

Seyfarth, Heather

From: Daniel Adams <danielnicholasadams@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 11:51 AM
To: Council of the Commons
Cc: City Council
Subject: Public inquiry - Funding sources/fundraising
Attachments: LGC Board Support-01032022.pdf

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Council Members:

I'm writing to request that the next Council of the Commons agenda include a detailed update on the project's overall financial status, including a summary of Library Green Conservancy's fundraising progress, fundraising plan, and financial support for the as-yet unissued design RFP.

Over the last four years, the city and taxpayers have generously supported the Task Force and the Council of the Commons ("CotC"). We have little to show for that investment. The project is badly behind schedule. The design process has not commenced. Library Green's fundraising updates during CotC meetings, when they do occur, are cursory and uninformative.

What financial information that Library Green has made public raises troubling questions about its operations, finances, and commitment to the project. As of October 2022, Library Green's members on the CotC reported having raised \$70,000, and set a goal of raising \$90,000 by the end of the year. My understanding is that \$120,000 is required to issue the RFP, which is the first step to beginning formal design work. The city has earmarked \$40,000 for that phase of the project, leaving Library Green to raise the remaining \$80,000.

Library Green, however, has pledged only \$20,000 to the RFP (see attached). Either Library Green has significantly overstated its fundraising progress, or it is inexplicably refusing to commit available resources--donations solicited and collected with the expectation that they would be invested for precisely this purpose--to begin design work, thereby further delaying this project by months or perhaps years.

Library Green has operated largely independently and without meaningful public oversight into its finances and operations, all the while demanding robust public funding, city staff support, and a public/private partnership with the city. The public deserves an opportunity to evaluate whether this project remains viable and whether Library Green has demonstrated that it is a committed, capable partner in making that project successful.

Respectfully,
Daniel Adams