DIRECTORS' ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Monday, February 4, 2019
555 S. 10TH STREET
BILL LUXFORD STUDIO

I. MINUTES

1. Approval of Directors' minutes from January 14, 2019

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

III. CITY CLERK

IV. MAYOR'S OFFICE

V. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. Long-Range Plans - Lincoln Bike Plan and 33rd & Cornhusker Hwy
2. Administrative Approvals from January 22, 2019 through January 28, 2019

VI. BOARDS/COMMITTEES/COMMISSION REPORTS

1. DLA - Eskridge, Gaylor Baird (01.22.19)
2. ILC - Eskridge, Christensen, Shobe (01.28.19)
3. PAC - Lamm, Shobe, Raybould (01.30.19)
4. PRT - Lamm (01.31.19)

VII. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE

1. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Charma Hicks
2. Proposed Transportation Sales Tax - Robert Way
3. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Cindy Faris
4. Charter Revision Committee - Jim Frohman
   Staff response provided by Rick Hoppe, Chief of Staff Mayor's Office
5. Firearms/Safe Storage Task Force - Frank Medeiros
6. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Jody Cameron
7. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Kevin Burkland
8. Proposed Eagle Parking Garage Lease, opposition - Mike James
9. Firearms/Safe Storage Task Force - Rhett Taylor
   Staff response provided by Tom Casady, Director of Public Safety
10. Request for Star Tran information - Les Helms
    Staff response provided by Mike Davis, Star Tran Transit Manager
11. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Malcolm Heard
12. Proposed Transportation Sales Tax - Eugene Cook
13. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Debbie Hoeft
14. Proposed Krueger Development, opposition - Sandra Klocke
15. Proposed Transportation Sales Tax, opposition - Russell Miller
16. Safe Storage Resolution and letter of Support - Lancaster County Democrats

VIII. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS

See invitation list.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Angela M. Birkett

From: Geri K. Rorabaugh
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 1:31 PM
To: Council Packet
Cc: David R. Cary; Paul D. Barnes; Kellee B. Van Bruggen; Andrew D. Thierolf
Subject: City Council Items - February 11, 2019

Greetings City Council Members:

Two long-range plans are scheduled for hearing on the February 11th City Council agenda – the Lincoln Bike Plan and the 33rd & Cornhusker Subarea and Corridor Enhancement Plan. Material from these draft plans are available for your review at the links below.

Lincoln Bike Plan PowerPoint:
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a90401b25bf0260b7fc4d54/t/5c507e0170a6ad97a7cec971/1548779041257/Lincoln+Bike+Plan+City+Council+012819.pdf
Plan Document: https://www.lincolnbikeplan.com/maps-and-documents/

33rd & Cornhusker PowerPoint:
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a302e8f12abd927a53eedfb/t/5c50716003ce6461fcc0b6ca/1548775790528/1.28.19+City+Council+Briefing.pdf
Plan Documents: https://www.33rdcornhusker.com/planning/

Please contact us if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Paul Barnes
Long Range Planning Manager
Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department
555 S. 10th Street, Room 213
Lincoln, NE 68508
402-441-6372

Geri Rorabaugh, Administrative Officer
Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department
(402) 441-6365

Memorandum

Date: ✦ January 29, 2019

To: ✦ City Clerk

From: ✦ Amy Huffman, Planning Dept.

Re: ✦ Administrative Approvals

cc: ✦ Geri Rorabaugh, Planning Dept.

This is a list of county administrative approvals by the Planning Director from January 22, 2019 through January 28, 2019:

Administrative Amendment 19001, to Special Use Permit 11I, Southridge Use Permit, approved by the Planning Director on January 25, 2019, to revise the parking lot height reconcile actual site conditions due to the existing grade sloping away from the building, generally located at S. 27th Street and Pine Lake Road.

F:\DevReview\AA\AA weekly approvals City.doc

City/County Planning Department
555 S. 10th Street, Ste. 213 • Lincoln NE 68508
(402) 441-7491

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 4:21 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 : 1/28/2019 4:21:24 PM

name Charma Hicks
address 2856 Porter Ridge Road
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68516
email charma@live.com
comments Dear Council Members:

I live on the North side on Porter Ridge RD.

I strongly object to Rick Krueger building apartments next to me. These buildings would be too close to me and many others. His drawings are deceiving. They look farther away. I would think with a complex this big should have 70-100 ft. set backs. This area is not the place for this kind of development. There will be no privacy at all! And the noise level would be terrible.

Another issue would be parking. There would not be enough parking. The traffic is bad now. If you add 121 apartments to this area and a possible 242 people living there would be horrendous! Along with Starbucks having 1,000+ drive throughs a day.

Mr. Krueger stated that our property values would go up. Who would want to live in a place staring at a huge building, noise and all the other commotion. He also shows this
green space that looks so nice on his drawing. We would need 50 ft. pine trees!

Finally, I want to mention the Planning Commission voted AGAINST this January 23rd. 7-0. Why do we have a Planning Commission if the City Council override their votes?

Thank you for your time.

Charma Hicks

IP: 104.218.65.213
Form: https://www.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/17.17134

Angela M. Birkett

From: Robert Way <robertway11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:38 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: My ramblings

Dear Council members:

I addressed the city council last on Monday January 28th. I thought it might be better to send this message to clarify my position. Without the restrictions placed by the open mike format.

The city council has been treated like a rubber stamp and the three proposed and interconnected piece of legislation that just went through first reading. Namely, 19R-22, 19R-23, and 19R-24, those pieces of legislation are being "fast tracked" for no reason I can see.

Both a testifier for LIBA and mayor's staff have already named the day it would be on the ballot. Neither the mayor's staff or LIBA has that authority, only the council members do.

The bills as written has significant flaws. While it is probably legal in it's wording, it complete violation of the one issue on one ballot measure principle.

I interpret that city character as a safeguard against rash action. That is why the system is complex. The legislative branch also should be check on the ballot executive and most especially this executive. Because unlike in anytime before, this executive has been term limited by a vote of the people.

I disagreed with that vote, but I people have spoken and I don't always get what I want. That being said, I don't understand how it is a reflection of the will of people that a person that was term limited should be fast tracking bills which determine impact fees five years after he leaves office.

Thank you for your time.

Robert Way
801 El Avado Ave
Lincoln, NE 68504

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:48 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 : 1/28/2019 8:47:46 PM

name Cindy Faris
address 7937 South 17th Street
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68512
email cfaris01@yahoo.com
comments Please keep apartments away from the 27th and Pine Lake Street by Krueger Construction. We do not need any more apartments at this location. There are apartments that have been for lease for more than 6 months and you can see that these apartments have not been leased. Traffic is also a major concern. Pine Street is quite busy.

IP: 40.131.185.5
Form: https://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (X11; CrOS x86_64 10452.96.0) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/66.0.3359.181 Safari/537.36

Angela M. Birkett

From: Rick D. Hoppe
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 8:21 AM
To: jimfrohman@outlook.com
Cc: Cyndi Lamm; Jon Camp; Jane Raybould; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Roy A. Christensen; citydesk@journalstar.com; nhicks@journalstar.com; news@klin.com; jackm@klin.com; dtl@klin.com; Chris J. Connolly; Council Packet
Subject: FW: Stop Ignoring Commission on Charter Revisions

Good morning, Mr. Frohman

Your email was forwarded to me for response. The Administration plans to offer a package of charter revision ballot proposals to the City Council for the May election. The proposals are based on the Commission's recommendations.

Have a good day.

Rick Hoppe
Chief of Staff
Mayor Chris Beutler

From: Jim Frohman <jimfrohman@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 9:51 AM
To: Bennie R. Shobe; Mayor
Cc: Cyndi Lamm; Jon Camp; Jane Raybould; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Roy A. Christensen; citydesk@journalstar.com; nhicks@journalstar.com; news@klin.com; jackm@klin.com; dtl@klin.com; Chris J. Connolly; Council Packet
Subject: Stop Ignoring Commission on Charter Revisions

It will be over six months before the Council considers the recommendations of the Charter Revision Commission if you do so at your February 4th or March 4th meetings. Twenty-two months to possibly get on a ballot if changes have to wait for the May 2020 ballot.

Why would anyone make recommendations to a commission that no one listens to? Why would anyone serve on a commission whose recommendations are ignored? If this commission serves no purpose then disband it. Otherwise, consider its recommendations in a timely manner.

There are two elections this spring. Please consider the seven changes recommended by the Charter Revision Commission for inclusion on whichever election the Mayor's sales tax issue is not on.

Thank you.

Jim Frohman
7335 Pioneers Blvd
Apt. 212
Lincoln, NE 68506

Angela M. Birkett

From: Frank Medeiros <frank_sfp@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 12:55 PM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: Safe gun handling

Dear Mr.
Dear Ms.
I have become aware that Lincoln is has assembled a panel to consider reducing access to firearms by children, and increase use of safe storage of firearms. While on the surface this has a nice ring, it has overwhelmingly failed in other places in the past. I know this because I have lived through this in California. To pass laws in the efforts to force people to lock up firearms is over reach and doomed to failure. In many cases it forces lawful citizens to disarm in their own homes where many keep them for their family's protection. The best approach is EDUCATION of the children, AND owner too. There are a few very good programs available for FREE too from those who know best, and are vested the most, the NRA. There programs do not promote gun ownership, but educate those who are unfamiliar with firearms, and how to safely deal with them. There programs have a proven track record in reducing accidental injury, and deaths associated with firearms.
My second concern is that it appears that the panel is comprised of those who do not have any interest or knowledge in the ownership, and handling of firearms. There needs to be a balanced view in all matters of public interest otherwise highly erroneous concoctions will most likely be reached because of lack of knowledge in the matter. I am sure that everyone currently involved are intelligent and capable people, but if everyone involved is lacking in knowledge, poor or erroneous decisions will be made without realizing it.
Fire arm ownership is a constitutional right and it is too easy to draw wrong conclusions in a matter that many do not understand resulting in the loss of those rights, and exposure of innocent to other dangers. Please consider this insight as sage advice so that realistic and manageable resolutions can be reached. Education is the first and best answer to this subject that will have the greatest impact at a little to no cost to the tax payer.
With respect
Frank J Medeiros
Quote Of The Month:

> *"Good people do not need laws to tell them to act responsibly, while bad people **WILL** find a way around the laws." – Plato*

Frank Medeiros
Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 1:51 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 : 1/29/2019 1:50:57 PM

name Jody Cameron
address 3046 WILLIAMSBURG DR
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 685166002
email camskid@aol.com
comments I am writing today in opposition to the proposed Krueger development near 29th and Pine Lake in Lincoln. Ironically I work in a Krueger development directly across the street from this proposed development. I can tell you that the area is already congested and adding a development of this size will only make things worse. The City seems to have gotten caught up in the whole "new urbanism" movement by developers trying to get their projects approved. There are areas where this type of development can work in Lincoln but this is NOT one of them. Krueger seems to be pushing that he has made such sweeping changes to the project that it will not impact the area. Unfortunately if someone would do their due diligence and sit on this road for any period of time, you would see that it doesn't fit in this area. Starbucks alone should preclude this type of development. Their drive thru lane which is immediately adjacent to this proposed property is busy all day every day with cars spilling out into the street almost every morning. Further, if the City actually thinks that tenants in these apartment buildings are going to use transportation other than automobiles, decreasing the need for more parking, they are living in la la land. Krueger has spinned this project every way they can and for some reason the City keeps entertaining their propositions. The only type of building that should be placed in this area is an office building similar to those they already manage across the street. This small, narrow piece of land was not intended for an apartment complex and the increased traffic it will bring to this already over crowded area. There are four schools in very close proximity to this project as well as numerous businesses and food establishments. 29th Street is heavily traveled now and adding an apartment complex of this size is going to magnify the traffic. It also infringes upon the many homeowners whose homes will abut to this property. They were falsely led to believe that purchasing a home in this area would be protected by the zoning that was in place. Come on City Council. Wake up and realize that not everything in this city has to be urban and you do not have to kiss the feet of developers in this town! There are plenty of other areas in Lincoln where an apartment complex can be built that is already zoned for this purpose. Frankly, Lincoln has far too many apartments in the first place! Please think about your actions and the impact it will have on the many citizens and businesses already working and living here.

IP: 104.218.65.141
Form: https://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64; rv:64.0) Gecko/20100101 Firefox/64.0

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 2:22 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 : 1/29/2019 2:21:39 PM

name Kevin Burklund
address 7141 A St.
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68510
email kevin.burklund@woodsbros.com
comments I'm writing in opposition to the Kruger development near SouthPointe. I believe the traffic and parking issues will be increased substantially in an already stressed area. Also, I don't agree with changing land use when adjacent homes bought those homes "knowing" what would go behind them. I think the changes to their view and having apartments right behind them looking down into their homes are both unfair changes to make.

The city is very careful about its planning and land use. Allowing this kind of change in an established neighborhood is reckless and uncalled for. Thanks for your time, and for your service on our City Council.

Kevin

IP: 74.51.213.122
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/71.0.3578.98 Safari/537.36

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 7:53 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 : 1/29/2019 7:53:01 PM

name Mike James
address 4810 S 76th st
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68516
email mike.james4810@gmail.com
comments The city is proposing to the council to lease the eagle parking garage at 14th and N from its owners 1.87 million dollars. Then spend 5 million dollars to completely remodel it. The garage will then be public and available to use like any other city-owned parking garage. The big catch is we don't actually own it, we are just leasing it and after 32 years we will have to give it back to the owners. All that taxpayer money we invested fixing it up will transfer to private ownership. Could you imagine if we would have done the same deal for the center park garage 40 years ago?

The city is also planning to build a parking structure across the street in the Sharp parking lot. This garage will be owned by the city and 30 years from now we will still own it so any money invested in it will still be ours unlike the lease that David Landis is proposing to the council. I would encourage you to vote no on the lease agreement for Eagle garage. There is plenty of available land in the Southeast quadrant of downtown to develop parking structures, the sharp lot and the Pershing site offer enough land to build the parking structures we will need for the future growth of Southeast downtown.

I would support buying the Eagle Garage but not leasing it.

IP: 209.221.240.193
Form: http://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; WOW64; rv:60.0) Gecko/20100101 Firefox/60.0

Angela M. Birkett

From: Rhett D <rhetttaylor@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 9:37 AM
To: Tom K. Casady; Mayor
Cc: 1011 News Lincoln; Coby Mach; Bennie R. Shobe; Carl B. Eskridge; Cyndi Lamm; dtl@klin.com; Jon Camp; Jane Raybould; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Roy A. Christensen
Subject: Re: Firearm Safe Storage Task Force

Mr. Casady,

Thank you for your prompt reply.

I know my email was very long, but at your convenience I would appreciate a response from your office, or the Mayor's office, answering the questions I posed.

Why was the NFOA not contacted for representation on the Task Force, especially considering the presence of two memebers of an organization which has a history of physical and verbal attacks on supporters of firearms rights or their property?

Will the Mayor's office announce the members of the task force and their credentials before the project begins?

Why is the scope of the Task Force so narrowly limited to access and storage, when training and education has been so successful as proven by decades of good work by the likes of Nebraska Game and Parks and certified NRA youth instructors?

Almost all other pubic health issues are combatted — correctly — through training and education. The response to the opioid crisis is to inform and educate, not to mandate that all households store prescription painkillers in a steel vault.

Perhaps most of these questions are better answered by the Mayor, but I'm sure many other Lincoln residents would like more transparency and explanation. It seems like the well has been poisoned before the process has even begun, by standing up a Task Force without more information on its composition and with a strangely narrow scope.

Thanks again,

Rhett

On Thu, Jan 31, 2019 at 8:11 AM Tom K. Casady <TCasady@lincoln.ne.gov> wrote:

> Mr. Taylor,

Thank you for your email, and for sharing your viewpoint and information. I am familiar with the accidental death statistics you cite. I am also familiar with the data we have in Lincoln on deaths and injuries of children associated with firearms. I'm sure the task force will be examining these data.

I understand your concern that the "deck is stacked." I disagree, but I can appreciate your skepticism. I have worked with most of the 17 members in varying capacities for quite some time, and suffice it to say that I believe there will be considerably more diversity of thought than you do. Time will tell. The specific charge of the Mayor to the task force was published in the news release, and accurately reported in the local newspaper:

- Examine any available local data on access to firearms by children and the theft or misuse of firearms to determine the extent to which firearm storage may be a factor.
- Study the existing research literature about safe storage practices and the prevention of child access to firearms.
- Review strategies used in other communities.
- Identify helpful practices that are currently in place in Lincoln, or that could be considered for implementation here.
- Develop recommendations on how those helpful practices could be adopted, enhanced, or encouraged locally.

It appears to me that you have concluded the task force will inevitably recommend some sort of city ordinance mandating secure storage of firearms. I do not share that view, but again, time will tell. If such a recommendation were to come forward, the process of adopting a city ordinance requires public notice, three readings, a public hearing, and ultimately an affirmative vote by the majority of the city council. There would be ample opportunity for citizens to express their opinions to their elected officials.

Best regards,

Tom Casady
Director of Public Safety
575 S. 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508
tcasady@lincoln.ne.gov

From: Rhett D <rhetttaylor@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 10:36:46 PM
To: Mayor; Tom K. Casady
Cc: Cyndi Lamm; Jon Camp; Jane Raybould; Carl B. Eskridge; Leirion Gaylor Baird; Roy A. Christensen; Bennie R. Shobe;

dtl@klin.com; Desk@1011now.com
Subject: Firearm Safe Storage Task Force
Tom Casady
Director of Public Safety
575 S. 10th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508
Dear Director Casady,
I hope this e-mail makes it to you. I am guessing at your e-mail address. If I have it wrong, I trust that the Mayor's office or one of the City Council members will forward it to you.

I am writing regarding the Mayor's "Child Access to Firearms / Safe Storage Task Force." I understand that you are responsible for organizing the group and suggesting members to the Mayor.
A member of the Nebraska Firearms Owners Association (NFOA) recently wrote to the City Council expressing concern about the lack of inclusiveness on the Task Force. You were asked to respond back, and you stated that:
"Although I do not know everyone well enough to tell you how many of the members own firearms, I would not be at all surprised if several are gun owners—as gun ownership is rather common in Nebraska. The group includes the co-owner of a retail firearms business. I also personally know four of the members who have been firearms owners for their entire adult life, and have extensive training and experience with firearms. Of those, two are SWAT team commanders who have exceptional experience and training.
There are two representatives from Nebraskans Against Gun Violence on the 17-member task force. We reached out to the NRA for two representatives, through the law firm in Lincoln that represents their interests. They declined."
Based on that response, I would like to also express some thoughts about the way this Task Force has been stood up, the judgment exercised in selecting members, the lack of diversity on the Task Force, and the lack of transparency thus far in the process.
The first issue that surprises me is how quickly you seemed to give up when searching for Task Force members interested in firearm ownership rights and constitutional protections. While I have the greatest admiration for any law enforcement officers on the Task Force, and trust that they will provide good input with regard to the mechanical aspects of firearms, as well as the realities of criminal use of weapons, a career in law enforcement does not always equate to the ability to address firearm rights from the perspective of all owners and users.
I am not surprised that the NRA did not want to spend financial resources on sending attorneys to a nascent, city government task force. But did you truly stop there without considering other members? Why did you not reach out to NFOA for input?
By comparison, you put two members of Nebraskans Against Gun Violence (NAG-V) on the Task Force. I do not know who those members are (which speaks poorly about the Mayor's transparency so far in the process) but recall that at least two members of NAG-V have gone so far as to protest outside of an NRA lobbyist's house in Virginia, and one was charged with destruction of property. (Refs. 1, 2) I appreciate (non-destructive) political discussion but this is a group that is hardly apolitical. If you were going to put political activists on the Task Force, why did you decide to leave it unbalanced?
My second issue is with regard to the charter of the Task Force itself. To the best of my knowledge no charter documents have been publicized clearly explaining the purpose and scope of this undertaking. There have only been a few vague references to "concern over youth access to firearms" in a press release from the Mayor's office. In your response to the NFOA member I referenced above, you continued:
"The Mayor's charge to the committee is broad, and there are many potential options for recommendations other than passing laws. Even if the task force were to recommend some kind of change in the City ordinances, this would require that a council member introduce an ordinance, a public hearing, and a majority vote of the council."
Does this mean that the Task Force will only study access to firearms and safe storage, and not begin with an assessment of whether the "concerns" (again, the Mayor's term) are valid? Concern is an emotion and not necessarily rooted in facts. What are the actual behaviors that the Mayor and you believe can be eliminated? Suicide? Homicide? Accidental shootings? Those are tragic and emotional issues indeed. I know of people in our city who have heard an ambulance siren and felt the need to call their child at school to see if there had been a mass shooting. But such fears and phobias can lead to irrational responses or overreaching public policies. According to the Washington Post, the chance of an American school student being shot and killed in school on a given day is one in 614 million. (3)

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the leading cause of death for children and young people is “unintentional injuries”. This is true from one year old through middle age. In the late teen years through young adulthood, suicide and homicide start to become a factor, falling behind various diseases later in life. (4) When the CDC goes deeper into the data and parses out sub-categories of unintentional injuries, you will see that more children ages 1-14 die in the United States from unintentional drowning than from firearm homicide, firearms suicide and unintentional firearm discharge all combined. (5) Firearm deaths only surpass accidental drowning when the CDC moves to the next age range of 15-24, but the majority of that range includes ages during which the victims or perpetrators were of the age of majority and could buy a firearm themselves; not pertinent to a discussion of “safe storage” and “reducing access of firearms to children.”

I mention those statistics not to make a political statement, but again ask you about the scope of the task force and the selection of its members. If I would have appeared before the City Council recently, citing statistics about the number of unintentional drownings of children, I doubt that the Mayor would have commissioned a Task Force to consider requiring all swimming pool owners Lincoln to have a locking steel cover in place whenever the pool is not in use and supervised by an adult.

Will the Mayor’s Task Force begin the process with an objective analysis of whether the cited “concerns” are even rational? We have access to an outstanding University here in Lincoln. Did your Task Force member recommendations include any statisticians, epidemiologists or criminologists who could measure the probability of misuse compared to the burden of imposing storage requirements on thousands of households where the children would never consider misusing a firearm – regardless of how it is stored – because of how they are parented and raised?

The issue of parenting and training brings me to my third and final issue.

Last year, in conjunction with the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission and the Nebraska Trapshooting Association, 2,500 boys and girls gathered in Doniphan, NE for the Cornhusker Junior/Senior High School Trap Shooting Invitational. (6) For three days, these thousands of young people walked indifferently through racks holding many thousands of guns and, literally speaking, tons of ammunition.

Nobody shot anyone else, or themselves. If you were to ask a sixth grade shooter at the event why this was the case, he or she would probably look at you quizzically and explain simply that shooting oneself or others would be illegal, immoral and painful. This respect for firearms is not limited to that one sport. Throughout Lincoln and Nebraska, children with the correct training and parenting have the same respect for arms as they do for other common instruments and tools that can be harmful if misused.

This again speaks to the scope of the Task Force and your selection of its members. It’s very likely that “safe storage” is a Band-Aid fix at best, and true firearm safety comes from a combination of education and parenting. Did you consider reaching out to high school shooting coaches, or NRA-certified instructors who teach firearm safety to 4-H youth, or Boy Scouts? Did you solicit an educator from the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission who teaches hunter safety to children?

Based on the Mayor’s vague press releases, and your response regarding the composition of the Task Force, I wonder if the group is lacking representation from ordinary citizens whom this will affect, and people with proven track records in successfully making children safe with and around firearms. I would ask that you please consider re-establishing the Task Force to include a better cross section of unbiased experts and concerned citizens.

Thank you very much your service.

Sincerely,

Rhett Taylor

References

(1) https://www.omaha.com/news/education/higher-education/two-unl-profs-protest-against-nra-lobbyist-one-faces-property/article_2f53addd-ebdd-5c32-84b3-df70c8401410.html

Two UNL profs protest against NRA lobbyist; one faces property destruction charge | Education | omaha.com

www.omaha.com

Patricia Hill is a research assistant professor of sociology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

(2) https://twitter.com/NebGunReform/status/998762207855902720
(3) https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/school-shootings-are-extraordinarily-rare-why-is-fear-of-them-driving-policy/2018/03/08/f4ead9f2-2247-11e8-94da-ebf9d112159c_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.c2c1b8cd3069
(4) https://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/pdf/leading_causes_of_death_by_age_group_2016-508.pdf
(5) https://www.cdc.gov/injury/images/lc-charts/leading_causes_of_death_highlighting_unintentional_2016_1040w800h.gif
(6) https://www.cornhusker-trap.com/uploads/1/2/4/0/124006675/50th_cornhusker_fact_sheet_1-22-19.pdf

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.

January 20, 2019
5721 Gladstone St.
Lincoln, NE 68507

Dear Mr. Davis,

Under the Freedom of Information Act I am asking for the following information.

1. What is the total cost for having a driver fill in for a dispatcher when they are off for any reason? How many times in the last year have drivers filled in for dispatchers?
2. Regarding the policy of drivers fueling CNG buses, what is the total cost including "fueling time" for all of the drivers involved?
3. What is the current top pay for bus operators versus service workers?

Thank you,

Les Helms

cc.
Miki Esposito, Jane Raybould, Jon Camp, Bennie Shobe, Leirion Gaylord Baird , Roy Christiansen, Cindi Lamm, and Carl Eskridge.

* last year 2018

CITY OF LINCOLN NEBRASKA

PUBLIC WORKS & UTILITIES DEPARTMENT
StarTran
710 "J" Street Lincoln, NE 68508
402-441-7185 fax: 402-441-7055 lincoln.ne.gov

January 29, 2019

Les Helms
5721 Gladstone St
Lincoln, NE 68507

Dear Mr. Helms,

The following information is provided in response to your letter dated, January 20, 2019.

1. What is the total cost for having a driver fill in for a dispatcher when they are off for any reason?

   Operators currently make a $1.16 more an hour (5% of hourly pay) while working as a Temporary Supervisor. The Temporary Supervisor's driving shift is then covered by an extra board Operator if available or by overtime work. Total cost for each instance can vary depending on availability of the extra board and the Operator rate of pay.

   How many times in the last year (2018) have drivers filled in for dispatchers?

   255 times or 1,978.92 hours.

2. Regarding the policy of drivers fueling CNG buses, what is the total cost including "fueling time" for all of the drivers involved?

   Fueling time is built into shifts during the "run-cutting" process. Utilization of shifts with "guarantee time" or "penalty time" for fueling ("Guarantee time" or "Penalty time" is time when an Operator is getting paid but not driving) is a first priority since this has little or no additional cost. Currently, on a typical weekday, 15.75 hours of Operator shifts are dedicated to fueling. No shifts on Saturdays have fueling time.

3. What is the current top pay for bus operators versus service workers?

   Bus Operator - $23.177. Bus Service Worker - $21.842.

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Mike Davis

Mike Davis
StarTran Transit Manager

Cc: Miki Esposito, Jane Raybould, Jon Camp, Bennie Shobe, Leirion Gaylord Baird, Roy Christiansen, Cindy Lamm, Carl Eskridge

StarTran

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 3:33 AM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: InterLinc - Contact

City Council - Contact

Date : 1/31/2019 3:32:34 AM

name Malcolm Heard
address 7516 South 37th Street
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68516
email heardmalcolm2017@gmail.com
comments Krueger Development.

Following this. I have not studied maps or plans. I assume the Planning Commission did that and made their recommendation based on engineering studies. I am a casual observer that simply believes the proposed plan deviation would create a serious problem for traffic flow and safety in the area surrounding the project.

The parking along Pine Lake in the strip mall is maxed many times during the day. The interesting bottle neck is on the street, aka alley between U Stop and the dry cleaners, and the "road" behind the establishments from U Stop to Starbucks. Semis have to supply those businesses. Where are all the cars going to go.

I grew up in Jackson Mississippi where developers had free reign. It is a nightmare. I brag to my brother about how Lincoln is well planned. Why stop now? This is a developer prererence. He probably has an end game in mind and will attempt to negotiate down. Stop playing with people's lives and simple desire to enjoy their homes. Return this project to previous scope.

I am more than happy to be convinced I am misinformed. Please call. However having worked with the legislature I know that there were always stacks of letters for and against. The ruler made the decision for votes. Put my letter in the right "stack"

Malcolm Heard

IP: 104.218.66.236
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/71.0.3578.98 Safari/537.36

RECEIVED
JAN 24 2019
CITY COUNCIL
OFFICE

January 21,2019

TO: Councilman Jon Camp

I understand that there is a proposal to increase the Lincoln sales tax by one fourth of one percent to be used exclusively for road repair and construction. Supposedly this additional tax wold be effective for only six years.

While I am not opposed to this additional tax, it does nothing to address the horrible deteriorating conditions of many sidewalks in RESIDENTIAL AREAS. All the funding seems to go downtown for a variety of projects while the residential areas go without any meaningful funding for sidewalk repairs or re-construction. The current administration has done basically nothing for years to address this problem. I am totally surprised that someone has not tripped, fallen, broke bones and sued the city over their total disregard for this hazardous condition. I know that I and others have called in regarding this matter and have received no action.

I propose that a minimum of 25% of any additional city sales tax be set aside to be used exclusively for sidewalk repairs and re-construction in residential areas. If this requires a higher tax or extending the length of time that it would be effective, then so be it. I wold rather have my tax money going for repairs and re-construction on sidewalks in residential areas than on defending future lawsuits and paying large settlements for the city's shameful neglect of this matter.

Thank you for considering this very serious situation.

H. Eugene Cook

H. Eugene Cook
2200 Larchdale Drive
Lincoln, NE 68504
tele# (402) 327-0654

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 11:40 AM
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 : 1/31/2019 11:40:07 AM

name Debbie Hoeft
address 9211 Medinah Dr
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68526
email dkhoeft@gmail.com
comments Hello,
On February 11 you will once again consider Krueger Development's proposal for four-story "mixed-use" buildings near 27th and Pine Lake Road, which will be directly behind a townhome we own at 2846 Porter Ridge Road.
This latest proposal (which is only slightly different from the previous one) was unanimously denied 7-0 by the Planning Commission. 7-0!!! They heard the neighborhood's concerns about the 50-foot height of these buildings, and agreed that they would not be in scale with this established neighborhood. They heard the neighborhood's concerns about privacy with apartment tenants just feet away, 24 hours a day. They acknowledged that even with "100%" screening, it will be many years before the tree growth reaches 50 feet, and questions remain about the mix of trees (deciduous vs coniferous), how close together they can actually grow (and how close they will be to our homes), and how a wall of trees 20 feet from our decks will realistically look. The Planning Commission received at least 50 letters in opposition, which included people not residing in the abutting townhomes. There were no letters in support.
You may consider these concerns and still feel that, in the interests of the city, this project should still move forward because certain aspects appear to fit within the guidelines of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. But I urge you to really examine this area closely and think carefully about whether the supposed benefits really exist. This infill area is an oddly shaped, narrow, watery piece of land in a parking lot behind a very busy strip mall. A "mixed-use" building sounds good on paper, but how would it actually work? Tenants cannot easily walk to the other strip mall businesses without crossing parking lots and drivethrus and street entrances/exits to get to the front side, or to attempt to cross busy Pine Lake or 27th Street. It's not at all like an apartment building in the Haymarket or downtown area where one would walk on sidewalks from block to block.
Also, it's not at all clear about the other part of "mixed-use"- the commercial space. What if there are not enough commercial businesses that would find this odd location attractive? It will be hard to find (it's not on a street), hard to get to, hard to park and it's hard to imagine what other businesses are wanted or needed in this very busy developed area. If the commercial space is not filled (like what has happened at 48th and Holdrege), then the city has just ended up with a 50 foot, 4 story mixed-use building in name only.
The developer likes to say that traffic would be heavier if he built medical/office buildings and that there would be less green space. But traffic projections are based on three buildings of 53,660 square feet. There is no indication that the developer would actually build to the maximum allowed. Additionally, the neighborhood would prefer that kind of traffic throughout daytime hours and less green space if the

alternative is 121 apartment units.
The city does need more apartments, according to projections. But in this specific area, there are already many large apartment complexes with vacancies. This proposal does absolutely nothing to solve the affordable housing problem. NOTHING!! It just adds more of what we already have, to the detriment of the surrounding, established neighborhood.
This neighborhood has always known and accepted that commercial development would occur on this land. Everybody wins with that. This proposal, however, is a risk that could result in irreversible harm, and no real benefit to the surrounding community. It simply does not fit.
Thank you for your consideration.

IP: 104.218.67.70
Form: http://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/71.0.3578.98 Safari/537.36

Angela M. Birkett

From: WebForm <none@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:21 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 : 1/31/2019 12:21:03 PM

name Sandra Klocke
address 7130 Eagle Ridge Circle
city Lincoln
state NE
zip 68516
email sklogan524@gmail.com
comments I am supporting the Porter Ridge Townhome Association in their dispute with plans to build in the land area directly North of them. If you have not driven by that area, please do. The existing traffic patterns on the alley behind the existing strip mall is already quite congested with traffic to and from Starbucks as well as to the cleaners and gas stations located on the corner. This is a safety as well as an overuse issue.
In addition, to not be able to TRUST how developments are designed does not speak well for the city and respect for taxpayers. Individuals have right to expect privacy when investing in a home. Please respect these citizens in this issue.

IP: 104.218.65.141
Form: https://lincoln.ne.gov/city/council/contact.htm
User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (iPhone; CPU iPhone OS 12_1_2 like Mac OS X) AppleWebKit/605.1.15 (KHTML, like Gecko) Version/12.0 Mobile/15E148 Safari/604.1

Angela M. Birkett

From: Russell Miller <neb31340@twc.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 1:14 PM
To: Jon Camp
Subject: from russell miller about sales tax

I thought I had email this letter to you on 22 Jan. 2019 but appears you did not receive it because I cannot find it in the 'Directors' Agenda'.

Therefore I am sending it again.

russell

==========

From : Russell Miller 22 January 2019
341 S. 52
Lincoln. NE 68510

To : Lincoln City Council

Copy : Mayor's office

Subject : Proposed new City sales tax and paying for related infrastructure

Hello,

I am commenting on the information in the Lincoln Journal Star's article 16 January 2019 by Nancy Hicks about the sales tax proposal for streets.

A red flag should be the statement "The quarter-cent sales tax compromise plan **includes freezing the city's impact fees at the current level** for five years, **a concession to developers and home builders."** (I added the bold print)

The problem is that Lincoln is growing too fast for our tax base to pay for the required infrastructure to service that growth. Growth requires in-the-ground, ready-to-hook-up water and sewer leading to the development plus improved (usually means widened) streets leading to the development. An example of this is the $10 million Pine Lake to Highway 2 project which only serves housing growth in that southeast Lincoln area.

The funding for new water and sewer infrastructure is partly paid by impact fees but mostly by increased water and sewer fees. Since the impact fee ordinance was adopted, our water RATES have increased 64%. But more expensively, our monthly service charges have increased from $4.26 in 2003 to $10.38 per month in 2018. The monthly service fee is paid by everyone regardless of the amount of water that is used or if you are on a fixed income.

That is 124 dollars per year and what is it funding? To quote LWS billing statement "It also represents 'an ability to serve' charge. This means that water will be supplied through public water lines large enough to **meet the demands of each customer** and the needs of a city-wide fire protection system." I highlighted my point that growth is driving our water costs because more houses mean more water . Lincoln has enough water for our present size. We need additional water for GROWTH. WHO is expected to pay for that? It is being paid for with higher water rates and a much higher monthly service charge.

In 2002 Lincoln was having the same problem of finding money to pay for infrastructure growth. Impact fees were adopted that would pay approximately 16% of growth costs. However, that was skewed by the Council freezing impact fees for 6 years from 2008-2013. Plus impact fees were not being adjusted for inflation of building materials. Lincoln's ordinance has the adjustment pegged to Consumer Price Index (CPI) which is just a small fraction of the actual cost of BUILDING materials. I contend that because impact fees, which were supposed to pay for

infrastructure, are inadequate, the LWS customers are forced to pay an LWS monthly service charge of $124 per year.

A similar problem exists with street funding. All of the new developments on the edges of Lincoln require new and/or widened streets leading to those developments. Again, because the growth of impact fees was not allowed to grow with the cost of building material inflation, there was not enough money to build the necessary streets.

The money was ‘found’ by increasing Lincoln’s wheel tax. From 2004 to 2013 the wheel tax was increased from $44 to $74. That 61% wheel tax increase plus the large number of vehicles in all of Lincoln allowed the Wheel Tax to provide 41% of 2016/2017 CIP budget. Only 6% of wheel tax money went to all of Lincoln for residential rehab. Impact fees provided only 11.4% of that CIP budget, yet all of the actual street building projects were required because of growth. The exception is the 33rd & Cornhusker railroad crossing and that money is being provided entirely by the Railroad Transportation Safety District (RTSD).

Again we have the situation where the entities causing the expense are not paying for a problem that they are causing. The problem is growth requires immediate water and sewer service and shortly thereafter improved streets that serve their area.

Impact fees were the concept developed to provide the infrastructure required for steady growth and it would work IF the fees had been allowed to grow with construction cost inflation. Since that was not allowed to happen, we now have the ‘crisis’ of not enough infrastructure money.

Raising rates for infrastructure growth (impact fees) will have a painful sticker shock because cost of infrastructure has increased 100% since 2002 to 2018. Today a new single family house impact fee should be $2,300 higher for the street portion and $1,700 higher for water & sewer. BUT, if enacted, the developers will be assured of funding for their water, streets

and sewers because money for infrastructure will be pegged to the inflation costs of building materials.

This proposed sales tax increase will only make the problem worse because it does not address inflation of construction material. This means that the sales tax will have to be renewed every 6 years at an ever higher rate to cover inflation and so will LWS water/sewer service fees.

SUGGESTIONS:

Impact fees (paying for infrastructure growth) should be pegged to Iowa's DOT Price Trend Index. Possibly this 100% increase could be phased in over 2-3 years similar to what was done in 2003.

Recognize and correct that our past actions have unequally increased the tax burden on low income and fixed income persons by the increased water/sewer bills and wheel tax.

Recognize and correct that this proposed sales tax is a subsidy by Lincoln taxpayers for new home owners because the sales tax allows the new homes to be sold without paying the full cost of their infrastructure.

Thank you,

Russell Miller

January 24, 2019

Dear Mayor Beutler and Members of the City Council:

At the January 15th meeting of the Central Committee of Lancaster County Democratic Party, a Resolution was unanimously adopted in support of the Council and Mayor's offices investigating the addition and eventual passage of a Safe Storage Law in Lancaster County.

Attached is the Safe Storage Resolution for your records.

Sincerely,

Janet Chung
Chair
LCDPnechair@gmail.com

Mo Neal
Issues Committee Chair
moneal@unl.edu

LANCASTER COUNTY DEMOCRATIC PARTY

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SAFE STORAGE GUN ORDINANCE

JANUARY 15, 2019

Whereas the Lincoln Public School (LPS) and Lincoln Police Department (LPD) have recently entered into an agreement to supply additional Security Resource Officers to certain middle schools in addition to the high schools already served by SROs;

Whereas the addition of a Safe Storage law will reinforce the actions taken by LPD and LPS in reducing the incidents of gun violence and suicide among our residents; and allow LPS to include gun safety information in the material they release annually to parents;

Whereas Lincoln Police Department continues to report incidents of firearms stolen from unlocked and locked vehicles; national research suggests that 500,000 gun thefts occur annually;

Whereas members of LCDP acknowledge that there is a high number of gun deaths and injuries among all age groups and particularly among children between 0-18 years of age; an aging population places more people at risk from guns in the hands of Alzheimer patients and their families need the security brought with a Safe Storage law; and nationally compiled data shows gun violence in the USA is continuing to rise;

Whereas 4.6 million children live in a home with an unlocked and loaded gun;

Whereas firearms in the home are associated with a higher risk for adolescent and elder suicide, and more than 90% of suicide attempts with a gun are fatal;

Whereas up to December 12 in 2018 there have been 23 school shootings; and this is a public safety non-partisan issue;

Whereas most school shooters obtain their gun from their home or a relative, friend or neighbor; 2 out of 5 homes with kids have a gun;

Whereas since the Columbine shooting in 1999 there have been 219,000 children and 223 schools impacted by school shootings; and there have been at least 143 children, educators and others killed in assaults and another 288 have been injured;

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Lancaster County Democratic Party supports the adoption by the Lincoln City Council and Mayor of a common sense Safe Storage ordinance.

SOURCES USED IN THE RESOLUTION

GunViolenceArchive.com
November 15, 2018 Kids Killed or injured

Ages 0-11		Teens 12-18	
2018	584	2018	2,475
2017	732	2017	3,247
2016	671	2016	3,134
2015	695	2015	2,698
2014	610	2014	2,321

Pew Research Center, "America's Complex relationship with Guns", June 22, 2017

LawCenter.Giffords.org (500,000 gun thefts annually)

May 10, 2018 Issue of Journal of Urban Health (4.6 Million kids in homes…unlocked, loaded)

San Francisco Chronicle, "In school shootings, often the gun came from the home" Kath Tsakalakis, Aug. 28, 2018

Washington Post data base of School Shootings published April 20, 2018

Institute on Aging, Sept 19, 2017 "Grannies Got a Gun: How to Prevent Senior Suicide"

BradyCampaign.org "The Truth About Suicide & Guns" published since 2014

Prevent Child Abuse America

BBC News, "2018 'worst year for US school shootings' by Sean Coughlan, December 12, 2018. Data compiled by Education Week, a journal covering education in the USA