



PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION CALENDAR DECEMBER - JANUARY

December 10	City Council Work Session – Golf Course Project 7:00 PM City Hall Council Chambers
December 18	PAC Meeting 4:00 PM City Hall Council Chambers
December 24	City Offices Closed Noon – 5:00 PM Christmas Eve Holiday Observed
December 25	City Offices Closed Christmas Holiday Observed
December 31	City Offices Closed Noon – 5:00 PM New Years Eve Holiday Observed
January 1	City Offices Closed New Years Day Holiday Observed
January 15	PAC Meeting 4:00 PM City Hall Council Chambers

PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING - TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2007
4:00 P.M. – CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MEETING AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

A - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A-1 Minutes of the May 15, 2007

A-2 Minutes of November 20, 2007

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Skate Park Facility

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

B-1 Land Acquisition Strategic Plan Approval

B-2 Golf Course Report

B-3 Park Security Report

B-4 Gift Policy

C - NEW BUSINESS

C-1 Resolution to Recommend Approval of a Partnership Agreement Between the City of Ann Arbor and the Community Action Network for Operation of Bryant Community Center and the Northside Community Center

D - COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

D-1 Athletic Field Lighting

E - REPORT FROM PARKS AND RECREATION MANAGER

F - REPORT FROM MANAGER OF FIELD OPERATIONS

G - REPORT FROM RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

H - REPORTS FROM RELEVANT COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND/OR TASK FORCES

I - PUBLIC COMMENTARY – GENERAL (3 Minutes per Speaker)

J - CLOSED SESSION TO DEAL WITH LAND ACQUISITION ISSUES (If Applicable)

K - TRANSMITTALS

K-1 City Council Items Update

K-2 General Fund Allocation Plan

- K-3** Park Projects Update
- K-4** Ann Arbor News Readers' Choice Awards
- K-5** PAC Work Session Summary
- K-6** Park and Recreation Events for December - January 2007
- K-7** Park Advisory Commission 2008 Meeting Schedule

TELEvised ON ANN ARBOR COMMUNITY TELEVISION NETWORK CHANNEL 16

LIVE: Tuesday December 18, 2007 4:00 P.M.

****Persons with disabilities are encouraged to participate. Accommodations, including sign language interpreters, may be arranged by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 994-2700 (V/TDD) at least 24 hours in advance.****



DRAFT

**CITY OF ANN ARBOR – PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
May 15, 2007**

The regular meeting of the Parks Advisory Commission was held on Tuesday, May 15, 2007 at 4:08 p.m. in the Council Chambers located in City Hall, 100 N. Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

I. The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair, L. Berauer.

II. Roll Call:

- Members Present: (8) L. Berauer, B. Macomber, S. Offen, D. Barrett
T. Berla, J. Lawter, G. Nystuen, S. Rosencrans
- Ex-Officio Members Present: (1) R. Johnson, S. Kunselman (arrived at 5:33 p.m.)
- Ex- Officio Members Absent: (0) None.
- Members Absent: (0) None.
- Staff Present: (8) C. Smith, A. Kuras, K. C. Bemish, D. Borneman
T. Crawford, D. Thompson, K. Henderson
L. Bowen

PUBLIC COMMENTARY - AGENDA ITEMS (3 Minutes per Speaker)

Dan Pugh spoke on the off-Leash Dog Parks.

Harvey Caplan spoke on the General Fund Parks budget.

A - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS –

B - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

B-1 Park Security

L. Berauer moved, supported by G. Nystuen to open discussion regarding the Resolution addressing Park Security.

S. Offen read the Resolution regarding safety and security needs in the parks:

Resolution on Safety and Security Needs within the Ann Arbor Parks

Whereas, the Parks Maintenance Task Force Report of March 23, 2005, indicated that over 85% of Ann Arbor residents feel very safe or somewhat safe in the City's parks;

Whereas, personal safety and security were concerns mentioned by participants in the series of public meetings held by the Parks Advisory Commission during 2006;

Whereas, according to information provided by the Ann Arbor Police Department there has been a steady level of requests for service in the parks and appreciable increases in only a few categories during the past three years;

62 Whereas, according to information provided by the Ann Arbor Police Department
63 incidents in specific parks have not changed substantially during the past three years;

64
65 Whereas, the Ann Arbor Police Department has been very responsive to the requests for service
66 over the past several years;

67
68 Resolved, the Parks Advisory Commission acknowledges that personal safety and security
69 must remain a priority for parks operations;

70
71 Resolved, there is no urgency to establish a police presence in Ann Arbor Parks and that the
72 current level of service should be sustained.

73
74 Resolved, the Parks Advisory Commission should work with Community Services and Safety
75 Services Administration to create a plan to efficiently and effectively address the public's
76 concerns and implement this plan by April 1, 2008.

77
78 May 15, 2007

79
80 **G. Nystuen** expressed support for this resolution. She believed there were many questions that had not been
81 dealt with and that the City was not ready to proceed with a new security plan when parks were operating
82 smoothly. There were things to work on, she agreed, but there was no urgency to suddenly try this new program.
83 She expressed a need to think about it and get further assessment of what the needs are for each area of the
84 parks. She expressed that there is not an urgency to implement a program for Public Safety to patrol the Parks.

85
86 **T Berla** was sympathetic to this. One of things he thought was a problem was the process that was used in
87 that he felt it jumped over a few steps. What he thought should take place was to start the planning
88 process by saying that there was a problem and that there was a need for discussion and development of a
89 document that clearly states the problems. Then when that was established, the next step would have
90 been to develop a number of alternatives to talk about. This resolution says that while there is a problem,
91 there is not an immediate pressing problem that has to be dealt with. Berla indicated that it sounded as if
92 Jayne Miller had stated at a meeting last night that she was coming from different perspective, seeing this
93 as a very important problem. Miller indicated that this is one of the priorities that the millage is designed to
94 address. He said these were different viewpoints, quite separate from the actual solution.

95
96 He indicated that it seems to him that steps should have been taken to provide a more clear understanding
97 of what an enhanced security program was designed to address and then Staff and PAC and Council could
98 talk about whether the police pilot is the best solution or whether other alternatives would be better.
99 Specifically, these alternatives could have been to have more park rangers instead of a single ranger.
100 Another alternative could have been to establish a patrol supervisor permanent position and then have
101 temporary employees who did the patrolling. It could also be considered as to whether there is a need for a
102 seasonal position. Another alternative might have been to have safety services provide services similar to
103 that of a private security firm or another governmental agency (County sheriffs do the same thing under
104 contract). Had the City developed specific criteria for a new security program, PAC would have been
105 looking at a list of different alternatives and would have been able to discuss what could be achieved with
106 the \$250,000, and make other comparisons and could have exercised some flexibility.

107
108 Berla stated that he believed this police program was intended to establish more patrolling in the parks. He
109 feels that this is premature. Also, something was mentioned last night that he was not aware of, that if we
110 go ahead with the security services plan as proposed, then the police dept will not have to lay off any police
111 officers and if we don't, it was unclear whether there would be any layoffs. He thought this was interesting
112 because what he was here to do was to make sure that the money that the voters have approved for parks
113 is used as cost effectively as possible for the parks. He suggested that implementation of a Park Security
114 plan be postponed.

115
116 **L. Berauer** agreed that the process described by Berla was the one that ideally should have been followed.
117 However, reading the resolution on the table, she believes this resolution would accommodate exactly such
118 a process. The resolution states that Park Community Services, Safety Services, and PAC should work
119 together over the next year to develop a plan to efficiently and effectively address the public's concerns and
120 implement this plan by April 2008. The process of needs assessment, generation of options, and
121 community input outlined by Berla should be followed in the development of such a plan.

123 **T. Berla** agreed. He questioned if approving this resolution meant that PAC was recommending that
124 \$250,000 from the millage be used for another park purpose.

125
126 **L. Berauer** stated that there was a separate resolution that would be brought forward later in this meeting
127 that addressed this issue of what to do with the millage funds earmarked for park security if they are not
128 used for contracting with the police.

129
130 **S. Offen** stated that part of the discussion when the PAC ad hoc committee convened to develop this
131 resolution was to consider whether park patrol could be handled differently in specific parks. The ad hoc
132 group met and determined that there is no urgency to do anything with the safety and security issues and
133 no cause to spend \$250,000 on a program that had many elements out of place. The ad hoc group thought
134 there were concerns regarding violations of ordinances such as dogs off leash and mountain bikes, but
135 there were no critical issues to raise park security to the level of urgency or crisis. He thought the police
136 were doing a good job and are dealing with current issues.

137
138 **S. Rosencrans** said that it was his understanding that Councilmember Teall requested data on the number
139 of incidents that had occurred in the parks over the past couple of years that required police presence or
140 assistance. He wondered if this information could be provided, as he believed it would be helpful.

141
142 **L. Berauer** said this was requested and it had been received.

143
144 **G. Nystuen** said there was additional information that was requested but had not been received, and this
145 was the source of the calls to which police responded. She said it seemed that the police have responded
146 when assistance was requested. There were just over 600 responses in 2004, just under 600 responses in
147 2005, and a little over 600 responses in 2006. Nothing stood out as being unusual. She indicated that
148 almost 70% of the incidents occurred in 15-18 parks. There were many parks that did not have calls during
149 this period.

150
151 **D. Barrett** expressed confusion in that this pilot program was presented to PAC by the City, and therefore
152 the City must have perceived that the project should be budgeted.

153
154 **L. Berauer** stated that as the list of services to be provided under the new millage was developed, an
155 elaborate process was undertaken to determine what the millage funds could be used for and what should
156 be accommodated through the general fund. Parks security was identified as one of the items that could be
157 funded through the millage but how that was to be accomplished was not mentioned and certainly the idea
158 of providing funds to the police for this purpose was not discussed. When parks staff was developing the
159 new FY budget, they decided that the expense of the current park ranger was high based on the services
160 provided and that enhanced safety services could be provided by contracting with the police.

161
162 **D. Barrett** stated that his perceptions of the PAC deliberations were that some PAC members felt that
163 having police presence in the parks would represent something they did not want, and others, himself
164 included, who would feel that this might be helpful for City parks where there were serious violations. He
165 said this was subjective, as he looked at the data and saw that violent crimes rates were up. Barrett stated
166 that he was more concerned about this than other PAC members. When he read this resolution, it seemed
167 to him that it would be another year and then another year and then another year. He was more prone to
168 implement park security at this time.

169
170 **J. Lawter** stated that he was not opposed in theory to the police being contracted for additional park
171 security, especially since they currently provide service for special events; however, he did feel that the
172 contract as proposed was open-ended and that, particularly since park staff seem to know exactly what the
173 problems were, he would be more in favor of approving a structured plan with some alternatives that would
174 address the specific problems.

175
176 **L. Berauer** asked if Lawter was proposing an amendment to the resolution or whether his concerns can be
177 addressed within the parameters of the resolution as written.

178
179 **J. Lawter** felt his concerns are addressed by the resolution as written.

180
181 **S. Offen** stated that one of the reasons he drafted this resolution was because the staff has not developed
182 a plan for a security effort that would begin July 1. He said there have been good discussions, but no plan
183 had been presented. Offen emphasized that his proposal is to develop specific ideas of what could be
184 done with \$250,000 and here is how the officers and other employees would be deployed to provide safety

185 for the parks. In the absence of a plan, he was hesitant to begin a pilot. He thought that development of
186 the parameters for the pilot after the pilot's approval is too late. He was also concerned with the information
187 at the Council work session last night. If the police did not get the \$250,000, police would have to lay off
188 some officers, which implied to him that in order to maintain the same level of service to the rest of the City,
189 the police need this pilot funding. He did not see how the police could supply \$250,000 of additional service
190 and not hurt the rest of the City services.
191

192 **D. Barrett** stated that it was his perception based on comments from the Police Chief that the services may
193 not cost \$250,000, and that services could be on a month-to-month basis. This did not mean that this
194 should or should not be approved, but he said the Police Chief was very clear that the amount of funding
195 was not absolute.
196

197 **L. Berauer** stated she supported the Resolution and did not believe that millage funds should be used for
198 security services in the form of police contracts and that doing so is a bad precedent, and thought no such
199 decision should be made without a public hearing since it was not made explicit when presenting the
200 millage guidelines to the public prior to the vote for the ballot proposal.
201

202 **B. Macomber** expressed support for the Resolution for the reasons already stated. She believed the City has
203 heard from the public that they want increased patrols and security in the parks. She believed that during the
204 public hearing process for the millage proposals, people were thinking additional rangers and that they did not
205 have in mind that some of the money would be transferred to another department. She believed that transferring
206 millage money to another department was not a good precedent to set. Although she thought increased security
207 needed to be addressed, it should be done with general fund and not millage money. One point that she did not
208 think has been expressed at last night's working session was that Community Standards officers cost about \$30
209 an hour as opposed to \$50 per hour for a police officer. It seemed as though most of problems identified in parks
210 were code violations, therefore, Community Standards staff would be adequate for the job at a reduced cost.
211 She thought that the public's preference would not have been to transfer costs for increased security services
212 from the general fund to the millage and security services should be provided from the General Fund.
213

214 **Tom Crawford**, the City's Chief Financial Officer, stated that Community Standards personnel do not have
215 the authority to require someone to show identification. Effective ordinance enforcement, such as off-leash
216 dogs, would have to be done by an official police officer. We've not had any tickets written by our ranger.
217 Community Standards people cannot compel someone to give identification; they can look and see that
218 there is a violation but they can't require someone to present identification. This is not a transfer of money
219 to another department; this is a payment for a contractual service. This is not about giving police \$250,000.
220 If you don't want the police services, you can get the park security services from somewhere else. Council
221 will find a way to deal with the \$250,000 problem. What the Chief was trying to indicate was that you will be
222 hard pressed to find a more effective solution than the police department because they are a huge team.
223 There is not really another force that is out there that can provide the level of response and have the
224 enforcement powers that they do. The reason it made it into the recommended budget was because the
225 City Administrator has a responsibility to provide Council with his opinion, his recommended budget to
226 Council, and in his opinion, this was a good solution. You're going through the right process to question the
227 recommendation. It's normal process for the Administrator to present his recommendations for discussion.
228

229 **B Macomber** said she thought that the Chief had stated at the last PAC meeting that Community
230 Standards officers could ask for identification and had enforcement ability.
231

232 **L Berauer** said her understanding was also that they can request identification, but that they had no power
233 to require someone to show identification if the person refuses.
234

235 **Deputy Chief Bazick** responded to questions about community standards officers and provided
236 clarification of the scope of authority for community standards officers. He indicated that a community
237 standards officer can ask for a personal identification from an individual, but the validity of the identification
238 could not be verified. The difference between a non-sworn enforcement person and a sworn police officer
239 is that if there were a question about the validity of that identification. The police don't typically ask for
240 identification unless there is a violation they're dealing with. Ultimately a police officer can handle it under
241 refusal to identify until they're satisfied since they have broader enforcement powers.
242

243 **S Offen** asked if a Community Standards officer saw someone in the park with an off-leash dog, could they
244 ask for a piece of identification, such a license, so they could write a ticket.
245

246 **Deputy Chief Bazick** responded that Community Standards officers could ask but could be refused. At
247 that point they would have to decide whether or not it seemed credible before citing them.
248

249 **T Berla** stated that he believes the police would be the best people to have patrolling and believes they do
250 a great job and if money were no object would say give them lots of money and have lots of police officers
251 because they will do the best job and because for all of the reasons discussed, they can do the best job, but
252 that's not the case. The money is important and the only objection he has is the question of whether this is
253 the most cost effective way to provide the needed service and he doesn't know what that the answer is, but
254 feels that spending this much money when he doesn't know the answer doesn't seem a like a good idea.
255 He personally doesn't feel bad about the decision to contract for additional services from the police without
256 having public hearings because these PAC meetings are public meetings, this has been discussed for the
257 past 3 meetings, and it's on the front page of the paper. But he doesn't know if this is the most cost
258 effective and he doesn't know how to find out. His suggestion is to use a substantially smaller amount of
259 money to get the patrols going between now and April to just have some eyes in the park with a cell phone,
260 is there a way to do that? He feels that would be the smallest and least expensive step that could be done
261 to address the problem without taking the bigger step. He asked Jayne, Christen, Tom what their response
262 was to the resolution.
263

264 **Karla Henderson** provided a summary of the Park Ranger's authority. They want to do something about
265 the parks now and the new Millage takes effect July 1 which is why they thought it was a great time to make
266 the changes rather than waiting another year. When street maintenance paves a parking lot, that is a use
267 of Millage funds by another City department, it is done, but not with police before. They would like to try it
268 as a pilot at a cost of approximately \$77,000 for July-September, see what happens, come back with the
269 data and look at it at that point.
270

271 **T. Crawford** clarified the difference between a department transfer and a contract explaining that the
272 transfer would be something that is included in the budget. The contract is literally a contract for specific
273 services and specific time. He believes the concerns about terminating the contract would be addressed in
274 the contract.
275

276 There was a question about the hourly rate of the agreement.
277

278 **Deputy Chief Bazick** stated that a previous hand-out included an hourly breakdown based on the average
279 cost of average salary, benefits, radio, and vehicle costs. They have been trying to develop a clear hourly
280 cost for a police service unit. It's not just about this forum, it's about police services provided in general for
281 police officer activity time.
282

283 **G Nystuen** asked whether the animal control officer has the power of the police or Community Standards.
284 She also asked if there have been any other contracts within the City prior to this proposal.
285

286 **Deputy Chief Bazick** stated that it is a civilian employee, the same as a Community Standards officer, not
287 a sworn police officer. There have not been any other contracts within the City prior to this proposal. The
288 largest has been a contract with the UM Athletic Department for the football games. Contracts have been
289 discussed over the past couple of years including critical infrastructure after 911 where there was a lot of
290 additional patrols of water plants, wastewater facilities and other high risk areas that would be critical to
291 public safety infrastructure. It's a more transparent way of showing the taxpayers what you're doing with
292 their tax dollars. This the first attempt as a police department to work under a contract for service that is
293 specifically dedicated and defined as a service level agreement.
294

295 **D. Barrett** proposed an amendment, supported by **S. Rosencrans**, to propose a 3-month agreement for
296 police presence in the parks at a cost of \$77,000, and then look to see if the park security services are
297 valuable and what would be the criteria to evaluate it. The pieces are in place, it's not a money grab. What
298 Tom is telling them is that this is not \$250,000, this is \$77,000. Tom Crawford will present to PAC a
299 financial review of the police contract services after the initial 3 months of service.
300

301 There was a question about what would happen if PAC approves this and Council will approve a yearly
302 budget and if PAC says they want a 3 month service, can PAC recommend to either stop it or continue it or
303 increase it? How can that work in the context of the budget? PAC is concerned that at the end of the 3
304 months there would be a lot of pressure to continue the program since discontinuing it would be such a
305 disruption.
306

307 **T Crawford** answered that if it's discontinued at the end of 3 months, the Chief would be asked to find other
308 cost offsets for the year. Frequently people who retire are not replaced for a couple of months, saving
309 some money. There are lots of ways to recover some funds but that large a gap would be a little difficult to
310 cover and the Chief would probably struggle but would have to find a way.

311
312 **L Berauer** expressed her concern that when the contract is expiring and coming up for renewal, the
313 alternatives presented to PAC and Council would be either to renew funding the police contract with park
314 millage funds or lay off a police officer, and she does not think that is a fair burden to place on the park
315 millage funds. There would be great pressure to renew the contract to save a police officer's job, and the
316 decision would likely be made on those grounds alone, and not according to predefined criteria of cost
317 effectiveness and what is best for parks. That is not a fair burden to put on the park millage funds.

318
319 **S Offen** asked what would happen if they do choose to end the contract after 3 months and \$77,000, what
320 could be done with the balance of the Millage money that was originally budgeted? Would the full \$250,000
321 be budgeted as a contract payment and then if it were decided to end it partially through the year, what
322 happens to the balance of the money, or would only the \$77,000 be budgeted?

323
324 **T Crawford** answered that PAC could recommend that they only want to do a 3 month contract, Council
325 can tell PAC to go ahead with the 3 months. It may be that an officer will have to be laid off during the year,
326 it may be something else. PAC is authorized to spend the extra money on anything that is authorized in the
327 Millage.

328
329 **S Rosencrans** stated that he is more inclined to support the resolution with the amendment because he
330 believes that gives PAC an opportunity to show that they are being proactive toward public safety and also
331 provides an additional opportunity to collect the information they're looking for.

332
333 **S Offen** stated he would not support the amendment to go forward with a three-month agreement with
334 police for security, because the way he drafted his original resolution was that we don't assume there is any
335 one right way to provide security and by contracting with the City police, we assume it's the best alternative
336 immediately. We don't know if there's a better alternative. There is a funding mechanism in one of the later
337 resolutions that will allow this to happen if we want it to happen.

338
339 **T Crawford** clarified that PAC is an advisory board, Council has the final decision.

340
341 **L. Berauer** asked the Commission to vote on the amendment proposed by **D Barrett** to contract the police
342 for 3 months at a cost of \$77,000 to be used as a test pilot.

343
344 **The vote on the amendment was as follows:**

345
346 **Ayes: (2) D. Barrett, S. Rosencrans**

347
348 **Nays: (6) L. Berauer, B. Macomber, S. Offen, G. Nystuen, T. Berla, J. Lawter**

349
350 **Absent: (0) None.**

351
352 **Amendment failed 6-2.**

353
354 **L. Berauer** asked the Commission to vote on the original Resolution.

355
356 **Resolution on Safety and Security Needs within the Ann Arbor Parks**

357
358 Whereas, the Parks Maintenance Task Force Report of March 23, 2005, indicated that over 85% of
359 Ann Arbor residents feel very safe or somewhat safe in the City's parks;

360
361 Whereas, personal safety and security were concerns mentioned by participants in the series of
362 public meetings held by the Parks Advisory Commission during 2006;

363
364 Whereas, according to information provided by the Ann Arbor Police Department there has been a
365 steady level of requests for service in the parks and appreciable increases in only a few categories
366 during the past three years;

367

368 Whereas, according to information provided by the Ann Arbor Police Department
369 incidents in specific parks have not changed substantially during the past three years;

370
371 Whereas, the Ann Arbor Police Department has been very responsive to the requests for service
372 over the past several years;

373
374 Resolved, the Parks Advisory Commission acknowledges that personal safety and security
375 must remain a priority for parks operations;

376
377 Resolved, there is no urgency to establish a police presence in Ann Arbor Parks and that the
378 current level of service should be sustained.

379
380 Resolved, the Parks Advisory Commission should work with Community Services and Safety
381 Services Administration to create a plan to efficiently and effectively address the public's
382 concerns and implement this plan by April 1, 2008.

383
384 May 15, 2007

385
386 **The vote was as follows:**

387
388 **Ayes: (6) L. Berauer, B. Macomber, S. Offen, G. Nystuen, T. Berla, J. Lawter**

389
390 **Nays: (2) D. Barrett, S. Rosencrans**

391
392 **Absent: (0) None.**

393
394 **Resolution passed 6-2.**

395
396
397 **B-2 FY 2007/2008 and FY 2008/2009 Financial Plan**

398
399 **L. Berauer** moved, supported by **D. Barret**, to open discussion on the Resolution on General Fund
400 Allocation to Parks and Recreation for 2007-2008

401
402 **L Berauer** asked B Macomber to read the salient points of the resolution

403
404 **B Macomber** read from the following resolution:

405
406 **Resolution on General Fund Allocation to Parks and Recreation for 2007-2008**

407
408 Whereas, on October 3, 2006, the city Council unanimously approved a resolution setting forth a
409 policy with regard to Parks funding, in the event that the proposed Park Maintenance and Capital
410 Improvements Millage was approved by the voters, stating that "City Council wants to inform the
411 voters of the manner in which it intends to oversee the administration of the consolidated millage if the
412 proposed millage is approved by the voters";

413
414 Whereas, A Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage Administration Policy was
415 developed that included, in part:

416
417 Resolved, That City Council adopt the following policy guidelines for the Park Maintenance and
418 Capital Improvements Millage:

419
420 If future reductions are necessary in the City's general fund budget, during any of the six years of this
421 millage, beginning with Fiscal year 2007-2008, the general fund budget supporting the parks and
422 recreation system for that year will be reduced by a percentage no greater than the average
423 percentage reduction of the total City general fund budget;

424
425 If future increases occur in the City's general fund budget during any of the six years of this millage,
426 beginning with Fiscal Year 2007-2008, the general fund budget supporting the parks and recreation
427 system for that year will be increased at the same rate as the average percentage increase of the total
428 City general fund budget.

430 Whereas, The Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage was approved by the voters at
431 the election of November 7, 2006;

432
433 Whereas, The City General Fund expenditure for 2006-2007 is estimated to be \$78,590,829 and the
434 Proposed Budget for 2007-2008 projects a total General fund expenditure of \$80,590,829, an
435 increase of 2.2%.

436
437 Whereas, the estimated expenditures for Parks and Recreation for 2006-2007 will be \$6,568,846,
438 including expenditures by Community Services and Public Services, and the projected General Fund
439 allocation to Parks and Recreation in the Proposed Budget for 2007-2008 is \$6,074,460, a decrease
440 of 7.5%.

441
442 Whereas, Under the policy guidelines of City Council, the projected Parks and Recreation budget for
443 2007-2008 should increase by 2.2%, in line with the General Fund percentage increase, to
444 \$6,713,360, representing a difference in 2007-2008 of \$638,900;

445
446 Whereas, the City's Chief Financial Officer, states the generally accepted method of calculating City
447 department general fund increases and decreases takes in to account the projected rate of inflation of
448 specific expenses, especially personnel costs, referred to as Method #2 (see attached memo from the
449 CFO dated May 9, 2007), and which accounts for the apparent decrease in the projected Parks and
450 Recreation 2007-2008 general fund budget;

451
452 Whereas the Parks Advisory Commission agrees that Method #2 accounting practice is sound but
453 was not specified in the City Council resolution of October 6, 2006;

454
455 Whereas the Parks Advisory Commission believes that the City needs to keep faith with its voters who
456 went through a public meeting process around the proposed millage that did not include information
457 on Method #2 calculation of department General Fund allotments;

458
459 Whereas, The Parks Advisory Commission believes that requiring the City to provide an additional
460 \$638,900 into the Parks & Recreation budget for 2007-08 would cause undue hardship on other City
461 services;

462
463 RESOLVED, The Parks Advisory Commission recommends that the general fund allocation to the
464 Parks & Recreation budget for 2007-08 will increase by one-half of that \$638,900 or \$319,450 for
465 2007-08;

466
467 RESOLVED, The Parks Advisory Commission recommends that City Council amend the October 6,
468 2006 resolution to include language clarifying that Method 2 will be used to calculate compliance with
469 this resolution in future budget years starting with 2008-09;

470
471 RESOLVED, That if the plan in the 2007-08 budget to transfer \$250,000 of Millage funds to Safety
472 Services to provide security patrols in City parks is not approved, then \$250,000 of the \$319,450
473 additional general fund allocation to Parks & Recreation contained in this resolution will be used to
474 fund this plan to ensure current levels of Safety Services in the City and additional security patrols in
475 its parks.

476
477 May 15, 2007

478
479 **T Crawford** commented in the recommendation in this resolution that if the \$250,000 from the millage is not
480 spent on security, that the cost of security come from the general funds. Council guidelines when the
481 Millage was set up do not provide that. Any security costs for parks must come from the Millage. When the
482 Millage was adopted, one of the guidelines set up for how it would work was that the Millage would include
483 funding for security in parks. The level of service if the contracts are not approved would stay at what it is.

484
485 **J Miller** stated that the funding distribution guidelines developed stated that parks security staffing,
486 vandalism, repair, and maintenance can only be funded out the Millage.

487
488 **T Crawford** explained that using Method 1, if a certain amount is spent one year, that amount will go up the
489 following year by the same percentage as the whole general fund, with the result that that method will divert
490 funds from other areas of the City into Parks, causing the Parks budget to grow and the rest of the City
491 budget to shrink. When we look at what expenditures are required to do the same level of work from 07 to

492 08, Method 2 takes into account the fact that the same level of work costs more for the police than it does
493 for Parks because police expenditures are mainly made up of costs that have a high inflation rate. Parks
494 has a lower percentage of costs with a higher inflation rate. Those items with a higher inflation rate are
495 primarily employee benefits.
496

497 If the goal of Council's intent resolution as passed was to say that the parks system should be treated
498 equally with everything else in the general fund, Method 2 does that from an economic perspective. If you
499 use Method 1, you will be diverting funds, economically penalizing, other departments and rewarding Parks.
500 Method 2 has been used by the City in creating their annual budget at least since the time Roger Fraser
501 has been here (4-5 years ago). During the time that the reductions have occurred in the City, that's how it
502 has been used. In prior years when the target came out, and a 7% reduction was necessary, police was
503 favored and they only had to do 2 ½%, Parks had to do 7-7 ½%, but so did everyone else in the general
504 fund – Parks was treated like everyone else in the general fund except Police. The only difference is that
505 parks could cut costs and increase revenue so that their cuts were not as much. What has been
506 challenged most by the cuts have been general fund categories (excluding parks and police), then parks,
507 then police.
508

509 **B Johnson** stated that he didn't realize that one of the reasons the Parks budget was cut is because Parks
510 is being penalized for a reduction in its fee intake. If Parks takes in less revenue in fees this year, then the
511 budget is cut. It's very hard to explain this to the public.
512

513 **T Berla** stated that his take is that there is an agreement with the public that the Millage will not be
514 increased and then divert the money over to other departments – that is unacceptable to everyone.
515 \$100,000 of the \$600,000 has to do with the difference in accounting methods. Gross vs net budget.
516 Some of the \$600,000 is because the Leslie Science Center revenue doesn't go into or out of the general
517 fund, not a cut, just an accounting thing. Biggest revenue reduction was Rec & Ed. Revenue was reduced
518 because fees were raised so high that usage was down. Not sure if the intent of B Johnson's resolution
519 was to say that if revenues are off, that the general fund should step in with more money to compensate.
520

521 **B Johnson** believes that Parks needs a certain amount of money to operate and that should be
522 independent of the fees. Fees should not be a consideration.
523

524 **T Crawford** stated that the 07 general fund Parks budget was \$6.7 million. 5% inflation for keeping current
525 activities. % depends on the economic structure of the organization. To continue the same activities
526 different areas have a different average rate of inflation. \$7.064 million was increase to Parks. Total
527 revenue in general fund vs all projects was 7% short. Everyone was told to cut 7%. If you go up 5% and
528 down 7%, that \$6.7 million drops to \$6.5. Everyone went down by the same % basis, but your number was
529 reduced because the inflation rate is lower than the rate that had to be cut. That's why some budgets go up
530 and others go down, it's because of the mix of the economic structure of your organization. \$6.5 million to
531 \$6.1 million resulted from taking the economic items that are no longer occurring in the organization, giving
532 money for new items, taking away for discontinued items. Expenses are outpacing growth in revenues.
533 The target of \$6.5 million is based upon 2007 activities. Jayne has both a revenue and expenditure budget
534 and in balancing those, came up with \$6.1 million to balance. List of items includes \$230,000 in lower
535 revenues from Parks. Net subsidy general fund paid Parks in 2007 was 3.8 and 3.8, subsidy has gone
536 down by about \$50,000. Could ask for \$50,000 to have the subsidy be the same but from economic
537 perspective, that's still not fair to the other entities.
538

539 **B Macomber** stated that language of the parks budget going up and down with the general fund revenue
540 going up and down was put in the October, 2006 resolution so that Parks don't have to cut things like
541 Adaptive Recreation, Project Grow and Rec & Ed.
542

543 **B Johnson** agrees with Ms. Macomber that these things were cut because of cuts to the general fund
544 allocation to parks.
545

546 **T Crawford** stated that the \$6.7 million has Project Grow in it. Increase to \$7.1 keeps Project Grow. 7%
547 cut for everyone.
548

549 **B Macomber** stated her belief that intent of October, 2006 resolution of matching the increase or decrease
550 didn't factor in the use of Method 2 and while cuts might not happen this year, there would be such a
551 compounding of advantage of Parks over other departments that in another 5 years, Parks would have a
552 huge budget compared with other departments. This still left the issue that the October, 2006 resolution did

553 not say anything about Method 2 accounting. Promises were made to voters based on straight line
554 accounting of general fund increases or decreases relative to Parks funding.

555
556 **J Miller** read the language – “If future reductions are necessary in the City’s general fund budget during any
557 of the 6 years of this Millage, general fund budget supporting Parks & Recreation system will be reduced no
558 greater than the average percentage reduction for each particular year of the rest of the City general fund
559 budget for each of the applicable 6 years.” There are reductions that are occurring across the City
560 organization. It doesn’t talk about the general fund budget growing, it talks about if there are reductions and
561 it also talks about if there are increases. The reductions that Parks is being asked to do are no greater than
562 the reductions any other department is being asked to make. My belief was that the intent was not to
563 punish Parks any greater than other department. Is the language to the level of detail that we go to in
564 accounting – absolutely not. I think it would be very difficult to put that language in there but I think the way
565 this is worded does talk about if there are future reductions or if there are future increases. There are
566 reductions and they’re happening across the entire organization.

567
568 **B Macomber** stated that she understands that and that is why in her resolution she pointed out that she
569 believes Method 2 accounting is sound and the method that should be used but disagrees that it is clear in
570 the language of the October, 2006 resolution that a type of accounting like Method 2 is going to be used,
571 which is why she is proposing that the language be clarified, that the resolution be amended to make it
572 completely clear that Method 2 accounting is going to be used for future years and that there be some kind
573 of give back to the Parks & Recreation general fund budget for budget years 2007 and 2008.

574
575 **J Miller** will argue the other side of the equation, which is that the clarity is also not there to warrant the
576 assumption that the simple method will be used, that because the general fund budget went up 2%, that
577 does not necessarily mean there won’t be reductions to parks. She believes that it’s not clear on both sides
578 of the equation and it also says that if there are reductions, parks will have reductions.

579
580 **B Macomber** stated that her main concern was the concern that was brought up at the previous night’s
581 work session and right now she is most concerned with the impression being made on the public and the
582 impact on future Millage proposals which will be faced all too soon. The intent of her resolution is a good
583 faith gesture of trying to create an understanding with the public and creating a win-win situation for
584 everyone.

585
586 **T Crawford** stated that maybe you could take the formula out of the resolution, then you say Parks should
587 be treated with the same methodology and fairly with every other organization – that would be a clarification
588 of the wording that was there before. Is that the kind of wording you’re thinking of?

589
590 **B Macomber** stated that was the kind of thing she was thinking of. She believes that given the complexity
591 of the situation a lot of thought would have to go into creating language.

592
593 **J Miller** stated that she agreed with Brigit and she too is very concerned about the implications of the
594 decision about what to do with the budget. She believes that having been the spokesperson for the Millage,
595 that what is being done is in accordance with how she tried to craft the language and that the intent is being
596 followed. She understands that our budget system is extremely complicated. She also agrees with another
597 comment that was made at the previous night’s work session that part of the job is to educate people, to do
598 due diligence because the budget is so complicated. She believes that people can understand the
599 accounting system and the methodology that is used by Finance.

600
601 **L Berauer** stated that is one of the points of Brigit’s resolution, that she wants to ensure that the public
602 understands how this happened and it’s unfortunate that this wasn’t made clear when the public was asked
603 to approve the Millage. When promoting the millage, PAC didn’t understand that the intent was to use
604 accounting method 2 to determine park funding, apparently many Council members didn’t understand
605 which accounting method would be used, and it certainly was not conveyed to the public. That is the big
606 problem.

607
608 **B Johnson** stated that he has to emphasize that we promised the voters something as stated in the
609 October intent resolution and if Council feels that what they promised the voters isn’t correct, they should go
610 back and change it. We promised the voters a certain thing and that is that the park budget would go up
611 and down the same percentage as the general fund. That may not be what staff prefer and people may feel
612 that’s not the right thing, but that is nevertheless the resolution that Council passed unanimously. We think
613 for the time being we should follow the resolution. If Council decides to change it in the future, that will be a
614 different issue.

615
616 **T Berla** stated that when we talk about Methods 1 and 2, we're talking about \$130,000, that's not \$600,000.
617 That issue only account's for less than \$150,000. He can understand that Leslie Science Center decided to
618 change their status and then you changed the budget to reflect that. What he's unsure of is that when this
619 number came through of \$6.502 million, someone said that in order to hit that number we'll have to
620 discontinue something else, which resulted in further reductions. He believes the issue with the \$230,000 is
621 that if Parks collects less fees and other revenues, should the general fund step in or should that come out
622 of the Parks budget.

623
624 **T Crawford** stated that is correct. If you were going with Method 1 he would agree and say that you're no
625 longer doing these activities. Everyone had to have reductions equally. That what the resolution said was
626 "equal reductions". The way it happens is that it is stated that you want to spend \$6.5 million, that's my
627 target, here are my operations, then look at the revenue target which was lower and decided to make it up
628 somewhere, so expenses had to be reduced if revenue was going to be lowered – that accounts for
629 \$230,000.

630
631 **B Macomber** stated that we're no longer doing these activities because we cut them to save money.

632
633 **L Berauer** asked if that doesn't in essence mean that, since you're going to penalize Parks in terms of what
634 it's getting from the general fund because it's collected less revenue and fees, then you are treating your
635 regular Parks activities like an enterprise fund? In fact Parks has enterprise funds and regular facilities and
636 activities are not part of the enterprise fund and should not be treated as such.

637
638 **J Miller** stated that recreation facilities or operations where revenue is generated like that, they have an
639 expense budget and a revenue budget. Staff is told it doesn't matter if the expenses go up \$100,000 if
640 matching revenue is brought in so the net cost to the general fund stays the same since that is what the
641 general fund is built on for the City. If the revenues don't come in, either someone has to bail out that
642 shortfall of revenue or expenses have to be cut somewhere. This doesn't happen only in Parks, it happens
643 across the rest of the organization, most of the organization doesn't bring in revenue, i.e. Housing
644 Inspection rental program in Planning & Development. It's general fund and brings in revenue and they
645 have to look at the bottom line in terms of the general fund. If their expenses go up because of increased
646 rental activity, then the expectation is that revenue should be coming in so their net cost to the general fund
647 is no greater. Otherwise someone else would have to bail out the difference that's not coming in.

648
649 **T Crawford** stated that the City is committed to \$3.8 million of subsidy and it has continued that but to ask
650 the rest of the City to give more money next year because Parks fees were increased but facilities were
651 less in demand, that doesn't make sense because the reality is the correction needs to be made in the
652 organization. It's not being treated like a profit enterprise.

653
654 **D Barrett** suggested that it sounds as though there is a political problem to some degree and there is also
655 the supposed perception of the public as portrayed here as being we're going to get more money and isn't
656 that great. If what Jayne read is the exact wording, then the public has to right to complain because it's
657 fairly clear how this is going to be shared.....(blank tape). This supposed mandate, where's the money?
658 But when it was read, that's not what was crafted so he's unclear about the supposed public dissatisfaction
659 when there it is, it's clear that was what was voted on.

660
661 **L Berauer** agrees with D Barrett that there is a political problem. She believes that what many around the
662 table are suggesting is that they adhere to the language of Council's intent resolution literally and that a
663 literal adherence cannot accept going along with Method 2. Brigit's resolution accepts Method 2 as being a
664 valid method, acknowledges that the intent to use this method was not expressed at the time of the ballot
665 proposal, that to adhere to the literal wording of the Council intent resolution would cause hardship to the
666 General Fund and thus proposes to split the different – with parks receiving only half of what it would were
667 the intent resolution adhered to literally.

668
669 **T Berla** stated that it's only \$130,000, you can't get \$600,000 out of Method 2, it's totally unrelated. If we
670 want to ask for half of the difference between Method 1 and Method 2, that's \$65,000, not \$300,000. The
671 rest of the money are the things in Tom's list. One of the things that he believes happens is that if fewer
672 people do something, then not as many employees are needed, so the expenses go down so that's all part
673 of the balance. It doesn't make up the whole thing but it's part of the activity. What he's trying to determine
674 is what change happened and why.

675

676 **B Macomber** doesn't believe that makes sense because the expenses cut to save money don't count as
677 what was in the original budget.

678
679 **J Miller** stated that everyone knows about Leslie Science Center. The discontinuation of \$40,000 to Rec &
680 Ed and \$7,000 to Project Grow was done to meet the target of \$6.5 million. Two years ago we budgeted to
681 consolidate with Rec & Ed. It was believed that was an effort we could make and felt that there could be
682 significant savings – the \$150,000 we budgeted was felt to be a conservative estimate that consolidation
683 would get rid of a lot of overhead, duplication – that never happened so it was budgeted as revenue but it
684 was in essence a savings. There's \$150,000 that was never realized in this year's budget. \$230,000 is lost
685 revenue – more rain, less activities, fewer staff, still set costs that can't be reduced, that both revenues and
686 expenses must be factored in when looking at the entire budget.

687
688 **T Berla** asked if the \$230,000 was the actual amount of lost revenue in past year or projected for the
689 coming year.

690
691 **J Miller** stated that for the fiscal year ending June 30, over \$2.6 million in revenue was budgeted; now
692 projecting that only \$2.1 will be coming in for a shortfall of almost \$500,000 this year alone. Next year
693 projections are that revenues will be less, just over \$2 million, so when comparing what was budgeted and
694 expectation for revenues for this year and what is budgeted for next year, there is a \$550,000 gap in
695 revenue. \$230,000 is within the \$550,000.

696
697 **B Macomber** offered an amendment to her original resolution:

698
699 Proposal to change of the last four paragraphs, the one Whereas and the three Resolved, that of the four,
700 the second to last Resolved about recommending that City Council amend the October, 2006 resolution be
701 retained and that the other three paragraphs be removed.

702
703 PROPOSED TO DELETE: Whereas, The Parks Advisory Commission believes that requiring the
704 City to provide an additional \$638,900 into the Parks & Recreation budget for 2007-08 would cause
705 undue hardship on other City services;

706
707 PROPOSED TO DELETE: RESOLVED, The Parks Advisory Commission recommends that the
708 general fund allocation to the Parks & Recreation budget for 2007-08 will increase by one-half of
709 that \$638,900 or \$319,450 for 2007-08;

710
711 RESOLVED, The Parks Advisory Commission recommends that City Council amend the October 6,
712 2006 resolution to include language clarifying that Method 2 will be used to calculate compliance
713 with this resolution in future budget years starting with 2008-09;

714
715 PROPOSED TO DELETE: RESOLVED, That if the plan in the 2007-08 budget to transfer \$250,000
716 of Millage funds to Safety Services to provide security patrols in City parks is not approved, then
717 \$250,000 of the \$319,450 additional general fund allocation to Parks & Recreation contained in this
718 resolution will be used to fund this plan to ensure current levels of Safety Services in the City and
719 additional security patrols in its parks.

720
721 The meaning of the change is that PAC acknowledges that Method 2 accounting is legitimate but want City
722 Council to amend the resolution to clarify that Method 2 accounting will be used. The part of reallocating is
723 gone. Bottom line general fund contribution to Parks should be left as is.

724
725 **L. Berauer** asked the Commission for a show of hands on the Amendment.

726
727 **Ayes: (6) D. Barrett, B. Macomber, S. Rosencrans**

728
729 **Nays: (2) L. Berauer, T. Berla, J. Lawter, G. Nystuen, S. Offen**

730
731 **Absent: (0) None.**

732
733 **Amendment fails.**

734
735 **L Berauer** proposed another amendment: to delete the last three Whereas paragraphs and the current
736 Resolved paragraph and add the following:

737

738 RESOLVED, The Parks Advisory Commission recommends that the budget for Parks be revised to be in
739 strict accordance with the October 3, 2006 resolution.

740
741 Seconded by **B. Macomber**.

742
743 **B Johnson** stated that what the October, 2006 resolution says is quite clear. It was written with exquisite
744 care to be clear and was passed unanimously by Council and there is no controversy about what it says.

745
746 **L Berauer** stated that she believes that that when the public approved the new Parks Millage they did not
747 intend to create an opening to allow greater cuts in general fund expenditures for Parks than for other City
748 activities.

749
750 **T Crawford** stated that what Method 1 does is increase the percentage that Parks receives from the
751 general fund over time.

752
753 **L. Berauer** stated that the budget target methodology should have been discussed as the millage
754 resolution was under consideration.

755
756 **S Offen** recognizes that there can be multiple interpretations of this, what frustrates him and other PAC
757 members is that this issue didn't come up until approximately 1 month ago when Councilmember Johnson
758 brought it to their attention. He doesn't know if it was brought to anyone's attention either in October when
759 the Council intent resolution was passed or in January or February, when the FY targets were originally set.
760 He assumes that the targets were initially set and then given to the directors to come up with their individual
761 budgets. But when those targets were set, given that the accounting method that was to be used was not
762 brought forward in the October discussion, it should have at least been brought forward when the targets
763 were set so that everyone would know how staff would go about setting the targets and PAC and others
764 could have been asked does anyone have a problem with this. That would have been a good opportunity
765 to bring it to Council if there were any question about which method to use. It could have been brought to
766 Council, PAC to anyone else of these advisory groups and that would have given ample time to resolve this
767 issue then but at this late date, he agrees with Councilmember Johnson that the resolution is clear, %
768 means % and as simplistic as it may be, that's the wording, that's the intent. Councilmember Johnson is
769 the maker of the resolution. I think we should heed his opinion.

770
771 **L. Berauer** asked the Commission for a show of hands on this Amendment.

772
773 **Ayes: (5) B. Macomber, G. Nystuen, J. Lawter, S. Offen, L. Berauer**

774
775 **Nays: (3) T. Berla, D. Barrett, S. Rosencrans**

776
777 **Absent: (0) None.**

778
779 **Amendment passes 5-3.**

780
781 **L. Berauer** asked the Commission for a show of hands on the amended Resolution:

782
783 **Ayes: (5) L. Berauer, J. Lawter, B. Macomber, G. Nystuen, S. Offen**

784
785 **Nays: (3) D. Barrett, T. Berla, S. Rosencrans**

786
787 **Absent: (0) None.**

788
789 **Resolution as amended passes 5-3.**

790
791 The final resolution reads:

792
793 **Resolution on General Fund Allocation to Parks and Recreation for 2007-2008**

794
795 Whereas, on October 3, 2006, the city Council unanimously approved a resolution setting forth a
796 policy with regard to Parks funding, in the event that the proposed Park Maintenance and Capital
797 Improvements Millage was approved by the voters, stating that "City Council wants to inform the
798 voters of the manner in which it intends to oversee the administration of the consolidated millage if the
799 proposed millage is approved by the voters";

800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861

Whereas, A Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage Administration Policy was developed that included, in part:

Resolved, That City Council adopt the following policy guidelines for the Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage:

If future reductions are necessary in the City's general fund budget, during any of the six years of this millage, beginning with Fiscal year 2007-2008, the general fund budget supporting the parks and recreation system for that year will be reduced by a percentage no greater than the average percentage reduction of the total City general fund budget;

If future increases occur in the City's general fund budget during any of the six years of this millage, beginning with Fiscal Year 2007-2008, the general fund budget supporting the parks and recreation system for that year will be increased at the same rate as the average percentage increase of the total City general fund budget.

Whereas, The Park Maintenance and Capital Improvements Millage was approved by the voters at the election of November 7, 2006;

Whereas, The City General Fund expenditure for 2006-2007 is estimated to be \$78,590,829 and the Proposed Budget for 2007-2008 projects a total General fund expenditure of \$80,590,829, an increase of 2.2%.

Whereas, the estimated expenditures for Parks and Recreation for 2006-2007 will be \$6,568,846, including expenditures by Community Services and Public Services, and the projected General Fund allocation to Parks and Recreation in the Proposed Budget for 2007-2008 is \$6,074,460, a decrease of 7.5%.

Whereas, Under the policy guidelines of City Council, the projected Parks and Recreation budget for 2007-2008 should increase by 2.2%, in line with the General Fund percentage increase, to \$6,713,360, representing a difference in 2007-2008 of \$638,900;

Whereas, the City's Chief Financial Officer, states the generally accepted method of calculating City department general fund increases and decreases takes in to account the projected rate of inflation of specific expenses, especially personnel costs, referred to as Method #2 (see attached memo from the CFO dated May 9, 2007), and which accounts for the apparent decrease in the projected Parks and Recreation 2007-2008 general fund budget;

Whereas the Parks Advisory Commission agrees that Method #2 accounting practice is sound but was not specified in the City Council resolution of October 6, 2006;

Whereas the Parks Advisory Commission believes that the City needs to keep faith with its voters who went through a public meeting process around the proposed millage that did not include information on Method #2 calculation of department General Fund allotments;

Resolved that the Park Advisory Commission recommends that the budget for park be revised to be in strict accordance with the 2006 Council-approved resolution and uses accounting Method #1 as specified in the attached memo.

May 15, 2007

B-2 FY 2007/2008 and FY 2008/2009 Financial Plan

L. Berauer moved, supported by **D. Barrett** to discuss G. Nystuen's Resolution. The Commission agreed.

L Berauer asked G Nystuen to read the text of her resolution.

G. Nystuen read the resolution:

862
863 **Resolution to Reassign the \$250,000 of Park Millage Funds Currently Assigned**
864 **to the Police in the Proposed Budget to Parks Projects**
865

866 Whereas the Parks, Recreation and Natural Area Program have identified code enforcement of park
867 rules and park security as important parts of the park program, and
868

869 Whereas the adoption of the resolution to delete the line-item of \$250,000 of park millage to the
870 police would permit this \$250,000 of millage to be used for projects within parks in support of these
871 programs, and
872

873 Whereas there are three priority areas of code enforcement and security: “dog-off leash”, “mountain
874 bikes in restricted areas”, and “planning and assessment of overall code enforcement of city and
875 park rules within parks” that need to be addressed, and
876

877 Whereas there are many innovative methods that encourage conformance with codes and
878 alternatives to breaking rules, and
879

880 Whereas it is desirable to gain greater citizen support and understanding of the need to protect our
881 parks and observe rules so that our parks provide enjoyable experiences for all users,
882

883 Be it therefore resolved

884 That \$250,000 of millage be used to:

885
886
887 (1) Plan and construct a second mountain bike trail in the west or south part of the city, with
888 improved connections to bike paths and greenways in order to encourage use and provide
889 alternatives to riding in restricted areas and during times of the year when damage occurs, and
890

891 (2) Plan and develop a second dog park in the northern part of the city to compliment the dog park
892 that is to open in Swift Run Park so that there is another location accessible to more users, and
893

894 (3) Make a full assessment of code enforcement security issues throughout the park system
895 including incorporating means of having more volunteers and coordinating with the new Adopt-a-
896 Park and Park Stewards programs, and
897

898 (4) Develop an information program that provides ways citizens may participate as volunteers.
899

900 **L Berauer** summarized Nystuen’s resolution by saying that it proposes alternate uses for the funds
901 proposed for contracting with Safety Services and specifically uses that will go a long way toward
902 resolving some of the code enforcement issues in Parks.
903

904 **J Miller** had 2 comments: In the first resolution, \$250,000 was not spent, however the first resolution
905 also says to come up with a plan for April 1, 2008, our fiscal year doesn’t end until June 30. If there
906 is a proposal that gets supported, there is going to need to be money for it through the end of the
907 fiscal year, so the full \$250,000 will not be available for these. If you put a plan in place by April 1,
908 you will need to have money for April, May, and June to fund that. The second point and concern is
909 that there have been a series of public meetings about the dog park and adding a second dog park
910 you’ve had a series of meetings. My concern is the first item – have you gone through the public
911 process to say this is what the public wants to use this money for? That would be my only concern
912 about that.
913

914 **S. Offen** talked about the third part of the resolution at the bottom can be considered addressing the
915 issue of implementation of the plan and perhaps if people aren’t comfortable with that, we can
916 change the wording to be more specific. Jayne’s concern was that we need to make sure that out of
917 this \$250,000, there is money left for implementation since that is still part of 2008 and I’m saying that
918 part of this resolution does address security issues (item 3 under the Resolve’s), and I’m saying that
919 if that’s not clear enough, we could....
920

921 **L Berauer** suggested “that \$250,000 of the Millage funds may be used in part”
922
923

924
925 **J Miller** stated that another item that goes back to the first resolution that was passed says that there
926 is no urgency to change, put a police presence, and that the current level of service should be
927 sustained, which means that you also have to have money to continue the ranger program as it is until
928 you make a change in April, so you not only need the money for April, May, June, but you also need
929 the money to sustain the Park Ranger program as you asked to have done in the first resolved.
930

931 **L Berauer** stated that it's very clear that Gwen's intent is to maintain the current ranger program.
932

933 After lengthy discussion,
934

935 **D. Barrett** moved to table this discussion until the next meeting, seconded by **L Berauer**.
936

937 **T. Berla** asked J. Miller when Council would take action to approve the budget.
938

939 **J. Miller** answered that Council would be voting on the budget on Monday night. However with
940 regard to this particular resolution (the one that Gwen currently has on the table), if Council takes
941 action in the direction that you've already provided them, if they do those two things, there will be
942 money left over in the Millage to do other things. It just won't be earmarked for anything. It won't go
943 away because it's Millage money, it will be unearmarked money. It allows staff the time that if Council
944 wants to enact what you've already approved, it can be calculated to do what the costs are to do the
945 current program and what the costs are to do this other piece of security, this is what we expect will
946 be the lump sum of money leftover and then you can go the process of deciding what you want to do
947 with it.
948

949 **L Berauer** asked for a voice vote on the motion to postpone the discussion of this resolution until a
950 future meeting.
951

952 **On a voice vote Motion Passed – Unanimous**
953

954 **L Berauer** noted that PAC must now consider the resolution pertaining to the overall FY 2007-08
955 budget and FY 2008-09 financial plan.
956

957 **B Macomber** moved, supported by **S Offen**, to open discussion of the final resolution and proposed
958 an amendment.
959

960 **B Macomber** read the resolution with amended language inserted to reference the two resolutions
961 just passed:
962

963 **Resolution to Recommend to Adopt Ann Arbor Parks Budget for Fiscal Year 2007-2008 and**
964 **the Financial Plan for Fiscal Year 2008-2009**
965

966 WHEREAS, Parks Advisory Commission has reviewed the Parks and Recreation Services and
967 Field Operations Services Managers' proposed budgets to support the Ann Arbor parks system for
968 FY 2007-2008 and financial plan to support Ann Arbor parks system for FY 2008-2009, and
969

970 WHEREAS, A work session and public hearing have been held to obtain citizen input on the
971 proposed budget and financial plan;
972

973 RESOLVED, That the Parks Advisory Commission recommends approval of the proposed FY
974 2007-2008 budget and FY 2008-2009 financial plan to support the City of Ann Arbor parks system,
975 **as amended by the two attached resolutions approved at the Parks Advisory Commission**
976 **meeting on May 15, 2007.**
977

978 The amendment consists of the final phrase "as amended by the two attached resolutions approved
979 at the Parks Advisory Commission meeting on May 15, 2007."
980

981 **L Berauer** asked for a vote on the amendment.
982

983 The vote for the amendment was as follows:
984

985 Ayes: (6) L. Berauer, S. Offen, B. Macomber, G. Nystuen, J. Lawter, S. Rosencrans

986
987 Nays: (2) T. Berla, D. Barrett

988
989 Absent: (0) None.

990
991 Amendment passes 6-2

992
993 L Berauer asked for a vote on the amended resolution.

994
995 The vote for the amended Resolution was as follows:

996
997 Ayes: (6) L. Berauer, S. Offen, B. Macomber, G. Nystuen, J. Lawter, S. Rosencrans

998
999 Nays: (2) T. Berla, D. Barrett

1000
1001 Absent: (0) None.

1002
1003 Resolution passes 6-2.

1004
1005 B-3 Swift Run Park Agreement – discussion postponed

1006
1007 B-4 Bandemer Park Master Plan – discussion postponed

1008
1009 C - NEW BUSINESS

1010
1011 D - COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

1012
1013 E - REPORT FROM PARKS AND RECREATION MANAGER

1014
1015 F - REPORT FROM MANAGER OF FIELD OPERATIONS – None.

1016
1017 G - REPORT FROM RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION – None.

1018
1019 H - REPORTS FROM RELEVANT COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND/OR TASK FORCES

1020
1021 H-1 Greenway Task Force

1022
1023 I - PUBLIC COMMENTARY – GENERAL (3 Minutes per Speaker)

1024
1025 Dan Pugh spoke regarding the Dog Park issue.

1026
1027 J - CLOSED SESSION TO DEAL WITH LAND ACQUISITION ISSUES (If Applicable)

1028
1029 K - TRANSMITTALS

1030
1031 K-1 City Council Items Update – (Information in Packet)

1032
1033 K-2 Parks Project Update (Information in Packet)

1034
1035 K-3 Parks and Recreation Events for April 2007 – (Information in Packet)

1036
1037 K-4 McKinley Sculpture Update

1038
1039 K-5 Resident Comment

1040
1041 K-6 February PAC Work Session

1042
1043 There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting be adjourned at 6:33
1044 p.m.



DRAFT

**CITY OF ANN ARBOR – PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 20, 2007**

The regular meeting of the Park Advisory Commission was held on Tuesday, November 20, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers located in City Hall, 100 N. Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

I. The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Acting Chair, B. Macomber.

II. Roll Call:

- Members Present: (8) J. Grand, B. Macomber, D. Barrett
J. Lawter, S. Offen (arrived at 4:08 p.m.), G. Nystuen,
S. Rosencrans, T. Berla (arrived at 4:18 p.m.)
- Members Absent: (1) L. Berauer
- Ex-Officio Members Present: (1) S. Kunselman
- Ex- Officio Members Absent: (0) None
- Staff Present: (7) C. Smith, J. Dehring , A. Kuras,
D. Borneman, K. Bemish,
L. Bowen, T. McMurtrie
- Guests: (12) Bill Cassebaum, Bill Thompson, Ed Walsh,
Paul Bancel, Trevor Staple, Montatip
Krishnamra, Bob Weisman, Bill Newldmbe, Jane
Lumm, Matt Nelson, Manishe Mata, Rashal Mata

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Commissioner Rosencrans moved, supported by **Commissioner Lawter** to approve the agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY - AGENDA ITEMS (3 Minutes per Speaker)

Member of the audience (name was not listed on the sign in sheet) spoke of the value of maintaining the Huron Hills Golf Course. The Huron Hills Golf Course is an affordable recreation opportunity in the community and it is very important to a large segment of the Ann Arbor residents.

Bill Cassebaum spoke on the Golf Course study stating that he and his wife hold season passes for Huron Hills and Leslie Park Golf Courses and play several times a week. He also expressed that both he and his wife feel very strongly that both golf course should be maintained as 18-hole courses. He indicated that his statements reflect those of most patrons who play the courses. Huron Hills has been neglected by the City for a number of years and is need of repair. He does not think that the golf course needs capital investments of hundreds of thousands of dollars, but the City should make a modest increase in the operating budget to provide for replacement of equipment and full-time, on-site management of the Golf Course operations and the clubhouses.

Bill Thompson spoke on the Golf Course study and stated that he recently decided to return to the sport of golf and has found that Huron Hills Golf Course is a perfect place to play golf and he enjoys not only the golf game but also the scenery of golf course.

Ed Walsh spoke on the Golf Course study and expressed the importance of keeping Huron Hills as an 18-hole course. The course is playable for young people as well as retirees.

60 **Paul Bancel** stated that he and his 91-year old father play golf together. He indicated that there is not an
61 over-supply of Golf Courses in this area. Low rounds at the City courses may be a result of the city's lack
62 of advertisement and failure to offer promotions and discounts to attract players to the golf courses.
63

64 **Trevor Staples** addressed the Commission about a Skate Park facility. He indicated that an online petition
65 has been created and as of the end of September 2007 there were 528 online supporters for a skate park
66 facility. In addition, several hundred people have signed the paper petitions in support of a skate park
67 facility. The skate park group will address fundraising options. The cost and liabilities of a skate park facility
68 will be discussed at the December meeting
69

70 **Montatip Krishnamra** stated Huron Hills Golf Course was the first course she played and golf has enriched
71 her life through exercise, learning the game and improved health. She would like to have the City continue
72 to operate the golf courses.
73

74 **Bob Weisman** spoke about the importance of Huron Hills Golf Course in the community. He stated that
75 people driving by the course on a regular basis enjoy the beautiful golf course property; younger people
76 who have learned to play golf enjoy playing at Huron Hills. In addition, retirees enjoy playing the Huron
77 Hills course and he would like to have the course maintained as an 18-hole course.
78

79 **Bill Newcdmbe** distributed handout information to the Commission that included an article from the Ann
80 Arbor News. He described himself as a long-time resident of the City of Ann Arbor, as an avid golfer, and a
81 golf course architect. He indicated that the residents of Ann Arbor are fortunate to have the Huron Hills Golf
82 Course. His suggestions included investing modest monies to improve the course and management staff at
83 the course to improve the operations.
84

85 **Jane Lumm** expressed opposition to any changes to the Huron Hills Golf Course. She stated that the golf
86 courses should be moved into the general fund and should not be maintained in the enterprise fund. Leslie
87 Park and Huron Hills are not similar courses, Leslie Park is an advanced course. Huron Hills is for
88 beginning players and younger players.
89

90 **Rashal Mata** introduced himself as a 9th Grader at Huron High School and indicated that he learned to play
91 golf at Huron Hills Golf Course and still enjoys playing on this course with his family and friends do not want
92 any changes to the golf course.
93

94 **Matt Nelson** spoke about the Golf Course study and indicated his support for maintaining the golf courses.
95

96 **Manishe Mata** spoke in support of maintaining the golf course facilities.
97

98 **A - APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

99

100 **A-1** **Commissioner Macomber** suggested that approval of the minutes of May 15, 2007 be
101 postponed until the December 18, 2007 meeting. The Commission agreed.
102

103 **Commissioner Berla** moved, supported by **Commissioner Rosencrans** to approve the
104 minutes of October 16, 2007 with corrections. The minutes of October 16, 2007 were
105 approved unanimously
106

107 **SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

108 **Storm Water Management**

109

110 **T. McMurtrie** provided an overview of the new stormwater rate system. The Stormwater Utility has
111 been looking for opportunities to educate the public about stormwater including education about the
112 new rate system, opportunities to reduce stormwater payments through practices such as rain
113 gardens and rain barrels, and broader watershed management. One such opportunity has been
114 found with Parks and Recreation. For a number of years, Parks and Recreation Services and Park
115 Operations have been conducting activities that are beneficial to the stormwater system. These
116 activities range from educational signs about the new stormwater features at Olson Park to activities
117 conducted by the Natural Area Preservation unit, such as rain garden workshops and wetland
118 surveys.
119
120

121 **S. Offen** asked if the \$92,000 stormwater billing was included in the budget.
122
123 **C. Smith** stated that these billing were not budgeted. Staff has worked together to identify
124 approximately \$85,000 in stormwater educational credit. The total stormwater billing for the current
125 fiscal year for the parks will be approximately \$7,000.
126
127 **T. McMurtrie** stated that the intent of the stormwater education is to help people recognize the value
128 of the storm water mediation.
129
130 **G. Nystuen** asked if this assessment has been done with each of the parks so the cost can be
131 assessed at each park site.
132
133 **T. McMurtrie** indicated that storm water would be assessed for each individual parcel.
134
135 **G. Nystuen** stated that a number of the parks include areas that store storm water, and she asked
136 whether the parks would receive credits for those stormwater management areas.
137
138 **T. McMurtrie** stated that these areas are still under discussion.
139
140 **B. Macomber** asked if the Mary Beth Doyle Park would be used as credit for stormwater management
141 because of the stormwater management feature.
142
143 **T. McMurtrie** indicated that the park system would be credited for the retention area at Mary Beth
144 Doyle Park.
145
146 **B. Macomber** asked if there would be a credit given at Buhr Park the rain gardens in the park.
147
148 **T. McMurtrie** stated the educational credits have been assessed for Buhr Park.
149
150 **B. Macomber** asked for confirmation that the parks stormwater billing is \$92,000, the parks are being
151 credited for \$85,000 in educational activities, and the billing will be about \$7,000.
152
153 **T. McMurtrie** directed the commissioners to the City website for further information about the
154 stormwater program.
155

156 PUBLIC HEARINGS

157 **B - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

158 **B-1** Allen Creek Greenway Task Force Resolution

159
160
161
162 **B. Macomber** suggested that discussion of the Allen Creek Greenway Task Force Resolution be
163 discussed by the Commission at the January 2008 meeting. The Commission agreed.
164

165 **B-2** Park Security Pilot Report

166
167 **C. Smith** directed the Commissioner's attention to the Park Security Pilot report. The project was a
168 three-month pilot. The City Council has requested comment from PAC regarding the pilot project.
169

170 **D. Barrett** asked C. Smith for her impression about the success of the Park Security Pilot.
171

172 **C. Smith** stated this pilot was a three-way partnership with the Police Department, Park & Recreation
173 Services and Park Operations. C. Smith stated there were challenges. Staff have met on a regular
174 basis to share information that was not shared in the past. C. Smith stated she feels the pilot has
175 worked well. She cited warning and citations for off-leash dogs, parking tickets, camping in parks, as
176 examples of common violations that have been addressed.
177

178 **G. Nystuen** inquired about the number of police officer hours and the number of community
179 standards staff hours. She also expressed concern with issuing parking tickets in the parks. She
180 inquired about park security reports for October and November.
181

182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242

J. Lawter asked whether the program is continuing on a month-to-month basis.

C. Smith stated the park security program is on a month-to-month basis. The purpose of today's discussion is to gather comment about the pilot program from the Park Advisory Commission as requested by the City Council.

G. Nystuen asked when the comments from the Park Advisory Commission will be submitted to City Council.

C. Smith stated the report would be forwarded to City Council in December.

J. Lawter asked if there were any charges for the park security program.

S. Offen stated his concerns about charging the parks budget for the costs of providing park security.

G. Nystuen stated the costs for this pilot program were to come from the General Fund.

C. Smith stated that the Safety Services General Fund budget is currently being charged for park security.

T. Berla stated City Council should have a plan for future funding of the park security program if this pilot program continues. He encouraged a discussion of alternative funding options.

B. Macomber asked about how an emergency call at a Park would be charged. She expressed concern with one department paying another department for services and indicated that the public and very concerned about transferring monies to cover services.

D. Barrett also expressed concern regarding the cost of the services.

G. Nystuen stated that she is not in agreement to transferring monies.

J. Lawter asked to see information about current police assignments in the parks.

S. Rosencrans stated the police should be patrolling entire City, and the parks are within the City.

T. Berla stated that the park's department did have Park Rangers and there are no alternatives for park security being discussed.

S. Offen stated the duties have been transferred to the police and does not feel there is enough information to make a decision about the park security program and asked for a more comprehensive report.

J. Lawter suggested that a discussion of the park security program be scheduled when further information is gathered.

C - NEW BUSINESS

D - COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

E - REPORT FROM PARKS AND RECREATION MANAGER

C. Smith reported that the Swift Run Dog Park would open on December 1, 2007.

C. Smith informed the Commission that an RFP was released for the Community Center outsourcing. One proposal has been received.

C. Smith indicated that Jim Keegan would present the golf course study report to the Commission on November 27, 2007. Keegan will present his report to the City Council in a work session on December 10, 2007. Copies of the report are available to the public and comment will be accepted on the City website.

243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303

E-1 Market Business Plan

Jessica Black presented the Market Business Plan and provided an overview of the services and programs offered at the Market.

S. Offen asked how many stalls are available at the market.

J. Black stated that a total of 144 covered stalls and approximately 40 uncovered stalls are available at the Market.

S. Rosencrans asked about the Market renovation schedule.

C. Smith stated that planning for the renovation is in process and staff is working with the consulting firm to identify priorities and establish a budget for the project.

G. Nystuen asked if there was a Market Commission.

C. Smith indicated that a new Public Market Commission has been appointed and the new commission will begin meeting regularly in January 2008.

F - REPORT FROM MANAGER OF FIELD OPERATIONS

G - REPORT FROM RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

T. Berla reported that the Rec & Ed budget was discussed at the November meeting. T. Berla also reported that he has spoke with Rob Millett about the field lights at Veterans Memorial Park and has suggested options that will enable staff to turn the lights on and off and save power.

H - REPORTS FROM RELEVANT COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND/OR TASK FORCES

H-1 Athletic Field Task Force Update

D. Barrett stated the Park Advisory Commission should be aware of the problems and conditions of the fields. The City has recognized that the fields are in need of repair and City Council has recommended monies be allocated for the repairs.

There are three primary active fields for soccer: Olson, Southeast and Fuller. Southeast Area Park irrigation is being repaired and Fuller Park irrigation is on the schedule to be repaired.

There has been discussion of signage on fields that marks fields that are closed for renovation.

T. Berla shared with the Commission that the irrigation process has started at Fuller Park.

G. Nystuen asked if the monies for the repairs are in the budget.

B. Macomber stated there was \$287,000 allocated by City Council and asked if there have been decisions made on how these monies will be allocated.

C. Smith stated staff would provide a report in December for allocation of the funding.

I - PUBLIC COMMENTARY – GENERAL (3 Minutes per Speaker)

J - CLOSED SESSION TO DEAL WITH LAND ACQUISITION ISSUES (If Applicable)

K - TRANSMITTALS

K-1 City Council Items Update – (Information in Packet)

K-2 Parks Project Update (Information in Packet)

- 304
- 305 **K-3** Parks and Recreation Events for August - September 2007
- 306
- 307 **K-4** Golf Course Study Project Questions
- 308
- 309 **K-5** PAC Work Session Summary
- 310
- 311 **K-6** Golf Report Schedule
- 312
- 313 **K-7** Parks and Recreation Events for August - September 2007
- 314
- 315

316 There being no further business to come before the Commission, **Commissioner Rosencrans**
317 moved supported by **Commissioner Berla** that the meeting be adjourned. The regular meeting was
318 adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

319
320 Respectfully submitted,
321 *Lynn Bowen*
322 Lynn Bowen
323 Administrative Support Specialist V
324

MEMORANDUM

TO: Park Advisory Commission

FROM: Ginny Trocchio, The Conservation Fund

DATE: December 18, 2007

SUBJECT: Resolution to Approve the Strategic Plan for Parkland Acquisitions

Attached for your review and action is a resolution to support the Park Advisory Commission's Strategic Plan for parkland acquisitions. The Strategic Plan provides staff and the Park Advisory Commission direction for the purchasing of additional City parkland.

The City of Ann Arbor utilized GIS to develop a Strategic Plan for parkland acquisitions. Through GIS, vacant parcels were identified and ranked based on their suitability for acquisition as a park. In addition, areas within the City that are underserved for neighborhood parks, or not within a ¼ mile walking distance to a park, were also identified. Using functions of GIS, a separate ranking schema was developed for each of the four types of parks (neighborhood parks, community/active recreation parks, urban parks, and natural areas).

Prepared By: Ginny Trocchio, The Conservation Fund

Attach: Strategic Plan

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR PARKLAND
ACQUISITIONS

Whereas, Chapter 42 of the Ann Arbor City Code authorizes the acquisition of voluntarily offered land on property for City parkland;

Whereas, The Strategic Plan provides strategic direction for the purchasing of additional City parkland;

Whereas, GIS was utilized to identify vacant parcels remaining within the City;

Whereas, Neighborhoods not within a ¼ mile walking distance to a neighborhood park were identified;

Whereas, GIS functions were used to develop a ranking system for each of the four types of parks (neighborhood, community / active recreation parks, urban parks, and natural areas);

RESOLVED, That the Park Advisory Commission adopt the Strategic Plan for parkland acquisitions.

Date: December 18, 2007

November 8, 2007

Preface: Thank you for the opportunity to add our voice and opinions to your report on "The Future of Golf in Ann Arbor". We speak not as individuals but as residents of Ann Arbor, members of the Huron Hills community and as avid golfers. On Tuesday, November 6th, 790 members of our community spoke in unison by voting to replace one of our elected officials in a very tight race for city council. They nearly succeeded in that effort because their representative took lightly his responsibility to be a good steward of a property that is an integral part of the quality of life that Ann Arborites have enjoyed for over 50 years. We respectfully present our ideas and ask that they be made a matter for the public record by including them in a prominent section of your report.

SUGGESTIONS FOR HURON HILLS GOLF COURSE

Take both golf courses out of the Enterprise Funds. Other major sports such as hockey and swimming are not operated as business units. Why should Golf be? Golf is a popular form of recreation for many of the City residents. We realize that there are systemic issues with golf as a business but we hope you will begin to understand that golf as a form of recreation is still desirable to a large segment of our citizenry. Despite declining revenue the operation still produces a contribution to overhead. The money "lost" in golf operations is immaterial to the City Budget and in fact could be labeled a "rounding error". Additionally, if viewed in context of a typical balance sheet, the annual appreciation of the underlying assets would totally eclipse the loss.

Additionally, appoint a Golf Advisory Board of local area golfers with golf course, business or academic experience to suggest changes to make the courses more profitable. The golf course is not being managed optimally. Potentially profitable league opportunities have been dismissed outright by Leslie Park according to golfers from Pfizer. City Police and Firefighters conduct their leagues at Reddeman Farms 10 miles outside the City limits. Other community golf courses like the courses in the Kalamazoo Municipal Golf Association would provide a benchmark for how our two courses could be managed.

As you mentioned in your public meetings there are great numbers of the Baby Boomers retiring in the next ten years so the demand for courses like Leslie Park and Huron Hills will stabilize and potentially grow as marginal courses in the area go out of business. Additionally, Ann Arbor has a strong and growing number of Asians and African-Americans that play both Leslie Park and Huron Hills. We suggested these trends will continue. Closing Huron Hills would be extremely short sighted, almost irreversible move by the City. The cost to build a new facility that is suitable for young and/or beginning golfers to learn to play one of the oldest sports in a relaxed environment like Huron Hills would not ever again be justifiable from a cost benefit analysis.

Tiger Wood's First Tee organization is clearly demonstrating that using golf as an educational tool gives "young people of all backgrounds an opportunity to develop life-enhancing values such as confidence, perseverance and judgment through golf and character education." What better legacy could we leave our children?

In lieu of closing, lease courses to professional management firm. Lease revenue must cover all ongoing "costs" of the course. Lease would contain annual increases in lease payments. After interest on debt was paid off, the lease revenue would be a considerable source of revenue for the city. Other revenue opportunities are available like partnering with golf instructional academies like Total Golf Adventures from California. Total Golf has more than 25,000 youngsters enrolled in golf programs in 23 states. (<http://totalgolfadventures.com/press6.htm>)

Conclusion:

Without having access to the detailed financial reports of golf course operation, we are not in a position to make a recommendations on which alternative would be most beneficial for all parties. We have made several legitimate requests for that information but have been denied each time so our analysis must remain incomplete for now.

An additional page of excellent suggestions are attached in the form of an e-mail you have already received by William Cassebaum, Subject: Huron Hills (Ann Arbor), dated October 1, 2007.

Thank you listening and for your consideration of our views even if they are counter to you own. A well known consultant wisely suggests, "Seek first to understand, then to be understood", Seven Habit of Highly Effective Individuals, Stephen R. Covey.

Respectfully,

Paul Bancel
William Cassebaum
Stuart Dombey
Jane Lumm
Stewart Nelson
William Thomson
Ed Walsh
Robert Weisman

Municipal Golf in Ann Arbor – One Citizen's Views

Municipal Golf – A Community Benefit

I believe offering local, affordable golf provides a community benefit of no less value than the other city-sponsored recreation programs and, as a result, believe golf should be held to the same performance standards (operationally and financially) as other recreation activities. The latter naturally follows from the former, so by requiring that golf, uniquely among recreation activities, sustain itself without taxpayer subsidy, the City apparently has concluded that offering golf is not of equal value to the other activities. Perhaps more a question for Jayne, I would be interested in understanding the reasons behind that conclusion as well as when the conclusion was made and the process used to reach it.

Golf is a sport one can enjoy throughout his/her lifetime – it's a fun game (usually ☺), provides the opportunity to enjoy the outdoors, get a bit of exercise, social interaction, and as you have mentioned Jim, it's a sport that teaches very strong personal values. I wouldn't think golf is treated differently than other rec programs because of the sport itself. I also wouldn't think it's that significantly fewer Ann Arbor residents enjoy the City's two golf courses as utilize the other recreation facilities. If you look at the appendix of the 2006-2011 PROS Plan and compare golf with skating and canoeing for example, you see that more Ann Arbor adults (18+) engage regularly in golfing than either skating or canoeing and more teens (13-17) engage in golfing than skating (golfing and canoeing are the same). Only for pre-teens (6-12) was engagement in golfing below these other two activities. And as one would expect, participation in soccer, baseball, and basketball is higher than golf for non-adults, but more adults regularly engage in golfing than any of these other sports. Also apparent from the PROS Plan data is that, with the exception of Gallup, all the other individual city parks and recreation facilities serve limited audiences just as Leslie Park and Huron Hills do.

Perhaps the explanation for treating golf differently is that there are other courses in the area that folks could play other than AA's municipal courses, but there are also other facilities not operated by the City available for the other rec activities. While the PROS Plan indicates that swimming is a recreation activity

regularly engaged in at a fairly high rate for all age groups, swimming is also the activity listed first by residents when asked what activity do you engage in at a facility not operated by the City. Residents know there are other golf courses, but many still choose our municipal courses – just like many choose municipal swimming facilities. I am at a loss to explain why golf is perceived differently than other recreation activities and would appreciate knowing what I'm missing – what are the determining criteria? To me, they're all the same and the City should treat them all the same – either all in the GF where the community benefit warrants taxpayer support on top of fee revenues, or all expected to be self-supporting without the benefit of any taxpayer subsidy.

Please don't say, "Golf is an enterprise fund, the other rec programs are not." That is an artificial, arbitrary, fluid classification that easily can and should be changed – certainly not a "job stopper" when we're debating only where in the universe of the City budget this activity should reside. I understand Jim that this isn't a constraint you created, but as Jayne knows and you have probably become aware, there is flexibility in what is classified an enterprise fund as evidenced by the numerous changes that have occurred over the last few years. For example, all of the recreation activities were combined in an enterprise fund (called Recreation Facilities) until 2001 when all the other recreation facilities were moved to the General Fund. Just golf remained and the fund was renamed. In 2004-05, the City Hydropower operation was moved out of its enterprise fund into the

- 2-

GF because it couldn't sustain itself financially and in that same year, Solid Waste was moved from the GF into its own enterprise fund.

I believe ALL of our present recreation programs are providing a community benefit and are worth supporting with general tax \$'s (particularly when one considers that the preponderance of city parkland – 72% -- is, as noted in the PROS Plan, "unstructured and serves as open space" rather than utilized for active recreational uses). For that reason, I would recommend moving golf from an enterprise fund to the City's GF (as the others were in 2001). This action would simply rectify a present inconsistency and recognize that offering golf, like other recreation activities, is of value to the community. I'll dimension later what that would mean for the Parks budget and GF.

Mayor Hieftje, in a recent e-mail, also mentioned this alternative saying "one possible outcome might be making a decision to bring Huron Hills back into the General Fund." He goes on to say, "there would need to be a community conversation about this option." While I would (and have) encouraged a thorough community conversation about priorities, it is interesting to note that no such conversations occurred when all the other rec programs (except golf) were moved previously or when the decision was made to move Hydropower into the GF – those changes were made administratively and without any community fanfare/ "conversation". Over its last three years of operation while an enterprise fund, Hydropower's losses totaled over \$400K. I suspect the losses for the other, non-golf recreation activities were also significant in their final years prior to their being moved to the General Fund. Yet, for some reason, those transfers were not required to meet the same "community conversation" standard golf is – a curious inconsistency.

Any "community conversation" about the future of golf in Ann Arbor or about golf's worthiness to receive any general taxpayer support, must validate (or refute) the City's apparent determination that offering golf is of less value than other recreation programs. The City must explain why continuing to operate two municipal golf courses is primarily contingent upon their ability to generate a profit.

Both Golf Courses Contribute to the Community Benefit

If one accepts as I do that offering municipal golf does provide a community benefit, then the next question is whether that benefit is compromised with just one course. I believe it would be – Leslie Park and Huron Hills serve different audiences – both have loyal users/customers, both provide a community benefit, and both should be preserved.

You pointed out at the PAC meeting that the Stonebridge owner told you that Huron Hills is just what a municipal course should be – an entry point to the game. I think that says it very well. Yes, Leslie Park is certainly the more challenging course. It's the less talented players (youth, seniors), beginners, folks that simply don't have the time to play at Leslie or don't want that level of difficulty who, I've come to appreciate, prefer Huron Hills. I believe you mentioned at the PAC meeting that about 55% of the combined rounds played at the two courses were played at Leslie Park. It wasn't too many years ago that more rounds were played at Huron Hills, but even at 45%, that tells us there remains a core group of loyal customers/residents Huron Hills is serving. Many are youth – and, while I know you've stated that the national trends are that fewer young people are playing golf these days, that of course is not to say none are playing or that attracting more by offering a course suited to their needs isn't perfectly consistent with a city's mission to engage youth in positive, worthwhile

- 3 -

leisure activities. In correspondence you've received from some Huron Hills' golfers, the Herb Fowler Tournament at Huron Hills was cited as an example of a popular event to engage young golfers. You also should be aware that among the Huron Hills regulars are several local high school golf teams that use the facility for practice and occasionally (for the JV and Freshmen teams, I believe) for matches. Interestingly, the PROS Plan citizen survey responses showed that more Ann Arbor households used Huron Hills than Leslie Park.

Questions that come to mind here are – what does Ann Arbor want in its golf offering(s)? Is it a championship-quality course, an entry-level course, or both? Who are we serving/who is the target audience for this (and other) city sponsored recreation programs? Jayne mentioned that "Leslie Park is her priority" -- why is that (if they serve different audiences, why aren't both courses of equal priority)?

In our prior meeting, you mentioned a couple of times that in the survey Leslie Park was rated more favorably than Huron Hills. If you compare the survey results for Q's 8 and 10 (Q's asking those that have played these courses to evaluate certain aspects – Q8 Huron Hills, Q10 Leslie Park), you see that Leslie Park was rated more favorably on course condition, course layout, and customer service (Huron Hills more favorable on location). Again, I'll cover specific suggestions on Huron Hills later – the point here is that course condition and customer service are easily remedied, and given that the survey respondents listed course condition as the top criteria in their choice of courses and course condition is the primary area of concern for the golfers that played Huron Hills, that certainly provides a strong indication on where Huron Hills could be improved. No surprise that survey respondents favored the course layout at Leslie (it is more challenging), but it is interesting to note that the majority of folks (63%) that played Huron Hills assessed the layout as good or very good (again suggesting that not everyone wants/needs/expects a championship-level course).

You seemed to agree Jim with the statement that "Huron Hills is just what a municipal course should be." As a less challenging, walking-only, course in a beautiful setting, Huron Hills encourages exercise, provides a positive reinforcing experience to the game, and certainly meets the City's PROS Plan goal of combining recreation with the natural environment. But I'm not an expert, so I'll defer to William Newcomb (local golf course architect and former UM golf coach) – here's what Bill had to say about Huron Hills in his "Other Voices" piece in the Oct. 25th Ann Arbor News:

"The golfers who play it, love it. This is a course that serves golfers well. Seniors like it because they can walk. Better golfers use it as a practice round to work on the nuts and bolts of a swing. New golfers like it because they can play it as an acceptable challenge without losing a lot of golf balls. Juniors like it because the yardage is not overpowering and the cost is within budget to meet and play with other young athletes. The golfers who play Huron Hills want little to change."

The point obviously is that the two courses are not interchangeable – they do serve different audiences and just because Huron Hills is the less challenging, that doesn't at all suggest it provides less of a community benefit. I also would argue that there probably are more courses in the area that are Leslie Park equivalents than Huron Hills' equivalents – again, I'll admit I'm no expert, but I do not know of any

other walking-only courses targeted at the less advanced player that offer the natural beauty Huron Hills' back nine does. The golfing experience should not be any less for them.

I also share the view that I know some have expressed to you that closing Huron Hills (even 9 holes) would result in many of the HH's players, including the practicing high school teams, moving to

- 4 -

Leslie Park. That would certainly add to the difficulty in obtaining tee times that exists now at Leslie Park and perhaps also adversely impact pace of play at Leslie. Do you agree Jim that those would be issues/legitimate concerns?

Financial Considerations

A community conversation about golf must reflect a transparent, complete financial picture including the actual financial performance of golf (and other recreation activities), comparisons of the costs to continue golf vs. the other alternatives, as well as perspective/context of the costs in relation to the Parks and General Fund budgets. As you may know Jim, the other recreation programs are not enterprise funds and financial statements are not published publicly (although I do understand these data were subject to a recent FOIA request), so my comments here do not, consequently, address the other rec programs and facilities. I do know, however, that historically in Ann Arbor, golf was the strongest financial performer of any of the recreation programs by a fairly substantial margin.

Actual Financial Performance of Golf Courses

I certainly understand Jim that in addition to offering operational improvement suggestions, part of your charge is to project financial results into the future. As I mentioned to you before, I've always believed that the best place to start any forward year estimate is with recent actual results. The City has not published its audited Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the 2006-07 fiscal year, so the numbers that follow reflect the audited results for 2005-06 for the Golf Fund (Fund 47).

(In thousands)

Operating Revenues (Charges for Services)	\$998.2
Direct Operating Expenses	
Personnel	(561.7)
Materials and Supplies	(160.9)
Utilities/Insurance/Contracted Svc./Maintenance, Rent, Misc.	(82.1)
Contribution Margin (Op'g. Revenues less Direct Op'g. Exp.)	\$193.5

The blanket statements often made about the golf courses "losing \$" are at best too simplistic and, at worst, very misleading. Based on what they read/hear, most folks conclude the golf courses don't even cover the costs to run them on a daily basis. That's certainly not the case – the contribution margin (Revenues less Direct Operating Expenses) for 2005-06 was almost 20% of revenue which for most businesses/organizations is adequate to fund ongoing investments, overhead costs, and financing charges. But those businesses/organizations don't have to pay Municipal Service Charges (MSC) and IT charges amounting to 14% of their revenue, and interestingly, neither do the City's other enterprise funds (for all enterprise funds, the average MSC is about 3% of revenue). It is only because of these indirect charges/costs (which you have acknowledged are high) that the golf courses "lose \$".

- 5 -

Operating Revenues less Direct Operating Expenses	\$193.5
Other Charges/Expenses	

Municipal Service Charge/IT Charge	(143.7)
Depreciation (primarily Leslie Park improvements)	(125.4)
Operating Income/(Loss)	\$(75.6)
Non-Operating Expenses (primarily interest on debt for Leslie Park improvements)	(60.5)
Net Income/(Loss) before Transfers	\$(136.1)

It will be interesting to compare how the other recreation programs have performed financially when accounted for on the same basis.

Financial Outlook for the Golf Courses

The golf courses have been covering their direct costs and contributing to overhead. Accepting for the sake of discussion that (1) "financial viability" is the primary determinant of whether a recreation program should continue or not (of course it's only one of many factors), and (2) that without golf, there is a "no cost" option (of course, that's not the case either), then hypothetically, the financial outlook – whether the course will continue to generate a contribution margin – would drive the ultimate decision. Let's consider that question.

In your 10/31 e-mail to me, you indicated that "there will be significant losses, i.e., > \$250,000 annually for the foreseeable future regardless of what financial, operational, or strategic decisions are made." The natural first question is > \$250,000 on what accounting basis (contribution margin, fully-accounted loss)? A second question would be whether you have done cash flow projections?

Whatever the basis, however, the financial forecasts and cash flow projections obviously depend on the underlying assumptions (e.g., level of course improvements/capital investment, marketing/promotion, conditioning, liquor licensing, pricing, # of rounds played, etc., etc.). I (and others) want to understand (and yes, perhaps then challenge) those assumptions and that's why I have been persistent in asking for your financial models of the two courses (you had included the LP financial model in our Oct. 12th meeting, but not HH's). As you know from the e-mail exchanges last Friday, the City refused to share the models/projections with me and without the benefit of those models/projections, all I can do is work with the publicly available data the City has no choice but to publish.

We all recognize that the underlying fundamentals for golf have been adverse in recent years (demand stable, with supply increasing), but those trends are, of course, reflected in the current actual results. To conclude that "losses" will grow, you must be projecting further deterioration in those underlying fundamentals that would more than offset the financial benefits of the improvement ideas you and the community can generate. Is that correct?

In your Oct. 31st e-mail, you also mentioned that "of the 51% downturn in the courses' financial fortunes over the past decade, only 22% of it can be attributed to internal factors. Although I'm

- 6 -

curious how you derived that, it's certainly interesting – and encouraging. That says 43% (22% of 51%) of the decline, or almost half, is attributable to internal factors that are under the City's control – "self-inflicted wounds" that, presumably, could be corrected/reversed. That's good news as it suggests an upside opportunity to the current financial performance. I'd also think that certainly at least some of that could be realized without major investment – the "low hanging fruit" you referenced in your thoughtful Oct. 30th e-mail to Stuart Dombey. Without having your financial model/projections, all I can do is dimension the possible impact of correcting these self-inflicted wounds. With annual revenues of about \$1M, a 15% increase (hypothetically, a 20% increase in revenue net of 5% incremental op'g. expenses) generated

from improvement in internal factors (would seem reasonable if over 40% of decline attributable to internal factors) would add \$150K annually to a contribution margin of almost \$200K in 2005-06. And this is just to fix those specific items that contributed to the recent decline – it doesn't reflect the impact of other improvement suggestions/strategies that I'm sure you have.

Without the benefit of your model/projections, I can't precisely quantify the upside potential of positively addressing these internal factors, but the point is there is upside potential. I do not accept that the financial performance of the golf courses will necessarily deteriorate in the future. The underlying trends could stabilize (even improve) and the correction of the negative internal factors may then result in an improving, not deteriorating, bottom-line. Further, until the possibility of privatizing management of the courses is fully explored, any conclusions about the future financial performance of the golf courses is premature and incomplete. You indicated at our previous meeting that you had talked briefly with Kemper Sports Management and Billy Casper Management, but that's not sufficient. Jayne also indicated, when I asked if the City ever issued an RFP/RFQ to formally explore/solicit outsourcing management proposals, that ~4 years/so ago the City had looked at this, but never issued an RFP. Until the City completes a proper RFP process, we won't know what privatization opportunities might be available and whether those would result in better financial outcomes and/or qualitative improvements to the golfing experience. For example, I understand there is a local firm, Total Golf, Inc. in Milford, Michigan, that manages nine other courses. Are you familiar with them or whether they may be interested in managing our municipal courses? I suspect there are numerous other Total Golf kinds of management outfits that might be interested in some business, but we will never know unless we ask. Don't get me wrong Jim – I share your view that golf course staff have performed admirably – it's just that no one at city hall is an expert in the business of golf (and no one would expect them to be).

Comparing the Alternatives Financially

You are certainly correct that from a purely economic perspective, the only real financial carrot in all this would have been selling golf course property. It's not rocket science – residents have understood that's the only place where real \$ is – and that's why they have been concerned about property sales ever since the possibility of selling the woods adjacent to Huron Hills first surfaced in late 2004/early 2005. Recent events – RFP references to “future of the golf course properties” and “economic viability of golf”, newspaper articles, and most of all, Council's rejecting an amendment to your consultant RFP that would have told you not to spend time looking at property sales – fanned the flames. (I add this background only so that you'll better understand the reasons behind some folk's passion at the Cobblestone Farm meeting, not to open old wounds.)

You're also correct, however, that selling parkland doesn't work for the community or Council (fortunately, with City Council's recent resolution, that issue finally is put to bed). What's

- 7 -

unfortunate is that you spent time investigating land sale opportunities at the expense of other, more productive work. That's not your fault – you were just doing what the RFP (Task 2) stipulated.

I realize there were several land sale opportunities you had considered – front 7 at HH (the NY commercial developer “prospect”), land around hold #3 at Huron Hills for a restaurant (which, by the way sits in the Huron River floodplain), woods adjacent to HH – but with all due respect Jim, selling the woods to the neighbors with deed restrictions was a bit over the top. This is parkland taxpayers already own, and I'm sure you'd agree our neighborhood certainly should not be treated any differently than any other neighborhoods and other neighborhoods are not being asked to purchase their neighborhood parks. In suggesting that, you were probably not aware that over the last 15 years or so, the City purchased (with city \$) two separate, privately owned parcels adjacent to Leslie Park – Black Pond Woods (27 acres, \$1.2M, in 1991/1992; I served on the PAC at the time) and Stapp/Traverwood (8 acres, \$550K, in 2003-2004). But for Huron Hills, maintaining adjacent public parkland that has existed for decades should require the neighbors write checks? Obviously not very equitable.

In any event, with property sales now off the table, the list of alternatives (and range of financial outcomes) is narrower. The RFP (Task 7) states that one option that must be considered is the "continued operation of the golf courses as they currently exist." That baseline maintains two 18 hole courses and leverages your (and others') suggestions to optimize financial and operating performance (without significant capital investments). Once that optimized baseline is defined, then significant investments can be evaluated both financially (return and payback) and qualitatively vs. the baseline. Similarly, alternatives such as privatizing management of the courses or perhaps closing all or a part of the course(s) would also be evaluated against that optimized baseline. Am I correct in assuming that's the approach you will be taking to present the financial impacts of the alternatives?

I do not know at this point what alternatives you will present, but it seems clear that Leslie Park will remain an 18-hole golf course and the alternatives/decisions for Leslie Park simply evolve around operational improvements and the level of capital improvement. For Huron Hills, however, closure of at least 9 holes (RFP Task #7 requires that this option be evaluated) and perhaps the entire course, will be considered. Setting aside the qualitative arguments (above) that both courses should remain, if closure of Huron Hills is an alternative, it is important that your financial comparisons reflect that the golf course external debt (\$880K of Ann Arbor Building Authority Bonds at June 2006) and related interest payments as well as the golf course internal debt owed to other city funds (\$850K at June 2006) will both remain obligations for the surviving Leslie Park. That's proper analytical treatment and also appropriate given that the external debt was incurred primarily for the Leslie Park renovation in 1995. Leslie Park would also still be required to pay Municipal Service and IT charges and although the charges in total would be less, the amount Leslie Park would have to pay likely would be higher. You indicated at our meeting that you believed Leslie Park could sustain itself financially as an enterprise fund, but Huron Hills was "bleeding the enterprise fund". (I think the "actuals" on the prior pages speak for themselves – nothing's "bleeding".) Was the conclusion that Leslie Park could sustain itself based on the external and internal debt and MSC obligations removed or still included in the enterprise fund?

The practical reality is that Huron Hills occupies a large chunk of real estate. If not an 18 hole golf course, then what becomes of the property and at what cost? Given City Council's recent action to definitively state that no property at either course will be sold and that all golf course

- 8 -

property will remain a park even if no longer a golf course, there seem to be only two non-golf alternatives for Huron Hills (1) open parkland or (2) used for another recreational purpose, and both of these alternatives likely would cost the City more, not less, than maintaining Huron Hills as an 18-hole golf course.

At our meeting, you/Jayne indicated that the cost to maintain all of Huron Hills as open parkland would be about \$250,000 annually. In recent e-mails, you and Councilmember Rapundalo pegged this number at \$300,000 annually – if either are correct, that's more than the incremental costs to operate Huron Hills as a golf course. In your note to Stuart Dombey, you make that point as well. Given its higher cost, for this alternative to be viable, one must conclude that there is a significantly greater community benefit of Huron Hills as open parkland than as a golf course. I do not agree, particularly given the already skewed present mix of active/passive parkland in Ann Arbor, and would appreciate your thoughts on this Jayne. I would expect that maintaining a 9 hole golf course with the balance of property as open parkland (or part parkland, part driving range), would result in even higher costs as the economies of scale for either all golf or all open parkland are compromised.

The other alternative for Huron Hills would be to use the land for another recreation activity. I would anticipate that regardless of the recreation activity chosen, the cost for conversion of the property and for operation would exceed those to maintain Huron Hills as a golf course. Another important consideration would be the relative usage – would more residents be taking advantage of this other recreation activity than now do golf? Jayne – has any thought been given to this? If so, do you have any data you could share?

Therefore, if costs and financial viability are the key decision criteria, it would seem the optimal solution is to maintain Huron Hills (and Leslie Park) as 18-hole golf courses. Your note to Stuart Dombey suggests you agree.

Golf Course Financials in Perspective

To this point, the message from you, Jayne, and several councilmembers (in meetings and through e-mails) has essentially been that the golf course losses are substantial and will grow, that significant (one CM indicated “huge”) capital investments are required, and that moving golf to the General Fund isn’t possible because the GF doesn’t have any \$ either and can’t absorb more expenses. The only solution appears to be for taxpayers to, as one CM said, “ante up” if they want golf. (It was not clear if taxpayers would then need to “ante up” even more to keep the properties as open parklands.) I don’t know if city hall folks feel compelled to justify the city’s investment in you, but the hyperbole here is a bit much. Let’s dimension all this, put it in context.

First of all, I think you’d agree Jim that the amount of golf course profits or losses depends on how one presents the numbers:

- on a contribution margin basis (revenue less direct costs) the courses make \$ and contribute to covering city overhead
- on a fully-accounted basis (including MSC/IT charges, depreciation, and interest expense), they lose \$

Regardless of measure, the range of contribution margin to accounted loss is relatively small at about \$100-\$200K annually. I do not have your financial models, but would be very surprised if the “optimized base line alternative” I mentioned earlier – which maintains two 18-hole courses,

- 9 -

corrects the negative “internal factors”, adds your improvement suggestions, but does not make significant capital investments – would result in a dramatic change to the financial performance.

The golf courses have been essentially breakeven for years and even assuming the financial performance does deteriorate (as you believe it will), the City’s ongoing cost to maintain municipal golf in Ann Arbor would remain relatively modest, almost negligible when placed in context (not to mention, less it appears, than the costs to simply maintain as open parkland).

Regarding capital investments, I understand the RFP requires you to identify what capital investments could be made and also understand that your natural bias is to make the courses the best they can be. That’s understandable. At our meeting on Oct. 12th, you indicated that capital investment of \$1.6M at LP (tunnel, range, practice area, clubhouse renovation) and \$550K for HH (range, clubhouse renovation) were required to be “competitive”. If driving ranges and clubhouses are critical to success, why were they not included in the survey list of factors determining choice of course (seven other factors were listed)? Sure, driving ranges and nicer clubhouses might add to the overall experience, but I do not believe they are critical to success for municipal courses. As you will see later, like many of the folks you’ve heard from, I do support spending a bit more annually on course condition, promotion, and customer service – items I believe will contribute significantly more to improving the courses’ bottom-line (and the golfing experience for players) than driving ranges, clubhouses, and carts with tops/tunnel renovation.

It is not residents/golfers that are requesting the City invest \$2M or more of their tax dollars in capital improvements, it is you. Perhaps their expectations for the courses and definition of “competitiveness” is different from your’s. Please consider that possibility. You have also indicated that it wasn’t clear if investments would in fact pay back. I would defer to your expertise on that, but you should be aware that the City typically finds \$ to fund projects it believes will pay back (LED street lights, Automated Water Meter readers, and refuse “curb carts” and mechanical trucks are just a couple examples over the last few years). If you believe the investments would pay back, don’t accept that the funding isn’t available.

In any event, to engage in a community conversation about golf, folks need some perspective – we need to dimension what \$100-\$200K means. Let’s start with parks – for parks, \$100-200K annually represents:

- 0.7-1.4% of the annual parks budget (\$14M including both millages, GF allocation, and golf fund)
- 2-4% of the annual amount raised by the City's Parks Maintenance/Capital Millage (\$5M)
- 10-20% of the annual amount that same parks tax millage was INCREASED just this past year
- less than the \$287K unexpectedly ADDED to the parks budget at the Oct. 15th City Council meeting
- TBD% of the subsidy provided by the City for other recreation programs (10/17 FOIA request)
- 4-8% of the amount raised annually for the Greenbelt Millage (\$2.3M with about \$85M raised over its 30 year lifetime)

This past year, Ann Arbor voters once again demonstrated their support for parks by authorizing a 20% increase in the Parks Millage. That increase alone generated almost \$1M in additional annual revenue and is in addition to the revenue growth generated from ongoing increases in taxable values. In 2007-08, the City will collect about \$7.4M in tax revenue for parks -- \$5.1M for general parks maintenance/rehab and \$2.3M for the Greenbelt Millage. Five years ago (2002-03), the tax revenues for parks were \$5.1M in total -- \$3.3M for general parks and \$1.8M for parks acquisition. That's a 45% increase in five years -- 55% increase for general parks and 28% for acquisition. Not bad, given that inflation has been but a fraction of that! For general parks, annual tax revenues are \$1.8M

- 10 -

(55%) higher than they were five years ago and \$1M (20%) higher than they were just last year and the City can't afford \$100-\$200K for golf? Residents don't understand -- they are questioning where all the additional revenue has gone and why the City is considering eliminating/reducing one of its few recreation programs just when taxpayers have agreed to give parks so much more \$? I'm sure you'd agree these are fair questions that need to be answered in the "community conversation".

Before golf is discontinued completely or in part, a transparent community conversation would require that the "costs" to maintain golf be evaluated in the context of other programs and expenditures funded with the new millage revenue (and existing revenues for that matter). As Jayne knows, there was a long list of capital projects and enhanced maintenance efforts that accompanied the parks tax increase request of voters and the community should have the opportunity to prioritize maintaining golf vs. these other actions, just as the community is consulted on the PROS Plan goals/objectives (which, of course, contemplates HH's improvements, not closure). Am I correct in assuming you would agree that's appropriate?

Funding Solutions

Alternatively, if Staff and Council do not want to engage in priority debates (at the parks and/or General Fund levels), there are very easy and painless funding solutions available now (which addresses one Councilmember's concern that while actions implemented now may improve longer term financial performance "we must nonetheless identify a source of funding in the short term.") On October 15th, City Council raised the parks revenue budgets for 2007-08 and 2008-09 by \$287K in each year. Given that the parks expenditure budget had been set without this additional revenue, those funds could be used for the golf courses without compromising any other budgeted programs or services.

Additionally, \$250K in parks expenditures (transfer to Safety Services) were removed from the Administrator's proposed budget in the final adopted budget. While about \$75K of that was used to fund restoring a Parks Facility Manager position, the balance was (according to page 7 of the adopted budget) placed in the "contingency expenditure budget". I would think maintaining a recreation activity like golf would certainly be an appropriate use of parks "contingency" funds. So without touching budgeted parks programs/services, here's roughly \$450K in annual parks revenues that could be used for golf (if one believes that maintaining golf is an incremental cost that requires funding.) I would support either alternative -- using these revenues to fund golf or engaging in a community conversation about priorities (as long as that conversation is transparent and all programs and services are on the table for folks to prioritize). I suspect staff or our elected officials might respond by saying that revenue is already spoken for. Perhaps, but let's then compare the relative priority of maintaining golf vs. this expenditure added at the margin which didn't make the cut with \$1M more annually already added to parks revenues this year.

In the context of the City's General Fund budget, \$100K-\$200K becomes even more negligible – about 2/10's of a percent of the \$82M annual General Fund revenue budget. Yes, that's 2/10's of one percent. You may not be aware Jim, but for this fiscal year (2007-08), there's a General Fund budget surplus of \$1.3M (revenues of \$81.8M and expenses of \$80.5M) and for the next two years, a combined surplus of about \$700K. Without touching any General Fund programs or services, here's a one-time source of funds of another \$700K which could be used to retire the majority of the external golf course debt, and save approximately \$60K in annual interest payments.

- 11 -

Plus, as I understand it from the budget message in the adopted 07/08 budget book, the cost savings resulting from the recently negotiated union settlements (portrayed as significant) were not fully reflected in the budgets as several remained open when the budget was developed and adopted. I don't know what that's worth, but that should provide \$TBD of available ongoing funding (Jayne could fill in the TBD).

Identified painless funding = \$450 annually (plus TBD) and \$700K one-time. That's more than required to fund even the pessimistic projections of ongoing "losses", provides for debt reduction (or some level of capital investment if that's preferred), and is available now.

At our last meeting, I raised the possibility of moving some "Greenbelt" Funds (Fund 24) via voter referendum to general parks funds as a way to provide funding for parks and rec activities including golf. Jayne seemed excited about that possibility and you subsequently mentioned that was being discussed and studied – how did that come out? I understand the "greenbelt" is an acquisition millage, but given that 1/3 of proceeds were intended for use inside the City limits, it would seem appropriate to offer voters a chance to realign spending with changing needs and priorities. As I mentioned, I understand that would be a hard sell politically, but if Jayne and the City believe the relative needs and priorities have evolved, it's perfectly reasonable to propose offering voters the option for some level of funding realignment. A long shot but certainly doable, and this could be another source of funding.

Priorities and Benchmarks

I've purposely segregated the possible funding sources to those that don't require reductions elsewhere in order to avoid a debate about relative priorities. However, if anyone wants to open that debate, I'm confident the community would welcome it and would be surprised to see some of the places their tax dollars go.

I'll resist the temptation to speak to the relative priority of \$100K-\$200K required to maintain golf vs. \$35M-\$55M for a new Municipal Center, but would advise you to avoid the absurd conclusion reached by one councilmember recently that "if the public views the golf courses as a needed service then will they be prepared to ante up either via higher property taxes or millages." Huh? The public just did that last year. And, we're talking peanuts – a rounding error in the context of the GF budget. Council trumpets that they can pay for a new multi-million \$ Municipal Center without a tax increase, but keeping golf breaks the bank and would require a tax increase? Let's have the community conversation and see how long that one stands up.

Jim, I don't know how much you recall about Ann Arbor from your days at UM, but we are a heavily taxed community which enables our city government to afford just about the best of everything. We find the money, whether it's for:

- the investments I mentioned for the high tech streetlights/automated water meters/garbage cans and trucks
- or investments in city-wide bicycle paths (with accompanying added maintenance costs and occasionally elaborate retention walls)
- or investments in expanded recycling and composting programs and facilities
- or investments in alternative transportation/energy programs and mass transportation (\$9M annually in taxes for AATA, seed \$ for commuter trains)

- or investments in a world-class \$35M garage for city vehicles
- or substantial subsidies for human services – AA supplements federal funding for human services
- 12 –

with well over \$1M annually out of General Fund tax \$'s, and over the last couple of years, funded another \$1M+ to pay the rent for low-income folks displaced from the local Y facility. That facility was purchased by the City for \$3.5M and the carrying costs alone – costs of \$, etc. – are significant.

- or subsidies for our very own Hydropower plant

I selected the list above to demonstrate Ann Arbor's commitment to environmental/green and quality of life/human service values. It would seem to me, providing affordable golf is consistent with our values, actually a perfect fit – combining the best of both of these environmental and quality of life/human service values, by encouraging residents to affordably recreate and enjoy themselves in a natural environment.

I mention all this to provide further perspective on the cost of maintaining golf. In addition to the above, the City also pays significant amounts annually (in millions) for consultants and we choose to fund \$2M+ annually to purchase development rights on land outside our city limits, and we can afford \$35-\$55M to build a new Municipal Center. And this is during the tough times!! But the City can't find \$100-\$200K a year for golf – seems a bit absurd, doesn't it? I also mention it to provide context on who might be appropriate benchmarks for Ann Arbor. At our meeting, you mentioned that you thought two of the cities you had worked with – Ocala (Florida) and St. Paul (Minnesota) – were good benchmarks. I'm not so sure.

Ocala is half the population of Ann Arbor, with a general fund budget of about \$60M (vs. \$82M in AA). In looking at Ocala's budget website, it appears they spend relatively less on parks and rec activities (e.g., about \$250K annually for parks and rec capital improvements vs. AA's \$2-3M annually) and do not have any dedicated parks tax millages like Ann Arbor. Is that correct? The Ocala budget website also referenced a \$400K general fund subsidy for golf for Ocala's two courses, with a plan (probably your's) to eliminate that subsidy with changes in pricing, a marketing campaign, and \$2.5M in capital improvements. In reading the Sept. 30, 2007 article in the Ocala Star-Banner entitled "City Tries to Repair Divots Over Golf Fees", it is interesting to note one gentleman's comment that "not all local public golf loyalists think the upgrades and heavy investment are necessary" and "it's a joy to play it the way it is." Not dissimilar from Bill Cassebaum and other HH's season pass holders' thoughts regarding the necessity of big ticket investments. I do have to say though, Ocala's "vortex of death spiral" sure tops "the future is bleak." ☺

St. Paul is two and a half times the size of Ann Arbor with a general fund budget (according to the City's website) of about \$170M. Examining the relationship of parks and rec spending to total spending, St. Paul spends about the same as Ann Arbor does. In terms of capital spending, however, St. Paul spends proportionately a bit less (St. Paul spends \$5M annually vs. the \$2-3M in AA). The funding sources are different in the two cities. Looking at the St. Paul Parks and Rec budget, the general fund contributes roughly half of parks and rec funding with the balance from fees, intergovernmental revenues and transfers. By contrast, in Ann Arbor the general fund contributes about 40% to total parks and rec funding. In other words, St. Paul is relying more on its general fund to pay for parks and rec than Ann Arbor does. Also, it does not appear that St. Paul has any dedicated parks millages. Interestingly, for a population of 275,000, St. Paul has 145,000 rounds played annually for its four courses (or, 0.52 rounds per person). In AA, we have about 112,000 people and 40,000 rounds played (or, .36 rounds per person per year). This suggests there is upside potential to our rounds played, unless the competitive landscape is dramatically different. Clearly, AA has a weather advantage. St. Paul's golf performance measures include an objective to "improve marketing and community outreach to maintain and potentially increase golf rounds played." To achieve this objective, St. Paul established a 2007 Parks and Rec priority to "start a golf outreach program for the City's Latino community." While AA doesn't have a significant Latino population,

- 13 -

we certainly have a significant Asian population, and perhaps a similar outreach program might be effective here as a way to increase rounds played.

While Ocala and St. Paul do not appear to have dedicated parks millages, they clearly do not have anything resembling a greenbelt millage. I would also suspect their spending habits in other areas do not approach Ann Arbor's. I'm not sure they are particularly good benchmarks Jim, particularly Ocala, but that's certainly not to say we can't learn from their experience. I believe we also may be able to learn from Kalamazoo, Michigan – I'm told Kalamazoo has a very successful municipal golf program. I don't know the details, but looking at their website, it appears they have three courses managed by a citizen committee, the Kalamazoo Municipal Golf Association, with a pretty formal structure (Board of Governors). Are you familiar with what Kalamazoo has done Jim, and is there anything Ann Arbor could/should replicate? I ask because Kalamazoo might be a relevant benchmark, experiencing similar challenges of weather and U-hauls leaving the state.

Improvement Suggestions for Huron Hills and Leslie Park

At the PAC meeting in September, you told PAC members that the community was "indifferent" to golf at Huron Hills. With all due respect, that simply isn't accurate. While I understand you were perhaps distracted by some of the comments at the Cobblestone Farm meeting, there were several folks at that meeting who spoke passionately about golf at Huron Hills – offering suggestions for improving their golf course. Subsequent to the meeting, interested golfers have passed along to you many thoughts/comments (that I'm aware of) about how to improve golf at Huron Hills and I'm sure you've received other specific Huron Hills input as well. Hopefully, in your report, and in the meetings to review it with Staff, PAC, and councilmembers, you will correct that earlier mischaracterization.

As Bill Cassebaum, a HH's season pass holder, put it, "We golfers at Huron Hills do not want a Cadillac; a properly equipped and maintained Chevy will do." This same theme was confirmed in the survey you conducted. As mentioned earlier, the majority of folks (63%) that played Huron Hills assess the layout as good or very good (don't need a Cadillac) and respondents listed course condition as the top criteria in their choice of courses and course condition is the primary area of concern for the golfers that played Huron Hills (a properly equipped and maintained Chevy will do). And as you know, several of the notes you've received from interested golfers echoed the same theme. That certainly shouldn't be a surprise given what Huron Hills is and is intended to be – a pleasant, entry level course. Major capital investments are not what Huron Hills needs, but rather more attention to day-to-day details. Yes, this would result in higher operating costs, but not a significant amount. And I believe that, unlike major capital investments, the small investments (your low hanging fruit) required to improve course condition, customer service, and promotion would not only generate a positive financial return, they are all that is necessary at Huron Hills to avoid what you call "a below average golf experience". Huron Hills players don't need/want Augusta National, Radrick Farms or the UM Course, or even Leslie Park – just a properly maintained Chevy!

Specifically, for Huron Hills, I'd recommend:

Maintain present layout – the existing 18-hole layout meets/exceeds Huron Hills customers' expectations. It's sufficiently challenging with two unique and diverse nines in a beautiful natural environment. Converting to a nine-hole course would compromise Huron Hills and result in the "below average golf experience" you reference. It would also likely add to total

- 14 -

costs (i.e., not achieving economies of scale for either all golf or all parkland) and exacerbate problems at Leslie Park in terms of pace of play (i.e., resulting from fewer available tee times for customers, and elimination of playing opportunities for the high school teams and others – typically less advanced players – who utilize HH's).

Improve course condition – maintenance of greens. Customer expectations are not for immaculate fairways or tees, but greens should be reasonably well-maintained.

Improve course condition – clean up goose droppings. I grew up playing a course in Pennsylvania that faced the same problem and know the droppings can never be completely taken care of, but there are acceptable/unacceptable and unsanitary levels. Huron Hills customers' expectations reasonably include

finding that acceptable level. (One standard might be to ensure that when players return their bags and shoes to the trunks of their cars, their equipment isn't covered with goose you-know-what. ☺)

Improve course condition – water as necessary. Customer expectations are that golf courses should be reasonably “green” and the situation this summer at Huron Hills with the broken water pump was one of those “self-inflicted” wounds that can't be repeated.

Improve experience – offer hot dogs and beer. Customer expectations don't require a five course meal, a restaurant on the course overlooking the river, or even choices, just a “dog and a beer”. Because you distinguish between liquor licenses and beer licenses (don't know if there really is such a distinction), and Jayne stated that LP is the priority for a liquor license, a full liquor license is not required and simply a beer license at HH's would be sufficient. If that can't be acquired, still offer the hot dogs.

Improve experience – take care of the little things. Fix the spike cleaners as one golfer mentioned. Ensure that employees are courteous and say thank you. Follow-up with season pass holders and contacts for outings – doesn't cost more for the City to require employees to smile, say thank you, or to provide information on how to sign-up for the following year.

Promotion – use CTN. One resident (golfer and Cable Comm. mbr.) suggested using CTN to promote both golf courses and other recreation programs as well. An excellent suggestion as this source of free advertising is a competitive advantage for Ann Arbor's municipal courses. Yes, creating the promotional materials would cost a little \$, but certainly not much. Emphasize the Huron Hills' “experience” and that the “experience” has been made better.

Promotion – actively use Ann Arbor's government and other city websites (e.g., Convention and Visitor's Bureau) to better promote the golf courses. Another free source of promotion, city should benchmark Kalamazoo to see what can be done with websites (their city website includes several customer-friendly links to attractive/appealing Kalamazoo Municipal Golf Association webpages).

Promotion – consider cost/benefit of additional marketing/advertising. When asked in the survey the barriers to playing Huron Hills/Leslie Park, 41% and 31% respectively of the non-Ann Arbor, SE Michigan respondents indicated they were not aware the courses existed.

Promotion – cultivate league play through above promotional efforts and by follow-up with league contacts previous year.

Customer identification – the City does not seem to know who the players are at either course. (You, Jim, indicated you weren't able to id the HH's season pass holders for the City golf survey.) You are the expert, but it would seem to me there would be means to capture that information and subsequently use it for promotional purposes. Consider implementing an integrated tee time reservation and Point-of-Sale system (similar to St. Paul, MN).

Do not consider replacing holes 8 and 9 with a driving range. While certainly a “nice to have”, a driving range is not required to meet customer expectations. Beginners, kids, local school golf teams, seniors have enjoyed Huron Hills for decades without a driving range.

- 15 -

The capital and operating costs for a range are significant, and, as you mentioned, its location/proximity to adjacent homes is problematic. (As you may know, the UM driving range on State Street, where they erected a massive 50 ft. net, was closed because of safety issues/concerns.) There would be benefits of a range in terms of instruction, but considering that basic swing instruction can be accomplished with a net and that the Miles of Golf range is only 2.5 miles away from HH's, a range is an unnecessary investment.

Maintain as a “walking only” course – that's integral to Huron Hills' DNA/charm. I understand that adding a few carts may be a way to allow more players to enjoy the course and generate revenue, but believe it's inconsistent with customer expectations. Golfers at Huron Hills enjoy walking, particularly seniors who want the exercise, and lining up a putt with carts hovering (patiently or impatiently – rushing folks) in the fairway seems inconsistent with the leisurely experience of Huron Hills. Know this view is not shared universally, but in my opinion, carts and cart paths (expensive if required) would detract more than they would add.

Evaluate pricing – I understand there are multiple variables and competitive dynamics involved (season, daily, weekend rates, discounts for youth, seniors, etc.) and won't pretend to be able to predict the “sweet spot” in all this to maximize revenue. Fees should simply reflect a fair price, not “fire sale” prices. I understand that some courses are offering huge discounts, and not matching those represents a risk, but believe total revenue would be optimized at reasonable prices. Price is an important determinant of

course choice, but not the only or primary determinant as long as pricing is within a reasonable competitive range.

To implement the above, very little (or no) capital investment is required and it would seem that three additional seasonal employees (two for improved maintenance and course condition items and one for customer service/promotional aspects) would be sufficient. Annual operating costs would be increased by say \$75K, and one-time costs of perhaps \$25-50K should be more than adequate to create the promotional materials. Would the improvements generate additional revenue? Of course they would, but I certainly can't say for sure if incremental revenues would cover the added costs. I believe these relatively small investments would pay off and a trial period of a couple of years would seem appropriate to test the hypothesis (particularly given the funding sources identified above and the fact that the City would be enhancing the golfing experience for its users/customers in the meantime). Also, all of this assumes of course that the City has fully explored the option of privatized management (e.g., through a formal RFP process) and found that not to be a viable option.

Unique Recommendations for Leslie Park:

Many of the recommendations above – particularly the promotional, customer service, and customer identification related items – apply to Leslie Park as well as to Huron Hills. And like Huron Hills, the Leslie Park layout meets/exceeds customer expectations and does not need to be changed.

Course condition at Leslie Park was rated highly by survey respondents – unlike Huron Hills, that is not an issue and the primary barriers to playing Leslie Park that were identified by survey respondents were distance from residence (can't do much about that) and price.

Carts with tops/tunnel rehab – while I understand that folks prefer carts with tops, a \$1M investment on the tunnel to accommodate the tops isn't justified. It would seem, however, that a lower cost alternative could be found and, if so, the cost-benefit should be revisited, but it would need to be a very low cost alternative to warrant the expenditure.

Driving range – as with Huron Hills, a “nice to have”, but not a critical success factor.

- 16 -

Clubhouse/amenities – in your Nov. 1st response to Ken Ogilvie, you indicated that you were considering an expansion to the clubhouse so that league players and tournament players could sit in a protected area. You also noted it was important for Leslie Park to obtain a

liquor license. Certainly the two are related and if Leslie Park were to obtain the liquor license the City has applied for, the potential for additional revenue may justify an expansion.

League play/outings/tournaments – given Leslie Park's challenging layout, it offers tremendous potential to attract group events. This should be aggressively cultivated. You were a cc on a note speaking to the experience of a gentleman who was the Treasurer of the Parke Davis/Warner Lambert/Pfizer golf leagues suggesting that Leslie Park's unresponsiveness resulted in their moving their leagues elsewhere. That's one of those “self-inflicted” wounds that must be stopped.

Pace of play – based on several of the notes you've received, this seems to be one of the largest operational issues at Leslie Park. You noted the simple fix – pair up singles, twosomes, etc. – but an effective course ranger must be on-site, particularly on weekends. And as noted previously, closing all or part of Huron Hills will only exacerbate this problem.

Implementing the above for Leslie Park requires minimal to no capital investment unless it's determined that a clubhouse expansion would generate a positive return. On an operating basis, because course condition is not an issue, very little incremental cost is required at Leslie Park (perhaps just a part-time ranger).

Closing

I apologize for the length of this note and will spare you from rehashing my entire “vision”. In a nutshell, I believe offering local, affordable municipal golf is an important community benefit worthy of community support just as other recreation activities are – and that the unique enterprise fund treatment of golf

should be changed. I also believe that both courses are unique, important contributors to the community benefit and both should be retained and improved. The “costs” to maintain and improve golf at both courses is minimal (if really any at all), are less than the costs of the alternatives (including maintaining as parkland), and the funding to continue and improve golf is readily available.

I do not share your view that keeping what we have and simply trying to enhance the golfing experience at both courses, without making significant capital investments, constitutes a “path of least resistance” or having the “courses drip to death”. Sure we could have sold property and that certainly would have generated a wonderful financial return, but a net loss to the community. We could make significant investments in both courses with driving ranges, new clubhouses, even restaurants overlooking the river, and while exciting, those are not what customers are asking for or what drives a golfer’s decision on what course to play. Your survey, and the numerous comments from local golfers, clearly indicate folks value and desire simple operational improvements – among others, better course condition at Huron Hills, pace of play at Leslie Park, and customer service/identification/retention at both. A little promotion might help the bottom line, too. I recognize these are not very “sexy” recommendations, but sometimes meeting customers’ needs is just about consistently doing the simple things right.

Assuming you’ve made it through all this Jim, thank you very much for listening.

Jane Lumm

11/8/07

Hello,

As a lifelong resident of Ann Arbor, I would like to weigh in on the matter of Huron Hill's future as a golf course. Needless to say, there has been no strong support > no real support at all by the taxpayer residents > to sell or develop any parts of the course or lands adjacent. It is satisfying to know that this message, in the age of the Greenbelt voting, has been heard and that there is no more discussion about selling or developing Huron Hills land.

I would like to support the plan to further enhance Huron Hills and develop it further as a golf course. To let it be neglected any further would be an embarrassment for our community. It is a gateway to the city and it should be treated with importance and care. As the seasons and years cycle, golf has had its popular years and trends toward less popularity. Improving the course, with paid staff to run and maintain it, will only enhance our city and work toward our future. Golf will trend upward again, and Huron Hills will be there for the community, and others, to enjoy.

Please consider programs for youth golfers for Huron Hills. There should be more youth programs, with scholarships made available for those in need, as the course regains momentum through the development process. One day, when the course is at peak productivity, utilized by many, it will be good to look back and be grateful for the decisions made now, to further develop this gem, as opposed to giving up on it.

In closing, the winter program should be focused on, as well. Increasing use during the winter months, with possible payment for services (food, hot chocolate, rentals of equipment....) will also improve the valuable asset of Huron Hills.

Thank you,
Cindy Masini
734-971-7074

I understand that you are seeking information regarding the future of the subject golf course. One of Ann Arbor's primary natural assets is the Huron River, and the Huron Hills course allows this to be showcased as it should be. With all the high rise construction taking place in town, there needs to be a balance of open space within the city limits. I am a long time (since 1968) resident of AA and golf at Huron Hills very frequently all summer. This is a gem that needs to be maintained. I, and future generations that come to AA to enjoy its charm, will thank you.

Ken Timmer
2112 Ascot

Ann Arbor, Mi 48103

Dear Staff,

I'm writing to urge you to keep the Huron Hills Golf Course open and available to the public for golf. I golf there on a fairly regular basis.

Thanks for your consideration of my input.

Bill

--

William R. Dahms
3009 Geddes Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Phone: (734) 741-7500
Cell: (213) 220-5010
E-mail: wdahms@comcast.net

HURON HILLS Oct. 9, 2007

1) Benefits of having two 18 hole municipal golf courses:

A. Provide a service to Ann Arbor residents as part of the city's overall recreation program (swimming, boating, ice skating, etc).

B. Leslie and Huron Hills complement each other. Leslie is the more challenging course for advanced players. Huron provides a place for entry level and less advanced golfers.

2) Impact on Leslie if Huron Hills were to be closed or reduced to a 9 hole course:

A. Regular golfers at Huron would migrate to Leslie. This could create a logjam effect on the flow of play, especially with slower play by beginners and less experienced players.

B. Leslie might be expected to accomodate more high school teams for practice and match playing time; and, in addition, to provide time and space for instruction of both youth and adult groups, thereby further overloading the course.

3) Impact on Huron Hills if it were to be reduced to 9 holes:

A. Golfers who want to play 18 holes would move to Leslie or elsewhere.

B. Those who want to play only 9 holes (seniors, beginners, youth, time constraints) will lose the option of being able to play the front or the back nine.

C. Reduction to 9 holes will result in an overcrowding on the course.

4) Why eliminate 9 holes?

A. The same clubhouse, managerial staff, groundskeepers, equipment and so on would be needed, so how much cost saving will result?

B. Does the City have a plan to use the abandoned 9 holes (presumably including the seven holes of flat land on the northern side of Huron River Drive)? If there is a plan, what is it? If not, what rational rationale is there for eliminating the 9 holes?

Bill Cassebaum

On November 27, 2007, James Keegan of Golf Convergence Inc. released his final report on a study of golf operations in Ann Arbor. The report commissioned by RFP NO. 664, April 24, 2007 was tasked to conduct a thorough review of City golf operations, evaluate the future viability and profitability of the golf courses, and provide recommendations by December 31, 2007.

The purpose of this note is to examine the assumptions and recommendations presented in the report from the perspective of a group of Ann Arbor citizens all lovers of the game of golf and from various backgrounds and walks of life.

Our group is appreciative of the opportunity we had to meet with Mr. Keegan and Jayne Miller prior to the preparation of the final report. During that meeting we were able to present our ideas on operational issues and prospects mainly for the Huron Hills golf course. Some of the suggestions from our group were incorporated into the final recommendations so naturally there are parts of the final report that we agree with, but there are other recommendations we do not support. Let's start with the things we really like. Specifically:

We are very encouraged (and believe most residents of Ann Arbor would agree) that the report's recommendations do not include several options that were under consideration: reconfiguring Huron Hills, building a driving range, leasing part of Huron Hills for a restaurant, selling all or part of the land for private development or deeding 22 acres to local residents for a consideration. [Page 10] In October, City Council passed a resolution providing that the golf course properties would either continue to operate as a golf course or the properties would be maintained as open green space. We applaud City Council for recognizing the emotional impact the sale of parkland would have on the citizens of Ann Arbor. Next the report corrects a common misunderstanding that has been reported in the press and emphasized by members of the Administration and City Council that the courses are losing money on a cash basis. It is noted that earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization, frequently referred to as EBITDA or earnings from operations generated a positive cash flow of \$87,789 not a loss as widely reported. [Page 46] This is an extremely important concept to understand because if the golf operations are transferred to the General Fund, there will not be a large impact on the City budget because of golf operations. Below are numbers that show the total cash effect of transferring golf to the General Fund using Golf Convergence numbers. Notice that by 2013, the cumulative effect of moving the golf operations will be a cumulative loss of \$136,253 on a cash basis (an average "cost" of less than \$14,000 annually over the ten year period).

City of Ann Arbor										
	Actual				Projections					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Rounds	45,477	40,438	42,335	35,770	37,000	40,500	45,000	48,000	51,000	54,000
Adj Revenue	1,076,986	986,078	941,334	801,923	792,887	892,440	1,011,168	1,092,322	1,186,719	1,280,1
Expenses	904,491	691,268	697,081	714,134	949,927	1,162,267	1,221,793	1,253,145	1,285,437	1,318,6
Operating Income	172,495	294,810	244,253	87,789	(157,040)	(269,827)	(210,625)	(160,823)	(98,718)	(38,567)
Cumulative Inc		467,305	711,558	799,347	642,307	372,480	161,855	1,032	(97,686)	(136,253)

The group and report acknowledge that losses become significant when indirect charges such as the Municipal Service Charge, Information Technology charges and retiree medical charges are added to the equation. Mr. Keegan also acknowledges that there is very little golf course personnel can do to control these charges and more importantly that other recreational activities such as hockey, swimming and canoeing are not subject to these charges as they are part of the General Fund. The report goes on to present as an option for consideration that Huron Hills be removed from Fund 47 but it is unclear if Leslie Park should be in the General Fund. [Page 55]

The report did not point out that these indirect expenses will for the most part continue regardless of whether the golf operations stay or are removed from Fund 47. This omission is a glaring error that could cause one to decide that the course should be closed. As long as the course is contributing to overhead, it will always be beneficial to keep it as a golf course rather than a park (for Huron Hills, costs to maintain as open parkland have been estimated at \$250,000-\$300,000 annually).

We also agree with the recommendation that the marketing budgets be increased from \$10,000 to \$20,000 at Huron Hills and Leslie Park respectively and that the courses are positioned in the minds of the area golfers with Leslie Park as "Ann Arbor's Home For Championship Golf" and Huron Hills positioned as "The Home of Affordable Golf". [Page 70] This marketing initiative will support the reality that these are two very different courses and each have their own unique position in the development of the game with beginners, juniors and seniors looking for a place to play in a casual and relaxed yet very affordable environment while more experienced players can find more challenges at Leslie Park. We believe Huron Hills could also be effectively promoted as the city's learning/teaching facility, particularly for youth.

Another excellent suggestion in the report is that the golf courses need visionary leadership by an individual focusing on maximizing revenue, increasing operational efficiency and enhancing customer service. [Page 72] The City needs to recruit someone as Director of Golf who is skilled in the business of golf and not necessarily the game of golf. The report further specifies that this individual should plan to attend or join a variety of associations, foundations and institutes that will help the manager improve operations. We cannot agree more!

The report points out that 14% of our taxpayers are benefiting from our golf courses. That means that over 15,000 people are enjoying the direct benefit of municipal golf in Ann Arbor. Similar numbers are involved in other recreation General Fund activities like swimming and canoeing. Furthermore, the group agrees with the report's statement that the combination of being underfunded and overpriced is a perilous mix that will lead to long-term losses. [Page 5] No doubt lack of funding is leading to more deferred maintenance items at both courses, but we disagree that \$1,862,072 over the next one to seven years is necessary to restore Huron Hills to prime condition. [Page 33] The report does not contain supporting information to substantiate this contention other than a nebulous statement that a golf course is a living organism that requires investments in the greens, tees, fairways bunkers and rough. [Page 5] In fact in the customer survey, respondents when asked about the course condition of Huron Hills in 2007 over 65% responded that the course was in Good to Excellent shape! [Appendix F page 4] The City Golf Course Superintendents reported that \$494,000 was required to be invested in the course in 2008. [Page 71] \$425,000 of this amount is for irrigation piping and control. Why all that needs to be invested in 2008 is not elaborated on.

The group does not agree with the following statements in the report, and our rationale is included:

In the Ann Arbor survey, the respondents noted the inferior conditioning and pace of play at Huron Hills. [Page 7] This not true. As noted 65% rated the course in good to excellent condition and over 80% rated the pace of play as good to excellent. [Appendix F page 4]

Can the City reverse the economic fortunes of its golf course? Not without significant investment....The courses will not generate future sufficient earnings to mitigate the debt due other funds. [Page 12] This statement presupposes that the courses will remain in Fund 47. Removal from Fund 47 is one of the options presented later which would make this a moot point.

It is our professional opinion that City will experience increasing losses for the foreseeable future with aggregate losses in excess of \$4.0 million over the next 6 years. [Page 13] Once again this presupposes that the courses will remain in Fund 47. If the

courses are removed from Fund 47, the accounting losses will disappear and the course will actually produce a cash surplus over the same time period. Our group believes that this \$4.0 million "loss" is grossly exaggerated. We are looking for a "Chevrolet" at Huron Hills and not a "Cadillac". As stated before the courses generate positive cash flow.

Golf is an elitist game is clearly demonstrated because those with incomes greater than \$75,000 play 431% more than those that make less than \$34,999. [Page 23] We would view this a bit differently – the primary purpose of municipal golf courses is to ensure an affordable opportunity exists for all to enjoy the game.

The dissidents are correct in two ways. [Page 45] It is unfortunate that our group is viewed as "dissidents" rather than just plain citizens who care about golf.

Conclusion:

We want to again thank Mr. Keegan and Jayne Miller for their taking the time to meet with us and thank PAC also for listening to our comments at their recent meeting. Our group includes two golf industry professionals as well as players and we have offered our time to participate in any manner the City would find helpful -- to providing an informal sounding board to city staff and/or PAC to serving in a more formal capacity on a Golf Advisory Board (a structure utilized successfully in other cities for their municipal golf programs).

We support many of the recommendations in the report, but are concerned that a decision date to evaluate closing Huron Hills as early as July 2008 (or even July 2009) is premature – too early to see the full benefits and results of the improvements that can and should be made.

Sincerely,
Paul Bancel
Paul Bhatia

Bill Cassebaum
 Stuart Dombey
 Jane Lumm
 Stewart Nelson
 Bill Newcomb
 Bill Thomson
 Ed Walsh
 Bob Weisman

Keep Huron Hills golf course as is. I commend the city to initiate the preparation of strategic plan for golf in AA. It has provided a much needed education/information to all concerned. However a few important non-financial matters to keep Huron Hills operating as is need additional discussion and serious consideration by the decision makers. These factors are, but not limited to, consider golf at Huron Hills benefits as- swimming, hockey, skating, open green space, youth and senior activity etc.

I urge the city to consider Huron Hills as contributing a positive cash flow to the budget and not look at it as a profit making enterprise.

Thank you.

Inderpal Bhatia
 2555 Devonshire Rd
 Ann Arbor, Mich 48104

October 16, 2007

Ann Arbor News
 Letter to the Editor

To Ann Arbor Residents:

Help Save our Parks, Golf Courses and the Integrity of Ann Arbor Green Space! Sounds like a cry for help doesn't it? It is. Ann Arbor City Council will soon get a report analyzing Leslie Park and Huron Hills golf courses. We don't yet know the full contents of the report but, from trail balloons we do know, each citizen should be concerned and should buckle in for a shock. The Leslie Course will escape "change" because it stands on its own financially and not so long ago underwent course improvements. Huron Hills won't be so fortunate, even though, if an honest accounting were in place, it too would stand on its own.

Council has retained a golf course consultant who has a track record of suggesting golf course remedies which essentially boil down to closing and selling the course or parts of it, constructing imposing clubhouses to provide liquor to the golfers and suggesting expensive changes to a course to "improve it" and its revenues. All of this done in the name of "help" and the need to stop the financial bleeding. At the same time the report will suggest how utilize the course to raise money for a new City Hall. Each of the remedies that will be put forth, if enacted at Huron Hills, will be lethal for the residents and golfers of Ann Arbor. Some of these solutions might succeed for privately operated courses but historically, they have little success for a locally played public course. Huron Hills Golf Course is intended to provide a low key, enjoyable recreation experience at reasonable cost. Think of similar experiences like canoe rentals, tennis courts, soccer fields, softball fields and outdoor ice rinks for the enjoyment of all age groups that cost participants very little to use.

A golf course consultant has only a few basic suggestions available to affect golf course improvements. There are hundreds of small, tweaking efforts that can be made for any business, but it doesn't take a highly paid consultant to offer that advice. That advice should be provided by a citizens golf course committee at no cost. Ann Arbor doesn't have any such committee to help guide golf course operations. Huron Hills doesn't need a new clubhouse, new greens, new tees, bigger bunkers, or a water feature. It needs very little in the way of change. It simply needs some honest cost accounting to correctly determine operating expenses. This has never been done. Analysis suggests that with close attention to expenditures that we do know are necessary, the course would have enough funds to improve

maintenance and break even. That's all a golf course should be expected to do in an enterprise zone-- Provide a pleasant golfing experience and not overly burden city funds. Plus, Huron Hills always provides an impressive visual open space throughout the year as we drive along Huron Parkway watching golfers or children sledding.

Huron Hills Golf Course is what it is, a friendly, inexpensive fee golf course that has some classic character in the simplicity of the challenge. The golfers who play it, love it. This is a course that serves golfers well. Seniors like it because they can walk. Better golfers use it as a practice round to work on the nuts and bolts of a swing. New golfers like it because they can play it as an acceptable challenge without losing a lot of golf balls. Juniors like it because the yardage is not overpowering and the cost is within budget to meet and play with other young athletes. The golfers who play Huron Hills want little to change. What they do want, and what each of us should want, is to assure that we have an honest accounting for course operating expenses and a simple, one level up maintenance program.

The consultant's study will tell us that we need to spend a lot of money to improve the product. They will suggest this is money the city doesn't have and can't afford. They are simply setting the stage to mix financial need as a reason to a sell land.. This is an outrageous back door approach to raising money for a city budget that is desperate for money. Looking for funds by selling parkland.....to sell off a corner of the golf course is morally corrupt and philosophically bankrupt. Perhaps land will not be sold today...but this message will reappear if we are not vigilant as we move forward to make golf course improvements. Nor should anyone attempt to revise the golf course by replacing holes with a practice range located next to the Racquet Club tennis courts and risk landing golf balls at the feet of members and into the back yards of homes located on Hickory Lane. By acting on the golf course modifications that will be touted, it would need to eliminate and revise existing golf holes and cram new holes into other parts of the property bastardizing the current layout and the golf experience we now enjoy.

Residents of Ann Arbor love green spaces and have repeatedly supported mileage for parks. But now, with a questionable disruptive attack on the golf course under the guise of "Help Ann Arbor Raise Money" agenda that improves nothing and seeks change that we should reject. If the city sells even the smallest piece of park then all that we value in Ann Arbor is lost. We are spending a lot of money to purchase land outside Ann Arbor as part of a green space program. Why would we simultaneously sell park land inside our city limits? Why should anyone want to destroy an Arbor park, our golf course, least of all our City Council?

Please hear my cry for help! Save our city's great park and golf resources by voicing your support to reject selling parkland now occupied by Huron Hills Golf Course. Instead, support this recreation facility by supporting a moderate, not a large, budget increase to provide more fertilizer and manpower to make the course the best possible public golf experience Ann Arbor residents can enjoy.

William K. Newcomb
Golf Course Architect
Registered Landscape Architect
Ann Arbor Resident

December 6, 2007

Dear Mayor and City Council Members

On behalf of the residents of the Geddes Farms Community Association, we wish to express our appreciation for your responsiveness to the many city residents voicing their concern in various public forums to preserve the greenspace of the Leslie and Huron Hills Golf courses by passing the city resolution on October 21 to prevent sale for development of any portion of these properties.

Geddes Farms Community Association (GFCA) is located on the southeast corner of Huron Parkway and East Huron River Drive, extending east along E. Huron River Drive towards Chalmers Drive (to Woodland Road). There is consensus among the owners of the 32 homes & lots comprising GFCA that the city consider the importance of preserving both the green space of Huron Hills golf course and the

long-term health of the neighboring South Pond and Huron River while evaluating recommendations of the recently completed "City of Ann Arbor Business Plan: Golf Course Operations"

It is unfortunate that the many comments and suggestions voiced to the consultant during the community meetings held at both Leslie Park and Cobblestone Farms were omitted from the final report. For the consultant to prepare a 117 page report and omit all public input and suggestions collected from these two well-attended public meetings which the consultant facilitated in September is sloppy, at best. City Council should recognize the shortfall in this data collection methodology when viewing the consultant's recommendations on future golf course actions.

We understand from the City Clerk that there will not be an opportunity for public input at the December 10th City Council working session. Please consider forums to allow community input before decisions are made in altering the future use or ownership of these prized city properties.

Respectfully submitted,
 Representing Geddes Farms Community Association residents:
 Chris Brooks, President GFCA
 Dr. Robert Holkeboer
 Ann & Dr. Brad Hubbard
 Dr. Virginia & Dr. Len Rezmierski
 John & Sharon Stetz

To the Ann Arbor Consultants and whom it may concern,
 I am a life long resident of Ann Arbor and have played golf in Ann Arbor growing up including Huron Hills, Leslie Park and Ann Arbor Golf and Outing. I played golf for Huron in 1990-1992 and competed in the Herb Fowler at Huron Hills golf course each year. I was captain of the golf team as a junior and senior at Huron. After graduating from high school I attended the Univeristy of Michigan engineering program and became active coaching golf for Huron at the Freshmen and Junior Varsity level in 1997. Since then I have gone into teaching and currently I teach math at Huron and I am the Varsity Boys Golf Coach at Ann Arbor Huron.

As a competitive golfer, casual golfer and golf coach, I understand the value of golf for kids of all levels. Kids have to start somewhere in golf and it is very important that the kids start with a setting that offers a comfortable atmosphere on a course that offers a challenge but at the same time is short enough and forgiving to give the kids a good chance of succeeding on a regulation course. Huron Hills is this place for kids in Ann Arbor. Leslie Park does not offer this setting and other places like Georgetown are semi private with only par 3 holes and the next closest option to Huron Hills would be Fox Hills in Canton.

Ann Arbor currently has one of the best public options for kids of any city around with a beginners level course in Huron Hills and an advanced course option in Leslie Park. Huron Hills is special because the front 9 offers a regulation course option while the back 9 is shorter and is great for kids who are just beginning. Taking away either of these options is taking away a whole development period in the beginning golfers journey toward getting ready for Leslie Park.

I am very saddened that options are even being discussed with the possibility of removing even part of the course because we all know that it would be near impossible to return to current conditions once buildings are in place. Huron Hills is outstanding for introducing kids to the game with summer camps and a comfortable place to play with the back 9 being excellent for beginners and the front 9 for more advanced play. Once kids have gotten their work in at Huron Hills, then they are ready for attempting Leslie Park.

When making your final decision, please understand that if you do take away one of Ann Arbor's unique city characteristics of being able to offer public golf to all golfing ability levels it will be near impossible to return to the outstanding setting that we currently have. Golf continues to grow and gain popularity and I hope Ann Arbor remains in the forefront of offering quality golfing experiences to players of all levels. Thank you for your time and consideration in making sure we save ALL of Huron Hills.

Sincerely,
 Michael Lovelace
 Ann Arbor Huron
 Boys Varsity Golf Coach

The city can ill afford to diminish factors which contribute to quality of life while seeking to grow high tech business. The property formally known as Pfizer is undergoing a catharsis, with its new iteration likely to recruit several thousand new workers in the next two years to Ann Arbor.

The expansion of Skyline High School will add at least four new golf teams to the high school golf scene, with more eager young golfers needing access to Huron Hills to hone their skills.

In short, it is easy to look at the cyclic downturn the local economy is in and scream the sky is falling, but we really need to maintain our infrastructure to recruit the high tech jobs we need to grow out of this down cycle.

In short, closing Huron Hills would be exceedingly shortsighted. There is no other similar executive length course in the local area.

I've been reading the Golf Convergence report to the city, and I'm rather dismayed by what a shoddy report the contractor has provided for the city's money. It consists largely of comparing tidbits of local demographics with national averages, with little evidence of actual research. Clearly, this is a form-letter report that is dressed up with local details to sell for his considerable fee. It would be interesting to run a text comparison with his reports for other municipal courses.

I've started clipping some of my favorites:

page 9: Ann Arbor's golf courses are the only golf facilities in Washtenaw County without a liquor license. Although I agree that a license at Leslie (and Leslie only) could be a good move, most of the Washtenaw County courses I play don't serve beer: U-M Stadium, Pierce Lake, Radrick Farms, Georgetown ... they run the gamut from public to private, practice/beginner to premier.

There are references to operating Huron Hills until costs exceed that for parkland -- what cost this would be isn't researched adequately.

page 21: Golf reached its apex in 1990, and supply has been outpacing demand every since. But the graph this conclusion is drawn from shows that between 1994 and today, supply and demand have been approximately in balance at 2000 golfers per course. And now, as reported, course numbers are actually declining, which current speculative real estate trends (ie, the sub-prime bubble) will likely accelerate. Of course, these are all national statistics, still just window-dressing for a local report.

page 27: Currently, 68% of all rounds are played by those over 43. By 2010, because "Senior Citizens" will comprise 75% of all golf rounds ... Yeah. Somehow, in 3 years, 68% of rounds above 43 yrs old is going to turn into 75% above 55 or 62 or ?? yrs old? This despite an earlier Golf Magazine graphic showing a significant avid 20-something demographic?

also page 27: Nationally, only 9% of all golfers, ages 6 through 70+, play golf. No further comment.

Pellucid Corp. chart on page 28: published with no explanation of what it says at all ... with lots of typos (ie, rounds per year given as a percentage). I don't think our consultant understands the data. My impression is some of these stats are national averages despite the local title. Michigan has a golf participation rate more than double the national average (<http://www.nsga.org/public/pages/index.cfm?pageid=157>) and Ann Arbor may be even higher as a result of affluence. This would change many report conclusions.

It's true that Huron Hills is not a property that could likely be run at a profit, and maybe even a positive cash flow, without a major investment. But that doesn't mean it can't be operated with a clearer focus on

the seniors, beginners, and kids that it should appeal to far more than any other local learning course. How much would this property cost the city as a public park? Since that's the only alternative, that should be the starting point for any financial analysis.

As for Leslie, the city has one of the best public courses in the county, if we can figure out how to operate it correctly.

Paul Schulte
2nd Ward golfer and voter

12/7/07

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this message regarding the Leslie Park and Huron Hills Golf Courses here in Ann Arbor, Michigan. My name is Scott J. Pulido and I am a 26 year old recent transfer student here at the University of Michigan. I have relocated from Seattle, Washington to further my educational pursuits and aims.

Golf is a sport that intrigues me in all its magnificent aspects. Its history, the plethora of golfing techniques and styles, the multitude of landscapes and the ever-changing weather patterns makes it a different, engaging challenge day to day. I am an avid golfer and must concede that one of the great activities I enjoy here in the great lakes region of the United States is the beautiful golf courses that dot the state of Michigan. Ann Arbor is a special place where this beauty is found in magnificent splendor. The city of Ann Arbor's website states:

John Allen, the town's principal founder, had chosen the word 'arbour' to follow his wife's first name, it being commonly used in Virginia for a bower of trees. In Michigan Territory, arbour seemed appropriate to describe the setting of sunshine and shadow produced by the scattered oaks in the "opening" (<http://moaa.aadl.org/PictHistory/footnote.php#Annarbour>)

Just this Fall I found great pleasure golfing in between these great oaks amidst the multitude of assorted leaves seemingly painted in vibrant reds, oranges, pinks, yellows and greens. The fall season in Michigan is truly spectacular and the experience and memory of golfing in Ann Arbor will not be forgotten in all my days.

While I understand the economic problems that the state of Michigan and Ann Arbor are going through, I would be deeply saddened to see the loss of the Huron Hills and Leslie Park Golf Courses here in the A2. In many ways these golf courses have been a haven for me while I am engaged at school in Michigan. So far, far away from home. On multiple occasions I have commented to my peers back in Seattle on the wonderful golf community and courses found here in Ann Arbor. It would be a true travesty to have the Huron Hills and Leslie Park Golf Courses lost to residents, students, children and visitors in the future.

The golf report concerning this issue states that some people are moving away from Michigan "in one-way U-Haul rentals out of the State"

(http://www.a2gov.org/news/Documents/2006%20Archived%20Releases/news_thanksgiving_2006-11-14.pdf).

And while this may be true, I believe that these golf courses are a great resource for the remaining residents here in Ann Arbor. And maybe not just for these Ann Arborites. I believe that the use of these resources may also encompass future individuals who may decide to move to the A2 area. By taking away Huron Hills and Leslie Park another outdoor, positive environment and pastime is being lost. Not just people leaving Ann Arbor will be lost but also cherished memories: A first birdie. An ace. Golfing with a Family Member . Countless Smiles and Laughter. Maybe an occasional swear word when a ball hooks out of bounds.

In conclusion on my thoughts, I guess I just hope that future generations will have the opportunity to make memories like I have here at the Huron Hills and Leslie Park Golf Courses. Without these two golf

courses I know that one of the treasures I have found personally in Ann Arbor will have been lost. I hope to golf at Huron Hills and Leslie Park for many days to come. Crossing my fingers.

Scott J Pulido
Seattle, WA/Ann Arbor, MI

Dear Committee Members

I would like to urge you to keep the Huron Hills Golf Course open to the public instead of reducing it down to either 9 holes or closing it down completely.

Huron Hills is a good place to start the game of golf which will later on lead to many health benefits of the players. As a matter of fact, Huron Hills was my first exposure to the game after I took the lessons through Ann Arbor's Park and Rec.

There are indescribable benefits of golf that I have experienced personally from playing golf. I started to play golf seriously about two years ago. Prior to that time, I would have allergies and needed medication to help alleviate the symptoms. In Winter I would be sick with colds that I could not go to work for the whole week. However, since I started playing golf in 2005, those symptoms disappeared!

Golf also does not cause any injuries compared to other kinds of sports; you can have head injuries from football, soccer, basketball, skateboard, among others.

Golf is not a sport for rich people only. I do not make much money teaching a low enrollment class at the University of Michigan. Instead, I found that playing golf for \$10-15 for 2-4 hours (average \$2.50 - 3 an hour!) is such a good deal considering the health benefits golf brings to the players. People who play golf are healthy both physically and mentally.

While everyone is talking about the health care issue and how to reduce the cost of health care, I would recommend golfing as a way to better health. I am one of the living proofs. And it all started at Huron Hills Golf Course.

PLEASE KEEP HURON HILLS ALIVE!

Thank you very much.

Montatip Krishnamra
Lecturer IV, Thai Language and Literature
The University of Michigan
montatip@umich.edu

Dear Jan Barber

Thank you for providing widespread access and accepting comments on the analysis of golf in Ann Arbor by Golf Convergence, Inc. Its findings and recommendations for Huron Hills and Leslie Golf Courses are comprehensive and provide valuable and concrete information for constructive discussions. The future land use, sustainability stewardship, and level of recreational opportunities are keys to enhancing Ann Arbor as one of the most desirable communities to live in the U.S.

As an Ann Arbor Hills resident and frequent visitor to nearby Gallup Park and Nichols Arboretum, successful next steps would include:

The quick adoption by the city council of the proposed timeline outlined in the golf course business plan. This wise and prudent action provides the structure and timeframe to continue planning and adjust revenues while gathering further information and community support required in make final and necessary decisions.

The Park and Recreation Commission should develop a comprehensive proposal on the “strategic dilemma for the city focusing limited resources on the Leslie site because it offers a greater opportunity to address the public’s needs while attracting more competitive golfers.”

The Mayor’s Office or City Council should champion several public forums or focus groups on what potential opportunities exist for the Huron Hills site as well as other opportunities along the Huron River. This assumes that the Huron Hills site would not remain a golf course. The City needs a holistic review (cutting across departments) of how Ann Arbor can best capitalize and create new partnerships around the Huron River, a strategic and historic resource. For example at the risk of bringing up the dreaded Argo Dam discussion, it would be prudent for the city and citizens to explore the possibility of relocating the rowing clubs to the Huron Hills Golf Course site.

What could be gained from these approaches?

It would turn in the discussion from “look what we are giving up” to “here is what we can gain”
Take the millions of wish dollars and place them in an overall context; the big “general fund” just can’t pay for everything

Build a winning position for these parks

Demonstrate that Ann Arbor is spending precious tax dollars wisely

Potentially, create new opportunities for the City to fulfill its sustainability obligations

Develop new economically (yet ecologically) advantageous opportunities, perhaps in partnership with the state and area universities

Continue Ann Arbor’s cherished heritage as a “City Beautiful” landscape that evolves with the times.

A lack of decisive action is counterproductive to the dynamic and thoughtful nature already demonstrated by the city’s leadership.

Thank you
Tracy Aris
2650 Heather Way
Ann Arbor, MI



Parks and Recreation Services Policies and Procedures

Policy Title: Parks and Recreation Gift Policy	Policy Number:
Effective:	
Supersedes: NA	
Approval:	Page 1 of 6

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Ann Arbor gratefully accepts and encourages gifts and donations from private individuals, businesses, community organizations, and public entities that are given to support the parks and recreation system. The gift program will offer opportunities for gifting at all levels of support.

2.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of the parks and recreation gift policy is to establish a common philosophy and to establish guidelines and standards for acceptance of gifts to the parks and recreation system.

3.0 POLICY

It is the policy of the City of Ann Arbor:

- 3.1 To encourage and facilitate public and private gifts, bequests, and such contributions that enhance, beautify, improve, supplement, support, or otherwise benefit the park and recreation system.
- 3.2 To accept public and private gifts that are consistent with the following terms:

-
-
- 3.2.1 To accept gifts that are consistent with the mission, policies, and goals of the parks system, existing facilities and amenities, current park master plans, the current Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan, and recreation facility programs.
 - 3.2.2 To accept gifts given with the full understanding that they become the property of the City of Ann Arbor and are subject to the laws, policies, and procedures that govern the City parks, recreation facilities, and recreation programming.
 - 3.2.3 To accept gifts that are given with no contingencies other than that they be used to benefit a park or to support a specified program activity. Gifts may also be made with no specific purpose designation other than to benefit the parks system.
 - 3.2.4 To accept gifts that are given with the understanding that the City is not obligated to maintain or replace a gift if the gift is stolen, vandalized, worn out, weathered, in disrepair, irreparably damaged or destroyed unless the donor wishes to provide funds for replacement.
 - 3.2.5 Gifts shall not be made conditional on the City of Ann Arbor's performance.
 - 3.2.6 Operating/administrative costs associated with acceptance, design and installation of the gift shall not exceed 15% of the total gift value.
 - 3.2.7 In acceptance of a gift, consideration shall be given to the gifting organization's expectations of the City of Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Services Unit and the City of Ann Arbor.
 - 3.2.8 In acceptance of a gift, consideration shall be given to the gifting organization's timeliness in offering a gift, and the City of Ann Arbor's readiness to accept a gift.
- 3.3 Gifts may be declined by the City of Ann Arbor. The reasons listed below are included as examples and are not exhaustive:
 - 3.3.1 Gifts limited by special restrictions, conditions or covenants.
 - 3.3.2 Gifts which pose extreme budgetary obligations on the City.
 - 3.3.3 Gifts which may not be in the best interest of the park and recreation system.

3.3.4 Gifts which are not compatible with the park location, other park and recreation uses, or park and recreation users.

3.3.5 Other reasons deemed necessary by the Parks and Recreation Manager.

3.4 Existing gifts shall fall under the guidelines of this policy and supercedes any previous policies.

4.0 RECOGNITION OF GIFTS

4.1 The City of Ann Arbor appreciates all gifts that support the mission of the parks system.

4.2 In recognition of a gift, preference will be given to providing a form of recognition that is not displayed within the parks.

4.3 The form of any on-site recognition shall be of an appropriate size and color and shall not detract from the park surroundings or any interpretive message.

4.4 Any physical form of on-site recognition shall not interfere with park patron use, or routine recreation facility or park operations.

4.5 Recognition of a gift shall not suggest in any way the endorsement of the donor's goods or services by the City of Ann Arbor of the Parks System.

4.6 Recognition of a gift shall not suggest any proprietary interest of the organization in the City of Ann Arbor Parks System.

4.8 On-site recognition for memorial gifts will not be permitted.

5.0 TYPES OF RECOGNITION

Gifting organizations or individuals may be provided with a level of recognition that is commensurate with the dollar amount of their gift. In acknowledging a gifting organization, preference will be given to an off-site form of recognition that may include one or more of the following:

5.1 A thank you letter.

5.2 Publicity through The City of Ann Arbor website, flyers, media releases, and/or CTN, and through the sponsorship organization's newsletter, annual report, and website, or in the public media including, but not limited to, newspapers, radio, and television.

-
-
- 5.3 Events such as a press conference, photo opportunity, grand opening, ground breaking or ribbon cutting ceremony.
 - 5.4 Mayoral, City Council, or Commission acknowledgement at civic meetings and functions.
 - 5.5 Commemorative items such as a framed picture or a plaque.
 - 5.6 Register of gifts that is accessible to the public either on-line or at the City's administrative offices and recreation facility(s).
 - 5.7 Acknowledgement on printed materials such as recreational program brochures and flyers.
 - 5.8 Inclusion of the gifting organization's company name and logo on a gift recognition wall at a recreation facility or the administrative offices of the City of Ann Arbor.
 - 5.9 Where on-site recognition is to be provided, types of recognition may include:
 - 5.9.1 Temporary signs acknowledging a gifting organization during the construction or restoration of a particular facility, park, or an event. (Temporary is limited to six (6) months.)
 - 5.9.2 Permanent plaques or signs acknowledging a gifting organization or individual. Permanency is limited to the life of the asset .
 - 5.9.3 Naming of a recreation facility or a park as defined in the naming policy.

1 6.0 DEFINITIONS

- 6.1 Gifts - all gifts, bequests, or donations to include, but not limited to, endowments, structures or portions of structures; money or negotiable securities; materials; equipment, flora, or fauna; improvements to facilities or land; statues, monuments, sculptures, murals and other works of art; plaques, graphics and/or signs; or recreation and cultural arts programming, equipment, and supplies.
- 6.2 Donor Recognition Object - a physical object placed in a park to acknowledge a gift donor or in remembrance of an individual or event.
- 6.3 Donor - a private individual, for-profit company, non-profit organization, or public agency wishing to donate funds or objects to the Ann Arbor Parks System.

-
-
- 6.4 Gift Needs Inventory - a list of identified operational and capital needs for the parks and recreation system, which would make appropriate gifts.
 - 6.5 Park Improvement Proposal - may include a funded, partially funded or unfunded capital project(s), structures, or portions of structures; materials; equipment; flora or fauna; improvements to facilities or land and other non-art items.

7.0 RESPONSIBILITY

- 7.1. The parks and recreation services manager, or designee, is responsible as follows:

- 7.1.1. Generating a Gift Needs Inventory and reviewing it for currency and making updates to the Gifts Needs Inventory on a regular basis as needed.
- 7.1.2. Determining the life expectancy of gifts and the anticipated costs associated with on-going maintenance of gifts.
- 7.1.3. Determining the appropriateness and compatibility of all details of the proposed gift, park improvement and/or donor recognition object, including but not limited to the location, impact on other park uses or users, the size, scale, color, design, materials, contractor, construction schedule, and program of activities.
- 7.1.4. Making the final decision on acceptance of all gift proposals, unless determining it appropriate for the Parks Advisory Commission consideration or City Council consideration.

- 7.2. The individual, business, not-for-profit, community organization, or public entity interested in giving a gift to the City of Ann Arbor parks and recreation system is responsible for all, or a portion of the financial costs of gift and the installation, as well as a portion of all, of the financial costs associated with on-going maintenance of gift.

- 7.3. The Parks Advisory Commission is responsible as follows:

- 7.3.1 Reviewing proposals for gifts referred to the Park Advisory Commission by the parks and recreation services manager and for making a final acceptance decision, rejection decision, recommendation to City Council, or other action as deemed appropriate by the Parks Advisory Commission.

7.4 The City Council is responsible as follows:

7.4.1. Reviewing proposals for gifts referred to the City Council by the Parks Advisory Commission or the parks and recreation services manager and for making a final acceptance decision, rejection decision, or other action as deemed appropriate by City Council.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Park Advisory Commission

FROM: Christen Smith, Parks and Recreation Manager

DATE: December 18, 2007

SUBJECT: Resolution to Recommend Approval of a Partnership Agreement Between the City of Ann Arbor and the Community Action Network for Operation of Bryant Community Center and the Northside Community Center

Attached is a resolution recommending approval of a partnership agreement between the City of Ann Arbor and the Community Action Network for operation of the Bryant Community Center and the Northside Community Center.

The City of Ann Arbor owns and operates two community center facilities. The Parks and Recreation Services staff is recommending that the City enter into a partnership agreement with the Community Action Network to provide community-directed outreach, social, and recreation services creating community centers that serve the immediate geographic neighborhoods for the Bryant Community Center and the Northside Community Center. Under the terms of the agreement Community Action Network would manage and operate the two community centers.

Community Action Network will evaluate current social services and recreation services needs in the Bryant neighborhood and the Northside neighborhood. Based on the completed needs assessment, the Community Action Network will develop and deliver programming that will result in high-quality services and community relations that meet the needs of residents in the Bryant neighborhood and the Northside neighborhood. The initial agreement will be for a period of six (6) months, commencing in January 2008 and continuing until June 30, 2008 with the option to renew the agreement for one (1) additional year, July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009.

The Parks and Recreation Services staff and Community Action Network believe that the partnership between the organizations will enhance the scope and quality of the programming that can be provided to the Bryant and Northside Neighborhoods. Key elements of the partnership agreement include:

- Program development, community center operations, and staffing are transferred to the Community Action Network.
- The City will provide utilities, designated routine maintenance, non-routine maintenance and capital improvement activities.
- Financial support will be provided by the City as included in the approved FY 07-08 budget and the FY 08-09 Financial Plan (R-80-3-07).
- Administrative reviews of the Agreement, program reviews, and site reviews will be conducted by the City on a quarterly basis.

- Community Action Network will continue a scholarship program for Ann Arbor residents participating in programs and activities at the community centers.
- Tasks to be completed under the terms of the agreement include the following:
 - Conduct a thorough needs assessment for outreach services, social services, and recreation programming for the Bryant neighborhood and the Northside neighborhood.
 - Research and inventory existing outreach, social, and recreation service providers that currently offer services to the Bryant and Northside neighborhoods.
 - Engage the community and current patrons to gather comments through a needs assessment process.
 - Develop and deliver a program of services that addresses the needs of the Bryant neighborhood and the Northside neighborhood.

RFP No.681 documents were advertised on MITN BidNet and distributed to various organizations on October 8, 2007. Community Action Network submitted the sole proposal by the November 13, 2007 deadline. A task force of Community Services Area staff evaluated the proposal and invited the Community Action Network to provide further information in an interview with the selection committee. The selection committee, which included Community Service Area staff and two representatives from the Bryant neighborhood, interviewed the organization's staff. On the basis of the interview process, the selection committee determined Community Action Network was capable of implementing this partnership agreement.

This agreement is supported by the Community Action Network Board of Directors and City staff.

RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR AND THE COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK
FOR OPERATION OF BRYANT COMMUNITY CENTER AND THE NORTHSIDE
COMMUNITY CENTER

WHEREAS, The Community Action Network will work in partnership with the City of Ann Arbor and other community agencies to provide community-directed outreach, social, and recreation services creating community centers that serve the immediate geographic neighborhoods for the Bryant Community Center and the Northside Community Center;

WHEREAS, This partnership agreement will provide for City oversight of the Bryant Community Center and the Northside Community Center operation through regular reporting by the Community Action Network to the City Parks and Recreation Services staff and quarterly administrative review and site visits by the Parks and Recreation Services staff;

WHEREAS, The Procurement Office sought proposals on October 8, 2007 and the proposal received from Community Action Network was identified as the sole proposal;

WHEREAS, The committee of Community Service Area staff and two representatives from the Bryant Community Center interviewed the organization and determined the Community Action Network was capable of implementing the partnership agreement.

WHEREAS, Funds for implementation of the partnership agreement are included in the approved FY 2007-2008 General Fund budget and the FY 2008-2009 Financial Plan;

WHEREAS, Community Action Network will be required to received Human Rights and Living Wage approval prior to approval of a contract agreement indicating compliance with these requirements;

RESOLVED, That the Parks Advisory Commission recommend approval of a partnership contract agreement, per the requirements of RFP No. 681, with Community Action Network.

Submitted by: Christen Smith

Date: December 18, 2007

City Council Items Update List

December 2007					
	Cost	Staff	Council Date	Council Action	Source of Funding
Resolution To Approve Purchase of Two Zamboni Units for the Total Purchase Amount of \$144,300	\$144,300	DS	11/19/2007	approved	Fleet Fund & Fund 0071
Resolution to Approve a Construction Contract for Bandemer Park Site Renovations including Native Landscaping, Reconfiguration of the Parking Area, and Construction of a Dirt Bike Course	\$149,415	AK	10/1/2007	approved	Fund 0025
Resolution To Approve A Construction Contract for the Swift Run Dog Park Construction	\$143,698	JD	9/4/2007	approved	Fund 0018
Resolution to Approve a Partnership Agreement between the City of Ann Arbor Parks and Recreation Services Unit and Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation Commission for the Development, Maintenance and Operation of a Dog Park at Swift Run Park	NA	CS	8/6/2007	approved	NA
Resolution to Approve Off-Leash Dog Play Areas at Swift Run Park, Southeast Area Park, Olson Park and Leslie Park and Establish User Fees for Off-Leash Dog Permits	NA	CS	8/6/2007	approved	NA
Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Contract with Golf Convergence, Inc. for a Golf Course Operations Analysis	\$39,050	MW	7/18/2007	approved	General Fund
Resolution to Approve a Construction Contract with Cameron Contracting Company for Bandemer Park Disc Golf Course Construction	\$46,070	AK	7/16/2007	approved	Fund 0025
Resolution to Approve a Contract for improvements at Sylvan Park and Redwood Park	\$48,350	JD	7/2/2007	approved	Fund 0018
Resolution to Approve a Contract for Improvements at South Maple Park and Garden Homes Park and to Appropriate \$26,000.00 from the Parks Memorials and Contributions Fund to the South Maple Park and Garden Homes Park	\$72,328	AK	6/18/2007	approved	Fund 0018 Fund 0034
Resolution to Approve a Contract for the Leslie Science Center Critter House Renovation	\$42,735	AK	6/18/2007	approved	Fund 0018
An Ordinance to amend Section 9:45 and 9:47(Animals) of Chapter 107 of Title IX of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor and provide for off-leash dog play areas	NA	CS	7/16/2007 8/6/2007	approved	NA

City of Ann Arbor
General Fund Transfer
Parks System

	07-08 Budget		08-09 Financial Plan	
	Revenue Transfer	Proposed Expenditure	Revenue Transfer	Proposed Expenditure
Parks & Recreation Services				
Recreation Facility Equipment		\$25,000		\$25,000
Facility Maintenance		\$45,700		\$45,700
Parks & Recreation Services Marketing		\$15,000		\$15,000
Parks/Programs Customer Service Staffing		\$10,000		\$10,000
Parks & Recreation Services Subtotal	\$95,700		\$95,766	
Parks Operations				
Fuller Park Athletic Field Maintenance		\$191,820		\$191,820
Parks Operations Subtotal	\$191,820		\$191,820	
Total Transfer	\$287,586		\$287,586	

Park Planning Capital Project Update December, 2007

Bandemer Park

- Phase II: Bids were received for the site renovations, including parking, storm water retention, landscaping, and a dirt bike course. Work will take place in spring, 2008.
- Phase III: The disc golf course construction is complete. Fairway signs have been installed. Dead trees in the fairways will be removed over the winter months.
- Bids for vault-style restrooms are due in January.

Bluffs Park

- NAP will address trail signage, trail modifications, and removal of debris at the Bluffs Park site.

Bridge Repairs/Renovations

- An assessment of park bridge conditions at the Bandemer Park Vehicle Bridge, Island Park pedestrian bridge and Gallup Park Vehicle Bridge has been completed. Repair work for the Bandemer Park Bridge is expected to include installing riprap, replacing broken/damaged deck boards, and painting the infrastructure of the bridge. An engineering firm will be hired this winter to prepare construction documents for the repair work.

Buhr Park Pool

- Evaluation of the pool liner and mechanical systems is in process. Bid documentation will be prepared in the winter months and repairs will be completed in early spring for the 2008 pool season.

Cobblestone Farm Barn

- The lower level office area will be reconfigured to accommodate additional staff work sites at the facility. This project will be re-bid.
- Renovations and upgrades are planned for the kitchen area. The main level flooring will be replaced in winter 2009.

Mary Beth Doyle Park (Brown Park)

- Portions of the park remain closed. The park opening is anticipated in late May 2008.
- The installation of newly constructed wetland areas, native plant materials, and several varieties of seed stock has been completed. Temporary fencing is currently protecting much of this area.
- The disc golf course will be upgraded and some areas will be reconfigured.
- A new play structure will be installed in the spring, along with other play area upgrades.

Farmers Market

- Beckett & Raeder, Inc. has developed preliminary design schematics for the Market with updated cost estimates.
- Staff is evaluating project costs. Alternative funding options are being researched. A phased implementation schedule is anticipated.

Game Court and Pathway Paving Projects

- Bids were received for color seal coat surfaces at Churchill Downs, Glacier Highlands, Lansdowne, and Northside parks. Color coating work on these and several other game courts will take place in the spring, 2008.
- The Burns Park tennis courts, Ellsworth, Leslie, and Southeast Area basketball courts will be renovated in the Spring 2008. Bids for this work are expected in mid-January.

Greenview Park

- No further action has occurred on this site pending Ann Arbor Public Schools approval of City land use to install a playground.

Leslie Science Center

- Improvements at the Critter House began December 4th and will include an addition that will enlarge the classroom-like space. A window for wildlife viewing will also be added to the facility.

Olson Park

- Additional phases of improvements at Olson Park are scheduled spring 2008. Elements currently planned include the addition of a restroom building, parking lot final paving, and additional landscape plant materials.
- The Rotary Club hosted a volunteer tree-planting project on November 9th. The club planted over 100 trees.
- A contract has been awarded for the installation of additional naturalized planting areas in several locations in the park over a three-year period. The contractor will be working with County Drain Office staff to modify the constructed wetland areas in the park to comply with MDEQ requirements. This is a continuation of the original project construction scope.

Redwood Park

- The project is significantly complete including a bench, landscaping, and sidewalk through the park. Restoration work will be completed in the spring.

Sculpture Plaza

- Refurbishing of the sculpture is in process. CAPP is coordinating the renovation.

Swift Run Dog Park

- The project is significantly complete and opened for use on December 1st.
- Minor detail items will be finalized as weather permits.
- Washtenaw County Parks and Recreation will oversee operations of the Dog Park.

**Forth Annual Readers' Choice Awards
Ann Arbor News**

Best Place to Buy Produce:

GOLD: Ann Arbor Farmer's Market

Best Place to Hike:

SILVER: Bird Hills Nature Area

Best Soccer Venue:

SILVER: Fuller Park Fields

Best Golf Course:

GOLD: Leslie Park Golf Course

SILVER: Huron Hills Golf Course

Best Ice Rink:

SILVER: Veterans Memorial Park Sport Complex Ice Arena

Best Spot to Cross Country Ski:

GOLD: Huron Hills Golf Course

Best Sledding Hill:

GOLD: Veterans Memorial Park

SILVER: Huron Hills Golf Course

Best Community Park:

GOLD: Gallup Park

BRONZE: Riverside Park

Best Place for Kids Younger than 12:

SILVER: Gallup Park

2007 PAC Work Plan
(updated June 20, 2007)

Priority based on Feb. retreat	Project	Team
***** *****	Financial information that provides for “user-friendly” transparency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Intelligence; “Dash boards” • Understanding of different resources for the parks system (millage, General Fund; enterprise funds, acquisition millage) • Include financial data on website, millage financial information on website • Transparency in financial information 	Sam Brigit (John as backup) Christen Tom Crawford
*****	Athletic Field conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure quality of fields • user input for perceived quality • Checklists/assessment of fields 	David Tim John
*****	Allen Creek Greenway <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages 	Linda
****	Planning Commission Interface <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer-initiated projects • Getting early information from Planning • Staff-initiated projects 	Linda Gwen Sam
***	Ballot Initiative for Charter Amendment Placing Limits on Sale of a City Park	Bob J
***	Clear definition of Natural Area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of appropriate activities in Natural Area • Guidelines for Natural Areas • Lower quality Natural areas 	Gwen Bob J Scott
**	Regional Park System Feasibility	???

**	<p>Notice of Public Meetings re Park Development Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAC members in attendance • Notice in PAC packet • Notice by email 	Staff
**	<p>Acquisition of a large parcel to provide for development of a regional park Partnerships with other agencies, Washtenaw County, Townships</p>	LAC
**	<p>User fees/revenue policy and sponsorships</p>	???
*	<p>Develop Process for park development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flowcharts and timelines with specific points for PAC input • How are project identified • Document the process for park projects development/redevelopment 	Brigit Sam
*	<p>Adopt – A – Park</p>	Staff
*	<p>Records of customer concerns Gather input, comment cards, follow-up</p>	Staff
*	<p>Clarify roles of Dean Fund Committee, Cobblestone Farm Association, Kempf House Board</p>	Staff
	<p>Staff overview – Who does what</p>	Staff
	<p>Signage on-site to designated Millage-funded projects Develop a special logo for Millage Projects</p>	Staff
	<p>Parking space lease agreement</p>	Staff



CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
Parks and Recreation Services Administration Office
809 Taylor St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
Phone: 734.994.2780
 Web: www.a2gov.org/parks

For Immediate Release
 Dec. 3, 2007

CONTACT: Jason Nealis
 734.994.2785
 e-mail: jnealis@a2gov.org

Chinese hockey team to challenge Ann Arbor athletes at Veterans Memorial Park Dec. 16

Ann Arbor, MI – Veterans Memorial Sports Complex will host a Chinese professional hockey team Dec. 16 from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. The visiting team is slated to take on some of Ann Arbor’s best players including athletes from Veterans Memorial Park A Division team and league players from Ann Arbor Ice Cube.

“Playing hockey brings everyone together regardless of the language you speak or the country in which you live, particularly when you have athletes competing at an international level. Everyone scheduled to play in this game is extremely excited about the opportunity,” said Jeremy Lewis, city of Ann Arbor Parks & Recreation Services employee, event organizer and team manager/player.

The team from Harbin City, China will be staying in Ann Arbor from Nov. 22 to Dec. 17 training for the game, learning the rules of USA hockey regulations and visiting the area. Harbin’s hockey team is the longest standing team in China (established in 1954). Notable 2005 to 2006 players include Notable 2005-2006 players: D Wang Dahai, F Andre Smulter (Finland), F Stefan Linden (Sweden), G Liu Xue.

Admission is free and full concessions are available. Veterans Memorial Sports Complex is located at 2150 Jackson Road, Ann Arbor.

“I’m looking forward to having a big crowd that night. Between local hockey supporters cheering on their hometown athletes to individuals and families interested in watching the Chinese team – we should have a full house,” added Lewis.

Additional information: Harbin City is the capital of Heilongjian Province in northeastern China. The city is the hub of the region's economy and logistics. Harbin’s hockey team typically dominated the now-defunct Chinese League, often winning the All-China Championships and the Chinese National Winter Games. Harbin players and coaches are mainstays on Team China. Harbin's home rink was built for the 1996 Asian Winter Games.

Note: It is the intent of the city of Ann Arbor to provide equal opportunities and access to all programs and facilities. For special assistance or accommodation, call the individual facility. Find complete details at www.a2gov.org/parks.



CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
Parks and Recreation Services Administration Office
 809 Taylor St.
 Ann Arbor, MI 48105
 Phone: 734-994-2780
 Web: www.a2gov.org/parks

For Immediate Release
December, 2007

CONTACT: Christen Smith
734.994.1303
e-mail: ChSmith@a2gov.org

ANN ARBOR PARKS AND RECREATION EVENTS FOR DECEMBER 2007

Find complete details at www.a2gov.org/parks or by calling the individual facility.

Farmers' Market www.a2gov.org/market. 315 Detroit Street, 734.994.FARM (3276).

One of Michigan's longest running open air Farmers' Markets offering locally grown and produced products located in the Kerrytown District. Farmers Market Hours of Operation: Wednesday and Saturday **now through the end of December**, 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. **Saturday only, January to April**, 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. Please remember no dogs are allowed on market days. Did you know you can also rent the Farmers' Market? The open-air locale is great for any number of events including parties, fundraisers and more. Call 734.994.3276 and we'll help you plan your event. Call the

Leslie Science & Nature Center, www.a2gov.org/lsc, www.lesliesnc.org. 1831 Traver Road, 734.997.1553. E-mail lsc@a2gov.org. Call to register for the following events:

Creature Feature Tuesdays, Dec. 4, 11, 18; 9:30 to 11 a.m. \$36/\$27 resident discount (CODE: LS304). What is so amazing about toads, rabbits and hissing cockroaches? Through direct observations, crafts and animal stories we will uncover each creature's features.

Saturday Fling Dec. 15 (CODE: LS105), 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. \$30/\$24 resident discount, ages K-5th grade. Enjoy a Saturday of outdoor fun and exploration. We'll hike, play games, visit the Critter House and feast on a pizza lunch.

Tiny Tots Programs: Nov. 9, 30 and Dec. 14 and Jan. 11, 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. \$6 per child, Age 1 to 3 years old with a caregiver. Pre registration not required. Join us for a carnival of indoor and outdoor hands-on activities: explore the forests, fields and fauna through hikes, songs, stories, puppets, games and crafts. Stop in to the Critter House to visit Frieda the iguana and her animal friends or meander past our Resident Raptors to spy on owls, hawks and other raptors.

Holiday Break Camp:

Jan. 2 to 4, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. \$150 /\$125 resident discount

Session A: 1st/2nd grade (Code: LS113)

Session B: 3rd-5th grade (Code: LS114)

Celebrate the beauty and splendor of winter with games, sledding, hikes, and crafts. After a hike or sledding run, warm up by the fire with hot chocolate, popcorn and stories. Investigate and discover nature's winter surprises. Experiment with animal adaptations and see how they survive the cold, dark winter months. Call 734.997.1553 to register.

Parks and Recreation Adult Programs, 1320 Baldwin, 734.769.5911. www.a2gov.org/senior
Pilates. A mat-based workout to strengthen the body's core muscles, and firm the upper body. Mats are available or bring your own. Tuesdays, 5:30 to 6:20 p.m. Cost: \$60. Session Three (CODE: SC722) Jan. 7 to Feb. 19.

Baby Boomer, Meet & Greet! Meet people, mix and mingle with other Baby Boomers looking for adventure. Information on our various adventures from skiing trips, hot air balloon rides with a wine and cheese picnic, sushi and Saki, travel opportunities, theatre and more will be available. Meet & Greet night Monday, Dec. 3. Location: We will meet at Sweetwater's (123 West Washington Street) in the back room from 5 to 6 p.m. and then wander over to Grizzly Peak for drinks and appetizers.

Parks and Recreation Senior Programs, 1320 Baldwin, 734.769.5911.

Past Masters For age 60+ or goalies of any age, at **Veterans Memorial** Park Ice Arena. Informal play on Thursday afternoons. No body checking is allowed. First 24 players and two goalies per session may attend. Thursdays, now through May 8, 2:05 to 3:05 p.m.; Mondays, now to May 5, 8:40 to 9:40 a.m. Fees: \$10 per visit or \$273 season. Goalies are free.

Bridge, Duplicate. The same bridge hand (arrangement of cards) is duplicated at all of the tables playing, in order to allow a fair competition of playing skills. Second and fourth Mondays at the A2 Senior Center 12:45 p.m. Margaret Creger, instructor. Cost: \$1.

French Lessons Conversational. A minimum requirement of one year experience speaking French is helpful for this class. instructor, Jim McMurtrie Every Wednesday 9:45 a.m. Cost: Resident, \$39; non-resident, \$48. Session Two (CODE: SC602): Dec. 5 to Jan. 30 (no class 12/16).

French Lessons Beginner. The first step in learning to speak French. Wednesdays, 12:30 p.m. instructor, Jim McMurtrie. Cost: resident, \$39; non-resident, \$48. Session Two (CODE: SC612) Dec. 5 to Jan. 30 (no class Dec. 26).; Session Three (CODE: SC613) Feb. 20 to April 9.

Holiday Celebration. Annual holiday celebration. Enjoy excellent food and entertainment, door prizes and carol singing. Friday, Dec. 14, 11:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. Cost: \$20.

Investing Basics. Learn about different investments, read statements and examine your portfolio. Every Tuesday, 2:30 to 3:30 p.m. Jeff Crause of Edward Jones, instructor. Cost: Free.

Table Game Day. Play old favorites like euchre or rummy cube and exciting new games including Wii...an electronic new-age game that brings bowling and other similar games to interactive life. All skill levels welcome. Refreshments served by Ann Arbor's premier retirement residences. The first Monday of the month, 1 to 3 p.m. June Lynch, instructor. Cost: Free.

Buhr Park Outdoor Ice Rink, www.a2gov.org/buhr. 2751 Packard Road, 734.971.3228.

The rink has a cooled subfloor that allows us to maintain ice even when it is over 50 degrees outside! Activities include public ice skating, drop-in hockey and rental hours. The facility has a heated lobby, vending, restrooms and four separate locker rooms for hockey. Skate rentals available (we meet ADA requirements). Skate sharpening available: Immediate service, \$6; overnight, \$5.

	Resident Skating Fees	Public Skating Fees
Adult	\$5	\$6
Youth (17 & under)	\$3.75	\$5
Senior (60+)	\$3.75	\$5
Skate rental	\$3	\$3
Skate learners are free		

Skating Season Passes (valid at Buhr Park only)

	Resident	Non-resident
Adult	\$65	\$85
Youth/Senior	\$50	\$65
Family	\$125	\$160

Public Skating now to March 16, 2008

Sunday General skate, 3:15 to 5:30 p.m. (**new time**)

Monday	Drop-in Hockey, 7:30 to 8:30 p.m. (women only)
Tuesday	Sticks & Pucks, 5:15 to 6:15 p.m. (youth only) General skate, 7:45 to 8:45 p.m. (half price) Drop-in Hockey, 9 to 10 p.m. (men only)
Wednesday	Broom Ball & General Skate, 4 to 5:45 p.m. General Skate 7:15 to 8:45 p.m.
Thursday	General Skate, 7:15 to 8:45 p.m.
Friday	Drop-in Hockey, 4:45 to 5:45 p.m. (all ages) General Skate, 7:15 to 8:45 p.m.
Saturday	General Skate, 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. and 7:15 to 8:45 p.m.

School Break Skating. Additional public skating sessions will be held the following days.

Nov. 21 & 23, noon to 2 p.m.	Dec. 24, 10 a.m. to noon
Dec. 26-28, noon to 2 p.m.	Dec. 31, 10 a.m. to noon
Jan. 2-4, noon to 2 p.m.	Jan. 21, noon to 2 p.m.
Feb. 18, noon to 2 p.m.	Feb. 25-29, noon to 2 p.m.
March 10, noon to 2 p.m.	

Veterans Memorial Park Sports Complex, www.a2gov.org/veterans. 2150 Jackson Road, 734.761.7240.

Skating Schedule: Now to March 16, 2008

	Resident Skating Fees	Public Skating Fees
Adult	\$5	\$6
Youth/Senior	\$4	\$5
Skate rental	\$3	\$3

Veteran's Memorial Public Ice Skating Schedule:

SUN, Family Skate, 1 to 2:30 p.m. (17 years & under accompanied by an adult)
M, Instructional Skating Practice/General Skate, 9:50 to 10:50 a.m.
M, adults only, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. W, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.
T, adults only, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. T, general skate: 1:15 to 2:45 p.m.
TH, general skate, 11 a.m. to 12:50 p.m. F, patch, 9:15 to 10 a.m.
F, freestyle, 10 to 10:45 a.m. F, adults only, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.
SAT, General skate, 1 to 2:30 p.m.

Holiday Vacation Skating. Additional public skating hours are offered during the Ann Arbor Public School holiday vacation: Dec. 22 & 23, 1 to 2:30 p.m.; Dec. 26-30 & Jan. 2-4, 11 a.m. to 2:45 p.m.

Frosty on Ice. Dec. 16, 1 to 2:30 p.m. Skate with Frosty. General admission, (skater only need pay). Free candy canes and a meet and greet with pictures in the lobby with Frosty (all ages).

Past Masters For age 60+ or goalies of any age, at Veterans Memorial Park Ice Arena. Informal play on Thursday afternoons. No body checking is allowed. First 24 players and two goalies per session may attend. Thursdays, now to May 8, 2:05 to 3:05 p.m.; Mondays, now to May 5, 8:40 to 9:40 a.m. Fees: \$10 per visit or \$273 season. Goalies are free.

Veteran's Memorial Instructional Skating Schedule:

Session III, Jan. 26 to March 29 (8 classes). \$90/\$72 res. discount. No classes March 1 & 8.
Kinderskate, ages 3 1/2 to 6: M, 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. (CODE: VP311) class ends March 17; TH, 9:45 to 10:45 a.m. (CODE: VP313) & 1 to 1:55 p.m. (CODE: VP314) class ends March 20; SAT 9 to 10 a.m. (CODE: VP315).

Beginner & Intermediate, ages 6 (or first grade) to 15: F, 5 to 5:45 p.m. (VP334) class ends March 21; SAT, 10:10 to 10:55 a.m. (CODE: VP335); SAT, 11:05 to 11:50 a.m. (CODE: VP336).

Beginning Hockey Skills ages 6 (or first grade) to 12: SAT 11:05 to 11:50 a.m. (CODE: VP340).

Advanced, ages 6 to 15: F, 6 to 6:45 p.m. (CODE: VP352); SAT, 12 to 12:45 p.m. (CODE: VP353).

Adult, ages 16 and older: W, 9:30 to 10:30 a.m. (CODE: VP362); F, 6:55 to 7:40 p.m. (CODE: VP363) class ends March 21

Mack Indoor Pool, www.a2gov.org/mack. 715 Brooks Street, 734.994.2898.

Season Passes are valid now through May 30, 2008. Adult: Resident, \$115; non-resident, \$145; Youth/Senior: Resident, \$90; non-resident, \$110; *Family: Resident, \$200; non-resident, \$250. *Rate for up to five family members (two adults and three children). Each additional child is \$5.

Public swim ongoing. Adult: Resident \$4; non-resident \$5. Youth (17 & under) and Senior (55+): Resident, \$4.50; non-resident \$3.50.

LAP SWIM	SATURDAY A.M. LAP	OPEN SWIM
Tot pool all ages	Jan. 12 to May 3	Two lap lanes open for lap swim
M-F, 11 a.m. to noon	SAT, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.	M-F, 7:30 to 9 p.m.
T & TH, 6 to 7:30 p.m.	.	SAT, 1 to 5 p.m.
		SUN 11: 30 a.m. to 3 p.m.

DAWN DUCKS is for swimmers of all ages to get up early and enjoy the pool. Open space and lap lanes are available Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. Season passes are not valid during DD times. Daily cost: Seniors (55+) & Youth: Resident \$3; non-resident, \$3.75. Adults: \$4; non-resident, \$5; Term passes available.

A.M. & P.M. MASTER SWIMMING provides group training, planned workouts and coaching for all levels of adult swimmers, from recreational exercisers to triathletes. Minimum requirement to join the program is a swimming ability finishing one mile per workout. Registration is accepted directly by the coach for A.M. Masters and at the admission counter for P.M. Masters. For Morning Masters registration, please use the program codes listed below. Evening Masters will use a membership pass punch card for participation that can be purchased at Mack Indoor Pool. Please note: Evening Masters is offered three days a week, passes will be valid on Tuesdays and Thursday evenings if you'd like to catch up on a missed workout.

Times: Mornings, M-F, 5:45 to 7:15 a.m. & Evenings, MWF, 6 to 7:30 p.m.

Days	Session 3
	1/21 - 3/28
	CODE
2-days	MP632
3-days	MP633
5-days	MP635

Mornings/Evenings	Fee	Resident discount
2 days (each week)	\$82	\$70
3 days (each week)	\$98	\$80
5 days (each week)	\$128	\$105

JANUARY 2008 – DECEMBER 2008
LAC Meeting Dates - (All meetings held in the 6th Floor Conference Room*
On the first Tuesday of each Month)

January 8, 2008
February 5, 2008 – 2nd Floor, Council Workroom*
March 4, 2008
April 1, 2008
May 6, 2008
June 3, 2008
July 1, 2008
August 5, 2008
September 2, 2008
October 7, 2008
November 4, 2008
December 2, 2008

JANUARY 2008 – DECEMBER 2008

PAC Meeting Dates (All meetings will be held in Council Chambers
on the third Tuesday of each month, with the exception of the
February* meeting)

January 15, 2008
*February 26, 2008 (Meeting date changed due to City Council and the Presidents Day Holiday)
March 18, 2008
April 15, 2008
May 20, 2008
June 17, 2008
July 15, 2008
August 19, 2008
September 16, 2008
October 21, 2008
November 18, 2008
December 16, 2008