CITY-COUNTY COMMON MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday February 18, 2020  
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING 555 SOUTH 10TH STREET  
ROOM 113 - BILL LUXFORD STUDIO  
11:00 A.M. - 12:00 P.M.  

Present: Jane Raybould, Common-Chair; Roma Amundson, Common-Vice-Chair; Deb Schorr, Sean Flowerday, Rick Vest and Christa Yoakum, County Commissioners; Richard Meginnis, Bennie Shobe, Tammy Ward, Sandra Washington, Roy Christensen, City Council Members  

Absent: James Michael Bowers, City Council Member; and Leirion Gaylor Baird, Mayor  

Others Present: Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer; Angie Birkett, Administrative Secretary to the City Council; and Danielle Buck, Administrative Secretary to the County Board  

Advance public notice of the City-County Common Meeting was posted on the County-City Building bulletin board and the Lancaster County and City of Lincoln, Nebraska web site and provided to the media on February 14, 2020.  

The Chair, Jane Raybould opened the meeting at 11:01 a.m. and announced a copy of the Nebraska Open Meetings Act is located on the wall at the back of the room.  

1. APPROVAL OF COMMON MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 19, 2019  
Schorr moved and Ward seconded approval of the November 19, 2019 Common Meeting minutes. Raybould, Meginnis, Flowerday, Schorr, Ward, Vest, Washington, Yoakum, and Shobe, voted yes  
Amundson, Christensen abstained  
Bowers and Gaylor Baird were absent  
Motion carried 9-0  

2. MEDICAID EXPANSION  
Molly McCleery, Deputy Health Care Director, Nebraska Appleseed  

McCleery reviewed the Medicaid Expansion presentation and distributed copies of the presentation (Exhibit A).  

Concerning Medicaid Expansion, In November 2018, Nebraskans voted by a substantial majority to expand Medicaid. More than a year later, the Ricketts administration submitted a proposal to implement Medicaid Expansion with a complicated series of reporting requirements, incentives, and penalties.  

Nebraska Appleseed and the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) are proposing to create the Heritage Health Adult Plan through a proposed Section 1115 Waiver. Coverage under this plan would begin in October 2020. The proposed Section 1115 Waiver includes many elements, including some changes to current Medicaid policy. Most aspects of the Section 1115 Waiver, other than the elimination of retroactive coverage, apply only to adults eligible for Medicaid expansion. The Heritage Health Adult Plan features two levels of coverage: Basic and Prime.  

A waiver is a discretionary project with the Federal Government where they can approve the whole proposal, or parts of the proposal and deny other parts. DHHS is estimating approval by April 15, 2020 with enrollment and a program to begin August 1, 2020, with coverage beginning October 1, 2020.  
Included in exhibit A is Table 1. New administrative requirements for states implementing Medicaid expansion “work and wellness” reporting requirement waivers. The check list compares how the proposed Nebraska
project compares the requirements of other states.

McCleery stated there are two legislative bills this year dealing with expansion; LB932, introduced by Anna Wishart which would require the state start expansion on October 1, 2020. The hearing for LB932 was on January 29, 2020. The October 1, 2020 start date is contingent on the April 15, 2020 approval date. There is no set timeline on when the Federal Government must approve, there are concerns if that timeline starts slipping enrollment will go past the October date which will then affect the budget. LB815, introduced by Adam Morfeld is up for hearing next week. LB815 would prohibit pursuit of, application for, or implementation of a federal waiver as prescribed; and to repeal the original section.

Yoakim commented on the retroactive Medicaid; Having worked in long term care for several years, on a regular basis people were admitted into the facility who had no awareness they were eligible for Medicaid and had been living in their own home. Once it was determined they were eligible for Medicaid it would retroactive back, it seems that it would kill most of the nursing homes that already suffer across the state.

McCleery responded long term care is one of the categories where retroactive coverage would stay. What has been seen by other states is there is an increase in personal debt that goes to collections on the part of the consumer using health services and then there is an increase in hospitals and providers writing off elderly care debt.

Flowerday asked if they would get the waiver by April. Flowerday stated the Feds are slow walking the whole thing, it’s callous, the state is intentionally pushing it back and I refuse to pretend otherwise. Flowerday further stated he spent the morning discussing infrastructure funding and can’t help but think if the County wasn’t having to pay for general assistance, if we had Medicaid expansion in place the County wouldn’t have had to raise the levy this last year. I’m salty over it.

McCleery responded that she is receptive to where Flowerday is coming from and works with individuals who would be eligible for this program who have been waiting since 2013 when this option became available. There is not a set timeline in which these approvals have to take place. From the Legislative hearing it is the understanding that there are on-going communications trying to get that April 15th date met. On the point of paying for general assistance the last available data was that Lancaster County paid out about $2.5 million over the biennium. The longer this continues the more we will see on the supportive services.

Flowerday stated to be clear the levy raise that was just done brought in $2.1 million, literally would have covered it.

Raybould asked McCleery to talk a little bit about the role of the court, referencing a recent court hearing striking down the ability to put in work requirements with any Medicaid action.

McCleery responded regarding the Arkansas waiver project there was a hearing, going back to the core purpose of Medicaid and that is defined under Federal Medicaid law, as being, providing health insurance to those who can’t afford it. There’s a lot that states can do with Medicaid but the core purpose is providing that insurance. When courts are looking at programs, like Arkansas, Kentucky, and pending litigation in New Hampshire, Indiana and likely in Utah, when work is being required in order to receive those benefits and those benefits are taken away that is in contradiction with the core purpose of Medicaid. McCleery further stated the courts have
also looked at the fact that these waivers have to go through public notice and comment periods, both at the state and federal level. With these other states there has been ample evidence that what is supposed to be tested through these waivers has already been tested and won’t work. Things such as, taking away someone’s benefits in order to get them to work has actually had the opposite impact; if people are unable to get the health care they need, they are less likely to be able to go to work. The Federal Administration has ignored that administrative record so there is now an administrative claim in there as well.

Raybould asked McCleery to explain the Federal dollars that would help match and the state dollars that would go into the Medicaid expansion and share with us the amount of Federal dollars the state of Nebraska has lost over all the years we have not included Medicaid expansion.

McCleery responded in 2013 when this first became an option it would have been 100% federally matched. The way the law was written it would stagger down to 90% federal funding. The traditional Medicaid program is around 50/50 depending on each state’s economic situation, you can get a little more in you’re not doing as well or that minimum of 50 if you’re doing a little better. 90% is the minimum a state could get. Nebraska did not expand until we were at that 90% point, so we missed years of full funding and between 100% and 90%. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been lost by the state of Nebraska.

Raybould stated if the County is estimated to lose $2.5 million, or what is being paid for general assistance, I guess we don’t really know how many bridges that would have repaired. Washington stated 2 ½ bridges. Flowerday stated it would depend on the size of the bridge. Raybould stated 2 ½ bridges every year.

Raybould asked how this impacts the private insurers. If the City and County residents are paying that $2.5 million for general assistance how does that impact a private payer and their cost of insurance?

McCleery responded the $2.5 million does not include any of the corrections cost which could also be reduced. In other states that have expanded they have seen a reduction in both County and State corrections cost. Ultimately without Medicaid expansion the data show that private insurance rates are higher due to uncompensated care, there essentially a hidden tax on the premiums we pay ourselves or through our employer to off-set the cost of the uninsured.

Raybould stated in addition to the $2.5 million we are also paying additional amount in our insurance premiums and deductibles.

Flowerday stated because these people aren’t getting covered, we are paying for it in the most expensive way possible when they go to the emergency room; there is no preventative care.

Raybould inquired if there were any action items the City or County can take.

McCleery responded with the legislative bills making their way through there is no action needed on them. What is missing in the conversations is having good data from the City and County level.

Raybould asked how many years has the County Board been working with Legislature on Medicaid expansion? When Raybould served on the County Board it was the County Boards number one priority working with the Nebraska Legislature trying to get them to pass Medicaid expansion.
Schorr responded the County has testified on it many times because of the direct impact on the general assistance budget.

Materials from the Medicaid Expansion presentation were distributed (Exhibit A)

3. SOUTH BELTWAY
Steve McCullough, Assistant Design Engineer – Roadway, Nebraska Department of Transportation (NDOT); and Curt Mueting, District 1 Construction Engineer, Nebraska Department of Transportation

McCullough reviewed the Lincoln South Beltway presentation (Exhibit B).

McCullough stated he is here to give a short presentation and provide information, no action will be taken.

Concerning the South Beltway project, this is the single largest construction project for Nebraska and will serve as a significant improvement. A majority of the project will be substantially complete in three years. Year 4 incidental remaining work is expected to be complete. Funding for the project has been through Federal dollars, Tiger Grant, City of Lincoln and the Railroad Transportation Safety District (RTSD) and Build Nebraska Act. Hawkins Construction was awarded the bid for the project.

Washington inquired about the 68th/70th and Saltillo interchange.

McCullough responded the 82nd street interchange will be the first phase of construction and include a traditional diamond interchange, there will be no stop control lights, and roundabouts will allow for free flow movement and add a cost savings to the project. 68th/70th street(s) will be a single lane roundabout on opening day. Most of the project will be completed in three years. Year four incidental remaining work will be completed at 82nd street(s).

McCullough stated as we move into construction, Hawkins Construction will begin tree removal, box culverts and crushing concrete. Full notice to proceed with construction is anticipated to begin, May 2020. A public meeting is scheduled for March 11, 2020, and there will be monthly progress meetings.

Flowerday inquired if the State will be providing assistance with maintenance on Saltillo Road. Flowerday stated during the construction process there will be 150 – 200 trucks, per day, traveling on Saltillo Road which will tear up the road. Flowerday further stated County infrastructure funding is limited.

McCullough responded stating there will be a safety project on Saltillo Road shortly after the Beltway opens for traffic, which includes some interchange work and shoulder work. Regarding the condition of Saltillo, McCullough stated legal sized loads will be maintained, five million yards of dirt is anticipated to be moved in the first eighteen months of construction. The condition of Saltillo will be monitored, if it gets to a point where it is deteriorating discussions will be had on what needs to be done to repair the road.

Flowerday further stated you can’t complete a project as big as the South Beltway without using other roads to get the project completed. We just have to recognize that it is currently one of the most dangerous roads in the County and now we’re going to be really hard on it with additional construction traffic.
Raybould inquired to the Build Nebraska Act, stating the City and County are the beneficiaries of a percentage of those funds. In regard to the South Beltway and the portion of funding that is coming from the Build Nebraska Act; will that have any effect on the percentage that goes to the City and County?

McCullough responded eighty-five percent of the Build Nebraska Act goes to the NDOT and fifteen percent goes to the City and County. Funding for the South Beltway that is coming from the Build Nebraska Act is coming out of the eighty-five percent; not the fifteen percent that is earmarked for municipalities.

Raybould inquired to the right-of-way acquisition and asked if all the necessary land has been acquired; are there contracts still pending.

McCullough stated he believes there may be one or two contracts still remaining, everything has pretty much been purchased and is green to go. Railroad agreements my still be in the finalization phase and possibly one tract that is still in the process.

Raybould stated on behalf of everyone we are beyond thrilled, we are grateful for the generosity of the State and all the other grant monies that has been received from our federal representatives, and the generous contribution from the RTSD. We are also grateful for the leadership and stewardship of the NDOT for watching over the project. We support the initiative in getting the project completed in three years. Raybould announced a reminder of the public meeting scheduled for March 11, 2020, 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., at the Sesostris Shrine Center.

4. ELECTION SECURITY
Dave Shively, Election Commissioner; Wayne Bena, Deputy Secretary of State for Elections; and Jim Anderson, Information Services

Shively provided introductions and briefed officials on the importance of election security. The Help America Vote Act; passed in 2002 presented funds to the states that allowed for projects to be completed. Additional funds were received a few years ago, primarily designed for election security. Over the past two years these funds have allowed for the State to implement additional security measurements. In addition, the State last year funded new voting equipment and handicap accessible equipment. Election staff is currently working on internet and email safety.

Bena advised and briefed officials on three main components:

- Voter Registration System
  Prior to 2018 the State authorized and implemented two-factor authentication on the voter registration systems; any person who has access to the voter registration system has to use a user name and password as well as a token that generates a random code in order to access the system. Work was done with Homeland Security to obtain an Albert Monitor which provides network security alerts for both traditional and advanced network threats, helping organizations identify malicious activity for voter registration systems. Homeland Security assumed all voter registration systems were on State networks; however, Nebraska’s voter registration information is hosted by the vendor of election system and software. Work was done with the Federal Government to provide the vendor the Albert Monitor to be put on the voter registration system. This was the first time the Albert Monitor had been used by a
private election vendor and the first virtual monitor in Homeland Security’s history. This project won the 2019 Inaugural Election Innovation award from the National Association of State Election Directors; the project has been copied in seven States and Territories. As always, the voter registration information is backed up nightly.

- Election Counting Equipment
Last year funding was secured to purchase new election counting equipment; 70 of the 93 Counties in the State have received new equipment. Lancaster County has purchased the DS850 which is a high-speed, digital scale ballot tabulator. Five additional scanners will be purchased to replace the existing scanners. These machines are not connected to the internet; they are a paper based system. Each County counting machine goes through three independent tests of ballots to ensure they are counting them appropriately; a mock election is held before every election to make sure you can count your ballots then upload them to the State site. After each election a hand count of races in 2-3% of the precincts in Nebraska is hand counted to make sure the hand count matches the ballot report on the machines. Erase marks can account for inaccuracy, voters are encouraged to get a new ballot if they need to erase a selection.

- Election Night Reporting
The State has recently purchased a hardened computer for every County in the State that uses our reporting software to the State. This will allow for the results coming out of the machine to be compiled on a computer that has no internet access; once compiled it will generate a report; now you have a basis of what your count machine results are; the results can then be taken to an internet connected computer, upload the results to the Lancaster County Election Commission site, the State site, and then once you see those results you know the results match what you have on the report. At the point that you do have an internet connection to report those results, you also have the reports from the hardened computer, and the reports from the machine not connected to the internet. The States election night reporting vendor also uses multi-factor authentication to ensure they are the only ones that can access the site. One of the biggest fears on election night is a denial of service attack; this occurs when someone throws so much traffic at a website that you can’t access it. Because of this the site is stored on the cloud. The vendor has taken renowned focus on election security. Due to clouds being in a virtual environment the State is currently working with the Federal Government helping to develop new technology for the Albert Monitor to be installed in a cloud environment. An Albert Monitor has been purchased for Lancaster County and other strategic locations throughout the State. The Albert Monitor monitors traffic twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

Bena wrapped up by stating, no votes were changed in the 2016 election but people’s impressions were changed in 2016. Share with your constituents to go to trusted sources for their information; the Lancaster County Election Commission, the Secretary of State’s Office; trusted sources of election information ensure the integrity of the perceptions of our elections.

Anderson added all the traffic on the City/County network is monitored by the Albert Monitor. The traffic is reviewed, and the City is notified of any alerts that come up, appropriate action can then be taken. This has been a great benefit to the City Information Services Department; it gives them visibility of what is going in and out of the network and if there is any malicious or potential malicious activity threatening the network. Homeland
Security has the ability to conduct a penetration test of the network, using techniques that a threat actor will use to try and break into your network, and provide a report to correct any possible threats.

Washington stated this gives her great comfort in knowing we have unconnected machines, back-ups, and ways to test everything.

Shobe commented on the State not deviating from the current method rather enhancing the method with added security benefits.

Shively responded technology changes constantly and that is said to be true of the new counting machines. It’s important to keep with the changes in technology. Better technology means upgrading to the next version of the machines.

Schorr stated she is proud to have Bena in the position that he is in; he has come from a County elections background; is a national leader. To also have Shively as the Lancaster County Election Commissioner, almost everyiolet project starts in Lancaster County; Shively is so well respected across the State.

Raybould stated she is not surprised Nebraska leads the way in some things on innovations.

Raybould inquired to having more Federal dollars from Homeland Security and asked if there are plans to apply for more grant money or is there a level of satisfaction that Nebraska is receive an adequate amount of Federal assistance in helping us do these amazing things.

Bena responded by stated federal funding is fantastic. From a budget standpoint, I would rather know I’m getting a set dollar amount every year for a specific number of years rather than getting a lump sum amount one time and not knowing when it is coming. Secretary of States across the nation are very thankful for these funds. The two grants that Nebraska received would not have covered the entire expense of the new equipment. Legislature is stepping up and it has helped but a reliable source of funding, reoccurring every year, would allow us to budget more appropriately. Right now the two grants that have been received have to be spent in five years, so rather than investing in people we are investing in equipment. The first round of funds will be going towards election security efforts. The second round of funds is primarily going to pay for the maintenance and licensing costs of the new equipment through the end of the contract. We didn’t want the burden of that expense to be absorbed by the Counties. Funding is secure through the end of the contract; we are hoping to secure funding after that. Year to Year funding will allow us to budget better.

5. COUNTY-CITY MASS NOTIFICATION SYSTEM DISCUSSION – Jerry Witte, Captain, Lancaster County Sheriff’s Office

Witte reviewed the County-City Mass Notification System presentation (Exhibit C).

Concerning the County-City Mass Notification System Witte advised in 2010 the Meridian phones were replaced with the Avaya VOIP phones. Officials were given a brief overview on Mass Notification via voice and text alerts and the importance of needing to upgrade to the current software. Currently the ANS is not working; the current system does not interface with windows 10; at this time we are not capable of providing a mass notification through the Avaya VOIP phone system. SKC Communications is the licensed dealer for the
Avaya phone. They have a solution as the City is several software upgrades behind on the Avaya VOIP phones. It would be approximately $24,000 expenditure for both the County and the City to move forward with the upgrades, which would then allow for the ability to send mass notifications; Information Services would provide oversight and project management. Upgrading the notification system would allow for the sender to send mass notifications remotely and would give the ability for those notifications to be launched to cell phones in addition to office phones and could be done in “real time”, it would also eliminate some security risks.

Schorr asked if the $24,000 would be for each entity or total dollar amount.

Witte responded that would be the total amount.

Amundson suggested speaking with each entity, City Council and County Commissioners, individually with a budget request.

Witte responded this would affect all of the phones currently in the County and the City and if this is something that you think is a worth-while project in moving forward; because of the complexity of the project equally involving the City and County it was deemed appropriate to present here at the City-County Common Meeting to gage over-all interest.

After a brief discussion it was determined it would be appropriate to take this request to the Information Services Policy Committee (ISPC). Overall the City-County Common members are supportive of moving forward with this project.

6. AMENDMENT OF THE CITY-COUNTY COMMON BY-LAWS - Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer for the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners

Eagan reviewed the By-Laws, with the proposed changes (Exhibit D).

Concerning the draft proposal of amendments to the By-Laws it was determined the procedure would be to take the request back to the respective bodies; City Council and County Board. In addition to the proposed amendment changing the monthly meetings to quarterly meetings, Eagan proposed to amend the last paragraph; to say any future amendments to the By-Laws can be the City-County Common rather than having to go before the separate bodies.

Flowerday asked if action is to be taken at a Common meeting how is the quorum counted.

Eagan responded there is no mention of a quorum in the By-Laws. The City-County Common is not intended as a body that takes action on matters. Rather it’s a body that discusses issues of mutual consent; any action would then be taken by the respective body; City Council or County Board.

Schorr inquired about the section stating meeting will be televised by 5 City-TV and inquired as to if that is being done now.

Christensen responded we are live now.
Raybould announced the next City-County Common Meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 18, 2020, at 1:00 p.m. in the Bill Luxford Studio.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Washington moved and Flowerday seconded to adjourn at 12:22 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by Angie Birkett, City Council’s Office
Heritage Health Adult Plan
Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services Medicaid Expansion Proposal

**Tiered Benefits System**

The Heritage Health Adult Plan features two levels of coverage: Basic and Prime. Basic Coverage includes all Medicaid benefits except dental, vision, and over the counter drugs. Prime Coverage includes all benefits plus dental, vision, and over the counter drugs. DHHS estimates that about one-third of the beneficiaries in the Medicaid expansion group would not receive the full Prime Coverage.

- Unless exempt, in order to receive Prime Coverage, Medicaid enrollees must meet nine separate requirements:
  1. Meet community engagement, or work requirements (see below for details);
  2. Fill prescriptions routinely;
  3. Participate in health and social determinants screening upon enrollment and annually thereafter;
  4. Attend a qualifying annual health visit;
  5. Select a primary care provider;
  6. Do not miss three or more appointments in a six month period;
  7. Maintain commercial health insurance coverage, if available; and
  8. Provide DHHS notice of any change in status within 10 days of such change.

- Benefit tiers will be reviewed every six months.

- Non-exempt newly eligible Medicaid expansion adults will have access to Basic Coverage for the first six month period. If they meet the requirements, they can receive Prime Coverage for the next six month period.

- If non-exempted participants do not meet some of the requirements, they can be locked out of Prime Coverage for one year.

**Work Requirements**

Beginning in the second year of the program, to receive Prime Coverage, enrollees, unless exempt, must:

- Work or volunteer at a public charity for at least 80 hours per month;
- Enroll at least half time in authorized educational programs;
- Be a qualified caregiver or be a relative, kinship or licensed foster parent;
- Participate in certain government programs; or
- Engage in certain job search activities for at least 20 hours per week.

**Retroactivity**

Currently, Medicaid eligibility is retroactive for up to three months prior to the date the person applies for Medicaid if the person would have been eligible during that period had they applied. DHHS is proposing to limit retroactive coverage to only go back to the first day of the application month for all Medicaid populations, including the expansion group, except for pregnant women, children ages 0-18, beneficiaries dually-enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid, and beneficiaries residing in nursing facilities.

- DHHS estimates that over 29,000 beneficiaries in the first demonstration year, increasing in each subsequent year to over 41,000 beneficiaries in the last demonstration year, would be impacted by limiting retroactive coverage.
NEBRASKA'S UNINSURED AND THE COVERAGE GAP BY COUNTY

The U.S. Census Bureau’s 2017 American Community Survey estimates about 141,000 Nebraskans are without health insurance, and about 97,000 of them are employed. This map includes American Community Survey’s five-year estimate of the number of Nebraskans falling into the coverage gap, as well as estimated percentages of working age population without health coverage and those who are employed without coverage.

Even with the passage of Medicaid expansion in November 2017, these Nebraskans who fall into the coverage gap continue to have no way to get health insurance. They don’t qualify for Medicaid—they either earn more than Medicaid’s very low income threshold (about $17,000 per year) or they don’t fit into other Medicaid-eligible categories (children, elderly, people with disabilities). These Nebraskans also do not make enough income to qualify for subsidies that would help them buy coverage from the Health Insurance Marketplace. Enrollment in expanded Medicaid coverage is anticipated to begin in August 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage of residents uninsured, ages 19 to 64</th>
<th>Estimated number in coverage gap, ages 19 to 64</th>
<th>Percentage of employed who are uninsured, ages 19 to 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Butte</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuming</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawes</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuel</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>24,035</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundy</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnas</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosper</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keya Paha</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11,730</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loup</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrill</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage of residents uninsured, ages 19 to 64</th>
<th>Estimated number in coverage gap, ages 19 to 64</th>
<th>Percentage of employed who are uninsured, ages 19 to 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nance</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemaha</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuckolls</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otoe</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawnee</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Willow</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpy</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Bluff</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska as a whole</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>141,326</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, S2701
Nebraska’s Proposed Medicaid Reporting Requirements: A Costly Burden on the State’s Government

Governor Ricketts is proposing a complex set of reporting requirements and bureaucratic hurdles as part of the long-delayed implementation of Nebraska’s voter-approved Medicaid expansion. These reporting requirements include reporting on both employment status and other so-called “beneficiary engagement” activities. But the evidence on these requirements from other states is overwhelming: Implementing these types of requirements will be costly to state taxpayers and will mire Nebraska in years of litigation.

In November 2018, Nebraskans voted by a substantial majority to expand Medicaid. More than a year later, the Ricketts administration submitted a proposal to implement Medicaid expansion with a complicated series of reporting requirements, incentives, and penalties.

Nebraska is not the first state to try to implement work reporting requirements in Medicaid, and the track record of these programs is poor. Furthermore, Nebraska’s proposal is even more complicated than the versions that have failed in other states.

According to a recent report from the Government Accountability Office (GAO), states have reported costs in the hundreds of millions of dollars in the first years of implementation.

> Medicaid reporting requirements are expensive to implement: If Nebraska implements the reporting requirements it has proposed, it will be taking on hundreds of millions of dollars in new costs for which it will receive a low federal match. Multiple states have tried to implement these reporting requirements and found them to be costly and administratively burdensome for the state, in addition to being onerous for patients and providers. According to a recent report from the Government Accountability Office (GAO), states have reported costs in the hundreds of millions of dollars in the first years of implementation.

Medicaid reporting requirements have a lot of expensive components, including additional staffing, information technology systems changes, beneficiary outreach, and new vendor contracting. Even worse, most of these costs will get a lower federal matching rate than Nebraska usually receives for its Medicaid program because these costs are administrative
Nebraska Medicaid’s proposed administrative burden is even higher than the burden other states have taken on.

Because its proposed reporting requirements and tiered benefits are so complicated, Nebraska’s administrative costs will likely exceed those of other states who have tried similar programs: Unlike other states, Nebraska is proposing multiple layers of reporting requirements on top of the work reporting requirement. These additional requirements include, among others, documentation of selection of primary care physician, annual health visits, and changes in income. Each of these reporting requirements will involve multiple notices mailed out to beneficiaries and new staff and information technology to handle the reporting that comes in.

As shown in table 1 (page 3), Nebraska Medicaid’s proposed administrative burden is even higher than the burden other states have taken on.

Like other states, Nebraska will face years of litigation before — if ever — it can implement these reporting requirements: Governor Ricketts’ proposal will face the same court challenges every similar state proposal has faced. State after state that has tried to implement Medicaid “work requirements” has either had their program blocked in federal court or has simply given up and suspended the program. So far, every lawsuit challenging CMS’s approval of Medicaid work reporting requirements has been successful. And Nebraska’s proposal will likely have similar legal problems.

Nebraska’s voters approved a simple Medicaid expansion well over a year ago. But the Ricketts administration’s needlessly complex proposal will make implementation much more expensive and drag the state into lengthy litigation.
Table 1. New administrative requirements for states implementing Medicaid expansion “work” and “wellness” reporting requirement waivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Nebraska (likely if approved)</th>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining mechanisms to stop/start payments to managed care organizations based on compliance with reporting requirements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging data on compliance with reporting requirements with other programs and agencies (SNAP, TANF, employment agencies)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing timely and adequate notices on whether, how, and when beneficiaries comply with reporting requirements and exemptions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining if further exemptions are necessary in areas with high barriers to compliance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing community support and assistance to help beneficiaries meet requirements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing barriers, providing modifications for beneficiaries with disabilities</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining eligibility system to timely suspend/terminate and reinstate coverage based on compliance with reporting requirements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing beneficiary protections (appeal rights, eligibility screenings, information on accessible health care) before and after suspension/termination of coverage</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring availability and accessibility of a range of qualifying work activities</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting active outreach and education beyond notices</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional assurances related to reporting on eligibility status (for example, timely processing of renewals and eligibility verifications, use of ex parte renewals and pre-populated forms, etc.)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional assurances related to reporting on medical appointments attended</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional assurances related to reporting on primary care provider selection/engagement</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional assurances related to reporting on prescription medications filled</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional assurances related to reporting on health risk screenings and social determinants assessments</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional assurances related to reporting on annual health visits</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional assurances related to reporting on commercial coverage</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Endnotes


3 Governors in Maine and Kentucky withdrew their waivers. Arkansas and New Hampshire (and Kentucky) have had implementation of their waivers halted in court. Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Arizona have delayed implementation of their waivers. Ohio and South Carolina have not yet implemented their waivers. Utah implemented its waiver on January 1, 2020, with disenrollments set to begin on May 1, 2020.


5 Heritage Health Adult Demonstration Final Waiver Application (Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, 2019), http://dhhs.ne.gov/Documents/1115_HHA_Application.PDF.
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Beltway Basics

• Largest single construction project in NDOT history
• Significant Safety, Mobility, and Economic benefits
• Traditional NDOT funding approach would be eight years of construction

• Build the project all at once and deliver in 3 years
• Establish a payment schedule that matches the traditional timeline
Design Layout
Project Schedule

**Substantial Completion** - 1095 days after award

- Segments have been fully constructed and open to traffic.

**Project Completion** – 1460 days after award

- Remaining elements including the completion of S. 27th Interchange & S. 84th Interchange
Anticipated Project Phasing
Anticipated Project Phasing
Anticipated Project Phasing
Anticipated Project Phasing
Local, State and Federal Funding Support

Recent examples of increased state funding for transportation include:

• **Build Nebraska Act (2011)**
  - Revenue from ¼ of 1 percent of the general state sales tax rate
  - Dedicated to NDOT (85%) and local (15%) transportation projects
  - Lincoln South Beltway’s primary state funding source
  - Lincoln South Beltway is NDOT’s highest priority BNA project

• **Local funds from the City of Lincoln**
  - $50 million cost sharing
  - Includes City Capital Improvement funds and Railroad Transportation Safety District (RTSD) funds.

Also, federal funding in the form of a $25 million TIGER Grant
Moving into Construction

- Hawkins Construction was awarded the project

- Early activities taking place include:
  - Tree removal
  - Box culverts that do not disrupt existing traffic
  - Crushing concrete off-site

- Full Notice to Proceed is expected at the beginning of May

- Public Meeting is scheduled for March 11, 2020
QUESTIONS?
UPDATING THE AVAYA NOTIFICATION SOLUTION

Captain Jerry Witte
jwitte@Lancaster.ne.gov

Curt Helgoth
chelgoth@Lincoln.ne.gov
DO YOU REMEMBER MERIDIAN?
VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL (VOIP)

*Voicemail / Caller ID
*Messaging
*Internal Directory
*Recorded Lines
*Out of Office Notifications
*Portability
AVAYA NOTIFICATION SOLUTION (ANS)

*Mass Notification (Voice and Text)*
*Active Shooter*
*Bomb Threat*
*General Evacuation*
*Weather Threat*
WHY UPDATE THE ANS SYSTEM?

* ANS currently is not working
* Security Risks from hackers
  - Eavesdropping
  - Denial of Service (DOS) Attacks
  - Malware and Viruses
WHAT WILL IT TAKE TO UPDATE?

SKC Communications
*Licensed Avaya Technical Service Provider
Information Services
*Provide Oversight / Project Management
$24,150
HOW WILL VOIP CHANGE?

*ANS will function with added improvements
  - Remote Activation
  - Mobile Phones
  - Real Time Communication as Event Unfolds

*More Secure Software

*Expandability for other applications
PHYSICAL SECURITY AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Emergency Response

HVAC Fault, Building Systems

Building Evacuation

Reduced Time to Resolution, Effective Response
Avaya Notification Solution – Interfaces

**Administrator Portal**
- Users and groups
- Configuration for devices (e.g., conferencing, dial-in trigger)
- System reporting and alarms

**Operator Portal**
- Message creation and configuration
- Recipients (user/group profiles)
- Escalation chains
- Message broadcast
- Reporting

**Triggers and APIs**
- Multiple ways to trigger notification
- Open standards API

**Interfaces**
- Administrator Portal
- Operator Portal
- Dial-in Trigger
- Email Trigger
- Web Services API
Avaya Notification Solution IP Phone/ IP Speaker Zone Paging

ANS Web Portal

Admin
Operator/Manager
User

ANS HA configuration

Dial-in Trigger

HTTP HTTP HTTP HTTP SIP

Zone X
Avaya IP Phones (WML / Push)

Zone Y
IP-PBX

Speakers
Digital/Analog Phones
Upgrade Your Solution with Avaya Professional Services

Upgrade Services with support including:

- Program and project management
- Pre-implementation and implementation support
- Integrate with latest network and web security measures
- Product training/knowledge transfer
- Remote support
BY-LAWS

CITY-COUNTY COMMON
(Lincoln City Council and Lancaster County Board)
(Effective March 1, 2020)

ARTICLE I

NAME

Section 1. The name of this assembly shall be the City-County Common, hereinafter referred to as the Common.

ARTICLE II

PURPOSE

Section 1. The purpose of the Common shall be to foster a spirit of cooperation between the City of Lincoln and Lancaster County and to facilitate joint decision making in areas of mutual concern to City and County government. To further this purpose, the Common will meet as provided in these By-Laws to:

a. Receive information;
b. Discuss issues;
c. Take informal action;
d. Coordinate the decision-making process on matters of importance to both the City and County; and
e. Refer action items to the City Council and County Board for formal decisions.

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The membership of the Common shall consist of all elected members of the Lancaster County Board, the Lincoln City Council, and the Mayor of the City of Lincoln.
ARTICLE IV

MEETINGS

Section 1. Schedule. The Common shall be scheduled to meet quarterly each year, and at such other times as business requires, at times mutually agreeable to the City Council and County Board. At the request of the County Board or City Council, the regularly scheduled quarterly meeting may be cancelled by the Chair of the Common if there are no important matters to be discussed. Meetings will be televised by 5 City-TV.

Section 2. Open Meetings. Common meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the Nebraska Public Meetings Law, Neb.Rev.Stat. §§84-1408 et. seq.

Section 3. Quorum. Seven members shall constitute a quorum, provided at least three County Commissioners and four City Council members are present.

Section 4. Staff. Staff support for conducting the meetings and business of the Common shall be provided for alternating calendar years by either the City Council or the County Board, commencing with the City Council for 2005. Pursuant to the direction of the Chair of the Common, staff shall be responsible for preparation of agendas, taking minutes, giving notice of meetings, and other similar duties.

Section 5. Rules of Procedure. The current addition of Robert’s Rules of Order shall be used as a general guide, so long as they are not inconsistent with these By-laws or any special rules of order adopted by the Common.

Section 6. Super Common. From time to time issues coming before the Common may involve other public bodies. The Common shall have the authority to invite such other public bodies to join the Common at a special meeting to further the purposes stated in these By-Laws.

ARTICLE V

OFFICERS

Section 1. Positions. There shall be a chair and vice chair, each serving a one-year term. Each year the position of chair shall alternate between a member of the City Council and County Board, with the position of vice chair being held by a member of the other governing body.

Section 2. Duties. The chair shall be responsible for presiding over meetings, selecting the time and place for meetings in consultation with the County Board and City Council, preparing written agendas and minutes for meetings, and giving notice of meetings to members and the public.
The vice chair shall perform these duties in the absence of the chair.

Section 3.  **Election.** Officers shall be nominated and elected by the members of the Common during the meeting set for the final quarter of each year, or as soon thereafter as is practicable. The incumbent officers will continue to serve until new officers are elected.

**ARTICLE VI**

**AMENDMENTS**

Section 1.  These By-Laws may be amended by the affirmative vote of the Common.

These By-Laws are hereby adopted by the Lancaster County Board this _____ day of _________________, 2020.

______________________________
Sean Flowerday, Chair

These By-Laws are hereby adopted by the Lincoln City Council this _____ day of _________________, 2020.

______________________________
Jane Raybould, Chair
BY-LAWS

CITY-COUNTY COMMON
(Lincoln City Council and Lancaster County Board)
(Effective March 1, 2020)

ARTICLE I

NAME

Section 1. The name of this assembly shall be the City-County Common, hereinafter referred to as the Common.

ARTICLE II

PURPOSE

Section 1. The purpose of the Common shall be to foster a spirit of cooperation between the City of Lincoln and Lancaster County and to facilitate joint decision making in areas of mutual concern to City and County government. To further this purpose, the Common will meet as provided in these By-Laws to:

a. Receive information;
b. Discuss issues;
c. Take informal action;
d. Coordinate the decision-making process on matters of importance to both the City and County; and

e. Refer action items to the City Council and County Board for formal decisions.

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The membership of the Common shall consist of all elected members of the Lancaster County Board, the Lincoln City Council, and the Mayor of the City of Lincoln.
ARTICLE IV

MEETINGS

Section 1. Schedule. The Common shall be scheduled to meet one time each month quarterly each year, and at such other times as business requires, at times mutually agreeable to the City Council and County Board. At the request of the County Board or City Council, the regularly scheduled monthly quarterly meeting may be cancelled by the Chair of the Common if there are no important matters to be discussed. Meetings will be televised by 5 City-TV.

Section 2. Open Meetings. Common meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the Nebraska Public Meetings Law, Neb.Rev.Stat. §§84-1408 et seq.

Section 3. Quorum. Seven members shall constitute a quorum, provided at least three County Commissioners and four City Council members are present.

Section 4. Staff. Staff support for conducting the meetings and business of the Common shall be provided for alternating calendar years by either the City Council or the County Board, commencing with the City Council for 2005. Pursuant to the direction of the Chair of the Common, staff shall be responsible for preparation of agendas, taking minutes, giving notice of meetings, and other similar duties.

Section 5. Rules of Procedure. The current addition of Robert’s Rules of Order shall be used as a general guide, so long as they are not inconsistent with these By-laws or any special rules of order adopted by the Common.

Section 6. Super Common. From time to time issues coming before the Common may involve other public bodies. The Common shall have the authority to invite such other public bodies to join the Common at a special meeting to further the purposes stated in these By-Laws.

ARTICLE V

OFFICERS

Section 1. Positions. There shall be a chair and vice chair, each serving a one-year term. Each year the position of chair shall alternate between a member of the City Council and County Board, with the position of vice chair being held by a member of the other governing body.

Section 2. Duties. The chair shall be responsible for presiding over meetings, selecting the time and place for meetings in consultation with the County Board and City Council, preparing written agendas and minutes for meetings, and giving notice of meetings to members and the public.
The vice chair shall perform these duties in the absence of the chair.

Section 3. Election. Officers shall be nominated and elected by the members of the Common during the December meeting set for the final quarter of each year, or as soon thereafter as is practicable. The incumbent officers will continue to serve until new officers are elected.

ARTICLE VI

AMENDMENTS

Section 1. These By-Laws may be amended by the affirmative vote of the Common, both the City Council and County Board. Any proposed amendment must first be presented to the Common for discussion before being referred to the City Council and County Board for action.

These By-Laws are hereby adopted by the Lancaster County Board this _____ day of __________________, 2020.

______________________________
Sean Flowerday, Chair

These By-Laws are hereby adopted by the Lincoln City Council this _____ day of __________________, 2020.

______________________________
Jane Raybould, Chair