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Executive Summary

Participatory and responsive budgeting is a critical component for citizen engagement. This strategy gauges citizen’s interests in local services. Local governments should actively and inclusively build tools of participatory budgeting to engage with citizens. While building these tools, it is important to consider that the purpose of responsive budgeting is not to educate residents on the specific details of the budgeting process. Rather, the goal is to foster a trusting relationship between local governments and residents to ensure that the proposed budget reflects the interests and concerns of community members. Our team, as a part of the Applied Policy Seminar class at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, is responsible for providing responsive budgeting recommendations for the City of Ann Arbor to implement in their own budget process. Our analysis comprises of multiple case studies of cities around the country that utilize different strategies of resident engagement in its budget process. From our research and external outreach, we propose a four-step goal of planning, outreach, implementation, and initiatives for next steps for Tom Crawford, the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) of the City Ann Arbor, to engage with local residents.
Introduction
The City of Ann Arbor has performed various outreach measures to engage with its residents in local politics. This includes: three years of community meetings in all five wards, public council meetings, annual surveys distributed to residents via email and mail, town hall events and televised council meetings for wider reach. Although the goal was to improve resident engagement, the meetings within the community and public council meetings were not well attended. While these have served as sources of information for the administrators in City Hall, there has been a stronger need to better understand what resources and programs residents prioritize and what they really want to see more or less of in the budget. This challenge has led us to where we are now. Why does Ann Arbor want to gain more input from its residents? The City has attempted to implement new strategies, outreach, and process planning to engage with residents, but has not fully been able to satisfactorily integrate within the community.

In 2016, the CivCity Initiative, A2 Ethics, and the League of Women Voters of the Ann Arbor hosted an introduction to Participatory Budgeting meeting at the local library. Focusing on Cambridge, Massachusetts to discuss the roll out of their participatory budgeting, which also includes youth, Ann Arbor got a glimpse into the potential improvements of this type of engagement with the community. In approving the 2017-2018 fiscal budget, Ann Arbor City Council highlighted 19 priorities it wanted to focus on, ranging from affordable communities to improved transportation and a transparent and effective local government. Most recently, the City partnered with the Center for Priority Based Budgeting (CPBB) to design and promote an online budgeting survey to its residents to help form the 2020 and 2021 budgets. With these goals in place and a Policy Agenda Committee to design a well thought out process to engage with city leaders, the City has set the foundation for larger more integrated engagement from the community.

The next step for the City, in addition to its established tactics, ranges from a variety of engagement and outreach activities. Not specifically targeted towards financial education or budget literacy, but really focusing on listening to its community and involving them in the budget process. This brings us to our project; how to get a better response from residents regarding budget allocations and improve the communication and collaboration between residents and local government. Explaining and proposing budget allocations or large-scale projects for a diverse audience is difficult, although these are areas that impact the community
every day and, in the future, they are not easily explained topics. Getting residents, commuters, local businesses and others to give input on how much to spend on a project or on what specific service the community prefers is a difficult task and we understand that the strategy and implementation of outreach efforts needs careful planning.

To this end, we have focused this project on supporting the CFO of Ann Arbor in researching different tactics and approaches to better engage residents in the city budget process. Part I will include an evaluation of five different cities, three chosen by us and two proposed by the CFO, that have implemented some type of engagement and responsive budgeting program. Our evaluation includes information on the following: motives, if known, when the program began, who leads this initiative (city hall, a program partnership, etc.), common characteristics amongst all cities, any success or failures, and any progress reports that detail the effectiveness of the program. Part II will layout recommendations for outreach and communication based on our findings of these cities and in speaking with the Communications Director from the City of Ferndale as well as the Director of Civic Innovations at the Michigan Municipal League. Lastly, Part III will include resources and capacity measures we have researched from these cities as well as our conclusions explaining potential improvements of implementing such programs. With the first steps having been designed by the City Council and administrators in City Hall, we hope that these suggestions will strengthen current efforts, engage more residents, and prepare for future community involvement outreach.
PART I: Evaluation of Case Studies

SAN JOSÉ, CALIFORNIA
San José first began its participatory budgeting activities in 2011 with the launch of the Budget Games and goal of receiving resident input on necessary budget cuts. Still experiencing the negative spillovers of the great recession from 2008-2009, the City needed to address some budget allocations. Since then, they have explored three different strategies within the participatory budgeting field to obtain resident input.

First, the Budget Games. Partnering with Innovation Games® to design an online game specifically for San José called “Buy a Feature” the game consisted of:

1. **The planning stages:** First, staff from Innovation Games worked with the Mayor to set the goal for implementing this type of engagement. Needing to make some budget cuts due to the deficit, the main question the Mayor proposed was: “What are the preferences of the citizens relative to specific budget initiatives?”

2. **Game design:** With this question, the Mayor’s office was asked to narrow the scope of the services and programs it needed feedback on. From its long list of budget cut proposals, they chose 10-20 areas (10-20 was the maximum because the game could only be designed with 10-20 variables). Theses 10-20 areas were then created as a list of “Items for sale” ranging from more street lights to park and public maintenance that participants could choose to purchase or not.

3. **Framing the options:** Having this list allowed the game designers to frame these areas not as a possible reduction or increase but as a “do we buy this” or “do we do without” For example, “suppose that one potential cut is eliminating six positions associated with pavement maintenance for $400,000. In the game, players will be asked if they wish to purchase 6 positions for $400,000.”

4. **Playing the game:** The game proposed a set of limited economic resources that the players had control over and had to collaboratively work together as a team of 5-8 to decide what to purchase with all of their shares of money. This way participants had to decide between what they found important to keep and what items they could do without.

5. **Results:** The results highlighted the team’s priorities by what they purchased and the reason for coming to this agreement. The game was disbursed to hundreds of
neighborhoods reaching a range of people and also fostering more collaboration amongst the community.

Overall, the Budget Games were successful in not only implementing a new strategy for the Mayor's office to engage with residents, but also in its end goal of prioritizing areas for the budget. A second year of Budget Games were conducted and “80% of the recommendations proposed by citizens were integrated into the City’s $2.6 billion-dollar budget.”

Since then, San José has not planned any new budget games events but, has continued with other Participatory Budgeting strategies.

Its second approach was in 2016, introduced by Mayor Liccardo, the “San José Decides” initiative was a plan to further engage residents in allocating the budget to their needs. They launched a Zero Based Budgeting strategy with the main support from Councilmember Peralez in District 3, Vice Mayor Carrasco in District 5, and the Budget Office in City Hall. In January 2017, City Hall held its first event, facilitating the community event for residents to provide input for the 2017-2018 fiscal budget. The Zero Based Budgeting approach focused on:

1. **One constant budget:** Specifically, asking residents how they would like the budget allocated year after year, keeping the same amount from one year to the next, a ‘zero’ change. Different than the Budget Games that looked at specific areas the city was looking to cut back in.

2. **More, Less, Remain the Same:** Residents are able to decide if they would like to see more, less or no funding allocated to a current project or program, therefore prioritizing what they consider most important. While specific percent increases or decreases were not noted, the scale of ‘increase a lot more’ to ‘decrease a lot more’ residents were still able to decide what they would like to see. Residents were also encouraged to write in programs or services they would like implemented that were not currently on the budget platform, although, this may not be the case for all Zero Based Budgeting techniques in different cities.

Zero Based Budgeting was a simple approach given a set amount. However, we were not able to find information on any results or impact of this approach.
The last strategy was implemented between 2015 and 2016. San José conducted a pilot of Participatory Budgeting, a more general approach to Zero Based Budgeting, in one of its districts. With the support of Mayor Liccardo, councilmember Peralez and the nonprofit, Every Voice Engaged, “a nonprofit that helps citizens, governments and other nonprofit organizations solve problems that benefit from effective civic engagement;” the facilitation and design of the event generated a large turnout; “...with over 500 District 3 residents allocating $100,000 for eight neighborhood projects.” Unlike the previous two strategies, this Participatory Budgeting event consisted of:

1. **Gathering information and ideas:** Beginning in the Fall of 2015, residents were asked to share ideas for projects, services and programs using an open source mapping application. A Design Engine tool, provided by Every Voice Engaged, was used to allow residents to allocate $100,000 on services and projects in San José’s neighborhoods.

2. **Project submission:** With a large turnout and various groups, 150 projects were submitted to a group of “Budget Delegates” that volunteered to analyze each project for feasibility.

3. **Voting:** After projects were reviewed and narrowed, all residents in the district, ages 15 and up, were able to vote on the final qualified projects. Voting took place online and in various locations around the neighborhood.

Concluding in Spring of 2016, the voting resulted in nine projects being approved and were set to begin implementation this coming year. While this was about a six-month long process, the results were well worth it and the turnout was great. San José plans on continuing with this process going into its next fiscal year budget cycle.

**AUSTIN, TEXAS**

In 2017, the city of Austin, Texas prioritized transparency in the budget for residents by implementing “Open Budget ATX”, an interactive online portal which gave access to residents to view current proposed and amended budgets. The goal was to move from basic PDF documents to a more exciting interface that encourages citizen participation in the budget process. Navigating the interface is similar to an online-search engine. Residents can type and select a specific part of the budget and see how much money will be allocated to certain projects. Local non-profit organizations, government entities, and Austin residents can also request
particular open-source project ideas. Because budgeting and finance is a subject consumed with complex language, Open Budget ATX provides a glossary page for technical budgetary terms to aid those who are not well-versed in its jargon.

While this tool is in place today, it is unclear on any results or data that has been collected from residents using this web interface in the past year or its plan for the future. Nonetheless, it is important to note that Austin, Texas just started this initiative a year ago and that there is an extensive platform being used; a great first step in creating a new process toward resident participation.

HAMPTON, VIRGINIA

In 2010, Mary Bunting, Hampton’s City Manager had the goal of balancing the fiscal year budget of 2011 by including citizen input. This led to the creation of the “I Value” campaign to provide residents with the opportunity to evaluate the city services provided to residents against the services the community most valued. Bunting and her team implemented a variety of strategies to begin this campaign, including:

- Social media campaigns and online chat rooms
- E-newsletters
- “Budget 101” information sheet
- Public access to services polling results
- Communication with neighborhood groups
- Interviews
- Community meetings

The “I Value” campaign produced successful results that could be built upon. Ever since the campaign’s creation, the City saw an increase of 500 residents in public engagement each year. These strategies were successfully implemented and provided city administrators with the information they needed to draft the 2019 budget. From the survey, city administrators learned that residents wanted their budget to prioritize spending for public schools, roads and bridges, a drainage system, and incentives to attract new business. Hampton’s City Council was also surprised to see a budget cut approval. The budget was reduced by more than 5 percent without any contention from Hampton residents.
The City of Boise, Idaho recently took the step to adopt a responsive budgeting approach in 2017. Partnering with ResourceX, an organization specifically founded to support the Priority Based Budgeting (PBB) Community, they have begun this process with the hope of generating data involved decisions. As ResourceX provides the software and analytical tools to design PBB around data. As noted in their fiscal year 2018 annual budget, the PBB initiative is being led by the Department of Finance and Administration to provide City leaders with more information, and rolled out phase one during fiscal year 2017, laying out all of the city’s programs and costs. The following year each program was evaluated based on its alignment with the City’s goals and aim to allocate resources better as well as measure performance. Soon after, the Budget and Innovation and Performance team began the official process of PBB creating a city strategic framework in which departments outlined their programs that were then measured against the strategic framework. Steps one and two of the program focused on identifying all programs and the costs, including staff involvement. Step three was the largest part of PBB, the scoring of each program and peer review of all scores.

1. **Identification:** This phase included listing all programs and services the city provided, resulting in 400 city programs.
2. **Costs:** Analyzing each program and service for every expense, line by line.
3. **Scoring:** The programs were scored based on two frameworks: (see appendix)
   a. **Basic program attributes:** including the number of people served, community need, demand, cost recovery, mandates and benefits to vulnerable communities
   b. **Strategic framework:** measured against the agenda set by the City Council that contribute to making Boise a great city. These measures include: safety, health, a connected community, environmental sustainability, strong local economy and a creative informed community.

With a thorough process set in place on its first year, Boise plans on continuing the PBB process in its fiscal year 2020 budget planning.
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

In 2018, Evanston faced a multi-million-dollar deficit. Traditional ways to close the gap between the revenue and expenditure were not an option; Evanston already raised property taxes in 2017 to fund schools and pensions. In order for the City to continue providing quality governance with no new revenue, they needed to cut programs and services. Thus, the city turned towards their employees and the residents of Evanston to better understand the city’s priorities in hopes of lessening the negative impact of the budget cuts. Two innovations were implemented to gather feedback: Balancing Act and Priority-Based Budgeting:

1. **Balancing Act:** This online tool gives citizens the opportunity to provide feedback on the general fund budget. The user starts with the current deficit for the city (for FY 2019, this was $7.4 million.) Then, the user must balance the budget in order to submit their proposed budget. The user interface displays the general fund revenues on the left and expenses on the right. The expense side of the balance sheet lists broad categories, such as Administrative Services or City Manager’s Office, with subcategories, such as supplies or salaries, and their description. This is where financial adjustments can be made. Moreover, the user can include comments on each subcategory.

   Residents have 20 days in October to submit their results. During this time, the City Manager and staff are available to assist residents with the tool. These open meetings are held eleven times throughout the 20 days at various coffee shops and community centers around Evanston. The aggregate results are then presented in a City Council meeting before the actual budget is finalized. The Balancing Act tool remains accessible for the entire year for educating the population on city financial issues. (See appendix)

2. **Priority-Based Budgeting:** The Priority-Based Budget process allows city staff, City Council and Evanston residents to review and share their input on services and programs before the submission of the budget. The process is broken into three parts: staff process, public survey and comments.

   a. **Staff Process:** First, city staff compiled a list of 152 programs and services and scored each program and service using a scorecard. Each city department scored the programs and services based on two factors: basic program attributes and whether the programs/services met city council goals. Then, the Finance and Law Department staff reviewed these scores for accuracy. The results of the staff
process were presented at a City Council meeting. At this point, programs that brought in revenue, required services, and any programs/services cross-listed or double counted were removed from the list. The remaining 48 programs were chosen for the public to prioritize in a city-wide survey. (See appendix)

b. **Public Survey:** Out of the 48 programs and services selected by the city staff, a survey was created asking residents to rank what they believe to be the ten most important programs and services and ten programs and services the city should consider for reduction or elimination. The survey then asked residents to share their top three priorities for the City and three recommendations for the city to find savings. The surveys were available online and hard copies were available in libraries and community centers. The results are presented in a City Council meeting and reviewed by the City Council and city staff. The City Council and city staff also evaluate the reduction proposals for any equity concerns. This process is followed by another round of community input and city staff evaluation. (See appendix)

c. **Comments:** Throughout the year, the City of Evanston collects budget related comments from residents through mail, email, phone calls, text messages, on Facebook and Twitter. These comments are then taken into consideration for the following budget cycle.

Overall, while a very thorough process, there were several concerns about Evanston’s priority-based budget process. One concern was the use of a subjective scorecard. Instead of staff scoring the programs and services, an Alderwoman suggested the City should incorporate data-driven assessments.\textsuperscript{xxvii} Additionally, the public survey could have bias. It is a common concern that a small group of people, with the time and resources to participate in the budget process, would dominate the feedback channel. Another concern about Evanston’s priority-based budget process is how the city used the citizen input. For Evanston’s 2019 budget, residents proposed eliminating victim advocacy positions and the Mental Health Board. However, the City Council found these programs too important to cut and did not move forward with these suggestions. The City inevitably solved their deficit problems by raising property tax by 2% and increasing several fees instead of reducing programs and services.\textsuperscript{xxviii}
Common characteristics

After reviewing the five cities and their different approaches in engaging residents through their budget cycle, there were some common characteristics that worked well in rolling out these initiatives.

Clear goals, motives and thought out processes allowed for a clear message to be communicated with residents on why the City was looking to push this agenda forward. Partnership developments allowed for a wider connection to the community and ability to scale small town hall events to larger participatory budget events. Lastly, each city had a designated team, either city council administrators, the budget office team, or a smaller group of city staff working with the partners and city administrators to ensure a smooth delivery of these pilots and surveys, while also leveraging online technology tools and surveys.
PART II: Recommendations

Deciding to incorporate a participatory budget process implies that the city has a motive and clear goal that it wishes to address by obtaining more information from its residents. Given this assumption and based on our review of the five city programs, we recommend various strategies, in four different phases, as possible best practices in planning, developing and implementing a responsive budgeting process in Ann Arbor.

**Phase 1: Planning:** We recommend narrowing down on the list of programs or services that the City is looking to address in its budget cycle as to not overwhelm residents with too many items. As Boise, ID and Evanston, IL did in dividing line by line what each program and service was and costs associated with it, and then evaluating its value against the City’s goals. This way, one can start with a clear understanding of where resident input is needed and what areas may need to be evaluated for budget cuts. In speaking with Luke Forrest, Director of Civic Innovations at the Michigan Municipal League, one of the best practices is to make clear that ‘X’ amount of funds are available for ‘X’ program or service, so residents can see where their input would make the most impact. As seen in the Ann Arbor resident survey, many programs and services were listed with budget prices for residents to respond on a “allocate more, less, or remain the same” scale. This gives residents a clear picture of what is capable of being completed if the budget allocation remains the same or if more or less is added. However, while very informative, it could also lead respondents to simply ignore the category and not provide a thoughtful answer, which is why we suggest a narrow list of items.

One of the other aspects that cities had in the beginning stages was designated staff to work on the project. This helped smooth communication between city administrators or budget offices and any partnerships supporting the initiative. We recommend an Advisory Committee composed of the staff working on the project and a few organization leaders to spearhead working with city hall, organizations and residents. Not only to ensure input from various parties involved but also to support in the capacity efforts of implementing large events. Lastly, cities such as San José, and Boise, carefully designed either pilot programs or took six months to a year in planning and implementing its first set of budget games or participatory budgeting event. We recommend a five to
six-month timeline to plan and gather information, designate location(s) and develop outreach practices.

**Phase 2: Outreach:** Ann Arbor should be intentional in its ways that it targets the community and use multiple outreach methods in order to maximize citizen engagement. The language used during any method of outreach should be understandable and tailored to the targeted audience. We recommend the City of Ann Arbor to follow two rules: avoid financial jargon and keep it simple. Social media can be an effective way to reach the community and can be utilized in several different ways. Social media can be used to advertise the participatory budget process and encourage people to fill out a survey, use an interactive budget tool, or participate in a public forum. Additionally, city staff can interact with citizens on social media. In speaking with Kara Sokol, Communications Director of the City of Ferndale, she advise that one common approach to this was to have an “Ask Me Anything” session where someone is available on social media for a set amount of time to answer any budget related questions. For people who are not on social media, mail, email or bulletin board postings are still an effective way to reach citizens. Finally, we recommend engaging with local businesses, non-profits, schools, and religious organizations. Since citizens routinely interact with these entities, they can be an efficient way to access a wealth of information about citizen priorities.

**Phase 3: Implementation:** To implement these types of events, the city should use various citizen engagement methods. First, we recommend engaging with residents in a neutral location. A neutral location, such as a cafe or community center, may be a more convenient location for residents than a town hall. Additionally, engaging at a neutral location will reduce imbalanced power dynamics and make citizens more comfortable to candidly offer feedback. Therefore, we recommend the Finance and Administrative Services staff to hold open office hours at cafes or community centers around Ann Arbor. During this time, residents can openly discuss their budget priorities, ask questions and build relationships with city staff.

Secondly, we recommend to continue using surveys to gather citizen input on budget priorities. Surveys should be accessible, brief, and explicit. The city should be
transparent in their motives and the survey’s purpose should be clearly stated. Moreover, the survey should be distributed in multiple ways to reach different audiences. Surveys sent in the mail still reach a large part of the population, but having the survey available online, in libraries, churches, or community centers will reach more of the population at a low cost. Finally, we suggest partnering with community groups. These groups already have established networks in Ann Arbor and can be an efficient way the city to gather input from residents. We recommend the city to engage with these groups through community events, or, at the very least, send surveys to these groups and have their leadership aggregate the information for the City.

**Phase 4: Initiate Next Steps:** Citizen engagement should be a long-term goal that is transparent and adaptable. We recommend the city to create performance indicators for their engagement strategy. Key indicators could be used to assess participation turnout and how well the city incorporates resident input in the budget. Furthermore, performance indicators could be created for different demographics. Are all demographics giving input? If not, decipher which demographics are not represented in the budgeting process. This can be done by recording different demographic response rate. After assessing the participatory budget performance, we recommend the city to consistently redesign their approach to discovering resident demand to improve the process. Finally, once the citizen input has been aggregated, the results should be transparent. We recommend holding a public forum about the results as well as posting the results online. Included in the results should be a summary of how the city used the citizen input in the budget. Transparency will further build the trust between the city and its citizens as well as increase participation in subsequent budget cycles.
## Strategies for planning, developing and implementing responsive budgeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Narrow scale of programs & services | ● Clear idea of what the impact will be  
 ● Participants understand & not overwhelmed |
| Advisory committee | ● Clear communication  
 ● All parties involved |
| 5-6 month timelines | ● Ample time to plan and organize  
 ● Begin outreach and run pilots |
| **Phase 2: Outreach** | |
| Form partnerships | ● Broader reach within community |
| Outside city hall | ● Personalizes the government |
| Simplify language | ● Makes initiative understandable |
| **Phase 3: Implementation** | |
| Open office hours | ● Candid and thoughtful input  
 ● Builds trust in community |
| Community events | ● Reach diverse groups  
 ● High response rates |
| Surveys | ● Targets whole population |
| **Phase 4: Initiate Next Steps** | |
| Follow through | ● Builds trust |
| Flexibility | ● Increases participation |
| Transparency | ● Improves process and eliminates inefficiencies |
Part III: Conclusion

One of the main factors holding all of these processes together is the capacity of City budget offices to plan, strategize, partner, implement and follow up on these initiatives. In reviewing these city programs, most cities constitute a team of 1-4 staff, unknown if FTE or PT, from the budget, finance and administration office to spearhead the pilots or year long programs. This way, the city can leverage existing staff or create a new team to continue building a strong relationship between residents and city administrators. Creating that clear workflow process between residents, city administrators and decision makers can help ensure clear communication, allow ample preparation time for everyone involved and reduce the possibility of overwork in one group.

Ann Arbor should prioritize more space for community engagement to learn of residents’ needs and interests. This space can be outside of City Hall and more in locations within the community, at local businesses or reserving space at a restaurant that can be accessible to more residents. Also working with prominent community organizations in the Ann Arbor area that have a strong voice in the community and that in the past have generated a large turnout can be a starting point for event location or communication channels and survey distribution. More so, these organizations, can also meet with government officials to relay some budget concerns and interests to decision makers. Community newsletters via mail would also be another way to keep residents updated on the budget appropriation. While resident engagement in the budget process through participatory budgeting is a relatively new field, it is important to note that these suggestions are potential improvements, not a comprehensive set of best practices in the field. We hope that our evaluation of different cities and programs will help guide the City of Ann Arbor in its future goals and strategies for resident engagement.
Appendix

Boise, Idaho:
Priority Based Budgetting: Scoring Criteria and Cheat Sheets

### SCORING CRITERIA

Programs are first scored against the “Basic Program Attributes”, then the applicable “Strategic Framework” category (either external or internal). The process for scoring internal and external programs is the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING CATEGORIES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL PROGRAMS</th>
<th>INTERNAL PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>Safe and Secure Community</td>
<td>Innovative and High-Performing Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reliance</td>
<td>Healthy Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Vulnerable Communities</td>
<td>Responsible Built Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>Connected Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Population Served</td>
<td>Environmentally Sustainable Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Demand</td>
<td>Strong, Diverse Local Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative and Informed Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority Based Budgeting: Scoring Cheat Sheet

**Basic Program Attributes (25% of the total score)**

Before evaluating programs against the Strategic Framework, they will be scored against a series of program characteristics ("basic program attributes") that could influence the priority of a program beyond the program's ability to influence the goals/objectives outlined in the Strategic Framework.

1. Is the program mandated by another level of government or by the City itself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The program is required by Federal or State legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The program is required by charter/incorporation documents or to comply with regulatory agency standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Required by code, ordinance, resolution, or policy, or to fulfill executed franchise/contractual agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recommended by national professional organization to meet published standards, or other best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No requirement or mandate exists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Is this program provided solely by the City, or can these services be obtained by another governmental agency or private business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City is the sole provider of the program and there are no other public or private entities that provide this type of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City is currently the sole provider of the program, but there are believed to be other public or private entities that could reasonably be contracted to provide a similar service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program is offered by another governmental, non-profit, or civic agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program is offered by other private businesses, but none are located within City limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program is also offered by other private businesses within City limits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Has there been a change in demand for the services provided by this program over the past year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a substantial increase of 25% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a significant increase of 15% to 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a modest increase of 5% to 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a minimal increase of 1% to 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a minimal decrease of 1% to 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a modest decrease of 5% to 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a significant decrease of 15% to 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Program demand experiencing a substantial decrease of 25% or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Does this program pay for itself, or a portion of itself, through fees/charges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fees generated cover 75% to 100% of the cost to provide the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fees generated cover 50% to 74% of the cost to provide the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fees generated cover 25% to 49% of the cost to provide the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fees generated cover 1% to 24% of the cost to provide the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No fees are generated that cover the cost to provide the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What portion of the community is served by this program? NOTE: for internal facing programs, substitute “organization” for “community”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program benefits/serves the entire community 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program benefits/serves a substantial portion of the community (at least 75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program benefits/serves a significant portion of the community (at least 50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program benefits/serves some portion of the community (at least 10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program benefits/serves only a small portion of the community (less than 10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does the program benefit vulnerable, disadvantaged, or at-risk portions of the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program is geared specifically to benefit vulnerable, disadvantaged, or at-risk members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program is not geared specifically towards assisting vulnerable, disadvantaged, or at-risk portions of the community, but has provisions available for these members of the community (e.g. scholarship programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program is not geared towards vulnerable, disadvantaged, or at-risk community, nor does it have provisions available for these members of the community, but they would likely be disproportionately impacted if the program were to cease operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program provides an indirect benefit to vulnerable, disadvantaged, or at-risk members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program does not provide a direct or indirect benefit to vulnerable, disadvantaged, or at-risk members of the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Framework (75% of the total score)

As the second step in prioritizing programs, each program will be evaluated to determine how they contribute to the goal areas in the Strategic Framework. The goal areas are as follows:

For External/Public Facing Programs (Community Programs)
1. Safe and Secure Community
2. Healthy Community
3. Responsible Built Environment
4. Connected Community
5. Environmentally Sustainable Community
6. Strong, Diverse Local Economy
7. Creative and Informed Community

For Internal Facing Programs (Governance Programs)
1. Ensures all issues are approached through the perspective of “One City, One Team” and the city’s human, financial, physical and technological resources are protected, leveraged and shared across departments
2. Provides assurance of regulatory and policy compliance and minimizes/mitigates risk
3. Supports decision-making with timely and accurate short term and long range analyses that enhances financial sustainability, operational efficiency and visionary leadership
4. Engages citizens and ensures the organization is transparent and responsive through public access to information, materials, representatives and decision making processes
5. Attracts, develops, retains, and values a quality workforce dedicated to providing a “WOW” Citizen Experience
6. Contributes to the success of the entire organization by providing the information and resources necessary to get daily work done efficiently and effectively
7. Ensures “There’s Nothing We Can’t Do Better” by demonstrating responsibility, accountability and innovation in daily work

The scoring criteria for this phase of the evaluation process will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program is essential to achieving success in the goal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program strongly influences success in the goal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program has some influence in achieving success in the goal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program has a minor influence in achieving success in the goal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program has no influence in achieving success in the goal area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to the Strategic Framework goal areas when considering how to score programs. Under each goal area, there is a series of activities/elements that have been identified as strong contributors to achieving the goal. A program can score highly in a goal area if it contributes in a major way to only one of the elements, and a program can get a lower score if it contributes to all the elements but only in a minor way. There is no exact formula.
Evanston, Illinois

Balancing Act

### Where the Money Goes...

- Robert Crown Center - Debt Service: $1.0m
- Contribution to General Fund Reserves: $1.5m
- Overall City Changes: $0.00
- City Council: $542,030
- Salary and Benefits: $468,048
- Services and Supplies: $73,982
- City Clerk: $183,082
- City Manager's Office: $7.8m
- Law: $706,330
- Administrative Services: $9.4m

### Where the Money Comes From...

- Property Tax: $36.0m
- Other Taxes: $49.2m

### Administrative Services: $9.9m

- More Information:
  - Includes Human Resources training and testing costs, IT software and service costs, parking enforcement software costs, building maintenance supplies, and general office expenses.
Priority-Based Budgeting Scoring Guidelines

Part I: Basic Program Attributes

**Mandated to Provide Program**
- 4 Service is mandated Federally
- 3 Service is mandated by State
- 2 Service is mandated by City Charter
- 1 Service is mandated by City Ordinance or Resolution
- 0 Service is not mandated

**Cost Recovery of Program**
- 4 Service recovers 75-100% of costs
- 3 Service recovers 50-74% of costs
- 2 Service recovers 25-49% of costs
- 1 Service recovers 1-25% of costs
- 0 Service recovers less than 1% of costs

**Change in Demand for Service**
- 2 Demand is significantly increasing
- 1 Demand is slightly increasing
- 0 Demand is remaining constant

**Reliance on City to provide service**
- 4 Only City can provide service
- 3 Only government entities can provide service
- 2 Only public agencies can provide service
- 1 Service could be provided by a public agency or not-for-profit
- 0 Service can be provided by either a public or private entity

**Portion of Community Served by Program**
- 4 Program serves the entire community
- 3 Program serves a substantial part of the community
- 2 Program serves a significant part of the community
- 1 Program serves some portion of the community
- 0 Program serves only a small portion of the community
Part II: 2018 City Council Goals
Rating City Council goals: 0-4 scale

4 Program is essential to achieving the goal
3 Program has a strong influence on the goal
2 Program influences the goal
1 Program has some influence on achieving the goal, though minimal
0 Program has no influence on achieving the goal

Sub-points for each goal serve as guidelines for evaluating the program based on the ratings scale above.

Invest in City Infrastructure and Facilities
· Develops new infrastructure and facilities
· Improves infrastructure and facility effectiveness
· Provides for the maintenance of infrastructure and facilities
· Seeks opportunities to leverage new funding services for improvements
· Connects with the community to address issues and concerns regarding infrastructure and facilities

Enhance community development and job creation citywide
· Creates a safe, business-friendly and sensibly regulated environment that stimulates business development and increases the tax base
· Attracts, retains or develops a well-balanced, diverse mix of commercial, industrial and agriculture business that are sustainable and benefit the economy
· Effectively plans for a reliable, well-maintained and accessible transportation network that meets the current and future growth needs of the community
· Provides a secure, attractive and desirable place to live and work, offering access to core services
· Creates partnerships to expand cultural and artistic opportunities and events throughout the community

Expand Affordable Housing Options
· Facilitates housing options to accommodate a diverse community
· Encourages development of small scale housing options like accessory dwelling units, tiny homes, and micro apartments
· Encourages inclusionary housing practices in private businesses

Further Police/Community Relations Initiatives
· Encourages an inclusive community that is accepting, connected and promotes shared responsibility
· Promotes local community engagement with the Police Department
· Actively seeks honest, open and continued dialogue on issues of race and community relations within departments
Stabilize long-term city finances
· Generates or seeks new revenue to support City operations
· Supports best financial practices of auditing, purchasing, budgeting, and internal controls
· Supports long-term financial planning for debt and capital investment

Part III: Equity

Does the program benefit historically underrepresented or disadvantaged populations?

4 This program is in place specifically to meet the needs of historically underrepresented* Evanston residents
3 This program or service does not specifically target historically underrepresented residents, however, assistance (e.g. scholarship programs) is available to ensure accessibility for all residents.
2 This program does not target underrepresented populations nor does it have provisions to make the program accessible to those populations, however, it is likely that underrepresented populations would be disproportionately impacted if this program is cut.
1 This program provides indirect benefits to underrepresented populations.
0 This program does not provide direct or indirect benefits to underrepresented populations.

*histically underrepresented populations - race/ethnicity, sex, physical or mental disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, immigrant status, veteran status, language and/or socio-economic status.
Evanston
Priority-based Budgeting 2019 Budget Survey

In preparation for the 2019 Budget, the City of Evanston is pursuing a process to better align spending with community priorities, called Priority-Based Budgeting. Your input is a crucial part of this process. Thank you for participating in this survey. Responses will be accepted until June 7, 2018 at community centers, the Civic Center, and the libraries.

This survey asks about a list of 46 programs and services provided by the City of Evanston. Brief descriptions and net costs are shown with the programs listed below. The net cost is the difference between program expenses and the revenues generated by that program.

1.) Below is a list of 46 programs and services provided by the City of Evanston. Please select the 10 programs that you believe to be the most important for the City to provide.

- **School Crossing Guards** - *Net Cost: $461,791* - Part-time crossing guards at 52 intersections across the city
- **Human Resources - Training** - *Net Cost: $45,449* - Training for all employees
- **Divvy Bikes** - *Net Cost: $165,808* - Bike share program
- **Long-range planning (comprehensive plan, area plans)** - *Net Cost: $75,926* - Provides recommendations for future land use and capital improvement policies and decisions
- **Storefront Modernization Program** - *Net Cost: $99,980* - Small grants to improve the appearance and functionality of street-level commercial buildings located throughout the city
- **Sign Permits and Inspection Services** - *Net Cost: $24,639* - To ensure signs meet standards for appearance, safety and maintenance
- **Historic Preservation Review** - *Net Cost: $134,583* - Aid in restoration, rehabilitation, and conservation of landmark buildings and the preservation of historic districts
- **Mental Health Board** - *Net Cost: $750,931* - Provides funding on a grant-basis to organizations providing for the mental health and welfare of Evanston residents
- **Minority/Women/Evanston Based Enterprise & Local Employment Program** - *Net Cost: $140,940* - Administers the City's MWEBE and LEP Program
- **Sustainability Programs** - *Net Cost: $137,502* - Administration of sustainability, climate action, and livability
- **Boards, commission, and committee administration by resolution/ordinance** - *Net Cost: $293,777* - 22 standing committees created by City Ordinance or resolution; each committee is staffed by at least one employee
- **Tax Assessment Advocacy** - *Net Cost: $138,262* - City staff acts as a taxpayer advocate for Evanston residents in property tax appeal and exemption applications
- **Administrative Adjudication** - *Net Cost: $278,654* - Civil hearings offered to recipients of tickets or notices of violation issued by a City agency
- **Community Arts Administration** - *Net Cost: $214,656* - Coordinates the creation and installation of public art throughout Evanston
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Net Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue and Collections - Passport</td>
<td><strong>$15,473</strong></td>
<td>Serves as U.S. passport acceptance facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department Public Education/Community</td>
<td><strong>$73,448</strong></td>
<td>Includes the Citizen Fire Academy, Fire Explorer Program, CPR classes, and other outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health</td>
<td><strong>$266,476</strong></td>
<td>Works in collaboration with community members to plan, direct, and organize health education and wellness programs for community health needs                                                                 antlr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation Rental Permit and Administration</td>
<td><strong>$21,225</strong></td>
<td>Licensing for rental units offered for a period shorter than 30 consecutive days; includes a life-safety licensing inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services (Victim Advocacy)</td>
<td><strong>$356,289</strong></td>
<td>Assists survivors of sexual assault and domestic violence and increases their access to economic resources, physical safety, and legal protections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td><strong>$217,039</strong></td>
<td>Enforces animal ordinances, captures stray animals, controls nuisance wildlife, and removes dead animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Community Strategies Bureau</td>
<td><strong>$197,674</strong></td>
<td>Data analysis to identify crime trends and hotspots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-sponsored Special Events</td>
<td><strong>$149,375</strong></td>
<td>City-wide special events hosted by the Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development/Career Pathways</td>
<td><strong>$72,803</strong></td>
<td>Provides 20 Evanston participants (age 18-26) with a career pathway plan and paid training for entry-level positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's Summer Youth Employment Program</td>
<td><strong>$602,314</strong></td>
<td>Provides skills and workforce opportunities year-round for Evanston youth ages 14-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Food Program/Child Nutrition Program</td>
<td><strong>$53,129</strong></td>
<td>Variety of food programs including free breakfast and lunch for youth in the summer, donation-based senior meals, and snacks at multiple after-school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Meal Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Young Adult Services</td>
<td><strong>$940,844</strong></td>
<td>Violence interruption, alternative recreation, substance abuse treatment placement, emergency housing assistance and other services as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs-Morrison Cultural Center</td>
<td>**$203,339; **<a href="#">Outstanding capital $180,000</a></td>
<td>The building features a recording studio, community meeting space, performance venue, First Slice of Pie Café, and indoor/outdoor social gathering spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes Cultural Arts Center</td>
<td>**$45,794; **<a href="#">Outstanding capital $4,990,000</a></td>
<td>The Noyes Cultural Arts Center is home to over 20 artists in residence and arts organizations offering music, theater and visual arts programs and studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Recreation Programs</td>
<td><strong>$256,640</strong></td>
<td>Serves children and adults with disabilities including fitness programs, sports programs, Special Olympics, after-school programs and summer camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Recreation Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre</td>
<td><strong>$163,890</strong></td>
<td>Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre (FJT) features productions highlighting the Black experience in America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Rehabilitation Programs</td>
<td><strong>$17,603</strong></td>
<td>Assists clients in receiving expungements, criminal records sealing and clemency. This program is partially funded by Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center Bus Program</td>
<td>**$129,662; **<a href="#">Outstanding Capital $89,417</a></td>
<td>Provides transportation for after school programs, summer camps, special recreation trips and programs, special events and Levy Senior membership drop-off and pick-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*(#) Not included in total revenue for subsequent years.*
**Subsidized Taxicab Coupon program** - *Net Cost: $137,603* - Offers a low-cost taxicab service to income-eligible Evanston seniors over the age of 65 and residents with ambulatory disabilities who are registered for the Evanston Benefit Card

**Special Assessment Alley Improvements** - *Net Cost: $168,280, Capital cost $250,000* - This involves the administration, design and construction oversight of the 50/50 special assessment alley program

**Tree Preservation Permit Issuance and Enforcement** - *Net Cost: $36,109* - All excavations within 50' of a public trees require issuance of a tree preservation permit

**Bike Infrastructure Maintenance** - *Net Cost: $65,240* - Maintenance of existing bike lanes as well as associated assets to improve quality and safety

**Best practice tree maintenance and replacement** - *Net Cost: $922,698* - Tree Trimming, Removal and Planting, and Evaluations

**50/50 Sidewalk Program** - *Net Cost: $114,662; Capital cost $175,000* - This is the staff time/operations cost only for the management of the 50/50 sidewalk program, but there is an associated $175,000 annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) cost

**Special Refuse Pickups** - *Net Cost: $219,132* - The City of Evanston charges a fee for special pick-ups, which are defined as trash exceeding the capacity of your garbage cart plus one additional bag

**Permits for Block Parties, Moving Vans and Dumpsters** - *Net Cost: $70,427* - Permits are logged for distribution to Police, Fire, and Parks. Public Works delivers barricades

**Annual Dredging for Boat Launch and Harbor** - *Net Cost: $23,016* - Overseen by Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Department (PRCS) and assisted by the Public Works Agency during the mechanical removal of sediment within the launch area

**Twice-Annual Bulk Pick-ups** - *Net Cost: $172,856* - Free removal of up to six cubic yards of bulk garbage twice per year

**Dutch Elm Disease Control** - *Net Cost: $261,873* - Control includes injections of all public elms once every 3 years, plus staff costs for scouting for disease symptoms and removal of diseased trees

**Public Art Installation Support** - *Net Cost: $105,121* - Installation/placement and removal of art as well as their bases and foundations

**Special Event Support** - *Net Cost: $108,580* - Traffic control is provided in the form of temporary no parking signs, message boards, cones and barricades

**Athletic Field Maintenance and Programming** - *Net Cost: $280,790* - Maintenance provided by Public Works, rental and scheduling administered by PRCS Department
2.) Below is the same list of programs. Now, please choose 10 programs that you believe the City should consider for reduction/elimination.

   School Crossing Guards - *Net Cost: $461,791* - Part-time crossing guards at 52 intersections across the city

   Human Resources - Training - *Net Cost: $45,449* - Training for all employees

   Divvy Bikes - *Net Cost: $165,808* - Bike share program

   Long-range planning (comprehensive plan, area plans) - *Net Cost: $75,926* - Provides recommendations for future land use and capital improvement policies and decisions

   Storefront Modernization Program - *Net Cost: $99,980* - Small grants to improve the appearance and functionality of street-level commercial buildings located throughout the city

   Sign Permits and Inspection Services - *Net Cost: $24,639* - To ensure signs meet standards for appearance, safety and maintenance

   Historic Preservation Review - *Net Cost: $134,583* - Aid in restoration, rehabilitation, and conservation of landmark buildings and the preservation of historic districts

   Mental Health Board - *Net Cost: $750,931* - Provides funding on a grant-basis to organizations providing for the mental health and welfare of Evanston residents

   Minority/Women/Evanston Based Enterprise & Local Employment Program - *Net Cost $140,940* - Administers the City's MWEBE and LEP Program

   Sustainability Programs- *Net Cost $137,502* - Administration of sustainability, climate action, and livability

   Boards, commission, and committee administration by resolution/ordinance - *Net Cost: $293,777* - 22 standing committees created by City Ordinance or resolution; each committee is staffed by at least one employee

   Tax Assessment Advocacy - *Net Cost: $138,262* - City staff acts as a taxpayer advocate for Evanston residents in property tax appeal and exemption applications

   Administrative Adjudication - *Net Cost: $278,654* - Civil hearings offered to recipients of tickets or notices of violation issued by a City agency

   Community Arts Administration - *Net Cost: $214,656* - Coordinates the creation and installation of public art throughout Evanston

   Revenue and Collections - Passport - *Net Cost: $15,473* - Serves as U.S. passport acceptance facility

   Fire Department Public Education/Community Engagement - *Net Cost: $73,448* - Includes the Citizen Fire Academy, Fire Explorer Program, CPR classes, and other outreach

   Community Health - *Net Cost: $266,476* - Works in collaboration with community members to plan, direct, and organize health education and wellness programs for community health needs

   Vacation Rental Permit and Administration - *Net Cost: $21,225* - Licensing for rental units offered for a period shorter than 30 consecutive days; includes a life-safety licensing inspection

   Social Services (Victim Advocacy) - *Net Cost: $356,289* - Assists survivors of sexual assault and domestic violence and increases their access to economic resources, physical safety, and legal protections

   Animal Control - *Net Cost $217,039* - Enforces animal ordinances, captures stray animals, controls nuisance wildlife, and removes dead animals
Police Community Strategies Bureau - *Net Cost $197,674* - Data analysis to identify crime trends and hotspots

City-sponsored Special Events - *Net Cost: $149,375* - City-wide special events hosted by the Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department

Workforce Development/Career Pathways - *Net Cost $72,803* - Provides 20 Evanston participants (age 18-26) with a career pathway plan and paid training for entry-level positions

Mayor’s Summer Youth Employment Program - *Net Cost $602,314* - Provides skills and workforce opportunities year-round for Evanston youth ages 14-18

Summer Food Program/Child Nutrition Program/Congregate Meal Program - *Net Cost: $53,129* - Variety of food programs including free breakfast and lunch for youth in the summer, donation-based senior meals, and snacks at multiple after-school programs

Youth and Young Adult Services - *Net Cost: $940,844* - Violence interruption, alternative recreation, substance abuse treatment placement, emergency housing assistance and other services as needed

Gibbs-Morrison Cultural Center - *Net Cost: $203,339; Outstanding capital $180,000* - The building features a recording studio, community meeting space, performance venue, First Slice of Pie Café, and indoor/outdoor social gathering spaces

Noyes Cultural Arts Center - *Net Revenue: $45,794; Outstanding capital $4,990,000* - The Noyes Cultural Arts Center is home to over 20 artists in residence and arts organizations offering music, theater and visual arts programs and studios

Special Recreation Programs - *Net Cost: $256,640* - Serves children and adults with disabilities including fitness programs, sports programs, Special Olympics, after-school programs and summer camps

Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre - *Net Cost: $163,890* - Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre (FJT) features productions highlighting the Black experience in America

Certificate of Rehabilitation Programs - *Net Cost: $17,603* - Assists clients in receiving expungements, criminal records sealing and clemency. This program is partially funded by Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)

Recreation Center Bus Program - *Net Cost: $129,662, Outstanding Capital $89,417* - Provides transportation for after school programs, summer camps, special recreation trips and programs, special events and Levy Senior membership drop-off and pick-up

Subsidized Taxicab Coupon program - *Net Cost: $137,603* - Offers a low-cost taxicab service to income-eligible Evanston seniors over the age of 65 and residents with ambulatory disabilities who are registered for the Evanston Benefit Card

Special Assessment Alley Improvements - *Net Cost: $168,280, Capital cost $250,000* - This involves the administration, design and construction oversight of the 50/50 special assessment alley program

Tree Preservation Permit Issuance and Enforcement - *Net Cost: $36,109* - All excavations within 50' of a public trees require issuance of a tree preservation permit

Bike Infrastructure Maintenance - *Net Cost: $65,240* - Maintenance of existing bike lanes as well as associated assets to improve quality and safety

Best practice tree maintenance and replacement - *Net Cost: $922,698* - Tree Trimming, Removal and Planting, and Evaluations
50/50 Sidewalk Program - Net Cost: $114,662; Capital cost $175,000- This is the staff time/operations cost only for the management of the 50/50 sidewalk program, but there is an associated $175,000 annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) cost

Special Refuse Pickups - Net Cost: $219,132 - The City of Evanston charges a fee for special pick-ups, which are defined as trash exceeding the capacity of your garbage cart plus one additional bag

Permits for Block Parties, Moving Vans and Dumpsters - Net Cost: $70,427 - Permits are logged for distribution to Police, Fire, and Parks. Public Works delivers barricades

Annual Dredging for Boat Launch and Harbor - Net Cost: $23,016 - Overseen by Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Department (PRCS) and assisted by the Public Works Agency during the mechanical removal of sediment within the launch area

Twice-Annual Bulk Pick-ups - Net Cost: $172,856 - Free removal of up to six cubic yards of bulk garbage twice per year

Dutch Elm Disease Control - Net Cost: $261,873 - Control includes injections of all public elms once every 3 years, plus staff costs for scouting for disease symptoms and removal of diseased trees

Public Art Installation Support - Net Cost: $105,121 - Installation/placement and removal of art as well as their bases and foundations

Special Event Support - Net Cost: $108,580 - Traffic control is provided in the form of temporary no parking signs, message boards, cones and barricades

Athletic Field Maintenance and Programming - Net Cost: $280,790 - Maintenance provided by Public Works, rental and scheduling administered by PRCS Department

3.) What are your top three priorities for the City?
1. 
2. 
3. 

4.) What are areas where you recommend the City look to find savings?
1. 
2. 
3. 

5.) Please share any additional ideas you have for the 2019 City of Evanston Budget.

Optional Questions:
6.) Which ward do you live in? ______________
7.) What is your gender? ____________
8.) What is your age? ____________
9.) I identify my ethnicity as: ____________
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