

**DIRECTORS'/ORGANIZATIONAL AGENDA
ADDENDUM
Monday, May 7, 2018**

I. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE

II. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE

1. Proposed Porter Ridge Krueger project, opposition - Cyndi Miller
2. Proposed Inter-local Agreement, opposition - William Boernke
Staff response provided by Councilman Camp
3. Proposed Porter Ridge Krueger project, opposition - Andrew & Sally Hinds
4. Proposed Inter-local Agreement, opposition - Jim Frohman
5. Proposed Porter Ridge Krueger project, opposition - Mary Cox

Angela M. Birkett

From: Cyndi Miller <cmillerfamily@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 05, 2018 3:08 PM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: Porter Ridge Krueger proposed project

Hello Jon,

I have serious concerns about the proposed 4-5 story mixed use buildings by the Porter Ridge Townhouses. There simply isn't enough space there for that large of a construction project. It would loom over the townhouses there. There would be a big increase in traffic which [29th Street](#) and Porter Ridge Road wouldn't be able to accommodate.

There are a lot of kids from our neighborhood that are walking or biking to Scott Middle School and Southwest High School. The proposed project would greatly increase the traffic heading out of the neighborhood in the mornings and I don't feel it would be safe for the kids. Car traffic is already backed up between 29 and [27 on Pine Lake Road](#).

Additionally, Krueger isn't planning for enough parking for this project for the residents.

Also, I first heard of the project through the next door app. I was only informed today of your meeting planned for [May 9](#) by a townhouse resident. I haven't received any information from Krueger or the city about the proposed project as I feel you and they should be informing their neighbors.

Considering the city just now figured out to install a stop sign at Starbucks and across the road and also the one by the U-Stop tells me the city is pretty ignorant about the traffic flow in this neighborhood.

I feel the proposed project really should fit into the aesthetic of the neighborhood and have a homey feel and not urban aesthetic. The businesses on the east side of 29th are more homey than this proposed project. The proposed project shouldn't be so tall looking over the townhouses like that. The lack of parking is a huge concern. The Starbucks strip mall area has really been busy the past few years where the parking lot is completely full there by noodles and chipotle and you have to circle and circle to find a parking spot.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns.

Cyndi Miller
7430 South 29

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jon Camp <joncamp@lincolnhaymarket.com>
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2018 10:21 AM
To: boernke@icloud.com
Cc: Angela M. Birkett
Subject: RE: Interlocal agreements

Bill:

Thank you for your comments on the Interlocal. I agree that elected officials are better representatives. The JPA concerned me because the Mayor and LPS Board Chair (rotated frequently) and/or LPS Superintendent would make their selections on who served on the JPA Board. My personal experience has witnessed the Mayor either not appointing the most qualified elected official or extracting concessions in return for making an appointment.

Thus, I prefer a system that keeps the decision making as close to the entire elected body, e.g. City Council or LPS Board, as possible.

Best regards,

Jon

JON A. CAMP
Haymarket Square/CH, Ltd.
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
Website: www.lincolnhaymarket.com

Check our reception and event venues at:

<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Apothecary-Lofts-Ridnour-Rooms/173175799380032>

-----Original Message-----

From: Angela M. Birkett [<mailto:ABirkett@lincoln.ne.gov>]
Sent: Monday, May 7, 2018 8:49 AM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: FW: Interlocal agreements

Please see the email below which will be added to the Addendum for today.

Angie Birkett

Office Coordinator
Lincoln City Council
555 South 10th St., Ste 111
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone 402-441-6867
Fax 402-441-6533
abirkett@lincoln.ne.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: William Boernke [<mailto:boernke@icloud.com>]
Sent: Sunday, May 06, 2018 4:05 PM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: Interlocal agreements

Dear Councilperson Camp:

The problem with using an Interlocal agreement to fund school safety, compared to a government agency is that the Interlocal agreement will be managed by people appointed by the mayor and the LPS Superintendent, while the JPA will have managers who are elected to the school board and the city council.

In other words, we the taxpayers do not have direct control over the interlocal agreement, while we can vote the elected officials who sit on the JPA out of office if they do something we don't like.

My view is that the JPA is far superior to an interlocal agreement because I have more control over what happens in the JPA than I do in an interlocal agreement. Democracy is always superior to a system where people are appointed (not elected) to positions. The best example of this is the election of Donald Trump. More people voted for Hillary because she got a plurality of the votes. But Donald Trump is our president because a majority of a small group of unelected electors chosen by political parties voted for Mr. Trump. When a small group of people makes decisions, this is an oligarchy, not a democracy.

William Boernke, PhD
1004 Galloway Circle
Lincoln, NE 68512

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.

City of Lincoln Planning Department

5-5-18

City of Lincoln City Council

555 S 10th St

Lincoln, NE 68508

RE: Construction of apartment buildings by Krueger Development at South Ridge Village

Good Morning,

My husband and I bought our home and moved to the Porter Ridge townhomes in 2011. We considered this move carefully as we wanted no surprises. It was our understanding the area just north in Southridge Village was zoned for office use and would keep with the design of existing buildings in the area. In the 7 years we have lived in our home, we have noticed a significant increase in traffic on Porter Ridge Rd and the road directly East of U-STOP gas station. A stop sign was put up but cars go right through it onto Porter Ridge Road.

After reading the use permits that were submitted we are against any variances. Allowing 4 and 5 story apartment buildings with inadequate parking would only compound a high density traffic area. The height of the buildings will look totally out of place with existing esthetics of the entire area.

We respectfully request denial of the variances requested by Krueger Development.

Sincerely,

Andrew and Sally Hinds



2800 Lawson Drive

Srae365@gmail.com

402-875-0794

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jim Frohman <jimfrohman@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2018 8:54 AM
To: Mayor; sjoel@lps.org; Roy A. Christensen; lanny.boswell@lps.org
Cc: Jane Raybould; Jon Camp; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Cyndi Lamm; Bennie R. Shobe; barb.baier@lps.org; kathy.danek@lps.org; connie.duncan@lps.org; don.mayhew@lps.org; annie.mumgaard@lps.org; matt.schulte@lps.org; Jeff R. Kirkpatrick; jgessford@lps.org
Subject: Issues with Interlocal Proposal

The interlocal proposal is just what was requested, the JPA proposal in interlocal clothing.

It is a very flawed approach and not what those of us opposed to a JPA are advocating for as a better solution. Please throw out both proposals neither deserve to see the light of day.

For those of you that read past the headlines here are the issues and a better way to approach the solution the public really needs.

No JPA, yeah!

All the other problems from the JPA proposal still there and some are significantly worse, boo!

To keep this short I refer you back to my previous emails for the list of problems with the JPA proposal and now the interlocal proposal.

New or overlooked issues.

Just how much power is the Council and School Board going to give to the new administrators? It is not clear from the proposal but could be interpreted to be excessive. Why are they even needed? Is the current leadership council inadequate? Is current City and LPS oversight inadequate?

Is the current leadership council for CLCs going away? The new nonprofit's powers are also very vague. Just what are its powers? Does it set CLC policy? Does it just make recommendations? Does it answer to the administrators or do they answer to it? If the current leadership council is not going away what is its relationship with the nonprofit? Who does budgeting?

For a legal document, generated by very competent lawyers, these documents are filled with unanswered questions and are amazingly vague. Intentional, my guess is yes. Why? So that you can do anything that you want in the future. Not very transparent.

The interlocal agreement is even worse for LPS than the JPA agreement, which was completely unfair. The City is spending no new funds on CLCs, none.

Is the \$600k+ of CLC support that is being kicked back to the City going to fund the existing programs or is it being considered to be new money thus freeing up a \$600k+ for the Mayor's piggy bank. How these funds will be used isn't clear in the either proposal and is still unclear after multiple questions to staff by Council

members. It appears that either agreement is designed so that the City has more money to spend on other unrelated items, very misleading.

Are site coordinators going to be added to all CLCs? Any CLCs? Again the proposals are very vague. A cynic would guess the LPS is just going to pocket the cash just like the City. I'm still leaning towards optimism for LPS issues but these agreements are stressing that point of view.

The City and LPS have both pledged to make these agreements budget neutral. That promise is nowhere to be found. Hard to trust hot air especially considering past actions.

Better Solution

SRO and threat assessment officers, current and new should be handled in the existing interlocal agreement. The agreement should be enhanced to require a vote of the Council or School Board to terminate. It should also be made a two year agreement to show the sustainability that everyone wants.

A second interlocal should be created for CLCs. It should expand the leadership council and turn over complete control to it as a standalone nonprofit. The budget should be set in dollars not levy amounts and should be split 50 50. No money shall be kicked back to either the City or LPS. Services and employees provided to the new nonprofit would be considered in-kind donations and count toward the funding of the nonprofit. Both the City and School Board will have veto powers over the annual budget. The interlocal should be a two year agreement.

That is what the interlocal solution should look like.

If the City and LPS are serious about the issues these proposals raise then a serious solution is required. Both the JPA and interlocal proposals are horribly flawed, vague, and do not really address the issues that you have been talking about. Please put self interest and politics to the side and address these issues in a straight forward and serious manner.

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

Angela M. Birkett

From: Mary <mjcox955@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 06, 2018 10:08 PM
To: David R. Cary; Cyndi Lamm; Jon Camp; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Carl B. Eskridge; rchristensen@lincon.ne.gov; Bennie R. Shobe
Subject: Porter Ridge - Krueger Development

This email is in regards to the possible construction of a business/residential apartment building proposed at South 29th off Pine Lake Rd.

I am a townhome owner in the Porter Ridge area and I am opposed to this construction.

I object the height variance Krueger Development is applying for. The height of 61' would obstruct the view of the townhomes on Porter Ridge, Also, it would impact the property value of all of the townhomes in the area.

Also, a big concern if Krueger is allowed to build a 135 residential unit apartment building the problem it would create with parking.

It will consist of 30-35 two bedroom units, 100 being 1 bedroom units and also the addition of first floor business space with employees. This would possibly create a need for 334 parking spaces including apartment tenants and business employees. Krueger is proposing to provide 166 parking spaces. This would create a huge problem with parking congestion overflowing to the residential areas nearby.

The existing businesses on Pine Lake receive shipments and supplies via trucks in the alley between the restaurants and proposed new construction site. It has been informed that appx. 80 delivery trucks use this alley each day. This would increase the amount of traffic congestion with apartment parking added to the area.

The proposed buildings and parking lot expansion will cause a tremendous problem in handling the amount of potential rain run off, without enough retention area allocated in the proper areas. Some of the properties are boggy as it is now.

I hope you will take this into careful consideration when Krueger Development apply for their height variance. It would be helpful if you would take the time to drive by the proposed site and you will definitely understand our concerns.

Mary J Cox
2830 Lawson Dr.
Lincoln, NE
402-560-1050