

Memorandum

Date: September 17, 2007

To: Policy Board Members and Alternates

From: Robert D. Miller, Director

Subject: 2008 Administrative Budget Proposal

The draft budget proposal for 2008 is attached to this memorandum for your review and consideration. The spreadsheets are similar in format to past budget submissions. This years submission continues to incorporate the expenses of the Minneapolis and Saint Paul Home Tour and reflects the changed approach to paying the City for support from DFD and CPED. For the first time we have capped the fee to be paid for Contract Administration so that we can more effectively predict and manage our expenditures.

For the past 7 years a substantial percentage of our budget has been devoted to paying the fees assessed by government jurisdictions. In 2006 more than 24% of our budget was used to pay for City admin services. In 2007 that percentage will increase because of additional services for which NRP will be billed.

The central function of NRP's administrative office continues to be helping neighborhoods develop and implement their Phase II NAP's. This past year the office continued our commitment to the timely processing of Neighborhood Action Plans approved by neighborhoods. Eight (8) plans have been approved to date in 2007 by the Policy Board and the cumulative total for approved Phase II NAP's now stands at 38 (or 53% of the total number of plans that will be submitted for approval in Phase II). This work has been accomplished in the three years since the Board adopted the neighborhood allocations. In Phase I it took 5 years to approve 25 NAP's. Together, the approved NAP's for Phase II appropriate about 57% of the total set aside for neighborhoods in 2004.

In addition to helping with the development of plans, our contracting activity continues at a high level. We have also assigned two of our staff to assist DFD with the development and processing of housing related contracts to take up the slack after an unexpected staff change occurred in the Division. The pending decisions on neighborhood allocation levels, if no other action occurs to address the revenue shortfall, may, however, negatively impact contracting activity.

Last year the Policy Board took the initiative to put the discussion of NRP after 2009 on the table. The Continuation Task Force established by the Board in 2005 presented its report to the Board in April, 2006. They addressed both the immediate Phase II shortfall and the longer-term options for financing NRP and continued neighborhood improvement after 2009.

The Phase II shortfall became an even more pressing concern to NRP when the City published its new revenue projections for the Common Project in April. Those projections forecast a Phase II capitalization for NRP of \$ 66,476,583, **or \$ 7,695,665 less than the projections made in October 2005.** At the projected level of funding, NRP cannot provide the 70% of the original 2004 allocation (which was also based on projections by the City) that was the minimum that neighborhoods were expecting and that the Policy Board believed was reasonable and conservative.

This year, NRP staff reviewed the proposed options from the Task Force and produced a more detailed review of the Task Force's first choice to resolve the short-term revenue shortfall. That option has been discussed with several City Council members and was a key part of the Director's 2008 Budget presentation to the Mayor, Council leaders, and Finance Department staff in July. No action has yet occurred on the proposal and no other suggestions have been offered for addressing the Phase II shortfall.

The issues about future activity will have to be resolved soon, but the first priority of the office and staff has to be helping the thousands of residents and participants that are involved now in developing and implementing plans for the improvement of their neighborhood.

The Minneapolis and Saint Paul Home Tour continues to be a big event and a great marketing opportunity for city living. In 2007 almost 5,400 individuals made more than 36,700 visits to the 57 homes and development projects on the Tour. The number of visitors represented an increase of 35% over the corresponding figures for 2006. More than 27% of the visitors were from outside of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Sponsor and ad revenues covered all of the direct costs and indirect expenses have been reduced to 25% of their level only 3 years ago as a result of continually reexamining and modifying the manner in which the Tour is conducted. 2007 was the 20th year of the Tour and the 5th year of sponsorship by NRP.

We also conducted two sessions of the reformatted Community Leadership Institute. The course is now being offered and provided to one neighborhood at a time to maximize the number of residents in leadership positions that benefit from this training opportunity. It's target populations are existing neighborhood board members and emerging leaders. The new approach has been used with Stevens Square, Jordan, HPDL and McKinley. The next class will be with the American Indian community.

NRP has many contracts and agreements that begin and end at various times of the year. To accommodate these agreements we have, in the past, rolled over funds from the prior budget year to pay for the remainder of the expenses contracted for, but not delivered,

during that fiscal year. The City Council, during the discussion of the 2006 rollover request expressed the view that the budget should be constructed to include the anticipated costs of the contracts that extend beyond the year. We have constructed our budgets since that time to minimize the potential for a rollover from one budget year to another. This year's budget continues that practice.

The proposed budget for 2008 continues our efforts to reduce costs and staffing. The proposal is for the reduction of 1 FTE in the staff complement. Overall the proposed 2008 Budget is 6.6% less than the approved 2007 Budget and 2% less than the 2006 expenditures.

The City council has scheduled NRP for presentation of its budget proposal on October 3 and this budget will be the one that will be offered at that time, with the caveat that it is still a draft and has not yet been approved by the Policy Board. For the information of the Board I have also attached a copy of the material that I submitted to the Mayor during the Mayor's Budget hearing in July.

It is expected that the Board will adopt a final budget at either the October or November Board meeting.

2008 Administrative Budget
for the
Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP)

The following material is provided to conform to the City of Minneapolis Budget Process.

Mission:

The Mission Statement of NRP is drawn from its founding documents: the NRP statute, the Joint Powers Agreement and the Bylaws of the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization program (NRP) Policy Board.

The Mission of the Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) is to improve the quality of life in the City of Minneapolis by revitalizing its neighborhoods and making them better places to live, work, learn and play.

Goals:

To accomplish this Mission, the NRP adopted four Goals for Phase I. Those Goals were:

- Build neighborhood capacity
- Redesign public services
- Create a sense of community and place
- Increase intra and intergovernmental collaboration

In addition to these Goals, the Teamworks evaluation report on Phase I identified three additional goals that were distilled from a review of official documents by the NRP Evaluation Task Force, a Policy Board authorized multijurisdictional work team. The three other Goals were to:

- Improve the lives of the citizens of Minneapolis and enhance neighborhood stability
- Bring neighborhoods to a level at which they will attract private investment
- Improve the physical characteristics of neighborhoods, especially as embodied in infrastructure and housing

As part of the multi jurisdictional review and planning process for Phase II the Policy Board adopted six Goals for Phase II that build on, and expand, the Goals of Phase I and responded to the changed environment for NRP and its participating jurisdictions.

- Create a greater sense of community so that the people who live, work, learn and play in Minneapolis have an increased sense of commitment to and confidence in their neighborhood and their City

- Sustain and enhance neighborhood capability in order to strengthen the civic involvement of all members of the community
- Ensure that neighborhood-based planning remains the foundation of the program, is informed and leads to creative and innovative approaches
- Strengthen the partnerships among neighborhoods and jurisdictions to identify and accomplish shared citywide goals
- Ensure that government agencies learn from and respond to neighborhood plans so that public services ultimately reflect neighborhood priorities
- Develop and support life cycle housing citywide through the preservation of existing housing and new construction by reaffirming our commitment to the state mandate that 52.5% of NRP funds be spent on housing.

NRP uses five primary business lines to help accomplish these Goals.

1. Assist neighborhoods with development of NAPs.

NAPs are the building blocks of the NRP program and are developed and written by the neighborhoods. Each NAP provides a vision for the neighborhood, identifies the priorities for achieving that vision, and identifies and contains specific action steps (strategies) for implementation. The NRP statute requires that NAPs be prepared and approved before any NRP expenditures occur.

NRP staff provide guidance on development of the NAP, monitor the public participation process, help the neighborhood obtain any needed professional or technical support as the strategies are being considered, and assist, as needed and requested, with preparation of the draft plans.

2. Review, modify and approve NAPs prepared by neighborhoods.

During the development and drafting of the NAP, NRP staff help neighborhoods obtain needed support, information and perspectives from public and non profit staff with knowledge of the subject areas of concern to the neighborhood. After the neighborhood approves its draft NAP, the plan is reviewed by NRP staff and forwarded to public staff for comments and NRP's external counsel for a legal opinion on conformance with the NRP statute.

NRP staff work to make the NAP approval process as considerate and respectful as possible by providing information to the neighborhood before they begin the process, identifying possible problem areas in the plan draft, encouraging neighborhood representative attendance and presentations at the Policy Board during the review of the plan, providing assistance with making changes suggested by NRP, jurisdictional staff or

legal counsel before the Policy Board presentation, and preparing all needed transmittal and descriptive documents.

3. Oversee, monitor and evaluate implementation of approved NAPs and their strategies.

The City Attorney has opined that NRP staff cannot manage implementation contracts for strategies contained in an NAP unless they are for planning, oversight or evaluation. NRP staff serve as the contract administrator for the neighborhood organization activities associated with these functions and develop the scopes of service and budgets for the needed contracts. In this role they review reimbursement requests, monitor performance and ensure that implementation of the plan is occurring as approved.

NRP staff coordinate governmental and private efforts in the development of other needed contracts and implementation of NAPs. They serve as the contact for the involvement and participation of appropriate implementing departments, private for-profit and non-profit vendors and jurisdictions.

NRP staff work with neighborhoods and these organizations to clearly define the approved programs, projects, services or activities, and draft appropriate scopes of service, program guidelines and budgets prior to preparation of needed contracts or agreements. Another major part of the service provided by NRP staff is to ensure that funding is available, as needed, for the programs, projects, services or activities contained in an approved NAP.

4. Manage NRP's financial resources and expenditures.

NRP is responsible for the expenditures of NRP funds and for the management of the public resources that have been provided to the program. NRP monitors and evaluates program activities and expenditures to ensure consistency with approved contracts and the strategies in NAPs.

In addition, NRP works to minimize administrative costs for NRP's central office and the neighborhoods by initiating group purchase discounts, special professional service arrangements and elimination of duplicate activities.

One of the most important results that must be achieved is meeting the statute mandate that 52.5% of all NRP funds expended must be for housing or housing related programs, projects, services or activities.

5. Educate, inform and train residents for participating effectively in neighborhood improvement efforts.

Training and development is necessary to create new and informed leaders, a greater sense of community, increase civic involvement, and make it possible for meaningful partnerships between neighborhood organizations and government jurisdictions. NRP

offers training that provides neighborhood volunteers and staff with specific skills designed to help create and maintain healthy organizations. Workshops are offered on a regular basis and upon request to individual neighborhoods.

Organization Chart:

NRP's organization chart is attached.

Accomplishments:

The primary focus of NRP is on assisting with, and gaining approval of, neighborhood action plans. For that Business Line our goal is to have at least 75% of the 73 possible Phase II NAPs approved by the Policy Board by December 31, 2009.

NRP is well on the way to achieving this Goal. As of June 26, 2007 the Policy Board has approved 38 Phase II NAPs or 52.8% of the 73 possible plans. These approvals have allocated 57.1% of the funds allocated to neighborhoods based on the March 2004 City projections for Common Project revenues. Phase II Participation Agreements have been approved for more than 70% of the neighborhoods.

To date, fewer than 5 strategies from draft plans have been rejected by legal counsel as inconsistent with the NRP statute. After modifications were made, with NRP staff assistance, each and every plan, and all of the strategies in those approved plans has been reviewed and approved as an appropriate expenditure of NRP funds.

Neighborhood plans are allocating their funds to Housing programs, projects, services or activities. For the approved plans, 75.4% of their full allocation is committed to Housing programs, projects, services or activities. At this time, and with these commitments, NRP is less than 1% from meeting its legislated mandate for all of the funds appropriated since the program began in 1991. The issue, however, will be whether the commitments can be kept if the total dollars available to NRP declines to the level projected by City staff in April, 2007. **Without these Phase II housing expenditures, the program cannot meet the mandated percentage.**

The amounts allocated for Administrative costs by neighborhoods have also been reduced. For the plans approved to date, administrative expenses total only 18.5% of the appropriated funds.

NRP's central office staff will again be reduced by the proposed 2008 Budget. The recommendation to the Policy Board will be to reduce the office FTE count to 9. NRP has no vacancies and fills its staffing needs by reassignment of duties, professional service agreements, or MOUs. NRP intends to continue reducing central office staff and will do so, to the maximum extent possible, without layoffs or terminations. The extent and timing of these reductions will depend on the results from the community engagement discussions presently being conducted by the City and the progress made on addressing the short and long term financial issues of NRP.

What key trends and challenges does your organization face and how will they be addressed?

Neighborhoods in the City have improved greatly since NRP was initiated in 1990. The investment of NRP resources during the first ten years helped reverse years of neglect and decline in neighborhoods and provided resources that were used to leverage additional investments by public and private sources. In Elliot Park alone, the neighborhood's investment of \$ 4.4 million from NRP helped leverage over \$ 151 million of new development in that neighborhood. As improvement has occurred, however, the perceptions of need and the urgency attached to continuing NRP have changed.

In addition, government, at all levels, has had to cope with having fewer resources to provide the services needed to meet the continually changing requirements of residents, businesses and neighborhoods. State tax law changes adopted in 2001 and a more negative public attitude toward government, in general, have greatly reduced the revenues available for Phase II from the Common Project. Actions taken by the City Council and Mayor in 2003, 2005 and 2006 further depleted this resource.

Phase II was initially planned to begin in 2001. On February 24, 2001 more than 400 residents braved one of that winter's worst storms to celebrate neighborhood achievements in Phase I, honor exemplary projects and receive information and training that would help them in Phase II. With the tax law changes adopted by the legislature in 2001 NRP had to place implementation of Phase II on hold. Residents and neighborhoods that had expected to seamlessly move into Phase II as they completed their Phase I plans were forced to wait, and uncertainty about resource availability led to questions about city commitment, the value of resident-based planning and the interest in resident participation.

As the time required to answer the questions about future revenues grew longer, residents turned their attention to other areas of interest, neighborhoods lost volunteers, projects were placed on hold or canceled and questions were raised about whether there would even be a Phase II.

Adoption of the revised Chapter 419 of the Minneapolis City Ordinances in August 2003 and the March 2004 calculation of the Common Project revenue stream removed some of this uncertainty. Residents were encouraged to recommit to their neighborhood and the city, based on this renewed commitment to NRP. The Common Project revenue projections prepared by the City in June and October of 2005 and the updated projection in April 2007 have returned neighborhoods to the uncertainty of 2001.

The funding available for Phase II has changed dramatically over the past seven years. In June 2000, as NRP was about to begin its second decade, City officials projected, based on the legislation establishing NRP, the city ordinance implementing the program and the revenues anticipated from the tax increment districts in the Common Project, that approximately \$180 million would be available for Phase II. With the legislative changes

in 2001 and the results from the Brookfield loan negotiations, the revenues available from the Common Project dropped to less than \$ 85 million. The City released new projections for Common Project revenues in April 2007. This time, the projections show future revenues of only \$ 66.5 million. The immediate problem is that these projections will not allow NRP to fund even the 70% of Phase II neighborhood allocations that are being committed during the first 3 years of plan implementation.

Before, the issue was “Should NRP continue after 2009 and, if so, in what form?” Now a more immediate question needs to be addressed: “Do we want to find the resources to meet our Phase II commitments to residents and neighborhoods?” The total for all NRP related expenditures in 2006 was less than 6/10ths of one percent of the City’s 2006 Budget.

Neighborhoods have kept their part of the bargain: they accepted fewer resources in Phase II and still worked to improve participation and adopt plans to address their priorities. They reviewed results from Phase I, researched resident issues, gathered and analyzed data, created work groups and committees to develop strategies for Phase II NAPs, and drafted, discussed, reviewed, and finally approved Phase II plans.

NRP’s revenue steam officially ends in 2009. After that date, there is presently no commitment to any future investment in neighborhood improvement. Unless a plan for the future is implemented that includes resources for neighborhood priorities, NRP will meet its promise to close its doors on December 31, 2009.

What level of vacancies does NRP have? What strategies in the business plan are related to maintaining these vacancies? What possibilities exist for reducing these vacancies?

NRP has no vacancies. When a position is vacated, the responsibilities and skills required for the position are analyzed and redistribution, discontinuation or contracting are used to maintain the level of service for the office. NRP has gradually reduced its office complement from 25 FTE in 1995 to 9 FTE in 2008. We have done so without layoffs or terminations. The last hire made by NRP was in 1999.

What are the major areas of contractual expense for NRP? What opportunities or drawbacks exist to changing from contractual provision of services toward provision of services by NRP employees?

The largest single expenditure for NRP, outside of its personnel complement, is for services from CPED and DFD. The 2007 Memorandum of Understanding charges NRP \$ 375,000 for the contract management, support and legal services NRP receives from the City. This single line item now accounts for more than 20% of NRP’s administrative budget.

NRP has proposed that these services be provided in a more cost effective and efficient manner by offering to perform many of the currently outsourced contract administration

services with its own staff. A 2003 legal opinion by the City Attorney, however, has made this impossible. NRP is interested in pursuing legislative changes that could significantly reduce this expenditure and streamline our contracting and implementation processes.

What is the proposed budget for 2008?

The first draft of the 2008 NRP Administrative Budget is attached. The Budget proposes a reduction of 1 FTE in the staff complement and a reduction in the office budget of more than 6%. This budget is subject to significant changes and has not been discussed or presented to the NRP Policy Board. The Policy Board will be provided with a proposed budget at its September 2007 meeting.

FY 2008
NRP Administrative Budget (Proposed)
Contracts for Professional Services

	FY 2008 (Proposed) Amount	FY 2007 Budget	\$ Change	% Change
Professional Services				
CPED/City of Minneapolis (DFD)	\$ 375,000.00	\$ 370,000.00	\$ 5,000	1.35%
Office of Minnesota State Auditors	\$ 120,000.00	\$ 145,000.00	\$ (25,000)	-17.24%
Hennepin County	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ (5,000)	
The Gavzy Group (PlanNet NRP)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ (6,000)	-37.50%
Kennedy and Graven	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 45,000.00	\$ -	0.00%
Mike Wilson & Associates (Auditors)	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 5,000	12.50%
MTN (Video Communications)	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	0.00%
I-Systems (PlanNet NRP and network support)	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	0.00%
County Computer Support Services	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	0.00%
Other Consultants	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 35,000.00	\$ -	0.00%
Web Site Design/Support	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -	
Eve Borenstein (Attorney)	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ (1,500)	-37.50%
Minneapolis League of Women Voters	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -	0.00%
Total	\$ 688,500.00	\$ 716,000.00	\$ (27,500)	-3.84%
Detail for Other Consultants (Projected):				
Margo Ashmore (LINK)	\$ 12,000.00			
Do Good Biz (Mailings, Postage, Distribution)	\$ 2,000.00			
Margo Ashmore (Home Tour)	\$ 14,000.00			
Scott Amundson (Home Tour Photos)	\$ 7,000.00			

Revised: 9/19/07

		FY 2008 NRP Administrative Budget (Proposed)									
Codes	Description	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Budget	2007 Current ²	2008 Proposed	% Change 2008 vs 2007	
4000-4900	Salaries	\$ 641,691	\$ 637,004	\$ 649,288	\$ 624,579	\$ 619,626	\$ 631,500	\$ 397,637	\$ 580,475	-8.08%	
7800-7860	Fringe Benefits	\$ 127,811	\$ 131,919	\$ 136,104	\$ 141,382	\$ 141,671	\$ 153,000	\$ 92,260	\$ 151,500	-0.98%	
	Personnel Subtotal	\$ 769,503	\$ 768,923	\$ 785,392	\$ 765,960	\$ 761,297	\$ 784,500	\$ 489,896	\$ 731,975	-6.70%	
5010	Advertising & Publications ³	\$ 7,833	\$ 27,484	\$ 23,195	\$ 32,517	\$ 28,920	\$ 35,000	\$ 11,320	\$ 25,500	-27.14%	
5011	City Benefit Admin Fee ³	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,304	\$ 2,481	\$ 2,700	\$ 2,025	\$ 2,900	7.41%	
5015	BIS Charges	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,900	\$ 2,925	\$ 4,100	5.13%	
5017	Phone Charges ⁴	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,238	\$ 6,439	\$ 6,700	\$ -	\$ 6,900	2.99%	
5020	Communications	\$ 17,850	\$ 19,475	\$ 15,347	\$ 8,330	\$ 10,882	\$ 13,200	\$ 8,393	\$ 12,000	-9.09%	
5050	Printing	\$ 7,803	\$ 11,753	\$ 11,407	\$ 8,497	\$ 4,761	\$ 7,500	\$ 12,328	\$ 9,000	20.00%	
5070	Professional Services	\$ 752,194	\$ 641,932	\$ 657,836	\$ 617,487	\$ 693,478	\$ 736,000	\$ 456,638	\$ 688,500	-6.45%	
5080	Rent/Office Furniture ⁵	\$ 87,282	\$ 91,056	\$ 87,449	\$ 87,723	\$ 87,971	\$ 85,039	\$ 69,581	\$ 89,000	4.66%	
5130	Miscellaneous	\$ 7,250	\$ 10,484	\$ 3,797	\$ 1,072	\$ 2,060	\$ 1,500	\$ 8,191	\$ 2,500	66.67%	
6020	Legal Settlements	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,750	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	
6030	Cash Management	\$ 164	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	
6040	Transportation/Parking	\$ 189	\$ 440	\$ 421	\$ 508	\$ 296	\$ 600	\$ 57	\$ 750	25.00%	
6050	Education ⁶	\$ 39,155	\$ 26,850	\$ 48,750	\$ 32,650	\$ 29,250	\$ 34,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	-26.47%	
6060	Travel Expense	\$ 529	\$ 2,501	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,216	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,363	\$ 2,100	5.00%	
6080	Insurance ⁷	\$ 42,991	\$ 51,413	\$ 62,992	\$ 58,676	\$ 54,987	\$ 55,000	\$ 49,601	\$ 49,000	-10.91%	
6100	Administrative Supplies	\$ 11,997	\$ 9,828	\$ 8,211	\$ 8,959	\$ 4,868	\$ 3,200	\$ 6,245	\$ 6,200	93.75%	
7880	Workers Comp ⁸	\$ -	\$ 3,927	\$ 3,414	\$ 3,684	\$ 3,734	\$ 3,800	\$ 3,271	\$ 3,500	-7.89%	
8020	Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 500	0.00%	
8025	Hardware	\$ 5,168	\$ 17,814	\$ -	\$ 3,942	\$ 7,765	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ 2,500	-16.67%	
8035	Software	\$ 575	\$ 53	\$ 137	\$ -	\$ 1,438	\$ 750	\$ -	\$ 500	-33.33%	
	Non Personnel Subtotal	\$ 980,979	\$ 915,011	\$ 922,956	\$ 876,337	\$ 942,545	\$ 994,389	\$ 632,938	\$ 930,450	-6.43%	
	Totals	\$ 1,750,482	\$ 1,683,934	\$ 1,708,348	\$ 1,642,298	\$ 1,703,843	\$ 1,778,889	\$ 1,122,834	\$ 1,662,425	-6.55%	
¹ Expenditures as of 9/15/2007											
² Expenditures in 5010, 5050 & 5070 in 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 include Home Tour advertising, publications, printing and professional services.											
³ Added as a 2005 line item.											
⁴ Added as a 2006 line item. Previously paid by the City under the MOU.											
⁵ Code 5080 includes office rent, operating expenses and parking charges.											
⁶ Beginning in 2002 Code 6050 includes support for the Community Leadership Institute at St. Thomas.											
⁷ Code 6080 includes D&O Insurance for neighborhoods and the NRP Policy Board. The D&O premium for 2006 covers 67 neighborhood organizations (for \$ 52,706) and the NRP Policy Board (for \$ 2,229).											
⁸ Workers Comp payment in 2001 includes payment for 2002.											
Note: Expenses for the Home Tour in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 are included. Revenues from the Home Tour are not. In 2006 these revenues were \$56,180, with \$18,180 of this revenue actually received in 2007.											
Rev:9/18/07											