

**Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: April 2, 2012
 Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386**

| <u>Sent Time</u> | <u>Received Time</u> | <u>To</u> | <u>From</u> | <u>CC</u> | <u>Redactions</u> | <u>Reason for Redaction</u> |
|------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| 9:21 PM | 9:21 PM | Raymond Detter | Jane Lummm | | email | privacy |
| 9:12 PM | 9:12 PM | Margie Teall | Raymond Detter | | email | privacy |
| 9:10 PM | 9:10 PM | Margie Teall | Raymond Detter | | email | privacy |
| 8:05 PM | 8:05 PM | Jane Lummm | Raymond Detter | C. Robert Snyder | email | privacy |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Corts, Carynne

From: Lumm, Jane
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 9:21 PM
To: Raymond Detter
Subject: RE: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Ray, Thanks for the reminder – this is a helpful consideration and one I know the Public Art Commission considered when recommending this sculpture for the Justice Ctr. Appreciate that the Commission did its “due diligence” and had a good process in place for making this recommendation. Thanks to you, as well, for your commitment to and service on this cte. Still struggling w/the location/site, and wish it were more accessible to the public. Thanks for hanging in with me and for your added insight. All best, Jane

From: Raymond Detter [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 8:05 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: C. Robert Snyder
Subject: Re: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Jane,

Just keep in mind that the light art work will be constantly visible from the street for both pedestrians and street traffic as long as it is turned on.

Ray

On Apr 2, 2012, at 2:25 PM, Lumm, Jane wrote:

Dear Bob,

Thanks for your kind note, and thank YOU for your thoughtful message that initiated this exchange. Like you, I appreciate Ray's involvement in all things City and that both of you are active, involved citizens. We're here to serve you, afterall! :-)

Thanks again for your generous words, and I agree, it's good that these issues, no matter the outcome, are being openly discussed.

With gratitude to you both, Jane

(Ray, thanks again for forwarding -- had you not circled back to include me, I'd still be out-of-the-loop. Much obliged! :-)

From: C. Robert Snyder [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Mon 4/2/2012 1:53 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: Hieftje, John; Raymond Detter; Briere, Sabra; Kunselman, Stephen; Derezhinski, Tony
Subject: Re: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Dear Jane,

Very thoughtfully expressed. And my apologies for not getting it delivered to you directly (kept bouncing back) and thanks, Ray, for doing so!

If nothing else -- monies and sculpture --at least it's all out in the open, being discussed! I appreciate your addition to Council, and Ray's ever-active involvement in all things City!

Bob

On Apr 2, 2012, at 10:25 AM, Lumm, Jane wrote:

Dear Ray,

Thanks for your original note and follow-up. I am seeing your note and Robert Snyder's notes for the first time, and appreciate that you caught that the email addresses were incorrect and re-forwarded.

I appreciate your strong sentiment regarding the value of public art and that you support the selection and location of the sculpture for the Justice Building. I understand as well your point that a lighted piece was chosen so that it could be visible from the building exterior -- a very important consideration since this piece, given its location, will have very limited interior viewing access. I will be perfectly honest and share that I, too, like Councilmember Briere, and I sense the Mayor, am disappointed with the location -- it has very limited public access, and, in general, both the Municipal and Justice Centers are primarily visited and enjoyed by building occupants (know I'm stating the obvious) -- an issue that should be considered when choosing public art installations.

In my nearly five months on council, I have entered the Justice Building twice -- for my Safety Services orientation and tour and to attend Judge Burke's installation. In my comings/goings to the Municipal Center, I have often found myself thinking about users of these buildings and, typically, I've found myself in a place not unlike or dissimilar from how I viewed the public dynamic of this government building in its previous incarnation. That "place" that I find myself is one where I cannot help but appreciate that these edifices tend to be places where the general public visits on a very infrequent/irregular basis -- for those same reasons, e.g., to file a permit, submit a building proposal, pay a fee/ticket, attend a council meeting, etc., that folks have always ventured into the building. Is the building more attractive/inviting, are the customer service areas centrally located on the first floor? You bet. Does this translate into more people taking time out of their day to trek to the Larcom Building or the Justice Centers for an outing and, along the way, to view the art installations? I'm not convinced that we've accomplished that "destination" goal.

There's not an individual on council who doesn't support public art -- the differences of opinion on this topic have to do with the funding source and the issue of earmarking public dollars from taxpayer designated millage funds (utility fees, solid waste, streets, parks, municipal ctr. (aka GF), etc.). I know in this case the issue of whether/not to support this earmark was supported by the council majority, and that's not insignificant, yet, as Councilmember Briere notes, this proposal does not address the most primary issue of public space, public access. Yes, I understand that this sculpture was selected because it can be visible from the building exterior, but I can help but wonder and ask, is that adequate -- for this sum of money, I would much prefer a location that is not so pristine, secure and museum-like. The public is paying for the experience, and it seems that the experience should be more visually gratifying, interactive, accessible.

As you can see, I'm still grappling with this, and do share the concerns expressed by Councilmember Briere and Mr. Snyder. I understand and appreciate your view as well -- just trying to understand the rationale from both sides, and not yet won over by the concept of this installation in its proposed location.

Sorry to disappoint, Ray, and do sincerely appreciate your weighing-in.

Kind regards, Jane

From: Hieftje, John
Sent: Sun 4/1/2012 1:21 PM
To: 'Raymond Detter'; Lumm, Jane
Subject: RE: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Thanks Ray.

From: Raymond Detter [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2012 12:13 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Lumm, Jane
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

John and Jane,

I see that my message concerning public art in the new Justice Building did not get to you--apparently because of previous mistakes by others in email addresses. I hope this message does reach you. I feel very strongly that the importance and value of the public art we have selected for the lobby of the new Justice Building should not be held up because of arguments that the security measures in the lobby are excessive. Please read my message below.

This lighting art was clearly selected to be accessible to the public both day and night and it will be--regardless of the layout and timing of our security system for the building.

Ray

Begin forwarded message:

From: postmaster@mac.com
Date: April 1, 2012 11:15:40 AM GMT-04:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

This report relates to a message you sent with the following header fields:

Message-id: <DA54FFAC-95E2-43EC-B2A3-C5007A2BF36C@mac.com>
Date: Sun, 01 Apr 2012 11:15:24 -0400
From: Raymond Detter <[REDACTED]>
To: "Hieftje, John" <JHieftje@a2gov.org>
Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Your message cannot be delivered to the following recipients:

Recipient address: jilamm@a2gov.org
Reason: Remote SMTP server has rejected address
Diagnostic code: smtp;550 No such user (jilamm@a2gov.org)
Remote system: dns;mailfilter.a2gov.org (TCP|17.172.48.66|54889|198.108.51.2|25) (SMTP-a2gov.org - Welcome)

Original-envelope-id: 0M1T00BC63PQQ230@st11b01mm-asmt203.mac.com
Reporting-MTA: dns;st11b01mm-asmt203.mac.com (tcp-daemon)
Arrival-date: Sun, 01 Apr 2012 08:15:37 -0700 (PDT)

Original-recipient: rfc822;jilamm@a2gov.org
Final-recipient: rfc822;jilamm@a2gov.org
Action: failed
Status: 5.0.0 (Remote SMTP server has rejected address)
Remote-MTA: dns;mailfilter.a2gov.org (TCP|17.172.48.66|54889|198.108.51.2|25)

(SMTP-a2gov.org - Welcome)

Diagnostic-code: smtp;550 No such user (jlaam@a2gov.org)

From: Raymond Detter <rdetter@msa>
Date: April 1, 2012 11:15:24 AM GMT-04:00
To: "Hieftje, John" <JHieftje@a2gov.org>
Cc: "C. Robert Snyder" <csnyder@msa>, Sabra Briere <SBriere@a2gov.org>, Sandi Smith <SSmith@a2gov.org>, Stephen Kunselman <SKunselman@a2gov.org>, jlaam@a2gov.org, Mike Anglin <MAnglin@a2gov.org>, Marcia Higgins <MHiggins@a2gov.org>, Carsten Hohnke <CHohnke@a2gov.org>, Margie Teall <MTeall@a2gov.org>, Tony Derezinski <TDerezinski@a2gov.org>, Christopher Taylor <CTaylor@a2gov.org>, Dave Askins <dave.askins@annarborchronicle.com>, alliance neighborhoods <neighborhoods-alliance@griefnet.org>, Ryan Stanton <ryanstanton@annarbor.com>, Betsy Price <bprice@msa>, Peter Nagourney <nagourney@gmail.com>, Jack Eaton <jeaton@msa>, Tom Whitaker <twhitaker@gmail.com>, Anthony Pinnell <apinnell@msa>, Eppie Potts <epotts@msa>, Eppie Potts <epotts@msa>, Norman Tyler <ntyler@msa>, Marsha Chamberlin <mchamberlin@msa>, Margaret Parker <mparker@msa>, "Ilene R. Tyler" <ilene@msa>, Chris Crockett <chcrockett@msa>, Christine Brummer <cbrummer@msa>, Hugh Sonk <hsonk@msa>, Gwen Nystuen <gnystuen@msa>, John Nystuen <jnystuen@msa>, Kate West <kwest@msa>, Edward West <ewest@msa>, Ann Shriber <ashriber@msa>, Alice Ralph <aralph@msa>, Alan Haber <ahaber@msa>, Lisa Jevens <ljevans@msa>, Barb Copi <bcopi@msa>, Ann Larimore <alarimore@msa>, "Marc S. Gerstein" <mgerstein@msa>, Eleanor R Linn 1 <erlinn1@msa>, Ellen Ramsburgh <eramsburgh@msa>
Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Bob and John and Others,

I am a member of Art Task Force that selected the artist for the indoor lighting in the entry to the Justice Department Building. I want to point out that a specific requirement for the lighting art that was selected was that it would be visible both day and night to pedestrians and auto traffic on both Huron and Fifth Avenues as well as the large number of pedestrians who passed through the public entryway to both the Justice Building and the City Hall. The selection of the art, by the way, was made from 100 applicants. Let's not attack public art in one location in order to get it at another. If we are really committed to public art, we may be able to have it at an increasing number of locations.

I just got back last night from three weeks in Spain or I might have joined earlier in any public discussion that has taken place on this issue.

Ray

On Mar 31, 2012, at 5:11 PM, Hieftje, John wrote:

Hi Bob:

Hope you are well. Council Member Briere and I have discussed this installation and we share some of your concerns.

Thanks for writing,

John

From: C. Robert Snyder [<mailto:csnyder@msa>]
Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2012 4:57 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Briere, Sabra; Smith, Sandi; Kunselman, Stephen; jlaam@a2gov.org; Anglin, Mike; Higgins, Marcia; Hohnke, Carsten; Teall, Margie; Derezinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council)

Cc: Dave Askins; alliance neighborhoods; Ryan Stanton; Raymond Detter; Betsy Price; Peter Nagourney; Jack Eaton; Tom Whitaker; Anthony Pinnell; Eppie Potts; Norman Tyler; Ilene R. Tyler; Chris Crockett; Christine Brummer; Hugh Sonk; Nystuen, Gwen (PAC); John Nystuen; Kate West; Edward West; Ann Shriber; Alice Ralph; Alan Haber; Lisa Jevens; Barb Copi; Ann Larimore; Marc S. Gerstein; Eleanor R Linn 1; Ellen Ramsburgh
Subject: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

1. Mayor Hiefje and City Council Members,

Today, in a newsletter to her Ward 1 constituents, Sabra Briere alerted the public to "The City's" intention to appropriate \$150,000 for the design and construction of a large "public art" piece to be placed in the lobby (or entry atrium) of the new Justice Center on E. Huron and Fifth Avenue.

Unfortunately, for reasons cited by Council Member Briere, this "public work of art" will be seen by precious few of the tax-paying public.

1) access to the entrance lobby of the Police and Justice Building is rigidly restricted to the general public unless they are security-screened, and even then not allowed to "linger and take in" this work of art;

2) the reflective glass facade of the building makes it darn-near impossible to see from the outside anything on the inside;

3) the location of the building itself is not central to the city and its viewing/tax-paying citizens! A proposed city park/plaza further down Fifth Avenue on the "Library Lot" would seem to be a more suitable location to view, ooh and awe, now that someone's cockamamie (yes, it's spelled correctly!) idea of a convention center/hotel has been scuttled.

As a lover of the arts and taxpaying citizen having a preference for outdoor public spaces, I urge you not to approve this expenditure of \$150,000 and instead hold the money in a "trust fund" (we trust you!) for allocation toward a better, more suitable and more accessible work of art for ALL of us to see, touch, walk around, and enjoy!

Yours,
C. Robert Snyder

Resolution to Approve Professional Services Agreement With Ed Carpenter to Design, Fabricate and Install Public Art for the Ann Arbor Justice Center Lobby (\$150,000.00)

(Public Services - Craig Hupy, Interim Public Services Administrator) Attachments: Carpenter Proposal.pdf, Contract Justice Center Art Final.pdf

Corts, Carynne

From: Raymond Detter [mailto:raydetter@cityofalbuquerque.com]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 9:12 PM
To: Teall, Margie
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Margie,

For your information.

Ray

Begin forwarded message:

From: Raymond Detter <raydetter@cityofalbuquerque.com>
Date: April 2, 2012 8:05:28 PM GMT-04:00
To: "Lumm, Jane" <JLumm@a2gov.org>
Cc: "C. Robert Snyder" <csnyder@cityofalbuquerque.com>
Subject: Re: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Jane,

Just keep in mind that the light art work will be constantly visible from the street for both pedestrians and street traffic as long as it is turned on.

Ray

On Apr 2, 2012, at 2:25 PM, Lumm, Jane wrote:

Dear Bob,

Thanks for your kind note, and thank YOU for your thoughtful message that initiated this exchange. Like you, I appreciate Ray's involvement in all things City and that both of you are active, involved citizens. We're here to serve you, afterall! :-)

Thanks again for your generous words, and I agree, it's good that these issues, no matter the outcome, are being openly discussed.

With gratitude to you both, Jane

(Ray, thanks again for forwarding -- had you not circled back to include me, I'd still be out-of-the-loop. Much obliged! :-)

From: C. Robert Snyder [mailto:csnyder@cityofalbuquerque.com]
Sent: Mon 4/2/2012 1:53 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: Hieftje, John; Raymond Detter; Briere, Sabra; Kunselman, Stephen; Derezinski, Tony
Subject: Re: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Dear Jane,

Very thoughtfully expressed. And my apologies for not getting it delivered to you directly (kept bouncing back) and thanks, Ray, for doing so!

If nothing else -- monies and sculpture --at least it's all out in the open, being discussed! I appreciate your addition to Council, and Ray's ever-active involvement in all things City!

Bob

On Apr 2, 2012, at 10:25 AM, Lumm, Jane wrote:

Dear Ray,

Thanks for your original note and follow-up. I am seeing your note and Robert Snyder's notes for the first time, and appreciate that you caught that the email addresses were incorrect and re-forwarded.

I appreciate your strong sentiment regarding the value of public art and that you support the selection and location of the sculpture for the Justice Building. I understand as well your point that a lighted piece was chosen so that it could be visible from the building exterior -- a very important consideration since this piece, given its location, will have very limited interior viewing access. I will be perfectly honest and share that I, too, like Councilmember Briere, and I sense the Mayor, am disappointed with the location -- it has very limited public access, and, in general, both the Municipal and Justice Centers are primarily visited and enjoyed by building occupants (know I'm stating the obvious) -- an issue that should be considered when choosing public art installations.

In my nearly five months on council, I have entered the Justice Building twice -- for my Safety Services orientation and tour and to attend Judge Burke's installation. In my comings/goings to the Municipal Center, I have often found myself thinking about users of these buildings and, typically, I've found myself in a place not unlike or dissimilar from how I viewed the public dynamic of this government building in its previous incarnation. That "place" that I find myself is one where I cannot help but appreciate that these edifices tend to be places where the general public visits on a very infrequent/irregular basis -- for those same reasons, e.g., to file a permit, submit a building proposal, pay a fee/ticket, attend a council meeting, etc., that folks have always ventured into the building. Is the building more attractive/inviting, are the customer service areas centrally located on the first floor? You bet. Does this translate into more people taking time out of their day to trek to the Larcom Building or the Justice Centers for an outing and, along the way, to view the art installations? I'm not convinced that we've accomplished that "destination" goal.

There's not an individual on council who doesn't support public art -- the differences of opinion on this topic have to do with the funding source and the issue of earmarking public dollars from taxpayer designated millage funds (utility fees, solid waste, streets, parks, municipal ctr. (aka GF), etc.). I know in this case the issue of whether/not to support this earmark was supported by the council majority, and that's not insignificant, yet, as Councilmember Briere notes, this proposal does not address the most primary issue of public space, public access. Yes, I understand that this sculpture was selected because it can be visible from the building exterior, but I can help but wonder and ask, is that adequate -- for this sum of money, I would much prefer a location that is not so pristine, secure and museum-like. The public is paying for the experience, and it seems that the experience should be more visually gratifying, interactive, accessible.

As you can see, I'm still grappling with this, and do share the concerns expressed by Councilmember Briere and Mr. Snyder. I understand and appreciate your view as well -- just trying to understand the rationale from both sides, and not yet won over by the concept of this installation in its proposed location.

Sorry to disappoint, Ray, and do sincerely appreciate your weighing-in.

Kind regards, Jane

From: Hieftje, John
Sent: Sun 4/1/2012 1:21 PM

To: 'Raymond Detter'; Lumm, Jane
Subject: RE: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Thanks Ray.

From: Raymond Detter [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2012 12:13 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Lumm, Jane
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

John and Jane,

I see that my message concerning public art in the new Justice Building did not get to you--apparently because of previous mistakes by others in email addresses. I hope this message does reach you. I feel very strongly that the importance and value of the public art we have selected for the lobby of the new Justice Building should not be held up because of arguments that the security measures in the lobby are excessive. Please read my message below.

This lighting art was clearly selected to be accessible to the public both day and night and it will be--regardless of the layout and timing of our security system for the building.

Ray

Begin forwarded message:

From: postmaster@mac.com
Date: April 1, 2012 11:15:40 AM GMT-04:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

This report relates to a message you sent with the following header fields:

Message-id: <DA54FFAC-95E2-43EC-B2A3-C5007A2BF36C@mac.com>
Date: Sun, 01 Apr 2012 11:15:24 -0400
From: Raymond Detter <[REDACTED]>
To: "Hieftje, John" <JHieftje@a2gov.org>
Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Your message cannot be delivered to the following recipients:

Recipient address: jlaamm@a2gov.org
Reason: Remote SMTP server has rejected address
Diagnostic code: smtp;550 No such user (jlaamm@a2gov.org)
Remote system: dns;mailfilter.a2gov.org (TCP|17.172.48.66|54889|198.108.51.2|25) (SMTP-a2gov.org - Welcome)

Original-envelope-id: 0M1T00BC63PQQ230@st11b01mm-asmt203.mac.com
Reporting-MTA: dns;st11b01mm-asmt203.mac.com (tcp-daemon)
Arrival-date: Sun, 01 Apr 2012 08:15:37 -0700 (PDT)

Original-recipient: rfc822;jlaamm@a2gov.org
Final-recipient: rfc822;jlaamm@a2gov.org

Action: failed
Status: 5.0.0 (Remote SMTP server has rejected address)
Remote-MTA: dns;mailfilter.a2gov.org (TCP|17.172.48.66|54889|198.108.51.2|25)
(SMTP-a2gov.org - Welcome)
Diagnostic-code: smtp;550 No such user (j~~lamm~~@a2gov.org)

From: Raymond Detter <~~rdetter@annarbor.com~~>
Date: April 1, 2012 11:15:24 AM GMT-04:00
To: "Hieftje, John" <JHieftje@a2gov.org>
Cc: "C. Robert Snyder" <~~csnyder@annarbor.com~~>, Sabra Briere <SBriere@a2gov.org>, Sandi Smith <SSmith@a2gov.org>, Stephen Kunselman <SKunselman@a2gov.org>, j~~lamm~~@a2gov.org, Mike Anglin <MAnglin@a2gov.org>, Marcia Higgins <MHiggins@a2gov.org>, Carsten Hohnke <CHohnke@a2gov.org>, Margie Teall <MTeall@a2gov.org>, Tony Derezinski <TDerezinski@a2gov.org>, Christopher Taylor <CTaylor@a2gov.org>, Dave Askins <dave.askins@annarborchronicle.com>, alliance neighborhoods <neighborhoods-alliance@griefnet.org>, Ryan Stanton <ryanstanton@annarbor.com>, Betsy Price <~~bprice@annarbor.com~~>, Peter Nagourney <~~pnagourney@annarbor.com~~>, Jack Eaton <j~~eaton~~@a2gov.org>, Tom Whitaker <~~twhitaker@annarbor.com~~>, Anthony Pinnell <~~apinnell@annarbor.com~~>, Eppie Potts <~~epotts@annarbor.com~~>, Eppie Potts <~~epotts@annarbor.com~~>, Norman Tyler <~~ntyler@annarbor.com~~>, Marsha Chamberlin <~~mchamberlin@annarbor.com~~>, Margaret Parker <~~mparker@annarbor.com~~>, "Ilene R. Tyler" <~~ilene@annarbor.com~~>, Chris Crockett <~~ccrockett@annarbor.com~~>, Christine Brummer <~~cbrummer@annarbor.com~~>, Hugh Sonk <~~hsonk@annarbor.com~~>, Gwen Nystuen <~~gnystuen@annarbor.com~~>, John Nystuen <~~jnystuen@annarbor.com~~>, Kate West <~~kwest@umich.edu~~>, Edward West <~~ewest@umich.edu~~>, Ann Shriber <~~ashriber@annarbor.com~~>, Alice Ralph <~~aralph@annarbor.com~~>, Alan Haber <~~ahaber@annarbor.com~~>, Lisa Jevens <~~ljevens@annarbor.com~~>, Barb Copi <~~bcopi@annarbor.com~~>, Ann Larimore <~~alarimore@annarbor.com~~>, "Marc S. Gerstein" <~~msgerstein@annarbor.com~~>, Eleanor R Linn 1 <~~elinn1@annarbor.com~~>, Ellen Ramsburgh <~~eramsburgh@annarbor.com~~>
Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Bob and John and Others,

I am a member of Art Task Force that selected the artist for the indoor lighting in the entry to the Justice Department Building. I want to point out that a specific requirement for the lighting art that was selected was that it would be visible both day and night to pedestrians and auto traffic on both Huron and Fifth Avenues as well as the large number of pedestrians who passed through the public entryway to both the Justice Building and the City Hall. The selection of the art, by the way, was made from 100 applicants. Let's not attack public art in one location in order to get it at another. If we are really committed to public art, we may be able to have it at an increasing number of locations.

I just got back last night from three weeks in Spain or I might have joined earlier in any public discussion that has taken place on this issue.

Ray

On Mar 31, 2012, at 5:11 PM, Hieftje, John wrote:

Hi Bob:

Hope you are well. Council Member Briere and I have discussed this installation and we share some of your concerns.

Thanks for writing,

John

From: C. Robert Snyder [mailto:csnyder@cityofannarbor.com]

Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2012 4:57 PM

To: Hieftje, John; Briere, Sabra; Smith, Sandi; Kunselman, Stephen; jlammm@a2gov.org; Anglin, Mike; Higgins, Marcia; Hohnke, Carsten; Teall, Margie; Derezinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council)

Cc: Dave Askins; alliance neighborhoods; Ryan Stanton; Raymond Detter; Betsy Price; Peter Nagourney; Jack Eaton; Tom Whitaker; Anthony Pinnell; Eppie Potts; Eppie Potts; Norman Tyler; Ilene R. Tyler; Chris Crockett; Christine Brummer; Hugh Sonk; Nystuen, Gwen (PAC); John Nystuen; Kate West; Edward West; Ann Shriber; Alice Ralph; Alan Haber; Lisa Jevens; Barb Copi; Ann Larimore; Marc S. Gerstein; Eleanor R Linn 1; Ellen Ramsburgh

Subject: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

1. Mayor Hieftje and City Council Members,

Today, in a newsletter to her Ward 1 constituents, Sabra Briere alerted the public to "The City's" intention to appropriate \$150,000 for the design and construction of a large "public art" piece to be placed in the lobby (or entry atrium) of the new Justice Center on E. Huron and Fifth Avenue.

Unfortunately, for reasons cited by Council Member Briere, this "public work of art" will be seen by precious few of the tax-paying public.

- 1) access to the entrance lobby of the Police and Justice Building is rigidly restricted to the general public unless they are security-screened, and even then not allowed to "linger and take in" this work of art;
- 2) the reflective glass facade of the building makes it darn-near impossible to see from the outside anything on the inside;
- 3) the location of the building itself is not central to the city and its viewing/tax-paying citizens! A proposed city park/plaza further down Fifth Avenue on the "Library Lot" would seem to be a more suitable location to view, ooh and awe, now that someone's cockamamie (yes, it's spelled correctly!) idea of a convention center/hotel has been scuttled.

As a lover of the arts and taxpaying citizen having a preference for outdoor public spaces, I urge you not to approve this expenditure of \$150,000 and instead hold the money in a "trust fund" (we trust you!) for allocation toward a better, more suitable and more accessible work of art for ALL of us to see, touch, walk around, and enjoy!

Yours,
C. Robert Snyder

Resolution to Approve Professional Services Agreement With Ed Carpenter to Design, Fabricate and Install Public Art for the Ann Arbor Justice Center Lobby (\$150,000.00)

Corts, Carynne

From: Raymond Detter [redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 9:10 PM
To: Teall, Margie
Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Margie,

I just got back yesterday from three weeks in Spain and I have to chair two important organizational meetings on Tuesday. These emails on the Justice Building Art Work were near the top of over 400 emails, phone calls, etc. I responded to Bob's comments because I just thought they were absolutely wrong. I didn't realize that this had become a significant issue until I received a phone call from Sabra Briere shortly after I sent my email to all of you. In a long conversation with Sabra, I made clear that I disagreed with her position on our public art in the Justice Building. Today I received an email from Jane Lumm (I will pass it on to you). I also briefly let her know that I disagreed with her position as well. I wanted to recommend that she get a fitting for a straight jacket. So--unfortunately I can't be anywhere until I also do a presentation to the DDA on Wednesday at 12:00. After that, I will be wherever I might be of use on this issue or any other. Just let me know.

Now, my copying machine has collapsed. Shit just does happen.

Ray

On Apr 2, 2012, at 12:42 PM, Teall, Margie wrote:

Hi Aaron,

Please be prepared to answer questions regarding how much electricity will be used to keep the sculpture lit, tonight. Do you know who will be there tonight? Ray, will you be joining us?

Thanks.

-Margie

From: C. Robert Snyder [mailto:crsnyder@lamms.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2012 3:21 PM
To: Raymond Detter
Cc: Hieftje, John; Briere, Sabra; Smith, Sandi; Kunselman, Stephen; jlamm@a2gov.org; Anglin, Mike; Higgins, Marcia; Hohnke, Carsten; Teall, Margie; Derezinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council); Dave Askins; alliance neighborhoods; Ryan Stanton; Peter Nagourney; Jack Eaton; Tom Whitaker; Anthony Pinnell; Eppie Potts; Eppie Potts; Norman Tyler; Marsha Chamberlin; Margaret Parker; Ilene R. Tyler; Chris Crockett; Christine Brummer; Hugh Sonk; Nystuen, Gwen (PAC); John Nystuen; Kate West; Gary Supanich; Edward West; Ann Shriber; Alice Ralph; Alan Haber; Lisa Jevens; Barb Copi; Ann Larimore; Marc S. Gerstein; Eleanor R Linn 1; Ellen Ramsburgh
Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Ray and Irene too (with copies to John, Sabra),

Oops! Stepped in it again! There are so many darned task forces you wonder how anything gets done! Or maybe because there are so many, that's how and why things get done!

Anyway, that being the case, I think the questions Sabra raised in writing still warrant some consideration.

First, while both E. Huron and N. Fifth do have a lot of vehicular traffic, in the case of N. Fifth it's running north to south and could only be seen if drivers looked over their shoulders. E. Huron traffic would have a better view for those driving east to west; west to east, the view sort of sneaks up on drivers/passenger only almost only as E. Huron crosses Fifth, heading east.

Second, as for pedestrian walk-by/walk-in traffic goes, the per-hour foot traffic has yet to be calculated but for certain is considerably less than north-south-east-west foot traffic south of E. Huron (the Library Lot being one of the expected get-out-and-walk locales downtown).

Lastly, while I like things that light up, I have to wonder in whose budget, especially in lean or mean times, the additional art-wattage will have a line-item? I was shocked to hear several months ago, at a neighborhood "we want your input" meeting led by a member of the city's Parks (or Planning) team, at Angell School, that when I brought up the topic of having just one loan bulb on a light pole back in the far northeast corner, near some shrubbery and bushes, for safety of the nighttime users, I was told that there was a "No New Lights" decree from on-high, as a budget-slashing measure! Our brand new City Administrator was also present and heard the blackout policy being put forth! And the Justice Department Building light sculpture is going to have how much wattage?

I'm all for art. My BS from U of M is in Industrial Design. I worked a total of 13 years for Herman Miller, one of the top design furniture companies. I set up and taught a graduate degree program in Facility Design and Management at Michigan State. I am an avid buyer and displayer of fine and some not-so-fine art. I am all for spreading the benefits and joys of having good art, indoors and out, complimenting good designed buildings! I leave it to Council and citizen participation groups to slug it out!

Go van Gogh!
C. Robert Snyder

On Apr 1, 2012, at 11:15 AM, Raymond Detter wrote:

Bob and John and Others,

I am a member of Art Task Force that selected the artist for the indoor lighting in the entry to the Justice Department Building. I want to point out that a specific requirement for the lighting art that was selected was that it would be visible both day and night to pedestrians and auto traffic on both Huron and Fifth Avenues as well as the large number of pedestrians who passed through the public entryway to both the Justice Building and the City Hall. The selection of the art, by the way, was made from 100 applicants. Let's not attack public art in one location in order to get it at another. If

we are really committed to public art, we may be able to have it at an increasing number of locations.

I just got back last night from three weeks in Spain or I might have joined earlier in any public discussion that has taken place on this issue.

Ray

On Mar 31, 2012, at 5:11 PM, Hieftje, John wrote:

Hi Bob:

Hope you are well. Council Member Briere and I have discussed this installation and we share some of your concerns.

Thanks for writing,

John

From: C. Robert Snyder [mailto:csnyder@cityofannarbor.com]

Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2012 4:57 PM

To: Hieftje, John; Briere, Sabra; Smith, Sandi; Kunselman, Stephen; jlamm@a2gov.org; Anglin, Mike; Higgins, Marcia; Hohnke, Carsten; Teall, Margie; Derezinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council)

Cc: Dave Askins; alliance neighborhoods; Ryan Stanton; Raymond Detter; Betsy Price; Peter Nagourney; Jack Eaton; Tom Whitaker; Anthony Pinnell; Eppie Potts; Eppie Potts; Norman Tyler; Ilene R. Tyler; Chris Crockett; Christine Brummer; Hugh Sonk; Nystuen, Gwen (PAC); John Nystuen; Kate West; Edward West; Ann Shriber; Alice Ralph; Alan Haber; Lisa Jevens; Barb Copi; Ann Larimore; Marc S. Gerstein; Eleanor R Linn 1; Ellen Ramsburgh

Subject: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

1. Mayor Hiefje and City Council Members,

Today, in a newsletter to her Ward 1 constituents, Sabra Briere alerted the public to "The City's" intention to appropriate \$150,000 for the design and construction of a large "public art" piece to be placed in the lobby (or entry atrium) of the new Justice Center on E. Huron and Fifth Avenue.

Unfortunately, for reasons cited by Council Member Briere, this "public work of art" will be seen by precious few of the tax-paying public.

1) access to the entrance lobby of the Police and Justice Building is rigidly restricted to the general public unless they are security-screened, and even then not allowed to "linger and take in" this work of art;

2) the reflective glass facade of the building makes it darn-near impossible to see from the outside anything on the inside;

3) the location of the building itself is not central to the city and its viewing/tax-paying citizens! A proposed city park/plaza further down Fifth Avenue on the "Library Lot" would seem to be a more suitable location to view, ooh and awe, now that someone's cockamamie (yes, it's spelled correctly!) idea of a convention center/hotel has been scuttled.

As a lover of the arts and taxpaying citizen having a preference for outdoor public spaces, I urge you not to approve this expenditure of \$150,000 and instead hold the money in a "trust fund" (we trust you!) for allocation toward a better, more suitable and more accessible work of art for ALL of us to see, touch, walk around, and enjoy!

Yours,
C. Robert Snyder

Resolution to Approve Professional Services Agreement With Ed Carpenter to Design, Fabricate and Install Public Art for the Ann Arbor Justice Center Lobby (\$150,000.00)

(Public Services - Craig Hupy, Interim Public Services Administrator) Attachments: Carpenter Proposal.pdf, Contract Justice Center Art Final.pdf

Corts, Carynne

From: Beaudry, Jacqueline
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 8:54 PM
To: *City Council Members (All)
Cc: Powers, Steve; Postema, Stephen
Subject: FW: DC1

Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk

Please Note: The City Clerk's Office has relocated back to City Hall.

City Clerk's Office | Guy C. Larcom City Hall | 301 E. Huron, 2nd Floor · Ann Arbor · MI · 48104

734.794.6140 (O) · 734.994.8296 (F) |

jbeaudry@a2gov.org | www.a2gov.org

☑ Think Green! Please don't print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary.

-----Original Message-----

From: Smith, Sandi

Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 7:18 PM

To: Beaudry, Jacqueline

Subject: DC1

Resolved that this resolution may be rescinded or amended by the City Council at any regular meeting or at any special meeting called for that purpose.

Sandi Smith

Ann Arbor City Council Member

First Ward

ssmith@a2gov.org

o: 734-302-3011

c: 734-216-6414

"There is nothing wrong with change, if it is in the right direction" ~ Winston Churchill

Corts, Carynne

From: Raymond Detter [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 8:05 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: C. Robert Snyder
Subject: Re: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Jane,

Just keep in mind that the light art work will be constantly visible from the street for both pedestrians and street traffic as long as it is turned on.

Ray

On Apr 2, 2012, at 2:25 PM, Lumm, Jane wrote:

Dear Bob,

Thanks for your kind note, and thank YOU for your thoughtful message that initiated this exchange. Like you, I appreciate Ray's involvement in all things City and that both of you are active, involved citizens. We're here to serve you, afterall! :-)

Thanks again for your generous words, and I agree, it's good that these issues, no matter the outcome, are being openly discussed.

With gratitude to you both, Jane

(Ray, thanks again for forwarding -- had you not circled back to include me, I'd still be out-of-the-loop. Much obliged! :-)

From: C. Robert Snyder [<mailto:chazsnyd@me.com>]
Sent: Mon 4/2/2012 1:53 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: Hieftje, John; Raymond Detter; Briere, Sabra; Kunselman, Stephen; Derezinski, Tony
Subject: Re: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Dear Jane,

Very thoughtfully expressed. And my apologies for not getting it delivered to you directly (kept bouncing back) and thanks, Ray, for doing so!

If nothing else -- monies and sculpture --at least it's all out in the open, being discussed! I appreciate your addition to Council, and Ray's ever-active involvement in all things City!

Bob

On Apr 2, 2012, at 10:25 AM, Lumm, Jane wrote:

Dear Ray,

Thanks for your original note and follow-up. I am seeing your note and Robert Snyder's notes for the first time, and appreciate that you caught that the email addresses were incorrect and re-forwarded.

I appreciate your strong sentiment regarding the value of public art and that you support the selection and location of the sculpture for the Justice Building. I understand as well your point that a lighted piece was chosen so that it could be visible from the building exterior -- a very important consideration since this piece, given its location, will have very limited interior viewing access. I will be perfectly honest and share that I, too, like Councilmember Briere, and I sense the Mayor, am disappointed with the location -- it has very limited public access, and, in general, both the Municipal and Justice Centers are primarily visited and enjoyed by building occupants (know I'm stating the obvious) -- an issue that should be considered when choosing public art installations.

In my nearly five months on council, I have entered the Justice Building twice -- for my Safety Services orientation and tour and to attend Judge Burke's installation. In my comings/goings to the Municipal Center, I have often found myself thinking about users of these buildings and, typically, I've found myself in a place not unlike or dissimilar from how I viewed the public dynamic of this government building in its previous incarnation. That "place" that I find myself is one where I cannot help but appreciate that these edifices tend to be places where the general public visits on a very infrequent/irregular basis -- for those same reasons, e.g., to file a permit, submit a building proposal, pay a fee/ticket, attend a council meeting, etc., that folks have always ventured into the building. Is the building more attractive/inviting, are the customer service areas centrally located on the first floor? You bet. Does this translate into more people taking time out of their day to trek to the Larcom Building or the Justice Centers for an outing and, along the way, to view the art installations? I'm not convinced that we've accomplished that "destination" goal.

There's not an individual on council who doesn't support public art -- the differences of opinion on this topic have to do with the funding source and the issue of earmarking public dollars from taxpayer designated millage funds (utility fees, solid waste, streets, parks, municipal ctr. (aka GF), etc.). I know in this case the issue of whether/not to support this earmark was supported by the council majority, and that's not insignificant, yet, as Councilmember Briere notes, this proposal does not address the most primary issue of public space, public access. Yes, I understand that this sculpture was selected because it can be visible from the building exterior, but I can help but wonder and ask, is that adequate -- for this sum of money, I would much prefer a location that is not so pristine, secure and museum-like. The public is paying for the experience, and it seems that the experience should be more visually gratifying, interactive, accessible.

As you can see, I'm still grappling with this, and do share the concerns expressed by Councilmember Briere and Mr. Snyder. I understand and appreciate your view as well -- just trying to understand the rationale from both sides, and not yet won over by the concept of this installation in its proposed location.

Sorry to disappoint, Ray, and do sincerely appreciate your weighing-in.

Kind regards, Jane

From: Hieftje, John
Sent: Sun 4/1/2012 1:21 PM
To: 'Raymond Detter'; Lumm, Jane
Subject: RE: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Thanks Ray.

From: Raymond Detter [mailto:]
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2012 12:13 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Lumm, Jane
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

John and Jane,

I see that my message concerning public art in the new Justice Building did not get to you--apparently because of previous mistakes by others in email addresses. I hope this message does reach you. I feel very strongly that

the importance and value of the public art we have selected for the lobby of the new Justice Building should not be held up because of arguments that the security measures in the lobby are excessive. Please read my message below.

This lighting art was clearly selected to be accessible to the public both day and night and it will be--regardless of the layout and timing of our security system for the building.

Ray

Begin forwarded message:

From: postmaster@mac.com
Date: April 1, 2012 11:15:40 AM GMT-04:00
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

This report relates to a message you sent with the following header fields:

Message-id: <DA54FFAC-95E2-43EC-B2A3-C5007A2BF36C@mac.com>
Date: Sun, 01 Apr 2012 11:15:24 -0400
From: Raymond Detter <raydett@mac.com>
To: "Hieftje, John" <JHieftje@a2gov.org>
Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Your message cannot be delivered to the following recipients:

Recipient address: jlaamm@a2gov.org
Reason: Remote SMTP server has rejected address
Diagnostic code: smtp;550 No such user (jlaamm@a2gov.org)
Remote system: dns;mailfilter.a2gov.org (TCP|17.172.48.66|54889|198.108.51.2|25) (SMTP-a2gov.org - Welcome)

Original-envelope-id: 0M1T00BC63PQQ230@st11b01mm-asmt203.mac.com
Reporting-MTA: dns;st11b01mm-asmt203.mac.com (tcp-daemon)
Arrival-date: Sun, 01 Apr 2012 08:15:37 -0700 (PDT)

Original-recipient: rfc822;jlaamm@a2gov.org
Final-recipient: rfc822;jlaamm@a2gov.org
Action: failed
Status: 5.0.0 (Remote SMTP server has rejected address)
Remote-MTA: dns;mailfilter.a2gov.org (TCP|17.172.48.66|54889|198.108.51.2|25) (SMTP-a2gov.org - Welcome)
Diagnostic-code: smtp;550 No such user (jlaamm@a2gov.org)

From: Raymond Detter <raydett@mac.com>
Date: April 1, 2012 11:15:24 AM GMT-04:00
To: "Hieftje, John" <JHieftje@a2gov.org>
Cc: "C. Robert Snyder" <chazsnyd@me.com>, Sabra Briere <SBriere@a2gov.org>, Sandi Smith <SSmith@a2gov.org>, Stephen Kunselman <SKunselman@a2gov.org>, jlaamm@a2gov.org, Mike Anglin <MAnglin@a2gov.org>, Marcia Higgins <MHiggins@a2gov.org>, Carsten Hohnke <CHohnke@a2gov.org>, Margie Teall <MTeall@a2gov.org>, Tony Derezinski <TDerezinski@a2gov.org>, Christopher Taylor <CTaylor@a2gov.org>, Dave Askins <dave.askins@annarborchronicle.com>, alliance neighborhoods <neighborhoods-alliance@griefnet.org>, Ryan Stanton <ryanstanton@annarbor.com>, Betsy Price <betsyprice@annarbor.com>, Peter Nagourney <peter.nagourney@annarbor.com>, Jack Eaton <jack.eaton@annarbor.com>, Tom Whitaker <tom.whitaker@annarbor.com>, Anthony Pinnell <anthony.pinnell@annarbor.com>, Eppie Potts <eppie.potts@annarbor.com>, Eppie Potts

<[REDACTED]>, Norman Tyler <[REDACTED]>, Marsha Chamberlin <[REDACTED]>, Margaret Parker <[REDACTED]>, "Ilene R. Tyler" <[REDACTED]>, Chris Crockett <[REDACTED]>, Christine Brummer <[REDACTED]>, Hugh Sonk <[REDACTED]>, Gwen Nystuen <[REDACTED]>, John Nystuen <[REDACTED]>, Kate West <[REDACTED]>, Edward West <[REDACTED]>, Ann Shriber <[REDACTED]>, Alice Ralph <[REDACTED]>, Alan Haber <[REDACTED]>, Lisa Jevens <[REDACTED]>, Barb Copi <[REDACTED]>, Ann Larimore <[REDACTED]>, "Marc S. Gerstein" <[REDACTED]>, Eleanor R Linn 1 <[REDACTED]>, Ellen Ramsburgh <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

Bob and John and Others,

I am a member of Art Task Force that selected the artist for the indoor lighting in the entry to the Justice Department Building. I want to point out that a specific requirement for the lighting art that was selected was that it would be visible both day and night to pedestrians and auto traffic on both Huron and Fifth Avenues as well as the large number of pedestrians who passed through the public entryway to both the Justice Building and the City Hall. The selection of the art, by the way, was made from 100 applicants. Let's not attack public art in one location in order to get it at another. If we are really committed to public art, we may be able to have it at an increasing number of locations.

I just got back last night from three weeks in Spain or I might have joined earlier in any public discussion that has taken place on this issue.

Ray

On Mar 31, 2012, at 5:11 PM, Hieftje, John wrote:

Hi Bob:

Hope you are well. Council Member Briere and I have discussed this installation and we share some of your concerns.

Thanks for writing,

John

From: C. Robert Snyder <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2012 4:57 PM

To: Hieftje, John; Briere, Sabra; Smith, Sandi; Kunselman, Stephen; jamm@a2gov.org; Anglin, Mike; Higgins, Marcia; Hohnke, Carsten; Teall, Margie; Derezinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council)

Cc: Dave Askins; alliance neighborhoods; Ryan Stanton; Raymond Detter; Betsy Price; Peter Nagourney; Jack Eaton; Tom Whitaker; Anthony Pinnell; Eppie Potts; Eppie Potts; Norman Tyler; Ilene R. Tyler; Chris Crockett; Christine Brummer; Hugh Sonk; Nystuen, Gwen (PAC); John Nystuen; Kate West; Edward West; Ann Shriber; Alice Ralph; Alan Haber; Lisa Jevens; Barb Copi; Ann Larimore; Marc S. Gerstein; Eleanor R Linn 1; Ellen Ramsburgh

Subject: "Public Art", but Not for the Public to See!

1. Mayor Hiefje and City Council Members,

Today, in a newsletter to her Ward 1 constituents, Sabra Briere alerted the public to "The City's" intention to appropriate \$150,000 for the design and construction of a large "public

art" piece to be placed in the lobby (or entry atrium) of the new Justice Center on E. Huron and Fifth Avenue.

Unfortunately, for reasons cited by Council Member Briere, this "public work of art" will be seen by precious few of the tax-paying public.

- 1) access to the entrance lobby of the Police and Justice Building is rigidly restricted to the general public unless they are security-screened, and even then not allowed to "linger and take in" this work of art;
- 2) the reflective glass facade of the building makes it darn-near impossible to see from the outside anything on the inside;
- 3) the location of the building itself is not central to the city and its viewing/tax-paying citizens! A proposed city park/plaza further down Fifth Avenue on the "Library Lot" would seem to be a more suitable location to view, ooh and awe, now that someone's cockamamie (yes, it's spelled correctly!) idea of a convention center/hotel has been scuttled.

As a lover of the arts and taxpaying citizen having a preference for outdoor public spaces, I urge you not to approve this expenditure of \$150,000 and instead hold the money in a "trust fund" (we trust you!) for allocation toward a better, more suitable and more accessible work of art for ALL of us to see, touch, walk around, and enjoy!

Yours,
C. Robert Snyder

Resolution to Approve Professional Services Agreement With Ed Carpenter to Design, Fabricate and Install Public Art for the Ann Arbor Justice Center Lobby (\$150,000.00)

(Public Services - Craig Hupy, Interim Public Services Administrator) Attachments: Carpenter Proposal.pdf, Contract Justice Center Art Final.pdf

Corts, Carynne

From: Crawford, Tom
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2012 7:06 PM
To: *City Council Members (All)
Subject: Feb 12 Monthly Financial Report
Attachments: Council Report - 02.29.12 revised.pdf

It appears I neglected to send the Feb. monthly report last month. My apologies. Please see attached. I'll have the March report to you before you next Council meeting.

Tom

**City of Ann Arbor
General Fund**

For the month ending February 2012 (67% through the year)

| Account Type | Revenue | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------|--|--|--|
| | Column Labels | | | | | Fiscal Year 2011 | | | | | Fiscal Year 2012 | | | | |
| | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used | | | |
| 0010 General | 79,921,252 | 67,324,841 | 12,596,411 | 84% | 77,987,857 | 67,437,188 | 10,550,669 | 86% | | | | | | | |
| Taxes | 49,389,214 | 49,709,710 | (320,496) | 101% | 49,020,805 | 48,578,903 | 441,902 | 99% | | | | | | | |
| Licenses, Permits & Registrations | 1,195,950 | 980,781 | 215,169 | 82% | 1,309,350 | 884,523 | 424,827 | 68% | | | | | | | |
| Intergovernmental Revenues | 11,451,880 | 4,955,422 | 6,496,458 | 43% | 10,923,423 | 8,441,727 | 2,481,696 | 77% | | | | | | | |
| Charges For Services | 5,261,897 | 3,428,251 | 1,833,646 | 65% | 5,441,362 | 3,140,960 | 2,300,402 | 58% | | | | | | | |
| Fines & Forfeits | 4,756,999 | 2,576,339 | 2,180,660 | 54% | 4,462,745 | 2,588,460 | 1,874,285 | 58% | | | | | | | |
| Investment Income | 786,097 | 356,037 | 430,060 | 45% | 335,343 | 316,296 | 19,047 | 94% | | | | | | | |
| Miscellaneous Revenue | 570,181 | 356,023 | 214,158 | 62% | 721,612 | 179,174 | 542,438 | 25% | | | | | | | |
| Contributions | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | 10% | 1,000 | 1,570 | (570) | 157% | | | | | | | |
| Operating Transfers In | 3,208,345 | 2,780,867 | 427,478 | 87% | 2,808,396 | 1,353,927 | 1,454,469 | 48% | | | | | | | |
| Intragovernmental Sales | 3,299,689 | 2,181,310 | 1,118,379 | 66% | 2,963,821 | 1,951,648 | 1,012,173 | 66% | | | | | | | |
| Grand Total | 79,921,252 | 67,324,841 | 12,596,411 | 84% | 77,987,857 | 67,437,188 | 10,550,669 | 86% | | | | | | | |

| Account Type | Expenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------|--|--|--|
| | Column Labels | | | | | Fiscal Year 2011 | | | | | Fiscal Year 2012 | | | | |
| | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used | | | |
| 002 Community Development | 82,165,945 | 53,675,578 | 28,490,368 | 65% | 79,549,025 | 53,861,549 | 25,687,476 | 68% | | | | | | | |
| Personnel Services | 2,136,896 | 1,097,160 | 1,039,736 | 51% | 2,013,654 | 1,049,887 | 963,767 | 52% | | | | | | | |
| Personnel Services-Other | 263,340 | 160,387 | 102,953 | 61% | 241,439 | 136,143 | 105,296 | 56% | | | | | | | |
| Payroll Fringes | - | 2,603 | (2,603) | - | - | 2,264 | (2,264) | - | | | | | | | |
| Employee Allowances | 146,468 | 94,497 | 51,971 | 65% | 148,679 | 91,398 | 57,281 | 61% | | | | | | | |
| Other Services | 288,417 | 85,013 | 203,404 | 29% | 2,765 | 1,020 | 1,745 | 37% | | | | | | | |
| Other Charges | 162,927 | 128,624 | 34,303 | 79% | 217,389 | 114,316 | 103,073 | 53% | | | | | | | |
| CDBG Recipients | 1,275,744 | 626,036 | 649,708 | 49% | 1,587,753 | 125,835 | 32,918 | 79% | | | | | | | |
| 010 Mayor | 355,096 | 227,980 | 127,116 | 64% | 362,496 | 243,047 | 119,449 | 67% | | | | | | | |
| Personnel Services | 34,212 | 154,275 | (120,063) | 451% | 34,210 | 162,778 | (128,568) | 476% | | | | | | | |
| Personnel Services-Other | 201,576 | (571) | 202,147 | 0% | 201,556 | - | 201,556 | 0% | | | | | | | |
| Payroll Fringes | 33,192 | 22,091 | 11,101 | 67% | 40,907 | 24,483 | 16,424 | 60% | | | | | | | |
| Other Services | 7,966 | 376 | 7,590 | 5% | 2,500 | 918 | 1,582 | 37% | | | | | | | |
| Other Charges | 77,238 | 51,344 | 25,894 | 66% | 82,423 | 54,799 | 27,624 | 66% | | | | | | | |
| Materials & Supplies | 912 | 464 | 448 | 51% | 900 | 69 | 831 | 8% | | | | | | | |

| Row Labels | Fiscal Year 2011 | | | | Fiscal Year 2012 | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|
| | Full Year | Year-to-Date | Remaining | % Used | Full Year | Year-to-Date | Remaining | % Used |
| | Amended Budget | Actual Amount | Budget | | Amended Budget | Actual Amount | Budget | |
| 011 City Administrator | 535,441 | 320,052 | 215,389 | 60% | 536,037 | 319,564 | 216,473 | 60% |
| Personnel Services | 250,404 | 156,024 | 94,380 | 62% | 250,404 | 115,288 | 135,116 | 46% |
| Personnel Services-Other | | | | | | 31,621 | (31,621) | |
| Payroll Fringes | 103,830 | 67,630 | 36,200 | 65% | 124,274 | 82,079 | 42,195 | 66% |
| Employee Allowances | 94,670 | 42,603 | 52,067 | 45% | 6,432 | 1,334 | 5,098 | 21% |
| Other Charges | 81,662 | 53,176 | 28,486 | 65% | 77,000 | 39,447 | 37,553 | 51% |
| Materials & Supplies | 4,875 | 620 | 4,255 | 13% | 76,427 | 49,795 | 26,632 | 65% |
| 012 Human Resources | 1,297,687 | 817,453 | 480,234 | 63% | 1,295,999 | 861,127 | 434,872 | 66% |
| Personnel Services | 674,496 | 428,951 | 245,545 | 64% | 642,096 | 426,747 | 215,349 | 66% |
| Personnel Services-Other | - | 4,641 | (4,641) | | 6,656 | 31,277 | (24,621) | 470% |
| Payroll Fringes | 332,384 | 221,837 | 110,547 | 67% | 345,036 | 228,374 | 116,662 | 66% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | | 1,352 | 1,914 | (562) | 142% |
| Other Services | 55,826 | 19,759 | 36,067 | 35% | 49,856 | 9,321 | 40,535 | 19% |
| Other Charges | 210,481 | 140,742 | 69,739 | 67% | 231,005 | 153,070 | 77,935 | 66% |
| Materials & Supplies | 24,500 | 1,524 | 22,976 | 6% | 19,998 | 10,423 | 9,575 | 52% |
| 014 Attorney | 1,814,316 | 1,119,603 | 694,713 | 62% | 1,864,303 | 1,227,266 | 637,037 | 66% |
| Personnel Services | 1,019,280 | 591,749 | 427,531 | 58% | 993,048 | 653,106 | 339,942 | 66% |
| Personnel Services-Other | - | 33,217 | (33,217) | | - | 8,758 | (8,758) | |
| Payroll Fringes | 479,820 | 302,747 | 177,073 | 63% | 511,715 | 322,924 | 188,791 | 63% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | | 9,864 | 5,250 | 4,614 | 53% |
| Other Services | 24,337 | 18,572 | 5,765 | 76% | 21,000 | 24,065 | (3,065) | 115% |
| Other Charges | 233,379 | 154,578 | 78,801 | 66% | 292,453 | 198,706 | 93,747 | 68% |
| Materials & Supplies | 48,000 | 18,739 | 29,261 | 39% | 30,723 | 14,457 | 16,266 | 47% |
| Capital Outlay | 9,500 | - | 9,500 | 0% | 5,500 | - | 5,500 | 0% |
| 015 City Clerk | 991,243 | 646,857 | 344,386 | 65% | 896,335 | 590,748 | 305,587 | 66% |
| Personnel Services | 310,488 | 191,273 | 119,215 | 62% | 301,623 | 204,815 | 96,808 | 68% |
| Personnel Services-Other | 224,272 | 170,603 | 53,669 | 76% | 119,293 | 79,123 | 40,170 | 66% |
| Payroll Fringes | 183,403 | 122,725 | 60,678 | 67% | 200,282 | 126,748 | 73,534 | 63% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | | - | 888 | (888) | |
| Other Services | 75,539 | 43,405 | 32,134 | 57% | 80,824 | 54,810 | 26,014 | 68% |
| Other Charges | 164,541 | 109,840 | 54,701 | 67% | 172,813 | 115,320 | 57,493 | 67% |
| Materials & Supplies | 33,000 | 9,012 | 23,988 | 27% | 21,500 | 9,043 | 12,457 | 42% |
| 018 Finance | 3,574,595 | 2,256,967 | 1,317,628 | 63% | 3,422,768 | 2,155,888 | 1,266,880 | 63% |
| Personnel Services | 1,650,861 | 1,014,699 | 636,162 | 61% | 1,656,311 | 986,976 | 669,335 | 60% |
| Personnel Services-Other | 10,300 | 38,093 | (27,793) | 370% | 29,798 | 43,614 | (13,816) | 146% |
| Payroll Fringes | 834,941 | 539,437 | 295,504 | 65% | 895,220 | 544,173 | 351,047 | 61% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | | 19,476 | 9,738 | 9,738 | 50% |
| Other Services | 187,106 | 115,070 | 72,036 | 62% | 115,065 | 99,995 | 15,070 | 87% |
| Other Charges | 720,579 | 484,742 | 235,837 | 67% | 659,640 | 442,284 | 217,356 | 67% |
| Materials & Supplies | 170,808 | 64,926 | 105,882 | 38% | 47,258 | 29,107 | 18,151 | 62% |

| Row Labels | Fiscal Year 2011 | | | Fiscal Year 2012 | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|
| | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used |
| 019 Non-Departmental | 13,086,846 | 11,384,616 | 1,702,230 | 13,297,892 | 10,649,200 | 2,648,692 | 80% |
| Personnel Services | 27,780 | 632,231 | (604,451) | - | 36,132 | (36,132) | |
| Personnel Services-Other | 238,625 | 36,723 | 201,902 | 613,326 | 6,781 | 606,545 | 1% |
| Payroll Fringes | 15,273 | 223,439 | (208,166) | - | 12,822 | (12,822) | |
| Employee Allowances | | | | - | 887 | (887) | |
| Other Services | 332,087 | 211,820 | 120,267 | 163,234 | 49,372 | 113,862 | 30% |
| Other Charges | 1,727,601 | 251,615 | 1,475,986 | 1,570,717 | 908,510 | 662,207 | 58% |
| Materials & Supplies | 35,000 | 15,381 | 19,619 | 117,000 | 74,925 | 42,075 | 64% |
| Pass Throughs | 10,548,074 | 9,862,198 | 685,876 | 10,833,615 | 9,559,770 | 1,273,845 | 88% |
| Capital Outlay | 162,406 | 151,207 | 11,199 | - | - | - | |
| 021 District Court | 3,860,579 | 2,462,990 | 1,397,589 | 3,799,926 | 2,433,167 | 1,366,759 | 64% |
| Personnel Services | 1,644,312 | 998,051 | 646,261 | 1,691,490 | 1,062,295 | 629,195 | 63% |
| Personnel Services-Other | 18,100 | 36,134 | (18,034) | 23,704 | 24,055 | (351) | 101% |
| Payroll Fringes | 832,440 | 563,546 | 268,894 | 973,731 | 597,203 | 376,528 | 61% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | 6,588 | 4,452 | 2,136 | 68% |
| Other Services | 712,192 | 371,902 | 340,290 | 386,765 | 266,301 | 120,464 | 69% |
| Other Charges | 526,935 | 396,428 | 130,507 | 666,648 | 444,386 | 222,262 | 67% |
| Materials & Supplies | 126,600 | 96,929 | 29,671 | 51,000 | 34,476 | 16,524 | 68% |
| 029 Environmental Coordination Ser | 114,106 | 72,317 | 41,789 | 110,349 | 64,487 | 45,862 | 58% |
| Personnel Services | 32,562 | 19,723 | 12,839 | 31,972 | 15,132 | 16,840 | 47% |
| Personnel Services-Other | - | 7,500 | (7,500) | 14,238 | 10,287 | 3,951 | 72% |
| Payroll Fringes | 16,730 | 11,721 | 5,009 | 19,617 | 11,199 | 8,418 | 57% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | 659 | 329 | 330 | 50% |
| Other Services | 26,642 | 8,394 | 18,248 | 2,900 | 649 | 2,251 | 22% |
| Other Charges | 37,722 | 24,980 | 12,742 | 40,513 | 26,742 | 13,771 | 66% |
| Materials & Supplies | 450 | - | 450 | 450 | 150 | 300 | 33% |
| 031 Police | 26,081,054 | 16,613,716 | 9,467,338 | 25,592,784 | 17,678,635 | 7,914,149 | 69% |
| Personnel Services | 12,284,757 | 7,578,573 | 4,706,184 | 11,666,418 | 7,647,522 | 4,018,896 | 66% |
| Personnel Services-Other | 1,219,757 | 980,807 | 238,950 | 1,070,021 | 1,553,027 | (483,006) | 145% |
| Payroll Fringes | 7,078,274 | 4,492,650 | 2,585,624 | 7,001,685 | 4,558,099 | 2,443,586 | 65% |
| Employee Allowances | 200,750 | 200,004 | 746 | 225,020 | 209,163 | 15,857 | 93% |
| Other Services | 1,218,697 | 671,050 | 547,647 | 1,406,612 | 922,321 | 484,291 | 66% |
| Other Charges | 3,933,094 | 2,612,755 | 1,320,339 | 4,063,051 | 2,709,218 | 1,353,833 | 67% |
| Materials & Supplies | 120,725 | 64,994 | 55,731 | 134,977 | 55,913 | 79,064 | 41% |
| Capital Outlay | | | | - | - | - | |
| Vehicle Operating Costs | 25,000 | 12,883 | 12,117 | 25,000 | 23,372 | 1,628 | 93% |

| Row Labels | Fiscal Year 2011 | | | | Fiscal Year 2012 | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|
| | Full Year | Year-to-Date | Remaining | % Used | Full Year | Year-to-Date | Remaining | % Used |
| | Amended Budget | Actual Amount | Budget | | Amended Budget | Actual Amount | Budget | |
| 032 Fire | 13,786,926 | 8,638,488 | 5,148,438 | 63% | 13,381,132 | 8,884,536 | 4,496,596 | 66% |
| Personnel Services | 6,254,570 | 3,793,028 | 2,461,542 | 61% | 5,858,884 | 3,736,252 | 2,122,632 | 64% |
| Personnel Services-Other | 627,873 | 436,125 | 191,748 | 69% | 395,703 | 536,030 | (140,327) | 135% |
| Payroll Fringes | 3,480,602 | 2,249,750 | 1,230,852 | 65% | 3,506,570 | 2,353,176 | 1,153,394 | 67% |
| Employee Allowances | 179,824 | 140,608 | 39,217 | 78% | 191,244 | 137,732 | 53,512 | 72% |
| Other Services | 1,006,110 | 559,108 | 447,002 | 56% | 996,495 | 545,463 | 451,032 | 55% |
| Other Charges | 2,090,048 | 1,393,640 | 696,408 | 67% | 2,205,957 | 1,469,873 | 736,084 | 67% |
| Materials & Supplies | 146,879 | 59,773 | 87,106 | 41% | 146,879 | 96,183 | 50,696 | 65% |
| Pass Throughs | 600 | 400 | 200 | 67% | 600 | 400 | 200 | 67% |
| Capital Outlay | - | 5,982 | (5,982) | | 78,380 | 8,750 | 69,630 | 11% |
| Vehicle Operating Costs | 420 | 75 | 345 | 18% | 420 | 677 | (257) | 161% |
| 033 Building | 2,290,814 | 1,124,788 | 1,166,026 | 49% | 1,536,513 | 884,826 | 651,687 | 58% |
| Personnel Services | 695,514 | 397,663 | 297,851 | 57% | 596,776 | 326,073 | 270,703 | 55% |
| Personnel Services-Other | 38,959 | 6,324 | 32,635 | 16% | 10,000 | 39,244 | (29,244) | 392% |
| Payroll Fringes | 380,211 | 231,625 | 148,586 | 61% | 353,291 | 212,470 | 140,821 | 60% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | | 4,636 | 1,668 | 2,968 | 36% |
| Other Services | 543,012 | 41,917 | 501,096 | 8% | 130,104 | 10,200 | 119,904 | 8% |
| Other Charges | 517,618 | 372,938 | 144,680 | 72% | 324,306 | 218,940 | 105,366 | 68% |
| Materials & Supplies | 15,500 | 7,657 | 7,843 | 49% | 17,400 | 9,564 | 7,836 | 55% |
| Pass Throughs | 100,000 | 66,664 | 33,336 | 67% | 100,000 | 66,667 | 33,333 | 67% |
| 050 Planning | 619,828 | 435,469 | 184,359 | 70% | 919,413 | 608,503 | 310,910 | 66% |
| Personnel Services | 374,217 | 268,242 | 105,975 | 72% | 438,284 | 303,127 | 135,158 | 69% |
| Personnel Services-Other | - | 15,508 | (15,508) | | 7,100 | 2,512 | 4,588 | 35% |
| Payroll Fringes | 197,661 | 141,059 | 56,602 | 71% | 253,249 | 167,753 | 85,496 | 66% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | | 1,304 | 657 | 647 | 50% |
| Other Services | 39,950 | 5,921 | 34,029 | 15% | 30,450 | 8,843 | 21,607 | 29% |
| Other Charges | 3,000 | 2,541 | 459 | 85% | 184,776 | 123,317 | 61,459 | 67% |
| Materials & Supplies | 5,000 | 2,198 | 2,802 | 44% | 4,250 | 2,295 | 1,955 | 54% |
| 060 Parks & Recreation | 3,688,326 | 2,160,266 | 1,528,060 | 59% | 3,590,302 | 2,295,475 | 1,294,827 | 64% |
| Personnel Services | 796,452 | 504,640 | 291,812 | 63% | 807,905 | 467,582 | 340,323 | 58% |
| Personnel Services-Other | 721,547 | 479,550 | 241,997 | 66% | 719,438 | 517,153 | 202,285 | 72% |
| Payroll Fringes | 512,642 | 331,553 | 181,089 | 65% | 541,839 | 339,807 | 202,032 | 63% |
| Employee Allowances | | | | | 11,767 | 5,860 | 5,907 | 50% |
| Other Services | 991,533 | 479,377 | 512,156 | 48% | 831,450 | 539,675 | 291,775 | 65% |
| Other Charges | 481,852 | 271,494 | 210,358 | 56% | 505,860 | 334,321 | 171,539 | 66% |
| Materials & Supplies | 179,450 | 90,210 | 89,240 | 50% | 165,843 | 87,435 | 78,408 | 53% |
| Vehicle Operating Costs | 4,850 | 3,443 | 1,407 | 71% | 6,200 | 3,642 | 2,558 | 59% |

| Row Labels | Fiscal Year 2011 | | | Fiscal Year 2012 | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget |
| 061 Field Operations | 5,324,482 | 2,800,586 | 2,523,896 | 4,128,390 | 2,186,125 | 1,942,265 |
| Personnel Services | 768,705 | 395,291 | 373,414 | 494,036 | 155,510 | 338,526 |
| Personnel Services-Other | 260,775 | 72,987 | 187,788 | 32,585 | 35,294 | (2,709) |
| Payroll Fringes | 463,606 | 286,705 | 176,901 | 328,335 | 149,447 | 178,888 |
| Employee Allowances | | | | 1,163 | 1,200 | (37) |
| Other Services | 2,296,000 | 1,369,431 | 926,569 | 2,020,297 | 1,152,053 | 868,244 |
| Other Charges | 1,020,927 | 501,473 | 519,454 | 839,330 | 559,109 | 280,221 |
| Materials & Supplies | 161,205 | 38,689 | 122,516 | 70,743 | 21,849 | 48,894 |
| Pass Throughs | 351,664 | 125,947 | 225,717 | 333,901 | 111,309 | 222,592 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs | 1,600 | 10,064 | (8,464) | 8,000 | 355 | 7,645 |
| 070 Public Services Administration | 374,414 | 337,781 | 36,633 | 296,811 | 196,407 | 100,404 |
| Other Services | 60,662 | 128,613 | (67,951) | 3,055 | 569 | 2,486 |
| Other Charges | 313,752 | 209,168 | 104,584 | 293,756 | 195,837 | 97,919 |
| 074 Utilities-Water Treatment | 462,551 | 225,136 | 237,415 | 537,639 | 478,783 | 58,856 |
| Personnel Services | 45,244 | 56,756 | (11,512) | 38,792 | 24,994 | 13,798 |
| Personnel Services-Other | 6,000 | 1,687 | 4,313 | 4,273 | 979 | 3,294 |
| Payroll Fringes | 24,734 | 24,616 | 118 | 23,058 | 15,051 | 8,007 |
| Employee Allowances | | | | 132 | - | 132 |
| Other Services | 101,681 | 75,563 | 26,118 | 55,790 | 52,291 | 3,499 |
| Other Charges | 54,892 | 14,664 | 40,228 | 30,594 | 13,729 | 16,865 |
| Materials & Supplies | 20,000 | 22,670 | (2,670) | 18,750 | 5,488 | 13,262 |
| Pass Throughs | | | | 366,250 | 366,250 | - |
| Capital Outlay | 210,000 | 29,181 | 180,819 | | | |
| 078 Customer Service | 249,423 | 164,074 | 85,349 | 265,206 | 177,722 | 87,484 |
| Personnel Services | 128,016 | 85,378 | 42,638 | 131,531 | 90,010 | 41,521 |
| Payroll Fringes | 86,772 | 55,862 | 30,910 | 94,343 | 61,921 | 32,422 |
| Other Services | - | 250 | (250) | - | 57 | (57) |
| Other Charges | 33,874 | 22,584 | 11,290 | 38,600 | 25,733 | 12,867 |
| Materials & Supplies | 761 | - | 761 | 732 | - | 732 |
| 091 Fleet & Facility Services | 1,521,322 | 769,278 | 752,044 | 1,701,076 | 876,157 | 824,919 |
| Personnel Services | 289,893 | 149,397 | 140,496 | 297,154 | 172,186 | 124,968 |
| Personnel Services-Other | 26,100 | 18,628 | 7,472 | 9,950 | 17,523 | (7,573) |
| Payroll Fringes | 179,953 | 107,257 | 72,696 | 197,345 | 118,498 | 78,847 |
| Employee Allowances | | | | 6,514 | 4,048 | 2,466 |
| Other Services | 639,897 | 349,411 | 290,486 | 816,488 | 413,553 | 402,935 |
| Other Charges | 108,615 | 72,618 | 35,997 | 136,855 | 91,237 | 45,618 |
| Materials & Supplies | 43,050 | 23,339 | 19,711 | 43,000 | 39,652 | 3,348 |
| Pass Throughs | 12,794 | 8,528 | 4,266 | 13,770 | 9,180 | 4,590 |
| Capital Outlay | 220,220 | 40,100 | 180,120 | 180,000 | 10,280 | 169,720 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs | 800 | - | 800 | | | |
| Grand Total | 82,165,945 | 53,675,578 | 28,490,368 | 79,549,025 | 53,861,549 | 25,687,476 |

10,525,445
(1,561,168)
8,964,277

Unassigned Fund Balance 6/30/2011
Budgeted Change in Fund Balance
Budgeted Ending Fund Balance 6/30/2012

City of Ann Arbor
All Budgeted Non-General Operating Funds
For the month ending February 2012 (67% through the year)

| Row Labels | Revenue | | | Expenses | | | Remaining Budget | % Used |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|
| | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | % Used | | |
| COMPONENT UNITS | 23,744,889 | 1,141,857 | 22,603,032 | 26,002,082 | 698,538 | 5% | 25,303,544 | 3% |
| 0001 DDA Housing Fund | 10,899 | - | 10,899 | 502,000 | 0 | 0% | 502,000 | 0% |
| 0003 DDA Housing Development Authority | 3,928,906 | (4,398) | 3,933,304 | 5,428,185 | 29,733 | 0% | 5,398,452 | 1% |
| 0009 Smart Zone LDFA | 1,626,288 | 1,146,254 | 480,034 | 1,708,191 | 668,805 | 70% | 1,039,386 | 39% |
| 0033 DDA Parking Maintenance | 2,016,044 | - | 2,016,044 | 1,881,900 | 0 | 0% | 1,881,900 | 0% |
| 0063 DDA Parking Fund | 16,162,752 | - | 16,162,752 | 16,481,806 | 0 | 0% | 16,481,806 | 0% |
| Dedicated Funds | 25,319,036 | 11,919,602 | 13,399,434 | 27,864,499 | 11,794,496 | 47% | 16,070,003 | 42% |
| 0002 Energy Projects | 43,750 | 27,746 | 16,004 | 158,462 | 44,741 | 63% | 113,721 | 28% |
| 0007 Local Law Enforc Block Grant | 62,827 | 91,100 | (28,273) | 62,827 | 29,634 | 145% | 33,194 | 47% |
| 0017 Homeland Security Grant Fund | 110,680 | 17,108 | 93,572 | 115,724 | 4,498 | 15% | 111,226 | 4% |
| 0016 Community Television Network | 1,745,685 | 572,537 | 1,173,148 | 1,863,345 | 1,005,280 | 33% | 858,065 | 54% |
| 0021 Major Street | 6,808,905 | 4,042,405 | 2,766,500 | 7,454,271 | 3,740,805 | 59% | 3,713,466 | 50% |
| 0022 Local Street | 1,710,662 | 982,665 | 727,997 | 1,710,662 | 794,848 | 57% | 915,814 | 46% |
| 0023 Court Facilities | 225,000 | 122,319 | 102,681 | 225,000 | 112,500 | 54% | 112,500 | 50% |
| 0025 Bandemer Property | 5,511 | 5,566 | (55) | 4,200 | 1,590 | 101% | 2,610 | 38% |
| 0026 Construction Code Fund | 1,982,800 | 1,880,305 | 102,495 | 2,240,353 | 1,359,394 | 95% | 880,959 | 61% |
| 0027 Drug Enforcement | 3,700 | 17,885 | (14,185) | 119,673 | 28,087 | 483% | 91,586 | 23% |
| 0034 Parks Memorials & Contributions | 148,686 | 127,680 | 21,006 | 386,284 | 20,658 | 86% | 365,626 | 5% |
| 0035 General Debt Service | 10,050,538 | 3,681,604 | 6,368,934 | 10,044,133 | 3,693,800 | 37% | 6,350,333 | 37% |
| 0036 Metro Expansion | 360,422 | 12,228 | 348,194 | 360,422 | 288,920 | 3% | 71,502 | 80% |
| 0038 Special Assistance | 8,049 | 3,236 | 4,813 | 8,000 | 0 | 40% | 8,000 | 0% |
| 0053 Police & Fire Relief | 10,000 | 6,453 | 3,547 | 8,000 | 0 | 65% | 8,000 | 0% |
| 0054 Cemetary Perpetual Care | 1,200 | 696 | 504 | 8,000 | 0 | 58% | 8,000 | 0% |
| 0060 Gen Debt Serv-Spec Assessments | 40,000 | 11,984 | 28,016 | 105,443 | 7,721 | 30% | 97,722 | 7% |
| 0064 Michigan Justice Training | 21,000 | 12,394 | 8,606 | 112,010 | 29,171 | 59% | 82,839 | 26% |
| 0070 Affordable Housing | 40,300 | 47,229 | (6,929) | 255,607 | 69,422 | 117% | 186,185 | 27% |
| 0073 Local Forfeiture | 300 | 266 | 34 | 26,538 | 2,449 | 89% | 24,089 | 9% |
| 0078 Community Dev Block Grant | 548,129 | 93,073 | 455,056 | 548,129 | 93,327 | 17% | 454,803 | 17% |
| 0083 Senior Center Endowment | 1,597 | 597 | 1,000 | 37,500 | 25,000 | 37% | 12,500 | 67% |
| 0090 HOME Program Fund | 2,310 | 7,125 | (4,815) | 2,310 | 0 | 308% | 2,310 | 0% |
| 00MG Major Grants Programs | 1,386,985 | 155,401 | 1,231,584 | 2,023,606 | 442,650 | 11% | 1,580,956 | 22% |

City of Ann Arbor
All Budgeted Non-General Operating Funds
For the month ending February 2012 (67% through the year)

| Row Labels | Revenue | | | Expenses | | | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | % Used |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | Full Year Amended Budget | Year-to-Date Actual Amount | Remaining Budget | | | | |
| ENTERPRISE FUNDS | 66,874,619 | 53,354,458 | 13,520,161 | 70,263,840 | 37,619,502 | 32,644,338 | | | | |
| 0042 Water Supply System | 22,271,128 | 17,598,729 | 4,672,399 | 20,865,207 | 13,517,767 | 7,347,440 | | | | 54% |
| 0043 Sewage Disposal System | 21,882,455 | 14,646,582 | 7,235,873 | 20,771,354 | 11,333,590 | 9,437,764 | | | | 65% |
| 0046 Market Fund | 167,732 | 53,090 | 114,642 | 165,118 | 114,128 | 50,990 | | | | 59% |
| 0047 Golf Courses Fund | 1,689,220 | 1,114,475 | 574,745 | 1,580,317 | 1,055,831 | 524,486 | | | | 69% |
| 0048 Airport | 830,619 | 557,992 | 272,627 | 902,195 | 427,374 | 474,821 | | | | 67% |
| 0069 Stormwater Sewer System Fund | 5,714,497 | 5,397,976 | 316,521 | 7,870,104 | 3,425,216 | 4,444,888 | | | | 47% |
| 0072 Solid Waste | 14,318,968 | 13,985,615 | 333,353 | 18,109,545 | 7,745,595 | 10,363,950 | | | | 44% |
| INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS | 47,502,695 | 30,400,820 | 17,101,875 | 52,764,062 | 23,413,354 | 29,350,708 | | | | |
| 0011 Central Stores | 1,571,428 | 777,468 | 793,960 | 1,571,428 | 775,014 | 796,414 | | | | 49% |
| 0012 Fleet Services | 7,102,606 | 4,224,037 | 2,878,569 | 10,205,730 | 3,221,145 | 6,984,585 | | | | 32% |
| 0014 Information Technology | 6,503,546 | 4,387,147 | 2,116,399 | 8,530,843 | 4,172,914 | 4,357,929 | | | | 49% |
| 0049 Project Management | 4,270,702 | 2,081,391 | 2,189,311 | 4,408,764 | 1,442,479 | 2,966,285 | | | | 33% |
| 0057 Insurance Fund | 27,543,953 | 18,597,247 | 8,946,706 | 27,543,953 | 13,562,970 | 13,980,983 | | | | 49% |
| 0058 Wheeler Center | 510,460 | 333,530 | 176,930 | 503,344 | 238,832 | 264,512 | | | | 47% |
| MILLAGE FUNDS | 16,997,593 | 17,353,999 | (356,406) | 48,852,963 | 12,124,692 | 36,728,271 | | | | |
| 0024 Open Space & Park Acq Millage | 2,336,586 | 2,563,055 | (226,469) | 2,330,461 | 1,844,094 | 486,367 | | | | 79% |
| 0062 Street Millage Fund | 9,660,277 | 9,783,281 | (123,004) | 39,972,902 | 7,148,735 | 32,824,167 | | | | 18% |
| 0071 Park Maint & Capital Imp Millage | 5,000,730 | 5,007,663 | (6,933) | 6,549,600 | 3,131,863 | 3,417,737 | | | | 48% |
| TRUST FUNDS | 43,759,786 | (9,311,904) | 53,071,690 | 32,629,210 | 13,483,483 | 19,145,727 | | | | |
| 0052 VEBA Trust | 2,269,524 | 477,630 | 1,791,894 | 409,022 | 116,544 | 292,478 | | | | 28% |
| 0055 Elizabeth R. Dean Trust Fund | 50,000 | 25,958 | 24,042 | 84,715 | 68,535 | 16,180 | | | | 81% |
| 0059 Pension Trust Fund | 41,440,262 | (9,815,492) | 51,255,754 | 32,135,473 | 13,298,404 | 18,837,069 | | | | 41% |
| Grand Total | 224,198,618 | 104,858,832 | 119,339,786 | 258,376,656 | 99,134,066 | 159,242,590 | | | | 38% |