

**Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: February 18, 2014
Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Sent Time	<u>Received</u> Time	TO	From	CC	Redactions	Reason for Redaction
2	7:41 PM		Aaron Seagraves, Craig Hupy, Sara Higgins, Steve Powers, Tom Crawford	Chuck Warpehoski			
3	8:15 PM		John Hieftje, Sumi Kailasapathy, Sabra Briere, Sally Petersen, Stephen Kunselman, Margie Teall, Jack Eaton, Chuck Warpehoski, Mike Anglin	Jane Lumm	Steve Powers	Email addresses	Privacy
4	8:25 PM		Jacqueline Beaudry	Sally Petersen	All City Council Members		
5	9:14 PM		John Hieftje	Marsha Chamberlin		Email address	Privacy
6	9:14 PM		Margie Teall	Marsha Chamberlin		Email address	Privacy
7	9:25 PM		Jack Eaton	Jacqueline Beaudry	Steve Powers, Anissa Bowden, Stephen Postema		
8	9:49 PM		Sabra Briere	Jane Lumm	Jack Eaton, Sumi Kailasapathy, John Hieftje		
9	9:57 PM		Jane Lumm	Mark Tucker			
10	10:11 PM		Margie Teall	John Kotarski		Email address	Privacy
11	10:35 PM		Jane Lumm	Sabra Briere	Jack Eaton, Sumi Kailasapathy, John Hieftje, Margie Teall		

**Ann Arbor City Council Regular Session: February 18, 2014
Email Redactions List Pursuant to Council Resolution R-09-386**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
			Mike Anglin, Jacqueline Beaudry, Anissa Bowden, Sabra Briere, Tom Crawford, Jack Eaton, Paul Fulton, David Harris, John Hieftje, Sara Higgins, Sumi Kailasapathy, Stephen Postema, Stephen Powers, Joanna Satterlee, Christine Schopieray, Christopher taylor, Margie Teall, Nancy Walker, Chuck Warpehoski, Lisa Wondrash	Jacqueline Beaudry			
12	10:41 PM						
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Warpehoski, Chuck
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 7:41 PM
To: Seagraves, Aaron; Hupy, Craig; Higgins, Sara; Powers, Steve; Crawford, Tom
Subject: Canoe imagine art

What are the appropriate potential source funds for the canoe imagine art program?

Chuck Warpehoski
Ann Arbor City Council, Ward 5
cwarpehoski@a2gov.org
c: 734-972-8304

Visit www.chuckwarpehoski.org for Ward 5 updates and to sign up for a Ward 5 email newsletter.

Emails received and sent to me as a Councilmember regarding City matters are generally subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Lumm, Jane
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 8:15 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Kailasapathy, Sumi; Briere, Sabra; Petersen, Sally; Kunselman, Stephen; Teall, Margie; Eaton, Jack; Warpehoski, Chuck; Anglin, Mike
Cc: Powers, Steve
Subject: FW: City Council Action on Trust Fund Request

From: Hall, Jennifer
Sent: Fri 2/14/2014 1:12 PM
To: Brett Lenart
Cc: Briere, Sabra; Lumm, Jane; Michael E. King; Callan, Mary Jo; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: City Council Action on Trust Fund Request

Hello Brett, thanks for asking. Because these funds are tied so closely with the DDA funds, it would be helpful but not critical if this was discussed by city council before the DDA's Feb 26th planning meeting for their budget. I am certain the DDA will be discussing our request to them on the 26th and they will be discussing our ask to the City as it relates to our ask to the DDA. The DDA will be much more assured if City Council has already approved these funds.

If the discussion did not occur prior to the 26th, as long as it occurred in March and not April or later, that would be fine for our timeline. As you know, it takes a lot of coordination between funders to get to a closing and the sooner we are able to get a commitment by resolution, the better it will be for our closing.

Take care,

Jennifer Hall

From: Brett Lenart [<mailto:lenartb@ewashtenaw.org>]
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2014 12:49 PM
To: Hall, Jennifer
Cc: Briere, Sabra; Lumm, Jane; Michael E. King; Callan, Mary Jo; [REDACTED]
Subject: City Council Action on Trust Fund Request

Jennifer-

There's been some discussion around the timing of the City Council action on the AAHTF request, and the best time to bring the item to the City Council for consideration. Specifically, there has been discussion of adding to the upcoming Council agenda, or postponing to the March 3rd agenda, where the resolution could be added via the normal submission process.

I know you're in the middle of assembling commitments for this work, can you speak to how Council action timing would impact your process?

-Brett Lenart
Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development
(734) 622-9006 ph.

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Petersen, Sally
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 8:25 PM
To: Beaudry, Jacqueline
Cc: *City Council Members (All)
Subject: DC-2 Ammendments

Amendment #1:

Resolved Clause #1: Change March 2 2015 to October 6 2014.

Amendment #2:

Add to Whereas #9: ... and has been awarded \$21K in grant monies toward the Canoe Imagine Art Project for which a \$21K match from the City is required to go forward;

Add to Resolved #4: and instead allocate \$21K from the Water Supply System fund toward the Canoe Imagine Art program;

Resolved #5: Change Water Supply system to \$197,570.00 and Total to \$936,140.00

Sally Hart Petersen
Ann Arbor City Council Member, Ward 2
2976 Hickory Lane
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
734-996-5569

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Marsha Chamberlin [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 9:14 PM
To: Hieftje, John
Subject: what about Jewett chair? 5K

--

Marsha Chamberlin
Art/Ann Arbor/Community
PH: [REDACTED] Web: marshachamberlin.com

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Marsha Chamberlin [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 9:14 PM
To: Teall, Margie
Subject: What about jewett chair \$5K

--

Marsha Chamberlin
Art/Ann Arbor/Community
PH: [REDACTED] Web: marshachamberlin.com

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Beaudry, Jacqueline
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 9:25 PM
To: Eaton, Jack
Cc: Powers, Steve; Bowden (King), Anissa; Postema, Stephen
Subject: Motion to Reconsider
Attachments: Reconsider Public Art Administrator Vote.docx

Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk

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.

..Title

Motion to Reconsider the February 3, 2014 Vote that Defeated the Resolution to Approve Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Aaron Seagraves as Public Art Administrator (\$18,500.00) and Appropriate Funds from the Public Art Fund Balance (\$20,500.00) **(8 Votes Required)**

..Body

I move for a reconsideration of the February 3, 2014 Vote that Defeated the Resolution to Approve Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Aaron Seagraves as Public Art Administrator (\$18,500.00) and Appropriate Funds from the Public Art Fund Balance. I voted on the prevailing side, which defeated the resolution.

Sponsored by: Councilmember Eaton

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Lumm, Jane
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 9:49 PM
To: Briere, Sabra
Cc: Eaton, Jack; Kailasapathy, Sumi; Hieftje, John
Subject: Resolutions DC-1 and DC-2 for March 3rd agenda

Obviously the resolutions have similarities and differences, and I would propose that one simple resolution which returns the funds be proposed, and a 2nd resolution which addresses the transition, FY 15 and 16 budgets and other recommendations, be put forward separately. Segregating these objectives would make more sense -- the objectives are not aligned and address different policies.

Welcome your thoughts, CM Briere.

Thanks, Jane

Alexa, Jennifer

From: marktuck@umich.edu
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 9:57 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Subject: Re: Public Art Support

I do, and I appreciate the chance to share viewpoints. Thanks so much!

From: "Lumm, Jane" <JLumm@a2gov.org>
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 2014 17:39:26 -0500
To: Mark Tucker <marktuck@umich.edu>
Subject: RE: Public Art Support

I also sit on the Bd. of Insurance where I see claims against the city -- serves to heighten my appreciation for the need to address these issues. Understand your pt., and hope you understand mine. Thanks, Mark

From: Mark Tucker [mailto:marktuck@umich.edu]
Sent: Tue 2/18/2014 5:30 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Subject: Re: Public Art Support

It's also part of the ups and downs of living in our climate. It's always been necessary, to fund public infrastructure. I'm not arguing that point--just the idea that it's an all or nothing proposal, at the expense of other worthy public endeavors, seems limiting to me.

On Tue, Feb 18, 2014 at 5:25 PM, Lumm, Jane <JLumm@a2gov.org> wrote:
For folks who are spending \$\$ to repair their vehicles when they hit a pothole (lots of these folks out there!), repairing the streets is an improvement. Glamorous? No. Discretionary? No.

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 18, 2014, at 4:36 PM, "Mark Tucker" <marktuck@umich.edu> wrote:

Well, once these public art funds return to their origins then I look forward to all of these repairs being made and our lives being improved immensely.

On Tue, Feb 18, 2014 at 4:28 PM, Lumm, Jane <JLumm@a2gov.org> wrote:
I can name, e.g., countless broken water mains, streets that need repair, etc., etc., etc. that don't get a look because of lack of funding. Yes, your Q is, sadly, an easy Q to answer.

From: Mark Tucker [mailto:marktuck@umich.edu]
Sent: Tue 2/18/2014 4:26 PM
To: Lumm, Jane

Cc: startboard@umich.edu
Subject: Re: Public Art Support

Can you name a time, or even imagine a scenario, when a capital project would have been halted due to a possible 1% deficit in funding?

On Tue, Feb 18, 2014 at 4:15 PM, Lumm, Jane <JLumm@a2gov.org> wrote:
Quick comments, running outta time, sorry!, in blue below. Thanks, Mark! -Jane

From: Mark Tucker [<mailto:marktuck@umich.edu>]
Sent: Tue 2/18/2014 4:01 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: startboard@umich.edu
Subject: Re: Public Art Support

Thanks again for taking time to elaborate on your views. (I promise I'll stop bugging you after this email)

I know that you've been a long time supporter of the arts so I find it discouraging that your rhetoric mimics the same responses I'm getting from the others who agree with you on council. It doesn't sound like an original response, but rather a chorus rallying around the notion of "fiscal responsibility". Glad to hear others are leaning on the side of "fiscal responsibility" -- it's not a notion, but a guiding principle, and no, we haven't compared notes, and the responses originate with the writers.

The fiscal responsibility mantra it's not a mantra, but a principle that I actually believe in wouldn't sound so hollow if it was actually centered around a significant financial event. If the public art fund was siphoning off vast amounts of money that actually tipped the balance on whether or not a capital project could proceed (or whether it even had any affect on human services spending) then I would concede your point. But what we're talking about here is, by comparison, an insignificant financial event. Why has this particular 1% (one percent) become the lightning rod for the other 99% of funding?

If it's not politically motivated it's not political, or politically motivated -- people have differences of opinion, that's an OK thing, and should not be attributed to some dastardly motive, malice aforethought, bad intention, etc., etc., etc. then I don't see how this action could possibly be construed as fiscally responsible when such intense efforts have been invested in derailing this program over 1% of a total budget. Have you and the rest of your supporters been concentrating the same efforts towards making sure that the other 99% is being as well managed? ... each and every day - we try If not, then that's what seems fiscally unbalanced and irresponsible to me.

--Mark

On Tue, Feb 18, 2014 at 2:59 PM, Lumm, Jane <JLumm@a2gov.org> wrote:
And thank you, Mark, for your kind reply.

And please know, I definitely understand where you're coming from, and you're a great advocate. I wish all were well in the world and there weren't so many competing and compelling demands for this funding, and for infrastructure/capital needs in particular.

The money that is to be redirected to the originating sources certainly won't come close to addressing all the needs for street, utility and other repairs, but it will help. We have an aging infrastructure, know it's not glamorous to spend millage dollars and utility fees on sewer pipes, water mains, street repairs, et. al. basic needs, but the needs are significant.

Again, I am very grateful for all that you do for our community, and appreciate your advocacy -- what I would expect! :-) I wish all were well in the world and the non-discretionary needs were being adequately addressed, but they are far from being adequately addressed, and that's the problem/challenge.

Do appreciate your thoughtful note and important efforts, and am sincerely grateful for your generous gifts of your time and talents!

My best, Jane

From: Mark Tucker [<mailto:marktuck@umich.edu>]
Sent: Tue 2/18/2014 12:16 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: startboard@umich.edu
Subject: Re: Public Art Support

Thanks Jane for your kind support of our endeavors and for your considered viewpoint on this topic.

I definitely understand where you're coming from. And I trust you have looked at both the positives as well as the negatives of keeping this funding intact. I think there are two main negative consequences that would occur if the arts funding were to be returned to their funds of origin. One is fiscal: 1% has accrued a viable amount for the funding of public art, but would have a relatively insignificant impact on the projects supported by the funds of origin. And the other consequence is psychological: No matter what verbiage is produced by council to indicate support for the future of public art in this city, removal of this 1% public art funding (which took 12 years to generate) would indicate the opposite. The domino effect of removing the funding would be hazardous to our ability as a community to do anything but champion basic needs and services from now on. Not exactly the kind of forward thinking, vibrant city, that people will constantly desire to live, work, and play in. Many people take for granted the fact that we were able to create FestiFools here, for instance. But, in fact, without the unique embrace and support of this particular community--without already stepping into an arts enriched community--FestiFools and FoolMoon could easily have gathered no traction. Similar events have been tried in other cities and have failed because the predominant culture of their communities were focused on bashing the arts instead of embracing them.

There are a great many of us who believe that it is council's job to not only take care of our basic needs, but to make sure that this marvelous city has a future predicated on not just providing basic municipal services, but on providing its citizenry multiple ways to express their involvement and engagement in the community in which they live (and pay taxes). The arts, when considered in this context, is an important part of the fabric for any city to thrive, self-reflect, and have a purpose that sets them apart from others.

I hope you can adjust your perspective to include supporting such ephemeral needs that are admittedly more difficult to champion than our most basic needs.

--Mark

On Tue, Feb 18, 2014 at 11:55 AM, Lumm, Jane <JLumm@a2gov.org> wrote:

Dear Mark,

Thank you for writing, for your public art advocacy, and for your extraordinary work and talent that you dedicate to the FestiFools and FoolMoon events -- your efforts in all these arenas are genuinely appreciated.

As you know, I believe it's important to return the unencumbered and unallocated % for Art Funds to the originating funding sources. These capital funds also have funding demands for infrastructure projects and basic maintenance that greatly exceed the available financing, and I feel it is our fiduciary responsibility and commitment to our residents who are paying the utility fees, street, park, solid waste millages and related taxes to direct their precious resources to the non-discretionary and undercapitalized needs that these funds were originally intended to support.

Again, I sincerely appreciate your advocacy, and look forward to advancing public art by encouraging private support for our community's art organizations, programs and related artistic endeavors.

With gratitude for all that you do for our community, Jane Lumm

From: Mark Tucker [<mailto:marktuck@umich.edu>]

Sent: Tue 2/18/2014 11:11 AM

To: Lumm, Jane

Cc: startboard@umich.edu

Subject: Public Art Support

Dear Jane,

Realizing that you must have a lot on your plate today, I just wanted to take a small bit of your time to put in a plug for the members of the Public Art Commission who are requesting that the funds currently in the Percent for Art budget remain there at least until a transition plan can be put into effect. Taking those funds out prematurely may spell death for the public art commission--and possibly the future of public art in Ann Arbor--(which would also make it very difficult to generate and accept private donations, since there won't be a commission to manage those types of unusual investments in our community.)

Returning the 1% public art funds to their funds of origin will only have a 1% impact on those original fund projects. The effect that the accrued funds could have on public art however--particularly as the

definition of public art has been broadened to include community, temporary, and performance art events (such as the ones we currently produce, for free, for all citizens of Ann Arbor)--could be dramatic.

I am buoyed by the prospect of being able to leverage existing public art funds into street level community art participation that we (producers of FestiFools and FoolMoon), as one example, have proven works--and at a fraction of the cost of creating monumental "permanent" artwork--and indeed, our style of public art making has multiplied and become more creative and has inspired others in our community to get more and more involved every year. The Water Hill festival is a prime example.

Our community-wide public art spectacles already provide a viable model for public/private funding and a reliable source for generating positive PR whenever our community needs it the most. But we could surely use a financial shot in the arm that funding from the City would accommodate, allowing us to concentrate much more on creating signature events for Ann Arbor than whether or not we can continue to afford to put on these popular public art events in the first place.

To return the funds to their fund of origins would not do much to assuage those who feel the need to compare arts funding with basic needs funding--since a mere 1% will not pave that much more road, nor clean that much more sewage. Hopefully, you'll be able to find a way to keep the public art funds where they belong for now--in hopes of creating a mechanism for funding current and future arts projects that truly do have a positive impact on our community.

Thanks for your time--and thanks for serving our community.

--Mark
Creative Director
WonderFool Productions/Producers of FestiFools and FoolMoon

Alexa, Jennifer

From: John Kotarski [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 10:11 PM
To: Teall, Margie
Subject: public art commission
Attachments: AAPAC talking points-2013.docx

Margie,

I want to thank you for your unending support for a sustainable public art program in Ann Arbor. It will all work out in the end.

I am sharing a document I prepared for Craig Hupy when Bob and I first started meeting with him to discuss reorganizing AAPAC. It outlines some of the things I mentioned tonight. I reached these conclusions after reviewing the ordinance, the historical material of AAPAC, and investigating other communities. I have shared it with Chuck and Jane because they asked. Please feel free to share as you see fit. I hope it helps.

Best,
John

Background

The predecessor and model for AAPAC was the Commission on Art in Public Places (CAPP), which was formed in 1998. CAPP was comprised of dedicated residents with a passion for public art who volunteered hundreds of hours and took a hands-on approach to its management. They built a broad-based group of stakeholders that raised money and selected artists for the Plymouth Road water tower as well as the Washington Street parking garage. However, their ambitious level of commitment, without administrative leadership, proved unsustainable.

CAPP's forward thinking approach is seen in an 8-page annual report published in 2002. The report details a competition for the Plymouth road water tower design. CAPP designed and distributed hundreds of coloring books to elementary students inviting them to imagine designs for the water tower. The competition generated 525 entries from local schoolteachers, students, and resident artists. The jury of 13 included the Mayor of Ann Arbor, the Curator at UM Art Museum, a Michigan Radio arts producer, the director of Arts of Citizenship at UM, a Pfizer art buyer, and a high school sophomore. Besides selecting the winning design, the jury awarded 13 other awards ranging from the Most Cerebral Award to the Too Much Fun Medal.

CAPP had an eleven member board in 2002 that included two ex-officio City Council Members, the Dean of UM Art School, a UM fundraiser, a Street Art Fair board member, two artists, and a UM art professor. The donor page lists 32 donors including banks, foundations, realtors, and wealthy residents. CAPP also co-sponsored a series of lectures on public art at the public library.

In 2006 Margaret Parker led an effort to persuade public officials to fund public art through a percent for art ordinance. Sue McCormick surveyed scores of cities, identified model programs, and developed benchmarks. These surveys show no program with part-time staff and most had ex-officio members. Additionally, no community relied exclusively on percent for art monies to fund their public art program. The percent for art ordinance was passed by City Council in 2008 tasking AAPAC with developing guidelines and determining administrative support.

It is hard to exaggerate the impact of the personality driven leadership AAPAC experienced in its early days. The revenue CAPP received from the city in FY2007 was \$10K. The revenue set aside for public art (AAPAC imagined this their money) from the city during FY2008 - FY2009 was over \$1M. \$441K was projected for FY2010. In spite of this growth in public art revenue; the AAPAC board shrank to nine members with no ex-officio Council members and no UM art school members. There were no donors listed in the 2009 AAPAC annual report and the art program was administered by a part-time art administrator who had no public art experience.

First Project

CAPP was a stellar startup, but as it grew into AAPAC, donors and broad community support seemed to be of marginal value to the Art Commission. The shrinking governing body lacked breadth and depth of experience while administrative leadership was less than adequate.

In spite of this weakness, the first project that AAPAC took on was 40 times larger than any previous project. What AAPAC also failed to do with this project was what CAPP did best – ground the project in an open competitive process that employed broad community outreach. The attendant criticism should not have been a surprise.

Lessons Learned

It is naive to think art commissioners with talent and expertise can be recruited to spend more than 2 hours a month. It is equally imprudent to entrust millions of taxpayer dollars to citizen volunteers without adequate administrative leadership.

These missteps have cost the public art program the community's trust. Absent a clearly defined mission and without institutional memory, the changeover in top city administration orphaned the public art program and made it vulnerable.

Conclusion

It might be more effective to think of the Art Commission as representatives of a culturally sophisticated community rather than public art experts. A trained, experienced, administrative leader can assemble the requisite expertise to serve on task forces depending on the project's need. Building public trust should be the first order of business moving forward.

Revised City Ordinance

The Public Art Commission by ordinance is intended to be an "oversight body". They are not an administrative or a managerial body. However they are tasked with:

- Making plans for a public art program
- Presenting reports of the program's efforts
- Working with city staff to identify potential for baked-in art
- Promoting public art
- Raising money beyond public funds for public art projects
- Advising administration and residents about public art

For the Public Art Commission to be sustainable, it must invent a way for others to complete these tasks. The Commission could then function as an oversight body to ensure that these tasks are well thought through, aligned to a master plan, and address the growing needs of Ann Arbor residents.

Commission's Mission and Public Art Plan

The Art Commission has several projects in process. Additionally, demands from administration, elective officials, and residents are increasing. The ship needs to be rebuilt while at sea.

A mission statement informed by the Commission's history and a professionally design, well-vetted public art plan that is steeped in community outreach is an important first step. If we do not know where we are going we will never know when we get there.

Ideally this public art plan could be drafted by the City's planning department laying out general types and locations for public art: parks, playgrounds, public transportation, vehicular arteries, central district, etc. The City's communication department could organize public forums to educate residents of the benefits and options for public art while seeking feedback on the plan.

The Commission must find a way of describing its function as more of a facilitator than gatekeeper. The Art Commission's meetings could serve as an educational venue by inviting regional leaders to make presentations about public art. These meetings could be staged in neighborhood centers and taped by CTN for cablecast.

A Long-Range Vision

A successful public art program is one that leverages public efforts in order to encourage expanded private efforts. To build a cohesive public art program, free guidance in creating public art is essential. The Art Commission must find a way to develop guidance that is valued. It must then offer this advice to municipal projects, non-governmental agencies, and private businesses.

I suggest the following tasks be addressed either by an Art Administrator, incorporated within an existing municipal office, or contracted out to another organization:

- Advise city administration about how public art can be baked-in to each municipal construction project and devise a maintenance schedule for existing public art.
- Develop and maintain a public art master plan/map that is informed by a) what other cities are doing, b) input from residents, c) input from regional arts organizations. Also, create a recognition program based on this input.
- Manage and select task forces set up to invite, refine, and select artists for projects.

- Promote public art as a valuable community resource
- Develop and maintain web-based resources that serve to a) educate residents about public art, b) train task forces, c) list options for citizens who want to organize themselves in order to create public art.
- Develop and manage a free, minimal, art-consult that will use community volunteers (art commissioners plus others) to help citizens, businesses, community groups think through the process of creating art in public places, including the funding processes (modeled after SPARK and MEDC consults for start-ups).

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Briere, Sabra
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 10:35 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Cc: Eaton, Jack; Kailasapathy, Sumi; Hieftje, John; Teall, Margie
Subject: Re: Resolutions DC-1 and DC-2 for March 3rd agenda

Dear Jane,

Since you are rightly concerned with adhering to the rules, I will respond to this message at some point after Council adjourns. This type of email is not one of the types allowed under the rules during a Council meeting.

I trust this email exchange will be published in the minutes of the 2/18/14 meeting.

Sabra

Sabra Briere
First Ward City Council
Ann Arbor
734-995-3518
734-277-6578 (cell)

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 18, 2014, at 9:49 PM, "Lumm, Jane" <JLumm@a2gov.org> wrote:

Obviously the resolutions have similarities and differences, and I would propose that one simple resolution which returns the funds be proposed, and a 2nd resolution which addresses the transition, FY 15 and 16 budgets and other recommendations, be put forward separately. Segregating these objectives would make more sense -- the objectives are not aligned and address different policies.

Welcome your thoughts, CM Briere.

Thanks, Jane

Alexa, Jennifer

From: Beaudry, Jacqueline
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 10:41 PM
To: Anglin, Mike; Beaudry, Jacqueline; Bowden (King), Anissa; Briere, Sabra; Crawford, Tom; Eaton, Jack; Fulton, Paul; Harris, David; Hieftje, John; Higgins, Sara; Kailasapathy, Sumi; Kunselman, Stephen; Lumm, Jane; Petersen, Sally; Postema, Stephen; Powers, Steve; Satterlee, Joanna; Schopieray, Christine; Taylor, Christopher (Council); Teall, Margie; Walker, Nancy; Warpehoski, Chuck; Wondrash, Lisa
Subject: Art Administrator resolution
Attachments: DB-1.pdf

Attached is the resolution for reconsideration.

Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk

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.



City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Text File

File Number: 14-0066

Agenda # DB-1

Introduced: 1/21/2014

Version: 1

Current Status: Held in Council

Matter Type: Resolution

Resolution to Approve Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Aaron Seagraves as Public Art Administrator (\$18,500.00) and Appropriate Funds from the Public Art Fund Balance (\$20,500.00) **(8 Votes Required)**

Your approval is requested for an amendment to the Professional Service Agreement with Aaron Seagraves for consulting services in the amount of \$18,500.00. This Professional Service Agreement will extend the term of his agreement by six months, through June 30, 2014 and add \$18,500.00 in compensation, for total compensation for the June 11, 2012 through June 30, 2014 period to an amount not to exceed \$67,400.00.

The purpose of the City's public art program is to create public art to improve the aesthetic quality of public spaces and structures, provide cultural and recreational opportunities, contribute to the local heritage, stimulate economic activity and promote the general welfare of the community. The Ann Arbor Public Art Commission (AAPAC) is the oversight body of the program. Commission members are nominated by the Mayor and approved by City Council. Craig Hupy, Public Services Administrator, acts as the City liaison to AAPAC, and, under his direction, the Public Services Area provides support to the Commission.

As the chief contact person for AAPAC, Mr. Seagraves reports directly to the City of Ann Arbor's Public Services Area Administrator. He is currently contracted to work an average of 20 hours per week. His services include providing overall leadership, general management and assistance in the daily operations of the public art program, planning and development, public relations, and the coordination of projects with City staff, stakeholders and artists.

Beginning July 1, 2013, due to the changes in the Public Art Ordinance, an administrative budget was not approved as part of the FY14 budget. This requested appropriation, along with other funding that may be available for particular projects, will serve as the dollars necessary to fund the Public Art Administrator; as well as miscellaneous administrative expenses.

Prepared by: Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator

Reviewed by: Abigail Elias, Chief Assistant City Attorney

Approved by: Steven D. Powers, City Administrator

Resolution to Approve Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Aaron Seagraves as Public Art Administrator (\$18,500.00) and Appropriate Funds from the Public Art Fund Balance (\$20,500.00) **(8 Votes Required)**

Whereas, The Public Art Administrator is currently administering several public art projects;

Whereas, A fourth amendment to the professional services agreement with Aaron Seagraves that extends the term of his agreement through June 30, 2014, and add \$18,500.00 in compensation for a total amount not to exceed \$67,400.00, will allow him to provide services for the administration of the current public art projects; and

Whereas, Funding for this agreement is available in the Public Art Fund, fund balance;

RESOLVED, That City Council approve the fourth amendment to the professional services agreement with Aaron Seagraves to extend the term of the agreement through June 30, 2014, and add \$18,500.00 in compensation for a total contract amount not to exceed \$67,400.00;

RESOLVED, That \$20,500.00 be appropriated from the Public Art Fund, fund balance, to be available without regard to fiscal year; and

RESOLVED, That the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized and directed to execute said fourth amendment to the professional service agreement with Aaron Seagraves after approval as to form by the City Attorney and approval as to substance by the City Administrator.