

DIRECTORS' ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Monday, March 5, 2018

555 S. 10TH STREET

BILL LUXFORD STUDIO

I. MINUTES

1. Approval of Directors' minutes from February 12, 2018
2. No minutes February 19, 2018 in observance of President's Day
3. No minutes February 26, 2018 due to night meeting

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

III. CITY CLERK

IV. MAYOR'S OFFICE

V. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. Administrative Approvals February 20, 2018 through February 26, 2018
2. Action dated February 28, 2018
3. Final Action dated February 28, 2018

VI. BOARDS/COMMITTEES/COMMISSION REPORTS

1. BOH - Shobe (02.13.18)
2. MAC - Shobe (02.13.18)
3. PBC - Camp, Raybould (02.13.18)
4. WHJPA - Eskridge (02.22.18)
5. PRT - Lamm (02.22.18)
6. DLA - Gaylor Baird, Eskridge (02.27.18)

VII. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE

1. Funding of City Streets - Russell Miller
2. Local Solutions to School Safety - Lisa Lightner
Staff response provided by Councilman Jon Camp
3. Staff response to Mary Borakove, LED Street Lights - provided by Councilman Jon Camp
4. LES Disconnect Notice - Joseph Dorenbach

VIII. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS

See invitation list.

IX. ADJOURNMENT



Memorandum

Date: ♦ February 27, 2018
To: ♦ City Clerk
From: ♦ Amy Huffman, Planning Dept.
Re: ♦ Administrative Approvals
cc: ♦ Mayor Chris Beutler
Planning Commission
Geri Rorabaugh, Planning Dept.

This is a list of the administrative approvals by the Planning Director from February 20, 2018 through February 26, 2018:

Administrative Amendment No. 17066, to Preliminary Plat No. 03004, Northbank Junction Preliminary Plat, approved by the Planning Director on February 20, 2018, to revise the drainage plan and lot layout, generally located at N. 56th Street and Alvo Road.

F:\DevReview\AA\AAA weekly approvals City.wpd



****ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION****

NOTICE: The Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at 1:00 p.m. in Hearing Room 112 on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St., Lincoln, Nebraska. For more information, call the Planning Department, (402) 441-7491.

The Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Commission will meet on Wednesday, February 28, 2018, immediately following the regular Planning Commission hearing, in Hearing Room 112 on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th St., Lincoln, Nebraska, to discuss the Downtown Master Plan Update.

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

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

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2018

[Commissioners Scheer and Washington absent]

Approval of minutes of the regular meeting held February 14, 2018. ****APPROVED: 7-0; (Scheer and Washington absent)****

1. CONSENT AGENDA
(Public Hearing and Administrative Action):

TEXT AMENDMENT:

- Page 01
- 1.1 Text Amendment No. 18003, to amend Section 27.02.160 of the Lincoln Municipal Code regarding the definition of 'Office', and repealing Section 27.02.160 of the Lincoln Municipal Code as hitherto existing.
Staff recommendation: Approval
Staff Planner: Brian Will, 402-441-6362, bwill@lincoln.ne.gov
Planning Commission recommendation: APPROVAL; 7-0 (Scheer and Washington absent). Public hearing before the City Council tentatively scheduled for Monday, March 19, 2018, 3:00 p.m.

2. REQUESTS FOR DEFERRAL: None.

3. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA - None.

4. PUBLIC HEARING AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION:

SPECIAL PERMIT:

Page
09

4.1 Special Permit No. 18004, to allow a Residential Healthcare Facility serving up to 20 people, on property generally located at 4141 South 56th Street.

****FINAL ACTION****

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval

Staff Planner: Dessie Redmond, 402-441-6373, dredmond@lincoln.ne.gov

Planning Commission 'final action': CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, as set forth in the staff report dated February 15, 2018: 7-0 (Scheer and Washington absent). Resolution No. PC-01590.

**AT THIS TIME, ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON AN ITEM
NOT ON THE AGENDA, MAY DO SO**

Adjournment: 2:17 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION NOTIFICATION

TO: Mayor Chris Beutler
Lincoln City Council

FROM: Geri Rorabaugh, Planning

DATE: February 28, 2018

RE: Notice of final action by Planning Commission: February 28, 2018

Please be advised that on February 28, 2018, the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission adopted the following resolution:

Resolution No. PC-01590, approving **SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 18004**, requested by Mental Health Association of Nebraska, SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 18004, to allow a Residential Healthcare Facility serving up to 20 people, on property legally described as Lot 189, located in the SE 1/4 of Section 5-9-7, 6th Principal Meridian, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, generally located at 4141 South 56th Street.

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

The Planning Commission Resolution may be accessed on the internet at www.lincoln.ne.gov (Keyword = PATS). Use the "Search Selection" screen and search by application number (i.e. SP18004). The Resolution and Planning Department staff report are in the "Related Documents" under the application number.

F:\devreview\final action notices\cc\2018\022818

As I wrote in my 7 Feb. 2018 letter to City Council, I detailed the reasons to revise impact fees to reflect today's road construction costs. I further stated a 20% impact fee increase over the 2002 rate would be appropriate which would cause a very tolerable 1.4% house price increase.

I am advocating that the impact fees for a single family house be raised to \$8,192 (the current total impact cost of \$4,992 plus \$3,200 for street increase). Based on the expected 1,700 annual increase in living units, impact fees should generate \$5.44 million a year. That number does not include the impact fees that will be collected from the commercial entities. Including both housing and commercial it should be reasonable to expect the updated impact fees to exceed \$7 million annually. The LTSRR estimates that a "At 0.25 percent, the sales tax yields \$12.0 million annually" (page 9.6 LTSRR).

The impact fee updating should be an easy sell to Lincoln voters because it will keep their wheel taxes from increasing and should reduce the need for the 1/2-cent sales tax increase to 1/4-cent or to even zero. I think there will a major uproar when the voters learn that most of their wheel tax is being sucked up by south Lincoln developments and not being used to maintain their residential streets.

Thank you,
Russell Miller 402-499-2611

Table 1

wheel tax spending		construction fund 40.63%, residential rehab 14.86% start sept2013, residual 44.51%																				
ALL \$ in 1,000		wheel tax last changed 2013																				
CIP project #	name	residual		residual	residual	residual	residual	residential	new construct ion	totals												
TOTALS of wheel tax moneys	cip year	2012/13	'2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	'2017/18	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	'2017/18	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	'2015/16	2016/17	'2017/18			
0005	0.0	south beltway																			0.0	
0175	1,893.9	safety improvement studies, row, plem eng	43.9			150.0	850.0	850.0													1,893.9	
0177	12,797.0		2,028.7	2,069.0	2,110.7	2,152.9	2,195.9	2,239.8													12,797.0	
0181	1,010.0	sidewalk	500.0	510.0																	1,010.0	
0181	0.0						fed 1,000.6														0.0	
0182	12,539.4	roadway bridge maint & rehab		3,500.0	2,209.7	1,659.3	1,059.5	4,110.9													12,539.4	
0183	14,818.4	residential rehab							1,995.9	2,492.4	2,421.6	2,460.3	2,702.5	2,745.7							14,818.4	
0202	2,250.0	east beltway	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0								250.0	250.0	250.0			2,250.0	
0203	0.0	sw 40 viaduct state & rstd																			0.0	
0269	6,443.5	traffic management		1,000.0	1,900.0	2,893.5	650.0														6,443.5	
0472	2,952.5	56th, shadow pines-old cheney													2,952.5						2,952.5	
0473	1,940.0	old cheney70 to 82													1,940.0						1,940.0	
0564	13,152.5	nw 48 'o' to adams				2,045.0	2,036.0								1,203.5	5,791.6	2,076.4				13,152.5	
0564	0.0	nw 48 impact \$1,200	impact 400			impact 400	impact 400														0.0	
0623	0.0	long range trans project (trp)																			0.0	
0624	9,560.5	s 14, warlick-old cheney	2,261.0	2,171.0											2,549.5	2,579.0					9,560.5	
0624	0.0	impact \$250	impact 250																		0.0	
0625	0.0	n 27 st bridge fed & state																			0.0	
0649	5,805.3	pine lake 61 to hwy 2					827.0	1,573.5													5,805.3	
0649	0.0	pine lake impact \$1,400														impact 1,000	impact 400				0.0	
0652	2,144.8	waterford estate north 100 & 'O'																		2,144.8	2,144.8	
0653	1,768.7	southwest village by denton rd																		1,768.7	1,768.7	
0654	400.7	penny bridge		400.7																	400.7	
0767	6,079.7	yankee hill 70 to hwy 2					1,000.0												5,079.7		6,079.7	
0767	0.0	yankee hill impact \$1,000				impact 1,000															0.0	
0768	0.0	west a sw 40 to folsom																			0.0	
0768	0.0	west a impact \$700					impact 100	impact 600													0.0	
0769	1,000.0	pedestrian to schools			500	500															1,000.0	
	0.0	rokeby 70 to 84																			0.0	
	0.0	rokeby impact \$1,285						impact 1285													0.0	
total all projects	96,556.9																					
	14,818.4	less street rehab																				
	81,738.5	total 'new construction' & 'residual' wheel tax portion for yrs 2013-2018																				
north lincoln	2,250.0	east beltway project 0202																				
	13,152.5	nw 48 project 0564																				
	2,144.8	waterford project 0652																				
14,818.4		street rehab project 0183																				
	17,547.3	total north lincoln projects or	21.47%	therefore south lincoln receives 78.5%																		

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jon Camp <joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 9:34 AM
To: lmlightner@gmail.com
Cc: Angela M. Birkett; Jeffrey Bliemeister; Roy A. Christensen; Jane Raybould; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Cyndi Lamm; Bennie R. Shobe
Subject: FW: local solutions to school safety

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Lisa

Thank you for your detailed email on a timely subject. I am forwarding your email to Police Chief Jeff Bliemeister. The Chief and I visited earlier this week and he is best positioned to provide information on current Lincoln safety programs in our LPS school system. The Chief may also include Joe Wright, a former LPD officer and now head of LPS security.

Again, thank you for sharing your thoughts and concerns.

Best regards,

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: Lisa Marie [<mailto:lmlightner@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 5:52 AM
To: Cyndi Lamm; Jon Camp; Jane Raybould; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Roy A. Christensen; Bennie R. Shobe
Subject: local solutions to school safety

Hello to you all,

I was not able to attend the city council meeting last night to speak on school safety, but would like to share my ideas. The following is in part information from a recent letter to the editor which I have just learned will be published in the Sunday paper.

First of all, I am against arming teachers, they are there to teach. There are many reasons why that is not a good idea, including those that are physically unable and the fact that they can become a target of the police who answer the call of an armed person.

My ideas for increased school safety include:

- metal detectors at the main entrances of schools
- police officers at each school (when I was growing up we had human resource officers)
- hire/volunteer staff of retired police officers/veterans (specifically for the main entrances which are currently staffed by office staff)
- add police sub stations at schools

I truly believe that having a police presence (particularly having sub stations at schools) would help create a sense of community and restore a sense of calm for children, teachers and parents.

I realize these things will cost money, but the safety of our children, and our teachers, should be our biggest priority.

Thank you for your time,
Lisa Lightner

In addition, here is a letter I sent to every legislature in Nebraska (except Mr. Chambers who does not have email- I am mailing his). For the record, to date, I have only heard back from two... to which I would only add, repealing our open carry laws.

I am a very concerned citizen of this state, wondering what I can do to protect not only the children of this state, but every citizen as well. None of us are immune, there have been mall shootings, nightclub shootings, concert shootings (Las Vegas), churches and theatre shootings across the country, all with multi-round assault weapons, enough is enough.

I would like to know how to go about introducing legislation (following the recent school shooting in Florida) on stricter gun control and background checks including the resale of firearms, specifically outlawing automatic assault weapons to the general public in Nebraska (and nationally).

I truly believe that no one needs to own one. In addition, we need stricter gun laws and national registries, that include regulating the sales of guns in general to those with criminal and mental health records/abuse harassment/stalking violations.

As a native Nebraskan, I understand that one, this is a republican state (though I am a democrat) and two, this is a state of hunters (which I and my husband are). I also understand that our congressmen/women are being supported by the NRA. I understand too the issue of individual rights, but believe that they should never outweigh the rights of the majority in regards to public safety.

I believe our children deserve to go to school without fear and that as parents and grandparents we should do everything we can to protect them. I do not support arming teachers.

I am committed to finding solutions to this problem and supporting the survivors of mass shootings, like those in Florida who are willing to speak out.

I look forward to your response.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jon Camp <joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 8:20 AM
To: MARYBORAKOVE@GMAIL.COM
Cc: Angela M. Birkett
Subject: LED Street Lights

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Mary

Thanks for your information on the California experience with LED street light conversions. I have additional concerns—for example, realizing the life of existing street lights. Some current legislation from the Mayor is suggesting a return in energy savings of 15 years. While we all believe in being prudent with energy consumption, one also has to consider the financial viability of conversion.

My observation is to continue to convert as street lights burn out or in sections that were replaced many years ago. I also share your thoughts on residential streets versus arterials. In residential streets less bright and obtrusive street light conversions should be considered to balance residence life style with safety.

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: WebForm [<mailto:none@lincoln.ne.gov>]
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2018 10:12 AM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: InterLinc - Contact

City Council - Contact

Date : 2/19/2018 10:11:49 AM

name MARY Borakove
address 1143 Mulder Dr
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68510
email MARYBORAKOVE@GMAIL.COM
comments Hello!

I read an article in the Journal Star that talked about the plan for Lincoln to change over to LED street lights.

I have also read a related article in a Discover magazine. It explored the issues that a 'green/environmentally" conscious town (Davis, California that is the home of UC Davis and is very progressive) had faced after switching over to LED lights. While LED street lights were an "upgrade", both cost-wise and environmental impact-wise, they didn't make the residents happy. Why? They were too bright! And having gone to college at the University of California at Davis, I can attest to the fact that the demographic is decidedly pro-environment. For them to eschew environmentally conscious choices must have only been because the lighting was dramatically different. The city ended up having to pull out all the LED street lighting they had installed and re-install the original type of lighting. To do so cost the city a lot of money, and the city regretted the decision.

CNN had another article about the same issue: www.cnn.com/2016/06/21/health/led-streetlights-ama/. They discuss the pitfalls of choosing the LED "gimme" in the cost/energy saving lighting arena. CNN discusses how the American Medical Association is advocating using "cooler" LED's. As the AMA said in their June 14, 2017 release: "Recognizing the detrimental effects of poorly-designed, high-intensity LED lighting, the AMA encourages communities to minimize and control blue-rich environmental lighting by using the lowest emission of blue light possible to reduce glare. The AMA recommends an intensity threshold for optimal LED lighting that minimizes blue-rich light. The AMA also recommends all LED lighting should be properly shielded to minimize glare and detrimental human health and environmental effects, and consideration should be given to utilize the ability of LED lighting to be dimmed for off-peak time periods."

I understand the progressive view that our Mayor and Council Members have regarding upgrading the street lights. Having seen LED lights go into the failed regular street lights in my neighborhood, I realize they are too bright for residential neighborhoods. I do acknowledge their value on arterial streets such as O Street and other such streets.

Our neighborhood: Eastridge, Piedmont and Taylor Meadows at 70th and A Street area could mobilize and request that we do not have the LED lights put into our residential street lights. That is not to say putting them into the boundary arterial streets would be bad--i.e. 56th St, 70th St and A St.

What do you think of putting this nuanced approach to LED's replacements of street lights forward within our whole community within Lincoln?

Thank you,

Mary Borakove

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2018 11:42 AM
To: Cyndi Lamm; Jon Camp; Jane Raybould; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Roy A. Christensen; Bennie R. Shobe
Subject: InterLinc - Contact

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

City Council - Contact

Date : 3/1/2018 11:41:35 AM

name Joseph

address Dorenbach

city Lincoln

state NE

zip 68502

email Jdorenbach57@gmail.com

comments When LES disconnects a customer's electric service for non payment that customer gets charged \$60/occurrence. If there is an attempt to not allow disconnects during cold weather months their "revenue" from this source of income will be significantly effected. And because of this you will get push back from the management there.

It should not be the mission of a public entity to profit in such a manner. Such a practice disproportionately effects lower income customers who have trouble enough paying their bill let alone the disconnect fee.

During the coldest months people should not have their heat turned off.

In my earlier days as a Credit Rep for LES it seemed that our focus was more on working on ways to assist customers with getting help in catching up on their electric bills . Later in my tenure it seemed that the focus shifted to attempting to disconnect as many services as possible in order to generate revenue.

And I do not believe that should be the mission of a publicly owned utility such as ours.

Thank you!

IP: 76.84.142.230

Form: <https://www.lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm>

User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (iPad; CPU OS 10_3_3 like Mac OS X) AppleWebKit/603.3.8 (KHTML, like Gecko) Version/10.0 Mobile/14G60 Safari/602.1