

From: "wally" <wallu@aol.com> Subject: From Wally Heitman Date: Mon, October 11, 2010 8:01 pm To: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org,slaverman@gmail.com,brennanmcg@gmail.com

---

Just to let you all know that I will be gone for the meeting tomorrow. Lucille and I are going to Santa Fe for a short vacation. I think you all know my position from our conversations. I think that Pat Bauer's analysis of the financial health of the city is more researched and valid than other opinions on this issue. There is also the human aspect of this whole issue - the legitimate concerns of the people most affected should have priority over profit and theories such as "Smart Growth", especially when the city seems so statistically divided. My own opinion is that there will be a lawsuit if this passes and who knows what the financial implications will be to the city. I also believe that if the vote were to be deferred till after the special election the opposition will have less fuel if Larry Wilson loses. By the same token for those of you who favor the development and believe that there is consensus in favor, you will legitimize that position if Jim Lane does win. I think it is important that with such a contentious issue that you have a clear mandate.

Thanks,

Wally

---

From: "Brennan McGrath" <brennanmcg@gmail.com> Subject: Re: Email? Date: Mon, October 11, 2010 8:25 pm To: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org

---

Mike,  
I will do that as soon as I can find some time.  
Thanks  
Brennan

On Mon, Oct 11, 2010 at 8:57 PM, <[mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)>wrote:

> Brennan,  
>  
> Last week I asked that everyone collect all the mail individually received  
> and any group email replied to and paste it into a single word processing  
> document, to be sent to me. You have forwarded several individual emails  
> but I would much prefer that you compile all your email as I have already  
> done the work of compiling the group email.  
>  
> -Mike  
>  
>  
>  
>> Thought I already emailed you. You have everything I have received.  
>> thanks  
>>  
>>  
>> i Sent from my Pad  
>>  
>> On Oct 11, 2010, at 5:23 PM, "[mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)"  
>> <[mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Brennan,  
>>>  
>>> Have you collected all your email together? I'd like to publish what  
>>> we've

> >> received in the last month.  
> >>  
> >> -Mike  
> >>  
> >>> Also i noticed Jim Lane is not on list, be sure to update your group  
> >>> list.  
> >>> Thx  
> >>>  
> >>> i Sent from my Phone4.1  
> >>> Brennan McGrath,CSW  
> >>> 319-855-0050  
> >>>  
> >>> On Oct 11, 2010, at 2:10 PM, Brennan McGrath <[brennanmcg@gmail.com](mailto:brennanmcg@gmail.com)>  
> >>> wrote:  
> >>>  
> >>> FYI I just did an interview with KCRG for 5:00 news.  
> >>>  
> >>> i Sent from my Phone4.1  
> >>> Brennan McGrath,CSW  
> >>> 319-855-0050

---

From: linddick@aol.com Subject: meeting Date: Mon, October 11, 2010 8:32 pm To: stan-laverman@university-heights.org,brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org,mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org,pat-yeggy@university-heights.org,jim-lane@university-heights.org

---

Good evening, councilors

I am sorry to have to miss the meeting tomorrow evening, but I would like to again express my position on the upcoming zoning change. I am opposed to the Maxwell plan and I would encourage the council to heed the numerous expressions of opposition as well as the detailed information presented to you regarding the ravine. Please listen to the members of the community and support the Zoning Committee recommendation to reject the rezoning request for the Maxwell plan.

Linda Fincham

---

From: "Rachel" <[rreyn1@yahoo.com](mailto:rreyn1@yahoo.com)> Subject: St. Andrews re-zoning Date: Mon, October 11, 2010 9:50 pm To: louise-from@university-heights.org,mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org,jim-lane@university-heights.org,stan-laverman@university-heights.org,brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org,pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

---

Dear Councilors and Mayor From,

It is fair to say that we are the target demographic for supporting the proposal that is being made by Mr. Maxwell to develop the St. Andrew's property. We are young and new to the community and relatively unhindered by bias, precedent, or past experience. Therefore, we probably are as close as you might come to finding objective residents on this issue. We have approached this issue the way we approach any new issue and that is to be open-minded and to learn as much as we can. One of us has attended all city council meetings at which this development has been discussed, we've attended nearly all of the zoning commission meetings, we have read all of the media accounts, and we have had many discussions with our neighbors on the topic.

One thing that has impressed us the most is the dedication of some community members

to researching and questioning the development. They have uncovered interesting and valid concerns that absolutely need to be addressed. We have also been surprised by the lack of critical involvement by several councilors and the mayor, who have failed to ask even ONE critical question of the developers. It gives us great concern that the supporters of the development seem uninterested in critiquing it. Even if you support something, you have to be willing to look for the holes that need to be plugged because no plan is airtight. And because the objectives of the developers and the objectives of the city differ, the councilors and mayor need to pursue their own independent critical efforts to vet this proposal. Some dedicated neighbors have been doing this work for you. They may differ in opinion from you but their research and hard work are sound and deserve your attention.

Having done our homework and listened to all of the sides, we have decided that we do not support the development as it has been proposed. We were much encouraged by Mr. Laverman's thoughtful questions and his interest in looking out for the welfare of the community at the August meeting. We are very concerned that there are too many loose ends and unanswered questions for this development to be approved at this time. We would always be open to revising our position on the issue though, and we hope that those who are in favor of it will be willing to ask challenging questions and think creatively about the future of the St. Andrews property, for the peace of this community, if for no other reason.

Sincerely,  
Greg and Rachel Prickman

---

From: "adudler" <adudler@adudler.com> Subject: Please do not pass Ordinance 180. Date: Mon, October 11, 2010 10:03 pm To: louise-from@university-heights.org,mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org,jim-lane@university-heights.org,stan-laverman@university-heights.org,brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org,pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

---

I am writing to voice my opposition to the current Maxwell plan for the St. Andrew property - One University Place. I have been a resident of University Heights for over 23 years. Our home was built by my cousin, Clayton Eden in 1948. We purchased our home from him. As many of you know, several years ago we remodeled our house. While we could have made the house larger or taller, we did what we thought was appropriate for our needs and was in keeping with the neighborhood.

Over the past several years, I have seen similar scenarios presented several times: Grandview Court, University Athletic Club, and now St. Andrew. In each case, proposals were brought before the Zoning Commission. After many hours of meetings and deliberation, the commission voted against the changes requested. These proposals were too tall, too dense and didn't include enough parking. They would also have been priced much higher than surrounding properties. With Grandview Court, the project lost its financial backer. For the Athletic Club, a lucrative offer from the University came before the project could get started. One University place has divided our small community and Mr. Maxwell has not been responsive to issues brought forth by the community. The issue of the ravine must be resolved.

I keep hearing that those who oppose the project are the vocal minority, but I have not seen, heard or read evidence of the silent majority supporting this project. Before you vote on changes that could detrimentally affect the future of University Heights, I beg you to slow down this process and address the issues that have been raised by those who oppose this project in its current form. I don't oppose development. We wouldn't live where we do if Clayton and Lura had not been allowed to build this house. If less dense development is financially viable on the former Neuzil property, why can't it work in University Heights? We've already seen that it can work in

Birkdale.

I hope that you will sincerely consider my concerns and slow down this process and do what is in the best interest of the community, not what is in the best interest of Mr. Maxwell.

Most sincerely,  
Ann Dudler  
205 Koser Avenue

---

From: "zlatko anguelov" <zanguelov@gmail.com> Subject: Date: Tue, October 12, 2010 9:39 pm To: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org

---

Mike,

Tonight you lost me. With full disbelief I was watching your hypocritical behavior: showing to the public that you seem to want discussion, but having made up your mind long before that. And not by an inch budging when you hear people's arguments. And in the restaurant, the other day, you have not listened an iota of what I told you.

You and the other three are in the pocket of Maxwell. And this is not about progressive thinkers vs conservative citizens; it is about big money vs. words' lack of power. As far as I'm concerned, Mike, you have no integrity. You delighted in your power, with your arrogant smile. It is about having power, Mike. That's what it is all about.

And before the end of the farce, I left and felt good. Because I'm not like you and the others who are even more despicable. I'll eventually leave this community, but you will stay, and all who have seen who you are are going to live next to you. Whether you will have a sound sleep in such environment, is entirely your business, Mike.

ZLATKo

--  
zlatko anguelov  
207 golfview avenue  
iowa city, ia 52246  
319-351-8778

---

From: "Alice Haugen" <alice.haugen@gmail.com> Subject: Thank you Date: Wed, October 13, 2010 8:14 pm To: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org Cc: "Stan Laverman - Council & Mayor Pro Tem" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>,"Patricia Yeggy - Council" <patbirk@yahoo.com>,"Brennan McGrath" <brennanmcg@gmail.com>,"Jim Lane - Council" <jimlane@yahoo.com>,"Louise From" <louisebob@mchsi.com>

---

Dear Mike,

Thank you for seconding some motions last night that you disagreed with so that they could be discussed. I am sure that I am only one of many who appreciate the opportunity to hear the council's thoughts on the various issues.

--  
Peace +

Alice

Ring the bells that still can ring  
Forget your perfect offering

There is a crack in everything  
That's how the light gets in.

---

10/10/10

Dear Mayor & Councilor,

I definitely oppose any increase or expansion in University Heights of any areas zoned for commercial use or for multi-family units. Our town was established as a single-family residential community with only one modest commercial area. We should not sacrifice the quiet peaceful nature of our town for additional tax revenue, which is illusory when considering the ~~additional~~ cost of the additional City services that would be required. If necessary to meet critical needs, property taxes for all should be raised.

Sincerely  
David Duvon

From: "jim lane" <jimlane@yahoo.com> Subject: Re: Value of Commercial Component of Proposed Development Date: Wed, October 13, 2010 7:29 pm To: "Pat Bauer" <pbb338koser@aol.com> Cc: "Mike Haverkamp - Council" <mayhem@ia.net>,"Stan Laverman" <slaverman@gmail.com>,"Brennan McGrath" <brennanmcg@gmail.com>,"Patricia Yeggy" <patbirk@yahoo.com>,"Louise From" <louisebob@mchsi.com>,"Christine MAnderson" <christine-m-anderson@uiowa.edu>,ballard@lefflaw.com

---

Pat, I have not been given any other number at this time. It was an estimated number but difficult to use to figure rental cost/sq. ft. Now that Maxwell plans to sell the commercial units to the owners then it is not significant for rental calculations. I am still asking for the basis of the number so I can see what is included in the number(i.e. parking spaces, storage space, commercial unit space,etc.). I will pass along if I get more information.

Jim Lane

--- On Wed, 10/13/10, Pat Bauer <[pbb338koser@aol.com](mailto:pbb338koser@aol.com)> wrote:

From: "Pat Bauer" <pbb338koser@aol.com> Subject: Value of Commercial Component of Proposed Development Date: Wed, October 13, 2010 9:02 am To: "Jim Lane - Council" <jimlane@yahoo.com> Cc: "Mike Haverkamp - Council" <mayhem@ia.net>,"Stan Laverman" <slaverman@gmail.com>,"Brennan McGrath" <brennanmcg@gmail.com>,"Patricia Yeggy" <patbirk@yahoo.com>,"Louise From" <louisebob@mchsi.com>,"Anderson, Christine M" <christine-m-anderson@uiowa.edu>,ballard@lefflaw.com

---

Dear Jim,

I wasn't sure exactly what you were referring to last night, but reviewing posted e-mails this morning saw the message pasted in below.

Following your message is what I'd previously received from Jeff Maxwell about this (July 21 e-mail & attachment), and would very much appreciate you letting me know if there's some other number that's been provided to you that should be used instead in subsequent discussions going forward.

Best regards,

Pat

From: jim lane [<mailto:jimlane@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2010 8:47 AM

To: Jim Lane; MayorLouiseFrom; Mike Haverkamp; PatYeggy; Stan 'the Man' U

Heights Council; Steve Ballard U Heights Attorney; Brennan McGrath;

[jmaxwell@maxwellconstructioninc.com](mailto:jmaxwell@maxwellconstructioninc.com); Kevin Monson

Subject: Re: Fwd: U Heights Commercial Leasing.

Bennan, I need help in determining where the \$8,328,116 value of the commercial property

was estimated by McGladrey? I could not find it any of the material that I had from the TIF

presentation they made. Perhaps it was in some other document. Thanks for your help. Jim

Lane

From: Deborah Svatos-Clark [<mailto:dclark@maxwellconstructioninc.com>] On Behalf Of Jeff Maxwell  
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 4:44 PM  
To: [pbb338koser@aol.com](mailto:pbb338koser@aol.com)  
Subject: FW: Further Information/Materials for Next Thursday's Zoning Commission Meeting

Pat:

In response to your questions, I respond as follows:

(1) Projected Assessed and/or Taxable Valuations of Proposed One University Place Development (for taxable valuations, please specify percentage amount of any assumed rollback)

ANSWER:

See revised Estimated Taxable Value of One University Place project attached hereto.

(2) Percentage of Increment and Temporal Duration of Potentially Requested TIF Agreement

ANSWER:

No formal proposal has been prepared at this time; this proposal will be subject to future City Council discussions.

(3) Likely Content of Condominium Covenant Use Restrictions (attached is the Birkdale Development Agreement referenced as an example last evening(see ¶ 3 at PDF page 1 and ¶ 18 at PDF pages 12-13).

ANSWER:

The content of Condominium Declaration use restrictions, or those that might be in other covenants, has not been developed at this time. We are open to discuss any use restrictions the Zoning Commission might recommend to be included in such covenants. We will at the appropriate time in the future submit covenants that are needed to implement any use restrictions imposed by the City Council as part of the PUD rezoning.

(4) 3D Computer Simulated Views (although not specified with particularity, concerns about impact on adjacent property owners seemingly would make appropriate views from the mid-point of the closest edge of all

properties within 200 feet of any of the four project parcels (see indicated buffer zones in attached PDF).

ANSWER:

Images will be available for the Zoning Commission's review at the Thursday Zoning Commission meeting.

Jeff Maxwell

---

From: "Alice Haugen" <alice.haugen@gmail.com> Subject: An attempt to clarify Date: Wed, October 13, 2010 8:20 pm To: "Mike Haverkamp - Council" <mayhem@ia.net>,"Stan Laverman - Council & Mayor Pro Tem" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>,"Jim Lane - Council" <jimlane@yahoo.com>,"Patricia Yeggy - Council" <patbirk@yahoo.com>,"Brennan McGrath" <brennanmcg@gmail.com>,"Louise From" <louisebob@mchsi.com>

---

Thank you for the opportunity to present our concerns about the ravine last night. It seems to me that now you are all more knowledgeable and aware of the need to preserve the ravine. However I am afraid that I did not convey clearly enough the need to protect the ravine in ordinance 180.

I have considerable confidence that each of you want to preserve the ravine. Deferring that protection to the PUD process however is not something that you and we can depend upon. All of you may intend and hope to protect the ravine during the PUD process, but you may not be the councilors when that comes up in three or five years' time. We don't know who will be on the council at that time. The best and surest way to protect the ravine is to protect it now, at the stage of the zoning. If it is left as R1 there may be future questions of a private owner seeking a building permit, but that will carry far less pressure than a developer who wants to go ahead with some project we can't foresee right now. I hope that this amendment can be revisited in November.

Thank you for your consideration and time.

--

Peace +

Alice Haugen  
1483 Grand Avenue

Ring the bells that still can ring  
Forget your perfect offering  
There is a crack in everything  
That's how the light gets in.

---

From: "City Clerk" <uhclerk@yahoo.com> Subject: Fw: Re: How many units in Grandview Court? Date: Fri, October 15, 2010 8:20 am To: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org

---

Mike,

Could you add this e-mail to the ones online? I'm not quite sure it it ties to the development but better to be safe.

Chris

--- On Tue, 10/5/10, Lori Kimura <[lkimura@keystoneproperty.net](mailto:lkimura@keystoneproperty.net)> wrote:

From: Lori Kimura <[lkimura@keystoneproperty.net](mailto:lkimura@keystoneproperty.net)>  
Subject: Re: How many units in Grandview Court?  
To: "Alice Haugen" <[alice.haugen@gmail.com](mailto:alice.haugen@gmail.com)>, "City Clerk" <[uhclerk@yahoo.com](mailto:uhclerk@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Tuesday, October 5, 2010, 9:28 AM

Chris -

I got Alice the info she needed on Friday - there's 133 units in Grandview. Sorry I didn't copy you on the original reply. Glad your computers are up and running!

Lori

On Fri, Oct 1, 2010 at 10:09 AM, Lori Kimura <[lkimura@keystoneproperty.net](mailto:lkimura@keystoneproperty.net)> wrote:

Hi Alice-

When I talked to Chris on Wednesday they didn't have working computers at her office - maybe something happened with the emails.....who knows! Normally Chris would be a better source, but coincidentally Keystone (my day job) manages the condo association so I know for a fact that there are are 133 units in Grandview Court. Let me know if you need anything else.

Have a good day!  
Lori

On Fri, Oct 1, 2010 at 8:58 AM, Alice Haugen <[alice.haugen@gmail.com](mailto:alice.haugen@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hi, Lori - I sent the question about how many units there are in Grandview Court a few days ago but hadn't heard back. I was afraid that maybe a spam filter had eaten it. If the treasurer would be a better source for this information, could you let me know that? Thanks very much!

On Mon, Sep 27, 2010 at 5:54 PM, Alice Haugen wrote:

Hello - could you tell me how many units there are in all the Grandview Court apartments and condos altogether? Thanks very much!

--  
Peace +

Alice

Ring the bells that still can ring  
Forget your perfect offering  
There is a crack in everything  
That's how the light gets in.

---

Monday, October 18, 2010 10:14 AM

From:

"jim lane" <jimlane@yahoo.com> [Add sender to Contacts](#)

To:

Katherine-belgum@uiowa.edu, c\_christiansen@mchsi.com

Carol Ann and Kathy, The two individuals I talked with on the St. Andrews Session were Eric Goers and Brad Baldes. I asked them if there was any problem releasing their names and they said no. They just did not want to be perceived in answering my hypothetical question as speaking for the Session. Jim Lane

---

From: "Alice Haugen" <alice.haugen@gmail.com> Subject: Re: References for Maxwell from clients? Date: Tue, October 19, 2010 7:53 pm To: "jim lane" <jimlane@yahoo.com> Cc: "Stan Laverman - Council & Mayor Pro Tem" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>, "Patricia Yeggy - Council" <patbirk@yahoo.com>, "Brennan McGrath" <brennanmcg@gmail.com>, "Louise From" <louisebob@mchsi.com>, "mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org" <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>, "jmaxwell@maxwellconstructioninc.com" <jmaxwell@maxwellconstructioninc.com>

---

Jim, thanks for that clarification. I did not understand from your presentation at the council meeting that these references came from clients who could judge the work done for them, rather than other contractors speaking of Maxwell's reputation.

Peace+ Alice

On Oct 19, 2010, at 8:45 PM, jim lane <[jimlane@yahoo.com](mailto:jimlane@yahoo.com)> wrote:

>

> Alice, Here are the names of the individuals with whom I spoke about the work performance of Jeff Maxwell. These folks are employees of General

Contractors or do Development work themselves. All of them have been clients of Jeff Maxwell's construction firm.

>

> Since I have experience in the construction business in this area, and realize the importance of an unbiased reference, I contacted all of these individuals on my own and asked if Jeff Maxwell had worked for them. I did not ask Jeff Maxwell for any references. I am sure Jeff would be happy to give you references if you give him a call. I tried to contact him this week and he is on vacation until next Monday.

>

> Tom Lopic- Lopic-Kroeger Realty  
> Gary Watts-Lopic-Kroeger Realty  
> Scott Pantel-Merit Construction-Cedar Rapids  
> Matt Bulkely-Knutson Construction  
> Russ and Mike Gerdin-Heartland Express

>

>

> --- On Sat, 10/16/10, Alice Haugen <[alice.haugen@gmail.com](mailto:alice.haugen@gmail.com)> wrote:

>

> From: Alice Haugen <[alice.haugen@gmail.com](mailto:alice.haugen@gmail.com)>

> Subject: Re: References for Maxwell from clients?

> To: "[slaverman@gmail.com](mailto:slaverman@gmail.com)" <[slaverman@gmail.com](mailto:slaverman@gmail.com)>, "Jim Lane - Council" <[jimlane@yahoo.com](mailto:jimlane@yahoo.com)>

> Cc: "Stan Laverman - Council & Mayor Pro Tem"

> <[stan-laverman@university-heights.org](mailto:stan-laverman@university-heights.org)>, "Patricia Yeggy - Council"

> <[patbirk@yahoo.com](mailto:patbirk@yahoo.com)>, "Brennan McGrath" <[brennanmcg@gmail.com](mailto:brennanmcg@gmail.com)>, "Jim Lane -

> Council" <[jimlane@yahoo.com](mailto:jimlane@yahoo.com)>, "Louise From" <[louisebob@mchsi.com](mailto:louisebob@mchsi.com)>,

> "[mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)" <[mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)>

> Date: Saturday, October 16, 2010, 11:01 AM

>

> My confusion -Jim, please consider my request.

>

> Peace+ Alice

>

> On Oct 16, 2010, at 10:20 AM, [slaverman@gmail.com](mailto:slaverman@gmail.com) wrote:

>

>> Alice-

>> Jim Lane made reference to this , not me.

>>

>> Thanks - Stan

>> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

>> From: Alice Haugen <[alice.haugen@gmail.com](mailto:alice.haugen@gmail.com)>

>> Date: Sat, 16 Oct 2010 10:01:13 -0500

>> To: Stan Laverman - Council & Mayor Pro Tem<[stan-laverman@university-heights.org](mailto:stan-laverman@university-heights.org)>

>> Cc: Patricia Yeggy - Council<[patbirk@yahoo.com](mailto:patbirk@yahoo.com)>; Brennan

>> McGrath<[brennanmcg@gmail.com](mailto:brennanmcg@gmail.com)>; Jim Lane - Council<[jimlane@yahoo.com](mailto:jimlane@yahoo.com)>; Louise

>> From<[louisebob@mchsi.com](mailto:louisebob@mchsi.com)>; <[mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)>

>> Subject: References for Maxwell from clients?

>>

>> Dear Stan,

>>

>> Thank you for seeking out references on Maxwell's work. It is reassuring to know that his colleagues think well of him. It would also be helpful though to hear from some of his clients. I know that you are very busy and have already done a lot of work on this aspect. If Mr. Maxwell will provide

you with a list of his five or ten recent clients, I am quite willing to make the contacts with them to get their opinions also. Please let me know either way. Thank you.

>>

>> Warm regards,

>>

>> Alice Haugen

>> 1483 Grand Avenue

>>

>>

>>

>> Ring the bells that still can ring

>> Forget your perfect offering

>> There is a crack in everything

>> That's how the light gets in.

---

From: "Carson Egglund" <carson.egglund@gmail.com> Subject: Re: Survey question Date: Mon, October 25, 2010 8:50 am To: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org

---

Thanks Mike. I appreciate you attempting to include newer members of the community with the "or current resident" line. Hope you are having a nice start to your week.

Carson

On Thu, Oct 21, 2010 at 7:42 PM, <[mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)>wrote:

> Hey Carson,

>

> Be on the lookout for the survey in your U.S. mail either tomorrow or

> Saturday. They are being sent to everyone who voted in any of the last

> three municipal elections. They are also being addressed to "or current

> resident" so that newer members of the community may also be included.

> Every survey comes with a stamped return envelope, that the survey should

> be returned in.

>

> Please let me know if you have any questions.

>

> -Mike Haverkamp

>

>> Hi Mike,

>>

>> My question regards the proposed community survey.

>>

>> There was a mention of randomizing this mailer to households who had

>> voted

>> for the past three consecutive city elections, or something to that

>> effect.

>> I assume this leaves our household out of the mix as we moved to

>> University

>> Heights just last year and have only voted in the most recent election.

> I

>> also assume it leaves out a number of residents who live in the

> > apartment/condo buildings on Sunset St., as this is generally a younger  
> > and  
> > more transient group.  
> >  
> > My general concern is that the "younger" population of University Heights  
> > will be ignored in this survey. Is this a valid concern?  
> >  
> > Thanks for your service to the community.  
> >  
> > Carson Egglund  
> > 1435 Grand Ave

---

From: "Ken Yeggy" <ken.yeggy@gmail.com> Subject: Traffic Study Date: Mon, October 25, 2010 4:21 pm To: "Patricia Yeggy" <pat.yeggy@gmail.com>, louise-from@university-heights.org, stan-laverman@university-heights.org, "McGowan, Laura" <laura.mcgowan@pearson.com>, jimlane@yahoo.com, mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org

---

Hi,

I was reading the minutes from the last city council meeting and it is stated "It was recommended that a Traffic Impact Study be conducted to evaluate the anticipated effect on the adjacent street system". Could someone tell me if this traffic study will include the traffic from and to St. Andrew church property as it exists today. Without this count it seems to me that the figures could be misleading.

Thank you

Ken Yeggy  
305 Ridgeview

---

From: mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org Subject: Re: proposed development Date: Sun, November 7, 2010 8:48 pm To: bedeker@mchsi.com

---

Darn it I hit return instead of tab! Ignore the incomplete one that came first.

Brian,

Sorry for the delay, it was harder to track down numbers than I thought it would be. As to heights:

Top of St. Andrew steeple 57 ft.  
Top of Maxwell building 64 ft.  
Top of Kinnick Press box 136 ft

I think that it may not stand out quite as much as feared.

As to tenants, the back building, according to what Maxwell's

representatives have said would have prices from 400K to 2M. The front building may have some studio or loft units which would be marketed to either residents at UIHC or law students. At the prices being charged I don't think that undergraduate students would be the target audience.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about this.

Great story on Matt in the paper too!

>

>> Mike, thanks for the reply. I still think the 6 storey height on that  
>> site will have a total higher "altitude" than Kinnick and will be the  
>> most  
>> imposing and skyline-dominating feature of the metro area. Also, the  
>> type  
>> of residential growth we would see with the Maxwell plan is not going to  
>> be from University employees. Those folks have families and are going  
>> to  
>> look for houses with yards. The Maxwell development will fill up with  
>> college students and perhaps some grad students for the most part. It  
>> will be a transitory population, with frequent turnover. If the units  
>> are  
>> sold separately as condos there will be investors who will purchase one  
>> or  
>> several units with the idea of using it as income property. Not an  
>> ideal  
>> situation for a suburban neighborhood. I'm sure there is a better use  
>> for  
>> that land.

>>

>> On a lighter note, the boys went trick or treating with their friends on  
>> the east side. Jack being in 7th grade and Sam in high school I don't  
>> know if they'll want to stay around home and trick-or-treat with Dad  
>> anymore! Brian

>> ----- Original Message -----

>> From: [mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org](mailto:mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org)

>> To: [bedeker@mchsi.com](mailto:bedeker@mchsi.com)

>> Sent: Mon, 1 Nov 2010 06:42:42 -0500 (CDT)

>> Subject: Re: proposed development

>>

>> Hey Brian,

>>

>> Thanks for the email, I'm happy to talk with you about your concerns. I  
>> didn't check my city mail over the weekend, I'll start a reply here, and  
>> may have to continue it later.

>>

>> As to the height of the back building. Yes, the six story height in the  
>> center of the building (four stories on the east side and three on the  
>> west) is tall. However the comparison to Kinnick may be a bit off. I  
>> believe (I'll check this today) that the height of the just the new  
>> pressbox itself, not sitting on top of the stadium, would be closer to  
>> the  
>> height of the proposed building. The maximum total height as allowed by  
>> council is 76 feet. Another major difference would be that unlike UI  
>> which  
>> is not bound by zoning codes, a Planned Unit Development agreement would  
>> have to be executed which spells out many specific details, such as the  
>> amount of light that would extend beyond the property lines. The best

>> description of that can be found in the UH Comprehensive Plan, under the  
>> section on "Future Land Use, starting on page 9.

>>

>> <http://university-heights.org/CompPlan10/CompPlanRevised5-2010.pdf>

>>

>> I agree that while we are not the urban center of the larger

>> metropolitan

>> area, we are within half a mile of the largest employer in the area,

>> University Hospitals and Clinics, which has more workers than the

>> downtown

>> does. Long term "smart growth" planning frequently highlights putting

>> residential growth near people's jobs.

>>

>> The traffic issue is a major concern. Right now Melrose handles

>> approximately 14,000 cars a day. A preliminary prediction, for the One

>> University Place development, made before council reduced the size of the

>> total project predicted a 10% increase in total traffic. At our October

>> meeting we asked JCCOG (Johnson County Council of Governments) to give a

>> more detailed analysis of traffic. We will get that report at our

>> November

>> meeting.

>>

>> I'm going to have to stop here and will get to your other concerns

>> tonight

>> when I get home from work. I hope that this begins to answer some of

>> your

>> questions.

>>

>> On to other topics: Tell Matt congratulations, it would appear that the

>> decorated windows paid off, it sounds like he and the team had a great

>> meet. I was also disappointed not to see Jack or Sam trick or treating

>> last night, I'm guessing they decided they are too old for it. I always

>> ask the kids who stop to tell me a joke for their candy, and they always

>> had the best ones.

>>

>> -Mike

>>

>>> Hi Mike, I am sending this note only to you out of all the city

>>> councilors

>>> who have voted for the rezoning because I think you are the only one

>>> that

>>> will reasonably consider my opinion. I am opposed to the development as

>>> it

>>> now stands for several reasons. The biggest one is the aesthetics. We

>>> already live in the shadow of the Kinnick pressbox addition (actually

>>> there

>>> is no shadow because of the lights shining in my bedroom window all

>>> night). When you look towards University Heights from any vantage

>>> point

>>> what you see is that pressbox sticking up like a sore thumb. Imagine

>>> what

>>> it will look like if you stick a 6 storey building on the tallest point

>>> in

>>> the metro area. You'll have an even bigger sore thumb that obviously

>>> looks out of place. I have heard the argument that we need to build

>>> vertically to house an increasing population rather than add housing

>>> units

>>> on the edge of town taking up more farm ground but I discount that  
>>> argument for this reason: we are a suburb. This is not an "urban  
>>> center". The urban center is downtown Iowa City. If you want to build  
>>> a  
>>> vertical housing center (high-rise) it should go downtown where the  
>>> rest  
>>> of the vertical housing centers (high-rises) are located.  
>>>  
>>> The second reason I oppose the Maxwell plan is the traffic. Clearly a  
>>> two-lane Melrose will not be able to handle the added traffic that this  
>>> development will cause, pushing traffic onto Koser and Grand Avenues,  
>>> which are not engineered to take that traffic. Years ago when Iowa  
>>> City  
>>> widened the Melrose bridge the city had the option to widen Melrose to  
>>> 4  
>>> lanes, and voted against it. Do you think we'll widen it now? Then  
>>> this  
>>> summer we put in new sidewalks along Melrose, eliminating the bike  
>>> lane.  
>>> So we'll have more car traffic, at least the same number bike traffic,  
>>> and  
>>> increased foot traffic along Melrose. Sounds like a huge headache to  
>>> me.  
>>>  
>>> Third, I am very concerned about the effects of putting an apartment  
>>> building in our neighborhood. I am worried that we'll end up with a  
>>> bunch  
>>> of college kids living in those apartments. I know that the city has  
>>> an  
>>> ordinance that prohibits non-related people living in the same  
>>> household  
>>> but that ordinance is rarely enforced. Look at our own street and  
>>> you'll  
>>> see this is true. And just look at the houses between Golfview and  
>>> Sunset  
>>> on Melrose. Do you really believe that those houses with 6 beat-up  
>>> cars  
>>> in the driveway aren't a group of non-related college kids? How long  
>>> will  
>>> it be before our neighborhood resembles downtown Iowa City, with  
>>> beautiful  
>>> old houses cut up into separate apartments or worse, torn down to make  
>>> way  
>>> for more apartment buildings?  
>>>  
>>> Mike, we've got a great neighborhood, nice comfortable homes, and a  
>>> safe  
>>> place for our kids to grow up. Don't jeopardize that. I want our kids  
>>> to  
>>> be able to ride their bikes up to the Athletic club without worrying  
>>> that  
>>> they'll get run over in the traffic. I want to be comfortable that  
>>> nobody  
>>> is going to walk into my garage and clean it out because I forgot to  
>>> lock  
>>> the door. I don't want to turn our neighborhood into another downtown  
>>> Iowa City. I want to keep the small-town vibe that lets us have a

>>> Sunday  
>>> afternoon parade, or a Chatauqua down on the corner, or a neighborhood  
>>> garden walk. I hope that's what you want, too. Thanks for considering  
>>> my  
>>> opinion. Brian

---

From: Bauer, Patrick B[mailto:patrick-bauer@uiowa.edu]  
Sent: 11/6/2010 2:12:07 PM  
To: mayhem@ia.net; jimlane@yahoo.com; stan-laverman@university-heights.org;  
brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org; patbirk@yahoo.com  
Cc: louise-from@university-heights.org; ballard@lefflaw.com;  
uhclerk@yahoo.com  
Subject : RE: Additional University Heights Financial Information

Attached is a memorandum addressing some of the matters coming up in the discussion of financial information occurring at last month's Council meeting

As always, please get back to me if you have questions about anything.

## MEMORANDUM

To: University Heights City Councilors

From: Pat Bauer

Date: November 6, 2010

Re: Additional University Heights Financial Information

The financial information I provided in a earlier memorandum was the subject of extended discussion at last month's Council meeting. To clarify some of the matters that were considered then, I am attaching further additional information in numbered Tables 6-10 (sequenced to follow numbered Tables 1-5 attached to the prior memorandum).<sup>1</sup>

### Computation and Composition of Municipal Revenues

As noted by Pat Yeggy, Table 1's presentation of the growth of municipal revenues did not detail the calculation or composition of Property Tax Revenues. Table 6 uses "index numbers"<sup>2</sup> in yellow-celled rows to show that a 66% increase in Total Property Tax Revenue (rows 14-15) from FY 2001 through FY 2009 involved (i) a 65% increase in Assessed Valuation (rows 6-7), (ii) a 20% decrease in the Rollback Factor (Rows 8-9) which reduced the growth in Taxable Valuation (rows 10-11) to 37%, which was in turn offset by (iii) a 22% increase in the City Levy Rate (rows 12-13).

The bottom part of Table 6 details both the dollar amounts generated by each particular kind of property tax levy with summary rows being followed by blue-celled rows of percentages of total property taxes attributable to (i) the "regular" general and debt service levies (rows 27-29) and (ii) the "special" additional levies that Pat Yeggy noted University Heights has increasingly utilized in recent years (rows 31-36).

As Table 7 demonstrates, however, the use of "special" non-general/non-debt service levies is a circumstance common to many other Johnson County municipalities. For the past eight years, University Heights has been at the middle or in the bottom half of the majority of municipalities using such levies. Questions of appropriate comparability certainly can be raised, but University Heights' use of such levies certainly does not indicate financial difficulties that are different in kind or quality from those faced by a majority of other area cities.

### Annual Budget Surplus / Deficit and Composition of Municipal Expenditures

Pat Yeggy noted the existence of budget deficits in six of the past nine years (detailed in the top part of Table 8), and such deficits generally involve expenditures increasing at a faster rate than

---

1. Most entries in Tables 6 and 8 are taken from specified rows in the spreadsheet previously circulated by Pat Yeggy (Exhibit A) (e.g., [PY3] in row 6 of Table 6 indicates entries taken from row 3 of Exhibit A). Although Pat and I are still working on confirmation of a few of the entries in her spreadsheet, any discrepancies are unlikely to materially affect the overall direction and magnitude of the analyses in my tables.

2. Indexing FY 2001 entries as 100 provides a ready measure of the direction and magnitude of changes over time. In Table 6, for example, the increase in Assessed Valuation in row 5 from \$59,519,268 in FY 2001 to \$98,503,249 in FY 2009 is reflected in row 6 by index numbers of 100 in FY 2001 rising to 165 in FY 2009 indicating an Assessed Valuation increase of 65%.

revenues. Analysis of the composition of expenditures, however, reveals significant differences in the rate of growth in particular categories of expenses.

The middle part of Table 8 again uses rows of yellow-celled index numbers to show that a 43% increase in Total “Base Budget” expenditures from FY 2001 through FY 2009 FY (rows 23-24) involved (i) only a 29% increase Non-Public Safety expenditures (rows 20-21) and (ii) a considerably more substantial 59% increase in Public Safety expenditures (rows 13-14). The rows of blue-celled percentages in the middle and bottom parts of Table 8 show that the bulk of Public Safety expenditures (row 15) are for Police (row 36), and the rows of yellow-celled index numbers in the bottom part of Table 8 also clearly demonstrate that expenditures for Police (rows 34-35) have increased at a much higher rate than expenditures for either Fire (rows 37-38) or Other Public Safety (rows 40-41).

Coming at much the same circumstance from another direction, Table 9 details the existence of striking differences in expenditures for Police in University Heights relative to other municipalities in Johnson County. Although population puts it exactly in the middle of this set of eleven cities, expenditures for Police in University Heights as a percentage of “base budget”<sup>3</sup> are approximately three times greater than in the other three cities with full-time police services (i.e., Iowa City, Coralville, and North Liberty) and approximately four to fourteen times greater than the remaining seven cities in which less-than-full-time contractual police services are provided by the Johnson County Sheriff’s Department. Somewhat similar differences in magnitude also exist on a per capita basis, with expenditures for Police in University Heights being approximately twice as great as those in the other three cities with full-time police services and approximately five to twelve times greater than the remaining seven cities that have less-than-full-time contractual police services.

Although a full explication of the effects of expenditures for Police probably should include offsetting entries for revenues realized through things such as law enforcement grants and fines, information concerning such revenues is not readily available and also properly would have to be qualified by measurements of any accompanying costs (e.g., any charges for prosecutorial services provided by city attorney). Perhaps as importantly, such offsetting revenues presumably also exist in other municipalities and thus relative comparisons would remain valid in the absence of some reason to believe that such revenues would be proportionately less than those obtained in University Heights.

Questions of appropriate comparison can again be raised, and in any event the residents of University Heights might well want to pay whatever is needed to provide the quality and quantity of currently existing levels of police services. At a minimum, however, concerns about University Heights’ financial health properly must be considered in a context that includes a full awareness of the financial circumstances that Tables 8 and 9 illuminate.

---

3. Because in a number of instances percentage differences would be increased quite dramatically by including municipal expenditures for Debt Service and Capital Projects, Tables 9 and 10 use relatively more normal “base budget” figures that are combinations of expenditures in the remaining categories of Public Safety, Public Works, Culture & Recreation, Community & Economic Development, and General Government.

The Potentially Elusive Quality of  
Any Eventually Materializing Significant Increases in Municipal Revenues

As noted in the prior memorandum, “both the timing and extent of additional property tax revenues from ... redevelopment are entirely dependent on the ... unknown dimensions of TIF financing arrangements consistently represented to be a necessary element of the project being proposed.” If the cost of providing Police Services continues to grow at a considerably faster rate than other municipal expenses, any eventually materializing significant increases in municipal revenue might well be substantially consumed by the increased costs of such services.

A somewhat different possibility is suggested by the relatively level cost of fire protection contractually provided by Coralville. Persons expressing concerns about University Heights losing its independence sometimes point to dependency on services provided by others. Given the stable cost of fire protection over the past nine years, the price University Heights is charged may to some considerable extent be constrained by how much others perceive it can afford to pay. (As Table 10 demonstrates, University Heights currently has the third lowest level of expenditures for Fire (both as a percentage of base budget and on a per capita basis) of Johnson County’s eleven cities.) If and to the extent University Heights realizes any additional revenues beyond those needed to cover the costs of desired police services, a perhaps predictable response by the providers of fire and other contract services could well be the pursuit of price increases gauged rather understandably to the circumstances of our increased ability to pay such higher prices.

UH Financial Information  
2001-2009  
Pat Yeggy (10/13/10)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b><u>Information</u></b>									
Valuation	\$59,519,268	\$59,224,218	\$65,038,570	\$65,634,199	\$70,787,904	\$71,092,060	\$85,586,484	\$86,088,654	\$98,503,249
Valuation w/ Rollback	32,647,806	34,412,939	34,497,912	34,705,086	35,343,438	35,246,894	40,504,313	40,349,810	44,825,554
Rollback	54.8525	56.2651	51.6676	51.3874	48.4558	47.9642	45.9960	45.5596	44.0803
City Levy Rate	9.11954	9.36835	9.89355	10.44133	10.46292	10.61560	10.39247	10.52988	11.08593
Debt Limit for Bonds	2,975,963	2,961,211	3,251,929	3,281,710	3,539,395	3,554,648	4,279,324	4,304,433	4,925,262
70% (Recommended) Limit	2,083,174	2,072,848	2,276,350	2,297,197	2,477,577	2,488,254	2,995,527	3,013,103	3,447,683
<b><u>Property Tax Levies</u></b>									
Reg Property tax - \$8.10/\$1000	253,884	280,085	279,433	293,817	286,282	285,500	328,085	326,833	363,087
Operate Transit							37,119	38,082	38,082
Liability Insurance				11,674	12,040	12,448	14,417	16,503	15,328
Library (voted)							10,936	10,894	12,103
<b>TOTAL GENERAL</b>	253,884	280,085	279,433	305,491	298,322	297,948	390,557	392,312	428,600
FICA & IPERS			19,821	18,192	20,913	21,716	23,546	25,913	27,573
Employee Benefits				6,714	7,226	8,214	6,837	6,868	8,843
<b>TOTAL SPECIAL REVENUE</b>			19,821	24,906	28,139	29,930	30,383	32,781	36,416
<b>DEBT SERVICE</b>	46,156	43,897	42,053	45,426	44,380	46,290	0	7,821	31,612
<b>TOTAL PROPERTY TAXES</b>	300,040	323,982	341,307	375,823	370,841	374,168	420,940	432,914	496,628
<b><u>Revenues &amp; Other Financing Sources</u></b>									
Property Tax Revenues	313,137	334,859	352,115	377,962	384,202	380,989	430,355	433,352	503,707
Other Governmental Revenues	103,046	92,916	96,006	83,407	84,738	84,847	92,491	114,056	96,804
City Revenues	72,819	81,838	77,247	103,691	99,307	138,624	133,635	121,104	102,805
Local Option Sales Tax									
Proceeds of Debt								240,000	
Wide Sidewalk Grant & Stimulus \$\$									
<b>Total Revenues</b>	496,023	509,613	525,368	565,060	568,247	604,460	656,481	908,512	703,316
<b><u>Expenditures &amp; Other Financing Uses</u></b>									
Public Safety	236,898	215,474	230,844	262,212	297,927	330,741	315,901	355,290	376,765
Public Works	209,547	191,023	144,896	160,706	153,304	143,072	150,377	175,710	173,140
Culture and Recreation	5,389	5,663	5,952	6,037	6,358	3,670	15,833	20,320	25,437
Community and Economic Development			158	836	1,175		1,793	2,230	1,652
General Government	86,172	107,337	93,607	109,043	104,569	93,893	84,842	121,431	133,842
Debt Service	41,333	44,723	43,078	46,380	44,380	47,340	0	7,821	31,612
Wide Sidewalk									
Capital Projects								176062	
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	538,006	519,497	518,535	585,214	607,713	618,716	568,746	858,864	742,448
Transfers Out							6,638		
<b>Total Expenditures/Transfers Out</b>	538,006	519,497	518,535	585,214	607,713	618,716	575,384	858,864	742,448
<b>Beginning Balance July 1</b>	199,242	157,259	147,375	154,208	134,054	94,588	80,332	161,429	211,077
<b>Ending Balance June 30</b>	157,259	147,375	154,208	134,054	94,588	80,332	161,429	211,077	171,945
<b>Over (Under) Expenditures</b>	-41,983	-9,884	6,833	-20,154	-39,466	-14,256	81,097	49,648	-39,132
<b>General Obligation Debt</b>	195,000	160,000	125,000	85,000	45,000	0	0	240,000	218,000

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	CITY OF UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS - MUNICIPAL REVENUES									
2										
3										
4	MUNICIPAL REVENUES, FY 2001 - FY 2009									
5		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
6	Assessed Valuation [PY3] [a]	59,519,268	59,224,218	65,038,570	65,634,199	70,787,904	71,092,060	85,586,484	86,088,654	98,503,249
7	Index (2001 = 100)	100	100	109	110	119	119	144	145	165
8	Rollback Factor [PY5] [a]	0.5485	0.5627	0.5167	0.5139	0.4846	0.4796	0.4600	0.4556	0.4408
9	Index (2001 = 100)	100	103	94	94	88	87	84	83	80
10	Taxable Valuation [PY4]	32,647,806	34,412,939	34,497,912	34,705,086	35,343,438	35,246,894	40,504,313	40,349,810	44,825,554
11	Index (2001 = 100)	100	105	106	106	108	108	124	124	137
12	City Levy Rate [PY6]	9.11954	9.36835	9.89355	10.44133	10.46292	10.61560	10.39247	10.52988	11.08593
13	Index (2001 = 100)	100	103	108	114	115	116	114	115	122
14	<b>Total Property Tax Revenue [PY20]</b>	<b>300,040</b>	<b>323,982</b>	<b>341,307</b>	<b>375,823</b>	<b>370,841</b>	<b>374,168</b>	<b>420,940</b>	<b>432,914</b>	<b>496,628</b>
15	Index (2001 = 100)	100	108	114	125	124	125	140	144	166
16	Intergovernmental [PY24]	103,046	92,916	96,006	83,407	84,738	84,847	92,491	114,056	96,804
17	Other City Revenue [PY25]	72,819	81,838	77,247	103,691	99,307	138,624	133,635	121,104	102,805
18	<b>Total Non-Property Tax Revenue</b>	<b>175,865</b>	<b>174,754</b>	<b>173,253</b>	<b>187,098</b>	<b>184,045</b>	<b>223,471</b>	<b>226,126</b>	<b>235,160</b>	<b>199,609</b>
19	Index (2001 = 100)	100	99	99	106	105	127	129	134	114
20	<b>Total Municipal Revenue [PY29] [b]</b>	<b>496,023</b>	<b>509,613</b>	<b>525,368</b>	<b>565,060</b>	<b>568,247</b>	<b>604,460</b>	<b>656,481</b>	<b>668,512</b>	<b>703,316</b>
21	Index (2001 = 100)	100	103	106	114	115	122	132	135	142
22										
23										
24	PROPERTY TAX REVENUES BY BASIS OF LEVY									
25		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
26	<b>Total Property Taxes [PY20]</b>	<b>300,040</b>	<b>323,982</b>	<b>341,307</b>	<b>375,823</b>	<b>370,841</b>	<b>374,168</b>	<b>420,940</b>	<b>432,914</b>	<b>496,628</b>
27	General Levy (\$8.10/\$1000) [PY11]	253,884	280,085	279,433	293,817	286,282	285,500	328,085	326,833	363,087
28	Debt Service [PY37]	46,156	43,897	42,053	45,426	44,380	46,290	0	7,821	31,612
29	<b>Total General Levy &amp; Debt Service</b>	<b>300,040</b>	<b>323,982</b>	<b>321,486</b>	<b>339,243</b>	<b>330,662</b>	<b>331,790</b>	<b>328,085</b>	<b>334,654</b>	<b>394,699</b>
30	Percentage of Total Property Taxes	100.0%	100.0%	94.2%	90.3%	89.2%	88.7%	77.9%	77.3%	79.5%
31	FICA & IPERS [PY16]			19,821	18,192	20,913	21,716	23,546	25,913	27,573
32	Employee Benefits [PY17]				6,714	7,226	8,214	6,837	6,868	8,843
33	Liability Insurance [PY13]				11,674	12,040	12,448	14,417	16,503	15,328
34	Transit [PY12]							37,119	38,082	38,082
35	Library [PY14]							10,936	10,894	12,103
36	<b>Total Non-Gen. Levy/Non-Debt Service</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19,821</b>	<b>36,580</b>	<b>40,179</b>	<b>42,378</b>	<b>92,855</b>	<b>98,260</b>	<b>101,929</b>
37	Percentage of Total Property Taxes	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	9.7%	10.8%	11.3%	22.1%	22.7%	20.5%
38										
39	[a] Because of differences in available sources, Assessed Valuation x Rollback Factor only approximates reported Taxable Valuation									
40	[b] Proceeds of debt (\$240,000) excluded from Total Municipal Revenue for FY 2008									

TABLE 6

**CITY TAX RATES  
JOHNSON COUNTY  
FY 2010 - FY 1999**

**2009/2010 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE		GENERAL		OTHER LEVIES				TOTAL	NON-GEN
	2000	JANUARY 1, 2008	LEVY	OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITAL	REGULAR	&
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY09/10	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE	W/0 AG	NON-DEBT
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	2,559,738,879	8.10000	1.64041	0.25607	4.21934	3.63680		17.85262	5.53328
CORALVILLE	17,269	740,541,205	8.10000	0.53640		2.01730	2.76396		13.41766	3.30036
OXFORD	705	10,602,910	8.10000	1.32039	0.27000		1.11290		10.80329	2.70329
SOLOM	1,177	52,870,304	8.10000	0.56081		0.27340	1.06071	0.67500	10.66992	2.29652
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	49,222,413	8.10000	1.41176		0.64221	0.79257		10.94654	2.20433
TIFFIN	975	25,640,557	8.10000	0.27000		1.80408	1.88549		12.05957	2.15549
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	451,758,007	8.10000	0.35096		0.97008	1.48889		10.90993	1.83985
LONE TREE	1,151	24,899,826	8.10000			1.48125			9.58125	0.00000
HILLS	679	28,351,644	8.10000						8.10000	0.00000
SWISHER	813	22,975,297	8.10000						8.10000	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	20,482,808	7.10000						7.10000	0.00000

**2008/2009 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE		GENERAL		OTHER LEVIES				TOTAL	NON-GEN
	JANUARY 1, 2007			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITAL	REGULAR	&
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY08/09	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE	W/0 AG	NON-DEBT
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	2,453,820,284	8.10000	1.63854	0.05000	4.30272	3.62548		17.71674	5.31402
CORALVILLE	17,269	704,297,996	8.10000	0.48466		2.01941	2.81570		13.41977	3.30036
OXFORD	705	10,377,688	8.10000	1.34751	0.27000		1.13310		10.85061	2.75061
SOLOM	1,177	49,149,503	8.10000	0.57325		0.25070	1.05309	0.67500	10.65204	2.30134
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	45,620,365	8.10000	1.48349		0.69004	0.81240		11.08593	2.29589
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	335,149,577	8.10000	0.32471	0.16337	1.05585	1.69338		11.33731	2.18146
TIFFIN	975	22,406,964	8.10000	0.09997		3.24446	1.44147		12.88590	1.54144
LONE TREE	1,151	23,498,712	8.10000			1.34575			9.44575	0.00000
SWISHER	813	19,642,514	8.10000						8.10000	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	21,258,458	7.10000						7.10000	0.00000
HILLS	679	28,534,801	7.00899						7.00899	0.00000

**2007/2008 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE		GENERAL		OTHER LEVIES				TOTAL	NON-GEN
	JANUARY 1, 2006			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITAL	REGULAR	&
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY07/08	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE	W/0 AG	NON-DEBT
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	2,331,569,522	8.10000	1.63252		3.78575	3.77835		17.29662	5.41087
CORALVILLE	17,269	666,348,651	8.10000	0.43153		2.06890	2.68600		13.28643	3.11753
OXFORD	705	9,962,171	8.10000	1.34850	0.26992		1.13399		10.85241	2.75241
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	41,125,810	8.10000	1.61745			0.81243		10.52988	2.42988
SOLOM	1,177	45,730,995	8.10000	0.54558			1.02416	0.67500	10.34474	2.24474
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	275,810,649	8.10000			0.97873	1.88726		10.96599	1.88726
TIFFIN	975	21,505,802	8.10000	0.09997		3.24481	1.44147		12.88625	1.54144
LONE TREE	1,151	21,639,086	8.10000			2.70003			10.80003	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	18,685,782	7.10000						7.10000	0.00000
SWISHER	813	25,407,638	7.09995						7.09995	0.00000
HILLS	679	25,904,784	6.36948						6.36948	0.00000

**2006/2007 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE		GENERAL		OTHER LEVIES				TOTAL	NON-GEN
	JANUARY 1, 2005			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITAL	REGULAR	&
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY06/07	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE	W/0 AG	NON-DEBT
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	2,283,511,711	8.10000	1.58610	0.03846	3.87900	3.69869		17.30225	5.32325
CORALVILLE	17,269	627,728,258	8.10000	0.44092		2.06883	2.67666		13.28641	3.11758
OXFORD	705	9,612,114	8.10000	1.35246	0.27000		1.13399		10.85645	2.75645
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	41,300,703	8.10000	1.54236			0.75011		10.39247	2.29247
SOLOM	1,177	42,665,494	8.10000	0.60353		0.53765	0.76586	0.67500	10.68204	2.04439
TIFFIN	975	20,279,550	8.10000	0.10000		1.34889	1.32646		10.87535	1.42646
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	230,570,908	8.10000	0.15036		1.29922	0.57502		10.12460	0.72538
LONE TREE	1,151	21,361,424	8.10000			2.80443			10.90443	0.00000
SWISHER	813	25,009,525	7.09997						7.09997	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	15,581,396	6.87557						6.87557	0.00000
HILLS	679	24,811,739	5.88431						5.88431	0.00000

**CITY TAX RATES  
JOHNSON COUNTY  
FY 2010 - FY 1999**

**2005/2006 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE			----- OTHER LEVIES -----					TOTAL REGULAR W/O AG	NON-GEN & NON-DEBT
	JANUARY 1, 2004			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITOL		
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY05/06	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE		
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	2,091,750,278	8.10000	1.52863	0.27000	4.14944	3.68113		17.72920	5.47976
CORALVILLE	17,269	599,340,111	8.10000	0.57318		1.80177	2.04393		12.51888	2.61711
OXFORD	705	9,049,678	8.10000	0.88401	0.27000	1.33196	1.01031		11.59628	2.16432
TIFFIN	975	17,500,581	8.10000	0.10011		1.27099	1.52909		11.00019	1.62920
SOLO	1,177	38,410,796	8.10000			0.66068	0.66317	0.67500	10.09885	1.33817
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	36,046,319	8.10000	0.35316		1.31331	0.84913		10.61560	1.20229
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	181,401,990	8.10000			1.39659	0.62364		10.12023	0.62364
LONE TREE	1,151	19,993,270	8.10000			1.97590			10.07590	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	12,282,601	7.10200						7.10200	0.00000
SWISHER	813	20,567,661	7.09998						7.09998	0.00000
HILLS	679	23,791,016	5.88457						5.88457	0.00000

**2004/2005 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE			----- OTHER LEVIES -----					TOTAL REGULAR W/O AG	NON-GEN & NON-DEBT
	JANUARY 1, 2003			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITOL		
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY04/05	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE		
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	2,049,483,853	8.10000	1.56744	0.27000	3.95361	3.42289		17.31394	5.26033
CORALVILLE	17,269	563,195,064	8.10000	0.52168		1.80080	2.09640		12.51888	2.61808
TIFFIN	975	17,720,304	8.10000	0.10028		1.36651	1.30810		10.87489	1.40838
SOLO	1,177	37,205,746	8.10000			0.59161	0.63649	0.67500	10.00310	1.31149
OXFORD	705	9,678,241	8.10000	0.51662		1.39029	0.66200		10.66891	1.17862
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	36,195,345	8.10000	0.34065		1.22612	0.79615		10.46292	1.13680
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	150,151,503	8.10000			1.49325	0.65675		10.25000	0.65675
LONE TREE	1,151	19,655,181	8.10000			1.91769			10.01769	0.00000
SWISHER	813	20,529,663	7.09997						7.09997	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	10,619,837	7.09992						7.09992	0.00000
HILLS	679	22,822,363	6.13433						6.13433	0.00000

**2003/2004 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE			----- OTHER LEVIES -----					TOTAL REGULAR W/O AG	NON-GEN & NON-DEBT
	JANUARY 1, 2002			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITOL		
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY03/04	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE		
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	1,978,126,434	8.10000	1.46358	0.27000	4.57022	3.19207		17.59587	4.92565
CORALVILLE	15,123	529,253,899	8.10000	0.37121		1.80080	1.89063		12.16264	2.26184
SOLO	1,177	39,219,631	8.10000			0.64763	0.63700	0.67504	10.05967	1.31204
TIFFIN	975	16,933,650	8.09997	0.09998		1.19537	1.05825		10.45357	1.15823
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	35,554,540	8.09998	0.33638		1.30447	0.70050		10.44133	1.03688
OXFORD	705	9,921,853	8.10000			1.35129	0.94881		10.40010	0.94881
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	127,541,776	8.10000			1.63252	0.51748		10.25000	0.51748
LONE TREE	1,151	20,701,543	8.10000			0.91769			9.01769	0.00000
SWISHER	813	18,970,360	7.09997						7.09997	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	10,009,797	7.09994						7.09994	0.00000
HILLS	679	22,327,184	6.27038						6.27038	0.00000

**2002/2003 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE			----- OTHER LEVIES -----					TOTAL REGULAR W/O AG	NON-GEN & NON-DEBT
	JANUARY 1, 2001			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITOL		
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY02/03	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE		
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	62,220	1,945,190,885	8.10000	1.43592	0.27000	4.16071	2.84681		16.81344	4.55273
CORALVILLE	15,123	498,789,722	8.10000	0.31965		1.80080	1.59944		11.81989	1.91909
TIFFIN	975	16,525,096	8.10000	0.10003		0.19144	1.09833		9.48980	1.19836
OXFORD	705	10,160,658	8.10000			1.38150	0.73657		10.21807	0.73657
SOLO	1,177	37,356,164	8.09998			0.71206		0.67499	9.48703	0.67499
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	35,338,767	8.10000			1.21900	0.57455		9.89355	0.57455
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	115,314,018	8.10000			0.49000	0.50000		9.09000	0.50000
LONE TREE	1,151	19,520,246	8.10000			0.82845			8.92845	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	250	9,015,741	7.10003						7.10003	0.00000
SWISHER	813	18,994,185	7.09996						7.09996	0.00000
HILLS	679	21,790,160	4.81869						4.81869	0.00000

**CITY TAX RATES  
JOHNSON COUNTY  
FY 2010 - FY 1999**

**2001/2002 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE			----- OTHER LEVIES-----					TOTAL	NON-GEN
	JANUARY 1, 2000			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITOL	REGULAR	&
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY01/02	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE	W/0 AG	NON-DEBT
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	59,738	1,922,751,152	8.10000	1.42429	0.26972	2.94479	2.11103		14.84983	3.80504
CORALVILLE	10,347	482,574,994	8.10000	0.43309		1.80080	1.48600		11.81989	1.91909
SOLOM	1,050	34,000,097	8.10000			0.81588		0.67500	9.59088	0.67500
TIFFIN	460	15,241,113	8.10000			1.47857	0.52490		10.10347	0.52490
NORTH LIBERTY	2,926	100,371,753	8.10000			0.49667	0.46968		9.06635	0.46968
OXFORD	663	10,692,613	8.10000			1.41932	0.28057		9.79989	0.28057
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	1,042	35,260,222	8.09998			1.26837			9.36835	0.00000
LONE TREE	979	20,065,934	7.92198			0.85042			8.77240	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	223	8,543,273	7.09997						7.09997	0.00000
SWISHER	645	19,839,535	7.09996						7.09996	0.00000
HILLS	662	20,274,826	5.17884						5.17884	0.00000

**2000/2001 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE			----- OTHER LEVIES-----					TOTAL	NON-GEN
	JANUARY 1, 1999			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITOL	REGULAR	&
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY00/01	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE	W/0 AG	NON-DEBT
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	59,738	1,810,400,475	8.10000	1.44187	0.27	2.99022	1.9555		14.75759	3.66737
CORALVILLE	10,347	444,603,214	8.10000	0.43909		1.8008	1.1357		11.47559	1.57479
TIFFIN	460	12,725,918	8.10000			2.04549	0.80309		10.94858	0.80309
OXFORD	663	9,870,342	8.10000			1.50627	0.60788		10.21415	0.60788
SOLOM	1,050	29,931,082	8.10000			0.78781		0.67498	9.56279	0.67498
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	1,042	33,830,972	7.75000			1.36954			9.11954	0.00000
LONE TREE	979	18,949,255	8.10000			0.9391			9.0391	0.00000
NORTH LIBERTY	2,926	88,683,278	8.10000			0.39438	0.46		8.95438	0.46000
SHUEYVILLE	223	7,629,581	7.10000						7.1	0.00000
SWISHER	645	19,052,682	6.71821						6.71821	0.00000
HILLS	662	19,751,136	5.31615						5.31615	0.00000

**1999/2000 CITY TAX RATES, BY CONTROL COUNTY**

	TAXABLE VALUE			----- OTHER LEVIES-----					TOTAL	NON-GEN
	JANUARY 1, 1998			OUTSIDE	EMERG	DEBT	EMPLOY	CAPITOL	REGULAR	&
	CENSUS	REGULAR W G&E	FY99/00	8.10000	LEVY	SERVICE	BENEFIT	IMPROVE	W/0 AG	NON-DEBT
<b>52 JOHNSON</b>										
IOWA CITY	59,738	1,726,109,142	8.10000	1.44094		2.30043	2.0093		13.85067	3.45024
CORALVILLE	10,347	427,912,459	8.10000	0.46752		1.8008	0.56088		10.9292	1.02840
SOLOM	1,050	28,187,260	8.10000			0.86741		0.675	9.64241	0.67500
OXFORD	663	9,677,048	8.10000			1.61677	0.62002		10.33679	0.62002
NORTH LIBERTY	2,926	78,630,738	8.10000			0.44454	0.41218		8.95672	0.41218
LONE TREE	979	18,596,263	8.10000			0.98865			9.08865	0.00000
TIFFIN	460	12,520,765	8.10000			0.9715			9.0715	0.00000
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	1,042	32,899,284	7.40001			1.4562			8.85621	0.00000
SHUEYVILLE	223	5,764,395	7.09996						7.09996	0.00000
SWISHER	645	19,061,398	6.50529						6.50529	0.00000
HILLS	662	19,518,087	5.37963						5.37963	0.00000

Data Sources: "City Tax Rates" Spreadsheets (Fiscal Year 2010 through Fiscal Year 2008)  
<http://www.dom.state.ia.us/local/city/index.html>  
 "City Tax Rates" Spreadsheets - Fiscal Year 2007 through Fiscal Year 2000  
<http://www.dom.state.ia.us/local/city/prop-tax-archive.html>

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	CITY OF UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS - MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES									
2										
3										
4	BEGINNING BALANCE - ANNUAL BUDGET SURPLUS/-DEFICIT - ENDING BALANCE									
5		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
6	Beginning Balance July 1 [PY44]	199,242	157,259	147,375	154,208	134,054	94,588	80,332	161,429	211,077
7	Surplus / -Deficit [PY46]	-41,983	-9,884	6,833	-20,154	-39,466	-14,256	81,097	49,648	-39,132
8	Ending Balance June 30 [PY45]	157,259	147,375	154,208	134,054	94,588	80,332	161,429	211,077	171,945
9										
10										
11	MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES, FY 2001 - FY 2009									
12		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
13	Public Safety [PY32]	236,898	215,474	230,844	262,212	297,927	330,741	315,901	355,290	376,765
14	Index (2001 = 100)	100	91	97	111	126	140	133	150	159
15	Percentage of Total Expenditures	44.0%	41.5%	44.5%	44.8%	49.0%	53.5%	55.5%	41.4%	50.7%
16	Public Works [PY33] [a]	168,214	146,300	144,896	160,706	153,304	143,072	150,377	175,710	173,140
17	Culture and Recreation [PY34]	5,389	5,663	5,952	6,037	6,358	3,670	15,833	20,320	25,437
18	Comm & Econ Devel [PY35]			158	836	1,175		1,793	2,230	1,652
19	General Government [PY36]	86,172	107,337	93,607	109,043	104,569	93,893	84,842	121,431	133,842
20	Non-Public Safety Expenditures	259,775	259,300	244,613	276,622	265,406	240,635	252,845	319,691	334,071
21	Index (2001 = 100)	100	100	94	106	102	93	97	123	129
22	Percentage of Total Expenditures	48.3%	49.9%	47.2%	47.3%	43.7%	38.9%	44.5%	37.2%	45.0%
23	Total "Base Budget" Expenditures	496,673	474,774	475,457	538,834	563,333	571,376	568,746	674,981	710,836
24	Index (2001 = 100)	100	96	96	108	113	115	115	136	143
25	Debt Service [PY37]	41,333	44,723	43,078	46,380	44,380	47,340	0	7,821	31,612
26	Capital Projects [PY39]								176,062	
27	Total Expenditures [PY29]	538,006	519,497	518,535	585,214	607,713	618,716	568,746	858,864	742,448
28	Index (2001 = 100)	100	97	96	109	113	115	106	160	138
29	[a] Adjustments in entries for FY 2001 & FY 2002 to exclude amounts for debt service subsequently listed separately									
30										
31										
32	BREAKDOWN OF PUBLIC SAFETY EXPENDITURES									
33		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
34	Police	157,075	156,205	171,307	200,077	254,274	268,302	250,699	301,786	311,125
35	Index (2001 = 100)	100	99	109	127	162	171	160	192	198
36	Percentage of Total Expenditures	29.2%	30.1%	33.0%	34.2%	41.8%	43.4%	44.1%	35.1%	41.9%
37	Fire	31,168	31,318	31,318	29,718	32,918	30,518	31,318	32,118	32,118
38	Index (2001 = 100)	100	100	100	95	106	98	100	103	103
39	Percentage of Total Expenditures	5.8%	6.0%	6.0%	5.1%	5.4%	4.9%	5.5%	3.7%	4.3%
40	Other Public Safety	48,655	27,951	28,219	32,417	10,735	31,921	33,884	21,386	33,522
41	Index (2001 = 100)	100	57	58	67	22	66	70	44	69
42	Percentage of Total Expenditures	9.0%	5.4%	5.4%	5.5%	1.8%	5.2%	6.0%	2.5%	4.5%
43	Breakdown of Public Safety Expenditures Obtained from Form F-66 / Page 6: Line 2 / Column h (Police) & Line 13 / Column h (Fire) (2004-2009)									
44	Line 4 / Column h (Police) and Line 23 / Column h (Fire) (2001-2003)									

TABLE 8

<b>POLICE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(percentage of base budget) [arrayed by FY 2009 percentage]</i>						
	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	46.2%	52.0%	49.6%	37.7%	48.4%
IOWA CITY	62,220	17.2%	17.7%	18.3%	18.2%	14.8%
CORALVILLE	17,269	22.8%	24.7%	23.6%	21.9%	14.5%
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	11.2%	5.5%	9.0%	13.1%	14.4%
SWISHER	813	7.3%	9.5%	8.0%	10.1%	11.1%
LONE TREE	1,151	5.8%	7.6%	10.1%	7.6%	9.8%
SHUEYVILLE	250	9.7%	16.8%	8.6%	2.5%	9.5%
OXFORD	705	9.4%	7.7%	5.7%	10.0%	8.3%
HILLS	679	5.4%	5.4%	5.3%	10.4%	5.4%
TIFFIN	975	1.2%	2.4%	3.3%	3.7%	4.7%
SOLO	1,117	3.5%	4.1%	3.8%	3.1%	3.3%

<b>POLICE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(percentage of base budget) [arrayed by population]</i>						
	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
IOWA CITY	62,220	17.2%	17.7%	18.3%	18.2%	14.8%
CORALVILLE	17,269	22.8%	24.7%	23.6%	21.9%	14.5%
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	11.2%	5.5%	9.0%	13.1%	14.4%
LONE TREE	1,151	5.8%	7.6%	10.1%	7.6%	9.8%
SOLO	1,117	3.5%	4.1%	3.8%	3.1%	3.3%
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	46.2%	52.0%	49.6%	37.7%	48.4%
TIFFIN	975	1.2%	2.4%	3.3%	3.7%	4.7%
SWISHER	813	7.3%	9.5%	8.0%	10.1%	11.1%
OXFORD	705	9.4%	7.7%	5.7%	10.0%	8.3%
HILLS	679	5.4%	5.4%	5.3%	10.4%	5.4%
SHUEYVILLE	250	9.7%	16.8%	8.6%	2.5%	9.5%

<b>POLICE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(per capita) [arrayed by FY 2009 per capita]</i>						
	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	\$263.50	\$300.80	\$285.72	\$325.35	\$348.48
CORALVILLE	17,269	\$160.55	\$182.54	\$175.96	\$180.25	\$197.52
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	\$78.09	\$93.81	\$114.29	\$153.41	\$180.02
IOWA CITY	62,220	\$131.41	\$139.58	\$146.06	\$154.73	\$151.80
SHUEYVILLE	250	\$32.03	\$34.21	\$33.95	\$56.16	\$67.39
SWISHER	813	\$35.18	\$37.29	\$37.29	\$43.17	\$43.17
LONE TREE	1,151	\$29.82	\$31.46	\$31.61	\$36.18	\$36.59
TIFFIN	975	\$14.08	\$18.03	\$21.53	\$28.80	\$36.00
SOLO	1,117	\$29.16	\$30.91	\$30.91	\$35.79	\$35.79
OXFORD	705	\$24.34	\$25.80	\$27.22	\$29.53	\$29.87
HILLS	679	\$20.22	\$20.22	\$20.22	\$29.03	\$29.03

<b>POLICE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(per capita) [arrayed by population]</i>						
	<u>Pop.</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
IOWA CITY	62,220	\$131.41	\$139.58	\$146.06	\$154.73	\$151.80
CORALVILLE	17,269	\$160.55	\$182.54	\$175.96	\$180.25	\$197.52
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	\$78.09	\$93.81	\$114.29	\$153.41	\$180.02
LONE TREE	1,151	\$29.82	\$31.46	\$31.61	\$36.18	\$36.59
SOLO	1,117	\$29.16	\$30.91	\$30.91	\$35.79	\$35.79
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	\$263.50	\$300.80	\$285.72	\$325.35	\$348.48
TIFFIN	975	\$14.08	\$18.03	\$21.53	\$28.80	\$36.00
SWISHER	813	\$35.18	\$37.29	\$37.29	\$43.17	\$43.17
OXFORD	705	\$24.34	\$25.80	\$27.22	\$29.53	\$29.87
HILLS	679	\$20.22	\$20.22	\$20.22	\$29.03	\$29.03
SHUEYVILLE	250	\$32.03	\$34.21	\$33.95	\$56.16	\$67.39

Data Obtained from City Budget Forms available at: [http://165.206.254.124/budget-results.asp?county\\_no=52](http://165.206.254.124/budget-results.asp?county_no=52)

Base Budget = Form 631.1 / Lines 15-20 / Column C

Police Expenditures = Form 631 A P1 / Line 1 / Column I

<b>FIRE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(percentage of base budget) [arrayed by FY09 percentage]</i>						
	<b>Pop.</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>
OXFORD	705	5.3%	9.5%	2.4%	6.6%	29.2%
HILLS	679	7.8%	7.8%	7.7%	13.3%	12.0%
TIFFIN	975	2.4%	4.3%	4.2%	12.6%	10.1%
IOWA CITY	62,220	10.4%	10.6%	11.0%	10.6%	8.6%
SHUEYVILLE	250	8.1%	15.3%	9.8%	3.3%	7.6%
LONE TREE	1,151	4.6%	5.7%	7.1%	4.7%	6.0%
SOLON	1,117	7.8%	10.5%	10.9%	5.4%	5.5%
SWISHER	813	3.5%	4.4%	4.0%	4.5%	5.1%
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	5.8%	5.3%	5.5%	3.8%	4.5%
CORALVILLE	17,269	3.2%	5.9%	6.4%	4.7%	3.6%
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	2.7%	1.5%	11.5%	4.0%	3.6%

<b>FIRE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(percentage of base budget) [arrayed by population]</i>						
	<b>Pop.</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>
IOWA CITY	62,220	10.4%	10.6%	11.0%	10.6%	8.6%
CORALVILLE	17,269	3.2%	5.9%	6.4%	4.7%	3.6%
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	2.7%	1.5%	11.5%	4.0%	3.6%
LONE TREE	1,151	4.6%	5.7%	7.1%	4.7%	6.0%
SOLON	1,117	7.8%	10.5%	10.9%	5.4%	5.5%
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	5.8%	5.3%	5.5%	3.8%	4.5%
TIFFIN	975	2.4%	4.3%	4.2%	12.6%	10.1%
SWISHER	813	3.5%	4.4%	4.0%	4.5%	5.1%
OXFORD	705	5.3%	9.5%	2.4%	6.6%	29.2%
HILLS	679	7.8%	7.8%	7.7%	13.3%	12.0%
SHUEYVILLE	250	8.1%	15.3%	9.8%	3.3%	7.6%

<b>FIRE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(per capita) [arrayed by FY09 per capita]</i>						
	<b>Pop.</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>
OXFORD	705	\$13.66	\$31.69	\$11.41	\$19.63	\$105.64
IOWA CITY	62,220	\$79.16	\$83.74	\$87.95	\$89.66	\$88.08
TIFFIN	975	\$27.69	\$33.10	\$27.69	\$99.09	\$76.92
HILLS	679	\$29.27	\$29.27	\$29.27	\$37.00	\$64.26
SOLON	1,117	\$65.37	\$78.68	\$88.76	\$62.32	\$59.44
SHUEYVILLE	250	\$26.78	\$31.13	\$39.04	\$74.69	\$54.35
CORALVILLE	17,269	\$22.71	\$43.29	\$47.38	\$39.02	\$48.95
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	\$18.88	\$25.39	\$146.59	\$46.86	\$44.68
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	\$33.35	\$30.92	\$31.73	\$32.54	\$32.54
LONE TREE	1,151	\$23.90	\$23.53	\$22.35	\$22.36	\$22.37
SWISHER	813	\$17.08	\$17.27	\$18.45	\$19.08	\$19.85

<b>FIRE EXPENDITURES BY CITIES IN JOHNSON COUNTY</b>						
<i>(per capita) [arrayed by population]</i>						
	<b>Pop.</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>FY 2006</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>	<b>FY 2008</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>
IOWA CITY	62,220	\$79.16	\$83.74	\$87.95	\$89.66	\$88.08
CORALVILLE	17,269	\$22.71	\$43.29	\$47.38	\$39.02	\$48.95
NORTH LIBERTY	5,367	\$18.88	\$25.39	\$146.59	\$46.86	\$44.68
LONE TREE	1,151	\$23.90	\$23.53	\$22.35	\$22.36	\$22.37
SOLON	1,117	\$65.37	\$78.68	\$88.76	\$62.32	\$59.44
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	987	\$33.35	\$30.92	\$31.73	\$32.54	\$32.54
TIFFIN	975	\$27.69	\$33.10	\$27.69	\$99.09	\$76.92
SWISHER	813	\$17.08	\$17.27	\$18.45	\$19.08	\$19.85
OXFORD	705	\$13.66	\$31.69	\$11.41	\$19.63	\$105.64
HILLS	679	\$29.27	\$29.27	\$29.27	\$37.00	\$64.26
SHUEYVILLE	250	\$26.78	\$31.13	\$39.04	\$74.69	\$54.35

Data Extracted from City Budget Forms available at: [http://165.206.254.124/budget-results.asp?county\\_no=52](http://165.206.254.124/budget-results.asp?county_no=52)

Base Budget = Form 631.1 / Lines 15-20 / Column C

Fire Expenditures = Form 631 A P1 / Line 5 / Column I

TABLE 10

From: "JOHN SAEHLER" <saehlerjohn@msn.com>  
Subject: Tuesday discussion Melrose Development  
Date: Mon, November 8, 2010 5:26 pm  
To: "Louise Frohm" <louisebob@mchsi.com>,"mike haverkamp" <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>,jim-lane@university-heights.org,"stan laverman" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>,brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org,"pat yeggy" <pat-yeggy@university-heights.org>

Dear Council Members:

This is John Saehler, I reside at 323 Highland Dr. and have lived in this area for many years. I probably won't make the Tuesday Council meeting, because of a prior Optimist Meeting that I serve as president. I know you don't hear from many of the residents that are for the St. Andrews development, but my wife and I are very supportive for growth in this area and see it as an opportunity for this community to move forward. University Heights seems to be in a state of no positive change in form of growth. I see the neighborhood homes getting older and more rentals becoming available. We need to grow with the times and we feel this would be an excellent time to control positive growth for our community. Please move us into the future by supporting positive growth change for our future.

Sincerely

John Saehler

---

From: "Bob Hanson" <bob.hanson@live.com>  
Subject: Majority opposes One University Place  
Date: Tue, November 9, 2010 6:56 am  
To: louise-from@university-heights.org,mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org,jim-lane@university-heights.org,stan-laverman@university-heights.org,pat-yeggy@university-heights.org

An article with the above title will appear in today's Press Citizen. It has all kinds of facts to show that the majority of those people who returned the recent survey oppose the Maxwell development. That certainly does not surprise me. Quite obviously all those opposed to the development turned in their survey. Whether or not all the persons favoring the Maxwell development turned in their survey is anyone's guess. I suspect that at least some did not. In addition, close to 200 surveys were not returned. We will never know how those folks felt. So, in my opinion, at best the survey results are definitely slanted toward the negative.

My wife and I support the Maxwell development. I am sure that there are many other University Heights residents that do as well. We would encourage you to vote in favor of this development as you have the past two times.

Best regards,

Bob Hanson  
506 Mahaska Ct.

---

From: "Duncan" <drs@drma.org>  
Subject: One University Place  
Date: Tue, November 9, 2010 8:29 am  
To: louise-from@university-heights.org,mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org,jim-lane@university-heights.org,jim-lane@university-heights.org,pat-yeggy@university-heights.org,brennan-mcgrath@university-heights.org

Dear Mayor and Council, in light of the survey results showing strong opposition to the proposed development on the St. Andrew's site I believe that it is incumbent upon you to table the third reading of the rezoning proposal. There is no need to rush into this, especially now that this public survey has demonstrated that you need to slow down and rethink this issue. Arguments that we "need" the putative income from this project are hollow-U Heights will see no tax income from this project until it is built several years from now, and the likelihood that the developer will ask for tax breaks for building means that we are even more unlikely to get any revenue for many years. Finally, as you are well aware, the UI is looking for sites to build new dormitories, if you rush this zoning change through is there any guarantee that the UI will not eventually end up with this land? Thus removing it from the tax rolls permanently? This matter is too important to rush through, please table the motion, talk with your neighbors who oppose this plan, and most importantly, allow the voters to vote in the special election to express their wishes at the ballot box.

Sincerely,

Duncan Stewart

1327 Oakcrest Ave

---

From: "Bonfield, Arthur E" <arthur-bonfield@uiowa.edu>  
Subject: Maxwell proposal on church property  
Date: Tue, November 9, 2010 11:13 am  
To: "mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org" <mike-haverkamp@university-heights.org>,"jim-lane@university-heights.org" <jim-lane@university-heights.org>,"stan-laverman@university-heights.org" <stan-laverman@university-heights.org>,"pat-yeggy@university-heights.org" <pat-yeggy@university-heights.org>

My wife and I support the proposal before the Council concerning the St. Andrews property. That proposal would add badly needed upscale condos to our community that would be very attractive to people working at UIHC and other parts of the University, would make possible the addition of light commercial uses like a coffee shop or another restaurant to our community that would benefit the people living in University Heights, and would increase the tax base of the community in a way that would stabilize its financing for a long time. We think the negative aspects of this proposal are small in relation to the long term benefits to the community as a whole.

Professor Arthur Earl Bonfield  
Allan D. Vestal Chair and Associate Dean for Research  
University of Iowa Law School  
Boyd Law Building  
Iowa City, IA 52242  
Phone: 319/335-9020 or 319/338-5017  
e-mail: arthur-bonfield@uiowa.edu

