter under State law or the City’s own Statutes? I would suggest it is decidedly not fair and equitable. Nor would such an ordinance likely withstand State Constitutional scrutiny if it were to be challenged.

4. **At a minimum when a violation is determined, if it is caused by the Tenant, it should statistically be noted as a Tenant-caused violation by the city and the Landlord should not be held hostage to the triggering points that cause further inspections.**

5. **Virtually all landlords have a mechanism ALREADY in place to allow the city to make this assessment in point #4. (The move-in check list form)**

6. Per Leirion G Baird’s comment in the Journal Star earlier this month: ‘Mayor-Elect Leirion Gaylor Baird said in an interview last week she doesn’t favor Lincoln adopting a universal inspection program like Omaha's because the city needs to be smart about how it uses its resources. She favors a more targeted approach that zeros in on
problem landlords, she said. "We need to be looking out for the quality of housing for all of our residents, not just the vast majority," Gaylor Baird said.

7. I would like to humbly suggest a **task force comprised of numerous Landlord associations to allow for private enterprise to address these problem landlords**. I can promise that the vast majority of Landlords in Lincoln are conscientious. A task force comprised of said Landlords will, I predict in less than a year, become the model for other private businesses to follow as the best and most cost-efficient way to make sure businesses are maintaining high standards that all Lincolnites can be proud of.

In summary there are currently two issues that city ordinances between landlords and tenants could be decidedly improved upon:

1. “Violations” need to be categorized as either tenant-caused or landlord-caused. This is critical and vital to insuring high quality housing in Lincoln. It is also fair and more than reasonable.

2. I predict a task force comprised of Landlords who can and will focus in on problem Landlords will provide the model and template for other private businesses to promote quality services to all Lincolnites.

Thank YOU for your consideration
Lee Todd
402-499-9000
gousa@windstream.net
Dear Council members,

We would like to thank you all for being open minded and understanding our industry's concerns with the proposed ordinance changes before you today. It is and will continue to be a cooperative process in order to support tenants and investors.

If you can make changes by requiring registering only property owners who are found to be in violation of an interior code, eliminating the 62 miles requirement and applying the stair step triggers (as the current policy does) to common owner properties, we can support the ordinance. We look forward to working with all the tenant advocacy groups and other rental, investor and real estate groups in creating new strategies to further enhance the quality and quantity of available rental units in Lincoln.

Sincerely,

Lynn Fisher - REOMA board