



**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.