



**AGENDA**  
**Committee of the Whole**  
**Monday, April 11, 2016 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall 10<sup>th</sup> Floor**

Councilmember Judi Brown Clarke, Chair  
Councilmember Jessica Yorke, Vice Chair

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Minutes:**
  - March 21, 2016
  - March 28, 2016
4. **Public Comment on Agenda Items**
5. **Discussion/Action:**
  - A.) Debt Book Presentation- Council Internal Auditor
  - B.) BUDGET
    - Budget General Overview
    - Fringe Benefits
    - Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
    - Council & Internal Auditor Budget
  - C.) Red Cedar Project Update – (Tree Cutting)
6. **Place on File**
  - Letter from Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel RE: Fahrenheit Lounge Violence
7. **Adjourn**

The City of Lansing's Mission is to ensure quality of life by:

- I. Promoting a vibrant, safe, healthy and inclusive community that provides opportunity for personal and economic growth for residents, businesses and visitors
- II. Securing short and long term financial stability through prudent management of city resources.
- III. Providing reliable, efficient and quality services that are responsive to the needs of residents and businesses.
- IV. Adopting sustainable practices that protect and enhance our cultural, natural and historical resources.
- V. Facilitating regional collaboration and connecting communities



**MINUTES**  
**Committee of the Whole**  
**Monday, March 21, 2016 @ 5:30 p.m.**  
**City Council Chamber**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT**

Councilmember Brown Clarke  
Councilmember Jessica Yorke  
Councilmember Patricia Spitzley  
Councilmember Adam Hussain  
Councilmember Kathie Dunbar- arrived at 5:31 p.m.  
Councilmember Carol Wood  
Councilmember Jody Washington  
Councilmember Tina Houghton

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Sherrie Boak, Council Staff  
Joseph Abood, Deputy City Attorney  
Randy Hannan, Mayor Executive Assistant  
Mary Riley, Human Resource Director  
Chris Swope, City Clerk  
Jim DeLine, Council Internal Auditor  
Kevin Elsenheimer, MSHDA Executive Director  
David Hollister, Financial Health Team  
Eric Scorsone, Financial Health Team  
Tom Edmiston, Cinnaire  
Robert Johnson, Planning & Neighborhood Development Director  
Brett Kaschinske, Parks and Recreation Director  
Kathie Raffone  
Julie Powers, GLHC  
Carolyn Condell

**Approval of Minutes**

Action moved to the next meeting on the minutes from February 29, 2016 and March 14, 2016.

**Public Comment**

No Public Comment

**DISCUSSION/ACTION**

**Set Public Hearing - ACT-16-2015 ; Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund Grant Application for the acquisition of Boat Club Property**

Council President Brown Clarke outlined the timeline and with the process, however it was referred but now requires action to set the public hearing.

Mr. Kaschinske outlined the property on the river front owned by the Boat Club and attached to Fine Park with 35 acres and Hunters Ridge is 28 acres. With the addition of this there would be over 100 acres along the river from Fine Park to Hunters Ridge. The grants have been favorable to acquisition property, 25% paid by for by the City, the balance by the Grant. The Boat Club is interested in selling the property to the City as park land. Some requirements of the grant are a public hearing, with the grant deadline of April 1<sup>st</sup>. The Park Board has approved and it does meet the Park and Recreation Master Plan.

Council Member Wood asked if the Administration had thoughts of selling part of the area for development in the past.

Council Member Washington stepped away from the meeting at 5:36 p.m.

Mr. Kaschinske confirmed it had not been discussed for this area. Hunter Ridge was purchased with a trust fund grant and once it is purchased there are limitations, making Hunter Ridge a dedicate park. Council Member Wood asked if the resolution should include a statement of the dedicated park. Mr. Kaschinske could not confirm but would have to look at the resolution in 1981 to see how it was addressed on how it was dedicated. Council Member Wood stated her confirmation she had no issue with setting the hearing, but want to make sure if it needs to be added it is updated with the Council by the March 28<sup>th</sup> hearing and adoption.

Council Member Washington returned to the meeting at 5:39 p.m.

Council Member Houghton asked there will be any maintenance and clearing for paths. Mr. Kaschinske clearing will occur for biking paths where they need to go over wetlands. There will be no bridge but something similar to a non- motorized river trail. Council Member Brown Clarke asked if the trails would be rough or based for handicap access. Mr. Kaschinske confirmed it would not be a mulch path and will include a picnic area at the river at Fulton Park. All boat traffic will enter west of Waverly.

Council Member Dunbar asked about the water trail systems. Mr. Kaschinske agreed that they are having discussion with groups all over the state on making it a water trail.

**MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER YORKO TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO SET THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MARCH 28, 2016. MOTION CARRIED 8-0.**

Ms. Raffone spoke in opposition to the agreement signed with the City Attorney. Ms. Raffone also submitted photos on nuisances in the City.

**PILOT Programs**

Council President Brown Clarke introduced the guest speakers from the FHT and MSHDA, and clarified that the topic was clarification on the last resolution that was approved on the current PILOT policy. The plan is to get guidance on how a PILOT works with the blue print of the City and any connections. Mr. Elsenheimer with MSHDA will outline the PILOT changes and what their criteria is, and FHT will discuss the impact.

DRAFT

Mr. Scorsone stated that in the terms of legacy cost, in the short term the City has budget stability, but the City should prepare for economic downturn. Mr. Scorsone stated his opinion that PILOT's are broad but good to have. The question is how to implement properly. Mr. Scorsone offered no further information stating he had not had time to do any investigation. Mr. Hollister added that the agenda for the FHT is to put together logic for the budget and make sure the Master Plan is consistent with the capital outlay which is then consistent with the multiyear budgeting. Mr. Hollister opinion was that Council should look at PILOT's to make sure they are consistent with Capital Outlay, and use as a legitimate tool.

Council Member Washington distributed a list of housing establishments in the City, stating her belief that there is already so much property that the City has no revenue from. The PILOT's need to be spread out not just in the City, with low income housing there is no income tax either. Council Member Washington asked Council in moving forward to consider asking themselves to consider not against poverty, but against the City going broke. If Council looks forward to more reduction, where are they getting the revenue. Council Member Washington added her opinion that the City needs market rate and high end single family homes, there needs to be a regional discussion. If the City approves the PILOTS, they only get 4% of what is actually collected with a PILOT. The City does not have the ability to continue, and it is not just the PILOT's but every other tax breaks they don't get income from.

Council Member Hussain stated to the rest of Council that they need to look at where the PILOT's are, because they are driving down to poverty and where predatory establishments go. With the developments Council needs to separate the problems.

Mr. Johnson spoke briefly about the PILOT policy, the preference for the CDBG areas, and under the policy there was housing preference for conversions and rehabs. There needs to be more thought to the PILOT and value of the PILOT. The City does not have a zoning district that is PILOT or low income, and they cannot question under the zoning ordinance based on expense or affordability. Economic development starts with affordable housing, and he agreed there has been a concentration of affordable housing on the south side which was not well thought out. The City needs to have a policy for diversity. Council President Brown Clarke reminded the Committee and guests that the meeting was to bring all the information all at the same time to balance the information but no decisions.

Council Member Yorke asked Mr. Johnson for the PILOT map he presented to the Committee on Development and Planning and Council staff printed the map and distributed.

Mr. Edmiston, on behalf of Cinnarie, stated his view of the PILOT as making credits available to bring equity into the projects, so the developer does not have to charge high rents. Mr. Edmiston belief is that this is the front end of making the development affordable and private investment. Mr. Edmiston distributed example outlining housing tax credits that were awarded in the tri-county area in 2010-2015 and two development in the City of Lansing. In this time frame the tri-county area received 11, and there were 42 in the State. Of the 11 in the tri-county area, two were in Lansing, one did receive a PILOT before 2010 and one did not request a PILOT.

Council Member Yorke referenced the map submitted by Mr. Johnson and the number of PILOTS. Mr. Johnson had to clarify that the map reflected PILOTS, but not all were residential PILOTS. Council Member Yorke asked about the status of those that had reached their sunset date. Mr. Johnson confirmed that 15 were active out of the 30 that were listed, so the upper 20 are active. Council Member Wood referenced the column on the spreadsheet that noted the sunset date, where some sunset in 2029, 2035 and 2032, which are not 10 year PILOTS but 35+ years. There is a question of when look at the budget, knowing Council is

DRAFT

getting a limited amount of revenue particularly the majority for 4%. Council Member Wood then asked Mr. Edmiston if he was once involved with Great Lakes Capital Fund and if they were still involved with Ferris Development PILOTS. Mr. Edmiston confirmed both questions. Council Member Wood pointed out Ferris Developments that still owe the City payments. Mr. Edmiston stated he would check on the properties.

Council Member Washington stated her view that when Council goes forward they have to report a market study because currently all the talk is about apartments. Her view is that the City is lacking in good single family homes. As the City gets developments the City then gets world class education and so they also need to reserve property for good single family homes.

Council Member Hussain added to the conversation that Council also needs to look at the single family market to bring in young families supporting the neighborhoods out of the downtown area. Mr. Hussain has begun discussions with LEAP and FHT on how to start to attract good businesses and neighborhoods outside of downtown.

Mr. Elsenheimer gave a brief overview of his experience as a municipal attorney, work in the State and recently as Executive Director of MSHDA. It was noted that this is a discussion common held all over the State, and the question is exactly how much low income is appropriate, what kind, what is helpful. MSHDA is not an entity that will come to the City and tell them they must engage in a PILOT to result in MSHDA funding for that project. MSHDA will not tell the City they have to have a PILOT policy and what it should be. Mr. Elsenheimer has seen generally a 30 year range for the sunset, but it is the City authority to put those terms in place. When MSHDA looks at applications, twice a year, and generally over the last couple years applications that have been successful have had their PILOT arrangements in place. For applicants to complete against other applications, they need to have some kind of PILOT resolved by the municipality. Not having one does not mean MSHDA wouldn't review or approve. Mr. Elsenheimer confirmed he had not seen an application himself in a year, however has veteran staff in his office if they had seen an application approved without a PILOT, and no one had. The process is competitive and oversubscribed. These tax credits are powerful, and provide equity and remove the risk from the developer from the projects. They wind up able to regenerate projects where the investments revitalize. Mr. Elsenheimer stated again MSHDA would not tell the City they have to engage in PILOTS or tell them at what level the City should. Every 2 years MSHDA does a review of the guide book that is used to compare applications around the State. The changes this year are minor, and will not impact the approach taken over time. MSHDA looks at walkability and transportation, and MSHDA expects those to continue with the new plan this summer. The currently discussed negotiations and decisions are in Councils control. Council President Brown Clarke asked if there is an advantage to anyone to have the City support when going to MSHDA.

Mr. Elsenheimer admitted MSHDA does not look at application if there is no support or approval from their municipality.

Council Member Spitzley asked Mr. Elsenheimer if during the application period is it true that a developer gets addition points in the application process if they have a PILOT form the City, which makes their application more competitive. Mr. Elsenheimer confirmed.

Council Member Wood noted that the City policy in 2003 should be reviewed so Council can determine what length of time a PILOT will be, so if they want a 50 year PILOT it is not initiated by MSHDA. Mr. Elsenheimer agreed that was accurate, because MSHDA has an allowance and statue to provide up to 50 years for a PILOT to be in place, but not all come in 50 years. The average Mr. Elsenheimer admitted he had seen was 30 years and he does see some with less time. MSHDA would want to see some generate with the period and the loan,

DRAFT

such as if 30 years with MSHDA it is important to see there is some kind of PILOT received for that same time. Council Member Wood asked if during the PILOT they have the opportunity to rescind. Mr. Elsenheimer deferred to the City Attorney, but stated that if it impacts MSHDA, the odds are good that once they enter into a relationship the relationship will continue, and MSHDA hopes the PILOT would continue.

Council Member Wood asked if there was anything to prohibit council from amounts of the PILOT 10% to 4%, and if the developer decided to have a portion market rate, would that prohibit council to add that in. Mr. Elsenheimer states that low income and single project is MSHDA policy.

Council Member Wood referenced a current PILOT proposal called Walnut Park, where the developer proposed it would not all be low income, but only 20% would be, so there is the assumption the balance would be market rate and full taxes. Mr. Elsenheimer stated he would work with the MSHDA attorney to work with Mr. Abood on clarification to discuss.

Council Member Washington reminded the group that Council is suppose to vote Monday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, and does not want Council to get harmed by just one entity but there is currently one project that is has a PILOT that says low income senior, except 10% market rate. She asked if the developer can't fill with seniors, do they have the opportunity under tax credits to fill with different a demographic such as low income or disability housing or does it have to remain senior housing. Mr. Elsenheimer stated it would depend on the application provided to MSHDA, and the application would specify a certain type of housing, and the credits and access to programs would be allowed based on that. Many project have multiple opportunities for use, and generally not unusual to see different types.

Mr. Edmiston joined into the discussion informing the Committee that when there is a tax credit, MSHDA enters into an agreement, and when it is not filled they can't rent to families. When that occurs they try to drop rents and offer incentives. MSHDA performs a study before tax credit application is submitted, and then a market study is done before the application is submitted to see if the income and age class will fill units.

Council Member Yorke also noted that MSHDA has age restrictions so there is no wiggle room, so developers have to go back to MSHDA for a change. Mr. Edmiston agreed, and noted there was a provision, but not seen often. Mr. Elsenheimer added that on occasion MSHDA does entertain modifications to the agreements, but it is rare and there is a high threshold. The Board generally does not want to change those agreements. MSHDA does want them to be successful. Council President Brown Clarke asked if there was documentation of any local review on the regulatory on the development. Mr. Elsenheimer could not speak to that. Council Member Yorke agreed with the earlier statement by Council Member Washington which was if a senior was not filled, then go to family. If is affordable senior housing then it needs to stay that way. When a developer talks about affordable and market rate, currently in the pending resolutions there are a number of units that are market rate. An opinion is needed for more single family housing and did the Design Lansing Plan call for a difference in the City, and that was asked of Mr. Johnson.

Council Member Dunbar asked Mr. Elsenheimer about the rating system for applications for a PILOT noting it is their understanding there is favor given if there is local support and that support could be the granting of a PILOT, therefore are there other forms of local support that would garner favor with MSHDA. Council could follow the master plan, a revitalization plan, or they could craft a resolution that says they support a PILOT. If Council did that does the PILOT still provide more points than a resolution of support. Mr. Elsenheimer noted that a resolution of support is different, it would not be points but a yes or no if they look at. There

DRAFT

are other opportunities for points. They may involve municipal support, but the clearest is the PILOT issue. Mr. Elsenheimer recommended that if Council is reviewing an ordinance for a general PILOT plan, they should review the application.

Council Member Dunbar asked what the PILOT means to MSHDA, and if the applicant has better relationship over the time they have the relationship with MSHDA. Mr. Elsenheimer stated it shows evidence of financial viability of the application which is important, less in taxes and which means they have more to do things that MSHDA wants done such as improvements, etc. This provides the evidence of support of the relationship between MSHDA, the developer and the community. Council Member Dunbar asked when MSHDA declares a senior housing development, is that for the length of the relationship between MDHDA. Mr. Elsenheimer confirmed it is the length of the relationship with the developer but when it ends it is often re-up. So a 15 year relationship could extent to 30 years, and at that point of extension there could be new capital. Every deal is different, every capital is different and some capital requires 15 years some 30 years. Council Member Dunbar asked Mr. Elsenheimer if he has ever seen PILOTS granted by a City that last longer than MSDHA. Mr. Elsenheimer could not speak to it, but would research it. Council member Dunbar then asked if Council can look at a PILOT time line with MSHDA before Council grants a PILOT. Mr. Elsenheimer informed the Council that the developer should be able to tell the Council based on what program they are asking for. Mr. Johnson stated that under ACT 346, it has to qualify or there is no tax abatement.

Council Member Washington noted her opinion that she wants something similar to East Village.

Council Member Yorke stepped away from the meeting at 7:14 p.m.  
Council Member Washington stepped away from the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Abood reviewed the legal opinion of March 21, 2016.

Council Member Yorke and Washington returned to the meeting at 7:16 p.m.

Mr. Abood outlined the questions that were asked on February 29, 2016.

Council Member Houghton stepped away from the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

Mr. Abood cited from the March 21, 2016 opinion addressing the questions "May restrictions as to age or May Council place restriction on PILOT's based on age of eligible persons or based on percentages? May Council take action to limit PILOT's if Council determines it wishes to do so?" Answers for the first question: "No. Codification is a legal term that refers in the City of Lansing to legislation by ordinance and there is no current ordinance that restricts PILOT's by policy.

Council Member Dunbar stepped away from the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

#2. Yes and No. Council may limit PILOT's under the Michigan State Housing Development Authority Act (the "Act") provided that it does this by ordinance and provided that the ordinance states by "class" the housing projects that will not be included in the PILOT program. However, the Act does not define the classes to which the State refers.

Council Member Dunbar returned to the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

#3 Yes. As stated in the short answer to question 2, the Council may limit PILOT's prospectively in the City, provided it does so by ordinance and by identified class."

Mr. Abood went on to reflect on Resolution 0556 of 2002 which resulted in the City establishing a moratorium on PILOT's so Council could analyze. Resolution 328 of 2003 adopted the PILOT policy of June 2003 by reference, which was developed by the analyzation. The 2003 policy stated that new developments would be 10% PILOT's, and under 10% would be reviewed case by case utilizing the criteria. Over the years we the City have been lumping similar projects to HUD, senior and disability. Since HUD has defined a class the City has been consistent in using that class definition. In limiting by class Council deviated, and because of deviation they are no longer active. Mr. Abood concluded by stating that nothing precludes Council from creating a new policy consistent with the original and with the State law. A moratorium however should be less than 12 months, and 6 months could be considerate amount of time.

Council Member Houghton returned to the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Mr. Abood acknowledged that he would discuss with MSDHA and will work expeditiously and have answer by March 28<sup>th</sup>. Council can consider PILOT's by preference to time frames. In 2003 0-9% were for only 10 years, and then they can re-evaluate. Any recommendation on that was deferred to Mr. Johnson. When looking at the policy Mr. Abood looked at three areas, the commencement which is what is to take place in a short time it is recommended a year from approval. Second topic is to make sure of the specific completion date, and that should be expeditiously. Council can tailor the ordinance that the completion date is the date of the certificate of occupancy. Final area is the want for specific time periods to run with the financial periods. When asking Council for 35-40 year PILOT that is specific in the ordinance, and if it commences in 2 years then add that to the years of the PILOT. The remainder of the 10% PILOT's do not seek approval unless the City creates an ordinance that eliminates that class. During the proposed moratorium the 10% PILOT's can be reviewed pursuant to criteria. Lastly it was concluded from the legal opinion that there should be checks and balances, and each PILOT should be done on a case by case basis with the appropriate time to review.

Council President Brown Clarke noted to Mr. Abood the information is time sensitive for next meeting on March 28<sup>th</sup> for discussion and help with the short term decision for projects that are proposed for hearings and action at the March 28<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. There is a second request to Law to review what is good for the long term policy.

Council Member Dunbar noted for the group that Council has never reviewed the policy since 2003, so every PILOT passed on the spreadsheet handout have all been 4% and 30 years, so no one paid attention to policy at the time. In the legal opinion the Act says 10% of PILOT is granted even without approval of the City. Council Member Dunbar asked the question to MSDHA representatives that if a developer pursues the PILOT at 10% would they lose points. Council President Brown Clarke suggested they would probably not score as high. Council Member Spitzley contributed to the discussion asking for a comprehensive review of the policy, and a return on the investment seeking out where are we within the City. She stated her concern that there are currently a number of PILOT's in front of Council now that need consideration and decisions. Council Member Spitzley has hopes there will be no moratorium on those that have currently had active public hearings, and Council will take the opportunity of the time between he April 1 MSHDA deadline and the October 1 MSHDA deadline to study, possibly have an independent study of experts in the field, and look at how PILOT's fair in the City. Council President Brown Clarke assured the Committee that the PILOT's that are in the queue will be looked at Monday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, then the Council will start on the policy to have in place by October when they will start to revisit PILOT applications.

DRAFT

Council Member Wood asked the question “what does Council need to do and know to make the decisions”. Questions that are still outstanding include “what PILOT’s at 4% are up for a vote and what ones have the City granted over the years, what ones are with market rate, lastly she asked for a copy of the MSHDA application of what the developers are applying for so that Council does not extend a PILOT for longer than the MSHDA application PILOT is for.

Council Member Spitzley stepped away from the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Council Member Wood reminded the Committee that over the years Council has asked if the PILOT applications are in line with the 2003 policy.

Council Member Spitzley returned to the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

Council Member Yorke asked the question of the PILOT’s being a viable deal without the incentive, and with a brownfield of \$38,000 new taxes over 17 year then the full tax capture. With the School for the Blind, with a 100% affordable scenario, \$40,000 for longer time period, so there will be a longer time when the property goes to full rate. With every project, Council encourages encourage community involvement. The policy in the future should be to look at comprehensive with all. Council Member Washington assured the Committee that her proposal for a moratorium cannot stop projects that are currently in the process. She will ask for moratorium in the Committee on Development and Planning because the City needs a vision on where the City is headed, Council needs the true financial outlet on what it will be.

#### City Attorney Status and Future of City Attorney

Council President Brown Clarke outlined the time line of the departure of Ms. McIntyre and her presence at the February 29<sup>th</sup> meeting representing she was back to work.

Council Member Yorke stepped away from the meeting at 7:51 p.m.

Council President Brown Clarke asked the Administrations for clarity on the expectations and clarity of the understanding of what and how the severance was determined. City Council is having difficulty obtaining Ms. McIntyre last contract, and contract extensions. Mr. Swope was then asked about his office’s process with contracts. Mr. Swope noted that contracts come to his office in two different ways.

Mr. Abood stepped away from the meeting at 7:54 p.m.

Mr. Swope outlined the process for employment contracts for department heads are submitted to the Clerk’s office after they are executed at which pointed they are logged in and placed in the vault. Council President Brown Clarke asked if they are signed and submitted to the Clerk in a timely manner. Mr. Swope confirmed it is an ongoing basis, department head contracts are usually on a calendar year, and therefore the Clerk’s office would get at the beginning of the calendar year. Council President Brown Clarke asked if they Clerk reviews his log to make sure nothing is missing. Mr. Swope stated his office files every contract that is brought to his office and not their practice to ask for missing documents. Council Member Wood noted to Mr. Swope that Council was not able to obtain or locate one of the renewal contracts.

Mr. Abood returned to the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

Council Member Wood asked Mr. Swope if the renewal was never given to the Clerk, or it was given to the Clerk and logged and not in the files now. Council has the March 2013 contract, the signed 2014 extension, but no extension for 2015.

Council Member Yorke returned to the meeting at 7:57 p.m.

DRAFT

Council Member Wood asked for the contract that was signed in 2015 that took effect 1/1/2016. Mr. Swope confirmed again that his office did not have that on file. Council Member Wood then asked Mr. Hannan if there was an extension for Ms. McIntyre for that year, and Mr. Hannan confirmed but his office was not able to locate the original but does have a final draft. Administration has also asked law to search their contract files. Mr. Hannan stated his understanding of the process that contracts should be filed with the Clerk by the City Attorney or Human Resources office. Mr. Hannan acknowledged that the Administration has a final draft and continues to search for the signed contract. Recently a new process for contracts is being implemented in ONBASE regarding contracts and the Administration, the Clerk and the HR department is working to make all contracts electronic and electronically archived. Council Member Wood asked if the draft that Mr. Hannan located is different than the signed original. Mr. Hannan stated no and he could provide a copy of the draft. Council Member Wood asked Mr. Swope if all other department heads contracts for the period of 2015 have been placed on file and Mr. Swope confirmed he had looked in one other file, and there was no 2015 contract in there either. Council President Brown Clarke asked Mr. Abood to locate all final drafts of the Department Executive Director contracts since they are not filed in the Clerk's office. Mr. Hannan informed the Committee that contracts are not on file in the City Attorney office, only the drafts. Council President Brown Clarke then asked where the other contract extensions for the executive staff for 2015 are. Mr. Hannan answered that they would be with the Clerk office, and Council President Brown Clarke asked again where else since the Clerk had stated they had none. Mr. Hannan stated it would then depend on the courier that delivered them, if they would be from the personnel in the City Attorney office or the HR Department.

Council President Brown Clarke addressed Ms. Riley and her familiarity with the {Personnel Rules, reading the rules for Executive Management Plan Employees which stated under Section E. "If an employee resigns, such resignation may be withdrawn only at the discretion of the Mayor or appointing authority. Employees are requested to give 30-days notice prior to the last day of work.", and therefore asked Ms. Riley if Ms. McIntyre gave notice, since Council was under the understanding she did not. Ms. Riley did not respond, but Mr. Hannan responded by stating that that the separation agreement in question was not entered into within the confines of the Executive Management Plan. It is not a severance it the terms it is a separation agreement and some do not adhere to all those perimeters and follow all those protocol. Mr. Hannan concluded stated the City was not given a 30 day notice. Council President Brown Clarke asked Ms. Riley and Mr. Hannan why the administration negotiated beyond the scope, what was the decision making to negotiate beyond the scope of the management plan since it was not under those guidelines. Mr. Hannan noted that he cannot disclose all particulars because it is in a confidential manner, 2<sup>nd</sup> they cannot disclose anything under attorney/client privileges. Council President Brown Clarke asked if Council was considered the client, and Mr. Hannan stated yes, but that privilege extends to a public meeting. He continued stated that the Administration is not interest in violating the privacy, and therefore cannot disclose. Under basic protocol, he can answer questions, but will be refined. Mr. Hannan spoke on behalf of the Mayor stating the Mayor believes the settlement agreement was in the best interest of the City, and it is similar in private and public sector where they release claims by both sides, so this case is not that unusual.

Council Member Washington repeated Mr. Hanna's confirmation that Council is the client, and also cannot discuss in a public meeting so why can't they go into closed session. Council Member Wood added that if the City attorney is the client, who is the attorney for the City. Mr. Hannan commented first on the closed session noting under the open meetings act, the only time Council can do that in a personnel matter is by request of the employee and since Ms. McIntyre is no longer an employee Council cannot. Mr. Hannan advised the Council that Ms. McIntyre was sitting at the DIAS on February 29, 2016 and Council could have asked then.

Council President Brown Clarke reminded Mr. Hannan that at the February 29, 2016 meeting there was no indication to Council that Ms. McIntyre would not continue in her duties as City Attorney and it was insulting to the Council that they were not made aware of the agreement prior to the February 29, 2016 meeting. Mr. Hannan stated that the Administration used Dykema Law firm, Kip Ford and Harry Portman and Associates. Council Member Wood asked what they were paid, and Mr. Hannan read from the invoice \$9,553.00. Council Member Wood asked Mr. Hannan if when Ms. McIntyre was present at the Committee and Council meeting on February 29, 2016 if the administration was aware there was already in agreement. Mr. Hannan acknowledged he was not but some in Administration were. Council Member Wood noted that it was evident the Mayor knew and yet he did not give the information to Council. Council was under the impression Ms. McIntyre was an employee, and she herself had scheduled a meeting with Ms. McIntyre. The Mayor has an obligation to let Council know even if the City Attorney had told Council herself. Council Member Wood continued by reminding Mr. Hannan that the Mayor himself made it well known in the public there was an issue with the Peter Lark and his severance agreement and even criticized the BWL Board on entering into that agreement, so how does the Administration justify the Mayor entering into this severance package. Mr. Hannan noted to Council that the BWL contract with Mr. Lark was a 5 year contract and that was the basis of concern for the Mayor. In this case it was a one year, under the new charter amendment. Funds in this settlement would have been similar to other employees, this was not a settlement designed within corners of the executive management plan or employment rules, but a settlement. Council President Brown Clarke asked if Brig Smith had a separation agreement and severance packet when he left, Mr. Hannan had no answer and will look at it. Ms. Riley also had no knowledge. Council President Brown Clarke reminded Ms. Riley that the Council Internal Auditor had sent an email request with this question prior to the meeting, with no response. Mr. Hannan stated they will look in the HR files, however Mr. Smith left under different circumstances, it was a standard employee leaving situation and this recent one was not a standard. Council Member Wood asked if the Mayor had anticipated entering into a separation agreement when he signed Ms McIntyre contract in December 2015 to extend her employment for another year. Mr. Hannan stated no. Council Member Wood then asked when outside counsel was hired, and Mr. Hannan could not provide a precise date but guess mid-January. Council Member Wood then asked for the precise date. This lead Council President to ask Mr. Abood about the date since his office secured the outside counsel. Mr. Abood could not verify the dates, but stated it was appropriate to secure outside counsel because his office was conflicted. Council President Brown Clarke asked again for the date. Mr. Abood confirmed he was not involved in the process and the law firm used was on the approved outside counsel list. They have done arbitrations and have an ongoing agreement so they were appropriate. As far as the procedure Law was aware but not involved in specifics. Council President Brown Clarke first acknowledged the Lansing State Journal for providing information to the Council that they were not able to obtain, then asked Ms. Riley her opinion on the FMLA requirements for leave and the amount of hours that Ms. McIntyre was reimbursed, if her opinion was that Ms. McIntyre never used vacation time while she was at the City and if she used any time during the FMLA leave. Ms. Riley noted it was a confidential personal matter, and she had no knowledge if she took time before she herself starting working for the City. Council President Brown Clarke then asked Ms. Riley to define what FMLA is, and if it is unpaid time. Ms. Riley confirmed it could be, and you can use vacation, personal, sick. Mr. Hannan interjected that under the executive management plan, department directors can get 120 hours of leave time as of January 1<sup>st</sup>, then 120 days the subsequent year, then each year of service up to 8 years of service. So by year two there could be 128 hours of leave time, year 3 136 leave. Mr. Hannan clarified that because Ms. McIntyre held a department dual role, she received additional allocations of leave time pursuant of leave time, 80 hours of leave over three years to 240 hours. Hypothetical Ms. McIntyre could accumulate 744 leave days over the time. Council President Brown Clarke asked if any other department directors have dual roles

accumulating time. Mr. Hannan confirmed Mr. Gamble did, but not at that level. Council Member Wood pointed out to Mr. Hannan that Mr. Gamble was asked who was in charge of the IT Department and he stated he was, so has he been collecting dual vacation time over the time the IT Director position has been vacant. Mr. Hannan stated no, and Ms. McIntyre did not receive dual pay for two departments. Council Member Wood asked for the contract verifying that for Mr. Gamble and Mr. Hannan confirmed he could not produce the one for Ms. McIntyre because it was missing. Council Member Wood concluded by reminding Mr. Hannan that in 2005-2006 the administration came to the Committee on Ways and Means and voiced concerns with excess vacation time that outgoing directors were getting paid, and now they are contradicting their concerns.

Council Member Washington reminded Mr. Hannan of the dates that she has conflicts with which include Ms. McIntyre last date of March 4<sup>th</sup>, but her arriving to work on February 29<sup>th</sup>, but signing the agreement on February 25<sup>th</sup>. The Council is aware of her vacation she took over her time with the City, so there is a conflict with the separation agreement. Council Member Washington then acknowledge the Lansing State Journal also for their report of information that Council was not provided. Council President Brown Clarke stated for the group that she hoped there will be clarification with the draft 2015 contract, which would show combined vacation, combined sick, combined personal time.

Council President Brown Clarke continued on with her notes, referencing page 2 which spoke to legal Clause #14 in the agreement which stated "other City leaders" and asked who that was. Mr. Hannan quickly stated management but then referred to Law stating it does not bind Council then read Article #13 and Article #14. Council President Brown Clarke asked why that language was added and Mr. Hanna's answer was that it was a standard boilerplate language in any employee separation. IT is designed to create separation. Council President Brown Clarke spoke about the reciprocal language and if Ms. McIntyre mirrored that language, Mr. Hannan stated she was an employee. Council President asked how long the parties were bound by the agreement, and Mr. Hannan confirmed indefinitely and by all parties named. Mr. Abood was then asked, and Mr. Abood stated the parties have signed an agreement that binds them, and does not believe it is time frame bound. As long as there is an agreement in place it is binding. We can envision scenarios where agreements would not last, because one side or another breach the agreement. If an agreement does not have a time frame it is meant to continue. Council President Brown Clarke referred back to the acknowledgement that Council is the client, and Mr. Hannan stated they cannot go into closed session, can Council read the opinion on the agreement from Dykema Gossett, the outside counsel. Mr., Hannan stated there was no opinion, but verbal advice, and a memo with the frame work and types of agreements were constructed, but that too is attorney client privileged that Mr. Abood can share with Council, but the document cannot be shared. Council President Brown Clarke asked again if Council was the client, and Mr. Hannan suggested they get their advice from Law. Mr. Abood confirmed that in this situation Council is the client. Council President Brown Clarke then asked to see the legal recommendation, notes, and any exchange from Dykema Gossett referencing or guiding this separation agreement. Mr. Abood answered the request by stating that with regards to the memorandum, Council could review that memorandum as long as they maintain the confidentiality the memorandum is entitled to have. Council President Brown Clarke asked how soon Council could have access to it, and if they need to go into closed session at the March 7<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Hannan cautioned Council from going into closed session, and stated the documents were transmitted to the City Attorney so viewing would be up to them to handle. The Administration will not participate. Council President Brown Clarke suggested seeking outside counsel for guidance on council legal authority, since closed session is only for employees and now that window is not open. Mr. Abood stated with the Open Meetings Act the Law Office would advise Council not to do something that would break the law, and

DRAFT

therefore they are recommended not to go into closed session. Council President Brown Clarke asked Law how Council knows if it is something for closed session if they can't see it. Mr. Abood offered to provide memorandum, but cannot go into closed session. There are confidential concerns and also advised not to be made public.

Council Member Yorke recapped the discussion and asked for additional information on the separation agreement.

Council Member Washington commented to the public that Ms. McIntyre was not just any employee, she worked for Council, and Council was never told anything until it was in the media. To say it was Council's responsibility to find out because she was their employee was insulting, because everything was kept a secret, then administration advises Council to discuss ongoing actions with active employees but Council is not aware of issues when they are active.

Council Member Dunbar asked Mr. Abood what path Council should take since the documents cannot be reviewed in closed session, they can't be left in their mailbox because confidential, and can't be discussed at an open meeting. Mr. Abood confirmed his office can hand the documents out individually to Council Members in his office. Council member Spitzley repeated that City Council is the client there is a concern they are bound by contract, so Council needs to make sure they are not in violation of contract. Mr. Abood stated that Council is party to certain parts of the agreement and released from future claims. Other parts of the agreement are the signator of the agreement, those that sign. Council Member Spitzley referenced the earlier statement of "leaders", and Mr. Abood noted it specifically states that class.

Mr. Hannan read the Charter stating this is an administrative function, and the charter states the responsibility of Council is the administrative activities limited to its own staff. Council Member Washington reminded Mr. Hannan this situation was not departmental, this position was a Council employee, and her position was council staff.

Council President Brown Clarke suggested that maybe the Council needs their own legal representation because the City Attorney cannot assist Council and the administration is bound by confidentiality, Ms. Riley cannot provide any input, and Council has no capacity and no one to help us walk thru. Council needs to look at outside counsel under confidential clause.

Council Member Washington reminded Mr. Hannan that it can't go both ways, stating one minute that Ms. McIntyre is a Council employee, then telling them she was not an employee, but always presented as an employee.

Council Member Houghton stated it appears that this situation is convoluted and secrecy. She has a concern with getting Council's own outside counsel because they would be spending additional tax payer dollars with still no answers. Having binding contracts and Council can't see them, how can another attorney.

Council Member Hussain opinion was with the hours Ms. McIntyre was reimbursed and the explanation that was given. Lastly he voiced his frustration with obtaining any information, and there may be a need for outside council to make sure this doesn't happen again.

Council Member Yorke agreed to meet one on one with the City Attorney office to review the documents they haven't seen.

DRAFT

Council Member Wood voiced her frustration on the overall leave time of Ms. McIntyre and then when she came back, it appears everything was already in motion for her separation agreement to be signed and yet Council was not part of it, even though the Mayor stated publicly that Ms. McIntyre was Council's employee.

Council Member Washington stepped away from the meeting at 9 p.m.

Council Member Wood asked Mr. Abood to provide the Council with the draft contract before the Council meeting, and Mr. Abood stated he would make every effort. Council Member Wood concluded that Council needs to let the public know where their tax payer dollars are going.

Council Member Washington returned to the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

Council Member Spitzley agreed with other Council Members on the statement of employee and employer relationship, and would like to err on the side of caution with the agreement and terms. She continued by noting that the agreement was done, signed she was not in favor of spending more money for outside counsel. Council Member Spitzley concluded by stating she does not like the issue, but not sure Council will get answered without outside counsel.

Council Member Dunbar was given the opportunity to address the topic and had nothing more to add.

Council Member Washington agreed to abide by what is directed however does not feel there is a legal obligation bound to it, Council needs to ask because it appears Administration is hiding something and Council cannot allow this to continue and this is the third time.

Council Member Wood stated to the Committee that when the Council developed the executive management plan it was after employee buy outs in 2005 with department heads, and at that time Council did hire outside legal counsel and based on that Council changed the ordinance and developed the Executive Management Plan. Mr. Abood was asked, based on comments by Mr. Hannan earlier, based on the recent Charter revision, the City was entering into a year contract, does that mean if an employee is bound by the Executive Management Plan, can they receive a year's pay. The severance package is less in the Executive Management Plan than what was received by Ms. McIntyre, therefore was is the clarification on this. Mr. Abood could not provide an answer and stated he would research.

Council Member Yorke and Council Member Dunbar stepped away from the meeting 9:08 p.m.

Council Member Wood noted that Mr. Abood should also research the limit in the Executive Management Plan of 120 days and limited vacation time.

Council President Brown Clarke presented two options for Council to consider which were that whatever review process that Mr. Abood will guide Council thru, they will then look at that point of time if they want to pursue outside counsel, or does Council we want to ask for outside counsel so they can look at it with us. The plan would be on Monday, March 28<sup>th</sup> there could be either a resolution for outside counsel to look at the documents, or Council we will move forward with setting up time with the City Attorney office. All Council Members should contact Council staff with their choice by Thursday, March 24. Council Member Washington asked if there were funds in the budget for outside Counsel, and Mr. DeLine referenced the miscellaneous account that is broad enough to absorb it.

DRAFT

Mr. Abood noted that while the City Attorney has separation with this negotiation, Law can still advise Council as long as not relative to. To the extent to which questions can answer, unless issue we are conflicted with. Any legal issue will be given best advice, if there is a conflict Law will notify Council.

Council Member Dunbar returned to the meeting at 9:13 p.m.

The Committee discussed the options of reviewing the Dykema Gossett documents before a decision is made on outside legal counsel, what is non-conflicting, and Council President Brown Clarke asked Mr. Abood to coordinate with each Council Member individually to set up an appointment to review documents in his office.

Council Member Yorke returned to the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Council Member Spitzley's opinion was not to make a decision on outside counsel until reviewing whatever document Law had, however was not in favor of hiring outside counsel.

Council President asked Mr. Abood what options were available after Council saw the documents and if they could decide on outside, or does City Attorney take and secure outside counsel to address the individual questions. Mr. Abood stated that any conflicted questions the City Attorney could not answer they would vet or seek outside counsel for. Council President Brown Clarke voiced her concern that Council as a whole will not see individual Council Members questions from the review of the documents, so will those be answered individually or a list of the questions and answers be submitted to the Council. Mr. Abood confirmed it would depend on the issue being answered.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by,  
Sherrie Boak, Recording Secretary  
Lansing City Council  
Approved by the Committee on



**MINUTES**  
**Committee of the Whole**  
**Monday, March 28, 2016 @ 5:30 p.m.**  
**City Council Chamber**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m.

**PRESENT**

Councilmember Brown Clarke  
Councilmember Jessica Yorko  
Councilmember Patricia Spitzley  
Councilmember Adam Hussain  
Councilmember Kathie Dunbar - arrived at 5:34 p.m.  
Councilmember Carol Wood  
Councilmember Jody Washington  
Councilmember Tina Houghton - arrived at 5:34 p.m.

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Courtney Vincent, Council Administrative Assistant  
Randy Hannan, Mayor Executive Assistant  
Joseph Abood, Deputy City Attorney  
Mark Dotson, Deputy City Attorney  
Brett Kaschinske, Parks and Recreation  
Doris Witherspoon, Planning & Neighborhood Development  
Robert Johnson, Planning & Neighborhood Development  
Donald Kulhanek, Planning & Neighborhood Development

**Approval of Minutes**

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER YORKO TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 29, 2016 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER YORKO TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM MARCH 14, 2016 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Stan Shuck, a resident of South Lansing, addressed the Committee to express his concerns regarding the City acquisition of the Boat Club property and NAPA contract issues.

Councilmembers Dunbar and Houghton arrived at 5:34 p.m.

Mr. Matt Bahr, a mechanic with the City of Lansing Fleet Services Division, addressed the Committee to express his concerns regarding the NAPA contract issues.

### **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

Councilmember Brown Clarke stated that agenda item 5.B. regarding the Montgomery Drain Drainage District Easements would be pulled from the agenda until a later date due to the item being incorrectly noticed. She specified that they would allow public comment on that agenda item during the City Council meeting to follow, but it would also be re-noticed for a later date. She restructured the Discussion/Action portion of the agenda to be heard in the following order: 5.A., 5.E., 5.C., 5.D., 5.F.

### **ACT-16-2015; Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund Grant Application for the Acquisition of Boat Club Property**

Mr. Brett Kaschinske, Director of the City of Lansing's Parks and Recreation Department, provided an overview of the City's interest in purchasing the Boat Club property and expressed his confidence that the funding request would be approved.

Councilmember Wood asked which park the Boat Club property would be attached to. Mr. Kaschinske replied that it would most likely be attached to Fulton Park.

Councilmember Hussain asked if purchase of this property was part of the 5-Year Master Plan, or if it was only the purchase of riverfront property in general that was part of the Plan. Mr. Kaschinske replied that it was riverfront property in general.

MOTION BY COUNCILMEMBER YORKO TO APPROVE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE MICHIGAN NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST FUND GRANT APPLICATION FOR THE ACQUISITION OF BOAT CLUB PROPERTY. MOTION CARRIED 8-0.

### **RESOLUTION – Set the Public Hearing; 5-year Consolidated Plan, Community Development Fund Resources, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)**

Mr. Donald Kulhanek, Development Manager for Planning and Neighborhood Development, reviewed the purpose of the 5-Year Consolidated Plan and the Annual Action Plan. He then stated that they were proceeding with the Participation Plan, which required a Public Hearing. He requested the City Council set a Public Hearing date for both the 5-Year Consolidated Plan for 2016-2021 and the Annual Action Plan for 2016.

Councilmember Wood remarked that this was being scheduled for a Public Hearing now because the CDBG budget needed to be passed before the annual budget for the City Council.

Councilmember Spitzley stated she would like more information on the economic development portion of the 5-Year Consolidated Plan.

Councilmember Washington requested more information on how the public was notified of the different programs available to them for assistance. Ms. Doris Witherspoon, Senior Planner for the Development Office, stated that the programs were advertised, and that information was available on the City's website, sent to neighborhood organizations, posted in some community facilities and libraries, and advertised in local newspapers. Councilmember Washington asked how residents could find out about specific programs such as the housing rehabilitation program. Mr. Kulhanek replied that they currently advertised programs on Facebook and Twitter as well as through the City's website, they had recently advertised the

building rehabilitation program on local radio stations, and they were also looking at expanding their advertising.

Councilmember Brown Clarke stated that the Council would send Mr. Kulhanek any further questions they might have on the issue. She also asked that Mr. Kulhanek discuss at the next meeting how the City Council could assist with pushing information on the various programs.

MOTION BY COUNCILMEMBER DUNBAR TO APPROVE RESOLUTION SETTING THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE 5-YEAR CONSOLIDATION PLAN AND THE ANNUAL ACTION PLAN FOR APRIL 11, 2016. MOTION CARRIED 8-0.

City Attorney Update on Cabaret License Revocation – A Peace of Mind Elite LLC dba Fahrenheit, 6810 S. Cedar S. Lansing, MI

Mr. Mark Dotson, Deputy City Attorney, handed out a copy of the Findings of Fact and Recommendation for the hearing that occurred on March 21, 2016 regarding the revocation of the Cabaret License for A Peace of Mind Elite LLC dba Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge, and summarized the proceedings. He mentioned that the Cabaret License was currently set to expire in May of 2016. He next discussed his findings from the hearing, stating that he was convinced Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge had been selected by Chief Yankowski because there were legitimate concerns for the operation of that facility, citing a list of the number of service calls to the property since 2009. He reported that Chief Yankowski had indicated 60 service calls per year as the average number for similar establishments, and that the average number for Fahrenheit annually was much higher. He discussed the details surrounding the shooting that occurred on the premises on March 13, 2016. He then discussed the effects the problems at Fahrenheit had on the surrounding neighborhood. He recommended the City Council consider revoking the Cabaret License.

Councilmember Spitzley asked if Mr. Germaine Redding, owner of the Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge, had been in attendance for the hearing. Mr. Dotson replied that he had been, and that he had not contested the recommendation. He added that Mr. Redding was intending to shut down Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge.

Councilmember Hussain asked if the average of 60 service calls per year took hours of operation into consideration, commenting that 60 seemed high considering Fahrenheit was not open every day of the week. Mr. Dotson replied that the figure was relative to the maximum crowd allowed and the size of the facility. He agreed with Councilmember Hussain that it did seem high when taken in the context of the hours of operation for Fahrenheit.

Councilmember Wood asked Mr. Dotson to explain for the benefit of the public what revocation of a Cabaret License entailed. Mr. Dotson explained that a cabaret includes any room in a hotel, restaurant, hall or other public place where music or dancing privileges or any other entertainment, except mechanical music alone, is afforded to patrons in connection with the servicing or selling of food, refreshments or merchandising.

Councilmember Wood stated that there was a hearing scheduled for April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016, regarding the revocation of the Liquor License, which was separate from the Cabaret License. She asked Mr. Dotson to clarify whether no music would be allowed at the facility if the Cabaret License was. Mr. Dotson replied that only mechanical music, such as from a juke box, would be allowed, and that no dancing would be allowed.

Councilmember Wood agreed with Councilmember Hussain's comment that the number of incidents was high considering the hours of operation for the facility. She commented on the Memorandum of Understanding that had been enacted between the owner and the City a few

years prior in an attempt to address the problems regarding the facility. She then mentioned that the shooting had occurred despite there being between 24 and 30 security personnel working the event on March 13<sup>th</sup>, with around 800 people in attendance.

Councilmember Washington asked if the Cabaret License was associated with the establishment, not the owner. Mr. Dotson replied that that was correct.

Councilmember Yorke commented that the number of service calls appeared to decline between 2010 and 2012, after the Memorandum of Understanding was put in place, but then gradually increased after that period. She remarked that the number of service calls to the establishment could place significant demands on the police. Mr. Dotson concurred. He also commented that the number of security personnel present at the March 13<sup>th</sup> event should have been a sufficient amount relative to the number of attendees.

Councilmember Dunbar asked if Mr. Redding intended to close the facility and what the estimated date for that would be. Mr. Dotson replied that Mr. Redding had indicated Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge would be going out of business, though he did not have details on what that entailed or when that might occur.

Councilmember Brown Clarke asked if the license revocation would apply to both the establishment and Mr. Redding. Mr. Dotson replied that the Cabaret License had been issued to A Peace of Mind Elite, LLC, dba Fahrenheit, and that Mr. Redding would have to obtain another license if he wanted to open another facility elsewhere.

MOTION BY COUNCILMEMBER WOOD TO ACCEPT THE HEARING OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION TO REVOKE THE CABARET LICENSE FOR GERMAINE REDDING, A PEACE OF MIND, LLC DBA FAHRENHEIT ULTRA LOUNGE, LOCATED AT 6810 S CEDAR. MOTION CARRIED 8-0

Councilmember Brown Clarke said a resolution approving the revocation of the Cabaret License would be discussed on the City Council meeting agenda as a late item.

Councilmember Dunbar mentioned the City Council would be addressing the Liquor License separately and asked if they revoked that license if Mr. Redding would still own the license or would it prevent it from being able to be resold or placed in escrow. Councilmember Wood explained that the Liquor License was part of the lease with Lansing Mark LLC, so the license would revert to them if the business closed. Mr. Abood agreed with Councilmember Wood's explanation.

#### RESOLUTION – Interim City Attorney

Councilmember Brown Clarke stated that the language for the proposed resolution had been taken from the 2013 resolution appointing Mr. Donald Kulhanek as the Interim City Attorney. Councilmember Yorke asked if the two month timeframe for the appointment had been a part of the resolution for Mr. Kulhanek. Councilmember Brown Clarke replied that it had.

Councilmember Brown Clarke asked how the review committee for the selection of the City Attorney was organized. Mr. Randy Hannan, Mayor Executive Assistant, replied that the Mayor selected the group, but that he did not know the formal process for that selection. Councilmember Brown Clarke suggested that the City Council have representation on the review committee. Councilmember Yorke suggested including a provision in the resolution that the City Council have a representative on the review committee. Councilmember Hussain agreed. Councilmember Wood suggested that the City Council representative be selected by the Council President.

Councilmember Yorke suggested adding the following language to the proposed resolution: "Whereas, the Lansing City Council requests representation in the selection committee for new City Attorney, to be appointed by the President."

Councilmember Dunbar asked if there was precedence for having a Council representative on the review committee. Councilmember Brown Clarke explained that it would allow for more transparency in the process. Mr. Hannan stated that he believed the Mayor would allow representation but that appointment of the City Attorney was at the sole discretion of the Mayor. He added that there was no formal meeting schedule and no specific constraints on when the selection process would begin or how it would be structured. He added that they would consider any request that came from Council.

Councilmember Washington stated she was comfortable with the suggested additional language. She then asked Mr. Abood about his daughter working under him in the City Attorney's Office. Mr. Abood replied that Ms. Nicole Malson, his daughter, had been hired by the former City Attorney, Ms. Janene McIntyre, and that he was talking with Ms. Mary Riley in Human Resources regarding the situation. He agreed that it was not appropriate for him to be Ms. Malson's direct supervisor, and stated that he had suggested Ms. Malson stay on in order to help transition whoever her replacement would be in order to maintain momentum.

MOTION BY COUNCILMEMBER WASHINGTON TO APPROVE RESOLUTION APPOINTING JOSEPH ABOOD AS INTERIM CITY ATTORNEY WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE: "WHEREAS, THE LANSING CITY COUNCIL REQUESTS REPRESENTATION IN SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR THE NEW CITY ATTORNEY, TO BE DESIGNATED BY THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT." MOTION CARRIED 8-0

#### DISCUSSION – City Garage Fleet Service Follow Up (NAPA)

Councilmember Brown Clarke asked if Mr. Chad Gamble, Executive Assistant to the Mayor, was present. Mr. Hannan replied that Mr. Gamble was not in attendance, and that he was not able to answer questions on the matter because he was not familiar with the details relative to this issue. He said that he could relay any questions the Council may have to Mr. Gamble.

Councilmember Wood stated that it was important Mr. Gamble be present for this discussion and suggested the Committee of the Whole meet on a day without a City Council meeting in order to continue discussion of this issue. Discussion ensued regarding an appropriate date to continue the discussion. Members of the Committee also expressed their frustration over Mr. Gamble's absence and the lack of an alternate familiar in the details of the matter at hand.

Councilmember Yorke stated for the record that prior to this meeting she had heard from some of the individuals involved in the new partnership that there were two City employees involved who she thinks were told they were going to be assigned to new positions but are still waiting to find out what would be the appropriate relocation for them.

Councilmember Wood suggested continuing the discussion during the Committee of the Whole meeting currently scheduled for April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Councilmember Brown Clarke stated that she would get confirmation of Mr. Gamble's attendance for that meeting. Councilmember Dunbar suggested having representation from the garage, specifically someone who oversees decisions regarding parts, attend as well.

Councilmember Yorke asked if this issue had been addressed by the Committee on Ways and Means. Councilmember Brown Clarke replied that discussion had been maintained through

Committee of the Whole, though the Committee on Public Service had addressed having some clarification questions answered.

Councilmember Houghton requested that Council staff call Mr. Gamble the day of April 18<sup>th</sup> to confirm his attendance. Councilmember Brown Clarke commented that if Mr. Gamble could not attend the meeting that alternates be in attendance who would be able to answer the Committee's questions.

**PLACE ON FILE**

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Courtney Vincent, Council Administrative Assistant

Lansing City Council

Approved by the Committee on \_\_\_\_\_



## CITY OF LANSING

### INTERNAL AUDITOR

124 W MICHIGAN AVE FL 10

LANSING MI 48933-1605

(517) 483-4159

Fax (517) 483-7630

## REPORT ON LONG-TERM DEBT

<b>DATE:</b>	April 7, 2016
<b>TO:</b>	Councilmembers <i>Jim</i>
<b>FROM:</b>	Jim DeLine, Internal Auditor
<b>CC:</b>	Mayor, City Clerk, Angela Bennett, Finance Director

This report, presented annually beginning in April 2013, is based on information contained in the fiscal year Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) as well as amortization schedules provided by the Finance Department. It is designed to compile those debt amortization schedules into an easy-to-use reference source.

Because of the similarity of names to many of the individual items, I have assigned an alpha-code to each in order to ease in referencing them across sections of the report. Feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

## REPORT ON LONG-TERM DEBT TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Recap of Debt by Type	
	a. General Obligation Bond .....	1 - 2
	b. Revenue Bonds.....	3
	c. Installment Purchase Agreements.....	3
	d. Loans Payable.....	4
II.	Recap of Debt by Fund	
	a. General Fund .....	1
	b. Major and Local Streets.....	1
	c. Stadium Fund .....	1
	d. Fire Stations .....	1
	e. Building Authority .....	1
	f. CIP Fund .....	1
	g. Golf Fund.....	2
	h. Municipal Parking System .....	2
	i. Recycling Collection .....	2
	j. Information Technologies .....	2
	k. Public Service -- Garage .....	2
	l. Public Service – Fleet.....	2
	m. Public Service – Internal Service Fund.....	2
	n. CSO (Wet Weather Program) 590 Fund.....	3
	o. Sewage Disposal System.....	3

III.	Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund	
	a. Fiscal Years 2016 -- 2018 .....	1 - 5
	b. Fiscal Years 2019 -- 2021 .....	6 - 10
	c. Fiscal Years 2022 -- 2024 .....	11 - 15
	d. Fiscal Years 2025 -- 2026 .....	16 - 20
IV.	Debt Authorized Not Appearing in FY 2015 CAFR.....	1 - 7



## **2015 REPORT ON LONG-TERM DEBT**

### **SECTION I. RECAP OF DEBT BY TYPE**

**I. Recap of City Debt by Type**  
As Of 06/30/15

**General Obligation Bonds**

The government issues general obligation bonds to provide funds for the acquisition and construction of major capital facilities. General obligation bonds are direct obligations and pledge the full faith and credit of the government. These bonds are issued as 10 to 30-year serial bonds with varying amounts of principal maturing each year. General obligation bonds outstanding as of June 30, 2014 are listed below.

Fund	Code	Discription	Orginal Amount	Balance Amount
<b>Governmental Activities</b>				
101	A	2006 Lansing Center	4,000,000	2,080,000
307	B	2005 Building Authority Refunding Bonds	1,470,000	475,000
202	C	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	1,137,600	270,000
202	D	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	3,602,400	855,000
306	E	2007 2007 Fire Station Refunding	1,780,000	795,000
Split 202/203	F	2008 2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	3,500,000	1,460,000
Split 202/203	G	2009 2009 Capital Improvement	10,197,000	9,105,000
640	H	2010 2010 Recovery Zone EDC	3,200,000	2,780,000
308	I	2010 2010 Refunding Bonds	2,470,000	1,230,000
101	GA	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Energy Efficiency	5,645,000	4,905,000
101	GB	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Phone System	240,000	120,000
645	GC	2013 2010 Op & Maint Limited Tax Refunding	465,000	155,000
630	IT	2014 2014 Capital Improvement Bonds - I.T.	2,275,000	1,525,000
Sub Total			<u>39,982,000</u>	<u>25,755,000</u>

**I. Recap of City Debt by Type**  
As Of 06/30/15

Fund	Code	Discription	Original Amount	Balance Amount
<b>Business-Type Activities</b>				
585	M	2005 Building Authority Refunding	15,975,000	7,960,000
585	N	2007 Building Authority Refunding	7,965,000	7,740,000
590 CSO	Q	1993 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-02	-
590 CSO	R	1994 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-03	185,000
590 CSO	S	1994 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-04	121,804
590 CSO	U	1994 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-06	340,000
590 CSO	V	1996 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-07	395,073
590 CSO	W	1996 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-08	720,000
590 CSO	X	1997 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-09	1,101,780
590 CSO	Y	1998 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-10	3,034,950
590 CSO	Z	1999 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-11	3,025,000
590 CSO	AA	2000 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-12	3,292,830
590 CSO	AB	2001 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-13	4,268,046
590 CSO	AC	2002 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-14	6,211,131
590 CSO	AD	2003 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-15	5,675,688
590 CSO	AE	2004 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-16	2,267,649
590 CSO	AF	2005 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-17	4,673,778
590 CSO	AG	2005 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-18	8,144,371
590 CSO	AH	2006 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-19	12,301,346
590 CSO	AI	2007 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-20	17,329,726
590 CSO	AJ	2008 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-21	21,734,933
590 CSO	AK	2009 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-22	12,630,604
590 CSO	AK1	2010 Limited Tax Sewer	5411-01	7,848,000
590 CSO	AL	2015 Limited Tax Sewer	5211-01	2,914,584
590 Sewer	BC	2009 Capital Improvement Refunding Bonds		9,420,000
585	BD	2009 Building Authority Refunding Bonds		8,161,691
585	BE	2012 Building Authority Refunding Bonds		6,405,000
585	BF	2013 Building Authority Refunding Bonds		-
583	BG	2013 Building Authority Golf Course Refunding Bonds		205,000
585	BH	2014 Building Authority Refunding Bonds		7,245,000
		Sub Total	<u>268,237,813</u>	<u>165,352,984</u>
		<b>Total General Obligation</b>	<b>308,219,813</b>	<b>191,107,984</b>

**I. Recap of City Debt by Type**  
As Of 06/30/15

**Revenue Bonds**

The City also issues bonds where the income derived from the acquired or constructed assets is pledged to pay debt service. Revenue bonds outstanding as of June 30, 2014 are listed below.

Fund	Code	Discription	Orginal Amount	Balance Amount
<b>Business-Type Activities</b>				
590 Sewer	RA	2013 Sewer Revenue & Refunding	21,765,000	20,275,000
<b>Total Revenue Bonds</b>			<u>21,765,000</u>	<u>20,275,000</u>

**Installment Purchase Agreements**

The government enters into installment purchase agreements for equipment and related capital assets. Installment purchase agreements outstanding as of June 30, 2014 are listed below.

Fund	Code	Discription	Orginal Amount	Balance Amount
<b>Governmental Activities</b>				
101	AR	2005 LEPFA Carpet	-	-
101	AS	2005 LEPFA Equipment	81,500	4,955
101	PA	2012 Showmobile	147,046	12,893
640	PB	2013 Garage	1,892,332	1,156,143
643	PC	2014 Recycling Trucks	1,550,855	1,302,507
234	BALL	2015 Ballpark Improvements Installment Purchase	13,500,000	13,500,000
643	LPD	2014 LPD Cruisers Installment Purchase	491,241	410,829
<b>Total Installment Purchase Agreements</b>			<u>17,662,974</u>	<u>16,387,328</u>

Fund	Code	Discription	Orginal Amount	Balance Amount
<b>Business-type Activities</b>				
597	PR	2014 Recycling Carts	1,737,000	1,459,431

**I. Recap of City Debt by Type**  
As Of 06/30/15

**Loans Payable**

The government has entered into loan agreements with certain State agencies for program purposes. Loans payable as of June 30, 2013 are listed below.

Fund	Code	Discription	Orginal Amount	Balance Amount
		<b>Governmental Activities</b>		
202	AZ	2004 Michigan Department of Transportation		
410	HUD	HUD HUD Section 108 Loan	5,900,000	5,900,000
202	SIB	2014 SIB Loan	1,972,600	1,972,600
		<b>Total Loans Payable</b>	<u>7,872,600</u>	<u>7,872,600</u>
		<b>Combined Totals</b>	<b>357,257,387</b>	<b>237,102,343</b>



## **2015 REPORT ON LONG-TERM DEBT**

### **SECTION II. RECAP OF DEBT BY FUND**

**II. Recap of City Debt by Fund**

As Of 06/30/15

Fund	Code	Discription	Orginal Amount	Balance Amount
<b>General Fund</b>				
101	A	2006 Lansing Center	4,000,000	2,080,000
101	AR	2005 LEPFA Carpet	-	-
101	AS	2005 LEPFA Equipment	81,500	4,955
101	GA	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Energy Efficiency	5,645,000	4,905,000
101	GB	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Phone System	240,000	120,000
101	PA	2012 Showmobile	147,046	12,893
		Subtotal	<u>10,113,546</u>	<u>7,122,849</u>
<b>Major and Local Streets</b>				
202	C	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	1,137,600	270,000
202	D	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	3,602,400	855,000
Split 202/203	F	2008 2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	3,500,000	1,460,000
Split 202/203	G	2009 2009 Capital Improvement	10,197,000	9,105,000
202	SIB	2014 SIB Loan	1,972,600	1,972,600
202	AZ	2004 Michigan Department of Transportation		-
		Subtotal	<u>20,409,600</u>	<u>13,662,600</u>
<b>Stadium Fund</b>				
234	BALL	2015 Ballpark Improvements Installment Purchase	13,500,000	13,500,000
<b>Fire Stations</b>				
306	E	2007 2007 Fire Station Refunding	1,780,000	795,000
308	I	2010 2010 Refunding Bonds	2,470,000	1,230,000
		Subtotal	<u>4,250,000</u>	<u>2,025,000</u>
<b>Building Authority</b>				
307	B	2005 Building Authority Refunding Bonds	1,470,000	475,000
		Subtotal	<u>1,470,000</u>	<u>475,000</u>
<b>CIP Fund</b>				
410	HUD HUD	HUD Section 108 Loan	5,900,000	5,900,000

**II. Recap of City Debt by Fund**

As Of 06/30/15

Fund	Code	Discription	Orginal Amount	Balance Amount
<b>Golf Fund</b>				
583	BG	2013 Building Authority Golf Course Refunding Bonds	405,000	205,000
<b>Municipal Parking System</b>				
585	BH	2014 Building Authority Refunding Bonds	7,245,000	7,245,000
585	M	2005 Building Authority Refunding	15,975,000	7,960,000
585	N	2007 Building Authority Refunding	7,965,000	7,740,000
585	BD	2009 Building Authority Refunding Bonds	8,161,691	8,161,691
585	BE	2012 Building Authority Refunding Bonds	7,200,000	6,405,000
585	BF	2013 Building Authority Refunding Bonds	-	-
		Subtotal	<u>46,546,691</u>	<u>37,511,691</u>
<b>Recycling Collection</b>				
597	PC	2014 Recycling Carts	1,737,000	1,459,431
<b>Information Technologies</b>				
630	IT	2014 2014 Capital Improvement Bonds - I.T.	2,275,000	1,525,000
<b>Public Service - Garage</b>				
640	H	2010 2010 Recovery Zone EDC	3,200,000	2,780,000
640	PB	2013 Garage	1,892,332	1,156,143
		Subtotal	<u>5,092,332</u>	<u>3,936,143</u>
<b>Public Service - Fleet</b>				
643	PC	2014 Recycling Trucks	1,550,855	1,302,507
643	LPD	2014 LPD Cruisers Installment Purchase	491,241	410,829
			<u>2,042,096</u>	<u>1,713,336</u>
<b>Public Service - Internal Service Fund</b>				
645	GC	2013 2010 Op & Maint Limited Tax Refunding	465,000	155,000

**II. Recap of City Debt by Fund**  
As Of 06/30/15

Fund	Code	Description	Original Amount	Balance Amount
<b>CSO Bonds 590 Fund</b>				
590 CSO	Q	1993 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-02	-
590 CSO	R	1994 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-03	3,234,722
590 CSO	S	1994 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-04	3,727,138
590 CSO	U	1994 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-06	7,595,611
590 CSO	V	1996 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-07	3,365,073
590 CSO	W	1996 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-08	3,995,000
590 CSO	X	1997 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-09	4,746,780
590 CSO	Y	1998 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-10	10,539,950
590 CSO	Z	1999 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-11	10,120,000
590 CSO	AA	2000 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-12	9,447,830
590 CSO	AB	2001 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-13	10,573,046
590 CSO	AC	2002 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-14	12,381,131
590 CSO	AD	2003 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-15	10,259,826
590 CSO	AE	2004 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-16	3,070,277
590 CSO	AF	2005 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-17	8,003,778
590 CSO	AG	2005 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-18	13,389,371
590 CSO	AH	2006 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-19	18,216,346
590 CSO	AI	2007 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-20	24,244,726
590 CSO	AJ	2008 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-21	27,494,933
590 CSO	AK	2009 Limited Tax Sewer	5005-22	15,615,000
590 CSO	AK1	2010 Limited Tax Sewer	5411-01	8,548,000
		2015 Limited Tax Sewer	5211-01	2,914,584
		Subtotal		211,483,122
				118,216,293
<b>Sewage Disposal System</b>				
590 Sewer	RA	2013 Sewer Revenue & Refunding		21,765,000
590 Sewer	BC	2009 Capital Improvement Refunding Bonds		9,803,000
		Subtotal		31,568,000
				29,695,000
		<b>Combined Totals</b>		<b>357,257,387</b>
				<b>237,102,343</b>



## **2015 REPORT ON LONG-TERM DEBT**

### **SECTION III. DETAIL OF DEBT SERVICE DUE BY FISCAL YEAR BY FUND**

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund		Description	FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018	
				Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
<b>General Fund</b>									
A	101	2006	Lansing Center	260,000	85,660	275,000	75,520	285,000	64,520
AR	101	2005	LEPFA Carpet	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS	101	2005	LEPFA Equipment	4,954	80	0	0	0	0
GA	101	2013	2013 Refunding Bonds-Energy Efficiency	470,000	117,720	3,880,000	106,440	3,230,000	93,120
GB	101	2013	2013 Refunding Bonds-Phone System	60,000	2,880	60,000	1,440	0	0
PA	101	2012	Showmobile	12,892	86	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	807,846	206,426	4,215,000	183,400	3,515,000	157,640
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>1,014,272</b>		<b>4,398,400</b>		<b>3,672,640</b>	

<b>Major and Local Streets</b>									
C	202	2007	Michigan Transportation Fund	132,000	13,500	138,000	6,900	0	0
D	202	2007	Michigan Transportation Fund	418,000	42,750	437,000	21,850	0	0
F	202	2008	2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	111,600	13,446	116,400	9,262	122,400	2,448
F	203	2008	2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	353,400	42,580	368,600	29,326	387,600	15,504
G	202	2009	2009 Capital Improvement	67,200	90,162	69,600	87,956	112,800	85,580
G	203	2009	2009 Capital Improvement	212,800	285,512	220,400	278,528	357,200	271,006
SIB	202	2014	SIB Loan	0	74,046	0	59,399	222,662	59,399
AZ	202	2004	Michigan Department of Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	1,295,000	561,996	1,350,000	493,221	1,202,662	433,937
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>1,856,996</b>		<b>1,843,221</b>		<b>1,636,599</b>	

<b>Stadium Fund</b>									
BALL	234	2015	2015 Ballpark Improve Install Purchase	375,014	391,500	766,987	388,040	790,169	364,858

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Debt Service - Fire Stations</b>									
E	306	2007	2007 Fire Station Refunding	200,000	35,800	200,000	25,800	200,000	15,800
I	308	2010	2010 Refunding Bonds	310,000	32,596	310,000	24,380	305,000	16,166
			TOTAL	510,000	68,396	510,000	50,180	505,000	31,966
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>578,396</b>		<b>560,180</b>		<b>536,966</b>	
<b>Debt Service - Building Authority</b>									
B	307	2005	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	150,000	23,750	160,000	16,250	165,000	8,250
<b>410 CIP Fund</b>									
HUD	410	HUD	HUD Section 108 Loan						
<b>Golf Fund</b>									
BG	583	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	100,000	4,920	105,000	2,520	0	0

### III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Municipal Parking System</b>									
M	585	2005	Building Authority Refunding	980,000	382,032	1,025,000	333,032	1,080,000	281,782
N	585	2007	Building Authority Refunding	415,000	328,388	435,000	307,638	455,000	285,888
BD	585	2009	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	0
BE	585	2012	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	400,000	164,490	405,000	160,890	410,000	156,030
BF	585	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	0
BH	585	2014	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	344,138	0	344,138	0	344,138
			TOTAL	1,795,000	1,219,048	1,865,000	1,145,698	1,945,000	1,067,838
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>3,014,048</b>		<b>3,010,698</b>		<b>3,012,838</b>	

#### Recycling Collection

PR	597	2014	Recycling Carts	212,759	27,567	216,950	23,377	221,223	19,104
----	-----	------	-----------------	---------	--------	---------	--------	---------	--------

#### Information Technology

IT	630	2014	Capital Improvement Bonds - I.T.	755,000	26,725	770,000	15,400	0	0
----	-----	------	----------------------------------	---------	--------	---------	--------	---	---

#### Public Service - Garage

H	640	2010	2010 Recovery Zone EDC	145,000	100,398	150,000	97,008	155,000	92,966
PB	640	2013	Garage	373,701	32,647	385,262	21,087	397,180	9,168
			TOTAL	518,701	133,045	535,262	118,095	552,180	102,134
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>651,746</b>		<b>653,356</b>		<b>654,314</b>	

#### Public Service - Fleet

PC	643	2014	2014 Recycling Trucks	189,882	24,603	193,622	20,863	197,436	17,050
LPD	643	2014	LPD Cruisers Installment Purchase	162,565	5,333	164,915	2,983	83,349	600
			TOTAL	352,448	29,936	358,537	23,847	280,785	17,650
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>382,384</b>		<b>382,384</b>		<b>298,435</b>	

#### Public Service - Internal Service Fund

GC	645	2013	2010 Op & Maint Limited Tax Refunding	155,000	3,720	0	0	0	0
----	-----	------	---------------------------------------	---------	-------	---	---	---	---

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018	
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
<b>CSO Bonds 590 Fund</b>								
		Limited Tax Sewer						
Q	590 CSO	1993 5005-02	0	0	0	0	0	0
R	590 CSO	1994 5005-03	185,000	1,850	0	0	0	0
S	590 CSO	1994 5005-04	121,805	1,218	0	0	0	0
U	590 CSO	1994 5005-06	340,000	7,650	0	0	0	0
V	590 CSO	1996 5005-07	195,000	8,889	200,073	4,502	0	0
W	590 CSO	1996 5005-08	235,000	13,556	240,000	8,213	0	2,756
X	590 CSO	1997 5005-09	265,000	21,809	275,000	15,734	280,000	9,490
Y	590 CSO	1998 5005-10	580,000	61,761	595,000	48,573	605,000	35,043
Z	590 CSO	1999 5005-11	575,000	75,625	590,000	61,250	605,000	46,500
AA	590 CSO	2000 5005-12	515,000	82,321	530,000	69,446	545,000	56,196
AB	590 CSO	2001 5005-13	565,000	106,701	580,000	92,576	595,000	78,076
AC	590 CSO	2002 5005-14	625,000	147,466	640,000	131,654	655,000	115,466
AD	590 CSO	2003 5005-15	510,000	135,517	520,000	122,642	535,000	109,455
AE	590 CSO	2004 5005-16	185,000	46,222	190,000	42,237	195,000	38,147
AF	590 CSO	2005 5005-17	380,000	95,280	390,000	87,099	400,000	78,706
AG	590 CSO	2005 5005-18	675,000	126,862	680,000	115,853	680,000	104,803
AH	590 CSO	2006 5005-19	890,000	192,665	900,000	178,122	910,000	163,416
AI	590 CSO	2007 5005-20	1,185,000	271,980	1,185,000	252,724	1,200,000	233,346
AJ	590 CSO	2008 5005-21	1,209,479	528,324	1,240,000	497,636	1,275,000	466,199
AK	590 CSO	2009 5005-22	605,000	308,203	620,000	292,890	635,000	277,203
AK1	590 CSO	2010 5411-01	370,000	191,575	375,000	182,262	385,000	172,762
AL	590 CSO	2015 5211-01	130,000	77,970	135,000	69,615	140,000	66,240
		TOTAL	10,341,284	2,503,444	9,885,073	2,273,027	9,640,000	2,053,803
		<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>12,844,728</b>		<b>12,158,100</b>		<b>11,693,803</b>	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Sewage Disposal System</b>									
BC	590 Sewer	2009	Capital Improvement Refunding Bonds	255,000	621,990	275,000	609,112	295,000	594,676
RA	590 Sewer	2013	Sewer Revenue & Refunding	1,550,000	861,188	1,550,000	799,188	1,550,000	737,188
			TOTAL	1,805,000	1,483,178	1,825,000	1,408,300	1,845,000	1,331,864
<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>				<b>3,288,178</b>		<b>3,233,300</b>		<b>3,176,864</b>	
<b>Combined Totals All Funds</b>				<b>19,173,051</b>	<b>6,683,650</b>	<b>22,562,808</b>	<b>6,141,353</b>	<b>20,662,018</b>	<b>5,589,043</b>
<b>Total Principal and Interest All Funds</b>				<b>25,856,701</b>		<b>28,704,161</b>		<b>26,251,061</b>	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2019		FY 2020		FY 2021	
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
<b>General Fund</b>								
A	101	2006 Lansing Center	295,000	53,120	310,000	41,026	320,000	28,006
AR	101	2005 LEPFA Carpet	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS	101	2005 LEPFA Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
GA	101	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Energy Efficiency	2,475,000	77,520	1,595,000	59,400	655,000	38,280
GB	101	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Phone System	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	101	2012 Showmobile	0	0	0	0	0	0
		TOTAL	2,770,000	130,640	1,905,000	100,426	975,000	66,286
<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>			<b>2,900,640</b>		<b>2,005,426</b>		<b>1,041,286</b>	

<b>Major and Local Streets</b>								
C	202	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	202	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	202	2008 2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	203	2008 2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
G	202	2009 2009 Capital Improvement	141,600	81,474	147,600	76,138	153,600	70,380
G	203	2009 2009 Capital Improvement	448,400	258,004	467,400	241,100	486,400	222,870
SIB	202	2014 SIB Loan	229,342	52,719	236,222	45,839	243,308	38,753
AZ	202	2004 Michigan Department of Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0
		TOTAL	819,342	392,197	851,222	363,077	883,308	332,003
<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>			<b>1,211,539</b>		<b>1,214,299</b>		<b>1,215,311</b>	

<b>Stadium Fund</b>								
BALL	234	2015 2015 Ballpark Improve Install Purchase	814,052	340,975	838,657	316,370	864,005	291,022

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2019		FY 2020		FY 2021		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Debt Service - Fire Stations</b>									
E	306	2007	2007 Fire Station Refunding	195,000	7,800	0	0	0	0
I	308	2010	2010 Refunding Bonds	305,000	8,082	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	500,000	15,882	0	0	0	0
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>515,882</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Debt Service - Building Authority</b>									
B	307	2005	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>410 CIP Fund</b>									
HUD	410	HUD	HUD Section 108 Loan						
<b>Golf Fund</b>									
BG	583	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	0

**III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund**

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2019		FY 2020		FY 2021		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Municipal Parking System</b>									
M	585	2005	Building Authority Refunding	1,130,000	227,782	1,190,000	171,282	1,250,000	111,782
N	585	2007	Building Authority Refunding	475,000	267,688	495,000	248,688	515,000	228,888
BD	585	2009	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	35,312	0	189,488	2,132,942	3,724,488
BE	585	2012	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	415,000	149,675	425,000	142,413	435,000	133,700
BF	585	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	0
BH	585	2014	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	344,138	0	344,138	0	344,138
			TOTAL	2,020,000	1,024,595	2,110,000	1,096,008	4,332,942	4,542,996
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>3,044,595</b>		<b>3,206,008</b>		<b>8,875,938</b>	

<b>Recycling Collection</b>									
PR	597	2014	Recycling Carts	225,580	14,747	230,023	10,304	234,553	5,773

<b>Information Technology</b>									
IT	630	2014	Capital Improvement Bonds - I.T.	0	0	0	0	1,737,700	153,118

<b>Public Service - Garage</b>									
H	640	2010	2010 Recovery Zone EDC	160,000	88,362	165,000	82,906	170,000	77,280
PB	640	2013	Garage	0	0	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	160,000	88,362	165,000	82,906	170,000	77,280
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>248,362</b>		<b>247,906</b>		<b>247,280</b>	

<b>Public Service - Fleet</b>									
PC	643	2014	2014 Recycling Trucks	201,324	13,161	205,290	9,196	209,333	5,152
LPD	643	2014	LPD Cruisers Installment Purchase	0	0	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	201,324	13,161	205,290	9,196	209,333	5,152
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>214,486</b>		<b>214,486</b>		<b>214,486</b>	

<b>Public Service - Internal Service Fund</b>									
GC	645	2013	2010 Op & Maint Limited Tax Refunding	0	0	0	0	0	0

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2019		FY 2020		FY 2021	
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
<b>CSO Bonds 590 Fund</b>								
		Limited Tax Sewer						
Q	590 CSO	1993 5005-02	0	0	0	0	0	0
R	590 CSO	1994 5005-03	0	0	0	0	0	0
S	590 CSO	1994 5005-04	0	0	0	0	0	0
U	590 CSO	1994 5005-06	0	0	0	0	0	0
V	590 CSO	1996 5005-07	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	590 CSO	1996 5005-08	0	0	0	0	0	0
X	590 CSO	1997 5005-09	281,780	3,170	0	0	0	0
Y	590 CSO	1998 5005-10	620,000	14,118	634,950	7,143	0	0
Z	590 CSO	1999 5005-11	620,000	31,375	635,000	15,875	0	0
AA	590 CSO	2000 5005-12	555,000	42,571	570,000	28,696	577,830	14,446
AB	590 CSO	2001 5005-13	610,000	63,201	625,000	47,951	645,000	32,326
AC	590 CSO	2002 5005-14	670,000	98,903	690,000	81,903	705,000	64,466
AD	590 CSO	2003 5005-15	550,000	95,893	565,000	81,955	575,000	67,705
AE	590 CSO	2004 5005-16	200,000	33,951	200,000	29,702	205,000	25,397
AF	590 CSO	2005 5005-17	410,000	70,099	420,000	61,280	425,000	52,302
AG	590 CSO	2005 5005-18	680,000	93,753	680,000	82,703	680,000	71,653
AH	590 CSO	2006 5005-19	920,000	148,547	930,000	133,516	940,000	118,322
AI	590 CSO	2007 5005-20	1,200,000	213,846	1,225,000	194,143	1,225,000	174,237
AJ	590 CSO	2008 5005-21	1,305,000	433,949	1,340,000	400,886	1,370,000	367,011
AK	590 CSO	2009 5005-22	650,000	261,140	670,000	244,640	685,000	227,703
AK1	590 CSO	2010 5411-01	385,000	163,138	395,000	153,388	400,000	143,450
AL	590 CSO	2015 5211-01	145,000	62,740	145,000	59,115	150,000	55,490
		TOTAL	9,801,780	1,830,393	9,724,950	1,622,896	8,582,830	1,414,507
		<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>11,632,173</b>		<b>11,347,846</b>		<b>9,997,337</b>	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2019		FY 2020		FY 2021		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Sewage Disposal System</b>									
BC	590 Sewer	2009	Capital Improvement Refunding Bonds	320,000	578,156	345,000	559,596	370,000	538,896
RA	590 Sewer	2013	Sewer Revenue & Refunding	1,550,000	690,688	1,550,000	613,188	1,550,000	535,688
			TOTAL	1,870,000	1,268,844	1,895,000	1,172,784	1,920,000	1,074,584
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>3,138,844</b>		<b>3,067,784</b>		<b>2,994,584</b>	
<b>Combined Totals All Funds</b>				<b>19,182,078</b>	<b>5,119,795</b>	<b>17,925,141</b>	<b>4,773,966</b>	<b>19,909,672</b>	<b>7,962,720</b>
<b>Total Principal and Interest All Funds</b>				<b>24,301,873</b>		<b>22,699,107</b>		<b>27,872,393</b>	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2022		FY 2023		FY 2024	
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
<b>General Fund</b>								
A	101	2006 Lansing Center	335,000	14,406	0	0	0	0
AR	101	2005 LEPFA Carpet	0	0	0	0	0	0
AS	101	2005 LEPFA Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
GA	101	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Energy Efficiency	0	15,720	0	0	0	0
GB	101	2013 2013 Refunding Bonds-Phone System	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	101	2012 Showmobile	0	0	0	0	0	0
		TOTAL	335,000	30,126	0	0	0	0
		<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>365,126</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	

<b>Major and Local Streets</b>								
C	202	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
D	202	2007 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	202	2008 2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	203	2008 2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
G	202	2009 2009 Capital Improvement	160,800	64,240	166,800	57,706	174,000	50,824
G	203	2009 2009 Capital Improvement	509,200	203,426	528,200	182,742	551,000	160,938
SIB	202	2014 SIB Loan	250,608	31,453	258,126	23,935	265,870	16,191
AZ	202	2004 Michigan Department of Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0
		TOTAL	920,608	299,119	953,126	264,383	990,870	227,953
		<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>1,219,727</b>		<b>1,217,509</b>		<b>1,218,823</b>	

<b>Stadium Fund</b>								
BALL	234	2015 2015 Ballpark Improve Install Purchase	890,120	264,907	917,024	238,003	944,741	210,286

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2022		FY 2023		FY 2024		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Debt Service - Fire Stations</b>									
E	306	2007	2007 Fire Station Refunding	0	0	0	0	0	
I	308	2010	2010 Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	
			TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Debt Service - Building Authority</b>									
B	307	2005	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>410 CIP Fund</b>									
HUD	410	HUD	HUD Section 108 Loan						
<b>Golf Fund</b>									
BG	583	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2022		FY 2023		FY 2024		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Municipal Parking System</b>									
M	585	2005	Building Authority Refunding	1,305,000	57,094	0	0	0	0
N	585	2007	Building Authority Refunding	535,000	208,288	555,000	186,218	580,000	163,326
BD	585	2009	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	2,062,630	3,723,147	2,014,483	3,998,058	1,951,636	3,723,940
BE	585	2012	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	440,000	123,913	455,000	113,133	465,000	101,075
BF	585	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	0
BH	585	2014	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	344,138	0	344,138	0	344,138
			TOTAL	4,342,630	4,456,579	3,024,483	4,641,546	2,996,636	4,332,479
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>8,799,209</b>		<b>7,666,029</b>		<b>7,329,115</b>	

**Recycling Collection**

PR	597	2014	Recycling Carts	118,344	1,742	0	0	0	0
----	-----	------	-----------------	---------	-------	---	---	---	---

**Information Technology**

IT	630	2014	Capital Improvement Bonds - I.T.	0	0	0	0	0	0
----	-----	------	----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Public Service - Garage**

H	640	2010	2010 Recovery Zone EDC	175,000	71,154	180,000	64,850	190,000	58,366
PB	640	2013	Garage	0	0	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	175,000	71,154	180,000	64,850	190,000	58,366
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>246,154</b>		<b>244,850</b>		<b>248,366</b>	

**Public Service - Fleet**

PC	643	2014	2014 Recycling Trucks	105,619	1,555	0	0	0	0
LPD	643	2014	LPD Cruisers Installment Purchase	0	0	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	105,619	1,555	0	0	0	0
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>107,174</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	

**Public Service - Internal Service Fund**

GC	645	2013	2010 Op & Maint Limited Tax Refunding	0	0	0	0	0	0
----	-----	------	---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2022		FY 2023		FY 2024	
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
<b>CSO Bonds 590 Fund</b>								
		Limited Tax Sewer						
Q	590 CSO	1993 5005-02	0	0	0	0	0	0
R	590 CSO	1994 5005-03	0	0	0	0	0	0
S	590 CSO	1994 5005-04	0	0	0	0	0	0
U	590 CSO	1994 5005-06	0	0	0	0	0	0
V	590 CSO	1996 5005-07	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	590 CSO	1996 5005-08	0	0	0	0	0	0
X	590 CSO	1997 5005-09	0	0	0	0	0	0
Y	590 CSO	1998 5005-10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Z	590 CSO	1999 5005-11	0	0	0	0	0	0
AA	590 CSO	2000 5005-12	0	0	0	0	0	0
AB	590 CSO	2001 5005-13	648,046	16,201	0	0	0	0
AC	590 CSO	2002 5005-14	725,000	46,591	740,000	28,278	761,131	9,514
AD	590 CSO	2003 5005-15	585,000	53,205	605,000	38,330	620,000	23,018
AE	590 CSO	2004 5005-16	210,000	20,987	215,000	16,472	220,000	11,850
AF	590 CSO	2005 5005-17	435,000	43,164	445,000	33,814	455,000	24,252
AG	590 CSO	2005 5005-18	680,000	60,603	680,000	49,553	680,000	38,503
AH	590 CSO	2006 5005-19	950,000	102,965	960,000	87,446	970,000	71,765
AI	590 CSO	2007 5005-20	1,225,000	154,330	1,250,000	134,220	1,250,000	113,898
AJ	590 CSO	2008 5005-21	1,405,000	332,324	1,440,000	296,761	1,480,000	260,261
AK	590 CSO	2009 5005-22	700,000	210,390	720,000	192,640	740,000	174,390
AK1	590 CSO	2010 5411-01	415,000	133,263	420,000	122,825	430,000	112,200
AL	590 CSO	2015 5211-01	155,000	51,740	155,000	47,865	160,000	43,990
		TOTAL	8,133,046	1,225,762	7,630,000	1,048,204	7,766,131	883,641
		<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>9,358,808</b>		<b>8,678,204</b>		<b>8,649,772</b>	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2022		FY 2023		FY 2024		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Sewage Disposal System</b>									
BC	590 Sewer	2009	Capital Improvement Refunding Bonds	395,000	516,140	425,000	491,452	455,000	464,466
RA	590 Sewer	2013	Sewer Revenue & Refunding	1,550,000	458,188	1,550,000	380,688	1,575,000	303,188
			TOTAL	1,945,000	974,328	1,975,000	872,140	2,030,000	767,654
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>2,919,328</b>		<b>2,847,140</b>		<b>2,797,654</b>	
<b>Combined Totals All Funds</b>				<b>16,965,367</b>	<b>7,325,273</b>	<b>14,679,633</b>	<b>7,129,126</b>	<b>14,918,377</b>	<b>6,480,378</b>
<b>Total Principal and Interest All Funds</b>				<b>24,290,640</b>		<b>21,808,759</b>		<b>21,398,756</b>	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2025		FY 2026		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>General Fund</b>							
A	101	2006	Lansing Center	0	0	0	0
AR	101	2005	LEPFA Carpet	0	0	0	0
AS	101	2005	LEPFA Equipment	0	0	0	0
GA	101	2013	2013 Refunding Bonds-Energy Efficiency	0	0	0	0
GB	101	2013	2013 Refunding Bonds-Phone System	0	0	0	0
PA	101	2012	Showmobile	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	0	0	0	0
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	

<b>Major and Local Streets</b>							
C	202	2007	Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0
D	202	2007	Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0
F	202	2008	2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0
F	203	2008	2008 Michigan Transportation Fund	0	0	0	0
G	202	2009	2009 Capital Improvement	181,200	43,528	189,600	35,814
G	203	2009	2009 Capital Improvement	573,800	137,840	600,400	113,410
SIB	202	2014	SIB Loan	273,840	8,215	0	0
AZ	202	2004	Michigan Department of Transportation	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	1,028,840	189,583	790,000	149,224
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>1,218,423</b>		<b>939,224</b>	

<b>Stadium Fund</b>							
BALL	234	2015	2015 Ballpark Improve Install Purchase	973,295	181,732	1,002,713	152,314

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2025		FY 2026		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Debt Service - Fire Stations</b>							
E	306	2007	2007 Fire Station Refunding	0	0	0	0
I	308	2010	2010 Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	0	0	0	0
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Debt Service - Building Authority</b>							
B	307	2005	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0
<b>410 CIP Fund</b>							
HUD	410	HUD	HUD Section 108 Loan				
<b>Golf Fund</b>							
BG	583	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2025		FY 2026		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Municipal Parking System</b>							
M	585	2005	Building Authority Refunding	0	0	0	0
N	585	2007	Building Authority Refunding	600,000	139,400	625,000	113,900
BD	585	2009	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0
BE	585	2012	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	480,000	87,125	495,000	72,485
BF	585	2013	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	0	0	0
BH	585	2014	Building Authority Refunding Bonds	0	344,138	0	344,138
			TOTAL	1,080,000	570,663	1,120,000	530,523
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>1,650,663</b>		<b>1,650,523</b>	

**Recycling Collection**

PR	597	2014	Recycling Carts	0	0	0	0
----	-----	------	-----------------	---	---	---	---

**Information Technology**

IT	630	2014	Capital Improvement Bonds - I.T.	0	0	0	0
----	-----	------	----------------------------------	---	---	---	---

**Public Service - Garage**

H	640	2010	2010 Recovery Zone EDC	195,000	50,998	205,000	43,438
PB	640	2013	Garage	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	195,000	50,998	205,000	43,438
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>245,998</b>		<b>248,438</b>	

**Public Service - Fleet**

PC	643	2014	2014 Recycling Trucks	0	0	0	0
LPD	643	2014	LPD Cruisers Installment Purchase	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	0	0	0	0
			<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	

**Public Service - Internal Service Fund**

GC	645	2013	2010 Op & Maint Limited Tax Refunding	0	0	0	0
----	-----	------	---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2025		FY 2026	
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest
<b>CSO Bonds 590 Fund</b>						
		Limited Tax Sewer				
Q	590 CSO	1993 5005-02	0	0	0	0
R	590 CSO	1994 5005-03	0	0	0	0
S	590 CSO	1994 5005-04	0	0	0	0
U	590 CSO	1994 5005-06	0	0	0	0
V	590 CSO	1996 5005-07	0	0	0	0
W	590 CSO	1996 5005-08	0	0	0	0
X	590 CSO	1997 5005-09	0	0	0	0
Y	590 CSO	1998 5005-10	0	0	0	0
Z	590 CSO	1999 5005-11	0	0	0	0
AA	590 CSO	2000 5005-12	0	0	0	0
AB	590 CSO	2001 5005-13	0	0	0	0
AC	590 CSO	2002 5005-14	0	0	0	0
AD	590 CSO	2003 5005-15	610,688	7,634	0	0
AE	590 CSO	2004 5005-16	220,000	7,175	227,649	2,419
AF	590 CSO	2005 5005-17	465,000	14,477	448,778	4,768
AG	590 CSO	2005 5005-18	680,000	27,453	680,000	16,403
AH	590 CSO	2006 5005-19	980,000	55,922	985,000	39,957
AI	590 CSO	2007 5005-20	1,275,000	93,393	1,275,000	72,674
AJ	590 CSO	2008 5005-21	1,515,000	222,824	1,555,000	184,449
AK	590 CSO	2009 5005-22	755,000	155,703	775,000	136,578
AK1	590 CSO	2010 5411-01	435,000	101,387	445,000	90,388
AL	590 CSO	2015 5211-01	165,000	39,990	170,000	35,865
		TOTAL	7,100,688	725,957	6,561,427	583,500
		<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>	<b>7,826,645</b>		<b>7,144,927</b>	

III. Detail of Debt Service Due by Fiscal Year by Fund

Code	Fund	Description	FY 2025		FY 2026		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
<b>Sewage Disposal System</b>							
BC	590 Sewer	2009	Capital Improvement Refunding Bonds	485,000	435,118	515,000	403,350
RA	590 Sewer	2013	Sewer Revenue & Refunding	1,575,000	224,438	1,575,000	145,688
			TOTAL	2,060,000	659,556	2,090,000	549,038
<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THIS FUND</b>				<b>2,719,556</b>		<b>2,639,038</b>	
<b>Combined Totals All Funds</b>				<b>12,437,824</b>	<b>2,378,488</b>	<b>11,769,140</b>	<b>2,008,035</b>
<b>Total Principal and Interest All Funds</b>				<b>14,816,311</b>		<b>13,777,176</b>	



## **2015 REPORT ON LONG-TERM DEBT**

### **SECTION IV. DEBT AUTHORIZED NOT APPEARING IN CAFR**

#### **IV. Debt Authorized Not Appearing in 2015 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report**

1. Approved by Council on November 9, 2015 - General Obligation Limited Tax Refunding Bonds
  - a. The following bonds are consolidated in the new refunding bond. See amortization schedules.
    - i. 2005 Building Authority Refunding Bonds (B) (Firing Range) – Table IV-1
    - ii. 2005 Building Authority Refunding Bonds (M) (Parking Ramp) – Table IV - 2
    - iii. 2006 Lansing Center (A) – Table IV-3
  - b. The bonds will be paid in full yet in fiscal year 2016 per the following tables:
    - i. 2005 Building Authority Refunding Bonds (B) (Firing Range) – Table IV-4
    - ii. 2005 Building Authority Refunding Bonds (M) (Parking Ramp) – Table IV - 5
    - iii. 2006 Lansing Center (A) – Table IV-6
  
2. Approved by Council on February 22, 2016
  - a. Wet Weather State Revolving Fund (SRF) Limited Tax General Obligation Bond
  - b. Not to exceed \$5,000.
  - c. No amortization schedule prepared until a draw is taken.

NOTE: Bonds and loans listed here are not included in any of the prior sections of this binder.

**Table IV-1**

\$320,000  
 CITY OF LANSING  
 COUNTY OF INGHAM AND EATON, STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**GENERAL OBLIGATION LIMITED TAX REFUNDING BONDS, SERIES 2015**  
 Portion that Refunded 1998 Portion of 2005 Bonds

Final Schedule of Principal & Interest Requirements

Payment Date	Principal Due	Interest Rate	Interest Due	Total Payment	Tax Year Total
6/1/2016			\$2,915.56	\$2,915.56	\$2,915.56
12/1/2016			3,200.00	3,200.00	
6/1/2017	\$160,000.00	2.000%	3,200.00	163,200.00	166,400.00
12/1/2017			1,600.00	1,600.00	
6/1/2018	160,000.00	2.000%	1,600.00	161,600.00	163,200.00
12/1/2018			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2019			0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2019			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2020			0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2020			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2021			0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2021			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2022			0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2022			0.00	0.00	
	\$320,000.00		\$12,515.56	\$332,515.56	\$332,515.56

PURCHASER: Hutchinson, Shockey, Erley & Co.  
 TRANSFER AGENT: Bank of New York  
 TRUE INTEREST COST: 1.64052%  
 SALE DATE: 12/1/2015  
 DATED DATE: 12/17/2015  
 DELIVERY DATE: 12/17/2015  
 ACCRUED INTEREST: \$0.00

Note: The above table does not reflect charges for bond registrar and paying agent services.

Public Financial Management, Inc.  
 3989 Research Park Drive  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108  
 Phone (734) 668-6688 Fax (734) 668-6723

prs/kcg  
 Dec-07-15

Table IV-2

\$6,765,000  
 CITY OF LANSING  
 COUNTY OF INGHAM AND EATON, STATE OF MICHIGAN  
 GENERAL OBLIGATION LIMITED TAX REFUNDING BONDS, SERIES 2015  
 Portion that Refunded 1995 Portion of 2005 Bonds

Final Schedule of Principal & Interest Requirements

Payment Date	Principal Due	Interest Rate	Interest Due	Total Payment	Tax Year Total
6/1/2016			\$72,273.89	\$72,273.89	\$72,273.89
12/1/2016			79,325.00	79,325.00	
6/1/2017	\$1,080,000.00	2.000%	79,325.00	1,159,325.00	1,238,650.00
12/1/2017			68,525.00	68,525.00	
6/1/2018	1,105,000.00	2.000%	68,525.00	1,173,525.00	1,242,050.00
12/1/2018			57,475.00	57,475.00	
6/1/2019	1,115,000.00	2.000%	57,475.00	1,172,475.00	1,229,950.00
12/1/2019			46,325.00	46,325.00	
6/1/2020	1,130,000.00	2.000%	46,325.00	1,176,325.00	1,222,650.00
12/1/2020			35,025.00	35,025.00	
6/1/2021	1,150,000.00	3.000%	35,025.00	1,185,025.00	1,220,050.00
12/1/2021			17,775.00	17,775.00	
6/1/2022	1,185,000.00	3.000%	17,775.00	1,202,775.00	1,220,550.00
12/1/2022			0.00	0.00	
	<u>\$6,765,000.00</u>		<u>\$681,173.89</u>	<u>\$7,446,173.89</u>	<u>\$7,446,173.89</u>

PURCHASER: Hutchinson, Shockey, Erley & Co.  
 TRANSFER AGENT: Bank of New York  
 TRUE INTEREST COST: 1.64661%  
 SALE DATE: 12/1/2015  
 DATED DATE: 12/17/2015  
 DELIVERY DATE: 12/17/2015  
 ACCRUED INTEREST: \$0.00

Note: The above table does not reflect charges for bond registrar and paying agent services.

Public Financial Management, Inc.  
 3989 Research Park Drive  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108  
 Phone (734) 668-6688 Fax (734) 668-6723

prs/kcg  
 Dec-07-15

\$1,770,000  
 CITY OF LANSING  
 COUNTY OF INGHAM AND EATON, STATE OF MICHIGAN  
 GENERAL OBLIGATION LIMITED TAX REFUNDING BONDS, SERIES 2015  
 Portion that Refunded 2006 Bonds

**Table IV-3**

Final Schedule of Principal & Interest Requirements

Payment Date	Principal Due	Interest Rate	Interest Due	Total Payment	Tax Year Total
6/1/2016			\$18,928.33	\$18,928.33	\$18,928.33
12/1/2016			20,775.00	20,775.00	
6/1/2017	\$280,000.00	2.000%	20,775.00	300,775.00	321,550.00
12/1/2017			17,975.00	17,975.00	
6/1/2018	285,000.00	2.000%	17,975.00	302,975.00	320,950.00
12/1/2018			15,125.00	15,125.00	
6/1/2019	290,000.00	2.000%	15,125.00	305,125.00	320,250.00
12/1/2019			12,225.00	12,225.00	
6/1/2020	300,000.00	2.000%	12,225.00	312,225.00	324,450.00
12/1/2020			9,225.00	9,225.00	
6/1/2021	305,000.00	3.000%	9,225.00	314,225.00	323,450.00
12/1/2021			4,650.00	4,650.00	
6/1/2022	310,000.00	3.000%	4,650.00	314,650.00	319,300.00
12/1/2022			0.00	0.00	
	<u>\$1,770,000.00</u>		<u>\$178,878.33</u>	<u>\$1,948,878.33</u>	<u>\$1,948,878.33</u>

PURCHASER: Hutchinson, Shockey, Erley & Co.  
 TRANSFER AGENT: Bank of New York  
 TRUE INTEREST COST: 1.64179%  
 SALE DATE: 12/1/2015  
 DATED DATE: 12/17/2015  
 DELIVERY DATE: 12/17/2015  
 ACCRUED INTEREST: \$0.00

Note: The above table does not reflect charges for bond registrar and paying agent services.

Public Financial Management, Inc.  
 3989 Research Park Drive  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108  
 Phone (734) 668-6688 Fax (734) 668-6723

prs/kcg  
 Dec-07-15

\$150,000  
 CITY OF LANSING  
 COUNTY OF INGHAM AND EATON, STATE OF MICHIGAN  
 2005 BUILDING AUTHORITY REFUNDING BONDS - 1998 Portion

**Table IV-4**

NON-REFUNDED PORTION TO BE PAID BY THE CITY

Schedule of Principal & Interest Requirements

Payment Date	Principal Due	Interest Rate	Interest Due	Total Payment	Fiscal Year Total
12/1/2015			\$11,875.00	\$11,875.00	
6/1/2016	\$150,000.00	5.000%	3,750.00	153,750.00	\$165,625.00
12/1/2016			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2017	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2017			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2018	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2018			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2019	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2019			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2020	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2020			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2021	0.00	4.375%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2021			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2022	0.00	4.375%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2022			0.00	0.00	
	<u>\$150,000.00</u>		<u>\$15,625.00</u>	<u>\$165,625.00</u>	<u>\$165,625.00</u>

PAYING AGENT: U.S. Bank  
 DATED DATE: 12/28/2005  
 NET INTEREST COST: 5.0000%

Note: The above table does not reflect charges for paying agent services.

Public Financial Management, Inc.  
 3989 Research Park Drive  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108  
 Phone (734) 668-6688 Fax (734) 668-6723

RJN  
 Dec-07-15

**Table IV-5**

\$980,000  
 CITY OF LANSING  
 COUNTY OF INGHAM AND EATON, STATE OF MICHIGAN  
 2005 BUILDING AUTHORITY REFUNDING BONDS - 1995 Portion

NON-REFUNDED PORTION TO BE PAID BY THE CITY

Schedule of Principal & Interest Requirements

Payment Date	Principal Due	Interest Rate	Interest Due	Total Payment	Fiscal Year Total
12/1/2015			\$191,015.63	\$191,015.63	
6/1/2016	\$980,000.00	5.000%	24,500.00	1,004,500.00	\$1,195,515.63
12/1/2016			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2017	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2017			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2018	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2018			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2019	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2019			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2020	0.00	5.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2020			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2021	0.00	4.375%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2021			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2022	0.00	4.375%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2022			0.00	0.00	
	<u>\$980,000.00</u>		<u>\$215,515.63</u>	<u>\$1,195,515.63</u>	<u>\$1,195,515.63</u>

PAYING AGENT: US Bank  
 DATED DATE: 12/28/2005

Note: The above table does not reflect charges for paying agent services.

Public Financial Management, Inc.  
 3989 Research Park Drive  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108  
 Phone (734) 668-6688 Fax (734) 668-6723

prs/kcg  
 Dec-07-15

**Table IV-6**

\$260,000  
 CITY OF LANSING  
 COUNTY OF INGHAM AND EATON, STATE OF MICHIGAN  
 2006 GENERAL OBLIGATION LIMITED TAX BONDS

NON-REFUNDED PORTION TO BE PAID BY THE CITY

Schedule of Principal & Interest Requirements

Payment Date	Principal Due	Interest Rate	Interest Due	Total Payment	Fiscal Year Total
12/1/2015			\$42,830.00	\$42,830.00	
6/1/2016	\$260,000.00	3.900%	5,070.00	265,070.00	\$307,900.00
12/1/2016			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2017	0.00	4.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2017			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2018	0.00	4.000%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2018			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2019	0.00	4.100%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2019			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2020	0.00	4.200%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2020			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2021	0.00	4.250%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2021			0.00	0.00	
6/1/2022	0.00	4.300%	0.00	0.00	0.00
12/1/2022			0.00	0.00	
	<u>\$260,000.00</u>		<u>\$47,900.00</u>	<u>\$307,900.00</u>	<u>\$307,900.00</u>

PAYING AGENT: U.S. Bank  
 DATED DATE: 2/1/2006  
 NET INTEREST COST: 3.9000%

Note: The above table does not reflect charges for paying agent services.

Public Financial Management, Inc.  
 3989 Research Park Drive  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108  
 Phone (734) 668-6688 Fax (734) 668-6723

RJN  
 Dec-07-15

**Fiscal Year 2017  
Capital Improvement Plan**

FY 2017 City-Wide Capital Improvement Program

Project	FY 2017 Appropriation	Funding Sources							
		General Fund	Parks Millage	Street Funds	Parking Fund	Sewer Fund	Information Technology Fund	Grants/ Trusts	Bonds/ Loans/ Spec. Assess.
<b><u>General Facilities</u></b>									
Stadium Turf and Irrigation	300,000	300,000							
Facility Needs	500,000	500,000							
Subtotal	800,000	800,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Technology/Equipment</u></b>									
Public Education & Gov't (PEG) Capital Improvements	200,000							200,000	
District Court E-Filing Project	100,000						100,000		
Virtual Servers and Storage	220,000						220,000		
Virtual Video Conferencing Bridge	19,000						19,000		
Computer Replacements	150,000						150,000		
Police Records Management System	350,000	-						350,000	
Election Equipment	500,000	100,000						400,000	
Subtotal	1,539,000	100,000	-	-	-	-	489,000	950,000	-
<b><u>Planning &amp; Neighborhood Development</u></b>									
Master Plan Update	30,000	30,000							
Parking Scooter Replacement	30,500				30,500				
On-Street & North Capitol Ramp Striping	15,000				15,000				
South Capitol Ramp Concrete Sealing	71,000				71,000				
South Capitol Ramp LED Lighting Upgrades	150,000				150,000				
Parking Ramp & Lot Wayfinding Signage	50,000				50,000				
Paystation & Office Equipment Credit Card Upgrades	33,500				33,500				
Ticket/Permit Software Upgrade	150,000				150,000				
Lot 49(A) Paving & Striping	25,000				25,000				
Parking Ramp Storm Drain Maintenance	150,000				150,000				
North Capitol Ramp Control System	17,000				17,000				
Parking Ramp Structure Maintenance	103,000				103,000				
Subtotal	825,000	30,000	-	-	795,000	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Parks &amp; Recreation</u></b>									
Grant Match Funds	200,000		200,000						
Parking Lot Repair/Replacement	230,000		230,000						
Citywide Repair & Maintenance	250,000		250,000						
Foster Community Center Ramp Replacement	15,000		15,000						
Community Center Carpet/Flooring Replacement	75,000		75,000						
	770,000	-	770,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Public Service</u></b>									
Sidewalk Repairs	350,000	250,000							100,000
Sidewalk Gap Closure Program	220,000			220,000					
Major Maintenance - Major and Local Streets	1,500,000			1,500,000					
Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Aid Project	2,500,000			1,000,000				1,500,000	
Signalization and Modernization of Traffic Signals	223,000			223,000					
Bridge Improvements	630,000			630,000					
Bike Lanes	152,500			152,500					
Trunkline Improvements	50,000			50,000					
Paulson Landfill - Engineering study /improvements	200,000	200,000							

FY 2017 City-Wide Capital Improvement Program

Project	FY 2017 Appropriation	Funding Sources							
		General Fund	Parks Millage	Street Funds	Parking Fund	Sewer Fund	Information Technology Fund	Grants/ Trusts	Bonds/ Loans/ Spec. Assess.
City Share of Sanitary Sewers	1,160,000					1,160,000			
City Share of Delta and Delhi Township Sewers	10,000					10,000			
Pump Station Radio System	230,000					230,000			
Pump Station Switchgear Maintenance	100,000					100,000			
Scott Park Pump Station VFD Replacement	320,000					320,000			
Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Efficiency Measures	50,000					50,000			
Wastewater Treatment Plant Roof Replacement	200,000					200,000			
Solids Handling Belt Filter Press	125,000					125,000			
Tertiary Buried Power Supply Replacement	40,000					40,000			
Wastewater Drying Bed Design	30,000					30,000			
Wastewater Digester Remediation	35,000					35,000			
Wet Weather Program	250,000					250,000			
Subtotal	8,375,500	450,000	-	3,775,500	-	2,550,000	-	1,500,000	100,000
<b><u>Fleet Services</u></b>									
Vehicle & Equipment Purchases	1,000,000	1,000,000							
	1,000,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Capital Projects - FY 2016/2017	13,309,500	2,380,000	770,000	3,775,500	795,000	2,550,000	489,000	2,450,000	100,000

(This page intentionally left blank)

# FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

## FACILITIES

### Stadium Turf and Irrigation

Replacement of turf and irrigation system for Cooley Law School Stadium due to age and condition of the current turf, which is over ten years old and has reached the life cycle for the turf and its components.

### Facility Needs

Funding for facility needs for City Hall and other various city facilities, as well as planning for future facility locations.

## TECHNOLOGY & EQUIPMENT

### Office of Community Media – Public Education & Government (PEG) Restricted Funds

The restricted PEG funds proposed for FY 2017 CIP include acquisition of and upgrades to equipment and facilities utilized by the Office of Community Media for the PEG network.

### District Court E-filing Project

Workflow and data management for State-mandated e-filing fee filing process.

### Virtual Servers and Storage

The city's virtual infrastructure is critical to the operation of the city's applications. While the majority of the city's servers are already virtualized on the VMware platform, there remain a number of old, physical servers that need to be virtualized. In addition, any new servers that are added due to new projects and applications will be virtualized. This growth has outpaced the existing virtual environment and requires additional resources be added to sustain the growth. Along with this, the existing data storage needs continue to grow and are also outpacing the available remaining storage resources. In order to accommodate the virtual server growth along with the exponential data storage needs, it is critical that additional storage is acquired and implemented soon.

### Virtual Video Conferencing Bridge

The existing video conferencing bridge is outdated and no longer functions with any of the newer video conferencing units that the city owns, such as those operated by the Fire Department. The video conferencing bridge is used by the city for day-to-day operations as well as emergency operations. In order to have an operational video conferencing bridge, a new platform must be acquired. The city's IT has tested various options and identified a product that is the most cost effective and compatible with the existing, modern video conferencing units. This is requested in order to acquire licensing to fully implement the platform that was tested.

## FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

### Computer Replacements

Replacement of aged, outdated computers in various areas of the City.

### Police Records Management System

Replacement of the current records management system, which will no longer be supported after January 1, 2018.

### Election Equipment

Local share of statewide replacement of election equipment. The State is covering 80% of the cost, with the remaining 20% funding from local jurisdictions.

## PLANNING & NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

### Master Planning Project

Update of the Design Lansing Comprehensive Plan, include 425 areas, blight reduction, and commercial corridors.

### Parking Scooter Replacement

Replacement of parking scooters used by parking enforcement workers, due to age and usage

### On-street & North Capitol ramp Striping

Restriping of on-street and North Capitol ramp parking spaces which have become worn and present challenges in terms of violation enforcement.

### South Capitol Ramp Sealer

Concrete sealing essential for the preservation of the South Capitol Ramp (performed every 5 years)

### South Capitol Ramp LED Lighting Upgrades

Purchase and installation of LED lighting in the South Capitol ramp for energy efficiency and lighting enhancement

### Parking Ramp & Lot Wayfinding Signage

New wayfinding signs on Cedar Street, City Market Drive and at the entrances/exits in the lots for replacement of old, weathered, and outdated signage.

### Paystation & Office Equipment Credit Card Upgrades

Upgrade of credit card processing for enhanced encryption and PCI chip recognition.

### Ticket/Permit Software Upgrade

Upgrade of software automation to enhance customer service, including upgrades to limit the need for handwritten parking tickets.

## FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

### Lot 49(A) Paving & Striping

Asphalt and striping of Lot 49(A) for event parking.

### Parking Ramp Storm Drain Maintenance

Necessary storm drain maintenance of parking ramps

### North Capitol Ramp Control System

Replacement of outdated facility control system for the North Capitol ramp to more efficiently pinpoint and address issues.

### Parking Ramp Structure Maintenance

Minor maintenance of parking ramps as needed throughout the fiscal year.

## **PARKS AND RECREATION**

### Grant Match Funds

Matching used for parks and recreation grant opportunities

### Parking Lot Repair/Replacement

Partial funding for parking lot repairs needed in a number of Parks & Recreation sites and in City cemeteries.

### City Wide Repair and Maintenance

Funding for repairs and maintenance needs throughout the Lansing parks system.

### Foster Community Center Ramp Replacement

Replacement of the entrance ramp at the Foster Community Center for accessibility and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance.

### Community Center Carpet/Flooring Replacement

Replacement of worn and damaged flooring in community centers

## **PUBLIC SERVICE**

### Sidewalk Repairs

This request will fund repair of the some of the existing sidewalk network. Property owners are assessed for a portion of the work, consistent with the City ordinance.

### Sidewalk Gap Closure

Installation of new sidewalk along high priority major street corridors, consistent with the Gap Closure Report originally created in 2005

### Major Maintenance – Major and Local Streets

Repairs to the street network.

## FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

### Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Aid Project

City's share of costs for federally funded Surface Transportation Program (STP) projects. Recipients of STP funds are obligated to pay for all of the engineering costs and 20% of the construction costs. This funding will provide the engineering and match funds for reconstruction of Michigan Ave. between Bingham and Clemens in FY 2017 and the design engineering funds for Michigan Ave. between Clemens and Charles scheduled for reconstruction in FY 2018.

### Signalization and Modernization of Traffic Signals

Part of the ongoing program to replace/modernize traffic signals and add new signals as necessary.

### Bridge Improvements

City's share of costs for projects awarded through the State's Local Bridge Program. Recipients of Local Bridge Program funds are obligated to pay for all of the engineering costs and 5% of the construction costs. The following bridges will be rehabilitated with this funding: Jolly Rd over Sycamore Creek, Elm Street over the Grand River, Aurelius Rd. over Sycamore Creek, and Cavanaugh Rd. over Sycamore Creek.

### Bike Lanes

Engineering and construction match for the extension of the Kalamazoo Street bike lanes from Larch Street to Washington Square and engineering of a bike facility on Shiawassee Street from Grand Avenue to Pennsylvania Avenue and extending through the Lansing School District property at the end of Shiawassee Street to Marshall Street.

### Trunkline Improvements

Funds for local match requirements for any major trunkline improvements along the State/Interstate system.

### Paulson Landfill – Engineering study/improvements

Site characterization and remedial technology investigations related to control of contamination originating on this former landfill.

### City Share of Sanitary Sewers

Capital improvements to the aging sanitary sewer collection system. The work is primarily related to repairing existing sewers.

### City Share of Delta and Delhi Township Sewers

As part of the sanitary sewer agreement with these townships, the City is required to set aside a portion of the budget.

### Pump Station Radio System

Current control (SCADA) communication with 30 pump stations is via telephone line. Radio communications will replace the phone lines more reliability and carry no phone bill.

## FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

### Pump Station Switchgear Maintenance

Cleaning, testing, and repair plant and pump station switchgear. Maintenance is required every 5 years to prevent catastrophic electric failures and associated injuries/death and plant shut downs.

### Scott Park Pump Station VFD Replacement

Replacement of variable frequency drives (VFDs) at the end of their useful life. VFDs power and control the sewage pumps. Also added engineering fees for Scott Park MCC Replacement and Ventilations Improvements Project (CIP FY16).

### Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Efficiency Measures

Replacement of fixtures on light towers throughout the plant with LED units.

### Wastewater Treatment Plant Roof Replacement

Many plant roofs are beyond their useful life. The worst roofing identified will be replaced.

### Solids Handling Belt Filter Press

Study to determine extent of the project. We are anticipating the need for a new belt filter press, odor control, an overhead crane, instrumentation, new controls for the existing press, new polymer addition system, and rehabilitating a digester to serve as a mixing/holding tank.

### Tertiary Buried Power Supply Replacement

The buried cable that carries electricity from the main switchgear building to low voltage switchgear in the Tertiary Filter Building needs to be replaced. We are beginning to experience power transmission problems. The cables have been tested and found to be at end of their service life.

### Wastewater Drying Bed Design

The drying bed is used by both O&M (for sewer cleaning) and the WWTP. The current drying bed was not designed as such and drains very poorly. In addition, significant grit escapes and enters the plant recycle area, causing operational problems. There are also occasional storm drain contamination events caused by the design of the current drying bed. Funds will be used for a study to determine extent of the project.

### Wastewater Digester Remediation

5 moth-balled digesters contain contaminated liquid and sludge. These funds will allow an engineering firm to review the existing data and amend the previously produced bid documents for removal of the oil layer.

### Wet Weather Program

Cleaning out of sediment from our major trunk and interceptor sewers in an effort to improve existing system performance as part of the Wet Weather Program.

## FISCAL YEAR 2017 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

### Fleet Services

Replace old and worn equipment and vehicles that are too costly to maintain. Frequency of replacement of vehicles and equipment is determined by calculations utilizing maintenance records, critical component failure, and resale value.

CITY OF LANSING

**CITY COUNCIL**  
FISCAL YEAR 2017 BUDGET PROPOSAL



**City Council Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Proposal  
Table of Contents**

<b>Required Submission to Finance</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Recent History - All Accounts</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Salary and Fringe Accounts</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Account</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Promotion Account</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Individual Accounts</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Annual Event Accounts</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Community Funding Account</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Temporary Help Account</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Mandated Accounts</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Training Account</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Equipment Account</b>	<b>12</b>

**Internal Auditor Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Proposal**

<b>Required Submission to Finance</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Recent History - All Accounts</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Salary and Fringe Accounts</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Account</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Mandated Accounts</b>	<b>18</b>

FY 2016 Year-End Projection/FY 2017 Budget Line Item Worksheet

Department: City Council

Account Code	Description	FY 2015		FY 2016	FY 2016	FY 2016	FY 2016 Jan.	FY 2016 Year-	FY 2017 Dept.
		Budget	FY 2015 Actuals	Adopted Budget	Amended Budget	Actuals & Enc. Thru Dec. 31	- June Estimate	End Projection	Submission
101.112101.702000.00000	SALARIES	260,628	241,987	282,296	282,296	122,699	151,900	274,599	284,566
101.112101.715300.00000	FRINGE BENEFITS - FIXED	134,417	129,315	140,852	140,852	66,120	65,000	131,120	126,718
101.112101.715400.00000	FRINGE BENEFITS - VARIABLE	54,756	46,196	61,192	61,192	21,865	30,200	52,065	63,543
101.112101.741000.00000	MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING	35,000	31,982	30,000	30,000	4,448	24,500	28,948	30,000
101.112101.741200.00000	PROMOTION	6,000	2,925	6,000	6,000	4,300	1,700	6,000	6,000
101.112101.741223.00000	COUNCILMEMBER WOOD	2,000	2,004	2,000	2,000	1,093	907	2,000	2,000
101.112101.741229.00000	COUNCILMEMBER DUNBAR	2,000	1,917	2,000	2,000	934	1,066	2,000	2,000
101.112101.741231.00000	COUNCILMEMBER QUINNEY	2,000	1,910	-	-	-	-	-	-
101.112101.741234.00000	COUNCILMEMBER ROBINSON	1,500	1,357	1,500	1,500	1,419	-	1,419	-
101.112101.741235.00000	COUNCILMEMBER YORKO	1,500	1,592	1,500	1,500	538	962	1,500	1,500
101.112101.741236.00000	COUNCILMEMBER HOUGHTON	1,500	1,729	1,500	1,500	120	1,380	1,500	1,500
101.112101.741237.00000	COUNCILMEMBER WASHINGTON	1,500	1,240	1,500	1,500	580	920	1,500	1,500
101.112101.741238.00000	COUNCILMEMBER BROWN-CLARKE	2,000	1,912	2,000	2,000	1,160	840	2,000	2,000
101.112101.741239.00000	COUNCILMEMBER DELGADO	-	-	2,000	2,000	595	250	845	-
new	COUNCILMEMBER HUSSAIN	-	-	-	-	-	750	750	1,500
new	COUNCILMEMBER SPITZLEY	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,000	2,000
101.112101.741246.00000	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR DAY	1,000	-	1,000	1,000	-	1,000	1,000	1,000
101.112101.741247.00000	CESAR CHAVEZ EVENT	1,000	500	1,000	1,000	-	1,000	1,000	1,000
101.112101.741256.00000	BEA CRISTY AWARDS DINNER	1,000	1,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
101.112101.741289.00000	COMMUNITY FUNDING	6,000	8,750	7,000	7,000	1,000	6,000	7,000	7,000
101.112101.743050.00000	TEMPORARY HELP-CONTRACTUAL	9,000	10,936	5,000	5,000	9,328	-	9,328	5,000
101.112101.743720.00000	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ALLOC	79,049	79,050	83,000	83,000	41,502	41,498	83,000	87,150
101.112101.744110.00000	UTILITIES - CITY HALL	39,424	45,467	48,641	48,641	10,393	33,965	44,358	50,000
101.112101.744200.00000	TELEPHONE	12,300	13,373	12,300	12,300	2,594	8,906	11,500	14,000
101.112101.747000.00000	TRAINING	2,000	54	2,000	2,000	106	1,644	1,750	2,000
101.112101.748000.00000	INSURANCE & BONDS	5,826	6,702	7,119	7,119	2,387	5,613	8,000	8,055
101.112101.977000.00000	EQUIPMENT	5,000	-	5,000	5,000	1,552	3,448	5,000	5,000
		<b>666,400</b>	<b>631,898</b>	<b>706,400</b>	<b>706,400</b>			<b>679,182</b>	<b>705,032</b>

**CITY COUNCIL**  
**101.112101**  
**fiscal year 2017**

Obj	Description	FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Budget	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Budget	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2017 Request
702000	SALARIES	237,190	237,237	226,740	215,238	252,542	246,583	260,628	241,987	282,296	284,566
712000	LONGEVITY	400	400	400	400	500	0	0	0	0	0
715000	FRINGE BENEFITS	201,373	200,367	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
715300	FRINGE BENEFITS - FIXED	0	0	124,660	118,956	151,697	150,103	134,417	129,315	140,852	126,718
715400	FRINGE BENEFITS - VARIABLE	0	0	62,838	36,031	34,300	42,171	54,756	46,196	61,192	63,543
741000	MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING	35,750	27,443	38,000	37,348	38,000	24,084	35,000	31,982	30,000	30,000
741200	PROMOTION	0	0	3,000	1,500	3,000	2,611	6,000	2,925	6,000	6,000
741223	COUNCILMEMBER WOOD	3,000	3,040	2,000	1,825	2,000	2,023	2,000	2,004	2,000	2,000
741227	COUNCIL MEMBER JEFFRIES	3,000	1,927	2,000	1,670	2,000	863	0	0	0	0
741229	COUNCILMEMBER DUNBAR	3,000	2,209	2,000	1,884	2,000	2,140	2,000	1,917	2,000	2,000
741231	COUNCILMEMBER QUINNEY	3,000	2,394	2,000	1,921	2,000	2,138	2,000	1,910	0	0
741233	COUNCILMEMBER HEWITT	2,500	1,804	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
741234	COUNCILMEMBER BOLES	2,500	2,685	1,500	1,474	1,500	1,743	1,500	1,357	1,500	0
741235	COUNCILMEMBER YORKO	2,500	2,312	1,500	1,418	1,500	1,643	1,500	1,592	1,500	1,500
741236	COUNCILMEMBER HOUGHTON	2,500	1,627	1,500	1,424	1,500	1,685	1,500	1,729	1,500	1,500
741237	COUNCILMEMBER WASHINGTON	1,250	488	1,500	192	1,500	1,805	1,500	1,240	1,500	1,500
741238	COUNCILMEMBER BROWN CLARKE	0	0	0	0	0	1,154	2,000	1,912	2,000	2,000
741239	COUNCILMEMBER DELGADO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0
741XXX	COUNCILMEMBER HUSSAIN										1,500
741XXX	COUNCILMEMBER SPITZLEY										2,000
741246	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR DAY	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000
741247	CESAR CHAVEZ EVENT	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	500	1,000	500	1,000	1,000
741256	BEA CRISTY AWARDS DINNER	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0
741289	COMMUNITY FUNDING	1,500	2,620	6,000	3,070	6,000	4,700	6,000	8,750	7,000	7,000
743050	TEMPORARY HELP-CONTRACTUAL	0	0	3,000	5,103	13,000	4,084	9,000	10,936	5,000	5,000
743720	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ALLOC	0	0	0	0	58,550	58,550	79,049	79,050	83,000	87,150
744110	UTILITIES - CITY HALL	26,000	32,924	26,500	37,192	28,360	45,857	39,424	45,467	48,641	50,000
744200	TELEPHONE	10,000	12,156	10,000	11,079	12,300	11,531	12,300	13,373	12,300	14,000
747000	TRAINING	4,500	0	2,000	100	2,000	1,061	2,000	54	2,000	2,000
748000	INSURANCE & BONDS	5,796	3,829	5,912	4,002	6,651	5,941	5,826	6,702	7,119	8,055
977000	EQUIPMENT	10,000	0	10,000	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	5,000	5,000
		555,759	535,460	536,050	481,826	628,900	613,971	666,400	631,897	706,400	705,032

Budgets are as approved without adjustments.

## Council Salary and Fringe Accounts

fiscal year 2017

**Salary and Fringe** - This account is used for the categories noted as itemized below. Fixed fringe includes worker's compensation and retiree benefits. Variable fringe includes social security, medicaid, and current insurance benefits. Budget amounts are calculated by the Finance Department.

	702000	715300	715400
	salary	fixed fringe	variable fringe
<b>Council</b>			
Council President	26,640	519	2,271
Council Vice President	25,140	519	2,156
6 councilmembers @ 24,240	145,440	29,113	17,098
Office Manager 30	51,694	52,093	23,042
Administrative Secretary 28	35,652	44,474	18,976
	284,566	126,718	63,543

**Council Miscellaneous Account**

fiscal year 2017

**741000 - Miscellaneous** - This account is used for the categories noted below.

	<u>FY 2012</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 2013</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 2014</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 2015</u> <u>Budget</u>	<u>FY 2015</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>Budget</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>YTD</u>	<u>FY 2017</u> <u>Request</u>
a Water, Coffee, Snack cupboard	2,502	4,445	1,741	4,200	1,045	3,500	452	2,800
b Office Supplies	5,489	4,509	2,661	4,200	3,370	3,500	1,321	4,000
f Office Misc - name plates, business cards	1,307	1,059	2,028	3,800	1,267	3,000	774	3,000
m Business meals, meeting expenses					622	0	746	1,000
p Parking	375	0	1,834	0	823	2,000	0	1,000
c Postage	1,414	930	2,009	3,800	1,430	3,000	79	500
d Copier	5,928	4,937	6,741	5,700	7,950	4,500	0	8,000
e Cable TV	451	452	1,005	1,900	895	1,500	500	1,000
t Temp help	7,377	19,382	0	2,000	0	1,500	0	1,500
g Community Involvement - sponsorships, ads, etc.	0	91	3,341	4,200	6,701	3,500	426	3,500
h Other / Unclassified	2,599	1,503	2,725	5,200	7,878	4,000	614	3,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,443</b>	<b>37,307</b>	<b>24,084</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>31,982</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>4,913</b>	<b>30,000</b>
Approved Budget	35,750	38,000	38,000		35,000	30,000		30,000

FY 2015 Other includes purchase of chairs for dais - \$7,024

FY 2016 Year-to-Date is current to January 27, though neither December or January Visa charges have been posted.

**Council Promotion Account**

fiscal year 2016

741200 - Promotion - This account is used at Council's discretion to support various community events.

	FY 2011 actual	FY 2012 actual	FY 2013 actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2017 Request
80'S FLASHBACK TABLE	350						
A Philip Randolph Institute					200		
ACTION OF GREATER LANSING					500		
Ann Council Ad to 741200			200				
ANUL RED/WHITE SCHOLARSHIP AD	100						
ASSOC OF NEGRO BUSINESS PROFESSIONALS				30			
B&GC 21 ANNUAL DINNER	450						
BEA CHRISTY COUNCIL PROMO	128						
BLK MEN INC OF GRTR LANSING -AD	400		150				
BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB					200		
CESAR CHAVEZ - AD				300	300		
Cncl Pro:32 AnSr.Salute FPgAd-ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA	100						
Copper Sponsor-Silent Auction-Hist Society of Grtr Lansing				100			
Council Pro:FIPg Ad & 8 Tkts - A PHILIP RANDOLPH INST	400						
Cristo Rey Fiesta Ad to 741200			300				
DREAMS AND VISIONS MANIFESTED					300		
EASTSIDE COMM ACTION CENTER	250			40			
Everett High School Program				250			
Freedom Fund Banquet/Dinner - NAACP				600			
GLACNBPWC AD FOUNDERS' DAY-Assoc of Negro Bus/Pro	50		200		100		
HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF GREATER LANSING					100		
HLTH AWARENESS CONFERENCE				396			
INFLAT WALL - IDV#30	750						
KAPPA ALPH PSI	250						
LANSING REGIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE				80			
MI BULLETIN-MLK BLK HISTORY AD	250						
MICH WOMENS HALL OF FAME - AD	200						
MICH WOMENS HISTORICAL					125		
MICHIGAN HISPANIC HERITAGE CAUCUS							
MLK HOLIDAY COM AD & TABLE	450						
NAACP AD	200				200		
NACCP TICKETS	400						
PER COUNCILMEMBER BOLES				65			
Progressive Empowerment Educational Resource Services					700		
PURCHASE PAYPAL			500				
PURCHASE PAYPAL PILGRIM REST B			150				
SHOP WITH A COP	500						
TEAM LANSING FOUNDATION					200		
WESTSIDE HOME TOUR AD	250						
ZONTA	250			750			
Total	5,728	0	1,500	2,611	2,925	0	0

Budget	9,000	0	3,000	3,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Residuals (Over)	3,272	0	1,500	389			

YTD figures are as of 02/10/15

### Council Individual Accounts

fiscal year 2017

**Individual Councilmember Accounts** - These accounts are used for expenses related to holding office and serving constituents.

	FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Budget	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Budget	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2016 YTD	FY 2017 Request
Councilmember Wood	3,000	3,040	2,000	1,825	2,000	2,023	2,000	2,004	2,000	1,173	2,000
Councilmember Jeffries	3,000	1,927	2,000	1,670	1,000	863	0	0	0	0	0
Councilmember Dunbar	3,000	2,209	2,000	1,884	2,000	2,140	2,000	1,917	2,000	934	2,000
Councilmember Quinney	3,000	1,394	2,000	1,921	2,000	2,138	2,000	1,910	0	0	0
Councilmember Hewitt	2,500	1,804	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Councilmember Boles	2,500	2,685	1,500	1,474	1,500	1,743	1,500	1,357	0	1,419	0
Councilmember Yorke	2,500	2,312	1,500	1,418	1,500	1,643	1,500	1,592	1,500	538	1,500
Councilmember Houghton	2,500	1,627	1,500	1,424	1,500	1,685	1,500	1,729	1,500	265	1,500
Councilmember Washington	1,250	488	1,500	192	1,500	1,805	1,500	1,240	1,500	580	1,500
Councilmember Brown Clarke	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,154	2,000	1,912	2,000	1,160	2,000
Councilmember Delgado	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	595	0
Councilmember Hussain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	1,500
Councilmember Spitzley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000

NOTE: YTD figures are as of 01/26/16. Visa expenses have only been posted through November.

## Council Annual Event Accounts

fiscal year 2017

**Annual Event Accounts** - This account is used to support and attend the annual events noted below.

		FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Budget	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Budget	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2016 YTD	FY 2017 Request
741246	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	1,000
741247	Cesar Chavez Event	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	500	1,000	500	1,000	1,000	1,000
741256	Bea Christy Awards Dinner	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	0

Accounts were new as of fiscal year 2013.

YTD figures are current to 01/26/16

Funds for Bea Christy Awards reallocated to Community Funding for FY 2016

**Council Community Funding Account**

fiscal year 2017

**741289 - Community Funding** - This account is used to fund events making application to the General Services Committee and meeting Council requirements.

	FY 2011 actual	FY 2012 actual	FY 2013 actual	FY 2014 actual	FY 2015 actual	FY 2016 budget	FY 2017 request
Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority			100				
African American Parade / Festival	500						
Angel Tree Prison Fellowship					1,000		
Averill Fall Jamboree	500						
Bea Christy Dinner							
Bluebell Picnic			150				
Blvd Business BBQ	350						
Capitol Area Blues					500		
Cesar Chavez / TEJ / Latin Music Fest				1,200			
Cinco de Mayo	500						
City Blue Bags	105						
Colonial Village	500						
Cristo Rey Fiesta					1,750		
Fab Acres Annual Block Party	500		500				
J Robinson Games		45					
Juneteenth / PEERS		1,125	1,300		3,500		
Lutheran Social Services World Day	500	500					
March of Dimes Walk				500			
Martin Luther King Day			530				
Men Making a Difference			90	2,500	1,000		
Mosaic Festival	500						
NAACP Freedom Fund			400				
National Night Out	300						
New Mt Calvary Celebration	500						
Northtown Neighborhood Assoc				500			
Northwest Initiative					500		
Old Town Dickens Village	500						
Pinebrook Manor - Get to Know Your Ne	96						
Pow Wow event	50				500		
Shakespeare on the Grand	1,050						
Unknown IDV - June 16 &19, 2011	450						
Unknown IDV - June 17 &18, 2011	500						
Unknown IDV - other 1/2	500						
Unknown - Lot 56 Rental Fee		500					
Wexford Montessori		450					
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,901</b>	<b>2,620</b>	<b>3,070</b>	<b>4,700</b>	<b>8,750</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
Budget	12,000	1,500	6,000	6,000	6,000	7,000	7,000
Residuals (Over)	4,099	(1,120)	2,930	1,300	(2,750)		

**Council Temporary Help Account**

fiscal year 2017

**743050 - Temporary Help Account** - This account is utilized as needed, but particularly during budget review.

	FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Budget	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Budget	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2016 YTD	FY 2017 Request
Temporary Help	0	0	3,000	5,103	13,000	4,084	9,000	10,936	5,000	9,328	5,000

Account was new as of fiscal year 2013.  
YTD figures are through 01/26/16

## Council Mandated Accounts

fiscal year 2017

**Mandated Accounts** - These accounts are required as per City Finance.

		<b>FY 2012 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2012 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2013 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2013 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2014 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2014 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2015 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2015 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2016 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2016 YTD</b>	<b>FY 2017 Request</b>
743720	Information Technology	0	0	0	0	58,550	58,550	79,049	79,050	83,000	48,419	87,150
744110	Utilities - City Hall	26,000	32,924	26,500	37,192	28,360	45,857	39,424	45,467	48,641	10,393	50,000
744200	Telephone	10,000	13,156	10,000	11,079	12,300	11,531	12,300	13,373	12,300	2,594	14,000
748000	Insurance & Bonds	5,796	3,829	5,912	4,002	6,651	5,941	5,826	6,702	7,119	2,387	8,055

Information Technology account new as of fiscal year 2014.

YTD figures are current to 01/26/16

Utilities posted only through November.

Telephone posted only through October.

Information Technology and Insurance & Bonds are set by Finance Department

## Council Training Account

fiscal year 2017

**747000 - Training Account** - This account is used for seminars, workshops, etc. as needed.

	FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Budget	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Budget	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2016 YTD	FY 2017 Reques
Training	4,500	0	2,000	100	2,000	1,061	2,000	54	2,000	106	2,000

YTD figures are through 01/26/16

## Council Equipment Account

**fiscal year 2017**

**977000 - Equipment Account** - This account is used for computers and other office equipment as needed when not in the Information Technology budget.

	<b>FY 2012 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2012 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2013 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2013 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2014 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2014 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2015 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2015 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2016 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2016 YTD</b>	<b>FY 2017 Request</b>
Equipment	10,000	0	10,000	0	5,000	0	5,000	0	5,000	1,552	5,000

YTD figures are through 01/26/16

In FY 2015, new chairs for the dias were purchased for \$7,024 and charged to Miscellaneous.

CITY OF LANSING

# INTERNAL AUDITOR

## FISCAL YEAR 2017 BUDGET PROPOSAL



<u>Account Code</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>FY 2015</u> <u>Budget</u>	<u>FY 2015</u> <u>Actuals</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>Adopted</u> <u>Budget</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>Amended</u> <u>Budget</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>Actuals &amp; Enc.</u> <u>Thru Dec. 31</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>- June</u> <u>Estimate</u>	<u>Jan.</u> <u>End</u> <u>Projection</u>	<u>FY 2016</u> <u>Year-</u> <u>End</u> <u>Projection</u>	<u>FY 2017</u> <u>Dept.</u> <u>Submission</u>
<b>Internal Audit</b>										
101.112120.702000.00000	SALARIES	94,616	92,340	93,817	93,817	44,052	7,163	51,215	93,477	
101.112120.707000.00000	TEMPORARY HELP						12,273	12,273		
101.112120.712000.00000	LONGEVITY	1,200	1,500	1,600	1,600	2,000	-	2,000		
101.112120.715300.00000	FRINGE BENEFITS - FIXED	74,689	74,690	77,521	77,521	36,367	73,930	110,297	71,902	
101.112120.715400.00000	FRINGE BENEFITS - VARIABLE	23,206	22,775	23,456	23,456	10,643	5,422	16,065	23,400	
101.112120.741000.00000	MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING	1,500	647	1,500	1,500	758	442	1,200	2,600	
101.112120.743720.00000	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ALLOC	7,183	7,183	7,550	7,550	3,774	3,776	7,550	7,928	
101.112120.744200.00000	TELEPHONE	-	694	1,000	1,000	173	1,211	1,384	1,000	
101.112120.748000.00000	INSURANCE & BONDS	2,256	2,507	2,756	2,756	893	1,000	1,893	3,118	
		<b>204,650</b>	<b>202,336</b>	<b>209,200</b>	<b>209,200</b>				<b>203,877</b>	<b>203,425</b>

**INTERNAL AUDITOR**  
**101.112120**  
**fiscal year 2017**

Obj	Description	FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Budget	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Budget	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2017 Request
702000	SALARIES	84,132	84,042	90,180	86,679	94,700	78,161	94,616	92,340	93,817	93,477
712000	LONGEVITY	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,500	1,200	1,200	1,500	1,600	0
715000	FRINGE BENEFITS	61,972	59,833	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
715300	FRINGE BENEFITS - FIXED	0	0	63,833	62,405	70,110	69,355	74,689	74,690	77,521	71,902
715400	FRINGE BENEFITS - VARIABLE	0	0	10,189	9,508	10,255	18,368	23,206	22,775	23,456	23,400
741000	MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING	0	0	0	235	1,500	641	1,500	647	1,500	2,600
743720	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ALLOCAT	0	0	0	0	5,320	5,320	7,183	7,183	7,550	7,928
744110	UTILITIES - CITY HALL	0	439	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
744200	TELEPHONE	0	0	0	0	0	784	0	694	1,000	1,000
748000	INSURANCE & BONDS	2,245	1,432	2,290	1,497	2,575	2,167	2,256	2,507	2,756	3,118
		149,549	146,946	167,692	161,524	185,960	175,995	204,650	202,336	209,200	203,425

## internal Audit Salary and Fringe Accounts

fiscal year 2017

**Salary and Fringe** - This account is used for the categories noted as itemized below. Fixed fringe includes worker's compensation and retiree benefits. Variable fringe includes social security, medicaid, and current insurance benefits. Budget amounts are calculated by the Finance Department.

	702000	715300	715400	71200
	salary	fixed fringe	variable fringe	longevity
<b>Internal Audit</b>				
Internal Auditor 42	93,477.00	71,902.00	23,400.00	0.00

**internal Audit Miscellaneous Account**

fiscal year 2017

**741000 - Miscellaneous** - This account is used miscellaneous items such as dues, subscriptions and webinars.

	<b>FY 2014 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2014 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2015 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2015 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2016 Budget</b>	<b>FY 2017 Request</b>
Miscellaneous Operating	1,500	641	1,500	540	1,500	2,600

Account created in FY 2014

<b>FY 2017 Proposal</b>	
Membership - Association of Local Government Auditors	\$180
Membership - Institute of Internal Auditors	\$130
MICPA Governmental Accounting & Auditing Conference	\$329
3 ALGA webinars @ \$50	\$150
1 IIA e-seminar @ \$950	\$950
3 ACGA e-workshops @ \$199	\$597
Asst Office Supplies and Publications	\$264
	\$2,600

**Internal Audit Mandated Accounts**

fiscal year 2017

**Mandated Accounts** - These accounts are required as per City Finance.

		FY 2012 Budget	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Budget	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Budget	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Budget	FY 2017 Request
743720	Information Technology	0	0	0	0	5,320	5,320	7,183	4,792	7,550	7,928
744110	Utilities - City Hall	0	439	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
744200	Telephone	0	0	0	0	0	784	0	230	1,000	1,000
748000	Insurance & Bonds	2,245	1,432	2,290	1,497	2,575	2,167	2,256	1,132	2,756	3,118

Information Technology account new as of fiscal year 2014.

Information Technology and Insurance & Bonds are set by Finance Department



*Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

March 21, 2016

Lansing City Council  
10<sup>th</sup> Floor- City Hall  
124 Michigan Avenue  
Lansing, MI 48933

Re: Fahrenheit Lounge Violence

Dear Council President and City Council Members:

The main purpose of this correspondence is to support every effort by Mayor Bernero and Lansing City Council to revoke the liquor license currently held by Fahrenheit Lounge in South Lansing and shut the Lounge down; for good

Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel has been concerned and involved in trying to stop the serious violence since 2011; including serious fights and gun violence that has occurred inside and on the property of Fahrenheit Lounge.

Anyone who has been a part of Lansing or East Lansing for a period of years knows about Fahrenheit's nine lives. When they have been close to losing their liquor license, virtually shutting them down, they have promised the City of Lansing that they would institute a different genre of music and promised that a different, less violent kind of patron would begin to move into the bar's environment. The name of the bar may change, however; the genre of music and patrons did not.

*At this juncture, we want to emphasize that we in no way are stating that "all" patrons of Fahrenheit are violent. Many patrons of the Lounge just want a place they can frequent and have a good time with friends. They are not supporters of this violence in any way. Their safety is also at risk.*

It is important to note that the location of Causeway Bay Hotel is just yards from Fahrenheit and part of the two buildings are actually connected. We share an emergency exit with Fahrenheit and over the years we have had to deal with the negative impact of the conduct and behavior of many of the patrons of the Lounge.

- On several occasions we have had to deal with patrons of the Lounge filtering over to the hotel, extremely inebriated and making frightening scenes in the lobby in the presence of hotel guests.
- When there has been violence and shootings in and around Fahrenheit, we have had the responsibility of trying to comfort guests that could not be comforted. Those affected have been individuals, business travelers, and families. We are not certain that even those in Leadership positions totally understand how this violence affects our business and guests.
- In fact, over the years there have been dozens of employees that are fearful to walk to work and walk home due to the random yet ongoing violence in this area. Fahrenheit has contributed to



Causeway Bay Hotels

## *Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

this fear. On occasion, the hotel has picked up and dropped off employees when they have been needed but are fearful of walking at night.

- South Lansing is a location that desperately needs growing businesses. We have the potential to grow and we have employed many South Lansing residents over the years. We hire Vets, people who have made mistakes and need a second chance, people who have transportation issues etc. However, our growth has been stymied and we have direct evidence that Fahrenheit has been the largest deterrent to our growth. Two more recent examples:
  - ESPN wanted to contract with us for multiple years however; during their first stay in late 2015, there was a shooting at Fahrenheit. They packed their bags and left. We have been proactive in damage control however; they will not be returning.
  - Michigan State Police Precision Driving Division also contracted with the hotel to hold their meetings and trainings. Again, during their first stay in 2015, there was a shooting at Fahrenheit. Even with our outreach they made it very clear that they would not be back.

**We depend on word of mouth as a strong marketing strategy. Can you begin to imagine how that is working for us?**

- We know that Fahrenheit Lounge has allowed minors to enter their establishment. We have had minors staying at the hotel for organized group events that typically have adult advisors supervising the event. Teens will be teens and some have been able to mix with the patrons at Fahrenheit. We have witnessed these teens enter the hotel clearly inebriated after spending time next door at Fahrenheit. Our hands have been tied because we legally have no standing to act.
- Fahrenheit can draw very large crowds. Causeway Bay has many parking lots for our large events. The patrons of Fahrenheit would use our parking lots and we have many testimonies of guests who were intimidated by these individual's and the hotel guest's had to deal with inebriated and threatening patrons of Fahrenheit. It was suggested by some of Lansing's leaders that Causeway Bay should hire more security, set up parking lot metal guards etc., to try to control the Fahrenheit crowds. Our position is the same now as it was then; why would we have to set up these patrols and/or guards when these parking lots are owned by the hotel and are free to our guests?

## • Early morning shooting at Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge and Grill

**By Haley Herzog** Published: **March 13, 2016, 9:33 am** Updated: **March 13, 2016, 9:53 am**

(WLNS) – Two people were shot inside Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge and Grill during an event.

Lansing police shut down South Cedar Street in both directions while they cleared out the club.



Causeway Bay Hotels

*Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

Two ambulance vehicles drove off with the victims, and there is no update on their condition.

Officers told our crew at the scene they have not recovered a weapon, and have not made any arrests at this time.

We're following this story and will have updates online and on 6 News

In letters and communication (2011-2016) with the City Council, former Chief of Police, Teresa Szymanski, current Chief of Police, Chief Michael Yankowski we asked the question: "**When is Enough, Enough**"? We have been forced to lock down the hotel during these incidents. The effect of the lock downs has not only placed guests in fear and apprehension, it has traveled to many online hotel reviews as well as the community. The public is not inclined to use the services offered at the hotel under these present conditions. The hotel is branded as a hotel that is surrounded by violent crime; Aka: not safe.

We sincerely hope that a very serious review will take place by Lansing Leadership regarding the revocation of Fahrenheit Lounge's liquor license. This is the only decision that would stop the continuation of physical and gun violence at Fahrenheit Lounge and immediate area. Based on history, this community needs to know that a "new owner" or manager would not be able to promise a safer environment and would have no intention of delivering that promise. Once a liquor license is granted, we will be right back to square one fearing that the violence will begin again. Please be the Leaders that understand and are committed to the safety of the hotel guests and staff as well as the surrounding community.

Sincerely,

*Sherry L. Massey*

Sherry Massey MSW; JD  
[smassey1209@gmail.com](mailto:smassey1209@gmail.com)



Causeway Bay Hotels

*Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

**ADDENDUM TO LETTER**

This Addendum is a chronological collection of letters to the City Council, Chief of Police, Clients/Group damage control efforts and news reports regarding incidents at Fahrenheit Lounge.

**2015**

October 28th, 2015

**Re: ESPN Stay at Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel**

Dear Mr. Berano:

It has come to my attention that the ESPN group that stayed with Causeway Bay Lansing MI was not satisfied with their stay and considering not returning to the hotel. The following is a list of the complaints I would like to address.

**Noise Level** – During the weekend of Michigan States Homecoming game against Purdue the hotel had a very large Professional Group, The Michigan State University Black Alumni. The group uses our hotel and convention center once a year. This professional group is comprised of business men and women, judges, attorneys, doctors, professors etc. The noise level was high at times. Security and management were able to reduce the noise level on most floors however; we are aware that the noise continued in some rooms and corridors and for that, we apologize.

The plan was to have members of ESPN sectioned off in one wing so the potential noise factor would be minimized. Unfortunately, at the time of check-in the assigned rooms for ESPN were not in one wing of the hotel as originally assigned. If ESPN decides to return, I will make sure that they are sectioned off to eliminate noise.

**Report of shooting outside a near-by club** - We investigated reports of an alleged shooting and below is an article published by WKAR Lansing, MI.

**Police Investigating Shots Fired Report at Lansing Club**

*Updated: Sat 4:05 PM, Oct 03, 2015 By: News 10*

..."Lansing Police are investigating a shots fired report at "Fahrenheit [sic] Ultra Lounge.... Nearly a hundred people were at the South Cedar Street club, so Lansing Police, State Police and the Ingham County Sheriff's Office set up a perimeter. Investigators say they didn't find evidence of a shooting at the scene or any victims".

It is important to note that there were no witnesses to any shooting at this club.



Causeway Bay Hotels

*Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

We want to add that there are 40 restaurants, 2 nightclubs and big box retail businesses i.e. Lowes, Sams, Target etc. within a mile of Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel. While we are located in an older part of Lansing, it is a vibrant and growing area.

We would appreciate the opportunity to serve you in the future. If you choose to stay with us we want to offer the following

- Complimentary Dinner for ESPN members on first night
- Complimentary Champagne or Fruit Basket on first night

We sincerely hope that you reconsider. Please allow us to demonstrate our commitment and successful ability to make your stay a pleasant and satisfying one.

Your contact person is the Senior Sales Manager, Mr. Phil Ford.

Phone – 517.694.8123

Email – [phillip.ford@causewaybaylansinghotel.com](mailto:phillip.ford@causewaybaylansinghotel.com)

Sincerely,

*Lin Keung*

Lin Keung  
Owner  
Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel  
Lansing, MI

Cc: Sherry Massey  
Phillip Ford

October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2015

**Re: Michigan State Police Precision Driving Division- Stay at Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel**

Dear Lieutenant Gromak:

It has come to my attention that the Michigan State Police Precision Driving Division that stayed with Causeway Bay Lansing MI from 9/18 -9/22 2015 was not satisfied with their stay and considering not returning to Causeway Bay Lansing. Below is a list of Michigan State Police issues I would like to address.

**Hospitality Room** – We apologize for the misunderstanding regarding placing TV's in this area. We have corrected the oversight and I have been assured that this will not occur again.

**Report of shooting outside a near-by club** - We investigated reports of an alleged shooting and below is an article published by WKAR Lansing, MI.



Causeway Bay Hotels

## *Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

### **Police Investigating Shots Fired Report at Lansing Club**

*Updated: Mon 2:34 AM, Sep 21, 2015*

**Lansing, Mich.** Lansing Police are investigating an early morning [report of] shots fired report at [Fahrenheit]club... Witnesses tell police they heard between four to seven shots near Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge on Cedar Street. Officers were called there just after 1:30 a.m. Sunday, but say their search didn't turn up anything.

There were no reported injuries.

It is important to note that there were no witnesses to any shooting at this club.

We want to add that there are 40 restaurants, 2 nightclubs and big box retail businesses i.e. Lowes, Sams, Target etc. within a mile of Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel. While we are located in an older part of Lansing, it is a vibrant area that is seeing more attention to neighborhood and business growth.

We sincerely hope that you reconsider. Please allow us to demonstrate our commitment and successful ability to make your stay a pleasant and satisfying one.

Your contact person is the Senior Sales Manager, Mr. Phil Ford.

Phone – 517.694.8123

Email – [phillip.ford@causewaybaylansinghotel.com](mailto:phillip.ford@causewaybaylansinghotel.com)

Sincerely,

*Lin Keung*

Lin Keung

Owner

Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel

Lansing, MI

Cc:

Veto Enterprises

Sherry Massey

Phillip Ford



Causeway Bay Hotels

## Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center

**2014**



A gun went off Sunday morning on Lansing's south side. Lansing Police tell News 10 they were there when it happened. Police say they were responding to reports of a fight at Fahrenheit Ultra Lounge on the 6800 block of South Cedar Street.

They saw a large group leave the club and head out back. Then, police say, they heard a gunshot. Police cleared out the area but did not find a wounded person. Local hospitals have not reported anyone with a gunshot wound either.

At last check, police said they were looking for vehicles that may have been involved, but have not made any arrests.

YOU MIGHT LIKE

September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2014

Lansing City Council  
10<sup>th</sup> Floor- City Hall  
124 Michigan Avenue  
Lansing, MI 48933

Re: Fahrenheit Shooting

Dear Council President Wood and City Council Members:

I am writing on behalf of Causeway Bay Hotel Lansing, formerly Best Western Plus of Lansing Michigan. Ownership of the hotel remains with the same owner, Mr. Lin Keung.

Our ongoing and growing concern is that incidents at Fahrenheit continue to pose serious risk to the hotel's guests and employees. There was another shooting on Fahrenheit's property. Please see **Attachment A**. It might as well state that traveling to South Lansing is life-threatening. Not good PR for the hotel or any business for that matter.

I am also enclosing previous letters I have written which provide a background to our continued concerns. I have attended meetings with the Lansing City Council and Chief Yankowski in 2012 and 2013. I believe we were beginning to make progress and find some common ground. Mr. Keung would like to pick up where we left off and continue our efforts. It may be more of a zoning or Lansing City Ordinance Violation issue than a police issue however; it remains important to involve the City Council and Chief Yankowski in this process



Causeway Bay Hotels

*Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

**2013**

January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2013

Chief of Police  
Teresa Szymanski,  
120 W. Michigan Ave.  
Lansing, MI 48933

Re: Fahrenheit Shooting

Dear Chief Szymanski:

I am writing on behalf of Best Western Plus of Lansing Michigan. This past Saturday, January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013, a shooting occurred outside Fahrenheit next to the Best Western Plus. Needless to say, guests and employees were upset and fearful for the remainder of the night and early morning. We were forced to lock down the hotel. The effect of the lock down has traveled to many online hotel reviews as well as the community. The public is not inclined to use the services offered at the hotel under these present conditions. The hotel is branded as a hotel that is surrounded by violent crime; not safe.

This is not the first time violent crimes occurred next door at Fahrenheit.

2010-2012- Shootings at Fahrenheit – The department has the police reports.

2012 – Weekend of the Michigan State vs. Notre Dame football game.

- Our hotel was booked. Fahrenheit had a party attended by over 2000 people throughout the evening and early morning.
- Best Western Plus was bombarded with traffic. Fahrenheit used all of our parking lots as well as Lowes.
- Fahrenheit crowds interfered with traffic on Cedar Street to the point of police coming out to direct traffic and control the mass crowds in and around the hotel.
- After the football game, people were attempting to drive through crowds attending the Fahrenheit party.
- Traffic was deadlocked due to large numbers of Fahrenheit patrons crossing Cedar Street.
- Guests driving in from the football game could not get through to the hotel. Over 50 guests turned around and did not enter the hotel or check-in. We lost major business that night. Fahrenheit crowds entered the hotel in great numbers which upset even more guests and employees. Many were intoxicated and made highly offensive comments to guests. Threats were made that actually “terrified” guests as well as employees.

**When is Enough, Enough?** The owner of this hotel is doing everything in his power to build this hotel. I know you are aware that we are a major hiring entity for South Lansing. We hire Veterans. We hire many people that no other business would hire. We believe in second chances. This hotel is a Lansing landmark and is needed in the State Capitol.



Causeway Bay Hotels

*Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

What is it going to take to deal with this issue from a local government standpoint? Is it going to take a guest or employee being killed by a stray bullet or other crime? The Police Department and City Officials are aware of the legal games that the owners/managers of Fahrenheit have engaged in over the past few years.

We are requesting a meeting with you, Mayor Bernero, City Attorney Smith, and other City officials you deem necessary to discuss this issue. If a viable solution is not reached, this hotel will not be successful. We cannot override or market ourselves pretending we don't have a serious crime issue directly affecting our business. Violent crime is a death sentence to this hotel and its growth in the community.

I look forward to your response to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Sherry L. Massey MSW; JD  
General Manager  
smassey1209@gmail.com

Cc: Mayor Bernero, City Attorney Smith

August 12, 2013

Lansing City Council  
10<sup>th</sup> Floor- City Hall  
124 Michigan Avenue  
Lansing, MI 48933

Re: Fahrenheit Shooting

Dear Council President Wood and City Council Members:

I am writing on behalf of Best Western Plus of Lansing Michigan concerning events that are posing a serious risk to the hotel's guests and employees.

This past weekend, August 10<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 there was a shooting at the Fahrenheit Bar. Needless to say, guests and employees were upset and fearful for the remainder of the night and early morning. We were forced to lock down the hotel. The effect of the lock down has traveled to many online hotel reviews as well as the community. The public is not inclined to use the services offered at the hotel under these present conditions. The hotel is branded as a hotel that is surrounded by violent crime and not safe to stay in. We have large numbers of conferences/conventions at the hotel and the guests stay in the hotel during these events. Local groups in Lansing are finding it harder to bring their groups to Best Western Plus. This is an ongoing financial blow to the hotel. When we serve fewer guests we need fewer employees. This is not what we envisioned or intended to happen.



Causeway Bay Hotels

## *Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

This is not the first time violent crimes have occurred next door at Fahrenheit. Nor is it the first time management of the hotel was forced to lock down the hotel. People who have been partying at the Fahrenheit seem to think they can walk into the hotel in serious numbers and continue their rude, loud and drunken behavior in front of guests and employees. Patrons of the bar use our parking lots which causes problems when we are fully booked and guests cannot find parking places. Many guests of the hotel have commented that they do not feel their cars are safe. Each time a shooting or other violent crime occurs on the Fahrenheit premises, the risk for the hotel becomes greater. We need the City's support and assistance in finding a solution.

The bar property has had many names and owners over the years and they seem to convince the city that they will not be like the previous owners. They promise to have a different genre of music which will attract people who may be less inclined to participate in violent behavior, however; it has not happened and the bar continues to have serious crime problems. We understand that many people who attend Fahrenheit do not cause problems. Many like to dance and socialize with friends and have no intention of causing problems.

The time lines of the shootings are listed below. The list does not include other violent acts that have occurred at Fahrenheit over the last few years.

**2013 – August 10<sup>th</sup>/ 11<sup>th</sup>** – shooting outside Fahrenheit Bar parking lot which adjoins with Best Western Plus Lansing.

**2013- January 19<sup>th</sup>** –shooting outside the Fahrenheit Bar parking lot which adjoins with Best Western Plus Lansing

**2012 – Weekend of the Michigan State vs. Notre Dame football game.** I would like to comment further regarding this event.

- Our hotel was booked. Fahrenheit had a party attended by over 2000 people throughout the evening and early morning.
- Best Western Plus was bombarded with traffic. Fahrenheit used all of our parking lots as well as Lowes.
- Fahrenheit crowds interfered with traffic on Cedar Street to the point of police coming out to direct traffic and control the mass crowds in and around the hotel.
- After the football game, Best Western Plus guests were attempting to drive through crowds attending the Fahrenheit party.
- Traffic was deadlocked due to large numbers of Fahrenheit patrons crossing Cedar Street.
- Guests driving in from the football game could not get through to the hotel. Over 50 guests turned around and did not enter the hotel or check-in. Many more were highly concerned for their safety. We lost major business that night. Fahrenheit crowds entered the hotel in great numbers which upset the guests and employees even more. Many were intoxicated and made highly offensive comments to guests. Threats were made that actually “terrified” guests as well as employees.



Causeway Bay Hotels

## *Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

**2010-2012- Shootings at Fahrenheit** – The Lansing Police Department has the police reports. We do not know the exact dates.

**When is Enough, Enough?** The owner of the hotel is doing everything in his power to build this hotel. I know you are aware that we are a major hiring entity for South Lansing. We hire Veterans. We hire many people that no other business would hire. We believe in second chances. This hotel is a Lansing landmark and is needed in the State's Capitol.

What is it going to take to deal with this issue from a local government standpoint? Is it going to take a guest or employee being killed by a stray bullet or other crime? The Police Department and City Officials are aware of the legal games that the owners/managers of Fahrenheit have engaged in over the past few years.

We are requesting a meeting with you, the City Council Members and any other City Official you deem necessary to discuss this issue. If a viable solution is not reached, this hotel will not be successful. We cannot override or market ourselves pretending we don't have a serious crime issue directly affecting our business. Violent crime is a death sentence to this hotel and its growth in the community.

I look forward to your response and assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Sherry L. Massey MSW; JD  
[smassey1209@gmail.com](mailto:smassey1209@gmail.com)  
(269) 779-3702

## 2012

**2012 – Weekend of the Michigan State vs. Notre Dame football game.** I would like to comment further regarding this event.

- Our hotel was booked. Fahrenheit had a party attended by over 2000 people throughout the evening and early morning.
- Best Western Plus was bombarded with traffic. Fahrenheit used all of our parking lots as well as Lowes.
- Fahrenheit crowds interfered with traffic on Cedar Street to the point of police coming out to direct traffic and control the mass crowds in and around the hotel.
- After the football game, Best Western Plus guests were attempting to drive through crowds attending the Fahrenheit party.
- Traffic was deadlocked due to large numbers of Fahrenheit patrons crossing Cedar Street.
- Guests driving in from the football game could not get through to the hotel. Over 50 guests turned around and did not enter the hotel or check-in. Many more were highly concerned for their safety. We lost major business that night. Fahrenheit crowds entered the hotel in great numbers



Causeway Bay Hotels

*Causeway Bay Lansing Hotel and Convention Center*

which upset the guests and employees even more. Many were intoxicated and made highly offensive comments to guests. Threats were made that actually "terrified" guests as well as employees.

**2011**

August 19, 2011

It has come to the attention of the General Manager that there was an incident that occurred On Sunday, August 14, 2011. A guest at our establishment heard gunshots coming from the nightclub adjacent to our facility. This guest's room was within 100 feet from the nightclub.

Upon our own investigation, we learned that 911 was called to the scene. We were under the assumption that the nightclub was under new ownership and a new genre of music (Techno music) On Saturday evenings they continue to have the same DJ, the same Hip Hop music and the same patrons as the previous owner.

This nightclub has been the subject of other violent incidents in the past which have been a safety concern of the hotel's guests and staff.

I feel the need to bring this to the attention of the police department as well as other city officials for any further occurrences. I would appreciate a phone call to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,

Sherry L. Massey MSW; JD  
[smassey1209@gmail.com](mailto:smassey1209@gmail.com)  
(269) 779-3702