

**IN LIEU OF
DIRECTORS' ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Monday, February 22, 2021**

**I. DIRECTORS CORRESPONDENCE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

1. Final Action dated February 18, 2021

II. CONSTITUENT CORRESPONDENCE

1. Blanket Ban on Evictions – Dwayne G. Rice
2. Shelter for the Homeless – Gina King
3. Emergency Declaration and Access – Mary Hamilton
4. Mask Mandate – Sheri Robertson
5. Monday Night's Council Meeting – Scott Essink
6. Dangerous situation in the hallway – Samuel Lyon
7. 500 foot rule related to sex offenders – Brooke Bateman
8. Public Comment on Pending Agenda Items with no date certain – Mark Sroczynski
9. Council Chambers seating restrictions – Nicole Lyon
10. Eviction Moratorium – Mitzy Buchanan
11. Lincoln Climate Resiliency Action Plan – David R. Blythe
12. LB367 – Robert Boyer
13. Power and Foolishness – Dale McIntosh

III. CORRESPONDENCE – PROPOSED ORDINANCE RELATED TO CONVERSION THERAPY
See attached items

IV. CORRESPONDENCE – PROPOSED GATE HOUSE ROW PROJECT
See attached items

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION NOTIFICATION

TO: Mayor Leirion Gaylor Baird
Lincoln City Council

FROM: Geri Rorabaugh, Planning

DATE: February 18, 2021

RE: Notice of final action by Planning Commission: February 17, 2021

Please be advised that on February 17, 2021, the Lincoln City-Lancaster County Planning Commission adopted the following resolutions:

Resolution PC-01742, approving SPECIAL PERMIT 21002, to allow for excavation, on property legally described as a portion of Lot 2, Speidel 1st Addition, located in the SW 1/4 of Section 20-9-7, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, generally located at 4200 Yankee Hill Road;

Resolution PC-01743, approving PRELIMINARY PLAT 20005, as corrected for an H-4 (General Commercial District) preliminary plat consisting of one lot, on property legally described as a portion of Lot 53, I.T., located in the NE 1/4 of Section 28-11-7, Lancaster County, Nebraska, generally located at approximately N. 64th Street and Arbor Road; and

Resolution PC-01744, approving SPECIAL PERMIT 21003, as amended by the Planning Commission as requested by the developer, to allow for a CUP (Community Unit Plan) with up to 98 residential dwelling units on 8.72 acres, with associated waivers, on property legally described as Lots 1, 3, 4 and 5, and Lot 6, Block 7, Ridgeway; Lots 1-14, Roger's Subdivision of Lot 2, Block 7, Ridgeway; that portion of the east half of the vacated North 36th Street abutting Lots 1 and 4, Block 7, Ridgeway and Lots 7 and 8, Roger's Subdivision of Lot 2, Block 7, Ridgeway; the east 15 feet of vacated north 36th Street abutting Lot 3, Block 7, Ridgeway; All that portion of T Street and the East and West alleys located north of Lots 1-7 and located south of Lots 8-14, Roger's Subdivision of Lot 2, Block 7, Ridgeway; that portion of R Street between Lot 6, Block 7 and Lot 1, Block 20, Ridgeway; Lots 1 and 2, Block 20 Ridgeway; all located in the SE 1/4 of Section 19-10-7, Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, generally located at 3600 R Street.

The Planning Commission action on these applications is final, unless appealed to the City Council by filing a notice of appeal with the Planning Department within 14 days of the action by the Planning Commission

The Planning Commission Resolution may be accessed on the internet at www.lincoln.ne.gov (search for "PATS"). Click on "Planning Application Tracking Service (PATS)" at the top of the page, click "Selection Screen" under "PATS Tools" on the right side of the screen, type in the application number (i.e. SP21003, PP20005), click on "Search", then "Select", and go to "Related Documents".

Angela M. Birkett

From: jan@riceinvestments.net
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 1:25 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Say NO to Blanket Ban on Evictions !!

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Members of the City Council,

This campaign has nothing to do with the China Virus, as that will never end. There has never been a cure for any virus (The common cold is a virus as is the flu. This is about socialism and communism. This is to take away the rights to work and achieve.

This is a form of slavery. I will be in slaved to provide housing to people too lazy to work! This is a form of racism against people who work and try to achieve success.

The government makes me pay my taxes or takes my property! I have to pay my insurance no matter what!

I have to pay my mortgage no matter what!

I have to fix the roof no matter what!

I have to fix the furnace no matter what!

I have to fix the window or door even though I didn't break it!

I have to fix the dry wall even though I didn't break it!

I have to pay the water even though I didn't leave the faucet run!

I have to fix the water heater no matter what!

I have to mow the lawn because they were too lazy!

I have to remove snow because they were too lazy!

With this I will have to give them a place to live because they are too lazy to work or just didn't like what they were doing or they just haven't found themselves or their MOMMY quit babysitting them!

I would have to pay for those breaking the law. I don't do this for my health!

Do any of you have rental property? Put yourself in my shoes. I cannot pay my bills if I do not receive rent.

Thank you for looking at the whole picture !!

Dwayne G. Rice
5630 Baldwin Ave
Lincoln NE 68507

Angela M. Birkett

From: Rae King <rking529@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 5:03 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Burrrrr.....what is the plan?

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Good evening :

I am associated with several small non-profits taking on hunger and housing issues in our community.

Tonight my focus is shelter for our many homeless on the streets. We have a weather crisis facing our community and this crisis needs our immediate attention.

The Mission is doing a great job of meeting most needs. But they are stretched thin and at the max. We need temporary shelter mid-town to help people who can't get to the Mission.

Before we have a death, I am asking the city to immediately assess the situation and current needs. I know of a local non-profit that will provide manpower, food, coffee etc....if someone could just provide a location downtown; even just one small room.

Thanks
Gina King
2935 N. 53rd
Lincoln NE

Angela M. Birkett

From: mhamilt7@protonmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 9:53 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Emergency declaration and access

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

I am writing in regard to the declaration of emergency that you put in place March 16, 2020. I am wondering if you are going to end this emergency and if not, when are you going to allow the public to have some input and be able to speak about this issue at the council meetings? I would also like to address the issue of allowing us to sit in the council chambers. Other city councils in the state of Nebraska, such as Omaha and Papillion have allowed their citizens to sit in the chambers and get up and speak. It seems to me that you as a council, are silencing the voices of the citizens of Lincoln. Also, by not allowing us to sit in the chamber, you are limiting our representation during the council process. May I remind you that you work for us and that we elected you to represent us, not the other way around.

Mary Hamilton
Taxpayer and citizen of Lincoln, Nebraska

Sent from ProtonMail Mobile

Angela M. Birkett

From: Sheri Robertson <sid@cornhusker.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 8:42 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Mask Mandate

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

It is way past time to end the mask mandate and let citizens and businesses make their own decisions. Businesses should be able to make decisions on how they want to conduct business; and citizens should be able to make their own decisions as well.

Thank you

--

Sheri A. Robertson

Angela M. Birkett

From: Essink, Scott <Scott.Essink@nebraska.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 9:20 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Monday Night's City Council Meeting

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello city council representatives,

- 1) I am writing to let you know that I am disappointed in the overall response by the council regarding what Sam Lyon discussed with you...the emergency declaration and power given (by you) to the mayor. When he brought up the issue to you Ms. Raybould was quick to interrupt him (were you concerned because he was speaking truth?) with filibuster-type talk, then you bring in the mayor's city attorney (who didn't know the rules for how this situation is handled without some quick research himself).*

I am asking as a long time citizen of Lincoln and someone concerned about our leadership that you address this situation ASAP, give the citizens of Lincoln the opportunity to have a public forum to discuss/share their concerns and extreme frustration with you ASAP, and then do what is right and take your duties and authority BACK very, very quickly.

- 2) The image (as I watched the FULL city council meeting via TV due to other obligations this past Monday) of no citizens allowed in the room with you for the first portion of the night was of highly questionable motives and effort on behalf of all of you. If you did not agree with the decision to keep the citizens out of the room from the beginning then take a stand...*

Why does it take a citizen (again...no previous political ties or citizen leadership prior to poor choices by the council in the past year) to interrupt your agenda and bring this to your attention??? Why? Why is it that a citizen shows more concern and leadership Monday night than most of you (thank you Mr. Christensen for supporting and standing up for Sam Lyon Monday night...I thought Mr. Shobe would also, as he has been vocal in the past for citizen's rights to be heard). I thought you were leaders and had the fortitude to make the right decisions even if it is against your friends/political party???

Do the RIGHT thing and do not attempt to silence or limit the public from input...

Over 100 people crowded around 1 TV (yes, Ms. Raybould people want to SEE and HEAR what was going on inside prior to testifying...give me a break, and think of the people you represent wanting to be heard). How can you allow Ms. Lopez to simply walk away from a situation in which her leadership/answer is VITAL and for what we are paying not out of the realm of her job. How can the Mayor and Ms. Lopez be allowed to say/impose mandates on the residents and then not address an egregious violation within their own building (that was caused by YOU...not the citizens). Call our Mayor and have her show up to address the problem...The citizens could not socially distance...you enabled and encouraged it. You expect citizens to be lined up to the entrance doors waiting because you stay comfortable in the chambers by yourselves?

- 3) *Thank you Lincoln Journal Star for running the article this morning about the recall...I am not surprised, but VERY disappointed in all of you who were up for recall (including Mr. Meginnis who is a Republican who should support what the recall stood for). \$1,500 each from the city council members up for recall and during the recall you didn't DARE disclose that*

you were financing the counter practice??? So you support the people who were screaming things to our female recall volunteers things like “I hope you get raped”, and such? By bank rolling the effort you did just that. If you disagreed with what the LNK Recall effort was doing then be transparent and let your constituents know that you have been funding the counter effort...like I said above **TAKE A STAND AND DO WHAT IS RIGHT!** You didn’t do what was right, you funded a counter effort and acted as if you had no association with *Decline to Sign*. Of course our Mayor used reelection \$\$\$ to protect herself by financing the *Decline to Sign* movement...Ms. Washington / Mr. Shobe / Mr. Christensen...please make a public statement of disassociation with what your fellow council members have done.

Ms. Raybould / Mr. Bowers / Mr. Meginnis / Ms. Ward – Your decisions in the past year (and especially the past few months) have hindered the trust from the people you supposedly represent.

Ms. Washington / Mr. Shobe / Mr. Christensen – We will know in April or May whether you have done enough to continue to represent the citizens of Lincoln. I KNOW you haven’t done everything you should have. If I were on our city council I would have taken a stand, done everything I could to allow the citizens of Lincoln to keep as many freedoms as possible thru the past year, and if it didn’t make me popular...vote me out. To do nothing and allow Lincoln to go into a decline is simply not acceptable and shouldn’t have ever been!

**** Mr. Shobe is good at responding to emails and phone calls by the people he represents (thank you)...how about the rest of you? ****

Scott P. Essink

Cell Number: (402) 239-2782

Angela M. Birkett

From: Samuel Lyon <thefixitguy01@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Council Packet
Cc: Mayor
Subject: Dangerous situation in hallway

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.





Personal Property
Homestead Exemptions
Register of Deeds

Council,

When I spoke before you on February 8th, there seemed to be some confusion regarding the full extent of the consequences of your rule change banishing the public to the hallway. I told you I would send pictures. Please find them attached for your consideration.

Councilperson Raybould seemed confused as to why people might be interested in the meeting going on in the council chambers. The public had come to take part in the meeting and they were restricted from it.

I spoke with two women who left because they were not being accommodated. They had come to watch the meeting, but they were not planning on offering testimony. There was no place for them to safely watch the meeting. One man had trouble hearing from the monitor with the background noise of a busy hallway. Many were uncomfortable crowding around a monitor where no social distancing was possible.

This is obviously a huge problem and needs to be addressed before the next meeting. The public must have access to city council meetings!
Many people I have spoken with said being forced to wait in the hallway makes them feel like you think they are less valuable than those on the Council. Some reflected on the similarities to what it is like in other countries where a monarchy or a dictator is in power. People have to wait outside and are brought in individually. I'm confident this is not your intention and so I wanted to bring it to your attention quickly.

If safety and social distancing is the goal, then it would make sense to have the 18 chairs in the council chambers filled to allow for less people in the hallway. Just because you push the problem into the hallway, doesn't make it magically disappear. In fact, it makes the problem worse. This simply ensures that you just don't have to look at it.

Since the rule change in reality causes less possibility for social distancing, it leaves people to assume that perhaps you just don't want to see the faces of those you represent.

Please let me know how you intend to solve these issues.

Samuel Lyon
Lincoln, NE

Angela M. Birkett

From: Brooke Bateman <BrookeBateman@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:41 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: I want to speak with a council member ASAP.

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,

I'm a very concerned citizen and parent. I live in the northwest part of Lincoln, specifically in the neighborhood where West Lincoln Elementary School resides. I live less than 3/4 of a mile from that school and have a child who attends school there. I was recently made aware that there are two child sex offenders, living together, two houses away from me. I am aware that it is nearly impossible to find a place to live where NO children are present, and that these offenders still need a home to live in. However to live less than a mile from an elementary school seems a bit suspicious.

I was even less pleased when I found out however that the city of Lincoln only requires these offenders to not live within 500 feet of a school. Are you serious? Someone in the city of Lincoln can sexually assault a child and live less than a football field away from a school. Its a shame. It's disgusting. It needs to be changed. Every single house surrounding the offenders home has small children living in it. When I called the police station, the county sheriff, etc, I was told there is nothing that can be done. While I am a firm believer in rehabilitation of criminals (I truly believe most can turn their lives around), the state of Nebraska has labeled these offenders as lifetime offenders. Doesn't that say something? The state thinks they are dangerous enough that they are required to register for the rest of their lives. The city of Lincoln on the other hand, they are going to allow these offenders to live right next door to their target victims. There must be something done about this.

I expect a response from a council member. I would prefer that they email me back to set up a time to speak with them on the phone. However if you would prefer to reach me by phone the number is 402-217-2818.

Thank you,

Brooke Bateman

Angela M. Birkett

From: mark sroczynski <mark.sroczynski@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 12:07 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Sam lion

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Sam Lion brings up a very good point that an agenda item cannot be discussed because it's "pending" on the agenda and pending with no future date.

The point was raised to remove this off the agenda so a person can actually speak as a citizen of Lincoln, but effectively cannot due to a procedural practice to indefinitely keep the topic from being discussed.

Is this really where we are? Cancel any dissenting opinion or voice of people who wish to be heard on a subject that is greater than 300 days old? Is this really the stance and intent of a city council to not allow a topic to be heard.

Clearly this is a process to do that and strongly advocate to vote to remove for public comment.

I actually can't believe this isn't seen by the council and find myself wondering why it's necessary for me to even need to take the time to write this email. What country is this?

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Nicole Lyon <thelyoness86@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 1:55 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Let citizens back in your chambers

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

For weeks and months you have restricted Lincoln's citizens from entering your presence more than one at a time. This is not acceptable.

We are now in yellow and there can be no reason related to safety that would require this action. Especially considering that as it currently stands, citizens are allowed to enter a few at a time and while waiting for the next speaker, rotate through the same few chairs. These chairs are not sanitized between speakers. Out in the crowded halls, those coming to speak to you are forced to huddle around one single TV in an attempt to watch what is happening in your meeting. This additionally puts those desiring to speak to you in additional risk of health.

It may surprise you to know that after so many years of inattention from Lincoln's citizens, a growing number are being negatively affected by the Mayor. They have looked to you as City Council to intervene for them - as that IS your role. Your position was designed to be a check on our city's executive branch and to listen to what the people want/need. However, more and more of us are noticing that you are becoming a check on the people of Lincoln instead. For many years, your uninteresting meetings have not seen the desire of Lincoln's citizens to observe your dealings - That has now changed and it is your responsibility to safely accommodate them. Shoving them all together in front of 1 TV in the hallway while an entire room of seats stand empty is not a reasonable accommodation. Furthermore, it also discriminates against those with visual and hearing disabilities who are unable to see and hear one small TV in the bustle of an extremely crowded hallway.

Which leads us all to ask the question... Was this really for our safety in the first place? Or is it that you didn't want to even see the faces of you have silenced? One might even think the lack of seating, accommodating the viewing and sound from the meeting, etc. might be an attempt on your part to make your constituents as uncomfortable and unaccommodated as possible to discourage them from coming to speak to you at all.

I would appreciate hearing back from each of you with:

- How you intend to remedy this situation
- If you support opening the chambers again
- If the answer above is "no," what are your reasons as well as the facts and statistics supporting your current position

Thank you in advance for your reply,

Nicole Lyon
Lincoln, NE

Angela M. Birkett

From: Mitzy Buchanan <mitzy0718@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 6:53 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: eviction moratorium

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please don't allow renters to go rent free. I have one rental and I have to pay the bank monthly even if my tenants are not paying. I am a semi retired person that is just trying to make it so I won't be a drain on society as I age. If the banks will stop our mortgage payments then I am all for it. I don't have the money to pay two mortgages. This would cause me to sell my rental then what? Go on welfare when I get older? Please remember that not all landlords have a ton of property or money. Thank you for taking the small guy into consideration.

--

Mitzy Buchanan
402.770.2487
Nebraska Realty, Lincoln Ne
REALTOR, GRI
REALTOR EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE AWARD

Angela M. Birkett

From: David B <david@montecristoengdev.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:53 PM
To: Mayor; Council Packet
Subject: Considerations when evaluating and approving actions related to the Lincoln Climate Resiliency Action Plan

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Mayor and City Council Members,

The Climate Resiliency Action Plan that was developed and released last year places a high value on the transition to renewable sources of energy with a strong emphasis on wind and solar. I am all for renewable energy done right.

Below is an email I sent to the Lancaster County Board today specifically addressing the proposed change to offsets (the distance a wind turbine can be from residences) that is currently being considered and the potential health affects that need to be analyzed and assessed.

The end of my email focuses on the configuration of future renewable systems to better align with the needs of LES and how we as customers of use electricity 24x7, not on an intermittent basis as it is generated. This is a very important concept to understand as making renewables function as a baseload generating source like nuclear, coal or natural gas will require the implementation of energy storage systems increasing the CAPEX on these investments by up to 50% and extending the ROI over currently stated project costs and projections.

Like any good risk management plan, diversity is important. I believe the same goes for power generation. Wind and solar are great, however they are not the single "silver bullet". On cold days like today when the wind is not blowing and the solar panels are covered with ice and snow, the ability to generate the needed electricity for our city from cheap and abundant natural gas seems very wise. Advanced natural gas plants with the proper emissions technologies can have very low lifecycle carbon footprints.

Even coal plants with the proper NO_x, SO_x, and carbon sequestration technologies can keep our air fresh and our skies blue.

Power generation technologies improve over time along with their efficiencies. Just because a power generation source is not based on wind or solar does not mean it should automatically be discounted as part of Lincoln's future.

My suggestion to you is to take a measured approach to transitioning our power generation mix by placing the same priority on availability, reliability, and cost to the consumer as is being placed on carbon footprint reductions.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

David R. Blythe

Managing Director

Monte Cristo Engineering & Development



+1-303-330-8547

david@montecristoengdev.com

www.montecristoengdev.com

Lancaster County Board Members,

My name is David Blythe and have worked for power utilities and in the field of renewable energy for the past 35 years.

We work on wind, solar and hybrid power projects globally. We are very familiar with the current issues and regulations in the EU, specifically Germany where they have 5.2 GW of installed onshore wind power.

New projects in Germany are increasing setbacks, not reducing them. The current minimum setback is 1 km (.62 miles) and they are pushing to increase that to 1.2km minimum.

The reason for this is issues with low frequency sound called **"infrasound"**. Infrasound is not well understood and is just one of the potential health effects when in constant close proximity to large-scale wind turbines. Many health effects studies focused on Infrasound are underway world-wide.

The other potential health effects from close proximity to wind turbines include audible noise, EMF, and shadow flicker. Low audible noise of >40 dB(A) contributes to sleep disturbances.

Any planned reductions in wind turbine setbacks by Lancaster County are short-sided, the merits will be debated, and will likely result in litigation as has happened elsewhere.

With the land available in Nebraska and Lancaster County, reducing the setbacks should not be considered as a viable option until further studies are completed and liabilities assessed.

Furthermore, approving ANY wind project in Lancaster Country should include a requirement of a co-located energy storage unit (ie. battery) to ensure the power produced can be supplied on a

continuous, reliable basis. Intermittent power is power, however not the solution we need in Lancaster County.

Thank you for your time and attention to my email.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Robert Borer <robert.borer@doane.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 9:07 AM
To: expert.religion.alive.and.well@ne.leg.gov
Subject: Re: LB637 is infected with medical tyranny, Senator Hunt weighs in with expert religion

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Senator Hunt-

Thank you for your response and the opportunity to further address LB637 and medical tyranny.

#1) You missed, and failed to address, the entire point of my letter—the unconstitutionality of medical tyranny.

#2) Your faith in medical experts with regard to "infectious diseases" and alleged pandemics is naive and misplaced. I have queried your/our state and local so-called "public health experts" (Anthonie and Lopez, if interested) and neither they nor their hotshot lawyers could point me to any science proving SARS-CoV-2 to be a novel deadly contagion. There were already plenty of ways for people to get sick (not the least of which is allopathic medicine itself). All they needed was a narrative so they could fear-monger the population into accepting radical changes to society. Medical science is not a hard science. It's more akin to a cult, a false religion...and I can provide plenty of evidence to support that notion.

#3) What entitles you to make the judgment that medical experts are experts, anyway? Do you know everything they know and don't know? If not, then your judgment is entirely faith-based. The most you can say is that they have a certain degree—in a narrow field of pharmaceutical company indoctrination. That degree does not confer critical thinking skills and immunity to logical fallacies. Nor does it confer integrity and immunity to character flaws and corruption.

#4) Medical expertism is the new religion. People embrace it because it exempts them from having to take personal responsibility for their health. Politicians embrace it because they think it exempts them from having to do the hard work of thinking and making rational arguments. There's no place for it in the Constitution, except as the private religion of your choice. You can't force it on the rest of us. We expect reason, logic and common sense.

The fact that not all "medical experts" agree should be enough to destroy anyone's faith in the religion of medical expertism.

The fact that big pharma requires immunity from liability for vaccine damage should tell you all you need to know about the integrity of modern medicine and its so-called experts.

The fact that pandemic rules aren't consistent from one city and state to the next testifies to the arbitrary and political nature of "public health expert" edicts.

Medical experts can provide counsel, but that is it. They can't make laws, except as an elected member of a legislative body.

#5) I doubt you intended it (I'm sure you were trying to soft-sell the DHMs with euphemistic language/newspeak), but thank you for admitting that DHMs are nothing more than "guidelines." My friends and I will take that to the bank. That's exactly how we've been treating them and will continue to treat them.

Good Day-

Robert J. Borer

On Wed, Feb 17, 2021 at 12:52 PM Megan Hunt <mhunt@leg.ne.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon Robert,

Thank you for your email regarding LB 637. I truly appreciate hearing your perspective on this bill.

The Local Public Health Departments in our state are the experts on public health in their regional areas. They have been on the frontlines in fighting the pandemic and any future pandemics. The current statutes do not allow the local public health departments to issue necessary Directed Health Measures (DHM) within their regions without sign off from the State of Nebraska. This has led to a statewide DHM that does not always align with public health guidelines. LB637 would remove the requirement for the state to sign off on local DHMs.

Throughout the current pandemic, there have been questions of authority in relation to local governments. LB637 also clarifies that local public health departments will have authority over the spread of contagious diseases and other public health-related issues.

Local Public Health Departments are required to have at least one physician on the board, one dentist on the board and one county board member from any county that is within the health district. They also include members of the public who are interested in public health and often include elected municipal representatives and other local stakeholders. The board composition is intended to weigh public health expertise combined with community needs. The local boards of health are subject to the Open Meetings Act and thus require transparency and public input on decisions being made.

I will wait to commit my support for LB 637 until it advances from committee. Bills are often amended and changed after the committee hearing and between rounds of floor debate, and I expect LB 637 to be no exception. I understand that some individuals have concerns about the bill, and I expect them to make their views known to the legislature.

Thank you again for your time and engagement on this issue. Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Best,
Meg

On Wed, Feb 17, 2021 at 11:37 AM Robert Borer <robert.borer@doane.edu> wrote:

Family and Friends-

Nebraska State Senator Tony Vargas, a democrat and NYC transplant, seeks to expand the powers of local Nebraska "health" departments with LB637.

Vargas wants to give unelected local "health" officials "exclusive control and authority over the investigation

of the existence of any contagious or **infectious** disease" and authorize them to "adopt such measures, which shall have the force and affect of law, as [they deem] necessary to limit the spread and ameliorate the presence of such disease within the territorial boundaries of the health department."

Here's the problem. If the performance of our local "health" officials this past year tells us anything at all, it's that they can't be trusted with the power they already have. If they didn't take it upon themselves to abuse their power this past year, they played the puppet and allowed their power to be abused by unscrupulous politicians. They showed no regard whatsoever for the supreme law of the land.

Of course, the corrupt politicians didn't either. But they did swear an oath, and this makes them culpable.

Mr. Vargas appears to fall into this category. No regard for the Constitution, though he swore an oath.

If he did regard it, he wouldn't have proposed LB637. If he did regard it, he would know there is no infectious disease exception in the Constitution to our God-given, inherent and inalienable rights to life, liberty and providing for ourselves and our families. If he did regard it, he would know we are "by nature free and independent."

Listen. We simply don't need his nanny state medical tyranny. Not in this state. Big pharma germaphobia isn't the only way to deal with so-called infectious disease. There are much better ways.

With 27 years behind me as an EMT, I have been in close proximity to many patients with the conditions referenced in state statute as infectious. Not one of these patients ever "infected" me. I never worried any of them would infect me. HIV never concerned me. I was never afraid of germs and I never wore a mask.

I took the same approach, from day one, with regard to the current scamdemic...and I haven't had a sniffle since it started, despite being over 62 (in big pharma's alleged "high risk" category), traveling widely and socializing extensively.

You can deal with health problems in smart ways or in stupid ways, or you can prevent them. I prefer to prevent them, by building health. Germs aren't the problem—association isn't causation. They are certainly no threat to a healthy body and life. Covid mortality stats testify very loudly to that fact. The stats are the signature of chronic degenerative disease, not a contagion.

People compromise their health in a thousand different ways through poverty of character, squalor of behavior and ignorance—i.e., poor lifestyle choices. The best thing a doctor can do is teach. (But medical doctors don't get that kind of training, hence the huge flaw with big pharma "healthcare.") Nothing can make up for poor choices but changing them into good ones. The body is very forgiving, if we quit abusing it and get out of its way. It's self-healing abilities are amazing.

Covid mortality "represents an accelerated mass homicide of immune-vulnerable individuals, and individuals made more immune-vulnerable, by government and institutional actions." -Canadian Physicist Denis Rancourt

LB637 needs to die in committee. Join me in making this happen. If it doesn't, we're going to see more forced/unreliable testing, more forced masking, more forced isolation, more forced business closures and more forced vaccines...

...nevermind more social unrest...because people simply won't stand for such infringements. They are fed up with the arbitrary exercise of power. They intuitively know what the rule of law means and that they have a right to it, corrupt politicians and an otherwise dumbed down populace notwithstanding.

Good Day-

Robert J. Borer

P.S. I also raised six very bright, healthy kids without any help from big pharma doctors and their toxic meds and vaccines.

--

State Senator Megan Hunt

Nebraska Legislature :: 8th District

[Website](#) :: [Twitter](#) :: [Instagram](#) :: [Facebook](#)

State Capitol, PO Box 94604

(402) 471-2722

Angela M. Birkett

From: dmcintosh@neb.rr.com
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 11:51 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Power and Foolishness

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Good day,

I have lived in Nebraska a lot of years, sixties till today. I've lived in the country, small towns and Lincoln. In all that time I have never seen the power purposely shut off unless there was a problem with the local system. That is until this week. In all those years we had hydro, coal and nuclear power plants. Now we looked like a third world country.

It's not doing without power for an hour or unwillingness to help our fellow citizens. I know a little about sacrifice for others. But why, why have we gone backwards? We have always had cycles of cold weather, ice, deep snow. Yes we have had good winters and bad but this is not new. Our friends in Texas know this too. They had the experience, the warnings yet they were caught with their pants down,

Why, two things greed and the relentless crying about climate change. Now I don't believe in pollution yet people still buy water in plastic bottles while worrying about a cow passing gas. Why is this? Because it doesn't affect them if a rancher can't make a living but it does if they can't have their plastic bottle of water. So instead of you live your life and I'll live mine they have to ruin life for everyone.

I see the same thing happened in the power industry. They'll be forced to hear the scream about climate and science but never wonder about the fact the fella telling you this makes his living off of telling you this. Whether it's pay roll from government or a university, grants or some reward in some fashion, this goes on.

My point is we cannot go down this gopher hole. In extreme cold, frozen windmills, solar panels covered in snow and ice and battery powered anything are not going to work. They will not work tomorrow and they will not work decades from now.

One local power company in Nebraska during this cold had windmills producing 3%, yes 3 percent. That's not even enough to much more than power the warning lights on top of them. But this company was smart, they knew this. So what did they do? They thought ahead and they have multiple sources of power; hydro, coal, nuclear, wind, solar. They didn't bet the farm on wind or solar putting the lives of people counting on 25% of their power from wind or solar. They have a broad spectrum of options, reliable options AND they maintain their grid. Texas has not and we as well as them paid for it.

What does Lincoln need to do. Stop listening to people in California who can't even run their own state and have no idea what it's like to live in the cold AND listening to people that make their living telling you the sky is falling when the earth will do what it wants to do and man is no more than an ant in an elephant stampede.

Don't fall into the hole.

Sincerely,
Dale McIntosh

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jim & Deanna McClintick <jdmcc@neb.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 11:37 AM
To: Mayor; Richard W. Meginnis; Bennie R. Shobe; Sandra J. Washington; Roy A. Christensen; Jane Raybould; James M. Bowers; Tammy J. Ward; Council Packet
Subject: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,
Please to not pass the ordinance below. It is not appropriate to be part of a Municipal Code. It would be more appropriate in the state legislature and is quite controversial.

6.u. 21-18

Amending Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to incorporate the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance prohibiting conversion therapy for minors which seeks to change the minor's sexual orientation or gender identity.

21-18 Ordinance.pdf

Thank you for your service,
Deanna McClintick

Angela M. Birkett

From: Seth Brauning <sethjbr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 1:26 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Please Include in the Public Record
Attachments: Opposition to Conversion Therapy Ban Bill.pdf

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,

I am planning on testifying today against the bill that would ban conversion therapy. Please put the attached document into the public record. Thank you.

--
~ Blessings,

Seth Brauning

Angela M. Birkett

From: Roylene Michels <roylenem@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 1:41 PM
To: Mayor; Richard W. Meginnis; Bennie R. Shobe; Sandra J. Washington; Roy A. Christensen; James M. Bowers; Jane Raybould; Tammy J. Ward; Council Packet
Subject: Fwd: FW: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance ??

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

"rmeginnis@lincoln.ne.gov", "bshobe@lincoln.ne.gov", "swashington@lincoln.ne.gov", "rchristensen@lincoln.ne.gov", "jraybould@lincoln.ne.gov", "jbowers@lincoln.ne.gov", "tjward@lincoln.ne.gov", "councilpacket@lincoln.ne.gov"

Cc:

Sent: Monday February 8 2021 12:37:11PM

Subject: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance

Hello,

Please to not pass the ordinance below. It is not appropriate to be part of a Municipal Code. It would be more appropriate in the state legislature and is quite controversial.

6.u. 21-18

Amending Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to incorporate the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance prohibiting conversion therapy for minors which seeks to change the minor's sexual orientation or gender identity. 21-18 Ordinance.pdf

Thank you for your service,
Deanna McClintick

Angela M. Birkett

From: Mindy M. Rush Chipman
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 2:48 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: RE: Proposed Ordinance 21-18; Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

Mindy Rush Chipman

She.Her.Hers
Director of Lincoln Commission on Human Rights
Equity and Diversity Officer | City of Lincoln
P: 402.441.8691 | F: 402.441.6937 | C: 402.326.3637
555 S. 10th Street, Ste. 304
Lincoln, NE 68508



To report illegal discrimination within the City of Lincoln, fill out our [intake questionnaire](#)

From: Mindy M. Rush Chipman <MRushChipman@lincoln.ne.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 2:21 PM
To: Richard W. Meginnis <RMeginnis@lincoln.ne.gov>; Roy A. Christensen <RChristensen@lincoln.ne.gov>; James M. Bowers <JBowers@lincoln.ne.gov>; Tammy J. Ward <TJWard@lincoln.ne.gov>; Bennie R. Shobe <BShobe@lincoln.ne.gov>; Jane Raybould <JRaybould@lincoln.ne.gov>; Sandra J. Washington <SWashington@lincoln.ne.gov>
Cc: Yohance L. Christie <YChristie@lincoln.ne.gov>; Abigail F. Littrell <ALittrell@lincoln.ne.gov>
Subject: Proposed Ordinance 21-18; Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

Chairperson Meginnis and City Councilmembers,

As the Director of the City of Lincoln Commission on Human Rights (LCHR), I had hoped to appear at today's City Council meeting to be available to answer any questions regarding the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance and LCHR's role. Unfortunately, I am quarantining as my oldest daughter returned home from college to isolate after she tested positive for COVID-19. However, I want to convey that LCHR supports all efforts to address and condemn harmful practices that target Lincoln community members, particularly youth, based upon protected characteristics, such as sexual orientation or gender identity, and has the infrastructure and capacity to enforce the ban on conversion therapy for minors as outlined in Ordinance 21-18.

Presently, there appears to be at least 20 states that have some type of anti-conversion therapy laws. These are California, Colorado, Delaware, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Utah. In addition, there are approximately 80 counties or municipalities who have also enacted anti-conversion therapy ordinances.

While I am a licensed attorney, my role with the City is not in such a role. So I would encourage you to seek the legal opinion of City Attorney Christie or Assistant City Attorney Abby Littrell (both cc'd). However, there are some misleading statements in Mr. Brooks' letter that I was provided that I would like to address. First, the cited case of *NIFLA v. Becerra*, 138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018) is not a case where the issue of anti-conversion therapy was decided--rather, the U.S. Supreme Court in *NIFLA v. Becerra* overruled a principle in more positive cases that did find these anti-conversion therapy ordinances permissible (such as *King v. New Jersey*, 767 F.3d 216 (3d Cir. 2014) and *Pickup v. Brown*, 740 F.3d 1208 (9th Cir. 2014)). This principle in *King v. New Jersey* and *Pickup v. Brown* is in both cases the courts distinguished between "professional speech" like those from a therapist and "ordinary speech." So, what this simply means is that any ordinance that the City passes related to the anti-conversion therapy ban will be subject to "strict scrutiny" to see if it is permissible for the City to restrict the "speech" of these therapists practicing conversion therapy under their freedom of speech rights guaranteed to them by the U.S. Constitution. Secondly, while it is true that the Eleventh Circuit in *Otto v. City of Boca Raton*, 981 F.3d 854 (11th Cir. 2020) found an anti-conversion therapy ordinance to be unconstitutional, that decision is an outlier and being challenged on a motion for rehearing before the entire Eleventh Circuit.

What I can tell you are that many municipalities have continued to pass bans on conversion therapy since the *NIFLA v. Becerra* case was decided June 26, 2018. See Anchorage, Alaska:

<https://www.alaskapublic.org/2020/08/27/anchorage-assembly-passes-ban-on-conversion-therapy/>; City of

Louisville, Kentucky: <https://www.courier-journal.com/story/news/2020/09/17/conversion-therapy-metro-council-votes-ban-practice-city/3486560001/>;

Rochester, Minnesota: <https://www.medcitybeat.com/news-blog/2020/rochester-bans-conversion-therapy>;

and Roeland Park, Kansas: <https://shawneemissionpost.com/2020/06/02/roeland-park-becomes-first-city-in-kansas-with-conversion-therapy-ban-93981/>.

And, not only have similar ordinances have been passed, but courts have found them to be constitutional. See *Doyle v. Hogan*, 411 F.Supp.3d 337 (2019) where the U.S. District Court for Maryland decided [September 2019](#) that the conversion therapy for minors ban was constitutional.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.

Best,

Mindy

Mindy Rush Chipman

She.Her.Hers

Director of Lincoln Commission on Human Rights

Equity and Diversity Officer | City of Lincoln

P: 402.441.8691 | F: 402.441.6937 | C: 402.326.3637

555 S. 10th Street, Ste. 304

Lincoln, NE 68508



To report illegal discrimination within the City of Lincoln, fill out our [intake questionnaire](#)

Angela M. Birkett

From: Mathew Shurka <mathew@bornperfect.org>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Richard W. Meginnis; James M. Bowers; Jane Raybould; Tammy J. Ward; Sandra J. Washington; Bennie R. Shobe; Roy A. Christensen; Council Packet
Cc: Shannon Minter
Subject: Support for Conversion Therapy Ordinance
Attachments: BP letter to Lincoln.pdf

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

To Lincoln City Council Members,

Please see attached letter in support to protect LGBT youth from conversion therapy,

Mathew

Mathew Shurka | Co-Founder & Chief Strategist

(Pronouns: he, him, his)

mathew@bornperfect.org

+1 (516) 287-7072

Born Perfect Ending Conversion Therapy

www.bornperfect.org | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

Born Perfect is the leading campaign to end conversion therapy. We are survivors, lawyers, and policy experts working together to protect LGBTQ+ people nationally and around the globe. Born Perfect is a program of the National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR).

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jeff Julie Collins <collinsfamily4jesus@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Amending Ordinance 21-18 -- Sexual identity/Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

City Council Members,

Thank you for serving our community. Although I don't reside in Lincoln, I live near Raymond and am employed in Lincoln.

I am writing to express concerns regarding the proposed amendments to Ordinance 21-18.

First, I would object to the wording on page 9, line 22.

"Contemporary science recognizes that being lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender is part of the natural spectrum of human identity..."

These lifestyle "choices" are not normal, as God created men and women with distinct differences. If a person chooses to go against their natural, God-given design, that doesn't necessarily make it part of the "natural spectrum of human identity". One's choice of how they "identify" sexually does not give them special or protected rights, other than the ones guaranteed to all people.

Second, I disagree with the conclusion found on page 10, lines 7-10

"Sexual orientation or gender identity change efforts or conversion therapy lead to critical health risks..."

The same could be said of those who have chosen an alternate lifestyle choice. Depression and suicide among transgenders and lesbian/gay individuals is alarming. To say that attempting to counsel or inform these individuals who are confused or questioning their sexual identity causes critical health risks is a presumption rather than a factual, data-driven conclusion.

Third, and most concerning, is the "slippery slope" this legislation could lead to.

On Page 9, lines 1-5, the word "*practice*" could be interpreted quite loosely to refer to any teaching or instruction about sexual identity and gender issues. I am especially concerned with how this might impact our church, and its ability to communicate the truth as found in the Holy Scriptures regarding these topics. Churches and pastors across our country have been the targets of censorship, including the requirement of some to submit sermons and teaching materials to government officials. This is an obvious violation of the First Amendment which safeguards not only free speech, but the free exercise of religion.

The phrase "...including, but not limited to..." is also concerning. This leaves the door wide open to a number of other "practices" that the Lincoln Commission on Human Rights could in the future deem "discriminatory". Would my pastor be in violation of this ordinance if he taught what the Bible says about sex, marriage, homosexuality, or any other issue that might be considered "offensive"? Would I, as a father, be silenced by this ordinance so that I was unable to instruct my own children about these sensitive issues?

In conclusion, I would say that I see no need for these amendments to this ordinance. I'm not sure how common this practice of "conversion therapy" is actually, but I can't imagine needing to include it in the growing list of

"discriminatory" acts. I am fearful that this will be just the initial steps leading to other "practices" to silence those in our community that are counter-culture and seen as a threat to a more progressive agenda.

Faithfully submitted,

Jeffrey W. Collins
12801 NW 56th Street
Raymond, NE 68428
(402) 613-4721

--

"The LORD bless you and keep you; The LORD make His face shine upon you,

And be gracious to you; The LORD lift up His countenance upon you, And give you peace."

Numbers 6:24-26

Angela M. Birkett

From: Shannon Minter <SMinter@nclrights.org>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 4:15 PM
To: Mathew Shurka; Richard W. Meginnis; James M. Bowers; Jane Raybould; Tammy J. Ward; Sandra J. Washington; Bennie R. Shobe; Roy A. Christensen; Council Packet
Subject: NCLR letter of Support for Conversion Therapy Ordinance
Attachments: NCLR letter to Lincoln.pdf

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear Council Members:

Attached please find our letter of support for the pending ordinance protecting youth from conversion therapy.

Sincerely,

Shannon Minter
Legal Director
NCLR
www.nclrights.org
(415) 624-6071

Angela M. Birkett

From: Renae Ninneman <renae.overbeek@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 4:40 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Ban Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear Lincoln City Council Members,

My name is Renae Ninneman and I live in Council Person Bowers' district. I support the ordinance to ban conversion therapy within Lincoln City limits for minors 19 and younger. As a resident of Lincoln, I feel strongly about this not being a practice in Lincoln. I do not identify as LGBTQ, but I have spent many many years working with children and teens. I've seen teenagers in a variety of different positions talking about, learning about, and exploring their sexuality. The most happy, confident and powerful kids are the ones who are comfortable in their own skin and proud of their sexuality. Conversion therapy is a dangerous tool used to shame children into being something they cannot and do not want to be. Conversion therapy causes long-term damage and trauma. It must be banned.

I'm a sign of the times. I was raised to believe that being gay was sinful, but having done a 180 degree change, and now I believe that our LGBTQ population are an important and beautiful part of our society. We need to do better to protect our kids from permanent trauma. We need to make Lincoln a safe place for LGBTQ youth. It's easier to prevent trauma than it is to heal it after the damage is done.

I've built my career on coaching the younger generations to grow up to make the world a better place, and this ordinance will only keep the path clear for their indomitable souls to thrive.

--

~Renae Ninneman
901 N 58th St

Angela M. Birkett

From: Mandy <berlin.coyle@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 5:14 PM
To: James M. Bowers; bschobe@lincoln.ne.gov; Jane Raybould; Mayor; Richard W. Meginnis; Tammy J. Ward; Sandra J. Washington; Council Packet
Subject: Ban Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

I am a Lincoln resident, Mandy Berlin Coyle, I speak for myself and only myself. I am not representing any group or organization. I am a licensed mental health provider, school social worker, board member of SIFN (human rights and justice advocacy non-profit), most important I am a parent like many of us.

As a parent we unconditionally love our child/ren. There are no constraints, no IF's. We foster and nurture who they are. We accept and celebrate their identity, their love of music or love of soccer or dogs or comedy. We don't tell them their love is wrong. We don't tell them they need to be fixed. We don't repair human beings!

That is what conversion therapy is, reparative therapy. Being gay is not being broken. Gender variations are not pathological.

Two weeks ago I saw this topic on the agenda, and later that day we had a school LGBT support club, I usually attend, there were about 15-20 teenagers in the room. I asked if any of them were familiar with conversion therapy. A collective wail. It was like I had thrown hot salt water. There was a physical, visceral pain at the mere mention of the word. It hurt to see their faces.

People within the LGBTQAI population seek therapy for the same reasons as anyone else. For depression, anxiety, for feelings of hopelessness. Not because of who they are but because of those around them. The environment is problematic, not the individual. From the moment a child is conceived, and sometimes before we set out a mold for their identity, hopes, dreams, and expectations but when that mold is broken we can feel loss and grief. That's on us.

It's absolutely true that discord can lead to feelings of rejection and self-worth. We know suicide risk is 8 times higher among the LGBT population. I see that in my own daily work right here in Lincoln when I look at my suicide risk reports. They're at 6x higher risk of depression. Homelessness is disproportionately high. Some estimates are 120% more likely. Every week I work with kids who have been kicked out of their house. Every week. In Lincoln. These are KIDS. Why would we do anything that puts harm on this vulnerable population? We shouldn't. More than 20 states have banned conversion or reparative therapy and at least 70 additional cities and counties. Medical and mental health organizations overwhelmingly agree, there is NO NO evidence it works, the evidence actually points to it being harmful.

I am a member of School Social Workers of Nebraska and NASW. NASW's official statement is "People seek mental health services for many reasons. Accordingly, it is fair to assert that lesbians and gay men seek therapy for the same reasons that heterosexual people do. However, the increase in media campaigns, often coupled with coercive messages from family and community members, has created an environment in which lesbians and gay men often are pressured to seek reparative or conversion therapies, which cannot and will not change sexual orientation. Aligned with the American Psychological Association's (1997) position, NCLGB [NASW's National Committee on Lesbian and Gay Issues] believes that such treatment potentially can lead to severe emotional damage. Specifically,

transformational ministries are fueled by stigmatization of lesbians and gay men, which in turn produces the social climate that pressures some people to seek change in sexual orientation. No data demonstrate that reparative or conversion therapies are effective, and in fact they may be harmful."

Most health organizations have similar stances. The

- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
- American Academy of Pediatrics
- American Association for Marriage and Family therapy
- American College of Physicians
- American Counseling Association
- American Medical Association
- American Psychiatric Association and World Psychiatric Association
- American School Counseling Association (ASCA)
- American School Health Association

Ect. Etc. etc.

We don't need to hurt our kids. Please, for their sake, let's ban conversion therapy.

Respectfully,
Mandy Berlin Coyle, LMHP

Angela M. Birkett

From: Harlan Musil <hrmusil@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 5:23 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: U6 initiative to ban Conversion Therapy in Lincoln Nebraska

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

I stand for this Initiative to Ban Conversion Therapy in Lincoln Nebraska.

I have lived in Lincoln for over 40 years and have witnessed the great harm that conversion therapy does to members of the LGBTQ persons.

I have friends and have spoken with young persons who have had the horrors of going thru the conversion therapy treatment and their lives are for ever a struggle afterwards.

The treatment does not work and it leave these individuals with low self esteem, inability to function well in society, they struggle with drug and alcohol addition and never feel the are

Enough. Individuals treated with conversion therapy often do self harm to themselves and others with the end result often leading to suicide.

Lincoln should ban the use of conversion therapy and as it is already banned in many communities already because it's very harmful dangerous practices.

I would move that the State of Nebraska should also ban conversion therapy and it should be banned from the USA entirely.

Sincerely,

Harlan R Musil
2525 Shaunte Ct.
Lincoln Nebraska 68507
402-890-8500

Angela M. Birkett

From: Denise Arnold <darnold4yourbooks@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 5:57 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: I was able to chime in today online and had a few statements

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear All,

No one is being forced into conversion therapy and there for any facility medical and/or religious should be able to continue this therapy.

If anything there have been people who have converted and very happily so and since this is not being forced, it's a choice, no programs should be stopped.

Also on another note we need to stop these ridiculous mask mandates and ensure that no one is forced to get the vaccination through work and travel mandates. Enough is Enough.

thanks
Denise

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jim & Deanna McClintick <jdmcc@neb.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 2:59 PM
To: 'Jim & Deanna McClintick'
Cc: Mayor; Richard W. Meginnis; Bennie R. Shobe; Sandra J. Washington; Roy A. Christensen; Jane Raybould; James M. Bowers; Tammy J. Ward; Council Packet
Subject: RE: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance-voting

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,
Thank you for holding such a long hearing.
Please do not pass this bill for many reasons.
This law was found unconstitutional by the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals and it was also repealed in New York City to avoid facing the court.
We do not want to have to fight this in court.
We need to maintain our freedom of speech and parental rights.
Thank you.
Deanna McClintick

From: "Jim & Deanna McClintick"
To: "Mayor@lincoln.ne.gov", "rmeginnis@lincoln.ne.gov", "bshobe@lincoln.ne.gov", "swashington@lincoln.ne.gov", "rchristensen@lincoln.ne.gov", "jraybould@lincoln.ne.gov", "jbowers@lincoln.ne.gov", "tjward@lincoln.ne.gov", "councilpacket@lincoln.ne.gov"
Cc:
Sent: Monday February 8 2021 12:37:11PM
Subject: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance

Hello,
Please to not pass the ordinance below. It is not appropriate to be part of a Municipal Code. It would be more appropriate in the state legislature and is quite controversial.

6.u. 21-18
Amending Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to incorporate the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance prohibiting conversion therapy for minors which seeks to change the minor's sexual orientation or gender identity.
21-18 Ordinance.pdf

Thank you for your service,
Deanna McClintick

Angela M. Birkett

From: Robert Borer <robert.borer@doane.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 7:22 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Ban on "conversion therapy"

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Council Members-

It would appear Mr. Bowers took an oath to tear down the Constitution rather than support it, and to replace it with rights only for a few...rights for people only like him.

These rights would include sexual activity/promiscuity as a minor, any sexual activity, without interference from parents, teachers, pastors, counselors, politicians, etc. And minors would also have the right to expect society at large to bear the cost for any negative consequences from this activity.

Mr. Bowers would deny that children need to be trained, disciplined, nurtured and educated, morally, mentally and physically.

Mr. Bowers would deny that children are very impressionable, in both good and bad ways, and that many voices, both spiritual and carnal, vie for their attention, and try to get the upper hand, before good character is established.

Mr. Bowers would elevate sexuality to the pinnacle of human identity and experience, rather than reason and mind/soul.

Mr. Bowers would deny that there is any design in our anatomy and physiology.

Mr. Bowers would deny that young people can/should control their passions and appetites.

Mr. Bowers would deny that sexual appetite, like other appetites, can become corrupted, distorted, perverted, addictive and corrected.

Mr. Bowers would allow the passions and appetites of our young to become perverted.

Mr. Bowers would then have them become slaves to those perverted carnal passions and appetites.

Mr. Bowers would deny the pangs of conscience, and blame difficult feelings on others...on those trying to help those who have fallen for a lie.

Mr. Bowers is projecting his own insecurities.

Mr. Bowers wants to add another dimension to the lockdown lunacy. He wants to lock our young in bondage to sin so he doesn't have to deal with his own conscience. Let even one person discover freedom, and it's all over, should he learn of it. The fight is on once again with his own conscience and he can't bear it.

Do I exaggerate? If so, it isn't by much.

What Mr. Bowers ought to do, rather than pursue this ordinance change, is repent.

Thank you for your time.

Robert J. Borer
402.570.2549

Angela M. Birkett

From: Brittany Sanchez <sanchezsevenmom@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I strongly oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because I believe it encroaches on our individual rights as citizens to make these decisions for ourselves. It is a very dangerous path to start down to pass vague legislation that can be applied even to how we run our homes.

Brittany Sanchez

Angela M. Birkett

From: Landon Sanchez <landon.sanchez@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 11:37 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I strongly oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because I believe it encroaches on our individual rights as citizens to make these decisions for ourselves. It is a very dangerous path to start down to pass vague legislation that can be applied even to how we run our homes.

Landon Sanchez

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: raeofsunshine28 <raeofsunshine28@netscape.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 11:51 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Opposed: Conversion therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because it encroaches on individual liberties.

Rachel Akridge

Angela M. Birkett

From: Liz Davids <lizdavids79@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 12:11 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Title 11

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because it is very vague, isn't back explicitly by research done in Lincoln, and doesn't address an explicit need of or harm to our community.

Thank you,

Liz Davids

Angela M. Birkett

From: Melissa Glenn <melissaglenn1402@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 12:58 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I very strongly oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because I believe it encroaches on our individual rights as citizens. It is a very dangerous path to pass vague legislation that can limit what happens even in our own homes.

Melissa Glenn

Angela M. Birkett

From: katie@danpaul.net
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current proposed ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because the language is vague and could restrict people that are genuinely seeking help. There are many root issues and one possible cause could be trauma. The proposed ordinance could have damaging effects on people that are seeking help or treatment where the root cause was trauma.

The fact is that people are all different and many situations are complicated and may need therapy to help sort out the issues. This ordinance could prevent therapists from even attempting to help or talk to individuals that desperately need it because it might fall under this very broad and undefined ordinance.

Please consider what would be in the best of interest of all individuals, including those who could genuinely be seeking treatment or therapy to deal with root cause issues.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katie Paul
402-499-6779

Angela M. Birkett

From: Ashley Mason <masonhouse.1005@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:32 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because it would completely restrict anyone from even looking into the possibility that trauma ect might be the root cause of and allowing them to process that trauma.

This ordinance is also extremely vague and undefined and could be used to implement in not only licensed therapies but also in ministries and even families.

Is is extremely concerning! The fact is humans are complicated and everyone is so very different.

My hope is that you will see my opposition and vote against this Ordinance.

Thank you,

Ashley Mason

Angela M. Birkett

From: Kati Miller <mrskatimiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:38 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Bill

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because it will have many unintended consequences if passed. There will be victims of sexual abuse that will feel like they cannot get help anywhere if someone of the same sex has been the abuser. Persons who feel that they do not want same sex attraction and would like help for those feelings would not be able to seek out how to change their thought processes through counseling in private places, such as mental health professionals, church counselors/ministers, and peer counselors. This is a harmful legislation to consider because it is not a clear cut issue. It is vague and can be used to harm the people it intends to help-the vulnerable and potentially confused.

Please do your best to see that this does not pass, as it will hurt those populations that it intends to help. These matters need to stay between client and helper, and not have legislation introduced to limit, restrict, or eliminate hope-giving counsel. It doesn't matter if you are pro LGBTQIA+ or not, as this has the potential to harm more than help those who do not want to experience SSA or have been sexually exploited by someone of the same sex and have trauma and confusion from those experiences.

Yours truly,

Kati Miller

Angela M. Birkett

From: Adam and Racheal Steinke <arsteinke@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:42 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because I believe people should have the freedom to seek any treatment they desire. Please consider your vote carefully.

Adam Steinke

Angela M. Birkett

From: Katie Lamarque <ktlamarque@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:57 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Concerned Conservative

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for prohibiting conversion therapy because it infringes upon my religious freedom and restricts citizens from making choices for themselves about what is right and wrong.

This ordinance is vaguely defined and my fear is that it could be implemented in not only licensed therapists but also in churches, ministries and even families. It is extremely concerning.

Thank you.

--

Katie Lamarque

Angela M. Birkett

From: JAIME SCHMIDT <timmyjam75@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Opposition to ordinance for prohibiting conversion therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered to prohibit conversion therapy because this ordinance could hamper councilors and guides and even families who want to talk through trauma with people who need to discuss the root causes of their issues. This ordinance is against the ability of those in a position to help, keeping them from being able to speak freely with those seeking to talk through their deepest feelings and desires. It is against families, places of fellowship, and counselors who love to help people by putting limits around what they can discuss and work through together.

Sincerely, Jaime Schmidt

Angela M. Birkett

From: judithgibson@inebraska.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 6:04 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Hearing on ordinance banning conversion therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

We watched the hours-long hearing on the conversion therapy ban proposal on the 5th. I admire the patience and civility of you all while you listened. I was especially insulted by those who came to give a sermon and those who spoke long minutes, while acknowledging not knowing what the proposal is.

I'm just wanting to let you know that I appreciate your good work.
Thanks.

Judith Gibson
1045 N. 41st St.
Lincoln

Angela M. Birkett

From: Tracie Beck <traciesbeck@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 9:37 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Oppose ordinance on conversion therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because it is extremely vague and undefined and could be implemented in not only licensed therapists but also to churches, ministries and even families. It is extremely concerning, as it would completely restrict anyone from even looking into the possibility that trauma, etc. might be the root cause and allowing them to process that trauma. This ordinance would alienate those who are not actually LGBTQ themselves and simply need talk therapy to work through things.

The fact is, humans are complicated and everyone is so very different. Generally speaking, who knows and cares more for someone than their parents? Or even their therapist who talks with them and knows their deepest thoughts? I completely acknowledge that there are always outliers where abuse and hurt happens. However, I expect this is the exception and not the rule. How many people could this ordinance affect? What are the unintended consequences? How many people might never get the help they need because therapists are anxiously avoiding pressing into anything that might fall under this very broad and undefined ordinance?

We often hear of the high depression and suicide rates in the LGBTQ community - if this ordinance passes, I fear that we will see it increase due to those who are unable to get the talk therapy they need to deal with trauma.

Thanks for hearing our voices,

Tracie Beck
6720 S Bermuda Dr
Lincoln, NE 68506

Angela M. Birkett

From: Kay Moore <kaydbug1@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 9:39 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because it would completely restrict anyone from even looking into the possibility that trauma, etc. might be the root cause and allowing them to process that trauma. This ordinance is extremely vague and undefined and could be implemented in not only licensed therapists but also to churches, ministries and even families. It is extremely concerning.

Kay Moore
5720 S 77th Street
Lincoln, NE 68516

Angela M. Birkett

From: Crystal Brown <dynamitecrystals@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 10:09 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: title 11 for conversion therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

This is aimed at Youth who are going through confusing situations.
Youth need guidance/mentors even those who do not share the same views
Transitioning at a young age is most likely irreversible damage
Walt Heyer is a man who was a transgender for 8 years and has a lot of
regret and here is his website <https://sexchangeregret.com/>

We need to stop being so "politically correct" that we loose sight of what is right and wrong. We are loosing sight of ourselves and beliefs. Our choices we make today could have strong repercussions in the future. God willing we make the right choices and not lead our children and youth down the wrong path. We should be here to guide them to what is right or wrong, not just go along with young people who have no idea that the choice they make in doing so, changes them for their lifetime and it's not just something temporary or like pretend play.

Thank You,
Crystal McCoy

Angela M. Birkett

From: christy gribble <endlessjoy777@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 4:55 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for banning conversion therapy because I believe in free choice of lifestyle for every individual. No one should tell another person who to be or how to live, and if a person wants this type of therapy they should be free to receive it.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Emmy J <miss-emmy@live.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 7:18 AM
To: Council Packet
Cc: Rick
Subject: Ordinance on Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because some young people with LGBTQ+ tendencies don't WANT to have those feelings. There is still no scientific evidence that children are "born" LGBTQ+ Sometimes, they experienced trauma and feel they way they feel because of it. (Sexual Assault or Abuse for instance) It will open the door for other useful therapies to be banned in the future. What if my child thinks they are dog or likes killing people or torturing animals are we to just ignore that and say, it is who they are & we need to embrace it?! As a Foster Mom and spouse of a Mental Health worker, I can tell you that the city IS not the one to be making this decision.

Thank You,

Emily Pollen
1334 Rose St.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Nicole Lyon <thelyoness86@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 7:33 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Ordinance regarding conversion therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello City Council,

I wanted to email and let you know what I think about your ordinance for conversion therapy. I watched your last meeting online and it broke my heart to hear testimony after testimony of hurt people telling of their experiences. There is real hurt there in the LGBTQ community that must be acknowledged.

My biggest concern is how broad and undefined the ordinance is. It includes cruel and inhumane things like shock therapy. Something that I agree absolutely should not be done - but that is also something that does not really happen anymore making an ordinance such as this one unnecessary.

It also seems to include any talk therapy that does not completely encourage them to the LGBTQ identity. I'm extremely concerned about this especially after chatting with my friend who also lives here in Lincoln. Prior to moving here, her daughter in 9th grade was bullied by another girl who took advantage of her and used bully tactics to try to convince her that she was a lesbian. Her daughter spiraled into depression and eventually attempted suicide. Thankfully, they got her the help she needed through talk therapy where she was able to sift through all the hurt and find that she was not actually a lesbian and to see the damage that the other girl had done. She was able to find the truth of who she was and in her case, her truth was that she was heterosexual.

Isn't that what the LGBTQ community is all about? Finding your truth? What if this happened to my friend's daughter after an ordinance was in effect? Would she have been able to find her truth or would her therapist have been afraid to explore the option that in this instance, she was not LGBTQ but it was instead trauma?

What about the groups of teenagers who think it's something cool to do? Statistically speaking, it's likely that not each and every one of them are LGTBQ, right? Is it even remotely possible that even one of them are just a victim of peer pressure? If so, would they even be able to get the help they needed to find their truth?

The fact is, humanity is complicated and messy and everyone is so very different. Generally speaking, who knows and cares more for someone than their parents and their therapist? I completely acknowledge that here are always outliers where abuse and hurt happens. However, I expect this is the exception and not the rule. How many people could this ordinance effect? What are the unintended consequences? How many people might never get the help they need to find the truth of who they really are because therapists are anxiously avoiding pressing into anything that might fall under this very broad and undefined ordinance?

Is the goal to get as many people in the LGBTQ community as possible? Or is it to help as many people find the truth of who they are, whatever that is - mind, body and soul? If the first option is the goal, this ordinance seems the obvious choice. But if the latter is the goal, we must allow for therapists to have freedom and not worry about repercussions could happen should they explore this area of their clients lives.

Councilman Bowers, I can see you have a big heart for helping people. I can also see that the LGBTQ community is especially full of hurts. I would caution you that in attempting to help, you may in turn doom a whole group of people who cannot get the help they need to find the truth of who they really are. You speak of the high depression and suicide rates in the LGBTQ community - if you pass this ordinance, I fear that we will see it increase due to those who are unable to find the truth of who they are.

I hope you each will consider opposing this ordinance - not out of an affront to the LGBTQ community- but rather out of a goal to allow therapists the freedom to help each and every client the way they personally need, to find the truth of who they are and what they were meant to be.

Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts,

Nicole Lyon
Lincoln, NE

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lynnette Hendrickson <nette6132@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 7:53 AM
To: Council Packet

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because this ordinance is extremely vague and undefined. It is an extremely concerning situation when this could be applied to any conversation anyone has, rather than to a specific harmful therapy. Please do not pass this ordinance as it is.

Thank you,

Lynnette Hendrickson

Angela M. Birkett

From: Barbara Bailey <bnb297@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 9:04 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: LBGQ Conversion Therapy

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,
I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because
It is too vague and will interfere with professional therapy in regards to trama and hinder discussion among
people learning and accepting.

Barbara N Bailey
Po Box 5712
Lincoln

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Angela M. Birkett

From: Rachel Gaarder <Rachel.Gaarder@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2021 10:40 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Ban - 6U

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please do not approve the proposed ban on conversion therapy. This unconstitutional ban is a threat to our constitutional rights to freedom of speech and religion.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Stephen Ackerman <sackerman@neheart.com>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 6:43 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: conversion therapy ban

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

i oppose the conversion therapy ban.

Stephen Ackerman, M.D.
Electrophysiologist
Nebraska Heart Inst

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

NOTE: This email and attachments contain information that may be confidential or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, notify the sender at once and delete this message completely from your information system. Further use, disclosure, or copying of information contained in this email is not authorized, and any such action should not be construed as a waiver of privilege or other confidentiality protections.

Caution: This email is both proprietary and confidential, and not intended for transmission to (or receipt by) any unauthorized person(s). If you believe that you have received this email in error, do not read any attachments. Instead, kindly reply to the sender stating that you have received the message in error. Then destroy it and any attachments. Thank you.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Dan Reinig <danielreinig@aim.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 8:54 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Please oppose the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Daniel Reinig, and I live in Lincoln at 859 S 40th St. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them. These are decisions that should not be imposed on families or individuals by politicians.

Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.

Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.

In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.

This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.

The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lydia Nielsen <lydianielsen519@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 9:07 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Lydia Nielsen, and I live in Lincoln at 8520 Fremont Street. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients. We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them. With this, In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality. The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Best,

Lydia Nielsen

Angela M. Birkett

From: Neal Bloomquist <nkktab@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 9:31 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is **Neal Bloomquist**, and I live in Lincoln at **4410 Ash Hollow Ct.** I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Neal Bloomquist

Angela M. Birkett

From: Aaron Offutt <aoffutt@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 9:25 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: OPPOSE YOUTH MENTAL HEALTH PROTECTION ORDINANCE

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Aaron Offutt, and I live in Lincoln at 5935 Elkcrest Drive. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Aaron Offutt

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jeffrey Scheich <jscheich5262@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 9:40 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance - Please oppose adoption

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

My name is Jeffrey Scheich 5141 Larkwood Rd, Lincoln, NE 68516

I'm writing to ask you to oppose the adoption of this Ordinance. The purpose of the Ordinance is laudable - but the results of adoption will be precisely the opposite of what is intended. The Ordinance will NOT protect youth mental health - in fact, it will do just the opposite.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect.

This ordinance does not do that. It in fact prohibits individuals and families from choosing the counseling goals which are best for them, and prohibits counselors from providing counseling that the counselee desires.

This ordinance prohibits the free exercise of religion and the freedom of speech, using the power of government to limit both the counselee and the counselor.

I urge you to oppose the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

Thank you.

Jeff Scheich

Angela M. Birkett

From: Sheri Wiemann <sherisheri@juno.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 9:35 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Sheri Wiemann and I live in Lincoln at 2432 Washington #2. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.

Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Vern Halstrom <vhalstrom@ymail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:09 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Oppose Title 11

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

As

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: edwardwnewland@gmail.com
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:17 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Oppose Young Mental Health "Protection" Ordinance!

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Edward Newland and I live in Lincoln at 1237 C street, apartment 6. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.

Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.

Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.

Best,

Edward

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jerome Rossow <jeromerossow@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:18 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

City council members,

I am Jerome Rossow, 2915 Coronado Dr, Lincoln, NE. I hope you read this whole email and not delete it! Please oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that I believe would violate free speech and religious freedom for counselors and parents and their children

There are many options for counseling that are available. If you disagree with what is being said, go elsewhere. Youth can express their feelings and find someone who will direct them to a different counselor.

To me the biggest problem is the assault on free speech and making decisions for what I feel is best for my family. We can make all kinds of laws and the world will not be perfect even though we wish this would be so. We are all flawed human beings and my discussions and yours are not always perfect. This "law" is an example. I am retired and worked with young people for many years. Growing up is tough and especially today in our culture. We need compassion for all people. Thank you for reading this.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Vern Halstrom <vwhalstrom@ymail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:21 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Subject: Title 11

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

My name is Victoria L. Halstrom. I live at 3716 Briarwood Ave., Lincoln, NE and I oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protector Ordinance that would violate the freedom of speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and patients.

The City Council should not be allowed to pursue this avenue as it is in direct violation of the United States of America freedom of speech and religion.

Please oppose this ordinance for the sake our children.



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lauri Coke <dclc2006@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:18 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Lauri Coke and I live in Lincoln at **1271 Hawkfly Rd.**

I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

Thank you,
Lauri

Angela M. Birkett

From: Amy Rung <amyrung@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:26 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Amy Rung, and I live in Lincoln at 5310 Woodland Avenue. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Respectfully,
Amy Rung
Amy Rung
402-617-0045
amyrung@gmail.com

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jim & Deanna McClintick <jdmcc@neb.rr.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:39 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, City Representatives,
Thank you for your service and the hearing on this issue.
The below expresses my concerns. Also, I feel it is the role of the city council to govern the city, not to get into social issues that are diverse and controversial.

Under the proposed "Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance," a child simply talking with a counselor about his or her feelings, experiences, and relationships in a way that changes or diminishes their same-sex attraction or gender identity perception would be illegal.

If this ordinance passes, licensed counselors and psychologists would only be allowed to affirm transgenderism and same-sex attraction in children.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.

Please consider views and represent us.

Jim and Deanna McClintick 7839 Agatha Dr Lincoln Ne 68516

Angela M. Birkett

From: Nancy Pekny <npekny@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:44 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please Do NOT pass this bill. I work for a mental health counselor and this would be detrimental not only to mental health counselors and others but more importantly to the kids/people who they are trying to help. Please, please think of the kids! They are the innocent ones we are trying to help and protect. Many of us will for sure be watching how you vote! Thank you!

Blessings!
Nancy Pekny

Angela M. Birkett

From: Danette Matty <danettematty@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:44 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Please oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,

My name is Lisa D. Matty and I live in Lincoln at 5224 Cameron Ct. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

L.D. Matty

Angela M. Birkett

From: Nancy Pekny <npekny@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:47 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Nancy Pekny and I live in Lincoln at 7521 S 29th St. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Blessings!
Nancy Pekny

Angela M. Birkett

From: Sandra Hilsabeck <shilsabeck@neb.rr.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:52 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Sexual orientation

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear Council members,

There are many movies, tv shows, and other media and communications out in this world today that promote choosing your sex. God chose our identity while we were in the womb. He knows us before we are born. We all have different feelings and can use them to be the best person we can be as God made us. We need counselors, pastors, parents and others to teach the way of our Lord. Please don't take that away from us and our children.

The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

Sandra Hilsabeck-Hastings

9223 Pioneer Court

Lincoln NE 68520

402-770-4289

Angela M. Birkett

From: Tony Pekny <tpekny75@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:58 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is **Anton Pekny and** I live in Lincoln at 7521 S 29th St I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: jim wharry <jimconch@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 11:01 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is James V Wharry, and I live in Lincoln at 7415 Tiffany Rd #4, Lincoln, NE 68506. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

James V. Wharry

Angela M. Birkett

From: Bill Heckathorn <bill@flyperformance.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,

My name is Bill Heckathorn and I'm a resident of Lincoln, NE. (6744 Glass Ridge Dr.)

I'm emailing to ask you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Ordinance.

One of the beautiful things about our country is our freedoms and religious rights which have lead to a wonderfully diverse society.

Please preserve the religious freedoms of others including Jews, Muslims, and Christians who may approach this difficult issue differently.

All the best,
Bill

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Larry Elias <lcelias5@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 12:53 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Larry Elias and I live in Lincoln at 7621 Karl Drive. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be able to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. The sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your attention and for considering my request.

Larry Elias

7621 Karl Drive
Lincoln, NE 68516

402.499.9083

www.larryeliasconsulting.com

<https://www.facebook.com/larryeliasconsulting/>

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/larry-elias-712a8045/>

Angela M. Birkett

From: David Stempson <davidstempson1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 12:55 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: YMHPO

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

My name is Dave Stempson a retired Asst U S Attorney. I don't think I have ever seen a proposal that violates the First Amendment in every way possible such as this and thus, is totally unconstitutional. This is the United States of America where individuals still, at least for now, have constitutional protections and this proposal takes all those protections away. This is not Russia!

Sent from my iPad

Angela M. Birkett

From: Mark Canfield <mdcanfield@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 12:49 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: proposed "Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance"

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Absolutely, 100%, opposed to the idea of the city Council legislating in a way that violates free-speech. No ordinance should force people to only one viewpoint.

Please oppose the youth mental health protection ordinance.

Mark Canfield

Angela M. Birkett

From: jeffvidra@windstream.net
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 1:00 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Title 11

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

please do not amend Ttitle 11 Thank you Jeff Vidra 2701 S. 75th Street 402-486-4432

Angela M. Birkett

From: Susan Jagoda <susan_jagoda1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 1:53 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Coercive legislation

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Susan Jagoda, and I live in Lincoln at **2432 South 18th Street**. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect.

****We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.****

Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.

Counselors shouldn't be used as tools to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

**** My problem is that you say you don't want to be coercive, but you don't seem to mind being coercive with counselors, or with those who might want to change their feelings or behavior. Yet these are the very reasons why people see a counselor in the first place! It seems as though there is one set of rules for people who agree with this legislation, and a different set for those who disagree. Coercive? Yes indeed!** sj**

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

Angela M. Birkett

From: Crystal Boysen <crystalboysen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 2:06 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Crystal Boysen, and I live in Lincoln at 5930 Elkcrest Dr. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Crystal Boysen

Angela M. Birkett

From: D Moore <dlminthevine@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 2:11 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Darlene Lucille Moore, and I live in Lincoln at **7150 Holmes Park Rd Apt 218, Lincoln, Ne 68506** I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Darlene Lucille Moore

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: genita@1791.com
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 2:29 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Gene Herzberg, and I live in Lincoln at 410 Cottonwood Dr.. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Catherine Nelson <catherine.nelson10@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 2:42 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Catherine Nelson, and I live in Lincoln at 6600 Franklin St. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Erin Rodriguez <erincoleen@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 3:09 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Erin Rodriguez, and I live in Lincoln at 886 Elmwood Ave. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Although the words in this email have been copied and pasted, I agree with every word. I couldn't have said it better if I came up with the text myself.

Thank you!

Erin Rodriguez

Angela M. Birkett

From: pqliess38 <pqliess38@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 3:43 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Ordinance on sex change counseling

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please drop any and all thoughts about passing this ill conceived ordinance.

Thanks Paul Liess

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Wanda OToole <gmasgr8@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 4:25 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Please do not amend Title 11

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, our names are Michael and Wanda O'Toole and we live in Lincoln, at 934 Benton Street, Lincoln NE 68521. We are contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.

Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.

This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.

We sincerely wish for our voice to be heard in this matter and appreciate you making the matter at hand a constitutional one.

Mr. Michael W. O'Toole

Mrs. Wanda L. O'Toole

Angela M. Birkett

From: Ben Feuerborn <jmanu96@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 4:48 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: This ain't right..

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Ben Feuerborn, and I live here in Lincoln. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

God bless and have a great day!
Ben Feuerborn

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lyle Middendorf <lyle.middendorf@licor.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 5:23 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Please oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Lyle Middendorf, and I live in Lincoln at 1311 Evergreen Dr. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

--

Lyle Middendorf
Senior VP and Chief Technical Officer
[LI-COR Biosciences](#)
4647 Superior St., Lincoln, NE 68504

lyle.middendorf@licor.com
402-467-0732 (direct)

Angela M. Birkett

From: Glenda Ward <glward2012@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 5:47 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is **Glenda Ward**, and I live in Lincoln at **4335 N. 1st Street Apt. 208**. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Sincerely,
Glenda Ward
4335 N. 1st Street Apt. 208
Lincoln, NE

Angela M. Birkett

From: Brent <pbjams51@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 6:10 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Brent Peekenschneider and I live in Lincoln at 4244 Everett Street. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different

beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Anita <anitalkey@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 7:20 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please consider my concern about this Ordinance. It violates religious rights and freedom of speech of counselors and their patients.

I am opposed to this ordinance , please consider the damage done in mental health if the counselors ability to help our people no longer have the freedom to do so. Thank you, Anita Key

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Chuck Myers <cdandlimyers@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2021 8:30 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Upcoming vote on Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Charles Myers, and I live in Lincoln at 2912 N 60th. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: Lynette Berry <berry.lynette@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 6:17 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

[Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance](#)

Hello, my name is **Lynette Berry** and I live in Lincoln. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith

who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Angela M. Birkett

From: Robert Borer <robert.borer@doane.edu>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 8:07 AM
To: mhilgers@leg.ne.gov; awishart@leg.ne.gov; Adam Morfeld; Suzanne Geist; mhansen@leg.ne.gov; ppansingbrooks@leg.ne.gov; ebostar@leg.ne.gov; mdorn@leg.ne.gov; tbrandt@leg.ne.gov; Council Packet; Mayor
Subject: Partners in crime

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Good Morning Friends, Family and Fellow Citizens-

I see that Lord Leirion has endorsed James Bowers' radical agenda to sexualize our youth...that is, to promote sexual activity and promiscuity of all kinds (natural and unnatural) amongst our community's minors...your, mine and our neighbor's children and grandchildren.

Not only should Bowers and Leirion be censured for promoting such nonsense, they should be denounced, for putting both the present and future physical, mental and emotional health of our youth at risk.

Not every child has the protection of good parents. But even when they are so graced, their parents shouldn't have to worry about such subversive ideas being crammed down their throats when they are out of sight and/or at "school."

Bowers and Leirion will attempt to push this agenda through on the 22nd in the Lincoln City Council Chamber. They could use a piece of your common sense- and virtue-loving mind before then. (I know not all that are included in this notice are of that mindset.)

The best way to make your thoughts known at this point is by sending them to the following address:
councilpacket@lincoln.ne.gov

Please forward to any like-minded friends and family.

Respectfully-

Robert J. Borer

Bcc: friends, family, community and state leaders, fellow citizens....

Angela M. Birkett

From: Marge Rudd-Hillhouse <mrudd2020@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 8:18 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Opposition to Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

My name is Marjorie Kathryn Rudd-Hillhouse of 2020 Surfside Drive here in Lincoln, and I strongly urge the City Council to not amend Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to incorporate this ordinance that infringes on the right of free speech. By limiting counselors to only affirm transgenderism and same-sex attraction for children is forcing counselors to not use their God-given right to free speech and is illegal in this nation.

Thank you for standing for the freedoms guaranteed in our Constitution.

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Gary Knaub <stepabov@netzero.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 8:43 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,

My name is Gary Knaub, and I live in Lincoln at 5508 M St., Lincoln, NE 68510. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Thank You, Have a Great Day!

Gary Knaub

Angela M. Birkett

From: Larry Middendorf <larrymiddendorf@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 11:09 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: A request to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council members,

Our names are Larry and Penny Middendorf and we are long-time Lincoln residents and we live at 7632 Ali Drive.

We are contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

We urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering our request.

Sincerely,

Larry and Penny Middendorf

Angela M. Birkett

From: Ed Nix <moginy@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 1:49 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: New Ruling

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Ed Nix, and I live in Lincoln at 5600 Dogwood Dr. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Blessings,

Ed Nix

Angela M. Birkett

From: Amanda Owens <amandaalowens@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 3:58 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear City Council,

I oppose the current ordinance being considered for conversion therapy because I have seen the good that conversion therapy can do. At the same time I have seen how a belief that conversion therapy was bad and the refusal to use it has been negative. I myself in highschool had a few friends go through a time where they questioned their sexuality. I felt pressured into this 'movement' of questioning, but thankfully I had the option of talk therapy with a social worker from school and through that I was able to see how this was not a questioning for me, as much as me just feeling 'left out' of this phenomenon/ social fad that swept through our highschool.

Of those friends who 'questioned' their sexuality due to this fad I had 2 of 5 friends who went on to decide that they were definitely gay. Of those 2 friends both of their families just accepted them for who they 'were'. They were never bullied for it and went on with their lives. A few years after high school one of those friends came to the realization that he was not indeed gay, he felt so much regret and anger becoming so depressed due to the unhappiness of their new reality that they took their own life. It is my (and others) firm belief that if he had the option of the therapies that I searched out (that he was refused due to his family pushing for acceptance over discussion) he would still be with us.

There are many things covered under this ordinance that can be extremely healthy and helpful for our youth today. Please do not let this go through, I believe the consequences may have dire consequences.

Thank you for your time,
Amanda Owens

Angela M. Birkett

From: Ronald Helsing <helsingr@windstream.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 4:37 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

This ordinance is the exact opposite of what it says. It is actually the Youth Mental Health Destruction Ordinance!!! Anyone who votes for it will never receive my support of any kind in the future!!

Why would you ever want to ruin the future for unsuspecting young people???

THINK!!!! Before you vote!!!

Ron Helsing

7644 Baldwin Ave

Angela M. Birkett

From: kacingega <kacingega@ymail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 6:26 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: oppose Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Kaci Ngega, and I live in Lincoln at **1635 N 25 Street**. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients..

- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Shelley Castinado <weluvcats2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 6:34 PM
To: Mayor; Richard W. Meginnis; Bennie R. Shobe; Sandra J. Washington; Roy A. Christensen; Jane Raybould; James M. Bowers; Tammy J. Ward; Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,
Please do not pass the ordinance below. It is not appropriate to be part of a Municipal Code. It would be more appropriate in the state legislature and is quite controversial.

6.u. 21-18
Amending Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to incorporate the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance prohibiting conversion therapy for minors which seeks to change the minor's sexual orientation or gender identity.
21-18 Ordinance.pdf

Thank you for your service,
Roshelle Castinado

Angela M. Birkett

From: Scott Kerr <skerr5179@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 7:57 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Opposed to the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear members of the Lincoln City Council,

As a resident of the city of Lincoln, I am opposed to the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance as I under it to be currently proposed to restrict the interaction between licensed, professional counselors and their clients.

Please do not vote in support of this proposal.

Robert S Kerr
5111 S Bristolwood Lane
Lincoln, NE 68516

Angela M. Birkett

From: Wayne Arnold <ne.sunandfun@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 8:04 PM
To: Council Packet

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

I'm Wayne Arnold I live in Lincoln @5210 Ervin. I am contracting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients. Wayne Arnold

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lisa Caha <lgummere96@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 8:36 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Lisa Caha and I live in Lincoln at 6925 Whitewater Lane. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.

Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.

In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Kris B. <kris.bloomquist@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2021 9:38 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is **Krystal Bloomquist**, and I live in Lincoln at **4410 Ash Hollow Ct**. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Krystal Bloomquist

Angela M. Birkett

From: Tricia Hiltgen <queenlatricia@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 12:34 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Amendment Changes Title 11, 21-18

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Council members,

I am writing to you in regards to the amendment changes in Title 11 for 21-18 regarding conversion therapy for people 19 years old and younger. The change in this bill is concerning because it does not allow for conversation to occur. The teenage years can be a difficult season to navigate, especially alone. The more conversation is allowed the better. It is not a good rule to live by to silence one or more groups of people's Constitutional freedoms because one does not agree with them.

My biggest concern of this amendment is the youth who consider themselves transgender and want to start hormone therapy. During this young age they are still going through puberty. Some medications or treatments they take may not be reversible. Walt Heyer is a man who lived a transgendered life for years as a woman. He is not the only one who regretted his choice. Please visit his website called sexchangeregret.com and read the scientific information and first hand experience.

Also, the amendment claims "the City of Lincoln has a compelling interest in protecting the physical and psychological well-being of minors, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth and in protecting its minors against exposure to serious harm caused by sexual orientation or gender identity change efforts or conversion therapy" (Section 11.09.010, Item 2, Lines 10-13). We know that electroshock therapy is not common practice and I want to go on record saying that electroshock therapy is inhumane and should not be done to any person, but this is not stated in this amendment. Section 11.09.010, Item 2, Lines 10-13 implies that the City of Lincoln (or the government) knows what is best to do for the youth of the city instead of the parents/guardians. The City of Lincoln does not have the authority to take parental control over all of the youth of Lincoln, even those who are not in the LGBTQ community.

Parents/guardians are also interested in the total well-being of the youth they were entrusted to care for.

I implore you not to approve this amendment for the sake of the youth.

Let them talk and have conversation freely. Additionally, if you decide to move forward in adjusting the amendment please consider another public hearing to address the changes.

Thank you,
Tricia Hiltgen

Angela M. Birkett

From: Debra Kerr <dkerrtwin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 7:58 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Ordinance to Amend Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Good Morning,

My name is Debra Kerr and I live at 5111 S Bristolwood Lane in Lincoln. I am sending this email to ask you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that I believe would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of patients and their counselors.

I believe all people should be treated with respect and dignity no matter what their gender identity or sexual orientation is. But I also believe that individuals and families should have the freedom to choose the counseling that is best for them. This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling.

I respectfully ask you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Debra Kerr

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lyle Middendorf <lyle.middendorf@licor.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: 'Transition' Treatment Harms Kids, Psychiatrist at UK Gender Clinic Says

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please read and consider the physical and mental health of our children. You have all been put in a position of authority and responsibility, and your decisions will be judged according to the impact on our society and by Almighty God...Lyle Middendorf

https://www.dailysignal.com/2021/02/09/transition-treatment-harms-kids-veteran-psychiatrist-at-uk-gender-identity-clinic-says/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=transition-treatment-harms-kids-veteran-psychiatrist-at-uk-gender-identity-clinic-says?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=MorningBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiTkROa1I6WTVNVGczTnpWbSIsInQiOiJ6OVVRNjlxG5scmo2eG9uTkJES0N1XC9SWXpnODdvMVk3Z1NBXC9yQW5TVDRlZ1I3OE9lZVExb24wMGV1clRMemFCdXZ1THV0YUITXC9KdnpIMDNzTEs5ODVNVctEa09UK0lzWDE5eFFWNFgwUG5ObjM3VW1VQUxyTlhONitEVyJ9

'Transition' Treatment Harms Kids, Veteran Psychiatrist at UK Gender Clinic Says

[Nicole Russell](#) / [@russell_nm](#) / February 09, 2021

<iframe src="//www.googletagmanager.com/ns.html?id=GTM-K54FBP" height="0" width="0" style="display:none;visibility:hidden"></iframe>



"The whole attitude of what's called 'affirmation' instead of neutrality and inquiry caused considerable damage," Dr. David Bell, a veteran psychiatrist in the United Kingdom, says. (Photo: EvgeniiAnd/Getty Images)

Children "have been very seriously damaged" in receiving treatment at the United Kingdom's premier gender identity facility, a former psychiatrist there says in a bombshell interview.

Dr. David Bell [faced disciplinary action](#) after writing an internal report in 2018 raising concerns about procedures at [The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust](#), which operates the U.K.'s sole "Gender Identity Development Service."

After working with Tavistock and Portman for 24 years as a consultant psychiatrist, Bell recently retired. In the [interview](#) with London-based Channel 4 News, he speaks openly about his observations about giving children puberty blockers, treating every girl with a gender or sexual issue as "conversion therapy," and politicizing support for transgender children.

Right away, Bell isn't shy about relating the concerns of parents and others about Tavistock's treatment plans. He tells reporter Cathy Newman:

Want to keep up with the 24/7 news cycle? Want to know the most important stories of the day for conservatives? Need news you can trust? Subscribe to The Daily Signal's email newsletter. [Learn more >>](#)

I was a representative of the clinical and academic staff. The concerns that were brought to me were very, very serious. The main concerns were issues that had to do with ... lack of consent. Many of the people who spoke to me did not think their children were able to consent to the treatment.

Then there were concerns of children being inappropriately pushed through to transition, where they had a lot of complex problems that really needed thinking about. The whole attitude of what's called 'affirmation' instead of neutrality and inquiry caused considerable damage to the capacity of the service and clinicians to take on the full complexities of the cases they were dealing with. As a result, children have been very seriously damaged.

Newman asks the psychiatrist in the interview whether children are at risk while receiving treatments at Tavistock.

Bell replies: "They're less at risk now because the puberty blockers have been stopped. The puberty blockers have been stopped because there is no evidence base for them at all. ... By putting them on that pathway, it rather becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy."

In December, a panel of three judges on the High Court of Justice issued a [landmark ruling](#) restricting Tavistock from issuing puberty blockers to children under 16. The High Court is one of the U.K.'s three senior courts under its Supreme Court.

The judges made their decision in part because of the testimony of Keira Bell, who is known in the U.K. for speaking out against the use of puberty blockers, which Tavistock prescribed to her when she wanted to become a male.

Channel 4's Newman asks Bell about the High Court ruling in that case regarding kids under 16.

The psychiatrist calls the decision “really important because it acts to protect them.”

Bell later says that the “positioning of these girls as only having a gender problem acts to prevent them from developing in a normal way and their own nonconforming gender identity or sexuality” and adds: “This is a form of conversion therapy among people that are gay or lesbian.”

Newman asks Bell whether he “might be on the wrong side of history” in failing to be as vocally supportive of the transgender movement as one might expect from someone who worked at a gender clinic for decades.

He appears to have no qualms about tying the gender debate to politics, saying later that “one of the things gone terribly wrong in the Tavistock and elsewhere is the invasion of the clinical domain by the political ideology.”

Bell articulates the very phenomenon that has grown in the United States as well:

This is a very highly politicized area. And leaders from movements with a very powerful ideological commitment have managed to capture policy both medically, professionally, in the media, and in government with no evidence basis, a purely highly politicized movement; we just have these consequences.

All I'm saying ... is [the children] need to wait. There needs to be a thoughtful engagement with them as opposed to motoring them through to treatment pathways that have irreversible consequences for their bodies. We're talking about not doing harm to children.

Bell is at his most compelling when he discusses a real-life example of someone who is struggling with her sexuality.

“Let me put it very simply. A girl of 12 may find that she is sexually attracted to other girls,” Bell says, adding:

It may go through her mind: ... Maybe I'm not a girl. Maybe I'm a boy. If that happened 10-15 years ago, that would have been a passing phase and things would have moved on.

But now because of hugely changed cultural context and the penetration of social media, such a girl may go online and she may easily come to the belief ... that she is a boy. And that having reached that [conclusion] ... there will be lots of forces around her that will support it, and all her other difficulties will be repositioned through that prism.

Although Bell says he doesn't believe that Tavistock tried to push him toward retirement or "hound him out," he says the facility made it clear "that people like me that spoke out will come under the scrutiny in this very negative way."

"I think it's like a message to everyone else who don't have my seniority, my safety: Oh, my God, I better not speak out, they'll think I'm transphobic."

Bell's comments during this interview confirm that the High Court made the [right decision](#) when it ruled that Tavistock must stop giving puberty blockers to children under 16.

The psychiatrist's articulations about gender ideology as a political movement, whether in the U.K. or the United States, are spot on. He was courageous to speak out on an issue that has become [so controversial](#) in [such a short time](#).

 <div style="display:inline;" >
 </div> <div style="display:none;" > </div>

Angela M. Birkett

From: Belkis Nesser <rnbnesser@inebraska.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 9:01 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

To the Lincoln City Council Members:

Hello, my name is **Belkis M Nesser**, and I live in Lincoln at 4200 Birch Creek Drive. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Richard Nesser <rnbnesser@inebraska.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 9:12 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

To the Lincoln City Council Members:

Hello, my name is Richard F Nesser, and I live in Lincoln at 4200 Birch Creek Drive. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

Here are my reasons:

Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.

Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.

This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.

A counselor should be allowed to use whatever tools available to help their clients on a case-by-case basis. The government should not use their power to take away tool that may be helpful for a client that wants it.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Thank you.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Rebecca Essink <essink6@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 9:38 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Oppose Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

City Council Members,

Greetings. My name is Rebecca Essink, and I live at 2530 J St. in Lincoln NE. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the first amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship. We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them. In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space MUST be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regard to human sexuality.

Again, I ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Essink

Sent from my iPhone

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lydia Arnold <wlarnold20@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 10:08 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

The proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance is unconstitutional, clearly violating the freedom of speech (and, by implication, freedom of thought) guaranteed to ALL citizens in the First Amendment.

Under our constitution, government is NOT allowed to mandate citizens' viewpoints. Citizens are free to research and choose their own viewpoints /perspectives. This implies differing viewpoints/perspectives being available to choose from.

Freedom of speech protects differing viewpoints. Regulations already in place protect counselees from unprofessional counselor behavior (abuse, coercion, etc). Counselees are free to start, continue or end counseling relationships as they see fit.

In the case of minors, it is the sacred right of guardians to determine the appropriateness of counseling relationships.

I urge you to oppose this proposed ordinance.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Lydia Susan Arnold
5210 Ervin Street
Lincoln, NE 68504

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lyle Middendorf <lyle.middendorf@licor.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 10:18 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: 'Transition' Treatment Harms Kids, Psychiatrist at UK Gender Clinic Says

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please read and consider the physical and mental health of our children. You have all been put in a position of authority and responsibility, and your decisions will be judged according to the impact on our society and by Almighty God...Lyle Middendorf

https://www.dailysignal.com/2021/02/09/transition-treatment-harms-kids-veteran-psychiatrist-at-uk-gender-identity-clinic-says/?utm_source=rss&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=transition-treatment-harms-kids-veteran-psychiatrist-at-uk-gender-identity-clinic-says?utm_source=TDS_Email&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=MorningBell&mkt_tok=eyJpIjoiTkROa1I6WTVNVGczTnpWbSlslInQiOiJ6OVVRNjlxG5scmo2eG9uTkJES0N1XC9SWXpnODdvMVk3Z1NBXC9yQW5TVDREOfphZlI3OE9lZVExb24wMGV1c1RMemFCdXZ1THV0YUITXC9KdnpIMDNzTEs5ODVNVVctEa09UK0lzWDE5eFFWNFgwUG5ObjM3VW1VQUxyTlhONitEVyJ9

‘Transition’ Treatment Harms Kids, Veteran Psychiatrist at UK Gender Clinic Says

[Nicole Russell](#) / [@russell_nm](#) / February 09, 2021

"The whole attitude of what's called 'affirmation' instead of neutrality and inquiry caused considerable damage," Dr. David Bell, a veteran psychiatrist in the United Kingdom, says. (Photo: EvgeniiAnd/Getty Images)

Children “have been very seriously damaged” in receiving treatment at the United Kingdom’s premier gender identity facility, a former psychiatrist there says in a bombshell interview.

Dr. David Bell [faced disciplinary action](#) after writing an internal report in 2018 raising concerns about procedures at [The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust](#), which operates the U.K.’s sole “Gender Identity Development Service.”

After working with Tavistock and Portman for 24 years as a consultant psychiatrist, Bell recently retired. In the [interview](#) with London-based Channel 4 News, he speaks openly about his observations about giving children puberty blockers, treating every girl with a gender or sexual issue as “conversion therapy,” and politicizing support for transgender children.

Right away, Bell isn't shy about relating the concerns of parents and others about Tavistock's treatment plans. He tells reporter Cathy Newman:

I was a representative of the clinical and academic staff. The concerns that were brought to me were very, very serious. The main concerns were issues that had to do with ... lack of consent. Many of the people who spoke to me did not think their children were able to consent to the treatment.

Then there were concerns of children being inappropriately pushed through to transition, where they had a lot of complex problems that really needed thinking about. The whole attitude of what's called 'affirmation' instead of neutrality and inquiry caused considerable damage to the capacity of the service and clinicians to take on the full complexities of the cases they were dealing with. As a result, children have been very seriously damaged.

Newman asks the psychiatrist in the interview whether children are at risk while receiving treatments at Tavistock.

Bell replies: "They're less at risk now because the puberty blockers have been stopped. The puberty blockers have been stopped because there is no evidence base for them at all. ... By putting them on that pathway, it rather becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy."

In December, a panel of three judges on the High Court of Justice issued a [landmark ruling](#) restricting Tavistock from issuing puberty blockers to children under 16. The High Court is one of the U.K.'s three senior courts under its Supreme Court.

The judges made their decision in part because of the testimony of Keira Bell, who is known in the U.K. for speaking out against the use of puberty blockers, which Tavistock prescribed to her when she wanted to become a male.

Channel 4's Newman asks Bell about the High Court ruling in that case regarding kids under 16.

The psychiatrist calls the decision "really important because it acts to protect them."

Bell later says that the "positioning of these girls as only having a gender problem acts to prevent them from developing in a normal way and their own nonconforming gender identity or sexuality" and adds: "This is a form of conversion therapy among people that are gay or lesbian."

Newman asks Bell whether he "might be on the wrong side of history" in failing to be as vocally supportive of the transgender movement as one might expect from someone who worked at a gender clinic for decades.

He appears to have no qualms about tying the gender debate to politics, saying later that “one of the things gone terribly wrong in the Tavistock and elsewhere is the invasion of the clinical domain by the political ideology.”

Bell articulates the very phenomenon that has grown in the United States as well:

This is a very highly politicized area. And leaders from movements with a very powerful ideological commitment have managed to capture policy both medically, professionally, in the media, and in government with no evidence basis, a purely highly politicized movement; we just have these consequences.

All I'm saying ... is [the children] need to wait. There needs to be a thoughtful engagement with them as opposed to motoring them through to treatment pathways that have irreversible consequences for their bodies. We're talking about not doing harm to children.

Bell is at his most compelling when he discusses a real-life example of someone who is struggling with her sexuality.

“Let me put it very simply. A girl of 12 may find that she is sexually attracted to other girls,” Bell says, adding:

It may go through her mind: ... Maybe I'm not a girl. Maybe I'm a boy. If that happened 10-15 years ago, that would have been a passing phase and things would have moved on. But now because of hugely changed cultural context and the penetration of social media, such a girl may go online and she may easily come to the belief ... that she is a boy. And that having reached that [conclusion] ... there will be lots of forces around her that will support it, and all her other difficulties will be repositioned through that prism.

Although Bell says he doesn't believe that Tavistock tried to push him toward retirement or “hound him out,” he says the facility made it clear “that people like me that spoke out will come under the scrutiny in this very negative way.”

“I think it's like a message to everyone else who don't have my seniority, my safety: Oh, my God, I better not speak out, they'll think I'm transphobic.”

Bell's comments during this interview confirm that the High Court made the [right decision](#) when it ruled that Tavistock must stop giving puberty blockers to children under 16.

The psychiatrist's articulations about gender ideology as a political movement, whether in the U.K. or the United States, are spot on. He was courageous to speak out on an issue that has become [so controversial](#) in [such a short time](#).

--

Lyle Middendorf
Senior VP and Chief Technical Officer
[LI-COR Biosciences](#)
4647 Superior St., Lincoln, NE 68504
lyle.middendorf@licor.com
402-467-0732 (direct)

Angela M. Birkett

From: Lyle Middendorf <lyle.middendorf@licor.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 10:20 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Recall: 'Transition' Treatment Harms Kids, Psychiatrist at UK Gender Clinic Says

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Lyle Middendorf would like to recall the message, "'Transition' Treatment Harms Kids, Psychiatrist at UK Gender Clinic Says".

Angela M. Birkett

From: Shantell Ferris <shanlynn12@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 11:25 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

The proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance violates the freedom of speech guaranteed to all citizens in the First Amendment.

Under our constitution, government is NOT allowed to mandate citizens' viewpoints. Citizens are free to research and choose their own viewpoints/perspectives. This implies differing viewpoints/perspectives being available to choose from. Restricting choices defeats the purpose of the principles on which America was founded.

Freedom of speech protects differing viewpoints. Regulations already in place protect counselees from unprofessional counselor behavior. Counselees are free to start, continue, or end counseling relationships as they see fit. Mandating what counselors can and cannot discuss is not ethical and does not support a healthy counselor/counselee relationship, resulting in less effective care for the counselee.

In the case of minors, it is the sacred right of guardians to determine the appropriateness of counseling relationships, not the government.

I urge you not to pass the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. The mental health of our community's youth is at stake.

Thank you for your consideration,

Shantell Ferris
Lincoln, NE

Angela M. Birkett

From: Laura Rauscher <ljrauscher20@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 11:26 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Act

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Laura Rauscher, living in Lincoln at 2411 South 58th St, 68506.

I am contacting you asking that each of you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom of counselors and their patients!

We agree that every person should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.

Professional regulations currently prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including talk therapy. Please keep in mind that very young children who are being introduced to all types of different gender identities may seek counsel from parents, relatives, or other trusted adults to answer basic questions. Could this very ordinance prohibit free speech to explain the viewpoint of various religions including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity?

No parent or counselor should be used as a tool to impose a government's view on their child or patient.

I urge you to oppose Youth Mental Health Ordinance. Please add my comments to the public record in opposition.

Thank you for your service to our community and the time it takes to consider my request.

Respectfully,
Laura Rauscher

Angela M. Birkett

From: Robert Shelbourn <robertshelbourn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 11:32 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Title 11

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Do not amend title 11.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Linda Dewey <ldewey49@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth mental health ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello my name is Linda Dewey, I live at 7105 South 94th Court in Lincoln, NE.

I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

Sent from my iPad

Angela M. Birkett

From: Jim & Deanna McClintick <jdmcc@neb.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 11:57 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: FW: RE: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance--today

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Please see my response to Councilman Bowers kind words.
Thank you.
Deanna McClintick

From: "Jim & Deanna McClintick"
To: "James M. Bowers"
Cc: "rmeginnis@lincoln.ne.gov"
Sent: Saturday February 13 2021 5:14:37PM
Subject: RE: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance-voting

Hello, James,

Thank you for clarifying that. I appreciate it very much.

I still would like to see licensed professionals as having options depending on their clients as the one who spoke at the hearing on the last half. Also, it bothers me about the full brain development being complete by age 25 and minors making major decisions at this time.

I still would rather other issues concerning city operations be the focus of the city council rather than issues such as this with varying degrees of opinions. I know there are good intentions, but we can't say one rule fits all. We are all individuals as you saw with the different clients with different out comes at the hearings.

Best regards,
Deanna McClintick

From: "James M. Bowers"
To: "Jim & Deanna McClintick"
Cc:
Sent: Saturday February 13 2021 2:51:48PM
Subject: RE: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance-voting

Hello,

Thank you for writing in and sharing your concern.

The 3rd and 9th Circuit Court has found that these ordinances are constitutional.

New York City introduced an ordinance that was much more broad than the one I introduced. They included

religious leaders non-licensed persons from performing conversion therapy and banned adults from receiving it. This ordinance is specific and tailored. This applies to registered/licensed professionals and to youth. Regulations that match what I have introduced remain in New York City and still are in place. Their repeal only applied to the much more broad reach.

James Michael Bowers

Council Member District 1

555 South 10th St.

Lincoln, NE 68508

402-441-7515

jbowers@lincoln.ne.gov

From: Jim & Deanna McClintick <jdmcc@neb.rr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 2:59 PM

To: 'Jim & Deanna McClintick' <jdmcc@neb.rr.com>

Cc: Mayor <mayor@lincoln.ne.gov>; Richard W. Meginnis <RMeginnis@lincoln.ne.gov>; Bennie R. Shobe <BShobe@lincoln.ne.gov>; Sandra J. Washington <SWashington@lincoln.ne.gov>; Roy A. Christensen <RChristensen@lincoln.ne.gov>; Jane Raybould <JRaybould@lincoln.ne.gov>; James M. Bowers <JBowers@lincoln.ne.gov>; Tammy J. Ward <TJWard@lincoln.ne.gov>; Council Packet <CouncilPacket@lincoln.ne.gov>

Subject: RE: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance-voting

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,

Thank you for holding such a long hearing.

Please do not pass this bill for many reasons.

This law was found unconstitutional by the 11th Circuit Court

of Appeals and it was also repealed in New York City to avoid facing the court.

We do not want to have to fight this in court.

We need to maintain our freedom of speech and parental rights.

Thank you.

Deanna McClintick

From: "Jim & Deanna McClintick"

To: "Mayor@lincoln.ne.gov", "rmeginnis@lincoln.ne.gov", "bshobe@lincoln.ne.gov",
"swashington@lincoln.ne.gov", "rchristensen@lincoln.ne.gov", "jraybould@lincoln.ne.gov",
"jbowers@lincoln.ne.gov", "tjward@lincoln.ne.gov", "councilpacket@lincoln.ne.gov"

Cc:

Sent: Monday February 8 2021 12:37:11PM

Subject: Feb 8 agenda Conversion Therapy Ordinance

Hello,

Please to not pass the ordinance below. It is not appropriate to be
part of a Municipal Code. It would be more appropriate in the state
legislature and is quite controversial.

6.u. 21-18

Amending Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code to incorporate the Youth Mental
Health Protection Ordinance prohibiting conversion therapy for minors which seeks to
change the minor's sexual orientation or gender identity.

21-18 Ordinance.pdf

Thank you for your service,

Deanna McClintick

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.

Angela M. Birkett

From: sjwestburg@aol.com
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 12:25 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear Council Members:

I am contacting you to request that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance currently under consideration.

It is extremely important that young people and their parents be presented with all factors involved in the emotional and physical issues concerning sexual orientation and gender identity.

Recommendations and treatments can have profound and sometimes irreversible effects. Children placed on puberty blockers may have slower rates of growth in height, and an elevated risk of low bone-mineral density.

Females given testosterone can develop acne, beard growth, deepened voice, and may be at risk of heart disease, vaginal and uterine atrophy, uterine cancer, and sterilization.

Males given estrogen may be more likely to have strokes and heart attacks, and have a higher risk of blood clots.

And then there are the long term and often irreversible effects of surgery for transitioning.

Counselors, psychologists, and doctors should have the opportunity to objectively discuss these and other critical factors with patients and their parents, so they can be aware of the seriousness of their decisions.

Therefore I respectfully urge you to oppose the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Stuart P. Westburg, M.D,
1100 Cobblestone Drive 68510
Lincoln, NE

Angela M. Birkett

From: Aaron Hiltgen <ahiltgen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 12:27 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Conversion Therapy Amendment Changes Title 11, 21-18

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Council members,

I am writing in regards to the amendment changes in Title 11 for 21-18 regarding conversion therapy. I do not support these changes and would like to see them removed from consideration.

As a parent and a citizen, it is my right, not the government's to determine what is proper care for myself and my dependent children. While I agree that certain forms of conversion therapy, including electroshock are inhumane and should be outlawed, the changes in this proposed amendment go far beyond just that. This amendment would make it criminal to even discuss opposing viewpoints regarding transgenderism and sexual orientation.

Restricting speech and freedom of religion both violate a number of constitutionally guaranteed freedoms, both in the US and Nebraska constitutions, such as "All persons have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No person shall be compelled to... nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted." (NE State Constitution section 1-4. Religious Freedom)

If my conscience, due to my worship of Almighty God, tells me that transgenderism and homosexuality are sins, I should be able to have a discussion about my religious beliefs with my children without fear that that discussion will lead to my arrest or censure. If I wish to lead my family based on biblical truth, that is my constitutionally guaranteed right as a citizen of the United States of America and my Biblical duty as a believer in Almighty God.

This amendment would abridge both those rights and is a direct violation of both the United States and the State of Nebraska constitutions as it is written, and as such must be removed from consideration.

I request that this e-mail be included as part of the public hearing record.

Thank You,
Aaron Hiltgen

Angela M. Birkett

From: Bill Carlson <bgcarlson1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 1:56 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Amending of Title 11 youth protection ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Lincoln City Council

My name is Bill Carlson I live at 2811 Tierra Drive Lincoln Ne. I ask you to oppose Amending Title 11 Youth Mental Health Ordinance which would violate free speech and violate religious freedom rights of Counselors and their patients. Every individual and All families should be able to freely choose Counseling goals which are best suited for them. The city council should not attempt to sanction moral beliefs of its citizens with regard to human sexuality. Please Oppose this amendment of Title 11 of the Youth Protection Ordinance. Thank you.

Angela M. Birkett

From: lloyd kettelhake <lkettelhake@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 5:03 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Lloyd Kettelhake, and I live in Lincoln at 7405 S. Hampton Road. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Emily Mefort <emilymefort@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2021 10:57 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Oppose Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Emily Mefort and I live in Lincoln at 6031 Skylark Ln. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We all know that freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship between the counselor and their patient.

All individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them. And counselors should be free to speak to their conscience and deeply held beliefs. A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

-Emily Mefort

Angela M. Birkett

From: Deb Struwe <struwed@christensen.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:39 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: vote to OPPOSE the proposed youth mental health crap

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Debbie Struwe, and I live in Lincoln at 330 Judson Street.

I am contacting you to ask that you **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Debbie Struwe, a Lincolnite who will continue to fight what is right for our city and in Nebraska!!

Angela M. Birkett

From: Merlin D. Holtzen <merlinholtzen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:56 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

From Merlin D. Holtzen, a resident at 5430 Stephanie Court in Lincoln:

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. It would not only prohibit counselors from serving their patients, but could also cause clients to be reluctant to seek the type of help they may have a strong desire to receive from their counselor. The city government should not be used to dictate beliefs about human sexuality upon their citizens. This would infringe upon the freedom of free speech of both the counselor and the client and would be unconstitutional.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Angela M. Birkett

From: Shelley Novosad <smnovosad@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 10:47 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Oppose the Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Shelley Novosad, and I live in Lincoln at 6721 Bernese Blvd. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them. Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship. This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Thank you,

Shelley Novosad

Angela M. Birkett

From: Charles Schmidt <rev.charles.schmidt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 11:36 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Mental health counseling

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Charles Schmidt, and I live in Lincoln at 7420 Exbury Rd. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors, and their patients as well as parents, and those with legal custody.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations already prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy. There is no need to expand regulations except to apply political power to support one particular view.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens by simply passing a resolution.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently attempting to use political power to advance a view that may or may not be the view of those counseling, being counseled, or those who have legal responsibility for the children involved.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the views of a third party on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Chris Oerman <coerman@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 1:30 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Letter in OPPOSITION to the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

My name is Chris Oerman, and my address is 5660 NW 11th Circle in Lincoln. I am writing to request that you **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. This dangerous proposal would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors, patients, and their families.

- While I believe that everyone should be treated with respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, we should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals they deem best in their situation. Furthermore, counselors must not be reduced to mere tools used to impose the government's preferred view on their patients.
- In a truly pluralistic society like ours, the freedom of people with differing views regarding how best to approach these sensitive issues must be preserved. The City Council should not overreach by sanctioning the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates extreme animus toward many of the world's major religions--including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, to name but a few--that teach about and profess the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those *currently* in political power.

I strongly urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.
Chris Oerman

Angela M. Birkett

From: Deb Struwe <struwed@christensen.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 2:05 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Concerned Citizen

Importance: High

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Council Members-

It would appear Mr. Bowers took an oath to tear down our Constitution rather than support it, and to replace it with rights only for a few...rights for people only like him.

These rights would include the right to virtually any sexual activity of their choice, without interference from parents, teachers, pastors, counselors, etc. The effect would be to also grant minors the right to expect society at large to bear the cost for any negative consequences from their illicit and immoral sexual activity.

Mr. Bowers would deny that unprotected and untrained children are susceptible and vulnerable to bad/harmful influences, and that many dark voices vie for their attention and try to get the upper hand, before good character is established.

Mr. Bowers would deny that children need to be trained, disciplined, nurtured and educated, morally, mentally and physically.

Mr. Bowers would elevate sexuality to the pinnacle of human identity and experience, rather than reason and mind/soul.

Mr. Bowers would deny that there is any design in our anatomy and physiology.

Mr. Bowers would deny that young people can/should control their passions and appetites.

Mr. Bowers would deny that sexual appetite, like other appetites, can be corrupted, perverted, addictive and corrected.

Mr. Bowers would allow the passions and appetites of our young to become perverted.

Mr. Bowers would then have them become slaves to those perverted carnal passions and appetites.

Mr. Bowers would deny the pangs of conscience, and blame difficult feelings on others...on those trying to help those who have fallen for a lie.

Mr. Bowers is projecting his own insecurities.

Mr. Bowers wants to add another dimension to the lockdown lunacy. He wants to lock our young in bondage to sin so he doesn't have to deal with his own conscience. Let even one person discover freedom, and it's all over, should he learn of it. The fight is on, once again, with his own conscience and he can't bear it.

Mr. Bowers would have us believe that only those struggling with deviant sexual desires experience emotional and mental pain and anguish.

Do I exaggerate in any of this? If so, it isn't by much.

What Mr. Bowers ought to do, rather than pursue this ordinance change, is repent.

Thank you for your time.

Very concerned Lincolnite!

Debbie Struwe
330 Judson Street
Lincoln NE 68521

<https://www.therapyequality.org/factsheet>

Angela M. Birkett

From: Rev. Mark Ebert <pastor.ebert@redeemerlincoln.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Mark Ebert, and I live in Lincoln at 4315 Bingham Circle. I am contacting you to ask that you **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

I urge you to **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Mark H. Ebert

Angela M. Birkett

From: Shelli Cook <shelli777@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 1:07 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Title 11 of the Lincoln Municipal Code

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear Lincoln City Council

I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

First of all, I would like I express my appreciate for those who are truly concerned about what 'conversion therapy' may cause. I am also sorry to hear that some feel they have extensively tried this approach, but that it didn't 'work' for them.

I must express **my concerns** in regards to **eliminating this option**, however.

- Despite how it may be portrayed in common media outlets, **many have been Helped by this type of therapy**, which actually encompasses a rather large body of work, and may even include stragies those who testified know not of (ex research and approaches of Joe Dallas-not PC, but widely acclaimed and found helpful by many, none the less). Just like any therapy, it also requires a person to be in a position of wanting and willing to make a change in how they are currently feeling in these regards.
- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
 - - *In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.*

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Shelli A. Cook, M.S. CCC-SLP
1944 S. 24 St, Lincoln, NE 68502

Angela M. Birkett

From: Josi Casebolt <josicasebolt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:43 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Please don't amend Title 11!

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Josiah L. Casebolt, and I live in Lincoln. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients. We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them. Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship. This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination. I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Brooke Reinhard <brookereinhard@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:52 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Brooke Reinhard and I live in Lincoln at 6658 Cavvy Rd

I am contacting you to ask that you **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Sincerely,
Brooke Reinhard

Angela M. Birkett

From: Max Whitson <max.whitson@uspetrolon.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 11:55 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is **Max Whitson**, and I live in Lincoln at **1240 Cessna Cir**. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.

Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy

- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Max Whitson

Angela M. Birkett

From: Mitzi Graham <RDGMG@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 2:55 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Mitzi Graham
814 Mulder Dr
Lincoln NE 68510

Angela M. Birkett

From: wabeard@earthlink.net
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 3:08 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Transgender vote

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is William Beard, and I live in Lincoln at 3921 N 23rd ST. I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Angela M. Birkett

From: dgtroester@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 4:33 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, our names are Kenneth E Troester and Debra K Troester, and we live in Lincoln at 7902 S 96th Bay. We are contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

We urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Kenneth E & Debra K Troester



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Angela M. Birkett

From: Sarie Whitson <sbwhitson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 7:31 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Please OPPOSE Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance changes

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Sarie Whitson, and I live at the edge of Lincoln at 17800 Shasta Ln, Walton NE. I am contacting you to ask that you **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients. Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship. The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power. A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Sarie Whitson

Angela M. Birkett

From: calberts@windstream.net
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 7:42 PM
To: Council Packet
Cc: calberts
Subject: Youth Mental Health proposal

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Honorable Lincoln City Council,

My name is Cheryl A Irwin, 3274 Merrill St. This is my first communique to the council.

I wish to commend you all in your leadership of our city, and the crushing effects of the pandemic, unrest and economic troubles of 2020, and into 2021. I believe you to be reasonable and sound people, and respect your positions. I ask that you respectfully consider my view on the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. I believe this proposal is an over-reach of government and would set a dangerous precedent for our city and community.

As I understand, this ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.

The proposed ordinance further muddies a slippery slope in our country, as it demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.

Thank you for considering my view. Please **oppose** the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance.

Respectfully,

Cheryl Irwin
3274 Merrill St.
Lincoln, NE 68503

Angela M. Birkett

From: rolson8148@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Freedom of speech. Do not amend Title 11

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello, my name is Randall Olson and I live in Lincoln at 864 Karen Drive Lincoln Ne. 68522 I am contacting you to ask that you oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance that would violate the free speech and religious freedom rights of counselors and their patients.

- We can all agree that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. We should also agree that all individuals and families should be free to choose the counseling goals best for them.
- Professional regulations prohibit abusive and coercive therapy, but this ordinance uses broad language to encompass any sort of counseling, including basic talk therapy.
- Freedom of speech is a fundamental right guaranteed by the First Amendment, and this proposed ordinance violates freedom of speech within a very private relationship.
- In a diverse and pluralistic society like ours, space must be given to people with differing views on how best to approach these sensitive issues. The City Council should not attempt to sanction the moral beliefs of its citizens with regards to human sexuality.
- This ordinance undermines individual freedom through its restrictions on counseling and unconstitutionally engages in viewpoint discrimination.
- The proposed ordinance demonstrates hostility toward many of the world's major religions, including Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, that teach about the sacredness of our biological design. These are sincere people of good faith who should not be punished for holding different beliefs on human sexuality than those currently in political power.
- A counselor shouldn't be used as a tool to impose the government's views on their patients.

I urge you to oppose the proposed Youth Mental Health Protection Ordinance. Thank you for your time and for considering my request.

Randall Olson
402-335-7649
Lincoln Ne 68522
rolson8148@gmail.com

Angela M. Birkett

From: weare camping <wearecamping@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 2:23 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Gatehouse Row Project "WYUKA"

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

I will have copies of emails I sent to the Planning Dept, City Council, and Mayors office (available to Hartley Neighborhood Assoc.) telling about the flooding that happens in the west Wyuka area where the 'Gatehouse Row Project' is in the planning stages. Hopefully that will help the people living in the project to collect for damages from flooding if the project is allowed. This will happen when during a heavy rain water runs down the alleys (washing the rock to 35th street) and the water runs down the streets with no storm water drains from 33rd and O NE to the one storm water drain at 36th and Vine. Along with the water that runs down the roadways of State owned Wyuka and the pond overflows to run to the same area to slowly run away after backing up to 36th and R. Wyuka knows what happens. This is the reason the area is unusable to them for burials. BUT i guess (someone thinks) for money it is good enough for low income people. Also a few years ago young girls tipped over stones in the area. What kind of fence is going to be put up to stop things like this from happening with children playing in the area.

Betty and Jerald Hunter
3501 S Street

Angela M. Birkett

From: Tom Dierks <tldierks@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 4:54 PM
To: James M. Bowers; Mayor; Council Packet; TJWare@lincoln.ne.gov
Subject: Gate House Row, Wyuka

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

To Whom It May Concern,

If a development is to happen at Wyuka, NW corner, I hope it is the fewest number of units or smallest development possible.

We need more housing in Lincoln so something could be built, but smaller is better in this "Park" of a cemetery!

Thanks,

Tom Dierks
3510 R St.
438-6353

Angela M. Birkett

From: tom armstrong <tastrongarm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 2:49 PM
To: Council Packet
Subject: Gate House Row Wyuka Project
Attachments: 35th St Traffic.JPG

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

From: Tom Armstrong <tomarmstrong007@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 2:41 PM
To: tom armstrong <tastrongarm@hotmail.com>
Subject: Fw: Gate House Row Wyuka Project

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: tom armstrong <tastrongarm@hotmail.com>
To: tom armstrong <tomarmstrong007@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021, 12:31:44 PM PST
Subject: Gate House Row Wyuka Project

Greetings to those involved in the decision regarding, the Gate Row House Apartment Project.

There are many red flags regarding this project but I will only touch on a couple, as safety for the citizens of Lincoln should always lead the way, I will begin with the traffic problem.

Attached is a photo taken at 4pm on a Thursday afternoon on North 35th St., three houses south of Vine St. Eight vehicles are lined up awaiting their turn to go left or right, the only through street between 33rd St. and 48th St., that allows this directional choice. It's this limited access to Vine St. that puts so much traffic in front of my home, making the intersection of 35th & Vine St. one of the most dangerous in Lincoln. Many times over the years I've heard the sound of a collision coming from the corner, with phone in hand I race to the scene calling 911 and checking on, and comforting those involved. The proposal of adding an additional 250 more vehicles, to this already congested neighborhood by building a 98 unit apartment complex along North 36th St., with no other exits to Vine St. or O St., can only cause more traffic congestion and accidents.

If you look closely at the photo you will notice in the upper left corner the green sign that indicates that 35th St. is also a Bicycle Route. Daily I see bicycle commuters travelling each direction, likely to UNL East Campus or the Mopac Trail, or a work location. As the weather

becomes nicer 35th St. becomes busier, adding leisure cyclists to the mix of bicyclists utilizing the only available crossing of Vine St.

Again, adding 250 more vehicles to this street will double the traffic on the street and in the photo, making 35th St. to dangerous to ride.

And since 35th St. is the only through north and south street designated as a Bicycle Route that gives such important access to students

walking and bicycling to UNL, isn't this something to be considered in the long-term planning of this mega apartment proposal?

Also, from the twenty years I have lived in the neighborhood and taken leisurely walks through Historic Wyuka Cemetery, it's important

to know that the creek that runs north and south behind the proposed building project floods regularly, as it drains O St., and the

neighborhood south of O St. The R St. entrance into Wyuka where the bridge crosses the stream was so badly damaged a few years ago

that the bridge was rebuilt and resurfaced. During that particular flood, water swamped the lower region to Vine St., threatening the

apartments at 3535 Vine St.

In Summary, this proposed project of 98 units in multiple buildings, stretching four blocks with no new access to Vine St. or O St., is overkill,

certainly for a neighborhood that CAN NOT handle it.

Thank You for your time and consideration,

Thomas Armstrong

Hartley Resident of 20 years.

Angela M. Birkett

From: Rhonda Schoenmaker <rhondaschoenmaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 11:25 AM
To: Mayor; Council Packet; Tammy J. Ward; James M. Bowers; Planning
Cc: hartleyneighborhoodassociation@gmail.com
Subject: Gate House Row, Wyuka

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing in support of construction of new affordable housing along the west edge of Wyuka cemetery, at a density of 54 housing units. I oppose construction of the 98 unit complex--Gate House Row Apartments--proposed by Fred Hoppe of Hoppe Homes.

Under the banner of “affordable housing” Hoppe Homes’ proposed mega-complex will: create the most physically dense living environment allowed. This complex will over-stress both the natural and human environment, and progressively denigrate the cohesive, vibrant and diverse Hartley neighborhood. A 98 unit complex on the proposed site will double the effective R4 zoning density of the neighborhood. As no new streets will be built, the projected 700+ trips per day generated by the complex will funnel through existing residential streets. The neighborhood will turn into a thoroughfare and cease to be a safely walkable and bikeable area, particularly for Hartley elementary students. Wyuka cemetery (under Neighborhood Watch) is currently a green space utilized by the city as well as the neighborhood. The proposed complex covers much of this green space, and compromises access to the rest. The developer promises to keep the R street pedestrian gate open, however, given greatly increased local traffic, it seems inevitable that Wyuka cemetery would soon close this entrance.

I support a revised Hartley Neighborhood Association proposal, constructing 54 units on this site. While 54 new units would be more dense than Hartley's current actual established density, the neighborhood can live with the increase. With 98 units the project is hardly compatible with the existing neighborhood. For example, the project proposes 38 two and three story units along the East side of 36th St between Q and R Sts. Across the street are 6 duplexes and 1 house, for 13 units. 13 vs 38 units. That's 3 times as many, with front yard setbacks reduced from 25 to 10 ft, and the same for the backyards, because one third of the land is a floodway.

Affordable housing at a density with 54 units supports the Resilient Lincoln vision, “a city that is inclusive, welcoming and fair”. It supports the long term stability and livability of **Hartley** Neighborhood, historically a diverse, vibrant area. Construction of new affordable housing which prioritizes stability and livability is welcome. The 98 unit mega housing complex proposed by Hoppe Homes may rent for below market value, but it simply exploits existing resources--including the current stability of the neighborhood--to the financial gain of the builder.

Please oppose Hoppe’s 98 unit complex proposal and approve a revised proposal of 54 units.

Respectfully,
Rhonda Schoenmaker
3411 S Street
Lincoln NE 68503-3339

Angela M. Birkett

From: INA <INA@neb.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 9:28 PM
To: Council Packet
Cc: hartleyneighborhoodassociation@gmail.com
Subject: Gate House Row, Wyuka

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Dear Members of the Lincoln City Council:

The Irvingdale Neighborhood Association Board would like to go on record in support of the Hartley Neighborhood Association in the position that they have taken regarding the proposed “Gate House Row, Wyuka” project.

Like Hartley residents, Irvingdale residents understand the need for, and support the development of, additional affordable housing in Lincoln. Also like Hartley residents, Irvingdalers do not feel that the onus to accommodate affordable housing should reside *exclusively* with the older neighborhoods. We feel that the Hartley neighborhood is being very reasonable in welcoming 54 new housing units through the Gate House Row Apartments, even though it will change the established density of their neighborhood. The proposed 98 units will not only change the density, but also the historic character of the neighborhood.

In addition, the Hartley Neighborhood Association’s request for 2 parking spaces per unit, rather than the proposed 1.4 parking spaces per unit is also sensible. The Hartley request is consistent with the current City standard. That standard was determined after much research and was established for a purpose!

Please take the position of the Hartley Neighborhood Association into account when considering this project. Know that they are not alone in their thinking, as their requests only serve to make Lincoln a better, safer, more hospitable home for all.

Sincerely,

Geri Cotter
President, Irvingdale Neighborhood Association Board

Angela M. Birkett

From: Sue Burkey <sueburkey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 4:34 PM
To: Planning; Mayor; Council Packet; Tammy J. Ward; James M. Bowers
Subject: Against Gate House Row, Wyuka Proposal

[CAUTION] This email comes from a sender outside your organization.

Hello,

I am against the proposed development referred to as Gate House Row, Wyuka, for a number of reasons.

Hartley neighborhood is already one of the the most densely populated neighborhoods in the city of Lincoln. It is one of the oldest neighborhoods, with a high concentration of racial and ethnic diversity, and our residents disproportionately fall into the low income category. The 'green belt' of land currently zoned as public use, is a vital part of the fabric of this historic neighborhood. Our families utilize this space as a place to gather, walk pets, exercise and enjoy the historic natural setting. Replacing this unique feature with a 98 unit apartment complex would have a huge negative impact on the neighborhood, and the city as a whole. It would forever alter the historic neighborhood, increase traffic in an already stressed infrastructure, raise the density to unacceptable levels, and send the message that segregating racially diverse and low income residents into certain areas of the city is a valid strategy for the city to move toward its goals of providing adequate housing to our more vulnerable populations.

The proposed development cannibalizes historic land and offers housing that has no path to homeownership to its residents, not to mention the critical lack of parking and access to arterial streets (Vine, O Street).

Please vote against this proposed development, and work towards meeting housing goals that respect neighborhoods, historic land, homeownership opportunities, neighborhood safety, diversity in housing, and existing zoning practices.

We can do better than this!

Thank you for your service, and consideration.

Sue Burkey
3528 Q
Lincoln, NE 68503
(402)438-7198

Sent from my iPad