

1/23/16 IGOV ASSEMBLY TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

WHAT WAS VALIDATED FOR YOU?

Table 1:

- Debt is complicated and tough to evaluate / utilize as a taxing body performance measure
- Debt is difficult to put into lay terms

Table 2:

- Good services
- Personnel costs
- Value of IGOV (cognizant of taxing bodies' impacts)

Table 3:

- Need to coordinate referenda
- Anecdotal vs. statistical and importance of understanding the big picture
- "Extent of decline in % of seniors over time"

Table 4:

- Large proportion of staff/benefits costs in all budgets

Table 5:

- Debt is not all the same – just an observation
- Demographic data supports notions of economic and ethnic diversity, including growth in diversity over census reporting periods
- Still a connection between socioeconomic diversity and ethnic diversity

WHAT SURPRISED YOU?

Table 1:

- Street and sewer expense / debt is fee based.
- Slow growth of Asian population over time.
- Actual demographic data reality vs. perception (anecdotal)

Table 2:

- Demographic stability
- How Oak Park rates compare in the *Tribune* article
- State resources are unstable and impact the most vulnerable we serve

Table 3:

- Mirroring of regional data
- Hispanic population % is as high as it is
- Cost savings scope of call center
- % of fund balances is greater than expected

Table 4:

- Village pension costs
- Fund balances policies differences
- Household income distribution

Table 5:

- Bi-modal bell curve "socio - not a growth high end"
- Getting data on housing stock availability and use across income levels

WHAT QUESTIONS DO YOU STILL HAVE?

Table 1:

- What approaches, strategies, etc. can be utilized to increase community engagement and participation in IGOV assemblies? E.g. Use of social media, collaboration by taxing body information officers, use of community public relations experts, block parties, Oak Park *FYI*.

Table 2:

- What will happen in Springfield?
- How does Oak Park debt compare to other communities?
- What are the planned investments in the future?

Table 3:

- Can there be a deeper dive into demographics?
- How are we caring for the disadvantaged families and are there ways for better communication and coordination?

Table 4:

- Infrastructure investment and bonding
- Ratio of debt service to total exposure

Table 5:

- Track growth in expenses in excess of inflation

TABLE NOTES COORDINATED WITH MATRIX:

A
B
C

Table 3:

- Services / information for families with special needs (Need help with first word of this comment)

D

Table 2:

- Continue intergovernmental collaboration
- Continue to develop awareness across taxing bodies of how individual taxing body actions impact the whole community

E

Table 2:

- Stop being overly concerned with anecdotal information e.g. pricing out seniors, taxes higher than anywhere else, etc. but continue to listen and respond
- Stop being “turfy”

F

Table 1:

- Demonstrate non-financial taxing body collaboration
- Provide more lead time to all board support staff to develop tables, template data, intergovernmental collaboration, etc.

Table 2:

- Start collecting and communicating data

Table 4:

- Debt service and financial matrices conversations
- Infrastructure conversations

G

Table 1:

- How can we continue to gather information of all types across all taxing bodies

Table 2:

- Value of meetings “forcing” discussions

Table 4:

- Marketing, Technology, Finance are areas where the different taxing bodies are already cooperating. Through continued IGOV discussion/research via full group and subcommittees, more opportunities for cooperation / collaboration can be found in these areas.
- IGOV should look for enhanced communicating, messaging to share what IGOV is doing e.g. meeting on a regular basis, sharing information in areas of finance, technology, marketing and the like, so our community has a better understanding that the taxing bodies are trying to make an effort to work together,

share information, avoid duplication of efforts, etc. (Editor's note: IGOV might want to consider the *FYT* and taxing body web pages as communication tools. JG.)

- The recommendation above is also made for COG.

Table 5:

- Thought leadership
- Mentor and encourage intergovernmental collaboration
- Tax burden session
- Continue demographic
- Balance costs and benefits
- Access to resources
- Equity Values
- Exp oppty

H

I

Table 4:

- Better education of boards about what is already happening in terms of cooperation between taxing bodies
- COG

WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR A FOCUS FOR ANY FUTURE IGOV ASSEMBLIES?

Table 2:

- Focus on needs/investment - comparing what we have service-wise versus other towns

Table 3:

- Case studies of other intergovernmental cooperation and collaboration
- Visit from county/state elected leaders
- Diversity recruitment of board members (how can we get a more representative sampling of the village on boards?)
- invite community partners to educate us on services (such as the food pantry, Housing Forward, mental health)

Table 4:

- Demographic and trends dialogue
- Tax rates compared with other communities
- Infrastructure comparisons / discussions with other communities to study / discuss how other communities address/handle aging infrastructures as this issue is an ongoing issue in older communities like Oak Park.

PARTICIPANTS AT THIS TABLE:

Table 1: Paul Aeschleman, Ted Foss, Jim Gates, Steven Isoye, Cara Pavlicek, & Holly Spurlock

Table 2: Peter Barber, Mary Cozzens, Win Fox, Steve Gevinson, Sandy Lentz, & Bob Spatz

Table 3: Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Jim O'Connor, Clarmarie Keenan, Bob Tucker, & Dave Wick

Table 4: Rupa Datta, Amy Felton, Sara Spivy, Jim Taglia, & Jeff Weissglass

Table 5: Jan Arnold, Graham Brisben, Tom Cofsky, Carol Kelly, Colette Lueck, & Gavin Morgan

PUBLIC TABLE COMMENTS

- A**
- Library is doing a great job with innovation and we appreciate the effort to reduce the tax burden.

- D**
- Continue support for the CEC
 - Continue joint grant applications for systemic change as opposed to individual programming

F

- Centralize application for subsidy support for fee based programs using a sliding scale – to promote access to all programs for all residents

G

- Continue looking for cost savings

H

- Happy to see cooperation among boards! And inclusion of public voice is much appreciated. Inclusion of qualitative data e.g. focus groups, surveys, etc. would be helpful

I

- Convene group to examine community center as a collective community effort

PARTICIPANTS AT THIS TABLE

Judith Alexander, Ann Courter, Linda Francis, Rebecca Morrow-Nye, & Igor S. (Wednesday Journal)

PUBLIC COMMENT CARDS SUBMITTED

A. Questions were directed to all taxing bodies:

Linda Francis

lfrancis@oprfcf.org

- “Have studies /research been done to determine the impact (pro and con) of the new high rises on the taxing bodies? (Particularly w/r/t youth?) If so, is that data available? E.g. schools, recreation, child care, etc.”
- “What efforts are underway to collect, manage, analyze data, and how can we collaborate this effort and communication with the community?”

B. This question was directed to the Library, Parks, Township, and Village boards

Win Fox

foxwinif@gmail.com

- “On demographic slide about age on p. 61, the population over 65 has dropped by over half since 1970. Isn’t that a trend we should be concerned with?”

C. Questions directed to a single taxing body have been communicated to IGOV members or those taxing bodies. Each taxing body is asked to respond to those citizens directly.