

CITY OF ANN ARBOR – PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES February 26, 2008

The regular meeting of the Park Advisory Commission was held on Tuesday, February 26, 2008 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 4:13 p.m. by Chair, L. Berauer.

II. Roll Call:

Members Present: (9) L. Berauer, B. Macomber D. Barrett, J. Grand, J. Lawter, G. Nystuen, S. Rosencrans, T.

Berla, S. Offen (arrived at 4:17p.m.)

Ex-Officio Members Present: (2) S. Kunselman (arrived at 4:18 p.m.), M. Anglin

Ex- Officio Members Absent: (0) None.

Members Absent: (0) None

Staff Present: (9) J. Miller, Colin Smith, D. Simon, Jason Nealis, D.

Thompson, Tim Nagae, J. Dehring, Jason Frenzel

(NAP), L. Bowen

Guests: (1) Deputy Chief Bazick

L. Berauer stated before the meeting that Christen Smith is no longer with the City of Ann Arbor and introduced Colin Smith to the Commission as Interim Parks Services Manager, and later in the meeting under the Report from Parks and Recreation Manager he will give an update on the staffing for Parks, how the search is going to fill open positions.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – L. Berauer asked the Commission if there was anything that needed to be discussed or if there were any additions or requests. There were none.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY - <u>AGENDA ITEMS</u> (3 Minutes per Speaker)

Tim Nagae stated he was a producer at CTN Network and has come to the Parks Advisory Commission meeting to promote a television show called "Eco Sense," which CTN have been producing for the last 6 months.

"Eco Sense" has a talk show format with various short documentary/news segments focusing on energy and environmental issues. Stating they just finished the first three shows, which are about energy. The show features Dave Konkle, the City's Energy Coordinator, who is the main panelist for these energy shows. Also, it has Robert Black of the Energy Commission, Mayor Hieftje, and Sean Reed of the Clean Energy Coalition as another panelist for each show.

53 54 55 56

The first "Eco Sense" show discusses problems caused by human energy consumption, such as global climate changes, Peak Oil, or energy shortage issues. Mayor Hieftje appears in the second show talking about the City's energy use, future plans like the LED light program, solar panels and windmills. And the third show includes alternative fuel vehicles and energy conservation issues.

58 59 60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

57

"Eco Sense" was made for the general audience. Mr. Nagae stated he understood all the PAC commissioners are familiar with these issues, so the contents of the show may not be anything new to them. Mr. Nagae stated he was confident that the show is visually interesting enough to draw more people's attention to energy and environmental issues. He would like PAC to watch the program, so he brought the DVD copies of the three "Eco Sense" shows recorded on one disk for all the PAC commissioners today.

Mr. Nagae asked the Commission to please share this video with anybody who is interested in viewing the show. He also states if there are any questions about the "Eco Sense show", to please call him at CTN at 769-7422.

"Eco Sense I, II & III"

(30 minute-talk/documentary TV Program about energy and environment)

69 70 71

"Eco Sense – Energy Challenge I" (Problems caused by human energy consumption)

72 73 74

75

76

Tuesday, 2/26 at 3:30pm Thursday, 2/28 at 9pm Sunday, 3/2 at 9am Friday, 3/7 at 8pm

77 78 79

"Eco Sense – Energy Challenge II" (Alternative energy sources)

80 81 82

83

84

Tuesday, 2/27 at 4pm Thursday, 2/28 at 9:30pm Sunday, 3/2 at 9:30am Friday, 3/7 at 8:30pm

85 86 87

88

"Eco Sense – Energy Challenge III" (Alternative fuel vehicles and energy conservation)

89 90

Premiere: Sunday, 2/24, in the 8 pm – 8:30pm time period.

91

92 Replays: Tuesday, 2/26 at 4:30 p.m. 93 Tuesday, 2/26 at 9:00 p.m. Thursday,2/28 at 2:00 p.m. 94 95 Saturday, 3/1 at 9:30 p.m. 96 Sunday, 3/2 at 10:00 a.m. 97 Sunday, 3/2 at 10:30 p.m. 98 Tuesday, 3/4 at 9:30 p.m. 99 Wednesday, 3/5 at 3:30 pm 100 Friday, 3/7 at 9:00 p.m. 101 Saturday, 3/8 at 10:00 p.m.

On Comcast Channel 19

L. Berauer stated when Mr. Nagae wrote her she felt what is being done in terms of the Environmental series is just absolutely wonderful, it's a great thing you are doing for the whole community getting the word out of what can be done.

T. Berla asked if any of the programming will ever come on non-Comcast television outlets.

Tim Nagae stated not at this time, only on Comcast. He also stated that he was hoping the Michigan Television Network would take it but they didn't.

T. Berla stated now that there are other television providers in the city it is an interesting situation because he can't watch the meetings on his television provider because it is not Comcast,.

Tim Nagae stated this is why he brought the DVD to the meeting, so that the Commissioners can watch it.

J. Miller stated the reason it is only on Comcast is because CTN receives revenues from Comcast, which is why 'Eco-Sense' is broadcast through Comcast and not any other provider. Comcast is actually a funding source for CTN and it is through the cable franchise agreement with Comcast why the City channels are only broadcast on Comcast.

T. Berla stated he was confused about that and maybe there is an answer to this, at some point he thought he saw a reference to similar revenues from AT&T and other providers in the same stream. First of all he thinks because this is a public service we want to be broadly available in the community if it's only going to be on Comcast because of the reason J. Miller stated, which is a good reason, then we need to re-think what we are doing and see if that is really smart, which can't be done in this meeting. If there is money going from AT&T then obviously the AT&T customers should get to see it.

J. Miller stated as TV or viewing has become so much broader and there are other providers that's very much an issue the City is trying to address.

L. Berauer stated she would like to add if there is any way, not knowing how expensive this is, but thinks it's be pretty simple, to get these programs on to the Web.

T. Nagae stated they are thinking of this, but this is a 30 minute show, maybe it can be put on YouTube because it would not be good quality otherwise.

L. Berauer stated she was not thinking of YouTube, she was thinking more of streaming video and there are high quality ways of doing it and then people could view it on demand.

Tim Nagae stated they are in the process of doing things like this and stated he could not answer when this would become available.

L. Berauer thanked Mr. Nagae for coming to the meeting, stating it is interesting because later in the agenda the Commission wanted to discuss the issue of the policy for lighting

our Athletic Fields and are interested in saving energy, stating this discussion fits in the agenda of today's meeting.

S. Rosencrans stated he has seen the first couple of episodes of the show and thinks it is very good, he truly enjoyed them and is nicely done. The other thing is just feedback since Mr. Nagae is here and since we are in a public meeting, just feedback to CTN if it can be communicated, that when he watches the meetings on television he gets a loud buzzing in the audio for the public meetings and not on other channels. If this is a technical problem it should be passed on to CTN.

Tim Nagae stated they have been having problems with this pertaining to bad connections and will take this information back to CTN.

S. Rosencrans stated 'Eco Sense" is a great show.

Tim Nagae passed out the DVD's of the "Eco Sense" program to the Commissioners.

Rosemarie Pitsch spoke on behalf of the Ann Arbor Soccer Association and asked that her memo be included in the minutes:

February 26, 2008

154

155

156 157

158

159

160

161

162

163 164

165

166 167

168 169

170 171

172

173 174

175 176

177 178

179

180 181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190 191

192

193

194

195 196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

Dear Members of the Parks Advisory Commission:

This letter serves both to introduce PAC to our organization, and to support efforts to improve the soccer fields at Fuller Park, our home for the past several decades.

The Ann Arbor Soccer Association is a volunteer-run non-profit organization that has served the Ann Arbor community for more than 30 years. Our mission is to promote and maintain the availability of adult recreational outdoor soccer. We provide a fun and safe atmosphere to all individuals, from the ages of 15 to senior citizens, regardless of playing experience or skill level. We are particularly unique because unlike leagues where players must wait for a spot on a team to become available and possibly have to try-out. we are truly open to anyone wanting to play soccer. Our format promotes skills development by blending less experienced players with more experienced players in a non-competitive environment. To our knowledge, there are no other organizations that offer the experience we do within 45 minutes of Ann Arbor. Further, as a not-for profit entity, we strive to keep our registration fees as low as possible so that we can provide an affordable fitness activity to as many people as possible. This activity promotes a healthier lifestyle than many other recreational activities because of the constant movement.

The fields at Fuller Park have fallen into a state of disrepair over the past few years. The irrigation system has not functioned properly in approximately 4 years, and as a result, there is very little grass and the ground is very hard and uneven. We have observed an increase in both the frequency and severity of injuries as a result. I attended the January PAC meeting, and was very surprised at Councilman Kunselman's hesitation regarding planned, long overdue improvements at Fuller. We wish to respond to some of the concerns he raised, as well as clarify a few facts so that PAC is fully informed before making recommendations to City Council.

Mr. Kunselman raised the question of how much it costs to maintain a soccer field. When considering the answer, PAC should be aware that AASA owns and maintains all of the goals and nets at Fuller Park, not the city of Ann Arbor. We also pay for the lining of the fields. We make use of these for 90 minutes, Monday through Friday, and they are available for public use and enjoyment the rest of the time. I have heard some of the Parks Department's plans to build fences around Fuller and only allow renters access to the fields. While we appreciate the desire to protect the fields, we want to promote accessibility over exclusion. This does come with the need to commit to field stewardship. We have committed to maintaining equipment and lining at Fuller, and have done so for many years. While we may experience frustration that our equipment is subjected to wear and tear by a broader constituency than our membership, we also recognize that part of our stewardship benefits the community as a whole. We are not in favor of making the fields into professional quality fields that restricts use to only groups with reservations, and leaves city residents who want to kick around a soccer ball with a few friends with nowhere to play.

 Our organization probably spends more time at this park than any other group, and we are not asking for World Cup quality playing fields. It is probably unrealistic to expect that at Fuller, but it is reasonable to expect a functional irrigation system and more grass than rocks and dirt. The first step should be to bring the irrigation system back to working order. Fields should be rolled in the spring while the ground is soft, and should be seeded and aerated as appropriate after that. Fuller Park is the only park in Ann Arbor with enough fields to support a league. In fact, there are only 11 soccer fields in Ann Arbor (many of which actually do not have any soccer goals on them, making Fuller one of the only places in Ann Arbor where park goers can play soccer). As the PROS plan indicated, the tremendous growth of soccer and other growing sports has placed severe demands on the existing facilities...and the current number of fields...does not come close to meeting the demand."

Mr. Kunselman seemed to imply that there is little interest in soccer in Ann Arbor, because "the same 400 people" sign up to play every season in our league. From our perspective, repeat business is an indication that we are doing a good job! It is neither fair nor appropriate to draw conclusions about the level of interest in the sport from the casual observation of one former player, however. The fact of the matter is that our growth is limited by the number of fields we are able to rent every year, either due to "resting" of fields or reservations from other groups. Our league has been running at capacity with approximately 1000 individual registrations over 3 seasons (and had waitlists for registrations) for the past few years. We have made virtually no effort to advertise our league beyond our website because the number of available fields limits our potential growth. Despite this, we do have a substantial number of new players every year, and we welcome them as much as we do our returning players.

Another area of concern was that Fuller Park is not used during the winter months. Very few of the city's many parks are used during these months, but if this was mentioned as an indication of a lack of revenue for the city, this is not entirely accurate. The city rents the parking lot at Fuller Park to the University of Michigan from Labor day-Memorial day. Knowing what I pay for my blue pass, I would certainly hope this is a lucrative source of income for the city.

Our organization has a vested interest in Fuller Park, both as soccer players and as residents of Ann Arbor. We wish to offer any assistance we can to improve the condition of the fields, and hope that we can work together with PAC to achieve this goal. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Rosemarie Pitsch

Rosemarie Pitsch Ann Arbor Soccer Association

L. Berauer asked Ms. Pitsch to send her comments electronically so that they could be included in the minutes and also asked if Ms. Pitsch had been in contact with our Athletic Field committee and hopes she will be meeting with them because they will be presenting their final report at the next meeting on March 18, 2008.

A - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **A-1 J. Lawter** moved, supported by **S. Offen** to approve the minutes of January 15, 2008 with additions. The minutes of January 15, 2008 were approved unanimously with stated corrections to be added.
 - **S.** Offen had a comment on page 9 regarding the Golf Course Resolution, and stated it would have been helpful if at the very end the entire amended Resolution would have been printed.
 - **L. Berauer** stated she noticed the Resolution was in the packet, but would agree that they should be re-inserted in the minutes in the appropriate place. Stating that the first amended Resolution should be inserted at line 458 and the Resolution regarding the Liquor License should be inserted at line 510.
 - **L. Berauer** commented that the minutes are amazing and that the January 15, 2008 meeting was a very intense meeting and the way the discussion was captured was absolutely a model, actually above and beyond and more than a model. Also stating Karen Sydney was a speaker at the January meeting and would send Lynn Bowen the actual document to also be added to these minutes.
 - **L. Berauer** asked for a vote approving the Minutes with the additions that she and **S. Offen** suggested. The Minutes were approved with the additions.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Buhr Park and Veteran's Park Staff presentation on Ice Arena

Jason Nealis, supervisor at Veteran's Park who has historically worked as a seasonal employee at Buhr for four years, spoke on the amenities at Buhr Park stating it is an outdoor skating facility with a pavilion style roof with open walls that gives the experience of skating outside. Also stating that It's kind of a throw-back that

a lot of communities don't have these days and has been mentioned nationally in Newsweek several years ago along with 3 other ice skating rinks, Rockefeller Center, the Frog Pond in Boston, and Glacier Point in Yosemite National Park. The story can still be found on-line. It was mentioned as one of the places to enjoy outdoor skating.

Roughly 95% of the user's are Ann Arbor City residents, and scholarships opportunities are available at Buhr Park and also at Veteran's Park.

Buhr Park offers public skating on a daily basis to enjoy and/or hockey events, whether it's drop-in for special interest groups for children, women or men, there are also opportunities for children to practice their hockey skills with sticks and pucks.

There have also been special event skating and weekend events at Buhr and Veteran's in an effort to boost public skating attendance. The 'Buhr Blast' was featured in the Ann Arbor News this past Sunday. This was one of a number of big events held throughout the winter.

Dennis Simon stated Veteran's is the indoor rink and is open from mid-September through mid-May every year. The only two days during that time that Veteran's is closed are Christmas Day and New Year's Day, other than those two days it is open from 6:00 a.m. to at least 12:00 a.m. 7 days a week. People are generally on the ice by 7:00 a.m. most days of the week and on the weekends go as late as 2:00 a.m., Vet's is a busy rink.

There is an instructional skating program for children aging from 3 1/2years of age to adults offered at Vet's. For the last 10 years the City's instructional program has placed in the top ten in the country with the United States Figure Skating Association's Basic Skills Program. Last year Vet's dropped down to 6th in the top 10, this year they are on pace to hit that number or increase that number back up to the top 4 or 5. There is an adult hockey program at Veteran's Park, currently the Adult Hockey program has 746 participants ranging from novice in the Never Ever league for the adult that has never skated or played hockey, it is a good way for them to get involved in the game, to the "A" division where there are former NHL players. There is also the 55 and older group that plays every Monday morning and Thursday afternoon, with some players being close to 80 years of age still playing twice a week.

A scholarship program is offered but currently the scholarship program numbers are low, so far 27 people have signed up, taking advantage of the scholarship program for instructional skating classes where otherwise they wouldn't have a chance to participate in that. We have approximately 895 scholarship rink/pool passes. The majority of the people use that pass in the summer but are able to use it in the winter as well for public skating.

Public skating is offered daily with adult skates in the morning on Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 11:00 to 1:00, and children's skating on weekends and during the week as well. Any time Ann Arbor Schools are closed, all adult skates are open to children, and it seems to be going very well. New this year there has been skating offered on Thursday's for pre-schooler's and home schooler's. On the first Saturday of every month there have been special events offered, ie Super Bowl, DJ Skate.

Also new this year, the Adult mid-western sectional competition for the Ann Arbor Figure Skating Club is being hosted at Veteran's on March 8 and 9. It's the first time in approximately 6 years that the Figure Skating Club has been back at Vet's. When the Cube was built, they moved all of their programming there. It will be great to have them back! Another special event this year was Team Harbin from China playing against our adult hockey league as an All-Star game. Other groups using Vet's are the Amateur Hockey Association for the youth hockey and Pioneer Girls Hockey team for the past 4 years. There is also a private group that rents ice every Friday night for a women's hockey league called Mackrel, they accept everyone of every skill level.

- **G. Nystuen** complimented staff on the spread featured in the Ann Arbor News, stating it was good to see and is important to our Parks. Also stating it seems that the programs out at Veteran's Park seem to be full, and asked D. Simon what his feeling was on how things are going and if he was satisfied.
- **D. Simon** stated he is not satisfied. He believes they could be getting more but with the economy being as it isa few people were lost. In years past in the instructional skating program families would sign up for all four sessions right away, but since the economy has been poor they are signing up one session at a time now. He would like to see the program grow. The instructional skating has been restructured, weekends had not been offered but that has been changed around this year for the first time in approximately 20 years, and numbers are starting to come back. Public skating is also starting to increase. Cheryl Saam came up with good ideas for special events and there have been very positive responses and an increase of participants, including new people, especially in the morning skates where it's typically been the same people for the last 20 years.
- **J. Nealis** stated public skating numbers are going up due to the supervisors at Buhr Park being very instrumental with new ideas for the public skating. Buhr doesn't have much programming during the ice season, it's mostly public skating and private rentals.
- **S. Offen** stated he looked at cost center reports and noticed the budget for administration for Veteran's Park was over \$100,000.00 more this year than last year in expenditures and for Buhr administration was approximately \$30,000.00 more than last year and asked for the increases to be explained.
- **D. Simon** stated since 2002 he had been the only full time supervisor at the Vet's, this year Jason is also a full-time supervisors at Veteran's Park and Cheryl Saam has come over from the canoe liveries during the winter months. Also the utilities have increased a little.
- **C. Smith** stated there has been a staff increase added to the expenses since it is not feasible to have only one supervisor at the facility since the hours of operation at Veteran's Park are so extensive. It is important to have both supervisors there.

There is also another new charge in the administration budgets for Vet's and Buhr which is the IT charge that in the past was paid out of the central administration budget in the General Fund where all facility IT charges were lumped in together. In the current budget IT charges have been allocated to each facility depending on what programs are used and the amount of computers you have. This is a substantial cost

and is approximately \$23,000 for Buhr, and for Veteran's it could be approximately this cost and possibly higher.

- **S. Offen** asked if D. Simon and J. Nealis were the only two staff members at Veteran's Park.
- **J. Nealis** stated there are also seasonal workers there, also explaining the other staff that are at this facility skating instructors, Zamboni operator, concessions operations.
- **S.** Offen asked if all those funds came from the administration budget.

- **D. Simon** explained depending on what activities, there are different areas that it would be charged to such as general skating, adult hockey etc. Some seasonal staff are charged to administration.
- **S. Kunselman** expressed his thanks to the staff and the efforts to bring more skaters to the ice rinks, he attended the Buhr Park Buhr Blast and it was very well attended with lots and lots of children which is what he likes to see. He believes that another program is half the cost on Tuesday nights and is very commendable. The costs are still being paid regardless if anyone is on the ice or not, the more people that are on this ice, we are definitely getting the monies worth of what we are spending to keep these facilities open. He also suggested not using metal handle brooms for the broom ball because he broke one twice, they don't last well, and we should stay with the wooden handle brooms. Also asking a question regarding the Women's Hockey league on Friday nights at Vet's and asked what happened to general public skating on Friday nights at Vet's? Expressing that general public skating on Friday nights was one of the most well attended general public skating time that he could remember growing up in Ann Arbor and brought in a lot of teenagers, where do they go now if they aren't going to Vet's?
- **D. Simon** stated that in 1996-1997 public skating on Friday's nights was discontinued because we were competing with the Ann Arbor Ice Cube, it was a new facility and everyone was going there. There weren't any adult Women's Leagues in Ann Arbor and there was a request for this. We had some users at Vet's that put together the league and they've rented it ever since then, it's worked out very well.
- **S. Kunselman** commented that if you could not go head to head with the Cube, maybe it's because of the fees, it is a dollar more for general public skate at Veteran's.
- **D. Simon** explained the difference in the ages (at the Ann Arbor Ice Cube you are considered an adult at the age of 12 years old, at the City of Ann Arbor you are an adult at the age of 18) as far as the consideration of being an adult which makes a difference in the price of admission. Cost wise we are comparable and pretty equal with the Ann Arbor Ice Cube, there are certain things that we don't charge for that the Cube does. The Cube charges \$2 for the skating tutors but we provide them for free.
- **C. Smith** explained the price is a little cheaper for the price of admission at the Ann Arbor Ice Cube but it is important to notice the difference in the ages, and what is even more important to know is if you want to go to a public skate at the Ann Arbor

Ice Cube during the week, the options on the weekdays are 6:00 a.m. to 7:50 a.m. or 10:30 to 11:50 a.m. The reason is primarily a rink wants to be able to rent their prime time ice in the evenings to teams, to leagues that will play and that will come week-in and week-out. This way revenue is guaranteed. At Buhr public skating is available every evening of the week other than Monday between 7:15 and 8:45, which is a team that could easily be rented to a hockey team. We choose not to do that because we think it's important that the public has an opportunity to get out and skate, the kids obviously can't skate at 6:00 am at the Ice Cube. We're also at the whim of the weather, if it's a day where it's cold, some people might not come out to the public skating but if it's a team that had rented the ice, they will show up.

- **S. Kunselman** expressed he was glad to see a lot of thought went into this. He still thought that if the leagues have the ability to rent, and do have the Ice Cube to rent, some of the emphasis should be on the general public skate for our community. From what he sees at Buhr at general public skate, we're also getting a lot of people from Saline, Ypsilanti and outside of the community. They're not going to the Ann Arbor Ice Cube, they're coming to our facility because it's a little cheaper and may be a little more accessible to them, and possibly because of the hours, which is very good. He wondered why Ann Arbor citizens would drive a little future to go to the Ann Arbor Ice Cube on a Friday night. Friday night was the most well attended time slot for many, many years. It's hard to believe that the Ice Cube siphoned off that number of people since they're out in the township. This is a topic he would like to see re-visited at some point. We're here to provide recreation not just for leagues and people who can join a team, but for the basic citizen and their families. He believes that's where the focus should be for the primary emphasis for Parks & Recreation.
- **T. Berla** asked when Buhr has general skating and if it was a technical decision that one of the two parks would be open for general skate but not both on the Friday night. He also asked the approximate cost for someone to use the rink, whether it is subsidized, and if so, the approximate subsidy. If it's rented to teams, the breakeven point is achieved but if there's a public skate, 30-35 people are needed to break even, sometimes you get enough to make money and sometimes not? On average, does it break even or not?
- **D. Simon** stated public skating is available every night at Buhr and that it was a technical decision that one of the two parks would be open for general skate but not both on Friday nights. For a public skate, approximately \$170.00 per hour needs to be generated. If only 10 people show up for a public skate, the \$170 is not met, while a rental guarantees that number, so the subsidy is not there.

 Depending on the time of the season, if the there is light weather the attendance may be down people aren't thinking skating. During the colder weather, mid-November through April, the public skate can consistently do quite well, hitting the max capacity 300 especially on the holiday skating. It's been a lot of years since we've seen those number but it's come back. On Sunday afternoons right now, that would be the busiest skate where there are over 100 participants typically.
- **S. Offen** asked if there was competition from Yost, they have public skates now and then.

- **D. Simon** stated there is not competition from Yost because the UM hockey team is in charge of that rink so if they need it for any reason, they can call off any scheduled event, they have precedence on that surface.
- **L. Berauer** asked if users dropped off because of the opening of Ann Arbor Ice Cube. She also said that it was mentioned that the scholarship numbers were a little disappointing and wondered how to get word out to the community that these are available.
- **C. Smith** stated the handout given to the Commission explains the numbers for the total visitors have actually stabilized or have actually gone up slightly over the last 3 seasons..
- **D. Simon** wasn't sure what needs to be done differently to let the public know. Once the summer rolls around, the use of the pool/rink pass is incredible. The rink has not seen a lot of scholarship use, and only a fraction of memberships are being used.
- **J. Nealis** stated when a scholarship is awarded, they are made aware that the pass is good for both the pool in the summer and the rinks in the winter. Ice skating is not as popular as going to a swimming pool.
- **L. Berauer** asked if the thought was that the dual scholarship is probably capturing most of the people who want to skate. She stated that the information was very enlightening.
- **J. Nealis** indicated she was correct about the dual scholarships.
- **C. Smith** stated compressors were purchased last year for both Veteran's and Buhr Park, which was a large capital purchase. The compressors that were replaced were approximately 25 years old. A resolution to purchase new Zamboni's for both facilities was recently approved by Council, replacing a 1984 model at Buhr and a 1986 model at Vets, which have been challenging to keep running. The rinks are excited to have this new equipment.

Adopt-A-Park Program Presentation

L. Berauer introduced Jason Frenzel from NAP who also runs the Adopt-A-Park program.

Jason Frenzel spoke of the upcoming special events for the volunteer program. He was very happy with the winter planning session. There are a lot of events for the upcoming spring volunteer program. The first-ever mud puppy survey just wrapped up. Mud puppies are an all-aquatic salamander that look a lot like mud. The frog and toad and salamander kick off is coming up as well as the prescribed burn program training for volunteer crews, and the breeding bird survey kick off. —There a ton of word days coming up, this year more than any other year. With the public events there is also a lot of work coming up with private groups, the Kiwanis, the Law School, the Business School, new incoming students come and work as a team building exercise, Fuller Field got adopted in the Adopt-A-Park program by the Ann Arbor Ultimate League to try to do some cleanup and planting. It's hard to find the private

groups and get to know them, it's very much word of mouth, but every year they all come back and we pick up a couple more. Last year there were 45 different groups, which was a distinct increase from the previous year. It's very exciting to have more and more partnerships with the community organizations who are out there. The Parks Steward program is also continuing to grow.

 NAP budget and staffing has slightly increased over the last number of years, his positions is now permanent and he has some paid staff assistants in the volunteer program which has freed him up to do some wonderful background projects he's wanted to do for several years, including developing a much more broad training spectrum for the Parks Stewards and implementing projects. The Adopt-A-Park program is going very well, mostly word of mouth including a little PR work and help from CTN to help develop a communication plan and promote the Adopt-A-Park program and big spring kick off, which is done on an annual basis. This year it's intentionally on the same date as the downtown cleanup so they will be partnering for raising awareness. It will be interesting to see how many people come out and hear about the programs as a result of the paid PR and see what that does differently since that's never been done at NAP before.

The Parks Advisory Commission is invited to all of the events, they are all family friendly, there's something for everyone to do at all of the events, and feedback is welcomed regarding programs from your perspective.

- **S. Rosencrans** asked for a brief explanation of the difference between what the people in the Parks Stewardship Program do versus the people in the Adopt-A-Park.
- **J. Frenzel** explained that the Park Stewardship program is a long term program for people who are committed to certain parcels of land, with long term learning, and a thorough, understanding relationship with the NAP office and staff, they are offered explanations of how eco-system dynamics and restoration works, offer them an opportunity to be out in the parks as much as they can, work on projects in the natural area that they're stewarding, marrying their passion in the project with NAP's priorities and understanding the importance of that part. Coming together in what could be done, not asking them to do projects they're not interested in, helping them to understand if they're considering doing something that's not appropriate in some way. The Steward program is a long term relationship between the volunteer, the parcel and NAP staff.

The Adopt-A-Park program is modeled somewhat after the Steward program and is an individual or group relationship with the park., it's a long term relationship. The learning curve is very accelerated or shortened because the things this group does is what we all do in our yards and gardens at home or we did as children, like planting trees and flowers, woodchipping, picking up trash and general beautification, and this group can literally go out the next day to start working, checking in with NAP staff and other Parks staff about what we're going to have them do because the expertise doesn't lie within NAP, it lies with the Park Planners' and field workers' hands. They can get out and start working right away and come back year after year. One of the reasons we have a kick off is not only to get PR value by having a big event but also to get the volunteers reinvigorated after the winter and get them out into the parks.

L. Berauer asked if the Park Stewards do trash pickup or plant trees.

- **J. Frenze**l explained the funding for the Adopt-A-Park is within the mowed, playground and open Parks, like Veteran's, Fuller Park or the neighborhood Park where there may be a playground. Both come from the Parks Millage but they are through different lines, NAP differentiates them through both funding and type of park. He tries to blur the line because at least half of the parks have both and the individual volunteer may or may not want to concentrate on any portions of those parks. He tries not to make it an issue in their eyes but internally there is a difference.
- **L. Berauer** summarized that the stewards work mostly in natural areas and the adopta-park people work in more neighborhood parks or active recreational parks.
- **T. Berla** asked is there a way the Frisbee group could be a part of Adopt-A-Park and a way to put this information on their web site.
- **J. Frenzel** stated that with the staff increases we have had for the past year, been able to update the NAP and Adopt-A-Park web page to have really useful interactive information. There is a purposeful decision to have a delay on it, the volunteers want the shiny bauble at the start so there is a 12-24 month window on the relationship to make sure it will stand for a while.
- **L. Berauer** asked how the connection was made with University of Michigan and if NAP was approached by them or not.
- **J. Frenzel** stated every entity within the University in essence is its own separate volunteering organization. There are a very small handful of over arching volunteering organizations within the University, and they do participate also where all of the undergrads can come out if they choose on a given volunteer day. The vast majority of where we get out volunteers or why we have University volunteers is because a huge portion of University groups have volunteering and community building as a charge in their missions, ie the fraternities and sororities whose literal mandate is to give to the community, the honor students come out every year, it's a great activity, that is their mission. We put out the PR to those places within the University and in all of the different buildings where we feel there is a moderate or mild overlap of the mentality.
- **L. Berauer** thinks it's great they're making those connections, she likes to see more student and University involvement in the community and this is a great way to do it. She asked if the Storm Water credit which is \$80,000 is going back to NAP and if it was NAP's staff who is going to implement most of it, certainly the educational activities.
- **J. Frenzel** stated he was not part of the decision making process regarding the Stormwater Credit, but understood that it was to be credited back to Parks in general.
- **J. Miller** stated it is a lump sum within the Parks & Recreation budget as well as credits for all of the other things we do, NAP does a lot of them and so does Leslie Science Center, and the Canoe Liveries, they're actually across the board, and they are identified by each park.
- **L. Berauer** stated the program is very impressive and are doing a great job.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B - <u>UNFINISHED BUSINESS</u>

B-1 Park Security Report

Deputy Chief Bazick stated that Deputy Chief O'Dell, Christen Smith and Karla Henderson had been regularly meeting about the information, also stated he did not have a lot of statistics and asked what information the Commission needs.

G. Nystuen stated the Commission had figures for 3 years of all of the police calls within the parks.

Deputy Chief Bazick asked if this was the report given to the Commission at the beginning of the pilot.

G. Nystuen stated now we have the calls that you have reported but it is not clear if they are all of the calls in the parks, or only those associated with this special program. They had 3 years of all of the calls in the Parks, which was approximately 600 calls each year, by month.

We don't know if these are all of the calls made to the parks 24-7 for an entire year, which we now have an entire year behind us - 2007. To see if there is any difference in the years we would need to get that for this last year, the equivalent of what we had for the previous year. She stated she had made a separate chart for the more serious incidents which really do concentrate in a few places, there were many parks where we never had a call. The ones where there are serious incidents, it would be good if a time could be put on it to get a sense of what was going on.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated if we were able to take a look at the calls by hour of the day and/or the day of the week, that would be a different picture from what was originally put together from what he recalled.

- **G. Nystuen** stated it was simply every call that the police made, it gave the Park and what kind of call it was. It was approximately 50 different categories of calls, the information was by the category, by the Park and by the month. She didn't think the information was given by the time and didn't think the time would be important except for the more serious calls. Approximately 10 were picked out that were the most criminal activities and would be good to get a better idea. It was clear that there was a concentration in certain Parks, which is expected.
- **L. Berauer** asked if data requested is what we originally asked for when the pilot started so the total can be compared with before and after.
- **G. Nystuen** stated yes, to see if there has been a significant difference of calls and activities after we emphasized this. It has been a great advantage from doing this pilot is that we are trying to coordinate information from people in Parks with Police about where problems were and if they could do a better job using Police resources than Parks, getting better coordination is a great advantage, whether there's been a

real significant difference in the amount of things going on is a little hard to tell until the four years are compared..

Deputy Chief Bazick asked if there were particular kinds of calls for service based on what PAC can remember from the initial graph that would be considered to be serious, because another way to handle this to try to simplify the information would be to categorize serious offenses versus moderate offenses.

- **G. Nystuen** expressed when she did a sub-chart of what had happened, she found the concentration in certain Parks, there were only certain parks with issues that seemed more serious, many calls were simply noise or other calls that were not considered serious.
- **S. Offen** stated that in addition to getting all of the incident information, he felt it would be very helpful to get an evaluation of how many and what hours officer's were actually on duty since this was on an as-needed basis and changed on a weekly or bi-weekly basis depending on need, now that we have had almost a year of experience it would be helpful to see what the trends are, how many hours per week were officers actually deployed between, the Police Officers and the Community Standards Officer's. He would also like information on what kind of decision making and what kind of logic went into how to deploy them and where to send them. I know this was supposed to be changing on an as-needed basis, based on the meeting of the staff and wondered how this process worked, and even if there is some anecdotal data which says that it was found there was a lot of activity in Leslie Park and therefore we had an officer go there on a regular basis over the next month and because of that we were able to curtail some incidents going on, some data to show how the system is working or not working.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated strategic resource allocation. A broader basis is done for the City with crime trends in general, we have a crime meeting twice a month and staff from shifts, the Detective Division, people from Probation Parole and the University of Michigan meet and take a look at crime trends, and we take a strategic approach to deploying resources for the coming weeks based on the location, time of day, day of week.

- **S. Offen** asked if these meetings took place and were they effective.
- **L. Berauer** asked S. Offen if what he's looking for is a more detailed breakdown than by month.
- **S. Offen** stated that he thought a month was too big a period of time.
- **T. Berla** stated what he thinks it would be very helpful to wait until summer when more hours are put in and see if one week in June, for example, to see a log of everything that occurred on a particular day at a particular park, ie on this day this officer went to Gallup Park, walked around for half an hour, including if this was for a call, something that was scheduled at a meeting, or something that was just done on the spur of the moment, what was the reason, what happened etc. These entries would give a feel of how much presence is actually in the Parks. One week with data would be helpful to visualize.

Deputy Chief Bazick passed communication to the Commission regarding patrol logs compiled since July., He explained that what Deputy Chief O'Dell had been doing was compiling the statistics from the Patrol Activity log. Each time an officer is the parks on patrol, not including calls for service where they are dispatched, the times are put in sequentially, the record will reflect exactly what the officer did and also could reference the violation if needed. The next graph provided will not look exactly like the last one because of transitions in the dispatch system this past year. This log would be the basis for compiling the type of report PAC is asking for.

- **T. Berla** stated the log is basically stating what was done on the entire shift, to see this would be helpful for a week.
- **L. Berauer** stated that overall what they are looking for in addition to more specificity, is the overall data so it can be compared to what went on before the pilot.
- **D. Barrett** stated when Christen Smith spoke of this and mentioned a violent crime at Bandemer had taken place and that having this service in place was very important in stopping this violent crime. He also asked if the logs given to the Commission would show notations that would distinguish a runaway dog versus a serious crime.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated these logs are a step back in time. They've been trying to converted these kinds of logs into electronic records, but for various reasons it hasn't completely worked out. This is the way that officers used to capture everything they did, a crime would have been noted if a report was taken and if an arrest had taken place. It might be on the log but it would certainly be on the computer-aided dispatch system. It will just be necessary to figure out how to combine the two.

D. Barrett stated a serious crime such as an assault versus a runaway dog is totally different and somehow this should be reflected in the information given to the Commission so it's possible to evaluate the importance of the program, it's not just raw data but also the contours of what is happening.

Deputy Chief Bazick asked the Commission what kind of feedback the Park Advisory Commission has received from the community since this pilot started, favorable, concerns from the public?

L. Berauer asked the Commission if anyone had heard anything from the public since the Pilot started. The response from the Commission was nothing negative has been mentioned regarding the pilot.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated if the Commission hears any feedback regarding the pilot program, let him know.

L. Berauer stated a table was in the report comparing the pros and cons of the Police versus the Park Rangers. She questioned whether the Community Standards Officers had gone into the parks before, and she believed that whatever ticketing had occurred was done by the Park Ranger. It would be helpful to have the hours worked by Community Standards Officers broken down by week rather than by month compared with the hours spent in Parks prior. She would like to get a sense from the department on whether Park Rangers at this point could be added with good effect in

terms of saving the Police Department time and labor, cost efficiencies and being able to do things that the Police cannot do, such as educational activities.

B. Macomber asked to have her memory refreshed on the timeline of the pilot program, and thought it was decided to be for the 2007-2008 fiscal year.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated that originally it was supposed to be for 90 days.

L. Berauer stated a major change took place for the funding. Originally a proposal was to be funded through the Park Millage money and ultimately the decision was made that the Park Millage money would not be used, and understood from Councilmember Kunselman it is being funded through Safety Services.

Deputy Chief Bazick confirmed that they were not receiving any funding as a subsidy. It's been factored in as part of the general fund budget to manage throughout the year.

- **L. Berauer** stated she would like an opinion from the Police on if there has been a detrimental effect on other areas of security in the City as a result of focusing more time in the Parks. Since July they have been putting in extra hours compared to what they used to do, spending more hours in the parks.
 - **S. Kunselman** stated it should be not be called extra hours, because the Police Department is here to provide general public safety, it's an additional task.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated it is directed patrol, we are not putting in more hours, there is not more than an 8 hour day required, but certainly focusing more of the 40 hour work week on time in the Parks.

- **B. Macomber** stated this pilot project that ended up getting extended from the 90 days to the 07-08 fiscal year, we now have the 08-09 year to figure a plan for Park Security, and it will take the form of a recommendation to City Council. She wondered about the timeframe for the recommendation.
- **J. Miller** stated we have a 2 year budget cycle, as part of that 2 year budget cycle, the first year of the 2 year cycle the budget plan is approved but they only have the authority to approve an annual budget. They approve the 2 year plan and as part of that they adopt the first year of the budget. This year they will approving the 2nd year of that plan. They already had the detailed information for the 2nd year, we're making adjustments to it as different cost factors change.

They will be formally receiving the budget for 08-09 in April, they are required to take action and approve that by the second meeting in May, if they do not take action by their second meeting in May, the City Administrator's recommended budget goes in place. The Park Advisory Commission should make their recommendations by the first meeting in May so that Council has time to consider your recommendations before they have to take final action on it.

B. Macomber asked what was in the second year of the budget to cover Parks Security at this point.

J. Miller stated her understanding is there are no additional resources in the budget, that if it is to continue, it will continue in the same framework that is currently being provided.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated this is also his understanding.

- **T. Berla** asked if the Commission needs to make their recommendation at the PAC April meeting so that Council can have it for their first meeting in May.
- **J. Miller** stated yes, getting the recommendation in early rather than later would be a good idea. Because it's the second year of the budget, there's a chance that Council may actually take action on the budget the first meeting in May, but they are required to do it no later than the second meeting in May.
- **L. Berauer** stated the Commission would need to see the budget for the next fiscal year at the March meeting, and put time on the April agenda to make the recommendations needed.
- **J. Miller** stated the budget may not be available for the March meeting, but can have it available for the April meeting. In terms of seeing the budget, the Commission saw it as part of the budget process last year. She stated the Commission may need to schedule a work session to discuss the budget. She agreed with T. Berla that the recommendation can be whatever PAC wants it to be and stated that she has heard nothing from Council about not continuing the program due to funding.
- **L. Berauer** asked for the extra data from Deputy Chief Bazick for the March meeting so PAC will have the extra information as they try to make their recommendation for the security budget.
- **B. Macomber** asked for clarification of the 08-09 budget and if it has a continuation of the current plan for the park security.
- **J. Miller** stated there is no money allocated from the Park's budget to cover Parks Security. Programmatically she didn't know if Council took any formal action about how it will be handled in 08-09. There is no money specifically allocated from the Parks budget and there's been no formal action by Council to say how they want parks security handled in 08-09.
- **S. Kunselman** asked the Commission if there will be a recommendation from PAC to say we would like to either a) get the Park Ranger back, b) continue with the pilot program as is, c) provide more funding to the Police Department so they will not work extra hours, but have more staff. If PAC wants that, there need to be some pretty clear ideas on what their thoughts are, ultimately he's not supporting taking any money from Park money and giving it to the Police. That's what the big fight was over the budget last year. He doubts that the administration would go for that again since it didn't work out last time, that's not to say that they don't want to see additional funding for the Police, because they want to see general security throughout the City, not just parks. Is there any concern in terms of parks security other than citizen perception, is there a need for greater Police funding for general security both in the parks and throughout the City? They need to know not just from the data and numbers, but also what the people in the parks are thinking and feeling.

PAC is the group that has the sense and pulse of what the community's desires are. He would like to know their opinions not just the numbers.

- **L. Berauer** stated that none of them have gotten emails or phone calls from community members complaining one way or another or saying it's great, they don't really know. She believes the data the Commission has asked for is really going to help them answer that question. It will also help them determine if perhaps they think a ranger could help with getting some of the things done and whether they want to recommend a resuscitation of the ranger program. She understands that PAC needs to give Council some solid recommendations. Deputy Chief Bazick to provide will help to make the decision regarding the recommendation.
- **S. Rosencrans** asked if there was a recommendation made to keep things as they are to Council.
- L. Berauer stated for this fiscal year.

S. Offen stated the opening of the Dog Parks should be evaluated in the next year or so as well. Has opening of the dog parks been successful in getting dogs off-leashes not being problems any more, or these people going to the dog parks and leaving the other parks, and if the Police Officer's have noticed any difference with dog's off leash.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated that maybe anecdotally but not necessarily with anything objective, for the dogs off-leash. He would like PAC to consider for whatever it does in the future about security, that what has been done for approximately 8 months is directing patrol time more specifically in the parks and as Councilmember Kunselman said, their responsibility is to the community at large and what may happen as time goes on, just a guess at best, there could be something else that occurs in the community that requires those resources to be redirected for a period of time which means that there would be a conflict with having them in the parks. The best examples he could think of would be how they contract with AATA. The officers have specific hours of the days and days of the week that they have to have an officer on the buses and if that officer calls in sick or takes a personal day, they have to pull someone out of patrol to get them on the buses, otherwise, they're not living up to the terms of the agreement/contract. That's a example of how the dedicated patrol and the expectation that they're there during certain periods of time is covered in an agreement. He would hate for PAC, to see over time because of something else going on in the community, the police cannot spend as much time in the Parks, as we look at the statistics we start to see things drop off as far as our time in the parks and maybe there's a correlation between a change and things going on in the parks and you haven't talked contemplated how to fill the gap, just throwing that out for consideration because that's the way that policing works. They are very reactive by nature in many cases in spite of their best efforts of trying to be proactive in catching trends before they become problems. Maybe in the long run the Park Ranger program enhances it in a way the Police can't meet, whether it's for the educational program or if nothing else visibility and presence, oftentimes presence is a big enough deterrent to make problems go away too.

G. Nystuen stated the park ranger had the authority to give parking tickets, now there is no one in the Park system that can do this and is done by Community

Standards, so it is really transferring duties, when we talk about security, issuing parking tickets is a total separate area and doesn't know if they have really tried to evaluate if there has been much change in that or not. There were 422 issued by the ranger in the year before and one of the criticisms of him was that the only thing he did in the way of issuing tickets, was parking, which has completely transferred over to Community Standards.

S. Kunselman stated the one thing about the Park Ranger is that it could *only* write parking tickets because they couldn't write tickets for any other activities such as dogs off-leash, open intoxicants, trespass etc. The Commission needs to think about that in terms of bringing a Park Ranger back because his perception is that he was not serving the function to deter crime in the Parks and believes Police have shown very good resolve in dealing with any perceptions of crime in the parks. The fact that no one has heard of anything makes it seem to him that things are going well. You only hear the complaints, not the positive. That's the kind of anecdotal information needed to get a feedback on. His perception is that it's going well and we need to continue it. Police Officers give a calming effect to families in the parks, knowing that they are there and that they can issue tickets and arrest people and deter crime. The Park Ranger could not do all that. The Park Ranger had a obviously had a lot of other benefits when it came to environmental education but we just had a presentation from Jason on Adopt-A-Park and Park Stewards and if there's going to be that kind of component, he believes it should go over there and not piecemeal this kind of effort with the Park Ranger, maybe Park Stewards could have that kind of component that a Park Ranger had. If anything it would be to put money back into the Police if in fact there was an issue of too many responsibilities. We're not going to contracts for the Parks with Police.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated in the end this would have to be evaluated and different options explored, it doesn't have to be all or nothing, because you do not want your Police Officers to take on the roll of Rangers, Nature education specialist, in the end that is not beneficial either because that is not the roll we are here for in the community.

L. Berauer asked what exactly can Community Standards actually do, they can't force people to show an id, they can issue parking tickets, what else can they do.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated he would go back to look at the provisions in the City code to see who else can take enforcement action. A lot is already defined in the City Code and we may find that there is something that has been collectively overlooked.

L. Berauer asked if this information could be given in addition to the other information the Commission has asked for.

Deputy Chief Bazick stated yes and if any questions could be coordinated through L. Berauer it would be very helpful. He can send a draft and she can tell him what needs to be tweaked.

B-2 Emerald Ash Borer report

- **L. Berauer** stated Karla Henderson was not able to attend today's meeting and they may be at the March meeting. Anyone that has any questions can send them to L. Berauer so she can include the answers in her report for next month.
- **S. Kunselman** asked at what point would no longer be called Emerald Ash Borer but then General Forestry and Parks.
- **L. Berauer** stated the interest is specifically the Emerald Ash Borer issue due to the several pots of money that was dedicated for this and that clarification needs to be given on what pots of money were used and how much was accomplished.
- **S. Kunselman** asked is there an ending date to the Emerald Ash Borer issue, and there are a lot forestry needs in the parks.
- **L. Berauer** stated it was assumed this was complete. She saw in the development activities report that at Bandemer a bid was being sent out for removing emerald ash borers, which was surprising because the impression was an extra bid did not need to go out. Maybe Amy can explain this at the next meeting.
- **T. Berla** stated there was an area where there was an abandoned piece of woods.where there are a lot of people, and the policy was to let trees fall down in the natural areas.
- **S. Kunselman** stated that again, it's not just ash trees that are an issue of these areas, there are also elm and we're not getting Dutch Elm disease reports.
- **L. Berauer** stated this was a huge millage issue that was asked for and lost and there was a lot of discussion of where the money was going to come from since the Millage was defeated. A big chunk of it was taken from the risk fund and one of the questions that she's waiting to hear is whether the risk fund needs to be reimbursed and the answer was "yes". Her next question was who was going to reimburse it.
- **S. Kunselman** stated that one of his questions was when this would end.
- **B-3** FY 08 6 Month Financial Report

Damon Thompson spoke and explained the financial report to the Commission that was included in the packet.

- **L. Berauer** asked if there were specific questions from the Commission.
- **B. Macomber** asked if the Commission could have a brief narrative of the budget explaining where they did well, here are where the concerns are, here's a variance etc.
- **D. Thompson** started with page one (page 6 of the report) and stated that expenses compared to budget are lower than last year, currently \$1.6 million which equates to 45% of the budget, revenue is doing well in comparison to last year. Revenue is up almost \$170,000.00 which equates to approximately 50% of the budget when compared to last year. One issue that has been mentioned in the administration expenditures are down slightly when you factor in all of administration. When you

look at just general administration, expenditures are down. As Dennis Simon discussed earlier, IT charges play a big role with what you see in the reduction. In terms of last year IT charges were paid primary all through central administration and now those charges have been allocated to all of the facilities and this is why you see the large expenditure drop in central administration.

On the revenue side as you can see the Park use fee, after talking to Jessica she feels the target will be met of the \$202,000.00. We've also received the operating transfer from storm water of \$85,000.00 for revenue for the general fund. When the budget was initially set up approximately 10 months ago the net for the Leslie Science Center from the general fund is set for approximately \$35,000.00. It's our goal that we're still going to reach \$35,000 between expenditures and revenue.

Another area to discuss is Cobblestone Farm, as you can see if you compare the expenditure budget you will there is a \$22,000.00 difference, a bulk of that is related to personnel charges, as you know when we initially set up the budget we proposed staff restructuring, then the cost for the person that was moved was actually absorbed in the general fund because they weren't actually to begin to work on capital projects until later in the year, one other charge that equates to the additional \$22,000.00 is in regards to a contractual services contract that we used coming in slightly higher than what was budgeted.

In terms of revenue, revenue for Cobblestone Farm, particularly the rental revenue, is actually absorbed in general administration, the park use fee. What I've proposed to do is working with Jessica to combine the facility rental budget, expenditure and revenue, and Cobblestone budget, expenditure and revenue, with some budget changes that we have to tweak so that when the budget is finalized for 08-09 you will just see the one category. The majority of the activity at Cobblestone Farm is related to facility rental so right now we have two separate categories, some activities for Cobblestone and some revenue, and then we have facility rental expenditures and park use fee. We need to combine all of that.

- **S.** Offen asked if all the rental money was moved into the Park use fee. That was a considerable amount of revenue and in 2008 there is no revenue.
- **D. Thompson** stated the majority of revenue moved into the Park use fee. The majority of revenue for facility rentals and the park use fee is in central administration.
- **C. Smith** stated we did actually move all of the rental revenue from Cobblestone Farm into the facility rentals cost center. It was a way of restructuring all the rentals in the Park system, but that revenue from Cobblestone rentals is still in the general fund. It's located on page 7 of B-3, object 6100, included in the \$202,000 for the revenue budget.
- **S.** Offen stated that it seemed odd that the revenue is being taken away from the parks and on the other hand the expenditures like the IT costs are being given to the parks.
- **J. Miller** explained the restructuring of the staff in Parks & Recreation Services particularly around Facility and Park rentals. From a customer perspective, facility

rentals, rentals of Parks and holding special events in Parks were disbursed in different places throughout the organization, and we felt we were not doing a very good job due to it being so spread out. At the beginning of this fiscal year, we took all of our facility rentals, all of our Park rentals and all our special events in Parks and have consolidated them into one operation from a customer service perspective. As part of the budget process we folded them into administration and one of the things we wanted to do early was to create a cost center around facility and parks rentals and special events. We weren't able to do that because Damon was doing other duties so effective July 1 of this fiscal year it was reflected. The problem is the way it's reporting out to you, it looks like it's all over the place because we haven't been able to re-funnel the money, the expenses and revenues, so it shows up like a cost center just like Cobblestone Farm or Buhr Park. That's what Damon is referring to, we haven't been able to do that so you can clearly see these are the expenses associated with these activities and these are the revenues. The reason why a big portion of Cobblestone's revenue is no longer showing up in Cobblestone is because it is facility rental revenue and it goes in the new cost center that we haven't created

- **S.** Offen asked if expenses are going to be taken from the individual facilities and put those over to the facility rental. He stated it seems like there would be much more to a facility rental than just the initial expense. Cobblestone Farm is going to incur a lot of other expense just by being there and the revenue is going to offset some of those expenses. I think all of the maintenance to maintain the facility, people are going to rent it because it's a very attractive facility, so how do you determine the cost of maintaining this attractive facility so that people want to rent it to the value you're going to get from the revenue you received from Cobblestone Farm.
- **J. Miller** stated that all of the facility expenses associated with the facility rental, all of the expenses associated with park rentals and special events, will be housed in one place. Part of what we factor in is we figure out what our fees for rentals are is what it costs to do some maintenance, granted we're probably not going to cover everything, but also you have to remember that certain expenses associated with the facility such as capital improvements, money we get from the old two millages and the new current one, do not show up in our operational expenses for the facility budgets, even if we're missing some of them for facility rental, we're also missing all of those expenses that are currently charged to millages that will continue to be charged to millages for all of our operations
- **B. Macomber** asked when this will be fully updated for 08-09.
- **D. Thompson** stated he wanted to point out on page 13 that revenue is up approximately \$90,000.00 at Veteran's Ice Arena and that is a tremendous accomplishment, compared with 2007 revenue, and also complimented the increased efforts of Cheryl and Dennis for the marketing efforts, particularly around the hockey league and overall rink revenue.
- **L. Berauer** stated it is nice to see positive news.
- **D. Thompson** commended the various facility mangers for doing a great job as far as sticking to their budgets, all of the managers have really tried to reduce their expenditures. So far there are no major concerns at the mid-year point, there have

been very few issues and the issues with Senior Center should be cleared up in the next several weeks that revolve around temporary pay and personnel time.

- **S.** Offen stated concerns regarding the City not doing a year-to-date budget. There is an annual budget and then you track expenses on a monthly basis and then you compare this year to last year, but there's no way to compare this year's expenses to where the budget would be as of December. There's no way to tell what the budget by the end of December should be for any of the categories. There's no report, he can't go to a computer.
- **D. Thompson** stated he could present a rough forecast.

- **S. Offen** stated this causes him to have difficulty interpreting the numbers. One example that happened early on is on the administration page (page 7) and in looking at the revenue on UM parking, this is revenue received from the University for parking at Fuller. Last year we received \$57,000, this year we only budgeted \$28,000, but we've already received \$28,000 so the question is "Is that all of the money we're going to get for this year or is that approximately equal to what we got last year?" He can't tell that from those numbers.
- **D. Thompson** answered that \$28,000 is all that will be received this year.
- **J. Miller** explained the report provides what S. Offen is looking for. In the 2008 expenditure budget and the 2008 revenue budget is what has been budgeted.
- S. Offen stated that actuals don't always track budget so he doesn't know for sure that the \$28,000 received so far year-to-date is all of the money that will be received from the University or is it that we're lucky we're getting twice as much.
- **J. Miller** stated that part of the complication is that there are anomalies with every budget for example the reason we received \$57,000.00 last year was because we received a payment that should have been received in 2006 in 2007, both payments were received in 2007.
- **S. Offen** stated that there are other examples but the point is that it's a much better evaluation tool to know where I am compared to where I thought I would be now than comparing where I am now with where I was last year at this time. The budget for this year may not be the same as the budget was for last year.
- **J. Miller** agreed and said that one of the challenges for Parks & Recreation, that is not true for Planning & Development or Community Development which are other portions of Community Services, is that by the very nature of the services we provide, every month there is not a consistent, we charge 1/12 over our budget every month, it doesn't happen that way and it makes it very difficult.
- **S. Offen** said that's exactly why there should be a monthly budget because there is the seasonality, because the costs are going to be less in winter in the summer-type parks, and they're going to be higher at the ice rinks and you have the seasonality and by budgeting on a monthly basis you can view that seasonality numerically and you can see how well you are doing compared to what I thought I would be doing, are my revenues tracking on a monthly basis to where I thought they would be

1223 1224

1225 1226 1227

1228

1229 1230 1231

1232

1233

1246 1247 1248

1253 1254 1255

1256

1261

1266 1267

1268 1269 1270

tracking. You can't do it by just comparing where you were last year. With golf for instance, if we tracked to where we were last year at Huron Hills, we may be doing better than we were last year, but we don't know how much we're hoping to do this year with all of the new programs, and hopefully that's built into the budget.

- L. Berauer asked if that was one of the things the sub-committee requested in the new format and if that was doable.
- **J. Miller** replied that she thought it would be very difficult to do.
- **B. Macomber** stated she cannot understand why the City cannot enter the budget on a monthly basis. Also asked if not being able to complete this task is due to a restriction in the City's software and if there's a plan to address that.
- **D. Thompson** stated one of his goals for fiscal year 2009 would be to create a forecasting model for Parks, Planning and Community Development so you not only have the historical piece but you have some sort of forecast that tells you month by month where you should be by May in comparison to your forecast.
- T. Berla asked if certain things can be factored in as far as if there are any expense for cutting the grass in December, factoring in any differences over the season.
- **D. Thompson** stated this is the goal, remembering that Parks is not as simple and cut and dry as Community Development but starting with the forecasting model we can use this and make any variations to it, to get to exactly what the Commission is looking for.
- **L. Berauer** asked when the forecasting model may be available.
- **D. Thompson** stated his goal was to have it prior to the end of the fiscal year.
- **B. Macomber** asked if this is something that will have to be exported to create, it's not something can be entered into the current accounting software.
- **D. Thompson** stated this will have to be created. He will be working with the Finance team to create some sort of model.
- B. Macomber stated it would be a huge help because the only thing over the past 4-5 years is that moving things from one category or program to another makes these year-to-date comparisons from the previous year almost meaningless.
- **C. Smith** stated in terms of the expenses on the monthly side, although it's not reflected, when the facility managers develop their budgets, they figure out how many hours they will need for their seasonal employees and that is how these numbers are determined. It's something that they're aware of and they work with.
- L. Berauer asked the budget committee if there are any other format requests to get these numbers available.
- **B. Macomber** stated the request was a part of the 2 year budget process, they were given a spreadsheet with the budget boiled down to a legal size page and they had

requested that it be compiled in a report form and ideally given on a quarterly basis so they could see what they basically have now on 12 pages boiled down to 1 page to make it easier for them to just see a snapshot of what's going on.

- **D. Thompson** asks if the request was for a quarterly report of the entire Parks system or just Parks & Recreation.
- **B. Macomber** stated it would be better for S. Offen, G. Nystuen and herself who is on the finance task force to meet with Tom Crawford, Damon Thompson and Jayne Miller to discuss this further.
- **S. Offen** asked what this budget would be called, if it would be all of Parks or just Parks & Recreation.
- **D. Thompson** stated this is Parks & Recreation, general fund, non-general fund, fund 18 and fund 71.
- **L. Berauer** stated the Commission would like to see the same for Park Operations as well.
- **S. Kunselman** stated that at the beginning it was mentioned that revenue was up from last year, admin expenses were down a bit and asked for an explanation of the IT charges.
- **D. Thompson** explained the IT charges showed a slight increase due to the method it was allocated, you will see a decrease in central administration because of removing IT charges, and then general increases and spikes at the facilities due to re-allocating the IT charges from central administration to all of the facilities.
- **S. Kunselman** stated that each facility gets an IT charge and out of that IT charge they are supposed to be getting services from the IT department, but they don't necessarily use all of those services from the IT department. He used the Golf Course as an example because that was one of the discussions he had with Mr. Rainey is that Leslie Golf Course gets an IT charge but yet they have created their own system for reservations that has nothing to do with the IT charge.
- J. Miller stated this was not true.

S. Kunselman asked J. Miller to explain this.

Jayne Miller explained the IT charge is a very detailed spreadsheet down to every piece of software, every piece of hardware that you have, one of the things within Parks & Recreation, particularly the facilities that makes the IT charges much higher than they are for probably the average user in the system, is that every facility is its own business, so they must have access to the City's entire financial, the AMS system, they have to have access to the HR system (Ulti-Pro), for hiring, firing, everything that has to do with personnel. They also have to have access to the budgetary system, which is BRASS, because they have to create and manage their budgets.

This is very unusual in the organization, compared to Planning & Development, only one person has all of those programs on their PC which is the manager because they manage the entire budget, all of the hiring, all of the personnel and all of the financial items. Whereas in the Parks & Recreational facility side of things, every facility supervisor is responsible for managing their own budget and personnel. Automatically they have 3 software systems on their PC that they must have to manage their operation whereas most other people in the organization don't have to do that. The cost for IT is much higher in Parks than a traditional City employee, that's how those costs are factored in and figured out for every employee or PC. The Golf Courses pay these costs because they have to access to it, the golf course staff created their own web site which is in addition to the City's Web Site, this was done above and beyond what they already have access and use of. This is being merged with IT and the City's home page so that they can be linked to each other for the public to see. That's the only thing the golf course did that was separate from the services they get from IT.

- **S. Kunselman** asked if IT deals with Parks Department differently because of their structure as opposed to other departments.
- **J. Miller** explained IT does not deal with them differently, it means the Parks facilities require more types of software because of the businesses they operate, what most employees have to have on their PCs. The services we get are the same as anybody else gets based on the technology they need to do their business.
- **S. Kunselman** asked if overall Parks pays a greater percentage of IT charges out of each facility as opposed to a larger unit like Planning & Development.
- **J. Miller** answered yes from the standpoint that, Parks & Recreation overall does not, but the recreation facilities, for example Parks Maintenance doesn't have the kind of use to disburse the City's financial system or HR system, but they have things like Citiworks (our maintenance/assessment management software system) that probably is disbursed a little more. Because there are so many assets in Parks & Recreation, they operation very differently that most other operations. There are certain kinds of software and hardware needed to do our business in Parks & Recreation when you think about that land is owned and managed, Planning & Development does not, they simply provide the service. It's really about how we have to conduct the business rather than looking at Parks & Recreation compared to other things, it's the way we do our business and the technology needed to do it.
- **D.** Barrett restated Jayne's comment that the customized nature of the Golf Courses etc is different from other more boilerplate departments in the City so consequently they need more customized IT.
- **J. Miller** disagreed that they need more customized IT, but they do need more tools to do their jobs, for example the financial system is a City-wide financial system but not as many people in Planning & Development need it as people within recreation facilities. The system by which it's utilized is an enterprise-wide system, it's just who needs to use it to do their job and provide the functions and services we need to provide. They are not more customized permutations, there are different applications that are needed to have on an average. Probably the typical employee in the organization needs the Microsoft Office suite, Excel, Word, which is standard

1372 on 1 1373 sys 1374 thir

on everyone's PC. In addition to that they need to have access to the financial system, the HR system the budget system, and Citiworks because of the number of things they have to provide.

1375 1376 1377

L. Berauer asked if the information on page 21, the Park & Recreation open space and parkland preservation millage is the Greenbelt millage.

1378 1379

D. Thompson stated yes.

1380 1381

1382

1385

1386

1387 1388

1389 1390

1391

1392

1393

L. Berauer asked if administration included salaries. For 07 the amount was \$2,536 and for 08 \$12,616 doesn't look right.

1383 1384

J. Miller explained that the \$12,000 is what has been budgeted but it should be remembered that if you go to page 23, fund 29, also says land acquisition, fund 24 is the fund where the tax levy amount comes in. The amount that the taxpayers pay and what we collect from the Millage, but remember that every land acquisition that we do, because we have bonded that money, we use the bond proceeds to pay those expenses associated with any land transactions we do, which is what fund 29 is. Based on if they're doing a land transaction or if it's an old land transaction that the Conservation Fund is working to clean up, that wouldn't get charged to the bond proceeds but would get charged to fund 24. You're not going to see the total salary costs for the Conservation Fundwe have a contract with them. For example the GIS work that our GIS staff does to do the analysis, that's a direct charge and that's going to show up in administration. It doesn't include the consultant, often the consultant's cost is under contracted services, not necessarily under Administration. They won't show up on this report because it doesn't have this level of detail. What you're seeing fund 24 under Administration is our internal cost for staff like our GIS staff who do work or if money is spent for marketing, those kinds of things that are actually City staff costs.

1398

1399

1400

1401

D. Thompson explained the consultant salary is listed under capital outlay, function 9000, which includes the contractual cost and includes the land acquisition costs.

1402 1403

1404 1405

1406

L. Berauer had some detailed questions about some of the specific park expenditures but she will email them to D. Thompson. The expectation was that we would receive the new formatted material in March, but now she understands the monthly forecasting won't be possible.

140714081409

1410

1411

D. Thompson hopes to have a different format for the cost center report prepared for the March meeting, basically a one page summary of all the facilities while still keeping a detailed attachment.

141214131414

C - <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

1415 1416

C-1 Athletic Field Lighting Policy Discussion

1417 1418

C-2 Citizen's Involvement in Golf Courses

1419 1420

1421

1422

J. Grand spoke on this issue stating there was a great deal of citizen input into what turned out to be the Park Advisory Commission's recommendations about the Golf Courses, and was very impressed with the expertise of the community. Our goal is to

include those people and to continue to receive their input because we do not want to lose that insight and that expertise.

At the same time, as a member of PAC and of the Golf Committee we don't want to abdicate our responsibility entirely to Council because we have asked Council to make a very significant financial investment in the Golf Courses at least for the time being to keep them both operating as Golf Courses. Due in part to that citizen input we want to try to see if we can make it a go. Since this Resolution was written there has been some activity from Council regarding having a separate Committee that does not have a lot of interaction with the Park Advisory Commission but instead reports directly to Council. We proposed this as an Adopt-A-Park program and I understand that might not be the best fit but I think it was in the spirit of wanting to have a citizen group but also making sure that the Park Advisory Commission stays involved and that we do not have this group that's outside acting independently and reporting to Council because there has been a great deal of time and energy invested and it is the responsibility of the Commission to continue to monitor what those recommendations are.

- **L. Berauer** stated as PAC heard from some of the emails they really want to stay involved and they have a right to stay involved. We are looking for a structure that makes the most sense. The understanding is Council did direct staff to work with this citizen's group but left it open-ended as to what the structure would be, and if a deadline was set. She was worried that staff was directed to work with the citizens group but left it completely open-ended and vague. She stated the Park Advisory Commission could facilitate and make it happen and if they are going to report directly to Council, which is great, then maybe we would want one Park Advisory Commission member in that group as well.
- **S. Kunselman** explained there are a lot of people and a lot of effort trying to make sure the golf courses are operational and on a financial stable footing. Council has not made a formal action on creating a Golf Course Advisory Committee as was talked about, nor have they heard from PAC on what a Friends of Huron Hills is. He did provide to councilmembers during their caucus the draft Resolution that J. Grand put together regarding Friends of Huron Hills. At that same meeting folks from the new Ann Arbor Golf Course Association made a presentation for the creation of a Golf Course Advisory Committee. They are balancing two entities, PAC and the citizens, all of whom have the same goals and the same objectives in terms of the operations of the golf courses. How is that balanced, created, addressed, is where it's at. Staff is being asked to come up with recommendations, ideally work with both. Speaking for himself, a Golf Course Advisory Committee with PAC members on it reporting to Council directly would be the best way to go. This is a much more specialized committee that they would like to tap into the wealth of expertise.
- **L. Berauer** stated that she believed that's what motivated J. Grand's resolution, is that there is so much professional expertise in this group of citizens that why not take advantage of it since they are so eager to help. She asked J. Miller if there was a timeline.
- **J. Miller** stated it wasn't a formal recommendation, it was that staff go start working with this group and bring something back. It was a little confusing, she got PAC's resolution and was aware that this group kind of morphed into a broader, not just

focusing on Huron Hills. She also spoke with Paul Bancel who is in this group and asked if this was a different group now saying they want to be involved in both golf courses or the group that was solely focused on Huron. He responded that they don't want to just focus on Huron, they want to be involved in both golf courses. It's the same group of people that want to focus on both Golf courses. He sent the group list and PAC got an email from Jane Lumm that was the same list. There will be a meeting scheduled with this group probably early to mid-March at the latest to start working through some of the issues and how they say them working together.

- S. Kunselman stated the expertise of this group and that they have different perspectives on how the Golf Courses should be operated that differ from what the Golf Consultant said, they are looking at it with some ideas that we don't have to spend as much money in terms of capital improvements and things of that nature and they do have a resolve to get the best bang for buck for the golf courses. He feels that is very admirable because they do have the expertise. Hopefully the structure of that Committee would include a Park Advisory Commission members, would include people outside of their association because they're obviously going to have their association and function within themselves, and he doesn't think the Golf Course Advisory Committee in draft form should be just that association as a committee reporting to Council. He thinks that it should include other recreational folks that have an idea of how we can bring in the marketing standpoint, if we do a better job of marketing, what's the best way of getting that out there and things of that nature. It's very exciting and it may be difficult to include everybody that wants to get so involved. He's hoping that for those who don't get on the Golf Course Advisory Committee, you can certainly put your energy to getting the skate park built.
- **J. Grand** stated one of the concerns with having this group operating especially outside of PAC is that there is a fine line between an advocacy group and an advisory group. If only certain citizens are involved, heir biases are going to come into the recommendations and it may not be what's ultimately best for Parks & Recreation, what's ultimately best for the golf course, it's just what is best for this more narrow group's particular interest, which is why she feels a lot of PAC members have an important role to play as well and if it's all given up, then it may become something that's driven by this interest group.
- **S. Kunselman** stated the importance of this Committee having a structure that is beyond just their association and does include PAC. There have been suggestions to include someone from the High Schools and someone from the private sector that actually runs a Golf Course. Also, any recommendations coming to PAC before it comes to Council is a good idea. It's not about stepping on PAC's toes because it is a fairly specialized operation. This proposal is based on the Kalamazoo model and certainly won't take the Kalamazoo model verbatim because they golf course advisory committee makes budget recommendations strictly for their operations, which isn't going to happen here. It does show that when you have a specialized committee working just for that operation, it might help relieve some of the pressure off of PAC to allow them to focus on other activities, not just golf.
- **B. Macomber** stated one of the other reasons we were looking at the Friends of the Parks model was to get this going as soon as possible and asked if this issue could ideally come to the next meeting.

J. Miller suggested that anyone from the Golf Committee from PAC that was working on the Golf issue should be included in the meeting that is set up with this group. It's going to happen before the March meeting and that way PAC is sitting at the table and there is a fine balance and does fall in the purview of PAC and many of PAC's comments are appropriate and by having someone sitting from PAC you bring the other perspective to the table, you also make sure that PAC's interests are being taken into consideration as the conversations go on so that as this group figures out what it's going to do and what the relationships are, that PAC is sitting at the table and involved in that and can also make a recommendation to Council.

- **J. Grand** stated that she thought they were also trying to address Parks staff concerns, there is a lot of concern that this is setting a precedent for hockey, soccer and other committees and could morph into something. It is understood that there is a unique position with golf because of all of the activity around golf but having a group that is not so dictorial is important for staff as well.
- **J. Miller** didn't disagree and thought that there are lots of examples where the intensity of a situation requires creation of a special group for a specified time period and goes away. A recent example that took an enormous amount of time was the Millage. A separate group met for over a year just focusing on the Millage, but it went away. This is the same thing where there is a concentrated effort for a period of time but doesn't become a standing kind of committee.
- **S.** Offen stated he is uncomfortable with the idea of this golf committee reporting directly to Council because it's clearly within the purview of PAC to oversee the golf courses and to take bits and pieces and have those report directly to Council does take some away from PAC's responsibility and breadth of interest. He doesn't think it is unreasonable to ask the committee to funnel things through PAC to City Council, and the committee will have one master and that master will be Council and if PAC disagrees with what the committee is recommending, Council will be listening to the committee and not necessarily to PAC.
- **L. Berauer** asked what the Golf Committee members think as far as the committee reporting line.
- **J. Grand** stated she felt this committee should come to the regular PAC meetings and then take their input report back to PAC and Council.
- **S. Rosencrans** was going to make the same point but wondered if it was now a moot point now that a dictate has come from Council.
- **J. Miller** felt that Council said that because time is of the essence, staff start working with this group, it didn't say how to do it, there was one Council member that said they wanted to report to Council but she didn't believe that was the consensus of all of Council. There was no formal resolution passed. She believes that they can start working with the group and part of the conversation can be how should the committee be formed, under what parameters does the group operate and that a recommendation come forward so that PAC can weigh in on it and ultimately the decision is probably going to be up to Council but she believes that PAC needs to be engaged in those conversations so that the framework is a recommendation from PAC and comes to Council.

- **D. Barrett** stated he shared J. Grand's concern and with all the comments he never heard anyone express PAC's concerns of the budget, the hemorrhaging of the money, which is part of what the conversation needs to be and would like, as a PAC member, to see that being part of the conversation because often it was we like it, we want to keep it, let's just keep doing it, we hired this consultant but he's wrong, so let's just keep playing golf, and his concern is that the voice of financial concern within PAC be part of that conversation, not dictated and maybe they do have a better way, but we paid someone who seemed to do a reasonable job, there seems to be a runaway committee that's between PAC and Council.
- **L. Berauer** believed there's a pretty good basis for a framework and asked if J. Grand would like to be on the committee.
- J. Grand stated yes.
- **J. Miller** will try to get started scheduling the meeting and will include S. Rosencrans, J. Lawter and J. Grand with everyone else and staff and try to get it scheduled so they can weigh in whether they can attend, and hopefully 2-3 can attend.
- **L. Berauer** asked G. Nystuen if she was part of the committee or would like to be part of the committee.
- **G. Nystuen** stated it is important to involve the people who were responsible and concerned about expenses and thinks it's very vital to go ahead, and agreed to be on the committee as well.
- **S. Kunselman** expressed his concern that the Commission may feel precedence may be set, he stated there is no precedence when you are dealing with issues in local government. He wants PAC to be open to sharing the responsibility with others who really want to be involved, not feel that there is a turf struggle.
- **L. Berauer** stated the Park Maintenance Issues will be a standing item on the agenda to bring to our attention. That will be an opportunity for any commissioner who has received any feedback from a constituent or who has walked through a park and noticed something amiss, to bring it to PAC's attention.

D - COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

D-1 Park Maintenance Issues

E - REPORT FROM PARKS AND RECREATION MANAGER

C. Smith stated in terms of the staffing for the Parks Manager and also the Operations Manager's position that a private recruiting firm called ARCUS has been hired to do a nationwide search to find candidates for these positions. ARCUS will be meeting with all of the different stakeholder's, staff and citizens, PAC, to see what the needs and skillsets are that the candidates should posses. The goal is to have a person in place by the end of the summer.

J. Miller explained she had just had a conference call with the firm and dates have been set for this process. She was very impressed with the work they did in filling the Community Development Manager's position was before they start recruiting. they meet with stakeholders over a series of two days, they meet with the staff they would supervise, organization peers, Administrator and some Council members and the Park Advisory Commission. The main idea is to get the full spectrum of who the candidate will work with, understanding of what every segment views is needed in the job, what are some of the dynamics and issues.

This will begin March 12, 2008 and March 13, 2008. They will be here and will meet with PAC. From there we will work with them to create a recruitment brochure for the recruiting, we will be scheduling interviews for May 2008, hopefully by June 2008 someone will be on board.

- **S. Offen** asked for an explanation of the responsibilities regarding the two positions that are to be filled.
- **J. Miller** explained the Parks & Recreation Manager was the position Christen Smith held. The Operation Manager position is the position that has been vacant for two years and has not been filled. Given the complexities of issues that come up within Parks & Recreation the two positions work very closely together. The Operations Manager will handle day-to-day duties that come up with staff allowing the Parks Manager to deal with PAC, or for example, the current Golf Course issue, the Millage or a major issue that comes up often with Parks, the Manager can focus on those broader policy issues, allowing the Operations Manager to take care of the day-to-day issues which PAC doesn't often see a lot of, but there are constantly things that come up and fires that have to be dealt with. It's very difficult for the Manager to take care of all of the broader issues and the day-to-day issues that invariably come up.
- **L. Berauer** asked if the Operations Manager would report to the Parks & Recreation Manager if anyone had ever been in this position.
- **J. Miller** explained in 2000 2003 there was a structure called Unit Supervisors with 3 Unit Supervisors who basically did this job. As we've downsized we've basically consolidated those 3 positions into this 1 Operations Manager position. Karla, Nancy Burghardt and Matt Warba were all Unit Supervisors
- **S.** Offen asked if this position is budgeted.

J. Miller stated yes, it has been budgeted for two years, and what has been done is Colin Smith and Matt Warba have been doing their regular duties as Facility Managers and also have taken on additional duties to fill in some of the gaps with the Operation Manager's position being vacant.

F - REPORT FROM MANAGER OF FIELD OPERATIONS

T. Berla stated we were going to talk about the lighting in the fields, but Karla Henderson was not in attendance at this month's meeting and it will be discussed at next month's meeting.

1678 L. Berauer stated Karla Henderson will be in attendance at the March meeting. Also 1679 asked T. Berla to send any questions he has via email. She would like Karla to have 1680 all of everyone's questions in advance so she can be prepared at the meeting. She 1681 also suggested the Commission think about having a group email that the public can 1682 use that will go to everyone. It can be discussed at the next meeting. 1683 1684 G - REPORT FROM RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION 1685 1686 H - REPORTS FROM RELEVANT COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND/OR TASK 1687 **FORCES** 1688 1689 PUBLIC COMMENTARY – GENERAL (3 Minutes per Speaker) **I** -1690 1691 J -CLOSED SESSION TO DEAL WITH LAND ACQUISITION ISSUES (If Applicable) 1692 1693 K -**TRANSMITTALS** 1694 1695 K-1 City Council Items Update 1696 1697 K-2 Park Project Update 1698 K-3 **PAC Work Session Summary** 1699 1700 1701 1702 K-4 Parks and Recreation Events for January – February 2008 1703 1704 K-5 Parks Advisory Commission 2008 Meeting Schedule 1705 1706 1707 There being no further business to come before the Commission, S. Rosencrans 1708 moved supported by **L. Berauer** that the meeting be adjourned. The regular meeting 1709 was adjourned at 7:15 p.m. 1710 1711 1712 1713